CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CONTAINING

THE PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES

OF THE

FIFTY-SIXTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION.

VOLUME XXXIII.

WASHINGTON:
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.
1900.

VOLUME XXXIII, PART I.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD,

FIFTY-SIXTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE FIFTY-SIXTH CONGRESS.

FIRST SESSION.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *December 4, 1899.*

The first Monday of December being the day prescribed by the Constitution of the United States for the annual meeting of Congress, the first session of the Fifty-sixth Congress commenced this day.

The Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. WILLIAM P. FRYE, a Senator from the State of Maine) took the chair and called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock noon.

PRAYER.

Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D., Chaplain to the Senate, offered the following prayer:

O Eternal God, we come into Thy presence bowed and heavy in heart under a weight of sorrow which words can not express, for we miss the presence of our beloved and honored Vice-President, a man to whom the nation gave the second place of honor and dignity in the land, and who, by his manliness, his sweet and genial character and bearing, won for himself the affection and warm regard of all who were brought in contact with him, so that we who remain behind feel that we have had a personal loss of the highest and tenderest sort.

Bless, we beseech Thee, the broken-hearted wife and the son. Fulfill Thy promise to be the stay of the widow and the father of the fatherless. Grant Thy blessing unto all his friends and brethren, the members of the Senate. Keep us in Thy ways, and may we bear in mind the testimony of this man's life and character to the best, the highest, and the noblest things. We humbly ask, through Jesus Christ our Saviour. Amen.

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY], who is not able to be present on account of personal illness, I present the credentials of the Hon. James P. Taliaferro as a duly elected Senator from the State of Florida. I ask that the credentials may be read and placed upon the files.

The credentials of James P. Taliaferro, chosen by the legislature of Florida a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1899, were read, and ordered to be filed.

Mr. PENROSE presented the credentials of Matthew S. Quay, appointed by the governor of Pennsylvania a Senator from that State; which were read, as follows:

In the name and by authority of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, executive department.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

Whereas a vacancy exists in the representation of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the Senate of the United States by reason of the expiration of the constitutional term of the Hon. Matthew Stanley Quay and the failure of the general assembly of the said Commonwealth to elect his successor:

Therefore, know ye, That reposing especial trust and confidence in the prudence, integrity, and ability of the Hon. Matthew Stanley Quay, I, William A. Stone, governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in conformity to the provisions of clause 2 of section 3 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States, have appointed, and do by these presents commission, him a Senator to represent this State in the Senate of the United States, to supply the vacancy in the Senate of the United States occasioned by the expiration of the term of office of the Hon. Matthew Stanley Quay, which occurred on the 4th day of March last.

He is, therefore, to have and to hold the said office, together with all the rights, powers, and privileges thereunto belonging, or by law in anywise appertaining, until the next meeting of the legislature of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, or until his successor shall be duly elected and qualified, if he shall so long behave himself well.

This appointment to compute from the day of the date hereof.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State at the city of Harrisburg, this 21st day of April, in the year of our Lord 1899, and of the Commonwealth the one hundred and twenty-third.

[SEAL.] WILLIAM A. STONE.

By the governor:

W. W. GRIEST,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the credentials be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. CHANDLER. There is no objection to that course. I submit a resolution which I ask may be referred at the same time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri moves that the credentials just read be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CHANDLER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections:

Resolved, That Matthew S. Quay be admitted as a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania in accordance with his appointment made on April 21, 1899, by the governor of said State.

Mr. BURROWS. There has been placed in my hands a memorial in the nature of a remonstrance against the seating of the appointee by the governor of the State of Pennsylvania, and I ask that it be received and referred also.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The memorial will be received and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I present a remonstrance by 78 members of the legislature of Pennsylvania protesting against the seating of Hon. M. S. Quay as a Senator in this body. I move that the memorial be referred, with the credentials and other papers, to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented the credentials of Monroe L. Hayward, chosen by the legislature of Nebraska a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1899; which were read and ordered to be filed.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I hope that the usual and orderly method of procedure will now go on; that the Senators-elect whose credentials are undisputed will be admitted to take the oath, and that if any Senator presents himself about whom there is a question he will stand aside and the proper order be taken. My reason for insisting upon this course is that so many Senators as are clearly entitled to their seats ought to be permitted to take part in every vote which we may pass.

SWEARING IN OF SENATORS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senators-elect whose credentials have been received and are on file will present themselves in groups of four to take the required oath of office. The Secretary will call alphabetically the names of the newly elected Senators.

The Secretary read the names of—

Nelson W. Aldrich, of the State of Rhode Island.

William B. Bate, of the State of Tennessee.

Albert J. Beveridge, of the State of Indiana.

Julius C. Burrows, of the State of Michigan.

As their names were called the respective Senators-elect (with the exception of Mr. Bate) came forward, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to them.

The Secretary read the names of—

Clarence D. Clark, of the State of Wyoming.

William A. Clark, of the State of Montana.

Francis M. Cockrell, of the State of Missouri.

Charles A. Culberson, of the State of Texas.

As their names were called the respective Senators-elect came forward, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to them.

The Secretary read the names of—

John W. Daniel, of the State of Virginia.

Cushman K. Davis, of the State of Minnesota.

Chauncey M. Depew, of the State of New York.

Addison G. Foster, of the State of Washington.

As their names were called the respective Senators-elect came forward, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to them.

The Secretary read the names of—

Eugene Hale, of the State of Maine.

Marcus A. Hanna, of the State of Ohio.

Joseph R. Hawley, of the State of Connecticut.

Monroe L. Hayward, of the State of Nebraska.

Mr. THURSTON. I desire to announce that my colleague, Senator-elect Hayward, is confined at his residence by illness and can not be present to take the oath at this time.

As their names were called the respective Senators-elect (with the exception of Mr. Hayward) came forward, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to them.

The Secretary read the names of—

John Kean, of the State of New Jersey.

Henry Cabot Lodge, of the State of Massachusetts.

Louis E. McComas, of the State of Maryland.

Porter J. McCumber, of the State of North Dakota.

As their names were called the respective Senators-elect came forward, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to them.

The Secretary read the names of—

Hernando D. Money, of the State of Mississippi.

Redfield Proctor, of the State of Vermont.

Joseph V. Quarles, of the State of Wisconsin.

Nathan B. Scott, of the State of West Virginia.

William M. Stewart, of the State of Nevada.

James P. Taliaferro, of the State of Florida.

As their names were called the respective Senators-elect came forward, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to them.

SENATORS PRESENT.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The roll of the Senate will now be called by the Secretary.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

From the State of—

Alabama—John T. Morgan and Edmund W. Pettus.

Arkansas—James H. Berry and James K. Jones.

California—George C. Perkins.

Colorado—Henry M. Teller and Edward O. Wolcott.

Connecticut—Joseph R. Hawley and Orville H. Platt.

Delaware—Richard R. Kenney.

Florida—James P. Taliaferro.

Georgia—Augustus O. Bacon and Alexander S. Clay.

Idaho—Henry Heitfeld and George L. Shoup.

Illinois—Shelby M. Cullom and William E. Mason.

Indiana—Albert J. Beveridge and Charles W. Fairbanks.

Iowa—William B. Allison and John H. Gear.

Kansas—Lucien Baker and William A. Harris.

Kentucky—William Lindsay.

Louisiana—Samuel D. McEnery.

Maine—William P. Frye and Eugene Hale.

Maryland—Louis E. McComas and George L. Wellington.

Massachusetts—George F. Hoar and Henry Cabot Lodge.

Michigan—Julius C. Burrows and James McMillan.

Minnesota—Cushman K. Davis and Knute Nelson.

Mississippi—Hernando D. Money and William V. Sullivan.

Missouri—Francis M. Cockrell and George G. Vest.

Montana—Thomas H. Carter and William A. Clark.

Nebraska—John M. Thurston.

Nevada—John P. Jones and William M. Stewart.

New Hampshire—William E. Chandler and Jacob H. Gallinger.

New Jersey—John Kean and William J. Sewell.

New York—Chauncey M. Depew and Thomas C. Platt.

North Carolina—Jeter C. Pritchard.

North Dakota—Henry C. Hansbrough and Porter J. McCumber.

Ohio—Joseph B. Foraker and Marcus A. Hanna.

Oregon—Joseph Simon.

Pennsylvania—Boies Penrose.

Rhode Island—Nelson W. Aldrich and George P. Wetmore.

South Carolina—John L. McLaurin and Benjamin R. Tillman.

South Dakota—James H. Kyle and R. F. Pettigrew.

Tennessee—Thomas B. Turley.

Texas—Charles A. Culberson.

Utah—Joseph L. Rawlins.

Vermont—Redfield Proctor and Jonathan Ross.

Virginia—John W. Daniel and Thomas S. Martin.

Washington—Addison G. Foster and George Turner.

West Virginia—Stephen B. Elkins and Nathan B. Scott.

Wisconsin—Joseph V. Quarles and John C. Spooner.

Wyoming—Clarence D. Clark and Francis E. Warren.

Mr. McENERY. I wish to state that the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY] is absent on account of severe illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-eight Senators having responded to their names, there is a quorum of the Senate present.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE.

Mr. CULLOM submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled, and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed, to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

Ordered, That the committee be appointed by the President pro tempore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed as the committee Mr. PLATT of Connecticut and Mr. JONES of Arkansas.

HOUR OF MEETING.

Mr. HOAR submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian until otherwise ordered.

SENATOR FROM MONTANA.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I present a memorial protesting against the validity of the election of WILLIAM A. CLARK, of Silver Bow County, on the 28th day of January, 1899, as a Senator from the State of Montana in the Senate of the United States for six years from the 4th day of March, 1899, for the reasons set forth in the protest or memorial. The memorial is signed by Henry C. Stiff, speaker of the house of representatives, and twenty-six members of the legislative assembly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What disposition does the Senator from Montana desire to have made of the memorial?

Mr. CARTER. I request that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, if that course meets the view of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CHANDLER. Let it be referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The memorial will be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. CHANDLER. I request that it be printed for the use of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order to print will be made.

Mr. CARTER. I also present a petition to the Senate, praying this honorable body at the earliest practicable moment to set a time and place for the hearing, before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, of the protest herein set forth. The protest calls in question the right of Mr. CLARK to a seat in this body. The petition is signed by Robert B. Smith, governor; T. E. Collins, State treasurer; Henry C. Stiff, speaker of the house of representatives, Sixth legislative assembly of Montana; Thomas W. Poindexter, jr., State auditor; A. J. CAMPBELL, member of Congress; and Charles S. Hartman, ex-Representative in Congress from the State of Montana.

I request that the same disposition be made of the petition as of the memorial just presented by me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petition will be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

DEATH OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT.

Mr. SEWELL. Mr. President, it becomes my painful duty to announce to the Senate the death of GARRET A. HOBART, of New Jersey, Vice-President of the United States and presiding officer of this body, and to offer the resolutions which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has received with the deepest regret information of the death of GARRET AUGUSTUS HOBART, late Vice-President of the United States.

Resolved, That the business of the Senate be suspended in order that the distinguished public services of the deceased and the virtues of his private character may be fittingly commemorated.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be instructed to communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

Mr. SEWELL. I ask that the resolutions may lie on the table, to be called up by me at a convenient season in the near future.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be so ordered.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. President, I move, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Vice-President, that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 5, 1899, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *December 4, 1899.*

This day, in compliance with the provisions of the Constitution, the members-elect of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-sixth Congress assembled in their Hall and were called to order by Mr. ALEXANDER MCDOWELL, the Clerk of the last House.

The CLERK. The House will now be in order.

Prayer will be offered by the Chaplain of the last House, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN.

The Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D., Chaplain of the last House, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, in whom all our longings, hopes, and aspirations are centered, both as individuals and as a nation, humbly and most reverently we bow before Thee, knowing full well that without Thee we can do nothing; but with Thee we are capable of the accomplishment of great things, and thus fulfill our individual destiny and make, to greater perfection, the genius of our Government.

We bless Thee for that providence which has upheld, sustained, and guided us through all the vicissitudes of the past, for the prosperity which now smiles upon us, for the intelligence, moral excellency, and religious attainments of our people, and for that prestige which under Thy providence has made us strong and influential throughout the world. We pray Thee that the onward march of progress may not be impeded by the new conditions which perforce have come upon us.

Make, we beseech Thee, for wisdom and righteousness our statesmen, that all the difficult and intricate problems which shall arise may be justly, wisely, and amicably adjusted.

To this end we most fervently pray for the President of these United States and all of his official advisers, that in the affairs of State he may be guided by the light of heaven.

Hear us when we commend to Thy special care the Congress now convened. Before it is an open page; and at its close we pray Thee that it may be writ with history which the American people may be proud to look upon and which shall meet Thy approbation. We pray that Thy Holy Spirit may come mightily upon the Speaker and upon all the members on this floor.

Since last we met many members who otherwise would be here have been removed by death. We lift up our hearts in behalf of their friends and their loved ones.

It would seem a great calamity that has been visited upon us in the death of our Vice-President. But Thou art God, and doeth all things well. May his character, unsullied, and his great example in private and in public life be an inspiration to us all, and may Thy loving arms be about his bereaved wife and child.

These things we ask in the spirit of our Lord, Christ, our Saviour. Amen.

The CLERK. The hour, under the Constitution, for the convening of the Fifty-sixth Congress having arrived, the Clerk will call the roll by States to ascertain if a quorum of members be present. Members will answer to their names when called.

The roll was called, showing the presence of the following Members and Delegates:

ALABAMA.

George W. Taylor.
Jesse F. Stallings.
Henry D. Clayton.
Gaston A. Robbins.
Willis Brewer.
John H. Bankhead.
John L. Burnett.
O. W. Underwood.

ARKANSAS.

Philip D. McCulloch.
John S. Little.
Thomas C. McRae.
William L. Terry.
Hugh A. Dinsmore.
Stephen Brundidge, jr.

CALIFORNIA.

John A. Barham.
Marion De Vries.
Victor H. Metcalf.
Julius Kahn.
Eugene F. Loud.
Russell J. Waters.
James Carson Needham.

COLORADO.

John F. Shafroth.
John C. Bell.

CONNECTICUT.

E. Stevens Henry.
Nehemiah D. Sperry.
Charles A. Russell.
Ebenezer J. Hill.

DELAWARE.

John H. Hoffecker.

FLORIDA.

Stephen M. Sparkman.
Robert W. Davis.

GEORGIA.

Rufus E. Lester.
James M. Griggs.
E. B. Lewis.
W. C. Adamson.
Leonidas F. Livingston.
John W. Maddox.
Farish Carter Tate.
William H. Fleming.
William G. Brantley.

IDAHO.

Edgar Wilson.

ILLINOIS.

James R. Mann.
William Lorimer.
George P. Foster.
Thomas Cusack.
Edward T. Noonan.
Henry S. Boutell.
George E. Foss.
Albert J. Hopkins.
Robert R. Hitt.
George W. Prince.
Walter Reeves.
Joseph G. Cannon.
Vespasian Warner.
Joseph V. Graff.
Benjamin F. Marsh.
William E. Williams.
Ben F. Caldwell.
Thomas M. Jett.
Joseph B. Crowley.
James R. Williams.
W. A. Rodenberg.
George W. Smith.

INDIANA.

James A. Hemenway.
Robert W. Miers.
William T. Zenor.
Francis M. Griffith.
George W. Faris.
James E. Watson.
Jesse Overstreet.
George W. Cromer.
Charles B. Landis.
Edgar D. Crumpacker.
George W. Steele.
James M. Robinson.
Abram L. Brick.

IOWA.

Thomas Hedge.
Joe R. Lane.
David B. Henderson.
Gilbert N. Haugen.
Robert G. Cousins.
John F. Lacey.
John A. T. Hull.
William P. Hepburn.
Smith McPherson.
Jonathan P. Dolliver.
Lot Thomas.

KANSAS.

W. J. Bailey (at large).
Charles Curtis.
J. D. Bowersock.
Edwin R. Ridgely.
J. M. Miller.
W. A. Calderhead.
W. A. Reeder.
Chester I. Long.

KENTUCKY.

Charles K. Wheeler.
Henry D. Allen.
John S. Rhea.
David H. Smith.
Oscar Turner.
Albert S. Berry.
G. G. Gilbert.
Samuel J. Pugh.
Thomas Y. Fitzpatrick.
Vincent Boreing.

LOUISIANA.

Adolph Meyer.
Robert C. Davey.
Robert F. Broussard.
Phanor Brazeale.
Joseph E. Ransdell.
Samuel M. Robertson.

MAINE.

Amos L. Allen.
Charles E. Littlefield.
Edwin C. Burleigh.
Charles A. Boutelle.

MARYLAND.

John Walter Smith.
William B. Baker.
Frank C. Wachter.
James W. Denny.
Sydney E. Mudd.
George A. Pearre.

MASSACHUSETTS.

George P. Lawrence.
Frederick H. Gillett.
John R. Thayer.
George W. Weymouth.
William S. Knox.
William H. Moody.
Ernest W. Roberts.
Samuel W. McCall.
John F. Fitzgerald.
Henry F. Naphon.
Charles F. Sprague.
William C. Lovering.
William S. Greene.

MICHIGAN.

John B. Corliss.
Henry C. Smith.
Washington Gardner.
Edward L. Hamilton.
William Alden Smith.
Samuel W. Smith.
Edgar Weeks.
J. W. Fordney.
Roswell P. Bishop.
Rousseau O. Crump.
William S. Mesick.
Carlos D. Shelden.

MINNESOTA.

James A. Tawney.
James T. McCleary.
Joel P. Heatwole.
Fred C. Stevens.
Loren Fletcher.
Page Morris.
Frank M. Eddy.

MISSISSIPPI.

John M. Allen.
Thomas Spight.
Andrew F. Fox.
John S. Williams.
Frank A. McLain.
Patrick Henry.

MISSOURI.

James T. Lloyd.
John Dougherty.
Charles F. Cochran.
William S. Cowherd.
David A. DeArmond.
James Cooney.
Dorsey W. Shackleford.
Champ Clark.
Richard Bartholdt.
Charles F. Joy.
Charles E. Pearce.
Edward Robb.
William D. Vandiver
Maecenas E. Benton.

MONTANA.

A. J. Campbell.

NEBRASKA.

E. J. Burkett.
David H. Mercer.
John S. Robinson.
William L. Stark.
Roderick D. Sutherland.
William Neville.

NEVADA.

Francis G. Newlands.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Cyrus A. Sulloway. Frank G. Clarke.

NEW JERSEY.

Henry C. Loudenslager. James F. Stewart.
John J. Gardner. Richard Wayne Parker.
Benjamin F. Howell. William D. Daly.
Joshua S. Salmon. Charles N. Fowler.

NEW YORK.

Townsend Scudder. John H. Ketcham.
John J. Fitzgerald. Aaron V. S. Cochrane.
Edmund H. Driggs. Martin H. Glynn.
Bertram T. Clayton. John K. Stewart.
Frank E. Wilson. Lucius N. Littauer.
Mitchell May. Louis W. Emerson.
Nicholas Muller. Charles A. Chickering.
Daniel J. Riordon. James S. Sherman.
Thomas J. Bradley. George W. Ray.
Amos J. Cummings. Michael E. Driscoll.
William Sulzer. Sereno E. Payne.
George B. McClellan. James W. Wadsworth.
Jefferson M. Levy. James M. E. O'Grady.
William Astor Chanler. William H. Ryan.
Jacob Ruppert, jr. De Alva S. Alexander.
John Q. Underhill. E. B. Vreeland.
Arthur S. Tompkins.

NORTH CAROLINA.

John H. Small, John D. Bellamy,
George H. White. Theodore F. Kluttz.
Charles R. Thomas. Romulus Z. Linney.
John W. Atwater. William T. Crawford.
William W. Kitchin.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Burleigh F. Spalding.

OHIO.

William B. Shattuc. John J. Lentz.
Jacob H. Bromwell. James A. Norton.
John L. Brenner. Winfield S. Kerr.
Robert B. Gordon, Henry C. Van Voorhis.
David Meekison. Joseph J. Gill.
Seth W. Brown. John Anderson McDowell.
Walter L. Weaver. Robert W. Tayler.
Archibald Lybrand. Charles Dick.
James H. Southard. Fremont O. Phillips.
Stephen R. Morgan. Theo. E. Burton.
Charles H. Grosvenor.

OREGON.

Thomas H. Tongue. M. A. Moody.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Galusha A. Grow (at large). Charles Frederick Wright.
Samuel A. Davenport (at large). Horace B. Packer.
Henry H. Bingham. Rufus K. Polk.
Robert Adams, jr. Thaddeus M. Mahon.
James R. Young. Edward D. Ziegler.
Alfred C. Harmer. Joseph E. Thropp.
Thomas S. Butler. Summers M. Jack.
Irving P. Wanger. John Dalzell.
Laird H. Barber. William H. Graham.
Henry D. Greene. Ernest F. Acheson.
Marriott Brosius. Joseph B. Showalter.
William Connell. Athelston Gaston.
Stanley W. Davenport. Joseph C. Sibley.
James W. Ryan. James K. P. Hall.
Marlin E. Olmsted.

RHODE ISLAND.

Melville Bull. Adin B. Capron.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

William Elliott. D. E. Finley.
W. Jasper Talbert. James Norton.
Asbury C. Latimer. J. William Stokes.
Stanyarne Wilson.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

[At large.]

Robert J. Gamble. Charles H. Burke.

TENNESSEE.

Walter P. Brownlow. John W. Gaines.
Henry R. Gibson. Nicholas N. Cox.
John A. Moon. Thetus W. Sims.
Charles E. Snodgrass. Rice A. Pierce.
James D. Richardson. E. W. Carmack.

TEXAS.

Thomas H. Ball. R. L. Henry.
Sam Bronson Cooper. Samuel W. T. Lanham.
R. C. De Graffenreid. Albert S. Burleson.
John L. Sheppard. Rudolph Kleberg.
Joseph W. Bailey. James L. Slayden.
R. E. Burke. John H. Stephens.

UTAH.

Brigham H. Roberts.

VERMONT.

H. Henry Powers. William W. Grout.

VIRGINIA.

William A. Jones. Peter J. Otey.
William A. Young. James Hay.
John Lamb. John F. Rixey.
Sydney P. Epes. William F. Rhea.
Claude A. Swanson. J. M. Quarles.

WASHINGTON.

[At large.]

W. L. Jones. F. W. Cushman.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Blackburn B. Dovener. David E. Johnston.
Alston G. Dayton. R. H. Freer.

WISCONSIN.

Henry A. Cooper. James H. Davidson.
Herman B. Dahle. John J. Esch.
Joseph W. Babcock. Edward S. Minor.
Theobold Otjen. Alexander Stewart.
Samuel S. Barney. John J. Jenkins.

WYOMING.

Frank W. Mondell.

ARIZONA.

J. F. Wilson.

NEW MEXICO.

Pedro Perea.

OKLAHOMA.

Dennis T. Flynn.

The CLERK. Three hundred and forty-seven members have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The next business in order will be the election of a Speaker.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Clerk, I move the adoption of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the House do now proceed by viva voce vote to the election of a Speaker to preside over its deliberations during the Fifty-sixth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

The CLERK. Nominations are now in order.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Clerk, I present the name of DAVID BREMNER HENDERSON, a Representative in Congress from the State of Iowa, for Speaker of the House. [Applause.]

Mr. HAY. Mr. Clerk, I present the name of JAMES D. RICHARDSON, a Representative in Congress from the State of Tennessee, for Speaker. [Applause.]

Mr. RIDGELY. Mr. Clerk, I present the name of JOHN C. BELL, a Representative in Congress from the State of Colorado, for Speaker. [Applause.]

Mr. WILSON of Idaho. Mr. Clerk, I present the name of FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS, a Representative in Congress from the State of Nevada, for Speaker. [Applause.]

The CLERK. Are there any other nominations for Speaker? If not, the following tellers are appointed: Mr. MORRIS of Minnesota, Mr. UNDERWOOD of Alabama, Mr. OVERSTREET of Indiana, and Mr. CARMACK of Tennessee. They will please take their places at the desk.

The tellers took their places at the Clerk's desk.

The CLERK. The roll will now be called, and when members' names are called they will announce the name of the candidate for Speaker for whom they desire to vote.

The question was taken; and there were—for Mr. HENDERSON 181, for Mr. RICHARDSON 156, for Mr. BELL 4, for Mr. NEWLANDS 2, not voting 12; as follows:

For Mr. David B. Henderson of Iowa—181.

Acheson,	Dahle,	Hopkins,	Needham,
Adams,	Dalzell,	Howell,	O'Grady,
Alexander,	Davenport,	Samuel Hull,	Olmsted,
Allen, Me.	Davidson,	Jack,	Otjen,
Babcock.	Dayton,	Jenkins,	Overstreet,
Bailey, Kans.	Dick,	Jones, Wash.	Packer, Pa.
Baker,	Dolliver,	Joy,	Parker, N. J.
Barham,	Dovener,	Kahn,	Payne,
Barney,	Driscoll,	Kerr,	Pearce, Mo.
Bartholdt,	Eddy,	Ketcham,	Pearre,
Bingham,	Emerson,	Knox,	Phillips,
Bishop,	Esch,	Lacey,	Powers,
Boreing,	Faris,	Landis,	Prince,
Boutell, Ill.	Fletcher,	Lane,	Pugh,
Boutelle, Me.	Fordney,	Lawrence,	Ray,
Bowersock,	Foss,	Linney,	Reeder,
Brick,	Fowler,	Littauer,	Reeves,
Bromwell,	Freer,	Littlefield,	Roberts, Mass.
Brosius,	Gamble,	Long,	Rodenberg,
Brown,	Gardner, Mich.	Lorimer,	Russell,
Brownlow,	Gardner, N. J.	Loud,	Shattuc,
Bull,	Gibson,	Loudenslager,	Shelden,
Burke, S. Dak.	Gill,	Lovering,	Sherman,
Burkett,	Gillett, Mass.	Lybrand,	Showalter,
Burleigh,	Graff,	McCall,	Smith, Ill.
Burton,	Graham,	McCleary,	Smith, H. C.
Calderhead,	Greene, Mass.	McPherson,	Smith, Samuel W.
Cannon,	Grosvenor,	Mahon,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Capron,	Grout,	Mann,	Southard,
Chickering,	Grow,	Marsh,	Spalding,
Clarke, N. H.	Hamilton,	Mercer,	Sperry,
Cochrane, N. Y.	Harmer,	Mesick,	Sprague,
Connell,	Haugen,	Metcalf,	Steele,
Cooper, Wis.	Heatwole,	Miller,	Stevens, Minn.
Corliss,	Hedge,	Minor,	Stewart, N. J.
Cousins,	Hemenway,	Mondell,	Stewart, N. Y.
Cromer,	Henry, Conn.	Moody, Mass.	Stewart, Wis.
Crump,	Hepburn,	Moody, Oreg.	Sulloway,
Crumpacker,	Hill,	Morgan,	Tawney,
Curtis,	Hitt,	Morris,	Tayler, Ohio
Cushman,	Hoffecker,	Mudd.	Thomas, Iowa

Thropp,	Wachter,	Watson,	Wright,
Tompkins,	Wadsworth,	Weaver,	Young, Pa.
Tongue,	Wanger,	Weeks,	
Van Voorhis,	Warner,	Weymouth,	
Vreeland,	Waters,	White,	

For Mr. James D. Richardson of Tennessee—156.

Adamson,	Davey,	Lester,	Ruppert,
Allen, Ky.	Davis,	Levy,	Ryan, N. Y.
Allen, Miss.	De Armond,	Lewis,	Ryan, Pa.
Atwater,	De Graffenreid,	Little,	Salmon,
Bailey, Tex.	De Vries,	Livingston,	Scudder,
Ball,	Denny,	Lloyd,	Shakleford,
Bankhead,	Dinsmore,	McClellan,	Sheppard,
Barber,	Dougherty,	McCulloch,	Sibley,
Bellamy,	Driggs,	McDowell,	Sims,
Benton,	Elliott,	McLain,	Slayden,
Berry,	Epes,	McRae,	Small,
Bradley,	Finley,	Maddox,	Smith, Ky.
Brantley,	Fitzgerald, Mass.	May,	Smith, Md.
Breazeale,	Fitzgerald, N. Y.	Meekison,	Snodgrass,
Brenner,	Fitzpatrick,	Meyer, La.	Sparkman,
Brewer,	Fleming,	Miers, Ind.	Spight,
Broussard,	Foster,	Moon,	Stephens, Tex.
Brundidge,	Fox,	Muller,	Stokes,
Burke, Tex.	Gaines,	Naphen,	Sulzer,
Burleson,	Gilbert,	Newlands,	Swanson,
Burnett,	Glynn,	Noonan,	Talbert,
Caldwell,	Gordon,	Norton, Ohio	Tate,
Campbell,	Green, Pa.	Norton, S. C.	Taylor, Ala.
Carmack,	Griffith,	Otey,	Terry,
Chanler,	Griggs,	Pierce, Tenn.	Thayer,
Clark, Mo.	Hall,	Polk,	Thomas, N. C.
Clayton, Ala.	Hay,	Quarles,	Turner,
Clayton, N. Y.	Henry, Miss.	Ransdell,	Underhill,
Cochran, Mo.	Henry, Tex.	Rhea, Ky.	Underwood,
Cooney,	Jett,	Rhea, Va.	Vandiver,
Cooper, Tex.	Johnston,	Riordon,	Wheeler, Ky.
Cowherd,	Jones, Va.	Rixey,	Williams, J. R.
Cox,	Kitchin,	Robb,	Williams, W. E.
Crawford,	Kleberg,	Robbins,	Williams, Miss.
Crowley,	Kluttz,	Roberts, Utah	Wilson, N. Y.
Cummings,	Lamb,	Robertson, La.	Wilson, S. C.
Cusack,	Lanham,	Robinson, Ind.	Young, Va.
Daly,	Latimer,	Robinson, Nebr.	Zenor,
Davenport,	Stanley Lentz,	Rucker,	Ziegler.

For Mr. John C. Bell of Colorado—4.

Neville,	Ridgely,	Stark,	Sutherland.

For Mr. Francis G. Newlands of Nevada—2.

Shafroth,	Wilson, Idaho.

Not voting—12.

Bartlett,	Catchings,	Hawley,	Richardson,
Bell,	Gaston,	Howard,	Stallings,
Butler,	Gillet, N. Y.	McAleer,	Wheeler, Ala.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Clerk, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] is detained from attendance on the House on account of death in his family, and has requested me to make a pair with him. I voted for General HENDERSON and desire to withdraw my vote. I understand the gentleman from Georgia would have voted for the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON].

The CLERK. The request will be granted, if there be no objection.

There was no objection.

The CLERK. The tellers agree in their tally. For Speaker, Mr. HENDERSON received 177 votes; Mr. RICHARDSON, 153 votes; Mr. BELL, 4 votes; Mr. NEWLANDS, 2 votes. Mr. HENDERSON, having received a majority of all the votes cast, is duly elected Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-sixth Congress. [Loud applause.] I appoint as a committee to conduct the Speaker-elect to the chair Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee, Mr. BELL of Colorado, and Mr. NEWLANDS of Nevada. [Loud applause.]

Mr. HENDERSON, on appearing with the members designated, was greeted with loud general applause, which was renewed when he ascended to the chair.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Gentlemen of the House: The committee appointed to wait upon the Speaker and inform him of his election have discharged that duty. I take pleasure in presenting to the House of Representatives the Hon. DAVID B. HENDERSON of Iowa, who has just been elected Speaker of the House. [Loud applause.]

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen of the House of Representatives: The voice of this House has called me to grave responsibilities. For that call I am most profoundly grateful, and I am keenly sensible of the weight of the responsibilities that attach to this great office. I am encouraged, however, by the thought that no member of this body can escape responsibility, both to his people and to his country. All of us are under bonds to do our best.

The approval of the country, the approval of one's own conscience, the attainment of great results, are not secured by petty contests on narrow fields, but must be sought and won on broad, patriotic lines of thought and action.

It is my duty, as it will be my aim and pleasure, to impartially administer the laws adopted for our government, but no Speaker can be successful unless he has the cooperation of the members of this House.

The generous partiality and kindness that have been shown to me by the entire membership here encourage me to believe that such imperfections as I may have will be modified by the considerate and supporting disposition of those constituting this great body.

I am ready to take the oath of office. [Loud applause.]

The CLERK. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HARMER], longest in continuous service of this House, will administer the oath to the Speaker-elect.

The oath of office was administered to the Speaker by Mr. HARMER.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

The SPEAKER then administered the oath of office to the Members and Delegates, the Members and Delegates presenting themselves as their names were called by States and Territories in the area in front of the Speaker's desk and taking the oath prescribed by law.

Mr. BROSIUS and Mr. BUTLER qualified by affirmation.

REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT FROM UTAH.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio (when the State of Utah was called). Mr. Speaker, I object to the swearing in of the Representative-elect from Utah and to his taking a seat in this body. I do so, Mr. Speaker, on my responsibility as a member of this House, and because specific, serious, and apparently well-grounded charges of ineligibility are made against him. A transcript of the proceedings of court in Utah evidences the fact that the claimant was in 1889 convicted, or that he pleaded guilty, of the crime of unlawful cohabitation. Affidavits and other papers in my possession indicate that ever since then he has been persistently guilty of the same crime, and that ever since then he has been and is now a polygamist. If this transcript and these affidavits and papers tell the truth, the member-elect from Utah is, in my judgment, ineligible to be a member of this House of Representatives both because of the statutory disqualification, created by the Edmunds law, and for higher and graver and quite as sound reasons. I ought also to say, in addition to what I have just said, that I have in my possession a certified copy of the court record under which the claimant to this seat was supposed to be naturalized, and that eminent counsel assert that if that be the record in the case there is grave doubt if the claimant is a citizen of the United States. I offer and express no opinion upon that proposition.

Mr. Speaker, if it were possible to emphasize the gravity of these charges and of the responsibility that is at this moment imposed upon this House, we will find that emphasis in the memorials, only a small part of which could be physically cared for in this Hall, but all of which I now present to the House, from over 7,000,000 American men and women, protesting against the entrance into this House of the Representative-elect from Utah.

Mr. Speaker, I yield a moment to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MCRAE].

Mr. MCRAE. Mr. Speaker, I also object to the gentleman from Utah being sworn in, and I adopt the facts the gentleman from Ohio has given. If these facts are true, the member ought not to be admitted. He is a polygamist, and his election is an assault upon the American home, an effort to degrade American womanhood and to destroy the sacred marriage system of one man to one woman. He has not only violated the laws of the United States, but also the fundamental compact made by his State with her Government. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that an opportunity will be given for a thorough and complete investigation. If the facts charged can be proved or established, there ought not to be a single member of this House who would vote to have him take his seat. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The House will observe order. The Chair will request the gentleman from Utah to step aside until the rest of the members are sworn in.

Mr. ROBERTS of Utah. In doing so, Mr. Speaker, I wish to have it understood that I waive no right in this matter.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can assure the gentleman that in stepping aside he will waive none of his rights.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas it is charged that Brigham H. Roberts, a Representative-elect to the Fifty-sixth Congress from the State of Utah, is ineligible to a seat in the House of Representatives; and

Whereas such charge is made through a member of this House, on his responsibility as such member and on the basis, as he asserts, of public records, affidavits, and papers evidencing such ineligibility:

Resolved, That the question of the prima facie right of Brigham H. Roberts to be sworn in as a Representative from the State of Utah in the Fifty-sixth Congress, as well as of his final right to a seat therein as such Representative, be referred to a special committee of nine members of the House, to be appointed by the Speaker; and until such committee shall report upon and the House decide such question and right the said Brigham H. Roberts shall not be sworn in or be permitted to occupy a seat in this House; and said committee shall have power to send for persons and papers and examine witnesses on oath in relation to the subject-matter of this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution which has been read.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I understood that there had been an agreement reached by which the consideration of this resolution would be postponed until after the reading of the President's message on to-morrow. If that is true, I have nothing to say at present.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. I understood that such an understanding was to be arrived at at some such juncture as this, and I ask unanimous consent that the consideration of the resolution be postponed until that time.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Until after the reading of the message to-morrow?

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. Until after the reading of the message to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. Unanimous consent is asked to postpone the consideration of the resolution until after the reading of the President's message to-morrow. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The oath of office was then administered to the remaining members.

ELECTION OF CLERK AND OTHER OFFICERS.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of completing the organization of the House, I offer the following resolution and ask for its immediate consideration:

Resolved, That Alexander McDowell, of the State of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That Henry Casson, of the State of Wisconsin, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives;

That William J. Glenn, of the State of New York, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

That Joseph C. McElroy, of the State of Ohio, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives; and

That Henry N. Couden, of the State of Michigan, be, and he is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the resolution by striking out all after the word "*Resolved*" and inserting the following:

That James A. Kerr, of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That E. V. Brookshire, of the State of Indiana, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives;

That Henry H. Mohler, of the State of Illinois, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

That George L. Browning, of Virginia, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives; and

That E. B. Bagby, of the State of Virginia, be, and he is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia to amend the resolution presented by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

The original resolution offered by Mr. GROSVENOR was agreed to.

The officers-elect mentioned in the resolution appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following resolution for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to inform the President of the United States that the House of Representatives has elected DAVID B. HENDERSON, a Representative from the State of Iowa, as Speaker, and ALEXANDER MCDOWELL, a citizen of the State of Pennsylvania, as Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-sixth Congress.

The resolution was considered and agreed to.

MESSAGE TO THE SENATE.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following resolution, and ask its consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a message be sent to the Senate to inform that body that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled; that DAVID B. HENDERSON, a Representative from the State of Iowa, has been elected Speaker, and ALEXANDER MCDOWELL, a citizen of the State of Pennsylvania, as Clerk, and that the House is ready to proceed to business.

The resolution was considered and agreed to.

COMMITTEE TO WAIT UPON THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I submit the resolution I send to the desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed by the Speaker, on the part of the House of Representatives, to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate, to wait on the President of the United States and notify him that a quorum of the two Houses has assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of the following committee on the part of the House: Mr. CANNON of Illinois, Mr. PAYNE of New York, and Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee.

THE RULES.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer the resolution which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the rules of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-fifth Congress be adopted as the rules of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-sixth Congress.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I should be glad if that resolution could be modified so as to provide for the adoption of the rules for a given length of time. But to adopt them now permanently, and offering at the same time no opportunity for either discussion or amendment, I think is hardly customary, and certainly presents a very objectionable proposition.

As far as I am concerned, I have no disposition to discuss the rules as a whole. But there are two or three amendments which I think would be a manifest improvement on them, and I suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that he modify his resolution so as to provide for their adoption for a given length of time. This would be entirely acceptable to me, and I imagine to the whole House.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, the rules referred to in the resolution have been operative for at least three Congresses, the Fifty-first, the Fifty-fourth, and the Fifty-fifth; and the operation of the rules is familiar to all gentlemen on both sides of the House.

Of course the rules on the whole are subject to amendment. From time to time it is the privilege of any gentleman, on either side of the House, to offer an amendment, which will go to the Committee on Rules and can be reported back, discussed, and, if acceptable to the House, adopted.

It seems to me, therefore, that under the circumstances—this side of the House being very desirous of proceeding to business—it would be well that we should adopt the resolution in its present form.

I ask the previous question.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I hope the gentleman will yield to me for a moment before doing that.

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly; I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, only a few moments ago I was informed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania that he intended to offer the resolution to adopt the rules which has just been presented by him and read at the desk. I stated to him that, so far as I was concerned, I would not agree to the adoption of the resolution, and in so far as I was authorized to speak for gentlemen on this side of the House, there would be no agreement to its adoption. I wish to emphasize what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] has so well said with reference to the rules for the government of the House, and would be gratified if his suggestion for a vote upon the various amendments referred to, and of other amendments, should meet the approval of gentlemen on that side.

I know from what I have seen in the public press that it will be futile for us to make any objection to the adoption of the code of rules as presented, and as they have existed in the House for at least two Congresses. I had hoped, however, if I may be permitted to express it, that the very able and distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], who now occupies his seat on the other side of the House, would bring forward his armies to take part in the contest against these rules. [Laughter.]

He knows quite well in such a conflict to reform the code of rules under which we have lived for two Congresses he would have the indorsement of every man upon this side of the House. [Laughter on the Republican side.] But if the reports in the papers are true, Mr. Speaker, my distinguished friend has marched his army up the hill, and, following an illustrious precedent on another occasion, has marched them down again. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] I understand that my friend from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] has withdrawn from the contest, and no longer offers objection to the adoption of the rules of the majority.

Now, I say, in view of this fact, and in view of the fact that that side of the House, being in the majority, has taken caucus action, as we are informed through the public press, and has pledged its party unitedly to force upon this House the rules as they now stand, it occurred to me that possibly, however desirous we might be, as stated by my friend from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], to reform these rules, we would be unable to do so. Therefore, knowing that objection could not avail anything, I simply intended to protest on behalf of the minority and on my own account against the adoption of these rules—rules which have been so severe as to invite the open criticism of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], and, I may say, of the intelligent men of this country everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I have made no agreement in respect to the adoption of the rules. The minority, if they see fit to do so, can vote against them, as I shall do; but I did not intend to make factious opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL].

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my friend from Pennsylvania will yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], if he desires to be heard.

Mr. DALZELL. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I do not want to exceed five or ten minutes.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield to the gentleman ten minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania yields, and the gentleman from Texas is recognized for ten minutes.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I agree with my distinguished friend from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] that an effort to prevent the adoption of substantially the code of rules that existed in the Fifty-fifth and Fifty-fourth Congresses would be futile; but I do believe that if this House were offered a fair opportunity to debate and to amend that code of rules, very great improvements could be made.

I feel certain that either the power of the Committee on Rules could be curtailed or the membership of that Committee could be enlarged. I remember that the first time I ever had the honor to address this House it was in opposition to the powers of the Committee on Rules in the Fifty-second Congress, and I predicted that the three members who constitute a majority of that Committee would in time become a legislative triumvirate. Under these rules the Committee on Rules not only decides what business the House must transact, but also what business the House shall not transact.

It is enough to clothe the Speaker with the power of recognition and to supplement that by adding the power to appoint the committees of the House; but to add to those powers, great almost to the point of being dangerous, the absolute control of the House through its Committee on Rules is giving greater power to the Speaker of this House than any one man in this free Republic ought to possess. To say that the power still remains with the House is a subterfuge, because the House can never pass upon a question until the Committee on Rules see fit to report. To say that the committee can be controlled by the majority is not candid, because that committee is considered the Speaker's official family and no gentleman of the Speaker's party would serve upon it unless he could support the Speaker's policy. If a Democrat were the Speaker of this House, and I could not cordially and loyally support his policy in that committee, I would resign my membership upon it.

I respect the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], and no man on this side of the Chamber respects the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON], now the honorable Speaker of this House, more than I do; and yet I divulge no secrets of the committee room when I say that with these gentlemen on it the Speaker of the Fifty-fifth Congress, with their help, absolutely controlled the Committee on Rules. I know that the Speaker of the Fifty-third and the Fifty-second Congresses—a great and splendid Democrat, whom we mourn even until this day—completely dominated the Committee on Rules when the House was Democratic. I know that the honorable Speaker of this House, under these rules, if they are adopted, will be practically the Committee on Rules; and the Committee on Rules is practically the House of Representatives. In view of that it does seem to me that if you will not curtail the power of that committee, certainly its membership ought to be enlarged.

But leaving aside this question, which may be considered partisan in its nature, there is another amendment that I believe gentlemen on both sides of this House would unite in adopting. For years I have been striving to devise a way whereby gentlemen with unobjectionable bills could secure the passage of them without having to run the gauntlet of unanimous consent; and I believe I have found an easy way. Under our rules as they stand now there is a morning hour devoted to the consideration of bills upon the House Calendar. A bill that appropriates a single dollar can not be considered in that hour, but one which involves a vital principle may be.

That, in my judgment, is a serious mistake. That rule ought to be amended so as to provide that the morning hour should be devoted to the consideration of bills that come with unanimous reports from committees of the House; and then, with the morning hour used as it would be used in a majority of the days, every member with an unobjectionable bill would be certain to secure its passage. Surely we could agree upon an amendment like that. Surely gentlemen will concede that a bill to pay a debt which is just and fair—so just and so fair that no member of the committee would resist its payment after an investigation—is a safer subject for consideration in this morning hour than a bill involving a great question, like the incorporation of the international bank.

I have seen some of the most important measures which have been presented for consideration to this House called up as a matter of right in this morning hour, while bills to repair some admitted injustice, or to pay some long-standing obligation of the Government, or to permit the construction of a bridge, must beg for unanimous consent. I have seen members obtain recognition from the Chair, and then some gentleman, under resentment of an objection against his own bill, would object and thus defeat the passage of a measure in which the people of a district might be deeply interested and which was absolutely free from all objection.

That is one amendment which I intended to propose to the code of rules; and I venture to assert that if we could obtain a fair vote upon it, that amendment, or something in the nature of it, would command a three-fourths vote of the body. I am not moved by any mere partisan opposition to the rules to resist the resolution offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL]. They are your method of transacting the public business. You adopt them, and you take the responsibility. But there are questions entirely outside of partisan questions in respect to which I believe the rules could be amended, and I believe the House ought to be offered an opportunity to amend them if it desires to do so. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DALZELL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is entirely appropriate that I should thank the gentleman from Tennessee for the very kindly reference he made to myself. His candor and sincerity are so well known [laughter] that when he brings them both to bear with encomium the man who has received his compliment may feel that he has an indorsement of character. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure, even after the assurance given by the gentleman from Tennessee, that if an effort had been made from this side of the House to secure a serious modification of the rules that every man on that side of the House would have been a supporter of such a proposition. I have been discontented with the rules of this House for several Congresses. I have been trying to secure an amendment in several; and I remember that in the Fifty-third Congress, when I made an effort, as I did in the last—a Congress in which the Democracy had the majority and had placed a Speaker in the chair—that there was no man on that side of the House more bitter in criticism upon myself and my efforts for amendment than the distinguished and sincere and candid gentleman from Tennessee. [Laughter on the Republican side.] The gentleman ought not to have made the positive declaration that he did. His memory is too short for purposes of that kind. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, there are many of the rules of this House that do not meet my approval; but their adoption became a subject of party action—I will say to gentlemen if they want the whole truth—of caucus action; and the wisdom of the majority determined that the rules as they are were the better for the future government of the House; and with that modesty which always characterizes "the gentleman from Iowa" [laughter], when the majority of my own party so said, I yielded that implicit obedience that I hope I will always be able to yield. [Applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the previous question.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will not the gentleman from Pennsylvania withdraw that for a moment?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes, for a moment.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not want to reply to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], but I want to say that his apology is accepted by me, and I hope by the House and the country. [Laughter.]

Mr. DALZELL. I now renew my motion, Mr. Speaker, for the previous question.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to yield to me for ten minutes.

Mr. DALZELL. I can not do that.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken, and, on a division (demanded by Mr. RICHARDSON), the Speaker announced that there were—ayes 174, noes 161.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I ask for tellers.

Several MEMBERS. The yeas and nays!

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think we might as well take it by yeas and nays, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 178, nays 159, not voting 18; as follows:

YEAS—178.

Acheson,	Boutelle, Me.	Cannon,	Dalzell,
Adams,	Bowersock,	Capron,	Davenport, Samuel
Alexander,	Brick,	Clarke, N. H.	Davidson,
Allen, Me.	Bromwell,	Cochrane, N. Y.	Dayton,
Babcock,	Brosius,	Connell,	Dick,
Bailey, Kans.	Brown,	Cooper, Wis.	Dolliver,
Baker,	Brownlow,	Corliss,	Dovener,
Barham,	Bull,	Cousins,	Driscoll,
Barney,	Burke, S. Dak.	Cromer,	Eddy,
Bartholdt,	Burkett,	Crump,	Emerson,
Bingham,	Burleigh,	Crumpacker,	Esch,
Bishop,	Burton,	Curtis,	Faris,
Boreing,	Butler,	Cushman,	Fletcher,
Boutell, Ill.	Calderhead,	Dahle, Wis.	Fordney,

Foss,	Jones, Wash.	Morris,	Spalding,
Fowler,	Joy,	Mudd,	Sperry,
Freer,	Kahn,	Needham,	Sprague,
Gamble,	Kerr,	O'Grady,	Steele,
Gardner, Mich.	Ketcham,	Olmsted,	Stevens, Minn.
Gardner, N. J.	Knox,	Otjen,	Stewart, N. J.
Gibson,	Lacey,	Overstreet,	Stewart, N. Y.
Gill,	Landis,	Packer, Pa.	Stewart, Wis.
Gillett, Mass.	Lane,	Parker, N. J.	Sulloway,
Graff,	Lawrence,	Payne,	Tawney,
Graham,	Littauer,	Pearce, Mo.	Tayler, Ohio
Greene, Mass.	Littlefield,	Pearre,	Thomas, Iowa
Grosvenor,	Long,	Phillips,	Thropp,
Grout,	Lorimer,	Powers,	Tompkins,
Grow,	Loud,	Prince,	Tongue,
Hamilton,	Loudenslager,	Pugh,	Van Voorhis,
Harmer,	Lovering,	Ray, N. Y.	Vreeland,
Haugen,	Lybrand,	Reeder,	Wachter,
Heatwole,	McCall,	Reeves,	Wadsworth,
Hedge,	McCleary,	Roberts, Mass.	Wanger,
Hemenway,	McPherson,	Rodenberg,	Warner,
Henry, Conn.	Mahon,	Russell,	Waters,
Hepburn,	Mann,	Shattuc,	Watson,
Hill,	Marsh,	Shelden,	Weaver,
Hitt,	Mercer,	Sherman,	Weeks,
Hoffecker,	Metcalf,	Showalter,	Weymouth,
Hopkins,	Miller,	Smith, Ill.	White,
Howell,	Minor,	Smith, H. C.	Wright,
Hull,	Moody, Mass.	Smith, Samuel W.	Young, Pa.
Jack,	Moody, Oreg.	Smith, Wm. Alden	
Jenkins,	Morgan,	Southard,	

NAYS—159.

Adamson,	Davey,	Lewis,	Ryan, Pa.
Allen, Ky.	Davis,	Little,	Salmon,
Allen, Miss.	De Armond,	Livingston,	Scudder,
Atwater,	De Graffenreid,	Lloyd,	Shackleford,
Bailey, Tex.	Denny,	McClellan,	Shafroth,
Ball,	De Vries,	McCulloch,	Sheppard,
Bankhead,	Dinsmore,	McDowell,	Sibley,
Barber,	Dougherty,	McLain,	Sims,
Bell,	Driggs,	McRae,	Slayden,
Bellamy,	Elliott,	Maddox,	Small,
Benton,	Epes,	May,	Smith, Ky.
Berry,	Finley,	Meekison,	Smith, Md.
Bradley,	Fitzgerald, Mass.	Meyer, La.	Snodgrass,
Brantley,	Fitzgerald, N. Y.	Miers, Ind.	Sparkman,
Breazeale,	Fitzpatrick,	Moon,	Spight,
Brenner,	Fleming,	Muller,	Stark,
Brewer,	Fox,	Naphen,	Stephens, Tex.
Broussard,	Gaines,	Neville,	Stokes,
Brundidge,	Gaston,	Newlands,	Sulzer,
Burke, Tex.	Gilbert,	Norton, Ohio	Sutherland,
Burleson,	Glynn,	Norton, S. C.	Talbert,
Burnett,	Gordon,	Otey,	Tate,
Caldwell,	Green, Pa.	Pierce, Tenn.	Taylor, Ala.
Campbell,	Griffith,	Polk,	Terry,
Carmack,	Griggs,	Quarles,	Thayer,
Chanler,	Hall,	Ransdell,	Thomas, N. C.
Clark, Mo.	Hay,	Rhea, Ky.	Turner,
Clayton, Ala.	Henry, Miss.	Rhea, Va.	Underhill,
Clayton, N. Y.	Henry, Tex.	Richardson,	Underwood,
Cochran, Mo.	Jett,	Ridgely,	Vandiver,
Cooney,	Johnston,	Riordon,	Wheeler, Ky.
Cooper, Tex.	Jones, Va.	Rixey,	Williams, J. R.
Cowherd,	Kitchin,	Robb,	Williams, Miss.
Cox,	Kleberg,	Robbins,	Wilson, Idaho.
Crawford,	Kluttz,	Robertson, La.	Wilson, N. Y.
Crowley,	Lamb,	Robinson, Ind.	Wilson, S. C.
Cummings,	Lanham,	Robinson, Nebr.	Young, Va.
Cusack,	Latimer,	Rucker,	Zenor,
Daly, N. J.	Lentz,	Ruppert,	Ziegler.
Davenport, Stanley	Levy,	Ryan, N. Y.	

NOT VOTING—18.

Bartlett,	Hawley,	Mesick,	Swanson,
Catchings,	Howard,	Mondell,	Wheeler, Ala.
Chickering,	Lester,	Noonan,	Williams, W. E.
Foster,	Linney,	Roberts, Utah	
Gillet, N. Y.	McAleer,	Stallings,	

So the resolution was adopted.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. CHICKERING with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. GILLET of New York with Mr. BARTLETT.

For this day:

Mr. HAWLEY with Mr. MCALEER.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. DALZELL, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was adopted was laid on the table.

DAILY HOUR OF MEETING.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the adoption of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives shall be 12 o'clock meridian.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, do not the rules as now adopted fix that hour without the aid of the resolution?

The SPEAKER. They do not.

The resolution was adopted.

RESERVATION OF GALLERIES.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I offer the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk, and ask for its immediate consideration. In view of the fact that there will be a great many in the galleries to-morrow, I offer this resolution providing for the issuance of tickets. I offer it at the request of the officers of the House.

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection, the resolution will be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That during the session of Tuesday, December 5, the galleries of the House, except the executive, diplomatic, and press galleries, shall be reserved under charge of the Doorkeeper, who shall issue two tickets to each member and mail the same to the members through the post-office of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. COX, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed, to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

And that in compliance with the foregoing the President pro tempore had appointed as said committee Mr. PLATT of Connecticut and Mr. JONES of Arkansas.

Also:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

DRAWING FOR SEATS.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I offer the resolution I send to the desk, and ask its immediate adoption.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House do now proceed to draw seats for Members and Delegates of the present Congress, in pursuance of Rule II of the Fifty-sixth House, and when names of members absent from the city or on account of sickness are called that seats be selected for them by their colleagues.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution presented by the gentleman from Maine.

The resolution was considered, and agreed to.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest in this connection—and I make the suggestion at the request of other members around me—that it would be a great convenience to all members if those who select their seats at the beginning of the drawing shall retain them until the close. This will prevent confusion and misapprehension in reference to seats which are or are not already occupied.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will suggest that the rule be read upon this subject.

The Clerk read as follows:

RULE XXXII.

1. At the commencement of each Congress, immediately after the Members and Delegates are sworn in, the Clerk shall place in a box, prepared for that purpose, a number of small balls, of marble or other material, equal to the number of Members and Delegates, which balls shall be consecutively numbered and thoroughly intermingled, and at such hour as shall be fixed by the House for that purpose, by the hands of a page, draw said balls one by one from the box and announce the number as it is drawn, upon which announcement the Member or Delegate whose name on a numbered alphabetical list shall correspond with the number on the ball shall advance and choose his seat for the term for which he is elected.

2. Before said drawing shall commence each seat shall be vacated and so remain until selected under this rule, and any seat having been selected shall be deemed forfeited if left unoccupied before the call of the roll is finished, and whenever the seats of Members and Delegates shall have been drawn, no proposition for a second drawing shall be in order during that Congress.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. GROW, as ex-Speaker of the House of Representatives, may be permitted to choose his seat before the drawing has begun.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I second the motion of the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER. This will have to be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have asked unanimous consent that this privilege be granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Is it not requisite that members shall vacate the seats in the Hall before the drawing begins?

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask consent——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin has been recognized.

Mr. BABCOCK. I rose for the purpose of requesting that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HARMER], the oldest member of the House in continuous service, be permitted to select his seat in advance of the drawing.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin. That was the request I was going to submit myself.

The SPEAKER. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HARMER], the father of the House, be permitted to select his seat in advance of the drawing. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask if any particular space is assigned or retained with the understanding that it is to be reserved exclusively for any particular party?

The SPEAKER. It has usually been understood that the Republican side of the House is on the left of the Chair.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. The distinction, Mr. Speaker, is such that the usual methods can of course be applied. The Republicans have invariably occupied this side of the House. The custom has prevailed for years that the Republicans occupy this side and the Democrats the other side of the aisle.

Several MEMBERS. Regular order!

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HULL. There are fourteen, I think, or perhaps more, of the Republican members of the House who can not be seated on this side, because of the limited seating capacity of the Hall. I assume, of course, that it will be the understanding, as heretofore, that we can take the last wedge of seats on the other side.

The SPEAKER. That has been customary. A member can select any seat in the Hall that he desires.

The drawing for seats will now begin, and the Clerk will proceed under the rule.

The drawing of seats began at 2 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m. and was concluded at 3 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.

During the drawing of seats the following occurred:

Mr. WEAVER (when his name was called). Mr. Speaker, I want to beg the pardon of the House. I understood that my number was called a long time ago, and my name as well, and therefore I chose a seat, to the detriment of some one else who, perhaps, would have preferred this seat. Therefore I will give up this seat, which I thought I had properly chosen at the proper time, and select another one, begging the pardon of the House for having occupied the seat as I have.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the gentleman's frank admission, I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to retain the seat that he now has.

The SPEAKER. You hear the request of the gentleman from New York. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk having completed the call,

The SPEAKER said: It appears that the names have all been called and the calls are exhausted. Is there any member who is not provided with a seat?

Mr. ROBERTS of Utah and Mr. WRIGHT rose.

The SPEAKER. There seem to be two gentlemen who have not secured seats. If there is no objection, these gentlemen will be allowed now to select any remaining seats. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HOWARD, indefinitely, on account of death in his family.

To Mr. BARTLETT, indefinitely, on account of sickness of himself.

RESERVATION OF THE GALLERIES.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state for the information of the House that in the resolution concerning tickets of admission to the galleries for to-morrow it is provided that the tickets be mailed to members. The Doorkeeper advises me that the length of time necessary to get the tickets out will require that they probably be mailed late, and members might come here early in the morning and their tickets be delivered at their residences after they leave for the Capitol. It is therefore thought best, if it is agreeable to the House, that the tickets be put into the House post-office and held there, so that members may get them in the morning. If there is no objection, the resolution will be modified in accordance with this suggestion of the Doorkeeper. Is there objection?

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it would be better to have the tickets delivered with our morning mail.

The SPEAKER. Well, you may lose them. They may pass you on your way to the Capitol. If there is no objection, the order will be made as suggested, and the tickets will be held in the House post-office.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the Speaker admonish the doorkeepers to respect the authority of the House and to admit people to the galleries upon the tickets only. I know that this morning several members came here and could not get ladies admitted to the galleries upon their tickets, because the galleries were already overflowing without even standing room remaining. It follows with absolute necessity, therefore, that some doorkeeper somewhere must have violated the injunctions of the Speaker and the rules of the House and must have admitted people to the galleries without tickets.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Mississippi and the House that in some instances members have brought people here and forced them by the doorkeepers; but the doorkeepers have been instructed that no one is to be admitted without a ticket; and if any doorkeeper violates that instruction, he should be at once reported for proper treatment.

DEATH OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, to me has fallen the melancholy duty of announcing to the House that GARRET A. HOBART, Vice-President of the United States, departed this life, at his home in Paterson, N. J., on the 21st day of November, 1899.

The marked administration of the high office which he held, the second in the gift of the Republic, his brilliant and useful career, his sympathetic touch with every class, the unsullied purity of his public and private life, had so impressed the country that his death occasioned expression of deep-felt grief so universal as to manifest a general and profound sense of national bereavement.

Congress will doubtless, by concurrent action of the two Houses, at an early moment set apart a time for proper expression touching the life, character, and services of this eminent citizen.

I move you, sir, that this House, out of respect for his memory, do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey moves, out of respect to the memory of the late Vice-President of the United States, that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a list of reports to be made to Congress by public officers, was taken from the Speaker's table and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes—ordered to be printed.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 2) to reclassify railway postal clerks and prescribe their salaries—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 3) for the erection of a public building at Kingston, N. Y.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 4) for the erection of a public building at Providence, R. I.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 5) to appoint a commission for the investigation of the pollution of water supplies, where such pollution affects, or threatens to affect, the sanitary condition of the people of more than one State—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 6) to amend an act entitled "An act defining butter, also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of oleomargarine"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 7) providing for free homesteads on the public lands in Oklahoma Territory for actual and bona fide settlers and reserving the public lands for that purpose—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: A bill (H. R. 8) for the erection of a public building at Boone, Iowa—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GROW: A bill (H. R. 9) to aid in establishing homes in the States and Territories for teaching articulate speech and vocal language to deaf children before they are of school age—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. YOUNG of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 10) providing for the purchase of the Temple farm, at Yorktown, Va., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LENTZ: A bill (H. R. 11) granting per diem pension service to honorably discharged officers and enlisted men of the Union Army in the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 12) to amend section 3117 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, in relation to the coasting trade on the Great Lakes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13) to define the standing of the officers of the Coast Survey during the late civil war—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BROSIUS: A bill (H. R. 14) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to army nurses," approved August 5, 1892—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15) for the retirement of Government employees in the classified civil service—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 16) to establish postal savings banks and to encourage small savings—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 17) to authorize the restatement, readjustment, settlement, and payment of dues to army officers in certain cases—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 18) to prevent and punish frauds and irregularities in the elections of Representatives and Delegates in Congress—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19) to regulate commerce among the several States and Territories in the products of convict labor—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20) to establish a bureau of mines and quarries—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21) for the relief of tobacco growers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22) to pension men who have been honorably discharged from their last contract of service—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23) to authorize personal payments of pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24) to facilitate the payment of pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25) to pension disabled teamsters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26) to pension scouts and spies—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27) to do justice to the widows of our soldiers and sailors—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 28) to grant a pension to all Union soldiers and sailors in certain cases—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29) to increase the pension of all helpless soldiers and sailors—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30) to do justice to all Union soldiers and sailors who were confined in rebel prisons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 31) to restore widows to the pension rolls in certain cases—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32) to amend section 4716 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 33) to prescribe the pleading, practice, and proof in prosecuting pension claims—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 34) to do justice to pensioners who enter the service of the United States—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 35) to provide for the erection of an addition to the United States public building at Knoxville, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 36) to establish a military post at Knoxville, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 37) to provide for the improvement of the Tennessee River and some of its tributaries in Tennessee—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 38) for the erection of a public building at Waterbury, Conn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 39) for the erection of a public building at Meriden, Conn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 40) donating to the State of Kansas, for use in certain colleges, the rifles, gun slings, cartridge belts, and belt plates used by the Twentieth Kansas Volunteers in the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 41) to amend sections 2 and 3 of the pension act of June 27, 1890—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 42) authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish two branch stations of his Department, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: A bill (H. R. 43) to amend an act entitled "An act defining butter, also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of oleomargarine"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEYER of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 44) for the construction of a wide deep channel from deep water of the Mississippi River to deep water of the Gulf of Mexico, by way of Southwest Pass—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 45) to provide for a public building at New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 46) to provide for the maintenance of the channel between South Pass of the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico during the construction of the work of improving the navigation of the Southwest Pass—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. OTEY: A bill (H. R. 47) to promote agriculture by encouraging the exportation of agricultural products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 48) to maintain and protect the integrity of the coins of the United States—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 49) to amend section 3255 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, concerning the distilling of brandy fruits—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 50) to restore a portion of captured and abandoned property—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 51) for the erection of a public building at Radford, Va.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 52) to repeal the stamp tax—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TONGUE: A bill (H. R. 53) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to the survivors of the Indian wars of 1832 to 1842, inclusive, known as the Black Hawk war, Creek war, Cherokee disturbances, and the Seminole war," approved July 27, 1892—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 54) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to place a clock on the Government building in the city of Newbern, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 55) to authorize the construction of an arsenal for the repair, storage, and distribution of ordnance and ordnance stores for the use of the Government of the United States at Fayetteville, N. C.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 56) to authorize needed repairs of the graveled or macadamized road from the city of Newbern, N. C., to the national cemetery near said city—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PEREA: A bill (H. R. 57) to enable the people of New Mexico to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 58) to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the northern district of New York, to divide the same into two districts, and provide for the terms of court to be held therein and the officers thereof and the disposition of pending causes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 59) for the proper recognition of the services of commissioned officers of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MADDOX: A bill (H. R. 60) to create the northwestern division of the northern district of Georgia for judicial purposes and to fix the time and place of holding court therein—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 61) to revive and amend an act to provide for the collection of abandoned property and the prevention of frauds in insurrectionary districts within the United States, and acts amendatory thereof—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 62) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Dalton, in the State of Georgia—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 63) to provide for the purchase of a site and for the erection of a public building thereon at the city of Wheeling, in the State of West Virginia—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 64) to promote the commerce and increase the foreign trade of the United States and to provide auxiliary cruisers, transports, and seamen for Government use when necessary—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 65) to authorize the holding of a regular term of the district court of the United States for the western district of Virginia in the city of Charlottesville, Va.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 66) to provide for the coinage of gold and silver bullion upon equal terms—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. S. A. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 67) to promote the efficiency of the clerical service in the Navy of the United States, to organize a clerical corps of the Navy of the United States, to define its duties, and to regulate its pay—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 68) to amend section 17 of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1899, entitled "An act to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States"—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 69) for the purpose of granting pensions to survivors of the war of 1861 to 1865 who have reached the age of 60 years and over—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 70) for the fitting up and reconstruction of the old frigate *Constitution*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 71) to amend section 4488 of the Revised Statutes relating to life-saving appliances on shipboard—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 72) to equalize the pensions paid to the Union soldiers and sailors of the rebellion of 1861 to 1865, and to the widows of said Union soldiers and sailors—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 73) to purchase and inclose the sites, or portions thereof, of certain forts, battlefields, and other ground containing the graves of American soldiers, sailors, and marines in the Maumee Valley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DE VRIES: A bill (H. R. 74) to provide for the examination and classification of certain lands in the State of California—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 75) to grant a pension to all soldiers of the United States who served in the war between the United States and Mexico in the years 1846 to 1848, inclusive, and in the Union Army in the rebellion of 1861 to 1865, inclusive, in the United States—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 76) confirming the title of certain lands in the State of California—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 77) to provide for the examination of certain lands in the State of California, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 78) to provide for the preservation of the timber in the Yosemite, General Grant, and Sequoia national parks, in the State of California, and for the restoration to the public domain of all timber land within said parks—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 79) to provide for the preservation of the timber in the Yosemite, General Grant, and Sequoia national parks, in the State of California, and for the restoration to the public domain of the timber land within said parks—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 80) to provide for the preservation of the timber in the Yosemite, General Grant, and Sequoia national parks, in the State of California, and for the restoration to the public domain of the timber lands within said parks—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 81) to provide for the further improvement of Green River, in the State of Kentucky—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 82) to provide for the improvement of Salt River, in the State of Kentucky—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 83) providing for widening and improving the road to the national cemetery in Marion County, Ky., and for the purchase of land to be used in connection with said cemetery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 84) authorizing and directing the construction of an addition to the United States Government building in the city of Augusta, Me.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 85) to amend section 4696 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 86) granting additional bounty to veteran volunteers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 87) for the payment of bounty to veteran volunteers—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TERRY: A bill (H. R. 88) to establish a United States court at Tishomingo, Chickasaw Nation, Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 89) to provide for a macadamized approach and roadway to the national cemetery at Little Rock, Ark., and for a suitable wall or iron fence around said cemetery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 90) to provide that United States railroad corporations shall, for purposes of jurisdiction, be deemed citizens of the respective States into which their line of railway may extend—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 91) to regulate and discharge the payment of contracts in any money made legal tender by law for the payment of debts, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 92) to amend section 864 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, in relation to taking depositions de bene esse—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 93) in relation to cigarettes and to limit the effect of the regulation of commerce between the several States and with foreign countries in certain cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 94) amending an act of January 29, 1887, relative to soldiers and sailors of the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 95) to amend section 22 of an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and amended March 2, 1889, and to permit common carriers to allow reduced rates to persons traveling on missions of mercy or charity, and to commercial travelers and other persons habitually traveling from point to point on any legitimate business—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 96) to provide rules and regulations governing the importation of trees, plants, shrubs, vines, grafts, cuttings, and buds, commonly known as nursery stock, and fruits into the United States, and rules and regulations for the inspection of trees, plants, shrubs, vines, grafts, cuttings, and buds, commonly known as nursery stock, grown within the United States, which become subjects of interstate commerce or exportation—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCUDDER: A bill (H. R. 97) to amend an act approved May 4, 1882, entitled "An act to promote the efficiency of the Life-Saving Service and to encourage the saving of life from shipwreck"—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 98) granting condemned cannon to the State of Iowa—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 99) to establish a military post at or near Des Moines, Iowa—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TERRY: A bill (H. R. 100) regulating the sale of certain agricultural products, defining "options" and "futures," and imposing taxes thereon and upon dealers therein—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 101) in relation to trusts and combinations—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 102) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Portsmouth, in the State of Virginia—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 103) for the erection of a public building at Gloversville, N. Y.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, A bill (H. R. 104) to fix the standard of weights and measures by the adoption of the metric system of weights and measures—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: A bill (H. R. 105) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Zanesville, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A bill (H. R. 106) making the anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birthday a legal holiday—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEBERG: A bill (H. R. 107) for the erection of a public building at Laredo, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 108) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 109) limiting the hours of daily services of laborers, workmen, and mechanics employed upon the public works of, or work done for, the United States, or any Territory, or the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 110) providing what shall be sufficient proof of marriage in pension cases—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 111) providing rules of evidence in pension cases—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAPRON: A bill (H. R. 112) for the erection of a public building in the city Woonsocket, R. I.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 113) for the erection of a public building in Westerly, R. I.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 114) providing for the erection of a monument at Put in Bay, Ohio, commemorative of Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry and those who participated in the naval battle of Lake Erie on the 10th day of September, 1813—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 115) making appropriation for site and pedestal of a statue of the late Maj. Gen. Ambrose E. Burnside in the city of Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 116) to provide a life-saving station at or near Greenhill, on the coast of South Kingston, in the State of Rhode Island—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 117) to provide for the enrollment and organization of a United States Naval Reserve—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 118) to fix the compensation of the collector of customs of the district of Bristol and Warren, R. I.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 119) to amend section 4965, chapter 3, Title LX, of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to copyrights—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 120) donating condemned cannon, cannon balls, and shells to the State of Rhode Island, to decorate the camp of the militia of said State—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 121) granting condemned guns and cannon balls to the Soldiers' Home at Bristol, R. I.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 122) granting obsolete shot and shell to States wherein the Government has built batteries—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 123) for the erection of a monumental statue in the city of Washington, D. C., to the late James G. Blaine—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 124) providing for the erection of a monument at Put in Bay, Ohio, commemorative of Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry and those who participated in the naval battle of Lake Erie on the 10th day of September, 1813—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 125) to provide for the erection upon the grounds of the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md., of a bronze statue of the late Hon. George Bancroft, formerly Secretary of the Navy and founder of the Academy—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 126) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-culture station in Narragansett Bay, in the State of Rhode Island—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BALL: A bill (H. R. 127) to prohibit the shipment of articles controlled by a trust from one State to another State or Territory, or from one Territory to another Territory or State—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 128) to amend certain sections of the Revised Statutes, and prohibit the use of the mail to advertise or carry on the business of a trust, combination, or monopoly—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 129) authorizing a survey of the Brazos River, in Texas, from its mouth to the city of Waco—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 130) to admit free of duty articles controlled by a trust—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 131) to suspend and withhold the payment of pensions while pensioners are in the service of the United States Government in a civil capacity and receive therefor compensation equal to $100 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 132) making appropriations for a water channel from the mouth of the jetties at Galveston, Tex., through present ship channel and up Buffalo Bayou to the city of Houston, Tex., and for a harbor at or near said city of Houston—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 428) to amend the law establishing a port of delivery at Des Moines, Iowa—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 449) to change the port of Tappahanock, in the district of Tappahanock, in the State of Virginia, to Keedville, Va.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 758) setting aside certain lands within the Mescalero Indian Reservation, in New Mexico, for the use of the Indians thereon, and providing for the sale of the residue of the lands therein for the benefit of said tribe of Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CAPRON: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) proposing amendments to the Constitution disqualifying polygamists for election as Senators and Representatives in Congress, and prohibiting polygamy and polygamous association or cohabitation between the sexes—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of New York: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 2) in relation to monument to prison-ship martyrs at Fort Greene, Brooklyn, N. Y.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GROW: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 3) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERCER: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 4) to restore the status of the Nebraska Militia who served during the late war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 5) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan ordnance and ordnance stores for military instruction in high schools—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 6) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to use $100,000 of the appropriations for the support of the Regular and Volunteer Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, for the construction of a modern military hospital at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 7) authorizing foreign exhibitors at the Pan-American Exposition to be held in Buffalo, N. Y., in 1901, to bring to this country foreign laborers from their respective countries for the purpose of preparing for and making their exhibits under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 8) to extend the time of payment to settlers on the ceded agricultural lands of the former Red Lake Indian Reservation, Minn.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BROMWELL: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 9) authorizing the construction of a movable dam in the Ohio River near the city of Cincinnati, Ohio—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 10) providing for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 11) providing that the Constitution of the United States be so amended that the President shall hold his office for one term of six years and shall not be eligible for reelection—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 12) for restoration of a road in Gettysburg National Park—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 13) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 14) providing for the appointment of a committee to consider and report the propriety of establishing a home for disabled soldiers in the war with Spain—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 15) to erect in the city of Washington, D. C., a memorial arch to commemorate and perpetuate the valor and the glory of the soldiers, sailors, and marines of the United States in the Spanish-American war. and to provide for the appointment of a commission to carry the same into effect, and making an appropriation therefor—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 16) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of Senators of the United States—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. JENKINS: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 17) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 18) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 19) for the removal of the bones of John Paul Jones from Paris, France, and their reinterment in Arlington Cemetery—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 20) tendering the thanks of Congress to the Sisters of Charity, the Sisters of Mercy, the Sisters of Holy Cross, the Sisters of St. Joseph, and the Sisters of American Congregation for ministering to the wants of soldiers in the Spanish-American war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 21) for the relief of John Lyons and the firm of James Collins & Co.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 22) asserting the pensionable status of commissioners and surgeons of the enrolling boards created by the enrollment act of March 3, 1863—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 23) to print 15,000 additional copies of the report of the dedication of the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BURTON: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 24) requesting negotiations to secure modifications of the treaty of 1817—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 25) establishing a reciprocity commission—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KITCHIN: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 26) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 27) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the levy of a tax on incomes and inheritances—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORLISS: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 28) proposing

an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of Senators of the United States—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 29) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of members of the House of Representatives of the United States every four years—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 30) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 31) to amend section 6, Article II, of the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 32) to authorize Capt. N. M. Brooks, Superintendent of Foreign Mails, Post-Office Department, to accept decorations from the Governments of Liberia and Venezuela—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 33) in reference to the employment of enlisted men in competition with local civilians—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: A resolution (House Res. No. 2) relating to the appointment of soldiers of the Spanish-American war in the civil service—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a resolution (House Res. No. 3) naming a torpedo boat the *Acton*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a resolution (House Res. No. 4) relating to the rights of American Hebrews in Russia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a resolution (House Res. No. 5) relating to the cost and construction of an armor plant at Charlestown Navy-Yard—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MANN: A resolution (House Res. No. 6) providing for the appointment of a person to prepare for binding Senate and House bills of various Congresses, etc.—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HULL: A resolution (House Res. No. 7) authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs to print papers and documents for the use of committee—to the Committee on Printing.

Also, a resolution (House Res. No. 8) providing for an assistant clerk to the Committee on Military Affairs—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. COCHRANE of New York: A resolution (House Res. No. 9) to continue George Jenison as a special messenger in the House—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A resolution (House Res. No. 10) to continue John T. Chancey as a special employee of the House—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Wisconsin relating to the naming of a vessel after the city of Milwaukee—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Wisconsin favoring legislation favorable to American shipping—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Wisconsin favoring national legislation for the suppression of trusts and other combinations—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Wisconsin favoring legislation by Congress favorable to American shipping—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Wisconsin favoring national legislation for the suppression of trusts and combinations—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Wisconsin favoring the naming of a United States vessel after the city of Milwaukee—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 133) granting increase of pension to survivors of the Mexican and Indian wars and to their widows—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 134) granting a pension to Ruetha Moran—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 135) to compensate the legal representatives of Henry S. Castellaw for stock and provisions taken for the use of the Army of the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 136) for the relief of the legal representatives of F. M. T. Brannan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 137) granting a pension to Thomas J. Morman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 138) granting a pension to Mrs. Penny F. Stevens—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 139) granting increase of pension to J. H. Jones, sr.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 140) granting a pension to James L. Strickland—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 141) granting increase of pension to R. H. Woods—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 142) for the relief of the heirs of S. H. Hill, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 143) granting a pension to Mrs. Roberts—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 144) granting a pension to Mrs. Elcy R. Kelly—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 145) for relief of Col. Albert W. Bishop, of Buffalo, N. Y.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 146) for the relief of Warren A. Woodson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 147) for the relief of James Kennedy, alias Charles Parish—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 148) for the relief of Frank W. C. Fox—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 149) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of William E. Woodbridge for compensation for use by the United States of his invention relating to projectiles, for which letters patent were ordered to issue to him March 25, 1852—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: A bill (H. R. 150) for the relief of Edwin L. Field, of Gray, Cumberland County, Me.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 151) for the relief of Bvt. Lieut. Col. J. Madison Cutts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROMWELL: A bill (H. R. 152) for the relief of John L. Jefferies—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 153) for the relief of Elizabeth Johns, widow of Joseph Johns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 154) to increase the pension of Benjamin F. Schott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 155) for the relief of L. O. Maddux, doing business as Maddux, Hobart & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 156) granting a pension to Lena E. Patterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 157) for the relief of the owners of the brig *Abby Ellen*—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 158) for the relief of Gustavus Cooley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 159) for the relief of the estate of George W. Lawrence—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 160) correcting the war record of V. W. Macfarlane, late of One hundred and sixty-fifth New York Regiment—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 161) granting a pension of $24 per month to William H. McPhail—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 162) granting a pension to Mrs. Sarah A. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 163) for the relief of Henry O. Morse—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 164) to remove the charge of desertion against David Hurlburt, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Infantry, Maine Volunteers, and authorize his honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROSIUS: A bill (H. R. 165) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Michael A. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 166) for the relief of Constantine Ruttgers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 167) to remove the charge of desertion standing against David Ruth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 168) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Valentine B. Rissler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 169) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Benjamin F. Phillips—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 170) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Thomas McBride—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 171) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Martin Kofroth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 172) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Andrew Laukhoff—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 173) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Henry Lupold—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 174) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Robert Hawthorne—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 175) to correct the military record of Sylvester S. Greth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 176) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Patrick Gaynor—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 177) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Henry Dimler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 178) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Hugh Cosgrove—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 179) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of George Brubaker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 180) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Philip Beidle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 181) to remove the charge of desertion standing against George Alexander—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 182) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Elijah Alexander—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 183) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Jacob Olmstead—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON: A bill (H. R. 184) placing upon the military rolls the names of Jackson M. Leland and others—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 185) amending the military record of John S. Chapman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 186) granting a pension to Amalia C. Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 187) to amend the muster rolls of Company B, Ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers, so as to place thereon the name of William C. Armstrong—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 188) for the relief of David B. Lawrence—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 189) granting an increase of pension to Richard Tiner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 190) granting a pension to Cecelia Cockley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 191) granting a pension to Laura P. Lee—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 192) granting an increase of pension to Anna H. Tupper—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 193) granting an increase of pension to Hester S. Crane—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 194) granting extension of time on letters patent 268401—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 195) to place on the pension roll the name of James G. Saint—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 196) granting a pension to Clarissa Wolcott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 197) providing for the recognition of the military service of the officers and enlisted men of the First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 198) for the relief of Henry Daniels—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 199) for the relief of Mrs. Katherine Ratchford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 200) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to place the name of Mary G. Reed, widow of Thomas B. Reed, on the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 201) to erect a monument to the memory of John Morton—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 202) to pay the Standard Steel Casting Company for one 6-inch gun casting—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 203) granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Guss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 204) to erect a monument on Brandywine battlefield, Chester County, Pa.—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 205) to increase pension of George C. Snyder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 206) to pension Isaac D. Smith, Company A, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 207) to pension Ellett L. Browne, Company B, Fifty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 208) for the relief of the Corn Exchange National Bank, of Philadelphia, Pa.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 209) for the relief of Theodore J. Arms, assistant paymaster, United States Navy—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 210) for the relief of Asst. Engineer (retired) Henry E. Rhoades, United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 211) for the relief of James E. Cann, paymaster in the United States Navy—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 212) for the relief of the owners of the British ship *Foscolia* and cargo—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 213) to pay the General Marine Insurance Company, of Dresden, the sum of $1,434.12 for certain coupons detached from United States bonds, which said coupons were lost on the Cunard steamship *Oregon*, sunk at sea March 14, 1886—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 214) to construe an act entitled "An act to authorize a retired list for privates and noncommissioned officers of the United States Army," and so forth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 215) to provide for the appointment of warrant pay clerks in the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 216) to adjust the pensions of those who have lost limbs or were totally disabled in them in the late war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 217) granting a deed of quitclaim and release to Lorillard Spencer, his heirs and assigns, of all the right, title, and interest in and to certain land in the city of Newport, R. I.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 218) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of those who were killed by the explosion of the gun-cotton factory at the United States torpedo station at Newport, R. I.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 219) for the relief of Joshua Sayer, of Newport, R. I.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 220) for the relief of Patrick J. Sullivan, Jeremiah McCarthy, and Bartholomew Shea, and for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of John B. Dillon—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 221) for the relief of George D. Nichols, of Providence, R. I.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 222) authorizing the Secretary of War to grant an honorable discharge to Mathew Logan, late a member of Battery H, First Regiment Rhode Island Light Artillery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 223) to correct the military record of and grant an honorable discharge to Peter Rourke, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment of Rhode Island Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 224) granting an honorable discharge to Dudley Doherty, late private, Company D, Sixteenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 225) for the relief of Frank Oldis, late of the Fifth Massachusetts Artillery and the Fourth Battalion of Rhode Island Artillery Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 226) to authorize the Secretary of War to remove the charge of desertion as to Jasper L. Dodge, late of Company F, First Rhode Island Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 227) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Thomas Holmes, of Company E, Seventy-ninth New York Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 228) to place the name of Joseph P. Manton on the rolls of the First Regiment of Rhode Island Militia Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 229) to promote Lieut. William McCarty Little, United States Navy, retired, to be a commander on the retired list—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 230) to restore Lieut. Samuel Howard to his proper rank—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 231) for the relief of John Dailey—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 232) granting a pension to John Vars, the totally blind son of Frank Vars, late master's mate on the United States steamer *Reliance*—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 233) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Hooper, of Providence, R. I., widow of Quincy A. Hooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 234) granting a pension to Catherine Collins, widow of Patrick Brady, late of Company B, First Regiment Rhode Island Light Artillery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 235) granting a pension to Amanda M. Hill, widow of Kendall H. Blanchard, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Massachusetts Heavy Artillery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 236) granting an increase of pension to Albert M. Bennett, of Providence, R. I.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 237) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 238) granting a pension to Ellen Dowdell, of Warren, R. I.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAPRON: A bill (H. R. 239) to increase the pension of Mary F. Hopkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 240) granting an increase of pension to George

W. Wakefield, of Pawtucket, R. I.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 241) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of Peter Rubadeau—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 242) for the relief of Herbert O. Dunn—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 243) for the relief of D. J. Connolly, Guy Avallone, and George Richards—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 244) to remove the charge of desertion against the military record of James W. McKachney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 245) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary Jane Bennett, dependent daughter of Joseph L'Esperance, a fifer in the Revolutionary war and companion in arms of General Lafayette—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COCHRANE of New York (by request): A bill (H. R. 246) for the relief of William H. Webster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 247) for relief of George C. Ellison—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 248) to refund certain money to the city of Leavenworth, Kans., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 249) to remove the charge of desertion against John Mahan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 250) for the relief of the workmen employed in the construction of Poverty Island light-house, Lake Michigan—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 251) for the relief of George A. Winslow—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 252) for the relief of Eunice Tripler, widow of Charles S. Tripler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 253) for the relief of Anna R. Kershner, administratrix of the estate of Col. Phillip Kershner—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DE VRIES: A bill (H. R. 254) to increase the pension of Louis Springer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 255) to grant a pension to William H. Shannon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 256) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against John W. Beach, and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 257) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge from the United States Army to James H. Treanor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 258) to grant a pension to Catherine Doan, widow of Wallace Doan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 259) to grant a pension to Susan Yeates, widow of Richard Yeates—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 260) to grant a pension to Sarah Charles, widow of Henry Charles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 261) to increase the pension of George N. McMurry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 262) for the relief of and to increase the pension of Mellen Lothrop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 263) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge from the United States Army to Francis M. Lyles—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 264) to grant a pension to Felix Spurgeon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 265) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge from the United States Army to William C. Looper—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 266) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge from the United States Army to Franz S. Zoller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 267) to increase the pension of William S. Peters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 268) to grant a pension to Charles Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 269) to place the name of Mrs. Rosa G. Thompson, formerly Mrs. Rosa G. Edwards, upon the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 270) to increase the pension of Joseph Adler from $12 per month to $25 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 271) to grant a pension to Joseph Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 272) to grant a pension to James Dean—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 273) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge from the United States Army to Charles Sims—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 274) for the relief of F. H. Trappeniers—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 275) for the relief of D. E. Goulding—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 276) for the relief of the legal representatives of Patrick Elliott, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 277) for the relief of B. F. Myres—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 278) for the relief of Maurice G. Griffith—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 279) for the relief of the legal representatives of Ewing M. Skaggs, deceased, late of Sacramento County, Cal.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 280) for the relief of Caroline Felsenthal, executrix, and so forth, of Phillip Felsenthal, of California—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 281) for the relief of Edward Newman—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. S. A. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 282) for the relief of Harriet V. Gridley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVEY: A bill (H. R. 283) for the relief of Mrs. Eliza E. Hebert—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 284) granting permission and authority to the Orleans levee board to move, without cost to the United States, the existing line of levee in front of the marine-hospital property in New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 285) for the relief of R. A. Sisson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 286) for the relief of Elias S. Wingate—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 287) for the relief of William M. Bird, James F. Redding, Henry F. Welch, and others—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 288) for the relief of John J. Driscoll—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 289) for the relief of the estate of Robert Fishburne, sr., deceased, late of Colleton County, S. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 290) for the relief of Michael B. Ryan, son and administrator de bonis non of John S. Ryan, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 291) to empower Robert Adger and others to bring suit in the Court of Claims for rent alleged to be due them—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 292) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of James H. Dennis—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 293) for the removal of charge of desertion standing against Frank Snypes, alias Frank Squares, late of Company C, Thirty-fourth United States Colored Troops—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 294) to remove the charge of desertion against July Scott, late private in Company K, Twenty-first Regiment United States Colored Troops—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 295) to authorize the appointment of Acting Asst. Surg. Allan Stuart, United States Navy, to the position of assistant surgeon, United States Navy, not in the line of promotion—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 296) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Mattie Otis Dickinson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GAINES: A bill (H. R. 297) for the relief of R. M. Kinnaird—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 298) for the relief of Mrs. Henry B. Plummer—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 299) for the relief of James E. Wilson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 300) to increase the pension of James Owen—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 301) for the relief of James T. Donaldson, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 302) for the relief of Stewart College (now Southwestern Presbyterian University), located at Clarksville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 303) for the relief of George H. Morton—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 304) for the relief of Christopher Powers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 305) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Robert C. Hoggins, and for the relief of his widow and children—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 306) for the relief of Payne, James & Co.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 307) for the relief of William B. Bayless—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 308) for the relief of Kinney, McLaughlin & Co., and others—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 309) granting a pension to James M. Kercheval—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 310) referring to the Court of Claims the claims of O. P. Cobb and others—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, A bill (H. R. 311) for the relief of George F. Roberts, administrator of the estate of William B. Thayer, deceased, surviving partner of Thayer Bros., and others—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 312) for the relief of the Continental Fire Insurance Company and others—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 313) for the relief of John Schierling, administrator de bonis non of the estate of Gallus Kerchner, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 314) for increased pension of Frederick Slocum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 315) granting a pension to Moses H. Taber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 316) to amend the record of William Befuhs—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 317) to amend the record of Stephen H. Borden—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 318) to amend the record of Philip M. Topham—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 319) granting a pension to Sergt. William H. Carney for extraordinary and distinguished services rendered in the Fifty-fourth Massachusetts Infantry during the late war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 320) for the relief of James B. Russell—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GROW: A bill (H. R. 321) for the relief of legal representative of Samuel Tewksbury, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 322) for the relief of Stephen McNamara—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 323) for the relief of Enoch Vernon, a citizen of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 324) to correct the military record of William Ginter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 325) for the relief of Charles Candy—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 326) granting a pension to Mary A. Thornton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 327) granting a pension to Margaret Love Skerrett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 328) for the relief of Eva J. Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 329) for the relief of John E. Welch, a citizen of the United States—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 330) granting a pension to Nelson B. Lutes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 331) granting a pension to May Henry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 332) granting a pension to George W. Richey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 333) granting an increase of pension to Miss Cornelia I. Skiles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 334) to correct the military record of Theodore Winters—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 335) granting an honorable discharge to Alva A. Miller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 336) granting a pension to Horace Barstow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 337) granting a pension to James C. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 338) granting a pension to Lawrence C. Power—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 339) granting a pension to Agnes Jenkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 340) for the relief of William Lyons—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 341) for the relief of Craven W. Clowe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 342) for the relief of Andrew J. Sayre—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 343) granting a pension to Sophia Kroll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 344) granting a pension to Henry H. Alcorn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 345) for the relief of John Q. Armitage—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 346) increasing the pension of Socrates Drummond—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 347) to increase the pension of W. H. H. Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 348) for the relief of Peter C. Lawyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 349) granting a pension to Robert D. Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 350) granting a pension to John J. Shockey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 351) granting a pension to Joshua R. King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 352) granting a pension to Anna Donaldson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 353) granting a pension to James Ridly Stobart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 354) granting an increase of pension to Eli Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 355) to increase the pension of James R. Pierce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 356) granting a pension to Hezekiah Heasley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 357) granting a pension to Henry H. Alcorn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 358) granting a pension to Silas Graham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 359) granting an increase of pension to William M. Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 360) to print the label of the Typographical Union of the United States and Allied Printing Press on all publications of the Government—to the Committee on Printing.

Also, a bill (H. R. 361) to correct the military record of Henry Farley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 362) granting an increase of pension to Joseph J. Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 363) granting an increase of pension to James Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 364) granting a pension to Lewis Black—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 365) granting a pension to Aries Butcher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FARIS: A bill (H. R. 366) for the relief of Strauss, Bianchi & Co., of New York City—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 367) for the relief of Lieut. Horace P. McIntosn—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 368) for relief of Francis M. Oliver—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 369) increasing pension of Henry Staff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 370) for the relief of James McD. Hays—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 371) increasing the pension of Milton Kinder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 372) granting a pension to Mike Noonan, alias Charles Wilson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 373) to increase the pension of James F. Dickey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 374) for the relief of the Atlantic Works, of Boston, Mass.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 375) for the relief of the Atlantic Works, of Boston, Mass.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 376) for the relief of Charles Speare—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 377) for the relief of Joseph F. Travers, guardian of Michael Travers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 378) for the relief of John Black—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 379) for the relief of heirs of Philip C. Rowe—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 380) for the relief of David D. Smith—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 381) for the relief of the Atlantic Works, of Boston, Mass.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 382) for the relief of Mary A. Flynn—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 383) for the relief of the Globe Works, of Boston, Mass.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 384) for the relief of the Globe Works, of Boston, Mass.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 385) for the relief of Charles Speare—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 386) for the relief of Joseph F. Travers, guardian of Michael Travers—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 387) to remove the charge of desertion from the naval record of Charles D. Moore—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 388) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas Cannon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 389) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Scanlan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 390) to remove the charge of desertion from

John Kelly, late an enlisted man in the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 391) to correct the military record of Timothy W. Riley, alias John Hennessy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 392) to pension Mrs. Walter E. Spicer, widow of Walter E. Spicer, late in the postal service of the United States at Guantanamo, Cuba—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 393) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Patrick J. Grady—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 394) granting a pension to George W. Vaughn—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 395) for the amendment of the record of James Johnson, late an enlisted man in the United States Navy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 396) for amendment of the record of Felix Sellim, late an enlisted man in the United States Navy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 397) for the amendment of the record of Henry McAlevey, late an enlisted man in the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 398) for the amendment of the military record of Herman Wenige—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 399) to increase the pension of Frederick G. Moore, late of Company I, One hundred and fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 400) to increase the pension of Michael H. Burke, late of the United States Navy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 401) to increase the pension of Frederick G. Moore, late of Company I, One hundred and fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 402) to reimburse David H. Blaney for taxes wrongfully paid by him—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 403) for the relief of the trustees of the Centenary Reformed Church, of Winchester, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 404) to preserve the grave of Gen. Daniel Morgan and erect a monument over the same—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HARMER: A bill (H. R. 405) for the relief of Julius A. Kaiser—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 406) granting a pension to Emma H. Higley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 407) granting a pension to John W. Lamb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 408) granting a pension to Charles Misner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 409) granting a pension to A. Norwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 410) for the relief of John Reed, alias Michael Flannigan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 411) for the relief of Henry Ickes, alias William H. Burkett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 412) for the relief of Elias S. Breese—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 413) for the relief of Arulus C. Parkhurst—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 414) granting a pension to Julia Ann Taggart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 415) granting a pension to Electa Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 416) for the relief of Jacob Cheout—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 417) for the relief of Henry Cook—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 418) granting a pension to William S. Dailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 419) removing charge of desertion from George J. Dennis, Company C, Thirty-third New Jersey Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 420) granting pension of $50 per month to H. C. Trout, late of Company G, Eleventh Pennsylvania Reserve Corps—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 421) for the relief of Capt. J. A. Olmstead—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 422) to increase the pension of Mary A. McCauley, widow of Patrick H. McCauley, late major of the Seventeenth Wisconsin Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 423) granting pension to James H. Cole, of Pleasantville, Marion County, Iowa—to the Committttee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 424) for the relief of James McKenzie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 425) for the relief of David K. Reynolds—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 426) granting pension to Julia A. Hays, widow of Edwin R. Hays, Company L, First Ohio Heavy Artillery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 427) for the relief of heirs of Mrs. Tellisse W. Wilson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 429) to increase the pension of John R. Joy, Company H, Thirty-ninth Iowa Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 430) increasing the pension of James Akers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 431) for the relief of Alfred E. Puffer, of United States steamer *North Carolina*, United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 432) for the relief of Elisha C. Bierce, Company F, Fifty-seventh Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 433) for relief of Elizabeth B. Eddy—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEATWOLE: A bill (H. R. 434) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 435) granting pay and allowances to Francisco V. De Coster, late captain, First Battalion of Cavalry, Mississippi Marine Brigade—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 436) to correct the record of John Hauck—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 437) granting a pension to Mary E. Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 438) granting a pension to Emma M. Kitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 439) to correct the military record of Thomas G. Drenning—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 440) for the relief of Moses M. Longley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 441) to amend the record of Fayette Adams, Company I, Thirty-seventh Illinois Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 442) for the relief of the heirs of P. A. Leatherbury, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 443) for the relief of Gipsie P. Powell, of Spottsylvania County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 444) for the relief of Joseph O. Smith—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 445) for the relief of Clare M. Ashby, widow of W. W. Ashby, late United States consul at Colon—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 446) for the relief of the trustees of Abingdon Protestant Episcopal Church, of Gloucester County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 447) to provide for the erection of a monument to the memory of James Monroe, at Fredericksburg, Va.—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 448) for the relief of the trustees of the Christian Church, of Fredericksburg, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 450) for the relief of the Potomac Steamboat Company—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 451) granting a pension to Sarah M. Best—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOY: A bill (H. R. 452) for the relief of Catherine Barry Meeha—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 453) to correct the military record of James Tracy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 454) for the relief of Hiram K. Hazlett—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 455) for the relief of Richard Mollencott—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 456) to correct the military record of James Kinney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 457) granting a pension to Mrs. Clara L. Harriman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 458) for the relief of William S. McKnight and James W. Richardson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KLEBERG (by request): A bill (H. R. 459) for the relief of Christiana Dengler—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 460) for the relief of the Union Iron Works, of San Francisco, Cal.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KITCHIN: A bill (H. R. 461) for the relief of Charles W. Johnson, administrator of Mrs. Lydia Johnson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 462) granting a pension to Edward Henry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 463) for the relief of Thomas H. Street, of Person County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 464) granting a pension to John T. Hopson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 465) for the relief of John D. Thorne—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 466) for the relief of Stephen T. Wrenn—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 467) granting a pension to Joel Savage—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 468) for the relief of Mrs. Consolacion Victoria Kirkland, widow of Admiral Kirkland—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LESTER: A bill (H. R. 469) for the relief of the estate of John W. Anderson, deceased, late of Savannah, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 470) granting a pension to Jane Dykes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 471) granting an increase of pension to John W. Craig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 472) granting a pension to Addison C. Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 473) for the relief of John C. Brown—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 474) granting a pension to James M. Muck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 475) for the relief of Simon Regnier—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 476) granting a pension to Samuel S. Garletts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 477) granting an increase of pension to Levi R. Long—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 478) for the relief of Frederick W. Baker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 479) to restore John F. Lewis to the United States Army, with the rank of captain of infantry, and place him upon the retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 480) to increase the pension of Samuel T. Derry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 481) granting a pension to Sarah R. Burrell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 482) granting an increase of pension to Frederick W. Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 483) granting a pension to Anne Tracy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 484) granting a pension to Martin Seiler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 485) granting an increase of pension to Burrel G. Hart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 486) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Bottjer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 487) granting an honorable discharge to W. J. Gardner, and correcting the date of his muster out from the service—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 488) for the relief of William L. Rose—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 489) for the relief of Johnson Adams—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 490) increasing the pension of Robert Nelson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: A bill (H. R. 491) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to compute the amount of pay and allowances due to Fitz John Porter—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 492) to increase the pension of Ruth A. Carleton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 493) granting a pension to Fanny M. Hays—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADDOX: A bill (H. R. 494) for the relief of Pleasant Grove Church, Catoosa County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 495) for the relief of Elisha Lowry—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 496) for the relief of the heirs at law of W. L. Barnes, of Cobb County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 497) for the relief of James M. Lowry, of Floyd County, Ga.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 498) for the relief of the First Baptist Church, of Cartersville, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 499) for the relief of Sarah A. Burney, of Floyd County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 500) for the relief of Joel Cross, of Dade County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 501) for the relief of Thornton Talley, of Gordon County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 502) to increase the pension of Mrs. Agnes Mullinnix—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 503) to increase the pension of B. F. Collins—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 504) to increase the pension of W. T. Lowry—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 505) for the relief of J. N. Wilson, of Rossville, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 506) for the relief of J. C. Gordon, of Catoosa County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 507) for the relief of Mrs. F. M. Osborn, of Walker County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 508) for the relief of T. W. and Gordon Lee, of Chickamauga, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 509) for the relief of Andy Osborn, of Walker County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 510) for the relief of the Lee & Gordon Mill Company, of Chickamauga, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 511) for the relief of Aaron Berger, of Chickamauga, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 512) for the relief of J. C. Gordon, of Catoosa County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 513) for the relief of W. L. Kinsey, of Catoosa County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 514) for the relief of C. J. Shelverton, of Austell, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 515) for the relief of S. H. Martin, of Catoosa County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 516) for the relief of J. T. Brown, of Walker County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 517) for the relief of G. E. D. Russell and Mrs. R. E. Stroup, of Catoosa County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 518) for the relief of Fielding Foster, of Rossville, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 519) for the relief of W. L. Edwards, of Ringgold, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 520) appropriating $2,500 to pay for the destruction of a brick church, corner of Fifth avenue and East Second street, Rome, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 521) for the relief of William H. McKinley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 522) for the relief of the persons who sustained damage by the explosion of an ammunition chest of Battery F, Second United States Artillery, July 16, 1894—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 523) for the relief of Arba N. Waterman—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 524) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 525) for the relief of S. Steele Finley—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 526) granting a pension to Joseph S. Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 527) to grant a pension to Lucy D. Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 528) granting a pension to Isabel B. Hamilton—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 529) granting a pension to Mrs. Sallie Lowe—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 530) to compensate Frank D. Allen for services as special counsel—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 531) to incorporate the John A. Winslow Kearsarge Survivors' Association—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 532) for the relief of the owners of the schooner *H. B. Diverty* and the tug *Clara Buhler*—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 533) to remove the charge of desertion against George J. Titcomb, and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 534) to remove the charge of desertion against Ogden H. Smith, and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 535) to remove the charge of desertion against Charles H. Leland, and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 536) to correct the military record of Henry Heath—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 537) granting a pension to Lydia Woodman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 538) granting a pension to Charles F. Winch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 539) granting a pension to Louisa S. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 540) granting a pension to Sarah A. Snay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 541) granting a pension to Ellen Norwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 542) granting a pension to Margaret Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 543) granting a pension to Patrick Layhee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 544) granting a pension to Delia Kimball—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 545) to increase the pension of Clara E. Daniels—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MORRIS: A bill (H. R. 546) for the relief of Alice Walsh—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 547) for the relief of Peter Guttormson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 548) granting a pension to Edward Harris—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 549) to refer the claim of the heirs of Jerome J. Getty for Indian war depredations to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 550) to refer the claim of A. M. Darling for Indian war depredations to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 551) granting an increase of pension to Frank F. Carnduff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OTEY: A bill (H. R. 552) granting a pension to James Whitten, Company K, Fifteenth Regiment New Jersey Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 553) to increase the pension of Fanny A. Marable—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 554) to place on the pension roll Mary A. Tracy, widow of John C. Tracy—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 555) for the relief of James D. Hankins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 556) for the relief of the Methodist Protestant Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 557) for the relief of the heirs of P. St. George Ambler—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 558) for the relief of W. R. Perfater, of Montgomery County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 559) for the relief of E. W. Donnelly, Roanoke, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 560) for relief of W. L. Lankford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 561) for relief of Mrs. Susan A. Dinwiddie, Campbell County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 562) for the relief of soldiers and sailors—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 563) for the relief of the heirs of Edward O. Watkins, deceased, late of the State of Virginia—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 564) for the relief of D. A. Brown, of Montgomery County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 565) for relief of W. S. Hodges—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 566) for relief of R. T. Vaughn, of East Radford, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 567) for the relief of J. W. Chandler, of Halifax County, Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 568) for the relief of W. T. Fitzpatrick, Bedford city, Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 569) for the relief of S. Plummer Morton, alias Martin Phelps—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 570) to remove the charge of desertion from John D. M. Perrow—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 571) for the relief of R. L. Johnson, Dryburg, Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 572) for the relief of the Free and Accepted Order of Masons in the town of Keysville, Charlotte County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 573) for the relief of Arthur Connell—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 574) for the relief of W. S. Rodden, of Halifax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 575) for the relief of Herbert Cushman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 576) for the relief of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 577) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John Lavigne—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RHEA of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 578) for the relief of Henry B. Hull—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 579) for the relief of the estate of Charles M. Roberts, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 580) for the relief of Mrs. L. A. Barber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 581) to amend the records on file at the War Department—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 582) for the relief of Alfred M. Burnham, of Lynn, Mass.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 583) granting a pension to Eleanor Shea—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 584) to pension Catherine B. Marshall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 585) granting a pension to Elizabeth M. Leach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 586) to increase the pension of George E. Tibbetts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 587) granting a pension to Elizabeth M. Leach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 588) granting a pension to John Eckland—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 589) for the relief of Joseph A. Greenwood—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 590) granting a pension to James F. Burchstead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 591) granting a pension to John L. Rumery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 592) for the relief of Henry Langdon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 593) for the relief of Oscar F. Huntoon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 594) for the relief of Homer Eugene Sawyer—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 595) to amend the military record of George W. Wilder—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 596) granting an honorable discharge to Michael J. Niland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 597) granting a pension to Frank J. Carr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 598) for the relief of William C. Allen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 599) for the relief of John Regan—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 600) for the relief of Charles O. Palmer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 601) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Shaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 602) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 603) granting a pension to Margaret Harrington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 604) for the relief of William Andrews—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 605) granting an increase of pension to Mary V. Wentworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 606) to amend the military record of William L. Parkhurst—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 607) granting a pension to E. F. Haskell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 608) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against Asa C. McInerney, alias McFee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 609) granting an increase of pension to George F. Hubbard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 610) granting a pension to Addie M. Tarr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 611) granting an increase of pension to Asa T. Tarbox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 612) for the relief of Mary Dunn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 613) for the relief of Ebenezer S. Bigelow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 614) granting an increase of pension to Francis A. Semons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 615) granting an increase of pension to George W. Vaughn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 616) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Phebe T. Drew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 617) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Ellis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 618) removing charge of desertion from the military record of James Donovan, of Boston, Mass.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 619) granting a pension to Sarah A. Sanborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 620) granting an increase of pension to Henry Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 621) to amend the military record of Henry W. Dunbrack—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 622) granting a pension to Sarah E. Sanborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 623) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against the name of W. B. Davis—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 624) granting an honorable discharge to William Loring—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 625) granting a pension to Wesley Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCUDDER: A bill (H. R. 626) for the relief of Lieut. Jerome E. Morse, of the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 627) to reimburse Mary C. Bristol, as executrix of the will of Charles P. Redmond, deceased, for money paid to the United States for certain real estate at Little Rock, Ark.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 628) for the relief of Hamilton M. Sailors—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 629) to grant a pension to Kate M. A. Mortensen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 630) for the relief of Edward Byrne—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 631) to reappoint Warren C. Beach a captain in the Army, and to place him on the retired list in addition to the number now authorized—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 632) granting a pension to Mary J. Smith, mother of James H. Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 633) granting an increase of pension to Vianna Mallard, widow of John Q. Mallard—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 634) for the relief of William L. Palmer—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 635) for the relief of O. H. Perry, administrator of the estate of George W. Perry, late of the county of Craven, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 636) for the relief of St. John's Lodge, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, No. 3, of Newbern, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 637) for the relief of certain soldiers, seamen, and marines—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 638) to extend certain patents of Seth H. Smith—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 639) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Nelson Conklin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 640) to pension Clementine M. Denslow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 641) to increase pension of Ambrose M. Conner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 642) to increase the pension of Gen. C. C. Doolittle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 643) to correct the military record of Wayne Mapes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 644) to increase pension of Wilson W. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 645) to pension James Ross Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 646) to pension Orilla Chadwick, widow of John Henry Chadwick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 647) to pension Dora Jones, invalid daughter of the late Orson H. Jones, Company I, Fifty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 648) to pension Mallissa La Flesh, widow of Capt. Isaac La Flesh, Ninth Indiana Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 649) to increase the pension of George B. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 650) to increase the pension of Zachary T. Parcher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 651) to correct the military record of Charles Bredt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 652) to grant arrears of pension to George W. Boggs, late first lieutenant Company G, Tenth Ohio Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 653) to correct the military record of the late Capt. Isaac L. La Flesh, Company A, Indiana Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 654) to correct the record of muster and discharge of Francis A. Kitchen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 655) for the relief of Frank Wenzel—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 656) for the relief of George W. Bowen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 657) granting a pension to Francis A. Kitchen, late surgeon, United States Army—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 658) to correct the military record of James Mally—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 659) to correct the military record of Charles Hollis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 660) to correct the military record of David Collins, late private of Company L, Third Ohio Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 661) to correct the military record of John Sanzenbacher, late private, Company B, Thirty-seventh Ohio Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 662) for the relief of Michael J. Higgins—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 663) to pension Angeline Mills—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 664) granting a pension to William H. Taylor, an army nurse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 665) to increase the pension of Charles S. Ely—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 666) to correct the military record of Bartholomew Malloy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 667) to pension William Rice, Company G, Tenth Ohio Cavalry, at an increased rate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 668) to correct the military record of James Taylor, alias James Wilson, late of Company I, Seventh Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 669) to correct the military record of Edward S. Knappen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 670) to correct the military record of George M. Kemp—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 671) to pension Eli Jacobs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 672) to pension David Miller—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 673) to pension John C. Purdy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 674) to increase pension of George W. Swift—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 675) to increase pension of Mary M. Talbot, widow of Thomas D. Talbot, late of Company A, Twenty-seventh Michigan Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 676) to increase pension of Hiram Henderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 677) to correct the military record of Alonzo J. McSchooler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 678) to correct the military record of Aaron Lanfare—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 679) granting a pension to Mary E. Hunter, alias Mary E. McCrory, an army nurse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 680) to increase pension of George W. Norton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHOWALTER: A bill (H. R. 681) authorizing and directing the repayment to Josiah B. Orbison, of Donegal Township, Butler County, Pa., the sum of $300, with interest, that he paid to avoid the draft in 1863—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 682) for the relief of the estate of R. Colvin, deceased, late of Taylor County, Ky., for stores and supplies taken by the military forces of the United States during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 683) granting a pension to Adolph Denkhoff, of Kentucky—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 684) granting a pension to James Bird, of Kentucky—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 685) to correct the military record of Ebenezer Logsdon, of Kentucky—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 686) granting a pension to John S. Whitledge, of Kentucky—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 687) to increase the pension of Clifford Haddock, of Kentucky—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 688) granting a pension to Bennett Davenport, of Kentucky—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 689) to increase the pension of W. H. Kyler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 690) for the benefit of H. C. Wood—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 691) granting a pension to Cynthia Stone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 692) to increase the pension of John R. Vickers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 693) to grant a pension to John M. Calloway

and correct his military record—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 694) for the relief of Anthony McAndrew, of Louisville, Ky.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 695) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles T. Jackson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 696) for the relief of Mrs. R. P. Raney—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 697) for the relief of Benjamin O. Purvis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 698) for the relief of Daniel J. Basham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 699) for the relief of Joseph Metcalfe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 700) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Stephen Greenwell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 701) for the relief of F. M. Vowells, late of Company H, Sixth Kentucky Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 702) for the relief of the estate of Levi Fields, deceased, of Hardin County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 703) granting a pension to Jacob D. Williams, of Marion County, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 704) granting a pension to Harvey Langham, of Hardin County, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 705) for the relief of Merril Denham—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 706) to remove the charge of desertion against Nathan Stewart—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 707) to place the names of William D. Rabern and George W. Raybern on the roll of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 708) granting a pension to James Rabern—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 709) granting a pension to Richard West—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 710) granting a pension to Rebecca Lewis, of Grayson County, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 711) granting a pension to Lucy B. Culver, of Hart County, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 712) granting an increase of pension to Napoleon McDowell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 713) for the relief of the minor children of Alice Evans, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 714) for the relief of Henry C. Bumgardner, of Hart County, Ky.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 715) for the relief of Squire Stinson, of Grayson County, Ky.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 716) for the relief of William W. Davis, of Green County, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 717) to amend and correct the military record of Thomas Etherton, of Hart County, Ky.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 718) to remove the charge of desertion from military record of W. T. Akridge and grant him a discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 719) for the relief of Clement Calhoon, of Larue County, on the border of Nelson County, State of Kentucky, for supplies and stores taken from him by the military forces of the United States for their use during the war for the suppression of the rebellion—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 720) to complete the military record of James Hicks, formerly captain Company M, Twelfth Regiment Ohio Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 721) granting an increase of pension to Hutly M. Hutchason—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 722) granting a pension to Harvey W. Kelly and Augustus Kelly, minor children of H. P. B. Kelly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 723) granting an increase of pension to Silas Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 724) to remove the charges of desertion from the military record of James Braden—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 725) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of David Coats and restore him to the pension roll of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 726) to remove the charge of desertion against W. B. Summers and to grant him a discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 727) removing charge of desertion from the military record of John P. Fox, of Kentucky, and to grant him a discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 728) to remove charge of desertion against Benjamin A. Helm—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 729) for the relief of Samuel Bartlett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 730) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary D. England—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 731) granting a pension to John J. Hornback, of Hardin County, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 732) granting a pension to Henry Ramey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 733) to increase the pension drawn by Mrs. Virginia Crump—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 734) granting a pension to Samuel T. Wallace—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 735) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of J. H. Morris, of Green County, Ky., and grant him a discharge—to the Committee of Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 736) for the relief of Mary L. Piatt—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 737) granting a pension to Cyntha A. Middleton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 738) granting an increase of pension to William M. Hicks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 739) granting a pension to Sidney Bozarth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 740) granting a pension to James Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 741) increasing the pension of Zedock C. Andrews—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 742) granting a pension to John Rogers, of Larue County, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 743) granting a pension to James I. McLain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 744) to remove the charge of desertion against John B. Perkins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 745) to amend the act approved March 15, 1878, entitled "An act for the relief of William A. Hammond, late Surgeon-General of the Army"—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 746) to grant a pension to W. C. Montgomery, a veteran of the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 747) for the relief of Charles A. Burton, of Donley County, Tex.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 748) for the relief of John W. Harlan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 749) for the relief of Harriet C. Hunter—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 750) for the relief of John Eastman—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 751) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Missouri F. Morton, a widow of a soldier of the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 752) granting a pension to Rebecca A. Langley, widow of George Langley, late of the United States Army—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 753) for the relief of C. W. Reid and Sam Daube—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 754) for the relief of Calvin R. Rutherford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 755) for the relief of Calvin T. Hazelwood—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 756) granting a pension to John Teague, a soldier of the United States Army in the war with Mexico—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 757) granting a pension to M. Yell and removing his political disabilities—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A bill (H. R. 759) to renew certain letters patent for an invention in the means of securing railroad rails to metallic ties, heretofore issued to Sidney B. Wright, late of Wyandotte, Mich.—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 760) to renew certain letters patent for a new and useful improvement in metallic railway ties, heretofore issued to Sidney B. Wright, late of Wyandotte, Mich.—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 761) for the relief of Job Trumble, late a private in Company C, Tenth Michigan Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 762) for the relief of Eli W. Marble—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 763) for the relief of Warren Shepard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 764) for the relief of George W. Bannan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 765) for the relief of Edward Finnegan, late of Company H, Fifteenth Illinois Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 766) for the relief of Amasa H. Ross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 767) for the relief of Benjamin Gilden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 768) for the relief of John Gracy, late of Company C, Seventy-fifth Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 769) for the relief of Jacob Black, late of Company D, First Michigan Sharpshooters—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 770) granting a pension to Elizabeth Fitzpatrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 771) granting a pension to Thomas J. Keyes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 772) granting a pension to Charles H. Van Etten—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 773) granting a pension to R. Randall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 774) granting a pension to Hannah C. Rich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 775) for the relief of Carlton Neal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 776) for the relief of A. E. Tower, late captain of Company E, Sixth Michigan Cavalry, now of Ionia, Mich.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 777) for the relief of Persons T. Carpenter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 778) granting a pension to Phœbe B. Beebe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 779) for the relief of Rodman Hart—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 780) granting a pension to Elizabeth Fitzpatrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 781) for the relief of James Moore, late of Company C, First Battalion Nineteenth United States Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 782) for the relief of Richard S. Gill—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 783) to correct the military record of Harvey Cluff—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 784) granting a pension to Margaret A. Barker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 785) for the relief of Lucas Peter Reterstorf—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 786) for the relief of William Leech—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 787) to increase the pension of John Richardson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 788) for relief of Mary E. Wilkinson, widow of Mortimer Wilkinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 789) to pension Harriet Mesecas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 790) for the relief of W. R. Barrett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 791) to reimburse Nelson H. Walbridge—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 792) granting a pension to Jane C. Cornell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 793) granting a pension to Henry Stockford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 794) for the relief of William Henry Stapleton, alias William Henry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 795) for the relief of Squire M. Armstead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 796) for the relief of Augustus Dudley Hubbell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 797) for the relief of Warren P. Wood, late of Company F, Nineteenth New York Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 798) to grant pension to Dr. Charles P. Bigelow, late of Company H, Third Michigan Infantry; Company E, Third Michigan Cavalry; acting assistant surgeon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 799) granting a pension to Walter S. Cole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 800) granting a pension to Mary E. Wilkinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 801) granting a pension to Sumner H. Tarbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 802) granting a pension to James M. Travis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 803) for the relief of George W. Hathaway, Third Pennsylvania Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 804) granting a pension to Susan Weiderwax—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 805) for the relief of James F. Baker, late of Company H, First Battalion Sixteenth United States Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 806) for the relief of Frances E. Childs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 807) for the relief of Adrian Yates—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 808) for the relief of A. E. Tower, late captain Company E, Sixth Michigan Cavalry, now of Ionia, Mich.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 809) granting a pension to Dolly Burger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 810) granting a pension to Charles E. Lewis, a dependent father—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 811) for the relief of John J. Waters—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 812) for the relief of Adam D. Shriner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 813) for the relief of James W. Long, late a captain in the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 814) for the relief of Samuel H. Keifer, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-second Pennsylvania Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 815) for the reimbursement of the heirs of James Anderson for transportation and expenses in recruiting troops for service in the Union Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 816) for the relief of Peter Duchane, late of Company G, Twenty-first Michigan Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 817) for the relief of William Barber, late of United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 818) for the relief of Richard Bruner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 819) for the relief of M. H. McCoy—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 820) granting a pension to Catherine E. Babcock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 821) for the relief of John W. Beatty, late of Company C, Seventh Tennessee Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 822) to increase the pension of Magnus D Slack, late sergeant, Company K, Thirtieth Regiment Michigan Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 823) granting a pension to Charles C. Epley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 824) for the relief of L. W. Bon—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 825) to increase the pension of F. H. Riggin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 826) to pension Mary J. Whitaker—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TERRY: A bill (H. R. 827) for the relief of the trustees of the Presbyterian Church of Dardanelle, Yell County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 828) for the relief of the estate of Parkes & Ward, of Yell County, Ark.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TATE: A bill (H. R. 829) for the relief of Webster R. W. Atkins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 830) to pension Webster R. W. Atkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 831) for the relief of Stephen M. Honeycutt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 832) for the relief of William N. Hammontree—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 833) for the relief of Margaret S. Fain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 834) to pension Sanford A. Pinyan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 835) to amend the records of the War Department in case of Jesse Elliott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 836) for the relief of Sanford A. Pinyan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 837) for the relief of Samuel Garner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 838) to pension Hix Patterson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 839) for the relief of Hiram A. Darnell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 840) to amend the records of the War Department in case of Curtis C. Hutcheson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 841) for the relief of Hix Patterson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 842) for the relief of James B. Fowler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 843) to pension Dorcus Elliott, widow of Jesse Elliott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 844) to pension Martha A. Mason, widow of Charles Mason—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 845) to pension Synthia Ann Mason, widow of Austin Mason—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: A bill (H. R. 846) for the relief of the estate of George H. Wells, late of Washington County, Ohio—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 847) granting an increase of pension to William H. H. Nevitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 848) granting an honorable discharge to John W. Harris—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER: A bill (H. R. 849) to correct the military record of William C. Keys—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 850) for the relief of John B. Ford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 851) for the relief of William H. Dotson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 852) to increase the pension of James Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 853) to increase the pension of Louisa Rose—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 854) to increase the pension of John J. McCormick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 855) for the relief of Mary M. F. Flagler, widow of Daniel W. Flagler, late a brigadier-general, United States Army—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 856) for the relief of Mary McCarthy, mother of John E. McCarthy, Sixth Company, First Battalion New York Sharpshooters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 857) for the relief of James Chapman, late surgeon Eighth New York Cavalry, assistant surgeon Ninetieth New York Infantry, and surgeon One hundred and twenty-third New York Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 858) for the relief of Patrick Dougherty, late private, Company A, Thirteenth New York Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 859) for the relief of George J. Campbell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 860) for the relief of William H. Wanamaker—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. YOUNG of Virginia (by request): A bill (H. R. 861) for the relief of R. T. Priddy, executor of John D. Priddy, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BROMWELL: Memorial of the American Seed Trade Association, in regard to free seed distribution by the Secretary of Agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorials of Hecker Post, No. 638, Grand Army of the Republic, of Cincinnati, Ohio; of the Ninth Ohio Volunteer Infantry Association, and of the One hundred and sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, asking for the enactment of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON: Petitions of the Ashtabula and Fairport, Ohio, life-saving stations, for a change in rate of wages of surfmen—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Petition of the Union League of New Bedford, Mass., urging that lynching be made a criminal offense—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of the Fall River (Mass.) Board of Trade, relative to an equitable treaty between the United States and Canada—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Evidence in support of the claim of Aries Butcher for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of the claim of Lewis Black for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of the common council of the city of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., for the establishment of an international tribunal of arbitration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Resolutions adopted at the Thirtieth Annual Reunion of the Society of the Army of the Potomac, held at Pittsburg, Pa., October 11 and 12, 1899; also of the Thirty-third National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic on September 6 and 7, 1899, asking for further appropriations for the completion of the National Military Park at Gettysburg, Pa.—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MAHON: Evidence in support of the claim of William H. McKinley for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OTJEN: Petition of surfmen and citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., relating to surfmen of the United States Life-Saving Service station at that city—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SPRAGUE: Resolutions of the Boston Associated Board of Trade, for the repeal of the duties on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Norwood (Mass.) Board of Trade, praying for the establishment of reciprocal trade relations between the United States and the Dominion of Canada—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Petition of citizens of Craven County, N. C., asking for an appropriation for the improvement of navigation of Swift Creek, Craven County, N. C.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: Evidence in support of the claim of John W. Harris for an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petitions of 82 citizens and the surfmen in the Life-Saving Service on the Great Lakes, asking for increase of pay in the Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Grand Army of the Republic Association of Philadelphia, for an appropriation for the erection of monuments on the battlefield of Gettysburg—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of C. A. Calhoun and others, of Oklahoma Territory, for his relief—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of J. Edward Buckley, in relation to the American legation at Bogota, South America—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *December 5, 1899.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

Mr. MARION BUTLER, a Senator from the State of North Carolina; Mr. HORACE CHILTON, a Senator from the State of Texas, and Mr. GEORGE W. MCBRIDE, a Senator from the State of Oregon, appeared in their seats to-day.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. FAIRBANKS, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

Mr. WILLIAM J. BROWNING, the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, appeared below the bar of the Senate and delivered the following message:

Mr. President, I am directed by the House of Representatives to inform the Senate that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled; that DAVID B. HENDERSON, a Representative from the State of Iowa, has been elected Speaker; that ALEXANDER MCDOWELL, a citizen of the State of Pennsylvania, has been elected Clerk, and that the House is ready to proceed to business.

Also, that a committee of three had been appointed by the Speaker, on the part of the House of Representatives, to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to wait on the President of the United States and notify him that a quorum of each of the two Houses had assembled and that Congress was ready to receive any communication he might be pleased to make, and Mr. CANNON of Illinois, Mr. PAYNE of New York, and Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee had been appointed such committee on the part of the House.

SENATOR FROM TENNESSEE.

Mr. TURLEY. Mr. President, Mr. Bate, Senator-elect from the State of Tennessee, is present and ready to take the oath of office. His credentials are already on file, and I ask that the oath be administered to him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator-elect will present himself and take the required oath of office.

Mr. Bate was escorted to the Vice-President's desk by Mr. TURLEY; and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut and Mr. JONES of Arkansas, the committee appointed in conjunction with a similar committee of the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States, appeared at the bar, and

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut said: Mr. President, the committee appointed by the Senate to join with a like committee on the part of the House of Representatives and inform the President that a quorum of each of the two Houses had assembled and that Congress was ready to receive any communication that he might be pleased to make have performed that duty. The President replied that he would communicate at once with the two Houses in writing. He also expressed his satisfaction at the assembling of Congress and his hope that great good might result to the country from its deliberations.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

At 12 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m., Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of the secretaries of the President of the United States, appeared below the bar and said:

Mr. President, I am directed by the President of the United States to deliver to the Senate a message in writing.

The message was received from the secretary and handed to the President pro tempore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The Secretary read the message, as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

At the threshold of your deliberations you are called to mourn with your countrymen the death of Vice-President Hobart, who passed from this life on the morning of November 21st last. His great soul now rests in eternal peace. His private life was pure and elevated, while his public career was ever distinguished by large capacity, stainless integrity, and exalted motives. He has been removed from the high office which he honored and dignified, but his lofty character, his devotion to duty, his honesty of purpose, and noble virtues remain with us as a priceless legacy and example.

The Fifty-sixth Congress convenes in its first regular session with the country in a condition of unusual prosperity, of universal good will among the people at home, and in relations of peace and friendship with every government of the world. Our foreign commerce has shown great increase in volume and value. The combined imports and exports for the year are the largest ever shown by a single year in all our history. Our exports for 1899 alone exceeded by more than a billion dollars our imports and exports combined in 1870. The imports per capita are 20 per cent less than in 1870, while the exports per capita are 58 per cent more than in 1870, showing the enlarged capacity of the United States to satisfy the wants of its own increasing population, as well as to contribute to those of the peoples of other nations.

Exports of agricultural products were $784,776,142. Of manufactured products we exported in value $339,592,146, being larger than any previous year. It is a noteworthy fact that the only years in all our history when the products of our manufactories sold abroad exceeded those bought abroad were 1898 and 1899.

Government receipts from all sources for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899, including $11,798,314.14, part payment of the Central Pacific Railroad indebtedness, aggregated $610,982,004.35. Customs receipts were $206,128,481.75, and those from internal revenue $273,437,161.51.

For the fiscal year the expenditures were $700,093,564.02, leaving a deficit of $89,111,559.67.

The Secretary of the Treasury estimates that the receipts for the current fiscal year will aggregate $640,958,112, and upon the basis of present appropriations the expenditures will aggregate $600,958,112, leaving a surplus of $40,000,000.

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899, the internal-revenue receipts were increased about $100,000,000.

The present gratifying strength of the Treasury is shown by the fact that on December 1, 1899, the available cash balance was $278,004,837.72, of which $239,744,905.36 was in gold coin and bullion. The conditions of confidence which prevail throughout the country have brought gold into more general use and customs receipts are now almost entirely paid in that coin.

The strong position of the Treasury with respect to cash on hand and the favorable showing made by the revenues have made it possible for the Secretary of the Treasury to take action under the provisions of section 3694, Revised Statutes, relating to the sinking fund. Receipts exceeded expenditures for the first five months of the current fiscal year by $13,413,389.91, and, as mentioned above, the Secretary of the Treasury estimates that there will be a surplus of approximately $40,000,000 at the end of the year. Under such conditions it was deemed advisable and proper to resume compliance with the provisions of the sinking-fund law, which for eight years has not been done because of deficiencies in the revenues. The Treasury Department therefore offered to purchase during November $25,000,000 of the 5 per cent loan of 1904, or the 4 per cent funded loan of 1907, at the current market price. The amount offered and purchased during November was $18,408,600. The premium paid by the Government on such purchases was $2,263,521 and the net saving in interest was about $2,885,000. The success of this operation was sufficient to induce the Government to continue the offer to purchase bonds to and including the 23d day of December, instant, unless the remainder of the $25,000,000 called for should be presented in the meantime for redemption.

Increased activity in industry, with its welcome attendant—a larger employment for labor at higher wages—gives to the body of the people a larger power to absorb the circulating medium. It is further true that year by year, with larger areas of land under cultivation, the increasing volume of agricultural products, cotton, corn, and wheat, calls for a larger volume of money supply. This is especially noticeable at the crop-harvesting and crop-moving period.

In its earlier history the National Banking Act seemed to prove a reasonable avenue through which needful additions to the circulation could from time to time be made. Changing conditions have apparently rendered it now inoperative to that end. The high margin in bond securities required, resulting from large premiums which Government bonds command in the market, or the tax on note issues, or both operating together, appear to be the influences which impair its public utility.

The attention of Congress is respectfully invited to this important matter with the view of ascertaining whether or not such reasonable modifications can be made in the National Banking Act as will render its service in the particulars here referred to more responsive to the people's needs. I again urge that national banks be authorized to organize with a capital of $25,000.

I urgently recommend that to support the existing gold standard, and to maintain "the parity in value of the coins of the two metals (gold and silver) and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the market and in the payment of debts," the Secretary of the Treasury be given additional power and charged with the duty to sell United States bonds and to employ such other effective means as may be necessary to these ends. The authority should include the power to sell bonds on long and short time, as conditions may require, and should provide for a rate of interest lower than that fixed by the act of January 14, 1875. While there is now no commercial fright which withdraws gold from the Government, but, on the contrary, such widespread confidence that gold seeks the Treasury demanding paper money in exchange, yet the very situation points to the present as the most fitting time to make adequate provision to insure the continuance of the gold standard and of public confidence in the ability and purpose of the Government to meet all its obligations in the money which the civilized world recognizes as the best. The financial transactions of the Government are conducted upon a gold basis. We receive gold when we sell United States bonds and use gold for their payment. We are maintaining the parity of all the money issued or coined by authority of the Government. We are doing these things with the means at hand. Happily at the present time we are not compelled to resort to loans to supply gold. It has been done in the past, however, and may have to be done in the future. It behooves us, therefore, to provide at once the best means to meet the emergency when it arises, and the best means are those which are the most certain and economical. Those now authorized have the virtue neither of directness nor economy. We have already eliminated one of the causes of our financial plight and embarrassment during the years 1893, 1894, 1895, and 1896. Our receipts now equal our expenditures; deficient revenues no longer create alarm. Let us remove the only remaining cause by conferring the full and necessary power on the Secretary of the Treasury and impose upon him the duty to uphold the present gold standard and preserve the coins of the two metals on a parity with each other, which is the repeatedly declared policy of the United States.

In this connection I repeat my former recommendations that a portion of the gold holdings shall be placed in a trust fund from which greenbacks shall be redeemed upon presentation, but when once redeemed shall not thereafter be paid out except for gold.

The value of an American merchant marine to the extension of our commercial trade and the strengthening of our power upon the sea invites the immediate action of the Congress. Our national development will be one-sided and unsatisfactory so long as the remarkable growth of our inland industries remains unaccompanied by progress on the seas. There is no lack of constitutional authority for legislation which shall give to the country maritime strength commensurate with its industrial achievements and with its rank among the nations of the earth.

The past year has recorded exceptional activity in our shipyards, and the promises of continual prosperity in shipbuilding are abundant. Advanced legislation for the protection of our seamen has been enacted. Our coast trade, under regulations wisely framed at the beginning of the Government and since, shows results for the past fiscal year unequaled in our records or those of any other power. We shall fail to realize our opportunities, however, if we complacently regard only matters at home and blind ourselves to the necessity of securing our share in the valuable carrying trade of the world.

Last year American vessels transported a smaller share of our exports and imports than during any former year in all our history, and the measure of our dependence upon foreign shipping was painfully manifested to our people. Without any choice of our own, but from necessity, the Departments of the Government charged with military and naval operations in the East and West Indies had to obtain from foreign flags merchant vessels essential for those operations.

The other great nations have not hesitated to adopt the required means to develop their shipping as a factor in national defense

and as one of the surest and speediest means of obtaining for their producers a share in foreign markets. Like vigilance and effort on our part can not fail to improve our situation, which is regarded with humiliation at home and with surprise abroad. Even the seeming sacrifices, which at the beginning may be involved, will be offset later by more than equivalent gains.

The expense is as nothing compared to the advantage to be achieved. The reestablishment of our merchant marine involves in a large measure our continued industrial progress and the extension of our commercial triumphs. I am satisfied the judgment of the country favors the policy of aid to our merchant marine, which will broaden our commerce and markets and upbuild our sea-carrying capacity for the products of agriculture and manufacture; which, with the increase of our Navy, mean more work and wages to our countrymen, as well as a safeguard to American interests in every part of the world.

Combinations of capital organized into trusts to control the conditions of trade among our citizens, to stifle competition, limit production, and determine the prices of products used and consumed by the people, are justly provoking public discussion, and should early claim the attention of the Congress.

The Industrial Commission, created by the act of the Congress of June 18, 1898, has been engaged in extended hearings upon the disputed questions involved in the subject of combinations in restraint of trade and competition. They have not yet completed their investigation of this subject, and the conclusions and recommendations at which they may arrive are undetermined.

The subject is one giving rise to many divergent views as to the nature and variety or cause and extent of the injuries to the public which may result from large combinations concentrating more or less numerous enterprises and establishments, which previously to the formation of the combination were carried on separately.

It is universally conceded that combinations which engross or control the market of any particular kind of merchandise or commodity necessary to the general community, by suppressing natural and ordinary competition, whereby prices are unduly enhanced to the general consumer, are obnoxious not only to the common law but also to the public welfare. There must be a remedy for the evils involved in such organizations. If the present law can be extended more certainly to control or check these monopolies or trusts, it should be done without delay. Whatever power the Congress possesses over this most important subject should be promptly ascertained and asserted.

President Harrison, in his Annual Message of December 3, 1889, says:

> Earnest attention should be given by Congress to a consideration of the question how far the restraint of those combinations of capital commonly called "trusts" is matter of Federal jurisdiction. When organized, as they often are, to crush out all healthy competition and to monopolize the production or sale of an article of commerce and general necessity, they are dangerous conspiracies against the public good, and should be made the subject of prohibitory and even penal legislation.

An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies was passed by Congress on the 2d of July, 1890. The provisions of this statute are comprehensive and stringent. It declares every contract or combination, in the form of a trust or otherwise, or conspiracy in the restraint of trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations, to be unlawful. It denominates as a criminal every person who makes any such contract or engages in any such combination or conspiracy, and provides a punishment by fine or imprisonment. It invests the several circuit courts of the United States with jurisdiction to prevent and restrain violations of the act, and makes it the duty of the several United States district attorneys, under the direction of the Attorney-General, to institute proceedings in equity to prevent and restrain such violations. It further confers upon any person who shall be injured in his business or property by any other person or corporation by reason of anything forbidden or declared to be unlawful by the act the power to sue therefor in any circuit court of the United States without respect to the amount in controversy, and to recover threefold the damages by him sustained and the costs of the suit, including reasonable attorney fees. It will be perceived that the act is aimed at every kind of combination in the nature of a trust or monopoly in restraint of interstate or international commerce.

The prosecution by the United States of offenses under the act of 1890 has been frequently resorted to in the Federal courts, and notable efforts in the restraint of interstate commerce, such as the Trans-Missouri Freight Association and the Joint Traffic Association, have been successfully opposed and suppressed.

President Cleveland in his Annual Message of December 7, 1896—more than six years subsequent to the enactment of this law—after stating the evils of these trust combinations, says:

> Though Congress has attempted to deal with this matter by legislation, the laws passed for that purpose thus far have proved ineffective, not because of any lack of disposition or attempt to enforce them, but simply because the laws themselves as interpreted by the courts do not reach the difficulty. If the insufficiencies of existing laws can be remedied by further legislation, it should be done. The fact must be recognized, however, that all Federal legislation on this subject may fall short of its purpose because of inherent obstacles, and also because of the complex character of our governmental system, which, while making the Federal authority supreme within its sphere, has carefully limited that sphere by metes and bounds which can not be transgressed. The decision of our highest court on this precise question renders it quite doubtful whether the evils of trusts and monopolies can be adequately treated through Federal action, unless they seek directly and purposely to include in their objects transportation or intercourse between States or between the United States and foreign countries.
>
> It does not follow, however, that this is the limit of the remedy that may be applied. Even though it may be found that Federal authority is not broad enough to fully reach the case, there can be no doubt of the power of the several States to act effectively in the premises, and there should be no reason to doubt their willingness to judiciously exercise such power.

The State legislation to which President Cleveland looked for relief from the evils of trusts has failed to accomplish fully that object. This is probably due to a great extent to the fact that different States take different views as to the proper way to discriminate between evil and injurious combinations and those associations which are beneficial and necessary to the business prosperity of the country. The great diversity of treatment in different States arising from this cause and the intimate relations of all parts of the country to each other without regarding State lines in the conduct of business have made the enforcement of State laws difficult.

It is apparent that uniformity of legislation upon this subject in the several States is much to be desired. It is to be hoped that such uniformity founded in a wise and just discrimination between what is injurious and what is useful and necessary in business operations may be obtained and that means may be found for the Congress within the limitations of its constitutional power so to supplement an effective code of State legislation as to make a complete system of laws throughout the United States adequate to compel a general observance of the salutary rules to which I have referred.

The whole question is so important and far-reaching that I am sure no part of it will be lightly considered, but every phase of it will have the studied deliberation of the Congress, resulting in wise and judicious action.

A review of our relations with foreign States is presented with such recommendations as are deemed appropriate.

The long-pending boundary dispute between the Argentine Republic and Chile was settled in March last by the award of an arbitral commission, on which the United States minister at Buenos Ayres served as umpire.

Progress has been made toward the conclusion of a convention of extradition with the Argentine Republic. Having been advised and consented to by the United States Senate and ratified by Argentina, it only awaits the adjustment of some slight changes in the text before exchange.

In my last Annual Message I adverted to the claim of the Austro-Hungarian Government for indemnity for the killing of certain Austrian and Hungarian subjects by the authorities of the State of Pennsylvania, at Lattimer, while suppressing an unlawful tumult of miners, September 10, 1897. In view of the verdict of acquittal rendered by the court before which the sheriff and his deputies were tried for murder, and following the established doctrine that the Government may not be held accountable for injuries suffered by individuals at the hands of the public authorities while acting in the line of duty in suppressing disturbance of the public peace, this Government, after due consideration of the claim advanced by the Austro-Hungarian Government, was constrained to decline liability to indemnify the sufferers.

It is gratifying to be able to announce that the Belgian Government has mitigated the restrictions on the importation of cattle from the United States, to which I referred in my last Annual Message.

Having been invited by Belgium to participate in a congress, held at Brussels, to revise the provisions of the general act of July 2, 1890, for the repression of the African slave trade, to which the United States was a signatory party, this Government preferred not to be represented by a plenipotentiary, but reserved the right of accession to the result. Notable changes were made, those especially concerning this country being in the line of the increased restriction of the deleterious trade in spirituous liquors with the native tribes, which this Government has from the outset urgently advocated. The amended general act will be laid before the Senate, with a view to its advice and consent.

Early in the year the peace of Bolivia was disturbed by a successful insurrection. The United States minister remained at his post, attending to the American interests in that quarter, and using besides his good offices for the protection of the interests of British subjects in the absence of their national representative. On the establishment of the new Government our minister was directed to enter into relations therewith.

General Pando was elected President of Bolivia on October 23.

Our representative has been instructed to use all permissible friendly endeavors to induce the Government of Bolivia to amend its marriage laws so as to give legal status to the non-Catholic and civil marriages of aliens within its jurisdiction, and strong hopes are entertained that the Bolivian law in this regard will be brought,

as was that of Peru some years ago, into harmony with the general practice of modern states.

A convention of extradition with Brazil, signed May 14, 1897, has been ratified by the Brazilian Legislature.

During the past summer two national ships of the United States have visited Brazilian ports on a friendly mission and been cordially received. The voyage of the *Wilmington* up the Amazon River gave rise to a passing misunderstanding, owing to confusion in obtaining permission to visit the interior and make surveys in the general interest of navigation, but the incident found a ready adjustment in harmony with the close relations of amity which this Government has always sedulously sought to cultivate with the commonwealths of the Western Continent.

The claim growing out of the seizure of the American-owned newspaper The Panama Star and Herald by the authorities of Colombia has been settled, after a controversy of several years, by an agreement assessing at $30,000 the indemnity to be paid by the Colombian Government, in three installments of $10,000 each.

The good will of Colombia toward our country has been testified anew by the cordial extension of facilities to the Nicaraguan Canal Commission in their approaching investigation of the Panama Canal and other projected routes across the Isthmus of Darien.

Toward the end of October an insurrectionary disturbance developed in the Colombian Republic. This movement has thus far not attained any decisive result and is still in progress.

Discussion of the questions raised by the action of Denmark in imposing restrictions on the importation of American meats has continued without substantial result in our favor.

The neighboring island Republic of Santo Domingo has lately been the scene of revolution, following a long period of tranquillity. It began with the killing of President Heureaux in July last, and culminated in the relinquishment by the succeeding vice-president of the reins of government to the insurgents. The first act of the provisional government was the calling of a presidential and constituent election. Juan Isidro Jimenez, having been elected President, was inaugurated on the 14th of November. Relations have been entered into with the newly established Government.

The experimental association of Nicaragua, Honduras, and Salvador, under the title of the Greater Republic of Central America, when apparently on the threshold of a complete federal organization by the adoption of a constitution and the formation of a national legislature, was disrupted in the last days of November, 1898, by the withdrawal of Salvador. Thereupon Nicaragua and Honduras abandoned the joint compact, each resuming its former independent sovereignty. This was followed by the reception of Minister Merry by the Republics of Nicaragua and Salvador, while Minister Hunter in turn presented his credentials to the Government of Honduras, thus reverting to the old distribution of the diplomatic agencies of the United States in Central America for which our existing statutes provide. A Nicaraguan envoy has been accredited to the United States.

An insurrectionary movement, under General Reyes, broke out at Bluefields in February last, and for a time exercised actual control in the Mosquito Territory. The *Detroit* was promptly sent thither for the protection of American interests. After a few weeks the Reyes government renounced the conflict, giving place to the restored supremacy of Nicaragua. During the interregnum certain public dues accruing under Nicaraguan law were collected from American merchants by the authorities for the time being in effective administrative control. Upon the titular government regaining power a second payment of these dues was demanded. Controversy arose touching the validity of the original payment of the debt to the *de facto* regent of the territory. An arrangement was effected in April last by the United States minister and the foreign secretary of Nicaragua whereby the amounts of the duplicate payments were deposited with the British consul pending an adjustment of the matter by direct agreement between the Governments of the United States and Nicaragua. The controversy is still unsettled.

The contract of the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua was declared forfeited by the Nicaraguan Government on the 10th of October, on the ground of nonfulfillment within the ten years' term stipulated in the contract. The Maritime Canal Company has lodged a protest against this action, alleging rights in the premises which appear worthy of consideration. This Government expects that Nicaragua will afford the protestants a full and fair hearing upon the merits of the case.

The Nicaragua Canal Commission, which had been engaged upon the work of examination and survey for a ship-canal route across Nicaragua, having completed its labors and made its report, was dissolved on May 31, and on June 10 a new commission, known as the Isthmian Canal Commission, was organized under the terms of the act approved March 3, 1899, for the purpose of examining the American Isthmus with a view to determining the most practicable and feasible route for a ship canal across that Isthmus, with its probable cost, and other essential details.

This Commission, under the presidency of Rear-Admiral John G. Walker, U. S. N. (retired), entered promptly upon the work intrusted to it, and is now carrying on examinations in Nicaragua along the route of the Panama Canal, and in Darien from the Atlantic, in the neighborhood of the Atrato River, to the Bay of Panama, on the Pacific side. Good progress has been made, but under the law a comprehensive and complete investigation is called for, which will require much labor and considerable time for its accomplishment. The work will be prosecuted as expeditiously as possible and a report made at the earliest practicable date.

The great importance of this work can not be too often or too strongly pressed upon the attention of the Congress. In my Message of a year ago I expressed my views of the necessity of a canal which would link the two great oceans, to which I again invite your consideration. The reasons then presented for early action are even stronger now.

A pleasing incident in the relations of this Government with that of Chile occurred in the generous assistance given to the war ship *Newark* when in distress in Chilean waters. Not alone in this way has the friendly disposition of Chile found expression. That country has acceded to the convention for the establishment of the Bureau of the American Republics, in which organization every independent State of the continent now shares.

The exchange of ratifications of a convention for the revival of the United States and Chilean Claims Commission and for the adjudication of claims heretofore presented but not determined during the life of the previous Commission has been delayed by reason of the necessity for fresh action by the Chilean Senate upon the amendments attached to the ratification of the treaty by the United States Senate. This formality is soon to be accomplished.

In view of disturbances in the populous provinces of northern China, where are many of our citizens, and of the imminence of disorder near the capital and toward the seaboard, a guard of marines was landed from the *Boston* and stationed during last winter in the legation compound at Peking. With the restoration of order this protection was withdrawn.

The interests of our citizens in that vast Empire have not been neglected during the past year. Adequate protection has been secured for our missionaries and some injuries to their property have been redressed.

American capital has sought and found various opportunities of competing to carry out the internal improvements which the Imperial Government is wisely encouraging, and to develop the natural resources of the Empire. Our trade with China has continued to grow, and our commercial rights under existing treaties have been everywhere maintained during the past year, as they will be in the future.

The extension of the area open to international foreign settlement at Shanghai and the opening of the ports at Nanking, Tsingtao (Kiao chao), and Ta-lien-wan to foreign trade and settlement will doubtless afford American enterprise additional facilities and new fields, of which it will not be slow to take advantage.

In my Message to Congress of December 5, 1898, I urged that the recommendation which had been made to the Speaker of the House of Representatives by the Secretary of the Treasury on the 14th of June, 1898, for an appropriation for a commission to study the commercial and industrial conditions in the Chinese Empire and report as to the opportunities for, and obstacles to, the enlargements of markets in China for the raw products and manufactures of the United States, should receive at your hands the consideration which its importance and timeliness merited, but the Congress failed to take action.

I now renew this recommendation, as the importance of the subject has steadily grown since it was first submitted to you, and no time should be lost in studying for ourselves the resources of this great field for American trade and enterprise.

The death of President Faure in February last called forth those sincere expressions of sympathy which befit the relations of two Republics as closely allied by unbroken historic ties as are the United States and France.

Preparations for the representation of the industries, arts, and products of the United States at the World's Exposition to be held in Paris next year continue on an elaborate and comprehensive scale, thanks to the generous appropriation provided by Congress and to the friendly interest the French Government has shown in furthering a typical exhibit of American progress.

There has been allotted to the United States a considerable addition of space, which, while placing our country in the first rank among exhibitors, does not suffice to meet the increasingly urgent demands of our manufacturers. The efforts of the Commissioner-General are ably directed toward a strictly representative display of all that most characteristically marks American achievement in the inventive arts, and most adequately shows the excellence of our natural productions.

In this age of keen rivalry among nations for mastery in commerce, the doctrine of evolution and the rule of the survival of the fittest must be as inexorable in their operation as they are positive

in the results they bring about. The place won in the struggle by an industrial people can only be held by unrelaxed endeavor and constant advance in achievement. The present extraordinary impetus in every line of American exportation and the astounding increase in the volume and value of our share in the world's markets may not be attributed to accidental conditions.

The reasons are not far to seek. They lie deep in our national character and find expression year by year in every branch of handicraft, in every new device whereby the materials we so abundantly produce are subdued to the artisan's will and made to yield the largest, most practical, and most beneficial return. The American exhibit at Paris should, and I am confidant will, be an open volume, whose lessons of skillfully directed endeavor, unfaltering energy, and consummate performance may be read by all on every page, thus spreading abroad a clearer knowledge of the worth of our productions and the justice of our claim to an important place in the marts of the world. To accomplish this by judicious selection, by recognition of paramount merit in whatever walk of trade or manufacture it may appear, and by orderly classification and attractive installation is the task of our Commission.

The United States Government building is approaching completion, and no effort will be spared to make it worthy, in beauty of architectural plan and in completeness of display, to represent our nation. It has been suggested that a permanent building of similar or appropriate design be erected on a convenient site, already given by the municipality, near the Exposition grounds, to serve in commemoration of the part taken by this country in this great enterprise, as an American National Institute, for our countrymen resorting to Paris for study.

I am informed by our Commissioner-General that we shall have in the American sections at Paris over 7,000 exhibitors, from every State in our country, a number ten times as great as those which were represented at Vienna in 1873, six times as many as those in Paris in 1878, and four times as many as those who exhibited in Paris in 1889. This statement does not include the exhibits from either Cuba, Porto Rico, or Hawaii, for which arrangements have been made.

A number of important international congresses on special topics affecting public interests are proposed to be held in Paris next summer in connection with the Exposition. Effort will be made to have the several technical branches of our administration efficiently represented at those conferences, each in its special line, and to procure the largest possible concourse of State representatives, particularly at the Congresses of Public Charity and of Medicine.

Our relations with Germany continue to be most cordial. The increasing intimacy of direct association has been marked during the year by the granting permission in April for the landing on our shores of a cable from Borkum Emden, on the North Sea, by way of the Azores, and also by the conclusion on September 2d of a Parcels Post Convention with the German Empire. In all that promises closer relations of intercourse and commerce and a better understanding between two races having so many traits in common, Germany can be assured of the most cordial cooperation of this Government and people. We may be rivals in many material paths, but our rivalry should be generous and open, ever aiming toward the attainment of larger results and the mutually beneficial advancement of each in the line of its especial adaptabilities.

The several governments of the Empire seem reluctant to admit the natural excellence of our food productions and to accept the evidence we constantly tender of the care with which their purity is guarded by rigid inspection from the farm, through the slaughterhouse and the packing establishments, to the port of shipment. Our system of control over exported food staples invites examination from any quarter and challenges respect by its efficient thoroughness.

It is to be hoped that in time the two Governments will act in common accord toward the realization of their common purpose to safeguard the public health and to insure the purity and wholesomeness of all food products imported by either country from the other. Were the Congress to authorize an invitation to Germany, in connection with the pending reciprocity negotiations, for the constitution of a joint commission of scientific experts and practical men of affairs to conduct a searching investigation of food production and exportation in both countries and report to their respective legislatures for the adoption of such remedial measures as they might recommend for either, the way might be opened for the desirable result indicated.

Efforts to obtain for American life insurance companies a full hearing as to their business operations in Prussia have, after several years of patient representation, happily succeeded, and one of the most important American companies has been granted a concession to continue business in that Kingdom.

I am also glad to announce that the German insurance companies have been readmitted by the superintendent of insurance to do business in the State of New York.

Subsequent to the exchange of our peace treaty with Spain Germany acquired the Caroline Islands by purchase, paying therefor $5,000,000. Assurances have been received from the German Government that the rights of American missionaries and traders there will be considerately observed.

In my last Annual Message I referred to the pending negotiations with Great Britain in respect to the Dominion of Canada. By means of an executive agreement a Joint High Commission had been created for the purpose of adjusting all unsettled questions between the United States and Canada, embracing twelve subjects, among which were the questions of the fur seals, the fisheries of the coast and contiguous inland waters, the Alaskan boundary, the transit of merchandise in bond, the alien labor laws, mining rights, reciprocity in trade, revision of the agreement respecting naval vessels in the Great Lakes, a more complete marking of parts of the boundary, provision for the conveyance of criminals, and for wrecking and salvage.

Much progress had been made by the Commission toward the adjustment of many of these questions, when it became apparent that an irreconcilable difference of views was entertained respecting the delimitation of the Alaskan boundary. In the failure of an agreement as to the meaning of articles 3 and 4 of the treaty of 1825 between Russia and Great Britain, which defined the boundary between Alaska and Canada, the American Commissioners proposed that the subject of the boundary be laid aside and that the remaining questions of difference be proceeded with, some of which were so far advanced as to assure the probability of a settlement. This being declined by the British Commissioners, an adjournment was taken until the boundary should be adjusted by the two Governments. The subject has been receiving the careful attention which its importance demands, with the result that a *modus vivendi* for provisional demarcations in the region about the head of Lynn Canal has been agreed upon; and it is hoped that the negotiations now in progress between the two Governments will end in an agreement for the establishment and delimitation of a permanent boundary.

Apart from these questions growing out of our relationship with our northern neighbor, the most friendly disposition and ready agreement have marked the discussion of numerous matters arising in the vast and intimate intercourse of the United States with Great Britain.

This Government has maintained an attitude of neutrality in the unfortunate contest between Great Britain and the Boer States of Africa. We have remained faithful to the precept of avoiding entangling alliances as to affairs not of our direct concern. Had circumstances suggested that the parties to the quarrel would have welcomed any kindly expression of the hope of the American people that war might be averted, good offices would have been gladly tendered. The United States representative at Pretoria was early instructed to see that all neutral American interests be respected by the combatants. This has been an easy task in view of the positive declarations of both British and Boer authorities that the personal and property rights of our citizens should be observed.

Upon the withdrawal of the British agent from Pretoria the United States consul was authorized, upon the request of the British Government and with the assent of the South African and Orange Free State Governments, to exercise the customary good offices of a neutral for the care of British interests. In the discharge of this function I am happy to say that abundant opportunity has been afforded to show the impartiality of this Government toward both the combatants.

For the fourth time in the present decade question has arisen with the Government of Italy in regard to the lynching of Italian subjects. The latest of these deplorable events occurred at Tallulah, Louisiana, whereby five unfortunates of Italian origin were taken from jail and hanged.

The authorities of the State and a representative of the Italian Embassy having separately investigated the occurrence, with discrepant results, particularly as to the alleged citizenship of the victims, and it not appearing that the State had been able to discover and punish the violators of the law, an independent investigation has been set on foot, through the agency of the Department of State, and is still in progress. The result will enable the Executive to treat the question with the Government of Italy in a spirit of fairness and justice. A satisfactory solution will doubtless be reached.

The recurrence of these distressing manifestations of blind mob fury directed at dependents or natives of a foreign country suggests that the contingency has arisen for action by Congress in the direction of conferring upon the Federal courts jurisdiction in this class of international cases where the ultimate responsibility of the Federal Government may be involved. The suggestion is not new. In his Annual Message of December 9, 1891, my predecessor, President Harrison, said:

> It would, I believe, be entirely competent for Congress to make offenses against the treaty rights of foreigners domiciled in the United States cognizable in the Federal courts. This has not, however, been done, and the Federal

officers and courts have no power in such cases to intervene either for the protection of a foreign citizen or for the punishment of his slayers. It seems to me to follow, in this state of the law, that the officers of the State charged with police and judicial powers in such cases must, in the consideration of international questions growing out of such incidents, be regarded in such sense as Federal agents as to make this Government answerable for their acts in cases where it would be answerable if the United States had used its constitutional power to define and punish crimes against treaty rights.

A bill to provide for the punishment of violations of treaty rights of aliens was introduced in the Senate March 1, 1892, and reported favorably March 30. Having doubtless in view the language of that part of Article III of the treaty of February 26, 1871, between the United States and Italy, which stipulates that "The citizens of each of the high contracting parties shall receive, in the States and Territories of the other, most constant protection and security for their persons and property, and shall enjoy in this respect the same rights and privileges as are or shall be granted to the natives, on their submitting themselves to the conditions imposed upon the natives," the bill so introduced and reported provided that any act committed in any State or Territory of the United States in violation of the rights of a citizen or subject of a foreign country secured to such citizen or subject by treaty between the United States and such foreign country and constituting a crime under the laws of the State or Territory shall constitute a like crime against the United States and be cognizable in the Federal courts. No action was taken by Congress in the matter.

I earnestly recommend that the subject be taken up anew and acted upon during the present session. The necessity for some such provision abundantly appears. Precedent for constituting a Federal jurisdiction in criminal cases where aliens are sufferers is rationally deducible from the existing statute, which gives to the district and circuit courts of the United States jurisdiction of civil suits brought by aliens where the amount involved exceeds a certain sum. If such jealous solicitude be shown for alien rights in cases of merely civil and pecuniary import, how much greater should be the public duty to take cognizance of matters affecting the life and the rights of aliens under the settled principles of international law no less than under treaty stipulation, in cases of such transcendent wrongdoing as mob murder, especially when experience has shown that local justice is too often helpless to punish the offenders.

After many years of endeavor on the part of this Government to that end the Italian Government has consented to enter into negotiations for a naturalization convention, having for one of its objects the regulation of the status of Italians (except those of an age for active military service) who, having been naturalized in the United States, may revisit Italy. It is hoped that with the mutually conciliatory spirit displayed a successful conclusion will be reached.

The treaty of commerce and navigation between the United States and Japan on November 22, 1894, took effect in accordance with the terms of its XIXth Article on the 17th of July last, simultaneously with the enforcement of like treaties with the other powers, except France, whose convention did not go into operation until August 4th, the United States being, however, granted up to that date all the privileges and rights accorded to French citizens under the old French treaty. By this notable conventional reform Japan's position as a fully independent sovereign power is assured, control being gained of taxation, customs revenues, judicial administration, coasting trade, and all other domestic functions of government, and foreign extraterritorial rights being renounced.

Comprehensive codes of civil and criminal procedure according to western methods, public instruction, patents and copyrights, municipal administration, including jurisdiction over the former foreign settlements, customs tariffs and procedure, public health, and other administrative measures have been proclaimed. The working of the new system has given rise to no material complaints on the part of the American citizens or interests, a circumstance which attests the ripe consideration with which the change has been prepared.

Valuable assistance was rendered by the Japanese authorities to the United States transport ship *Morgan City* while stranded at Kobe. Permission has been granted to land and pasture army horses at Japanese ports of call on the way to the Philippine Islands. These kindly evidences of good will are highly appreciated.

The Japanese Government has shown a lively interest in the proposition of the Pacific Cable Company to add to its projected cable lines to Hawaii, Guam, and the Philippines a branch connection with the coast of Japan. It would be a gratifying consummation were the utility of the contemplated scheme enhanced by bringing Japan and the United States into direct telegraphic relation.

Without repeating the observations of my special Message of February 10, 1899, concerning the necessity of a cable to Manila, I respectfully invite attention to it.

I recommend that, in case the Congress should not take measures to bring about this result by direct action of the Government, the Postmaster-General be authorized to invite competitive bids for the establishment of a cable; the company making the best responsible bid to be awarded the contract; the successful company to give ample bonds to insure the completion of the work within a reasonable time.

The year has been marked by constant increase in the intimacy of our relations with Mexico and in the magnitude of mutually advantageous interchanges. This Government has omitted no opportunity to show its strong desire to develop and perpetuate the ties of cordiality now so long happily unbroken.

Following the termination on January 20, 1899, by Mexico of the convention of extradition of December 11, 1861, a new treaty more in accordance with the ascertained needs of both countries was signed February 22, 1899, and exchanged in the City of Mexico on the 22d of April last. Its operation thus far has been effective and satisfactory. A recent case has served to test the application of its IVth Article, which provides that neither party shall be bound to deliver up its own citizens, but that the executive authority of each shall have the power to deliver them up if in its discretion it be deemed proper to do so.

The extradition of Mrs. Mattie Rich, a citizen of the United States, charged with homicide committed in Mexico, was after mature consideration directed by me in the conviction that the ends of justice would be thereby subserved. Similar action, on appropriate occasion, by the Mexican Executive will not only tend to accomplish the desire of both Governments that grave crimes go not unpunished, but also to repress lawlessness along the border of the two countries. The new treaty stipulates that neither Government shall assume jurisdiction in the punishment of crimes committed exclusively within the territory of the other. This will obviate in future the embarrassing controversies which have heretofore arisen through Mexico's assertion of a claim to try and punish an American citizen for an offense committed within the jurisdiction of the United States.

The International Water Boundary Commission, organized by the convention of March 1, 1889, for the adjustment of questions affecting the Rio Grande frontier, has not yet completed its labors. A further extension of its term for one year, until December 24, 1899, was effected by a convention signed December 2, 1898, and exchanged and proclaimed in February last.

An invitation extended to the President of Mexico to visit Chicago in October, on the occasion of laying the corner stone of the United States Government building in that city, was cordially accepted by him, with the necessary consent of the Mexican Congress, but the illness of a member of his family prevented his attendance. The Minister of Foreign Relations, however, came as the personal representative of President Diaz, and in that high character was duly honored.

Claims growing out of the seizure of American sealing vessels in Bering Sea have been under discussion with the Government of Russia for several years, with the recent happy result of an agreement to submit them to the decision of a single arbitrator. By this act Russia affords proof of her adherence to the beneficent principle of arbitration which her plenipotentiaries conspicuously favored at The Hague Disarmament Conference when it was advocated by the representatives of the United States.

A suggestion for a permanent exposition of our products and manufactures in Russia, although not yet fully shaped, has been so cordially welcomed by the Imperial Government that it may not inaptly take a fitting place in whatever legislation the Congress may adopt looking to enlargement of our commercial opportunities abroad.

Important events have occurred in the Samoan Islands. The election, according to the laws and customs of Samoa, of a successor to the late King, Malietoa Laupepa, developed a contest as to the validity of the result, which issue, by the terms of the General Act, was to be decided by the Chief Justice. Upon his rendering a judgment in favor of Malietoa Tanu, the rival chief, Mataafa, took up arms. The active intervention of American and British war ships became imperative to restore order, at the cost of sanguinary encounters. In this emergency a joint commission of representatives of the United States, Germany, and Great Britain was sent to Samoa to investigate the situation and provide a temporary remedy. By its active efforts a peaceful solution was reached for the time being, the kingship being abolished and a provisional government established. Recommendations unanimously made by the commission for a permanent adjustment of the Samoan question were taken under consideration by the three powers parties to the General Act. But the more they were examined the more evident it became that a radical change was necessary in the relations of the powers to Samoa.

The inconveniences and possible perils of the tripartite scheme of supervision and control in the Samoan group by powers having little interest in common in that quarter beyond commercial rivalry had been once more emphasized by the recent events. The

suggested remedy of the Joint Commission, like the scheme it aimed to replace, amounted to what has been styled a *tridominium*, being the exercise of the functions of sovereignty by an unanimous agreement of three powers. The situation had become far more intricate and embarrassing from every point of view than it was when my predecessor, in 1894, summed up its perplexities and condemned the participation in it of the United States.

The arrangement under which Samoa was administered had proved impracticable and unacceptable to all the powers concerned. To withdraw from the agreement and abandon the islands to Germany and Great Britain would not be compatible with our interests in the archipelago. To relinquish our rights in the harbor of Pago Pago, the best anchorage in the Pacific, the occupancy of which had been leased to the United States in 1878 by the first foreign treaty ever concluded by Samoa, was not to be thought of either as regards the needs of our Navy or the interests of our growing commerce with the East. We could not have considered any proposition for the abrogation of the tripartite control which did not confirm us in all our rights and safeguard all our national interests in the islands.

Our views commended themselves to the other powers. A satisfactory arrangement was concluded between the Governments of Germany and of England, by virtue of which England retired from Samoa in view of compensations in other directions, and both powers renounced in favor of the United States all their rights and claims over and in respect to that portion of the group lying to the east of the one hundred and seventy-first degree of west longitude, embracing the islands of Tutuila, Ofoo, Olosenga, and Manua. I transmit to the Senate, for its constitutional action thereon, a convention, which besides the provisions above mentioned also guarantees us the same privileges and conditions in respect to commerce and commercial vessels in all of the islands of Samoa as those possessed by Germany.

Claims have been preferred by white residents of Samoa on account of injuries alleged to have been suffered through the acts of the treaty Governments in putting down the late disturbances. A convention has been made between the three powers for the investigation and settlement of these claims by a neutral arbitrator, to which the attention of the Senate will be invited.

My Annual Message of last year was necessarily devoted in great part to a consideration of the Spanish war and of the results it wrought and the conditions it imposed for the future. I am gratified to announce that the treaty of peace has restored friendly relations between the two powers. Effect has been given to its most important provisions. The evacuation of Porto Rico having already been accomplished on the 18th of October, 1898, nothing remained necessary there but to continue the provisional military control of the island until the Congress should enact a suitable government for the ceded territory. Of the character and scope of the measures to that end I shall treat in another part of this Message.

The withdrawal of the authority of Spain from the island of Cuba was effected by the 1st of January, so that the full re-establishment of peace found the relinquished territory held by us in trust for the inhabitants, maintaining, under the direction of the Executive, such government and control therein as should conserve public order, restore the productive conditions of peace so long disturbed by the instability and disorder which prevailed for the greater part of the preceding three decades, and build up that tranquil development of the domestic state whereby alone can be realized the high purpose, as proclaimed in the joint resolution adopted by the Congress on the 19th of April, 1898, by which the United States disclaimed any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over Cuba, except for the pacification thereof, and asserted its determination when that was accomplished to leave the government and control of the island to its people. The pledge contained in this resolution is of the highest honorable obligation and must be sacredly kept.

I believe that substantial progress has been made in this direction. All the administrative measures adopted in Cuba have aimed to fit it for a regenerated existence by enforcing the supremacy of law and justice; by placing wherever practicable the machinery of administration in the hands of the inhabitants; by instituting needed sanitary reforms; by spreading education; by fostering industry and trade; by inculcating public morality, and, in short, by taking every rational step to aid the Cuban people to attain to that plane of self-conscious respect and self-reliant unity which fits an enlightened community for self-government within its own sphere, while enabling it to fulfill all outward obligations.

This nation has assumed before the world a grave responsibility for the future good government of Cuba. We have accepted a trust the fulfillment of which calls for the sternest integrity of purpose and the exercise of the highest wisdom. The new Cuba yet to arise from the ashes of the past must needs be bound to us by ties of singular intimacy and strength if its enduring welfare is to be assured. Whether those ties shall be organic or conventional, the destinies of Cuba are in some rightful form and manner irrevocably linked with our own, but how and how far is for the future to determine in the ripeness of events. Whatever be the outcome, we must see to it that free Cuba be a reality, not a name; a perfect entity, not a hasty experiment bearing within itself the elements of failure. Our mission, to accomplish which we took up the wager of battle, is not to be fulfilled by turning adrift any loosely framed commonwealth to face the vicissitudes which too often attend weaker states whose natural wealth and abundant resources are offset by the incongruities of their political organization and the recurring occasions for internal rivalries to sap their strength and dissipate their energies. The greatest blessing which can come to Cuba is the restoration of her agricultural and industrial prosperity, which will give employment to idle men and reestablish the pursuits of peace. This is her chief and immediate need.

On the 19th of August last an order was made for the taking of the census in the island, to be completed on the 30th of November. By the treaty of peace the Spanish people on the island have until April 11, 1900, to elect whether they will remain citizens of Spain or become citizens of Cuba. Until then it can not be definitely ascertained who shall be entitled to participate in the formation of the government of Cuba. By that time the results of the census will have been tabulated and we shall proceed to provide for elections which will commit the municipal governments of the island to the officers elected by the people. The experience thus acquired will prove of great value in the formation of a representative convention of the people to draft a constitution and establish a general system of independent government for the island. In the meantime and so long as we exercise control over the island the products of Cuba should have a market in the United States on as good terms and with as favorable rates of duty as are given to the West India Islands under treaties of reciprocity which shall be made.

For the relief of the distressed in the island of Cuba the War Department has issued supplies to destitute persons through the officers of the Army, which have amounted to 5,493,000 rations, at a cost of $1,417,554.07.

To promote the disarmament of the Cuban volunteer army, and in the interest of public peace and the welfare of the people, the sum of $75 was paid to each Cuban soldier borne upon the authenticated rolls, on condition that he should deposit his arms with the authorities designated by the United States. The sum thus disbursed aggregated $2,547,750, which was paid from the emergency fund provided by the act of January 5, 1899, for that purpose.

Out of the Cuban island revenues during the six months ending June 30, 1899, $1,712,014.20 was expended for sanitation, $293,881.70 for charities and hospitals, and $88,944.03 for aid to the destitute.

Following the exchange of ratifications of the treaty of peace the two Governments accredited ministers to each other, Spain sending to Washington the Duke of Arcos, an eminent diplomatist, previously stationed in Mexico, while the United States transferred to Madrid Hon. Bellamy Storer, its minister at Brussels. This was followed by the respective appointment of consuls, thereby fully resuming the relations interrupted by the war. In addition to its consular representation in the United States, the Spanish Government has appointed consuls for Cuba, who have been provisionally recognized during the military administration of the affairs of that island.

Judicial intercourse between the courts of Cuba and Porto Rico and of Spain has been established, as provided by the treaty of peace. The Cuban political prisoners in Spanish penal stations have been and are being released and returned to their homes, in accordance with Article VI of the treaty. Negotiations are about to be had for defining the conventional relations between the two countries, which fell into abeyance by reason of the war. I trust that these will include a favorable arrangement for commercial reciprocity under the terms of sections 3 and 4 of the current tariff act. In these, as in all matters of international concern, no effort will be spared to respond to the good disposition of Spain, and to cultivate in all practicable ways the intimacy which should prevail between two nations whose past history has so often and in so many ways been marked by sincere friendship and by community of interests.

I would recommend appropriate legislation in order to carry into execution Article VII of the Treaty of Peace with Spain, by which the United States assured the payment of certain claims for indemnity of its citizens against Spain.

The United States minister to Turkey continues, under instructions, to press for a money payment in satisfaction of the just claims for injuries suffered by American citizens in the disorders of several years past and for wrongs done to them by the Ottoman authorities. Some of these claims are of many years' standing. This Government is hopeful of a general agreement in this regard.

In the Turkish Empire the situation of our citizens remains unsatisfactory. Our efforts during nearly forty years to bring about a convention of naturalization seem to be on the brink of

final failure through the announced policy of the Ottoman Porte to refuse recognition of the alien status of native Turkish subjects naturalized abroad since 1867. Our statutes do not allow this Government to admit any distinction between the treatment of native and naturalized Americans abroad, so that ceaseless controversy arises in cases where persons owing in the eye of international law a dual allegiance are prevented from entering Turkey or are expelled after entrance. Our law in this regard contrasts with that of the European States. The British act, for instance, does not claim effect for the naturalization of an alien in the event of his return to his native country, unless the change be recognized by the law of that country or stipulated by treaty between it and the naturalizing State.

The arbitrary treatment, in some instances, of American productions in Turkey has attracted attention of late, notably in regard to our flour. Large shipments by the recently opened direct steamship line to Turkish ports have been denied entrance on the score that, although of standard composition and unquestioned purity, the flour was pernicious to health because of deficient "elasticity," as indicated by antiquated and untrustworthy tests. Upon due protest by the American minister, and it appearing that the act was a virtual discrimination against our product, the shipments in question were admitted. In these, as in all instances, wherever occurring, when American products may be subjected in a foreign country, upon specious pretexts, to discrimination compared with the like products of another country, this Government will use its earnest efforts to secure fair and equal treatment for its citizens and their goods. Failing this, it will not hesitate to apply whatever corrective may be provided by the statutes.

The International Commission of Arbitration, appointed under the Anglo-Venezuelan treaty of 1897, rendered an award on October 3d last, whereby the boundary line between Venezuela and British Guiana is determined, thus ending a controversy which has existed for the greater part of the century. The award, as to which the arbitrators were unanimous, while not meeting the extreme contention of either party, gives to Great Britain a large share of the interior territory in dispute and to Venezuela the entire mouth of the Orinoco, including Barima Point and the Caribbean littoral for some distance to the eastward. The decision appears to be equally satisfactory to both parties.

Venezuela has once more undergone a revolution. The insurgents, under General Castro, after a sanguinary engagement in which they suffered much loss, rallied in the mountainous interior and advanced toward the capital. The bulk of the army having sided with the movement, President Andrade quitted Caracas, where General Castro set up a provisional government with which our minister and the representatives of other powers entered into diplomatic relations on the 20th of November, 1899.

The fourth section of the Tariff Act approved July 24th, 1897, appears to provide only for commercial treaties which should be entered into by the President and also ratified by the Senate within two years from its passage. Owing to delays inevitable in negotiations of this nature, none of the treaties initiated under that section could be concluded in time for ratification by the Senate prior to its adjournment on the 4th of March last. Some of the pending negotiations, however, were near conclusion at that time, and the resulting conventions have since been signed by the plenipotentiaries. Others, within both the third and fourth sections of the act, are still under consideration. Acting under the constitutional power of the Executive in respect to treaties, I have deemed it my duty, while observing the limitations of concession provided by the fourth section, to bring to a conclusion all pending negotiations, and submit them to the Senate for its advice and consent.

Conventions of reciprocity have been signed during the Congressional recess with Great Britain for the respective colonies of British Guiana, Barbados, Bermuda, Jamaica, and Turks and Caicos islands, and with the Republic of Nicaragua.

Important reciprocal conventions have also been concluded with France and with the Argentine Republic.

In my last Annual Message the progress noted in the work of the diplomatic and consular officers in collecting information as to the industries and commerce of other countries, and in the care and promptitude with which their reports are printed and distributed, has continued during the past year, with increasingly valuable results in suggesting new sources of demand for American products and in pointing out the obstacles still to be overcome in facilitating the remarkable expansion of our foreign trade. It will doubtless be gratifying to Congress to learn that the various agencies of the Department of State are co-operating in these endeavors with a zeal and effectiveness which are not only receiving the cordial recognition of our business interests, but are exciting the emulation of other governments. In any rearrangement of the great and complicated work of obtaining official data of an economic character which Congress may undertake it is most important, in my judgment, that the results already secured by the efforts of the Department of State should be carefully considered with a view to a judicious development and increased utility to our export trade.

The interest taken by the various States forming the International Union of American Republics in the work of its organic bureau is evidenced by the fact that for the first time since its creation in 1890 all the republics of South and Central America are now represented in it.

The unanimous recommendation of the International American Conference, providing for the International Union of American Republics, stated that it should continue in force during a term of ten years from the date of its organization, and no country becoming a member of the union should cease to be a member until the end of said period of ten years, and unless twelve months before the expiration of said period a majority of the members of the union had given to the Secretary of State of the United States official notice of their wish to terminate the union at the end of its first period, that the union should continue to be maintained for another period of ten years, and thereafter, under the same conditions, for successive periods of ten years each.

The period for notification expired on July 14, 1899, without any of the members having given the necessary notice of withdrawal. Its maintenance is therefore assured for the next ten years. In view of this fact and of the numerous questions of general interest and common benefit to all of the republics of America, some of which were considered by the first International American Conference, but not finally settled, and others which have since then grown to importance, it would seem expedient that the various Republics constituting the Union should be invited to hold at an early date another conference in the capital of one of the countries other than the United States, which has already enjoyed this honor.

The purely international character of the work being done by the Bureau and the appreciation of its value are further emphasized by the active cooperation which the various governments of the Latin-American Republics and their diplomatic representatives in this capital are now exhibiting and the zealous endeavors they are making to extend its field of usefulness, to promote through it commercial intercourse, and strengthen the bonds of amity and confidence between its various members and the nations of this continent.

The act to encourage the holding of the Pan-American Exposition on the Niagara frontier, within the county of Erie or Niagara, in the State of New York, in the year 1901, was approved on March 3, 1899.

This Exposition, which will be held in the city of Buffalo, in the near vicinity of the great Niagara cataract, and within a day's journey of which reside 40,000,000 of our people, will be confined entirely to the Western Hemisphere. Satisfactory assurances have already been given by the diplomatic representatives of Great Britain, Mexico, the Central and South American republics, and most of the States of the United States that these countries and States will make an unique, interesting, and instructive exhibit, peculiarly illustrative of their material progress during the century which is about to close.

The law provides an appropriation of $500,000 for the purpose of making an exhibit at the Exposition by the Government of the United States from its Executive Departments and from the Smithsonian Institution and National Museum, the United States Commission of Fish and Fisheries, the Department of Labor, and the Bureau of the American Republics. To secure a complete and harmonious arrangement of this Government exhibit a board of management has already been created, and charged with the selection, purchase, preparation, transportation, arrangement, and safekeeping of the articles and materials to be exhibited. This board has been organized and has already entered upon the performance of its duties, as provided for by the law.

I have every reason to hope and believe that this Exposition will tend more firmly to cement the cordial relations between the nations on this continent.

In accordance with an act of Congress approved December 21, 1898, and under the auspices of the Philadelphia Commercial Museum, a most interesting and valuable exposition of products and manufactures especially adapted to export trade was held in Philadelphia from the 14th of September to the 1st of December, 1899. The representative character of the exhibits and the widespread interest manifested in the special objects of the undertaking afford renewed encouragement to those who look confidently to the steady growth of our enlarged exportation of manufactured goods, which has been the most remarkable fact in the economic development of the United States in recent years. A feature of this exposition which is likely to become of permanent and increasing utility to our industries is the collection of samples of merchandise produced in various countries with special reference to particular markets, providing practical object lessons to United States manufacturers as to qualities, styles, and prices of goods such as meet the special demands of consumers and may be exported with advantage.

In connection with the Exposition an International Commercial

Congress was held, upon the invitation of the Philadelphia Commercial Museum, transmitted by the Department of State to the various foreign governments, for an exchange of information and opinions with the view to the promotion of international trade. This invitation met with general and cordial acceptance, and the Congress, which began its sessions at the Exposition on the 13th of October, proved to be of great practical importance, from the fact that it developed a general recognition of the interdependence of nations in trade and a most gratifying spirit of accommodation with reference to the gradual removal of existing impediments to reciprocal relations, without injury to the industrial interests of either party.

In response to the invitation of His Majesty the Emperor of Russia, delegates from 26 countries were assembled at The Hague on the 18th of May, as members of a conference in the interest of peace. The commission from the United States consisted of the Hon. Andrew D. White, the Hon. Seth Low, the Hon. Stanford Newel, Capt. Alfred T. Mahan, of the United States Navy, Capt. William Crozier, of the United States Army, and the Hon. Frederick W. Holls, secretary. The occasion seemed to be opportune for the serious consideration of a plan for the pacific adjustment of international differences, a subject in which the American people have been deeply interested for many years, and a definite project for a permanent international tribunal was included in the instructions to the delegates of the United States.

The final act of the conference includes conventions upon the amelioration of the laws and customs of war on land, the adaptation to maritime warfare of the principles of the Geneva Convention of 1864, and the extension of judicial methods to international cases. The Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Conflicts embodies the leading features of the American plan, with such modifications as were rendered necessary by the great diversity of views and interests represented by the delegates. The four titles of the convention provide for the maintenance of general peace, the exercise of good offices and mediation, the formation of commissions of inquiry, and international arbitration.

The mediation provided for by the convention is purely voluntary and advisory, and is intended to avoid any invasion or limitation of the sovereign rights of the adhering states. The commissions of inquiry proposed consist of delegations to be specifically constituted for particular purposes by means of conventions between the contesting parties, having for their object the clear understanding of international differences before resorting to the use of force. The provision for arbitration contemplates the formation of a permanent tribunal before which disputed cases may be brought for settlement by the mutual consent of the litigants in each separate case. The advantages of such a permanent tribunal over impromptu commissions of arbitration are conceived to be the actual existence of a competent court, prepared to administer justice, the greater economy resulting from a well-devised system, and the accumulated judicial skill and experience which such a tribunal would soon possess.

While earnestly promoting the idea of establishing a permanent international tribunal, the delegation of the United States was not unmindful of the inconveniences which might arise from an obtrusive exercise of mediation, and in signing the convention carefully guarded the historic position of the United States by the following declaration:

> Nothing contained in this convention shall be so construed as to require the United States of America to depart from its traditional policy of not intruding upon, interfering with, or entangling itself in the political questions or policy or internal administration of any foreign state; nor shall anything contained in the said convention be construed to imply a relinquishment by the United States of America of its traditional attitude toward purely American questions.

Thus interpreted, the Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Conflicts may be regarded as realizing the earnest desire of great numbers of American citizens, whose deep sense of justice, expressed in numerous resolutions and memorials, has urged them to labor for this noble achievement. The general character of this convention, already signed by the delegates of more than twenty sovereign states, further commends it to the favorable action of the Senate of the United States, whose ratification it still awaits.

Since my last Annual Message, and in obedience to the acts of the Congress of April 22 and 26, 1898, the remaining volunteer force enlisted for the Spanish war, consisting of 34,834 regulars and 110,202 volunteers, with over 5,000 volunteer officers, has been discharged from the military service. Of the volunteers, 667 officers and 14,831 men were serving in the Philippines, and 1,650 of the regulars, who were entitled to be mustered out after the ratification of the treaty of peace. They voluntarily remained at the front until their places could be filled by new troops. They were returned home in the order in which they went to Manila, and are now all of them out of the service and in the ranks of citizenship. I recommend that the Congress provide a special medal of honor for the volunteers, regulars, sailors, and marines on duty in the Philippines who voluntarily remained in the service after their terms of enlistment had expired.

By the act of March 2, 1899, Congress gave authority to increase the Regular Army to a maximum not exceeding 65,000 enlisted men, and to enlist a force of 35,000 volunteers, to be recruited from the country at large. By virtue of this authority the Regular Army has been increased to the number of 61,999 enlisted men and 2,248 officers, and new volunteer regiments have been organized aggregating 33,050 enlisted men and 1,524 officers. Two of these volunteer regiments are made up of colored men, with colored line officers. The new troops to take the places of those returning from the Philippines have been transported to Manila to the number of 581 officers and 26,322 enlisted men of the Regular Army and 594 officers and 15,388 enlisted men of the new volunteer force, while 504 officers and 14,119 men of the volunteer force are on the ocean en route to Manila.

The force now in Manila consists of 905 officers and 30,578 regulars, and 594 officers and 15,388 of the volunteers, making an aggregate of 1,499 officers and 45,966 men. When the troops now under orders shall reach Manila the force in the archipelago will comprise 2,051 officers and 63,483 men. The muster out of the great volunteer army organized for the Spanish war and the creation of a new army, the transportation from Manila to San Francisco of those entitled to discharge, and the transportation of the new troops to take their places have been a work of great magnitude well and ably done, for which too much credit can not be given the War Department.

During the past year we have reduced our force in Cuba and Porto Rico. In Cuba we now have 334 officers and 10,796 enlisted men; in Porto Rico, 87 officers and 2,855 enlisted men and a battalion of 400 men composed of native Porto Ricans; while stationed throughout the United States are 910 officers and 17,317 men, and in Hawaii 12 officers and 453 enlisted men.

The operations of the Army are fully presented in the report of the Secretary of War. I can not withhold from officers and men the highest commendation for their soldierly conduct in trying situations, their willing sacrifices for their country, and the integrity and ability with which they have performed unusual and difficult duties in our island possessions.

In the organization of the volunteer regiments authorized by the act of March 2, 1899, it was found that no provision had been made for chaplains. This omission was doubtless from inadvertence. I recommend the early authorization for the appointment of one chaplain for each of said regiments. These regiments are now in the Philippines, and it is important that immediate action be had.

In restoring peaceful conditions, orderly rule, and civic progress in Cuba, Porto Rico, and, so far as practicable, in the Philippines, the rehabilitation of the postal service has been an essential and important part of the work. It became necessary to provide mail facilities both for our forces of occupation and for the native population. To meet this requirement has involved a substantial reconstruction. The existing systems were so fragmentary, defective, and inadequate that a new and comprehensive organization had to be created. American trained officials have been assigned to the directing and executive positions, while natives have been chiefly employed in making up the body of the force. In working out this plan the merit rule has been rigorously and faithfully applied.

The appointment of Director-General of Posts of Cuba was given to an expert who had been Chief Post-Office Inspector and Assistant Postmaster-General, and who united large experience with administrative capacity. For the postmastership at Havana the range of skilled and available men was scanned, and the choice fell upon one who had been twenty years in the service as deputy postmaster and postmaster of a large city. This principle governed and determined the selection of the American officials sent not only to Cuba, but to Porto Rico and the Philippines, and they were instructed to apply it so far as practicable in the employment of the natives as minor postmasters and clerks. The postal system in Cuba, though remaining under the general guidance of the Postmaster-General, was made essentially independent. It was felt that it should not be a burden upon the postal service of the United States, and provision was made that any deficit in the postal revenue should be a charge upon the general revenues of the island.

Though Porto Rico and the Philippines hold a different relation to the United States, yet, for convenience of administration, the same principle of an autonomous system has been extended to them. The development of the service in all of the islands has been rapid and successful. It has moved forward on American lines, with free delivery, money order, and registry systems, and has given the people mail facilities far greater and more reliable than any they have ever before enjoyed. It is thus not only a vital agency of industrial, social, and business progress, but an important influence in diffusing a just understanding of the true spirit and character of American administration.

The domestic postal service continues to grow with extraordinary rapidity. The expenditures and the revenues will each exceed $100,000,000 during the current year. Fortunately, since the revival of prosperous times the revenues have grown much faster than the expenditures, and there is every indication that a short period will witness the obliteration of the annual deficit. In this connection the report of the Postmaster-General embodies a statement of some evils which have grown up outside of the contemplation of law in the treatment of some classes of mail matter which wrongly exercise the privilege of the pound rate, and shows that if this matter had been properly classified and had paid the rate which it should have paid, instead of a postal deficit for the last fiscal year of $6,610,000, there would have been on one basis a surplus of $17,637,570, and on another of $5,733,836. The reform thus suggested, in the opinion of the Postmaster-General, would not only put the postal service at once on a self-sustaining basis, but would permit great and valuable improvements, and I commend the subject to the consideration of the Congress.

The Navy has maintained the spirit and high efficiency which have always characterized that service, and has lost none of the gallantry in heroic action which has signalized its brilliant and glorious past. The Nation has equal pride in its early and later achievements. Its habitual readiness for every emergency has won the confidence and admiration of the country. The people are interested in the continued preparation and prestige of the Navy and will justify liberal appropriations for its maintenance and improvement. The officers have shown peculiar adaptation for the performance of new and delicate duties which our recent war has imposed.

It can not be doubted that Congress will at once make necessary provision for the armor plate for the vessels now under contract and building. Its attention is respectfully called to the report of the Secretary of the Navy, in which the subject is fully presented. I unite in his recommendation that the Congress enact such special legislation as may be necessary to enable the Department to make contracts early in the coming year for armor of the best quality that can be obtained in this country for the *Maine*, *Ohio*, and *Missouri*, and that the provision of the act of March 3, 1899, limiting the price of armor to $300 per ton be removed.

In the matter of naval construction Italy and Japan, of the great powers, laid down less tonnage in the year 1899 than this country, and Italy alone has less tonnage under construction. I heartily concur in the recommendations for the increase of the Navy, as suggested by the Secretary.

Our future progress and prosperity depend upon our ability to equal, if not surpass, other nations in the enlargement and advance of science, industry, and commerce. To invention we must turn as one of the most powerful aids to the accomplishment of such a result. The attention of the Congress is directed to the report of the Commissioner of Patents, in which will be found valuable suggestions and recommendations.

On the 30th of June, 1899, the pension roll of the United States numbered 991,519. These include the pensioners of the Army and Navy in all our wars. The number added to the rolls during the year was 40,991. The number dropped by reason of death, remarriage, minors by legal limitation, failure to claim within three years, and other causes, was 43,186, and the number of claims disallowed was 107,919. During the year 89,054 pension certificates were issued, of which 37,077 were for new or original pensions. The amount disbursed for army and navy pensions during the year was $138,355,052.95, which was $1,651,461.61 less than the sum of the appropriations.

The Grand Army of the Republic at its recent national encampment held in Philadelphia has brought to my attention and to that of the Congress the wisdom and justice of a modification of the third section of the act of June 27, 1890, which provides pensions for the widows of officers and enlisted men who served ninety days or more during the War of the Rebellion and were honorably discharged, provided that such widows are without other means of support than their daily labor and were married to the soldier, sailor, or marine on account of whose service they claim pension prior to the date of the act.

The present holding of the Department is that if the widow's income aside from her daily labor does not exceed in amount what her pension would be, to wit, $96 per annum, she would be deemed to be without other means of support than her daily labor, and would be entitled to a pension under this act; while if the widow's income independent of the amount received by her as the result of her daily labor exceeds $96, she would not be pensionable under the act. I am advised by the Commissioner of Pensions that the amount of the income allowed before title to pension would be barred has varied widely under different administrations of the Pension Office, as well as during different periods of the same administration, and has been the cause of just complaint and criticism.

With the approval of the Secretary of the Interior the Commissioner of Pensions recommends that, in order to make the practice at all times uniform and to do justice to the dependent widow, the amount of income allowed independent of the proceeds of her daily labor should be not less than $250 per annum, and he urges that the Congress shall so amend the act as to permit the Pension Office to grant pensionable status to widows under the terms of the third section of the act of June 27, 1890, whose income aside from the proceeds of daily labor is not in excess of $250 per annum. I believe this to be a simple act of justice and heartily recommend it.

The Dawes Commission reports that gratifying progress has been made in its work during the preceding year. The fieldwork of enrollment of four of the nations has been completed. I recommend that Congress at an early day make liberal appropriation for educational purposes in the Indian Territory.

In accordance with the act of Congress approved March 3, 1899, the preliminary work in connection with the Twelfth Census is now fully under way. The officers required for the proper administration of the duties imposed have been selected. The provision for securing a proper enumeration of the population, as well as to secure evidence of the industrial growth of the Nation, is broader and more comprehensive than any similar legislation in the past. The Director advises that every needful effort is being made to push this great work to completion in the time limited by the statute. It is believed that the Twelfth Census will emphasize our remarkable advance in all that pertains to national progress.

Under the authority of the act of Congress approved July 7, 1898, the commission consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney-General, and the Secretary of the Interior has made an agreement of settlement, which has had my approval, of the indebtedness to the Government growing out of the issue of bonds to aid in the construction of the Central Pacific and Western Pacific railroads. The agreement secures to the Government the principal and interest of said bonds, amounting to $58,812,715.48. There has been paid thereon $11,762,543.12, which has been covered into the Treasury, and the remainder, payable within ten years, with interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum, payable semiannually, is secured by the deposit of an equal amount of first-mortgage bonds of the Pacific Railway companies. The amounts paid and secured to be paid to the Government on account of the Pacific Railroad subsidy claims are:

Union Pacific, cash	$58,448,223.75
Kansas Pacific, cash	6,303,000.00
Central and Western Pacific, cash	11,798,314.14
Notes, secured	47,050,172.36
Kansas Pacific—dividends for deficiency due United States, cash	821,897.70
Making a total of	124,421,607.95

The whole indebtedness was about $130,000,000, more than half of which consisted of accrued interest, for which sum the Government has realized the entire amount less about $6,000,000 within a period of two years.

On June 30, 1898, there were thirty forest reservations (exclusive of the Afognak Forest and Fish Culture Reserve in Alaska), embracing an estimated area of 40,719,474 acres. During the past year two of the existing forest reserves, the Trabuco Canyon (California) and Black Hills (South Dakota and Wyoming) have been considerably enlarged, the area of the Mount Rainier Reserve, in the State of Washington, has been somewhat reduced, and six additional reserves have been established, namely, the San Francisco Mountains (Arizona), the Black Mesa (Arizona), Lake Tahoe (California), Gallatin (Montana), Gila River (New Mexico), and Fish Lake (Utah), the total estimated area of which is 5,205,775 acres. This makes at the present time a total of thirty-six forest reservations, embracing an estimated area of 46,021,899 acres. This estimated area is the aggregated areas within the boundaries of the reserves. The lands actually reserved are, however, only the vacant public lands therein, and these have been set aside and reserved for sale or settlement in order that they may be of the greatest use to the people.

Protection of the national forests, inaugurated by the Department of the Interior in 1897, has been continued during the past year and much has been accomplished in the way of preventing forest fires and the protection of the timber. There are now large tracts covered by forests which will eventually be reserved and set apart for forest uses. Until that can be done Congress should increase the appropriations for the work of protecting the forests.

The Department of Agriculture is constantly consulting the needs of producers in all the States and Territories. It is introducing seeds and plants of great value and promoting fuller diversification of crops. Grains, grasses, fruits, legumes, and vegetables are imported for all parts of the United States. Under this encouragement the sugar-beet factory multiplies in the North and far West, semitropical plants are sent to the South, and congenial climates are sought for the choice productions of the far east. The hybridizing of fruit trees and grains is conducted in

the search for varieties adapted to exacting conditions. The introduction of tea gardens into the Southern States promises to provide employment for idle hands, as well as to supply the home market with tea. The subject of irrigation where it is of vital importance to the people is being carefully studied, steps are being taken to reclaim injured or abandoned lands, and information for the people along these lines is being printed and distributed.

Markets are being sought and opened up for surplus farm and factory products in Europe and in Asia. The outlook for the education of the young farmer through agricultural college and experiment station, with opportunity given to specialize in the Department of Agriculture, is very promising. The people of Hawaii, Porto Rico, and the Philippine Islands should be helped, by the establishment of experiment stations, to a more scientific knowledge of the production of coffee, india rubber, and other tropical products, for which there is demand in the United States.

There is widespread interest in the improvement of our public highways at the present time, and the Department of Agriculture is co-operating with the people in each locality in making the best possible roads from local material and in experimenting with steel tracks. A more intelligent system of managing the forests of the country is being put in operation and a careful study of the whole forestry problem is being conducted throughout the United States. A very extensive and complete exhibit of the agricultural and horticultural products of the United States is being prepared for the Paris Exposition.

On the 10th of December, 1898, the treaty of peace between the United States and Spain was signed. It provided, among other things, that Spain should cede to the United States the archipelago known as the Philippine Islands, that the United States should pay to Spain the sum of twenty millions of dollars, and that the civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territories thus ceded to the United States should be determined by the Congress. The treaty was ratified by the Senate on the 6th of February, 1899, and by the Government of Spain on the 19th of March following. The ratifications were exchanged on the 11th of April and the treaty publicly proclaimed. On the 2d of March the Congress voted the sum contemplated by the treaty, and the amount was paid over to the Spanish Government on the 1st of May.

In this manner the Philippines came to the United States. The islands were ceded by the Government of Spain, which had been in undisputed possession of them for centuries. They were accepted not merely by our authorized commissioners in Paris, under the direction of the Executive, but by the constitutional and well-considered action of the representatives of the people of the United States in both Houses of Congress. I had every reason to believe, and I still believe, that this transfer of sovereignty was in accordance with the wishes and the aspirations of the great mass of the Filipino people.

From the earliest moment no opportunity was lost of assuring the people of the islands of our ardent desire for their welfare and of the intention of this Government to do everything possible to advance their interests. In my order of the 19th of May, 1898, the commander of the military expedition dispatched to the Philippines was instructed to declare that we came not to make war upon the people of that country, "nor upon any party or faction among them, but to protect them in their homes, in their employments, and in their personal and religious rights." That there should be no doubt as to the paramount authority there, on the 17th of August it was directed that "there must be no joint occupation with the insurgents;" that the United States must preserve the peace and protect persons and property within the territory occupied by their military and naval forces; that the insurgents and all others must recognize the military occupation and authority of the United States. As early as December 4, before the cession, and in anticipation of that event, the commander in Manila was urged to restore peace and tranquillity and to undertake the establishment of a beneficent government, which should afford the fullest security for life and property.

On the 21st of December, after the treaty was signed, the commander of the forces of occupation was instructed "to announce and proclaim in the most public manner that we come, not as invaders and conquerors, but as friends to protect the natives in their homes, in their employments, and in their personal and religious rights." On the same day, while ordering General Otis to see that the peace should be preserved in Iloilo, he was admonished that: "It is most important that there should be no conflict with the insurgents." On the 1st day of January, 1899, urgent orders were reiterated that the kindly intentions of this Government should be in every possible way communicated to the insurgents.

On the 21st of January I announced my intention of dispatching to Manila a commission composed of three gentlemen of the highest character and distinction, thoroughly acquainted with the Orient, who, in association with Admiral Dewey and Major-General Otis, were instructed "to facilitate the most humane and effective extension of authority throughout the islands, and to secure with the least possible delay the benefits of a wise and generous protection of life and property to the inhabitants." These gentlemen were Dr. Jacob Gould Schurman, president of Cornell University; the Hon. Charles Denby, for many years minister to China, and Prof. Dean C. Worcester, of the University of Michigan, who had made a most careful study of life in the Philippines. While the treaty of peace was under consideration in the Senate these Commissioners set out on their mission of good will and liberation. Their character was a sufficient guaranty of the beneficent purpose with which they went, even if they had not borne the positive instructions of this Government, which made their errand preeminently one of peace and friendship.

But before their arrival at Manila the sinister ambition of a few leaders of the Filipinos had created a situation full of embarrassment for us and most grievous in its consequences to themselves. The clear and impartial preliminary report of the Commissioners, which I transmit herewith, gives so lucid and comprehensive a history of the present insurrectionary movement that the story need not be here repeated. It is enough to say that the claim of the rebel leader that he was promised independence by any officer of the United States in return for his assistance has no foundation in fact and is categorically denied by the very witnesses who were called to prove it. The most the insurgent leader hoped for when he came back to Manila was the liberation of the islands from the Spanish control, which they had been laboring for years without success to throw off.

The prompt accomplishment of this work by the American Army and Navy gave him other ideas and ambitions, and insidious suggestions from various quarters perverted the purposes and intentions with which he had taken up arms. No sooner had our army captured Manila than the Filipino forces began to assume an attitude of suspicion and hostility which the utmost efforts of our officers and troops were unable to disarm or modify. Their kindness and forbearance were taken as a proof of cowardice. The aggressions of the Filipinos continually increased until finally, just before the time set by the Senate of the United States for a vote upon the treaty, an attack, evidently prepared in advance, was made all along the American lines, which resulted in a terribly destructive and sanguinary repulse of the insurgents.

Ten days later an order of the insurgent government was issued to its adherents who had remained in Manila, of which General Otis justly observes that "for barbarous intent it is unequaled in modern times." It directs that at 8 o'clock on the night of the 15th of February the "territorial militia" shall come together in the streets of San Pedro armed with their *bolos*, with guns and ammunition where convenient; that Filipino families only shall be respected; but that all other individuals, of whatever race they may be, shall be exterminated without any compassion, after the extermination of the army of occupation, and adds: "Brothers, we must avenge ourselves on the Americans and exterminate them, that we may take our revenge for the infamies and treacheries which they have committed upon us. Have no compassion upon them; attack with vigor." A copy of this fell by good fortune into the hands of our officers and they were able to take measures to control the rising, which was actually attempted on the night of February 22d, a week later than was originally contemplated. Considerable numbers of armed insurgents entered the city by waterways and swamps and in concert with confederates inside attempted to destroy Manila by fire. They were kept in check during the night and the next day driven out of the city with heavy loss.

This was the unhappy condition of affairs which confronted our Commissioners on their arrival in Manila. They had come with the hope and intention of co-operating with Admiral Dewey and Major-General Otis in establishing peace and order in the archipelago and the largest measure of self-government compatible with the true welfare of the people. What they actually found can best be set forth in their own words:

> Deplorable as war is, the one in which we are now engaged was unavoidable by us. We were attacked by a bold, adventurous, and enthusiastic army. No alternative was left to us except ignominious retreat.
>
> It is not to be conceived of that any American would have sanctioned the surrender of Manila to the insurgents. Our obligations to other nations and to the friendly Filipinos and to ourselves and our flag demanded that force should be met by force. Whatever the future of the Philippines may be, there is no course open to us now except the prosecution of the war until the insurgents are reduced to submission. The Commission is of the opinion that there has been no time since the destruction of the Spanish squadron by Admiral Dewey when it was possible to withdraw our forces from the islands either with honor to ourselves or with safety to the inhabitants.

The course thus clearly indicated has been unflinchingly pursued. The rebellion must be put down. Civil government can not be thoroughly established until order is restored. With a devotion and gallantry worthy of its most brilliant history, the Army, ably and loyally assisted by the Navy, has carried on this unwelcome but most righteous campaign with richly deserved success. The noble self-sacrifice with which our soldiers and

soldiers whose terms of service had expired refused to avail themselves of their right to return home as long as they were needed at the front forms one of the brightest pages in our annals. Although their operations have been somewhat interrupted and checked by a rainy season of unusual violence and duration, they have gained ground steadily in every direction, and now look forward confidently to a speedy completion of their task.

The unfavorable circumstances connected with an active campaign have not been permitted to interfere with the equally important work of reconstruction. Again I invite your attention to the report of the Commissioners for the interesting and encouraging details of the work already accomplished in the establishment of peace and order and the inauguration of self-governing municipal life in many portions of the archipelago. A notable beginning has been made in the establishment of a government in the island of Negros which is deserving of special consideration. This was the first island to accept American sovereignty. Its people unreservedly proclaimed allegiance to the United States and adopted a constitution looking to the establishment of a popular government. It was impossible to guarantee to the people of Negros that the constitution so adopted should be the ultimate form of government. Such a question, under the treaty with Spain and in accordance with our own Constitution and laws, came exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Congress. The government actually set up by the inhabitants of Negros eventually proved unsatisfactory to the natives themselves. A new system was put into force by order of the Major-General Commanding the Department, of which the following are the most important elements:

It was ordered that the government of the island of Negros should consist of a military governor appointed by the United States military governor of the Philippines, and a civil governor and an advisory council elected by the people. The military governor was authorized to appoint secretaries of the treasury, interior, agriculture, public instruction, an attorney-general, and an auditor. The seat of government was fixed at Bacolod. The military governor exercises the supreme executive power. He is to see that the laws are executed, appoint to office, and fill all vacancies in office not otherwise provided for, and may, with the approval of the military governor of the Philippines, remove any officer from office. The civil governor advises the military governor on all public civil questions and presides over the advisory council. He, in general, performs the duties which are performed by secretaries of state in our own system of government.

The advisory council consists of eight members elected by the people within territorial limits which are defined in the order of the commanding general.

The times and places of holding elections are to be fixed by the military governor of the island of Negros. The qualifications of voters are as follows:

(1) A voter must be a male citizen of the island of Negros. (2) Of the age of 21 years. (3) He shall be able to speak, read, and write the English, Spanish, or Visayan language, or he must own real property worth $500, or pay a rental on real property of the value of $1,000. (4) He must have resided in the island not less than one year preceding, and in the district in which he offers to register as a voter not less than three months immediately preceding the time he offers to register. (5) He must register at a time fixed by law before voting. (6) Prior to such registration he shall have paid all taxes due by him to the Government. Provided, that no insane person shall be allowed to register or vote.

The military governor has the right to veto all bills or resolutions adopted by the advisory council, and his veto is final if not disapproved by the military governor of the Philippines.

The advisory council discharges all the ordinary duties of a legislature. The usual duties pertaining to said offices are to be performed by the secretaries of the treasury, interior, agriculture, public instruction, the attorney-general, and the auditor.

The judicial power is vested in three judges, who are to be appointed by the military governor of the island. Inferior courts are to be established.

Free public schools are to be established throughout the populous districts of the island, in which the English language shall be taught, and this subject will receive the careful consideration of the advisory council.

The burden of government must be distributed equally and equitably among the people. The military authorities will collect and receive the customs revenue, and will control postal matters and Philippine inter-island trade and commerce.

The military governor, subject to the approval of the military governor of the Philippines, determines all questions not specifically provided for and which do not come under the jurisdiction of the advisory council.

The authorities of the Sulu Islands have accepted the succession of the United States to the rights of Spain, and our flag floats over that territory. On the 10th of August, 1899, Brig. Gen. J. C. Bates, United States Volunteers, negotiated an agreement with the Sultan and his principal chiefs, which I transmit herewith. By Article I the sovereignty of the United States over the whole archipelago of Jolo and its dependencies is declared and acknowledged.

The United States flag will be used in the archipelago and its dependencies, on land and sea. Piracy is to be suppressed, and the Sultan agrees to co-operate heartily with the United States authorities to that end and to make every possible effort to arrest and bring to justice all persons engaged in piracy. All trade in domestic products of the archipelago of Jolo when carried on with any part of the Philippine Islands and under the American flag shall be free, unlimited, and undutiable. The United States will give full protection to the Sultan in case any foreign nation should attempt to impose upon him. The United States will not sell the island of Jolo or any other island of the Jolo archipelago to any foreign nation without the consent of the Sultan. Salaries for the Sultan and his associates in the administration of the islands have been agreed upon to the amount of $760 monthly.

Article X provides that any slave in the archipelago of Jolo shall have the right to purchase freedom by paying to the master the usual market value. The agreement by General Bates was made subject to confirmation by the President and to future modifications by the consent of the parties in interest. I have confirmed said agreement, subject to the action of the Congress, and with the reservation, which I have directed shall be communicated to the Sultan of Jolo, that this agreement is not to be deemed in any way to authorize or give the consent of the United States to the existence of slavery in the Sulu archipelago. I communicate these facts to the Congress for its information and action.

Everything indicates that with the speedy suppression of the Tagalo rebellion life in the archipelago will soon resume its ordinary course under the protection of our sovereignty, and the people of those favored islands will enjoy a prosperity and a freedom which they have never before known. Already hundreds of schools are open and filled with children. Religious freedom is sacredly assured and enjoyed. The courts are dispensing justice. Business is beginning to circulate in its accustomed channels. Manila, whose inhabitants were fleeing to the country a few months ago, is now a populous and thriving mart of commerce. The earnest and unremitting endeavors of the Commission and the Admiral and Major-General Commanding the Department of the Pacific to assure the people of the beneficent intentions of this Government have had their legitimate effect in convincing the great mass of them that peace and safety and prosperity and stable government can only be found in a loyal acceptance of the authority of the United States.

The future government of the Philippines rests with the Congress of the United States. Few graver responsibilities have ever been confided to us. If we accept them in a spirit worthy of our race and our traditions, a great opportunity comes with them. The islands lie under the shelter of our flag. They are ours by every title of law and equity. They can not be abandoned. If we desert them we leave them at once to anarchy and finally to barbarism. We fling them, a golden apple of discord, among the rival powers, no one of which could permit another to seize them unquestioned. Their rich plains and valleys would be the scene of endless strife and bloodshed. The advent of Dewey's fleet in Manila Bay instead of being, as we hope, the dawn of a new day of freedom and progress, will have been the beginning of an era of misery and violence worse than any which has darkened their unhappy past. The suggestion has been made that we could renounce our authority over the islands and, giving them independence, could retain a protectorate over them. This proposition will not be found, I am sure, worthy of your serious attention. Such an arrangement would involve at the outset a cruel breach of faith. It would place the peaceable and loyal majority, who ask nothing better than to accept our authority, at the mercy of the minority of armed insurgents. It would make us responsible for the acts of the insurgent leaders and give us no power to control them. It would charge us with the task of protecting them against each other and defending them against any foreign power with which they chose to quarrel. In short, it would take from the Congress of the United States the power of declaring war and vest that tremendous prerogative in the Tagal leader of the hour.

It does not seem desirable that I should recommend at this time a specific and final form of government for these islands. When peace shall be restored it will be the duty of Congress to construct a plan of government which shall establish and maintain freedom and order and peace in the Philippines. The insurrection is still existing, and when it terminates further information will be required as to the actual condition of affairs before inaugurating a permanent scheme of civil government. The full report of the Commission, now in preparation, will contain information and suggestions which will be of value to Congress, and which I will transmit as soon as it is completed. As long as the insurrection continues the military arm must necessarily be supreme. But

there is no reason why steps should not be taken from time to time to inaugurate governments essentially popular in their form as fast as territory is held and controlled by our troops. To this end I am considering the advisability of the return of the Commission, or such of the members thereof as can be secured, to aid the existing authorities and facilitate this work throughout the islands. I have believed that reconstruction should not begin by the establishment of one central civil government for all the islands, with its seat at Manila, but rather that the work should be commenced by building up from the bottom, first establishing municipal governments and then provincial governments, a central government at last to follow.

Until Congress shall have made known the formal expression of its will I shall use the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the statutes to uphold the sovereignty of the United States in those distant islands as in all other places where our flag rightfully floats. I shall put at the disposal of the Army and Navy all the means which the liberality of Congress and the people have provided to cause this unprovoked and wasteful insurrection to cease. If any orders of mine were required to insure the merciful conduct of military and naval operations, they would not be lacking; but every step of the progress of our troops has been marked by a humanity which has surprised even the misguided insurgents. The truest kindness to them will be a swift and effective defeat of their present leader. The hour of victory will be the hour of clemency and reconstruction.

No effort will be spared to build up the waste places desolated by war and by long years of misgovernment. We shall not wait for the end of strife to begin the beneficent work. We shall continue, as we have begun, to open the schools and the churches, to set the courts in operation, to foster industry and trade and agriculture, and in every way in our power to make these people whom Providence has brought within our jurisdiction feel that it is their liberty and not our power, their welfare and not our gain, we are seeking to enhance. Our flag has never waved over any community but in blessing. I believe the Filipinos will soon recognize the fact that it has not lost its gift of benediction in its world-wide journey to their shores.

Some embarrassment in administration has occurred by reason of the peculiar status which the Hawaiian Islands at present occupy under the joint resolution of annexation approved July 7, 1898. While by that resolution the Republic of Hawaii as an independent nation was extinguished, its separate sovereignty destroyed, and its property and possessions vested in the United States, yet a complete establishment for its government under our system was not effected. While the municipal laws of the islands not enacted for the fulfillment of treaties and not inconsistent with the joint resolution or contrary to the Constitution of the United States or any of its treaties remain in force, yet these laws relate only to the social and internal affairs of the islands, and do not touch many subjects of importance which are of a broader national character. For example, the Hawaiian Republic was divested of all title to the public lands in the islands, and is not only unable to dispose of lands to settlers desiring to take up homestead sites, but is without power to give complete title in cases where lands have been entered upon under lease or other conditions which carry with them the right to the purchaser, lessee, or settler to have a full title granted to him upon compliance with the conditions prescribed by law or by his particular agreement of entry.

Questions of doubt and difficulty have also arisen with reference to the collection of tonnage tax on vessels coming from Hawaiian ports; with reference to the status of Chinese in the islands, their entrance and exit therefrom; as to patents and copyrights; as to the register of vessels under the navigation laws; as to the necessity of holding elections in accordance with the provisions of the Hawaiian statutes for the choice of various officers, and as to several other matters of detail touching the interests both of the island and of the Federal Government.

By the resolution of annexation the President was directed to appoint five commissioners to recommend to Congress such legislation concerning the islands as they should deem necessary or proper. These commissioners were duly appointed and after a careful investigation and study of the system of laws and government prevailing in the islands, and of the conditions existing there, they prepared a bill to provide a government under the title of "The Territory of Hawaii." The report of the Commission, with the bill which they prepared, was transmitted by me to Congress on December 6, 1898, but the bill still awaits final action.

The people of these islands are entitled to the benefits and privileges of our Constitution, but in the absence of any act of Congress providing for Federal courts in the islands, and for a procedure by which appeals, writs of error, and other judicial proceedings necessary for the enforcement of civil rights may be prosecuted, they are powerless to secure their enforcement by the judgment of the courts of the United States. It is manifestly important, therefore, that an act shall be passed as speedily as possible erecting these islands into a judicial district, providing for the appointment of a judge and other proper officers and methods of procedure in appellate proceedings, and that the government of this newly acquired territory under the Federal Constitution shall be fully defined and provided for.

A necessity for immediate legislative relief exists in the Territory of Alaska. Substantially the only law providing a civil government for this Territory is the act of May 17, 1884. This is meager in its provisions, and is fitted only for the administration of affairs in a country sparsely inhabited by civilized people and unimportant in trade and production, as was Alaska at the time this act was passed. The increase in population by immigration during the past few years, consequent upon the discovery of gold, has produced such a condition as calls for more ample facilities for local self-government and more numerous conveniences of civil and judicial administration. Settlements have grown up in various places, constituting in point of population and business cities of thousands of inhabitants, yet there is no provision of law under which a municipality can be organized or maintained.

In some localities the inhabitants have met together and voluntarily formed a municipal organization for the purpose of local government, adopting the form of a municipal constitution and charter, under which said officials have been appointed; and ordinances creating and regulating a police force, a fire department, a department of health, and making provision for the care of the insane and indigent poor and sick and for public schools, have been passed. These proceedings and the ordinances passed by such municipalities are without statutory authority and have no sanction, except as they are maintained by the popular sentiment of the community. There is an entire absence of authority to provide the ordinary instruments of local police control and administration, the population consisting of the usual percentage of lawless adventurers of the class that always flock to new fields of enterprise or discovery, and under circumstances which require more than ordinary provision for the maintenance of peace, good order, and lawful conduct.

The whole vast area of Alaska comprises but one judicial district, with one judge, one marshal, and one district attorney, yet the civil and criminal business has more than doubled within the past year, and is many times greater both in volume and importance than it was in 1884. The duties of the judge require him to travel thousands of miles to discharge his judicial duties at the various places designated for that purpose. The Territory should be divided into at least two districts, and an additional judge, district attorney, marshal, and other appropriate officers be provided.

There is practically no organized form of government in the Territory. There is no authority, except in Congress, to pass any law, no matter how local or trivial, and the difficulty of conveying to the Congress an adequate conception and understanding of the various needs of the people in the different communities is easily understood. I see no reason why a more complete form of Territorial organization should not be provided. Following the precedent established in the year 1805, when a temporary government was provided for the recently acquired territory, then known under the name of Louisiana, it seems to me that it would be advantageous to confer greater executive power upon the governor and to establish, as was done in the case of the Territory of Louisiana, a legislative council having power to adopt ordinances which shall extend to all the rightful subjects of local legislation, such ordinances not to take effect until reported to and approved by the Congress if in session, and if that body is not in session then by the President. In this manner a system of laws providing for the incorporation and government of towns and cities having a certain population, giving them the power to establish and maintain a system of education to be locally supported, and ordinances providing for police, sanitary, and other such purposes, could be speedily provided. I believe a provision of this kind would be satisfactory to the people of the Territory. It is probable that the area is too vast and the population too scattered and transitory to make it wise at the present time to provide for an elective legislative body, but the conditions calling for local self-government will undoubtedly very soon exist, and will be facilitated by the measures which I have recommended.

I recommend that legislation to the same end be had with reference to the government of Porto Rico. The time is ripe for the adoption of a temporary form of government for this island; and many suggestions made with reference to Alaska are applicable also to Porto Rico.

The system of civil jurisprudence now adopted by the people of this island is described by competent lawyers who are familiar with it, as thoroughly modern and scientific, so far as it relates to matters of internal business, trade, production, and social and private right in general. The cities of the island are governed under charters which probably require very little or no change.

So that with relation to matters of local concern and private right, it is not probable that much, if any, legislation is desirable; but with reference to public administration and the relations of the island to the Federal Government, there are many matters which are of pressing urgency. The same necessity exists for legislation on the part of Congress to establish Federal courts and Federal jurisdiction in the island as has been previously pointed out by me with reference to Hawaii. Besides the administration of justice, there are the subjects of the public lands; the control and improvement of rivers and harbors; the control of the waters or streams not navigable, which, under the Spanish law, belonged to the Crown of Spain, and have by the treaty of cession passed to the United States; the immigration of people from foreign countries; the importation of contract labor; the imposition and collection of internal revenue; the application of the navigation laws; the regulation of the current money; the establishment of post-offices and post-roads; the regulation of tariff rates on merchandise imported from the island into the United States; the establishment of ports of entry and delivery; the regulation of patents and copyrights; these, with various other subjects which rest entirely within the power of the Congress, call for careful consideration and immediate action.

It must be borne in mind that since the cession Porto Rico has been denied the principal markets she had long enjoyed and our tariffs have been continued against her products as when she was under Spanish sovereignty. The markets of Spain are closed to her products except upon terms to which the commerce of all nations is subjected. The island of Cuba, which used to buy her cattle and tobacco without customs duties, now imposes the same duties upon these products as from any other country entering her ports. She has therefore lost her free intercourse with Spain and Cuba without any compensating benefits in this market. Her coffee was little known and not in use by our people, and therefore there was no demand here for this, one of her chief products. The markets of the United States should be opened up to her products. Our plain duty is to abolish all customs tariffs between the United States and Porto Rico and give her products free access to our markets.

As a result of the hurricane which swept over Porto Rico on the 8th of August, 1899, over 100,000 people were reduced to absolute destitution, without homes, and deprived of the necessaries of life. To the appeal of the War Department the people of the United States made prompt and generous response. In addition to the private charity of our people, the War Department has expended for the relief of the distressed $392,342.63, which does not include the cost of transportation.

It is desirable that the government of the island under the law of belligerent right, now maintained through the Executive Department, should be superseded by an administration entirely civil in its nature. For present purposes I recommend that Congress pass a law for the organization of a temporary government, which shall provide for the appointment by the President, subject to confirmation by the Senate, of a governor and such other officers as the general administration of the island may require, and that for legislative purposes upon subjects of a local nature not partaking of a Federal character a legislative council, composed partly of Porto Ricans and partly of citizens of the United States, shall be nominated and appointed by the President, subject to confirmation by the Senate, their acts to be subject to the approval of the Congress or the President prior to going into effect. In the municipalities and other local subdivisions I recommend that the principle of local self-government be applied at once, so as to enable the intelligent citizens of the island to participate in their own government and to learn by practical experience the duties and requirements of a self-contained and self-governing people. I have not thought it wise to commit the entire government of the island to officers selected by the people, because I doubt whether in habits, training, and experience they are such as to fit them to exercise at once so large a degree of self-government; but it is my judgment and expectation that they will soon arrive at an attainment of experience and wisdom and self-control that will justify conferring upon them a much larger participation in the choice of their insular officers.

The fundamental requirement for these people, as for all people, is education. The free schoolhouse is the best preceptor for citizenship. In the introduction of modern educational methods care, however, must be exercised that changes be not made too abruptly and that the history and racial peculiarities of the inhabitants shall be given due weight. Systems of education in these new possessions founded upon common-sense methods, adapted to existing conditions and looking to the future moral and industrial advancement of the people, will commend to them in a peculiarly effective manner the blessings of free government.

The love of law and the sense of obedience and submission to the lawfully constituted judicial tribunals are embedded in the hearts of our people, and any violation of these sentiments and disregard of their obligations justly arouses public condemnation. The guaranties of life, liberty, and of civil rights should be faithfully upheld; the right of trial by jury respected and defended. The rule of the courts should assure the public of the prompt trial of those charged with criminal offenses, and upon conviction the punishment should be commensurate with the enormity of the crime.

Those who, in disregard of law and the public peace, unwilling to await the judgment of court and jury, constitute themselves judges and executioners should not escape the severest penalties for their crimes.

What I said in my Inaugural Address of March 4, 1897, I now repeat:

> The constituted authorities must be cheerfully and vigorously upheld. Lynchings must not be tolerated in a great and civilized country like the United States. Courts, not mobs, must execute the penalties of the laws. The preservation of public order, the right of discussion, the integrity of courts, and the orderly administration of justice must continue forever the rock of safety upon which our Government securely rests.

In accordance with the act of Congress providing for an appropriate national celebration in the year 1900 of the establishment of the seat of Government in the District of Columbia, I have appointed a committee, consisting of the governors of all the States and Territories of the United States, who have been invited to assemble in the city of Washington on the 21st of December, 1899, which, with the committees of the Congress and the District of Columbia, are charged with the proper conduct of this celebration.

Congress at its last session appropriated $5,000 "to enable the Chief of Engineers of the Army to continue the examination of the subject and to make or secure designs, calculations, and estimates for a memorial bridge from the most convenient point of the Naval Observatory grounds, or adjacent thereto, across the Potomac River to the most convenient point of the Arlington estate property." In accordance with the provisions of this act the Chief of Engineers has selected four eminent bridge engineers to submit competitive designs for a bridge combining the elements of strength and durability and such architectural embellishment and ornamentation as will fitly apply to the dedication, "A memorial to American patriotism." The designs are now being prepared, and as soon as completed will be submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of War. The proposed bridge would be a convenience to all the people from every part of the country who visit the national cemetery, an ornament to the Capital of the Nation, and forever stand as a monument to American patriotism. I do not doubt that Congress will give to the enterprise still further proof of its favor and approval.

The Executive order of May 6, 1896, extending the limits of the classified service, brought within the operation of the civil-service law and rules nearly all of the executive civil service not previously classified.

Some of the inclusions were found wholly illogical and unsuited to the work of the several Departments. The application of the rules to many of the places so included was found to result in friction and embarrassment. After long and very careful consideration it became evident to the heads of the Departments, responsible for their efficiency, that in order to remove these difficulties and promote an efficient and harmonious administration certain amendments were necessary. These amendments were promulgated by me in Executive order dated May 29, 1899.

The principal purpose of the order was to except from competitive examination certain places involving fiduciary responsibilities or duties of a strictly confidential, scientific, or executive character which it was thought might better be filled either by noncompetitive examination, or in the discretion of the appointing officer, than by open competition. These places were comparatively few in number. The order provides for the filling of a much larger number of places, mainly in the outside service of the War Department, by what is known as the registration system, under regulations to be approved by the President, similar to those which have produced such admirable results in the navy-yard service.

All of the amendments had for their main object a more efficient and satisfactory administration of the system of appointments established by the civil-service law. The results attained show that under their operation the public service has improved and that the civil-service system is relieved of many objectionable features which heretofore subjected it to just criticism and the administrative officers to the charge of unbusinesslike methods in the conduct of public affairs. It is believed that the merit system has been greatly strengthened and its permanence assured. It will be my constant aim in the administration of government in our new possessions to make fitness, character, and merit essential to appointment to office, and to give to the capable and deserving inhabitants preference in appointments.

The 14th of December will be the One Hundredth Anniversary of the death of Washington. For a hundred years the Republic has had the priceless advantage of the lofty standard of character

and conduct which he bequeathed to the American people. It is an inheritance which time, instead of wasting, continually increases and enriches. We may justly hope that in the years to come the benignant influence of the Father of his Country may be even more potent for good than in the century which is drawing to a close. I have been glad to learn that in many parts of the country the people will fittingly observe this historic anniversary.

Presented to this Congress are great opportunities. With them come great responsibilities. The power confided to us increases the weight of our obligations to the people, and we must be profoundly sensible of them as we contemplate the new and grave problems which confront us. Aiming only at the public good, we can not err. A right interpretation of the people's will and of duty can not fail to insure wise measures for the welfare of the islands which have come under the authority of the United States, and inure to the common interest and lasting honor of our country. Never has this Nation had more abundant cause than during the past year for thankfulness to God for manifold blessings and mercies, for which we make reverent acknowledgment.

WILLIAM McKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *December 5, 1899.*

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of objection, the message of the President will be laid upon the table, and the usual number of copies will be ordered to be printed.

DEATH OF SENATOR-ELECT HAYWARD.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. President, it becomes my painful duty to announce that the Hon. Monroe L. Hayward, Senator-elect from the State of Nebraska for the term commencing March 4, 1899, departed this life at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes this morning, at his home in Nebraska City. On some future and fit occasion it is my purpose to present and ask consideration by the Senate of appropriate memorial resolutions. At the present time I offer the resolutions which I send to the desk, and ask their immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep regret and profound sorrow of the death of Hon. Monroe L. Hayward, lately elected Senator from the State of Nebraska.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolutions.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 6, 1899, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *December 5, 1899.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO WAIT UPON PRESIDENT.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the committee appointed, in connection with a similar committee from the Senate, to wait upon the President and inform him that a quorum of the two Houses are in attendance ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make, have performed the duty assigned to them, and the President was pleased to say that he would communicate with Congress forthwith in writing.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries.

COMMITTEE ON MILEAGE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will announce the following as the Committee on Mileage: Mr. BARHAM of California, Mr. REEDER of Kansas, Mr. STEWART of New York, Mr. COOPER of Texas, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

CHANGES OF MEMBERSHIP SINCE LAST SESSION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, showing the changes in membership since last session; which was ordered to be printed in the Journal and RECORD:

CLERK'S OFFICE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 5, 1899.

SIR: I have the honor to submit the following list of changes since the election of the Fifty-sixth House of Representatives:

District.	Name.	Date of vacancy.	Name of successor.
Seventh Kentucky	Evan E. Settle *	Nov. 16, 1899	
Fifth Louisiana	Samuel T. Baird *	Apr. 22, 1899	Joseph E. Ransdell.
First Maine	Thomas B. Reed †	Sept. 4, 1899	Amos L. Allen.
Second Maine	Nelson Dingley, jr. *	Jan. 13, 1899	Charles E. Littlefield.
Eighth Missouri	Richard P. Bland *	June 15, 1899	Dorsey W. Shackleford.
Sixth Nebraska	William L. Greene *	Mar. 4, 1899	William Neville.
Thirty-fourth New York.	Warren B. Hooker †	....do....	E. B. Vreeland.
Sixteenth Ohio	Lorenzo Danford *	June 19, 1899	Joseph J. Gill.
Ninth Pennsylvania	Daniel Ermentrout *	Sept. 17, 1899	Henry D. Green.

* Died. † Resigned.

Very respectfully,

A. McDOWELL,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Hon. DAVID B. HENDERSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

ELECTION CONTESTS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair also desires to submit to the House the report of the Clerk on contested-election cases. The Chair will assign the first three cases—one, two, and three—to Election Committee No. 1; four, five, and six, to Committee No. 2; seven, eight, and nine, to Committee No. 3; and ten to Committee No. 1. The report will be printed as a public document.

ANNUAL MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the annual message of the President; which was read.

[For text of message see proceedings of the Senate of this date.]

On the conclusion of the reading there was loud applause on the Republican side.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the President's message be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and printed.

Mr. GROW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make——

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state the question. The gentleman from New York moves that the President's message be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and be printed.

Mr. GROW. Before that motion is put, I ask: Is the message itself debatable? If so, I should like to make a few remarks on the most important subject contained in it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is almost impossible to hear what the gentlemen are saying, and we would like to have order.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order. Gentlemen will please resume their seats and preserve order. Does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. PAYNE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROW. On a motion to refer, Mr. Speaker, I take it, the message itself would be debatable. If so, I should like to make some remarks on the most important subject of the message.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose that it would be debatable in the House. Of course when we go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union it would be debatable, and I have no doubt an arrangement could be made by which my friend from Pennsylvania could fully address himself to the subject.

Mr. GROW. Very well. I am content.

Mr. GIBSON. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York how many copies would be printed under his motion? I suggest that he specify 20,000 copies.

Mr. PAYNE. There is no provision made for that. That will be considered later.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If the gentleman from New York will yield to me, I will state to my colleague from Tennessee that the law provides that 20,000 copies shall be printed.

The motion to refer was then agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep regret and profound sorrow of the death of Hon. Monroe L. Hayward, lately Senator from the State of Nebraska.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT FROM UTAH.

The SPEAKER. Under the order of the House on yesterday it is agreed that immediately after the reading of the President's message the House would proceed to consider the following resolutions, which the Clerk will again report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas it is charged that Brigham H. Roberts, a Representative-elect to the Fifty-sixth Congress from the State of Utah, is ineligible to a seat in the House of Representatives; and

Whereas such charge is made through a member of this House, on his responsibility as such member and on the basis, as he asserts, of public records, affidavits, and papers evidencing such ineligibility:

Resolved, That the question of the prima facie right of Brigham H. Roberts to be sworn in as a Representative from the State of Utah in the Fifty-sixth Congress, as well as of his final right to a seat therein as such Representative, be referred to a special committee of nine members of the House, to be appointed by the Speaker; and until such committee shall report upon and the House decide such question and right the said Brigham H. Roberts shall not be sworn in or be permitted to occupy a seat in this House; and said committee shall have power to send for persons and papers and examine witnesses on oath in relation to the subject-matter of this resolution.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a confirmation here of the arrangement made with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] as to the length of time the discussion on this resolution shall endure. I believe the understanding is that one hour and a quarter on a side is to be allotted.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes; or an hour and a half on a side, inasmuch as the gentleman from Ohio insisted that the time used by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. Roberts] should be charged to the minority. We thought he ought to have his own time within which to present his own case, and then, if we were given an hour, that would be satisfactory. The gentleman from Ohio would not agree to that, and we finally asked for an hour and a half, and I hope the gentleman will agree to give us an hour and a half on this side.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. The difficulty about that is that the hour to which the debate will run will not be fixed. I thought it wise to fix the time when the debate should end before we begin it. I suppose the member-elect from Utah will discuss the same side of the question as will the gentlemen represented by the gentleman from Tennessee, and therefore that time ought all to be counted together.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not know what line of argument the gentleman from Utah will make, and I thought that he ought to have his own time in which to debate it. If the gentleman will give us an hour and a half, I think we can get through.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, speaking for myself, I have no objection to the gentlemen on the other side having one hour and a half.

The SPEAKER. And the same length of time for your side?

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. The same length of time on this side.

The SPEAKER. The proposition is for three hours' debate, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAYLER] and one-half by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON]. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It is agreed between the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAYLER] and myself that the substitute we shall offer may be read and considered pending.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Brigham H. Roberts, from the State of Utah, has presented a certificate of election in due and proper form as a Representative from said State: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That without expressing any opinion as to the right or propriety of his retaining his seat in advance of any proper investigation thereof, the said Brigham H. Roberts is entitled to be sworn in as a member of this House upon his prima facie case.

Resolved further, That when sworn in his credentials and all the papers in relation to his right to retain his seat be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions to report thereon at the earliest practicable moment.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. I understand that is merely read for information.

The SPEAKER. It is read for the information of the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I want it considered as pending.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. I may want to make a motion affecting it.

Mr. Speaker, I am not unmindful of the importance of the question which the House is about to decide. It is unusual, but not unprecedented. It ought not to be resorted to for partisan purposes or for trivial reasons. Nor would I urge it now if I did not believe that a proper sense of our duty demanded it. We do not undertake to determine now the right of the claimant to a seat here, but only whether or not he shall be halted at the bar of the House and await the administration of the oath of office to him until a committee of the House and the House itself shall determine that right. If upon investigation it shall develop that the claimant is entitled to his seat, then an injustice will be done him by keeping him out. But that injustice is not comparable to the injustice and wrong that will result to the House and to the country if, being ineligible in the respects charged, he should sit for one hour as a member of the House. A due respect for the opinion of the country and for this House demands that, notwithstanding the preliminary character of this question, it shall be argued with reasonable fullness now.

Of course, I do not need to say that in so far as such a thing is possible I have not prejudged this case either as to the law or the facts. If it shall appear that the allegations made against him be false, I will welcome the claimant to a place on this floor. If the facts be as alleged and they create no lawful ineligibility, I will vote to permit him to take his seat on the floor of the House.

In the first place, I will minister to a much desired brevity and lucidity if I read the eighth section of what is known as the Edmunds Act and briefly quote from the proclamation of amnesty made by President Cleveland and before him by President Harrison.

SEC. 8. That no polygamist, bigamist, or any person cohabiting with more than one woman, and no woman cohabiting with any of the persons described as aforesaid in this section, in any Territory or other place over which the United States have exclusive jurisdiction, shall be entitled to vote at any election held in any such Territory or other place, or be eligible for election or appointment, or to be entitled to hold any office or place of public trust, honor, or emolument in, under, or for any such Territory or place or under the United States.

The proclamation of President Harrison, dated January 4, 1893, has this pardoning clause:

Do hereby declare and grant full amnesty and pardon to all persons liable to the penalties of this act by reason of unlawful cohabitation under the color of polygamous or plural marriages who, since November 1, 1890, have abstained from such unlawful cohabitation, but upon the express condition that they shall in future obey the laws of the United States hereinbefore named, and not otherwise.

The proclamation of President Cleveland granted pardon in this language:

To all persons who have, in violation of said act, committed either of the offenses of polygamy, adultery, or unlawful cohabitation under the color of polygamous or plural marriages, or who, having been convicted of violation of said act, are now suffering deprivation of civil rights in consequence of the same, excepting persons who have not complied with the conditions contained in said proclamation of January 4, 1893.

Mr. Speaker, Utah was admitted as a State into the Union on the 4th day of January, 1896.

These are the alleged facts against the claimant:

First. That he was indicted in February, 1887, for unlawful cohabitation under the Edmunds Act, and pleaded guilty April 29, 1889, and was incarcerated on that account in the penitentiary for four months.

Second. That he has persistently from that time forward down to a recent date been guilty of the offense of unlawful cohabitation, and also that he has continued from the date of his conviction to be, and is now, a polygamist.

Now, these propositions and questions are presented by the alleged facts:

First. That if he was convicted in 1889 under the Edmunds Act, did he not then become, and ever afterwards remain, by reason of section 8, ineligible to be a member of Congress unless he was pardoned? If he was guilty of polygamous cohabitation between November 1, 1890, and the date of the Harrison proclamation, he was not pardoned by that proclamation.

The Harrison proclamation pardoned no polygamist as such. If Roberts was a polygamist January 3, 1893, and prior thereto, even though not convicted, he did not receive pardon.

If, after January 3, 1893, and before September 25, 1894, he was guilty of polygamy or unlawful cohabitation, then he lost the benefit of the Harrison proclamation and the Cleveland proclamation did not affect him at all.

If, after September 25, 1894, and before January 4, 1896, the date of Utah's admission, he was either a polygamist or unlawfully cohabited, the pardons did not affect him.

All these things are charged, and it is claimed, on the basis of ex parte affidavits, can be proved.

Second. If he has been persistently guilty of the offense of which he was convicted, and has been ever since up to January 4, 1896, the date of the admission of Utah, a polygamist, is he not ineligible under the Edmunds law, independent of his conviction?

Third. If he has been ever since 1889 and is now a polygamist, may he not be ineligible to be a member of Congress if it so wills, independent of the ineligibility created by the Edmunds law? I will later on give the definition by the Supreme Court of a polygamist.

Fourth. Is it clear that the compact created between the United States and the people of Utah by the proclamations, enabling act, constitution of Utah, and the political history associated with these facts do not justify the House in refusing admission to the claimant?

Fifth. May it not be that upon a careful examination of the law it will be found that the claimant is not a citizen of the United States?

Sixth. Is it wise, if the facts be as alleged, except as to the status of the claimant as a present lawbreaker, to subject his case to the doubtful process of expulsion?

Doubtful for two reasons:

First. Because it requires the concurrence of two-thirds to expel him.

Second. Because very eminent lawyers from the beginning of the Government down to the present time have taken the position that the House has no right to expel except for some misconduct while a member and relating to his office as a member.

The House of Representatives has never decided that it had the power to expel under such circumstances, and it has decided that it has no right to expel under such circumstances.

In the first session of the Thirty-fifth Congress, the Congress of which our honored friend and colleague, Mr. GROW, was a member, one Matteson, against whom a resolution of expulsion had been passed in the preceding Congress, came, and a resolution to expel him for the offense for which they had expelled him in the preceding Congress was introduced, was referred to a committee of which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW] was a member, and that committee, by an all but unanimous voice, reported that the House had no power, mean and low and vile as the character of that man was, as exhibited by his conduct before that time, to expel him, because it had no right to expel a man for that which had occurred prior to his election to Congress. And the House, by a considerable majority, sustained the committee, and Matteson, who was declared unfit to be a Representative in Congress because of his connection with certain bribers and bribe takers, was permitted to remain further unquestioned as a member of the United States House of Representatives.

And so I give this warning to those of you who oppose the passage of this resolution in the fond hope that hereafter, if these facts be as alleged, you may satisfy your consciences and constituents by voting to expel the claimant. I warn you now that you will have a larger difficulty to satisfy your consciences and your judgments that this House has power to expel the claimant than that it has the right and power to exclude him now.

I shall not undertake to discuss all of the questions I have raised. Time forbids, and it is not otherwise necessary.

Two broad questions are raised in this case:

First. Is the claimant on the alleged facts eligible to be a member of Congress?

Second. Can the question of his eligibility be raised when he comes to the bar to be sworn, and can he be required to stand aside until the House shall have investigated the question of his right to take the seat?

On the first proposition, as to the question of eligibility, we must inquire first whether Congress has power to impose qualifications in addition to those enumerated in the Constitution; second, whether Congress has imposed any qualification—if it has that right; and third, has Congress, independent of any previously enacted law, the right to impose a qualification or declare a disqualification when a member-elect comes to the bar?

There are six different provisions in the Constitution respecting qualifications of a member of Congress. First, that he shall not be a member unless he shall have attained the age of 25 years; second, he shall have been a citizen of the United States for seven years; third, that he must be an inhabitant of the State where chosen; fourth, that he may be disqualified by judgment in cases of impeachment; fifth, a person holding an office under the United States shall not be a member of either House of Congress; and sixth, the provision in the constitutional amendment respecting those who have taken an oath inconsistent with their acts during the war of the rebellion.

There is no decision of the United States Supreme Court upon the question as to whether Congress has the power to add to the qualifications named. There has been much academic discussion of the subject. Some very excellent authority has declared that Congress has no such power. But, notwithstanding a feeling of reverence for the opinion of some men, I shall proceed briefly to combat that position.

Our State courts in many instances have construed exactly similar provisions. The supreme court of the State of New York, in the case of Rogers *vs.* Buffalo, in an opinion rendered by Mr. Justice Peckham, who now adorns the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States, held that a provision of the Constitution declaring certain qualifications for office was not exclusive and did not bar the legislature from imposing new, reasonable, and proper qualifications.

In a very learned opinion by one of the ablest judges that ever sat on the bench in Ohio, Judge McIlvaine, in the case of Ohio against Covington, the same doctrine is explicitly and carefully and most forcibly laid down, and in the case of Darrow against The People, in 8 Colorado, where a negative provision of the constitution exactly similar in its rhetorical construction to that I am now discussing was under consideration, it was held that as the provision of their constitution was negative, it imposed no restriction whatever upon the legislative body.

But I find stronger intrinsic argument right in the body of the Constitution itself against this authority to restrict the power of the House.

In the first place, the language providing for the age, and so on, is negative in its character. No person shall become a member of Congress unless he is of a certain age, etc. And that clause of the Constitution was most ably and ingeniously and persuasively argued in 1807 upon the floor of the House of Representatives by John Randolph. I think no man can read that argument without being convinced at least as to the power of Congress.

But, in the next place, I want to call your attention to the last paragraph of Article VI. Here we have the argument, by analogy, that, in my opinion, modestly put forward, is conclusive upon the question of construction:

> The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the members of the several State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution.

There is a positive affirmative declaration by the Constitution that a certain oath shall be administered to certain officers. If the construction contended for as to the qualification of members of Congress is correct, then Congress has no power to demand any other oath of any officer named in this section than that which is named in it.

Mr. Chief Justice Marshall had occasion to refer to that when he said, in the case of McCullough against Maryland, one of the greatest expositions of the Constitution to be found in the reports of the Supreme Court:

> He would be charged with insanity who should contend that the legislature might not superadd to the oath directed by the Constitution such other oath of office as its wisdom might suggest.

Now, if John Marshall characterized as insanity a proposition that a positive declaration of the Constitution respecting an oath could not be added to, I shudder to think what word he would have used had he been referring to the mere adding to a negative expression of the Constitution.

But that same clause has another paragraph in it:

> But no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.

Now, if the Constitution had laid down all the qualifications which Congress or any other power had the right to impose, then it was unnecessary they should go on and declare that no religious test could be required. The Constitution is inconsistent in its parts and contradictory of itself if it be true that it meant that no qualification should be added except those named. If without the provision about a religious test such test might have been required, then the asserted interpretation of the qualification clauses falls to the ground. The presence of the religious-test clause is only to be explained and justified on the ground that without it Congress would have had the power to impose it.

But the construction here contended for has often been asserted and passed upon by the House of Representatives in numerous cases that have been here decided. I shall not advert to them specifically now, for the reason that they become more pertinent as we proceed to the second broad question as to our right to stop the claimant at this point. But our statutes are full, fairly swarming with penal provisions declaring that persons who have committed certain offenses are ineligible to office or place under the United States; and all down along the line, from the very first Congress that sat, down until we had a complete penal system, Congress has recognized, and it has not been disputed, the right to declare persons ineligible to office for the commission of crime.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do not need for the purposes of this case to stand upon the broad right of Congress to add qualifications to those named in the Constitution. The ineligibility created in connection with the punishment of crime may and does arise out of the power inherent in Congress to punish crime; and in its spirit this does not conflict with the Constitution. It bars the way to no man against his will; it conflicts in no sense with the freedom of any man to follow any pursuit he pleases, and to put himself in any class which he may desire to put himself in. The ineligible class created by penal statutes is one that no man can enter without committing a crime. Do you think it violates either the letter or the spirit of the Constitution to say that no free agent who has every right that the laws or the Constitution ought to give to any man shall be barred from office unless he willfully goes into the criminal class?

Now, that proposition is not without authority. It is most cogently stated and reasoned and laid down in the well-known case of Barker against The People in 3 Cowen. I ought to say at this point that in that case the court first held—although it did not need to so hold—that every man was eligible for office who was not specifically disqualified by the Constitution. It thus directly opposes the position I took a moment ago; but the court goes on to elaborately show that in the way of punishment for crime the legislature had ample power and authority to disqualify.

But I ought also to say that Mr. Justice Peckham, in the case of Rogers against Buffalo, to which I referred a few moments ago, left nothing standing of the law in the Barker case except the proposition that I stand on here—that we may disqualify for crime—and pointed out most clearly that the position taken in

that case, in so far as it meant to declare the want of power in the legislature to add to the constitutional qualifications, was wrong, but that the legislature could not add arbitrary conditions, such as that no man who was a physician could be a candidate for office, and so on.

In the second place, under this head: Has Congress imposed any such qualification as apply to the claimant?

I have already read section 8 of the Edmunds Act. That law is in force to-day. It is a penal law of present operation in all of its parts over the Territories and the District of Columbia, and as to one who has rendered himself amenable to the punishment part of it it is operative everywhere where one is now that has been convicted under that law. That law has been held constitutional in the case of Murphy against Ramsey, in 114 U. S. Reports, page 15. It will be noted that that act makes ineligible not only one guilty of unlawful cohabitation, but also a polygamist, and does not require any conviction in either case. The charge is that the claimant was convicted of the first offense, and that he is now and has been for years a polygamist. Now, what is a polygamist? We are not in doubt as to that. The Supreme Court of the United States has made very clear what that is, and I will be pardoned for reading now very briefly what it has said. I make the following quotation from Murphy *vs.* Ramsey, 114 U. S., pages 41 and 42:

> In our opinion any man is a polygamist or bigamist, in the sense of this section of the act, who, having previously married one wife, still living, and having another at the time when he presents himself to claim registration as a voter, still maintains that relation to a plurality of wives, although from the date of the passage of the act, March 22, 1882, until the day he offers to register and vote, he may not in fact have cohabited with more than one woman. Without regard to the question whether at the time he entered into such relation it was a prohibited and punishable offense, or whether by reason of lapse of time since its commission a prosecution for it may not be barred, if he still maintain the relation, he is a bigamist or polygamist, because that is the status which fixed habit and practice of his living has established. He has a plurality of wives, more than one woman, whom he recognizes as a wife, of whose children he is the acknowledged father, and whom with their children he maintains as a family, of which he is the head. And this status as to several wives may well continue to exist, as a practical relation, although for a period he may not in fact cohabit with more than one; for that is quite consistent with the constant recognition of the same relation to many, accompanied with a possible intention to renew cohabitation with one or more of the others when it may be convenient.
>
> It is not, therefore, because the person has committed the offense of bigamy or polygamy, at some previous time, in violation of some existing statute, and as an additional punishment for its commission, that he is disfranchised by the act of March 22, 1882; nor because he is guilty of the offense, as defined and punished by the terms of the act; but because, having at some time entered into a bigamous or polygamous relation, by a marriage with a second or third wife, while the first was living, he still maintains it, and has not dissolved it, although for the time being he restricts actual cohabitation to but one. He might, in fact, abstain from actual cohabitation with all, and still be much as ever a bigamist or polygamist. He can only cease to be such when he has fully dissolved in some effective manner, which we are not called on here to point out, the very relation of husband to several wives which constitutes the forbidden status he has previously assumed.
>
> Cohabitation is but one of the many incidents to the marriage relation. It is not essential to it. One man, where such a system has been tolerated and practiced, may have several establishments, each of which may be the home of a separate family, none of which he himself may dwell in or even visit. The statute makes an express distinction between bigamists and polygamists on the one hand and those who cohabit with more than one woman on the other; whereas, if cohabitation with several wives was essential to the description of those who are bigamists or polygamists, those words in the statute would be superfluous and unnecessary. It follows, therefore, that any person having several wives is a bigamist or polygamist in the sense of the act of March 22, 1882, although since the date of its passage he may not have cohabited with more than one of them.

Now, I have already stated, and I shall not go on further with it, as to the operation of the two proclamations of amnesty. It is enough for me to say that if the facts be as alleged, the claimant is in no better position than if no proclamation for amnesty had ever been issued.

Finally, upon this subject of ineligibility—and I ask the attention of the House to these measured words—if we consider the great powers of Congress, unrestricted save by the Constitution, we shall see that it can impose qualifications and declare ineligibilities, probably sufficient where crimes or offenses against civilization are concerned, to justify it, and in some instances to command it, to refuse admission to persons thus tainted.

If I am correct in this interpretation of our rights and power, it is not difficult to find its just application to the asserted facts in this case. For all such exercises of power by Congress those who participate in it are answerable only to their consciences, their constituents, and their country.

Mr. Speaker, we are not without precedent upon that proposition. This House, so far from denying this power to act along the line that I have just suggested, has declared its right to exercise that power. In the Forty-first Congress Mr. Whittimore, of South Carolina, for some charge of selling cadetships, was under the ban of the House. A resolution to expel him was about to be adopted when he resigned, and the House lost its jurisdiction and could only pass a resolution of censure. Within six weeks from the date of his resignation he came to the bar of this House with a certificate under the broad seal of the State of South Carolina, exact, perfect, unquestioned, claiming his right to a seat under and by virtue of a new election at the hands of the constituency who knew his offense and sent him here as their representative.

Mr. Speaker, that man had committed a crime, but it was a crime which carried with it ineligibility, possibly not for Congress at all, and never, except after due conviction in the courts of justice in a constitutional manner. But the House did not allow itself to be thus hedged in by any inferior authority. It did not even wait to do the things that we want done here. The House not only did not suspend the administration of the oath until a committee might examine the question and the House later determine, but it said to him then and there, "You shall not now or ever be sworn;" and his credentials were thrown back in his teeth and he never took his seat. That is a case as parallel as two cases can be to the case that we make here, with this difference: Instead of giving the committee time to answer the question whether he was entitled to take the oath of office, they decided it right then and there and sent him back to his people.

This case I take up at this point as sustaining the general proposition I just made, and also as sustaining the second proposition, that the House has the right to halt a man on the ground of ineligibility and declare that he shall not take the oath of office until the question of his eligibility has been answered.

Now, the power and right of the House in this respect are inherent and can not be questioned. It is only a question of propriety; it is only a question of expediency; it is only a question of parliamentary wisdom in order that no unwise precedent may be created for a later day. There has been much loose talk in the newspapers and elsewhere about the right and power of Congress and its duty in this regard, and as to what it has done. I do not want to make the statement as absolutely correct, but to this extent: I assert that in so far as my investigation has gone, and it has covered hundreds of cases and many volumes of the RECORD and Globe, I can find no instance where the House of Representatives has declared that it has not the right and that it ought not to halt a man at the bar of the House when the question of his eligibility was raised.

On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, I have, besides the case to which I have already referred, many others which explicitly declare the right of the House to do just this very thing, and where the House did it and refused to permit the oath to be administered to the applicant.

The general doctrine on this subject is laid down in McCrary's Law of Elections. I read from that not because the citation appears in Judge McCrary's work, but because I have read speeches of, I think, a hundred eminent lawyers and statesmen on the floor of the House where the doctrine laid down by McCrary has been declared and sustained, and I assert that the instances where a contrary doctrine is sought to be asserted by any speaker on the floor of the House, or any lawyer of eminence throughout the country, are so small and so few as to be swallowed up and overwhelmed in the flood of contrary opinion as laid down by the best writers and speakers of the day.

McCrary says—and the first two sentences seem to be all that some people have read on this subject:

> The regular certificate of election properly signed is, as we have seen, to be taken as sufficient to authorize the person holding it to be sworn in. It is prima facie evidence of his election, and the only evidence thereof which can be considered in the first instance and in the course of the organization of a legislative body. But there are questions which may be raised touching the qualifications of a person elected which may be investigated and decided as a part of the prima facie case and as preliminary to the swearing in of the claimant.
>
> Time. If a specific and apparently well-grounded allegation be presented to the House of Representatives of the United States that a person holding a certificate of election is not a citizen of the United States, or is not of the requisite age, or is for any other cause ineligible, the House will defer action upon the question of swearing in such person until there can be an investigation into the truth of such allegation.
>
> It is necessary, however, that such allegation should be made by a responsible party. It is usually made, or vouched for at least, by some member or member-elect of the House. It is to be presented at the earliest possible moment after the meeting of the House for organization, and generally at the time that the person objected to presents himself to be sworn in. The person objected to upon such grounds as these is not sworn in with the other members, but stands aside for the time being, and the House, through its committee, with all possible speed proceeds to inquire into the facts.
>
> The certificate of election does not ordinarily, if ever, cover the grounds of the due qualifications of the person holding it. It may be said that by declaring the person duly elected the certificate by implication avers that he was qualified to be elected and to hold the office. But it is well known that canvassing officers do not in fact inquire as to the qualifications of persons voted for; they certify what appears upon the face of the returns and nothing more.

This action, as I have said, Mr. Speaker, has been sustained time and time again on the floor of the House with the overwhelming mass of declarations and testimony of the ablest men of the country, to which I have already referred.

A most elaborate Congressional discussion occurred in the Fortieth Congress as to the Kentucky election. This Congress met in special session on the 4th of March and adjourned to a fixed date about the 1st of April. Immediately after this elections were held in the State of Kentucky. On the 3d of July the Kentucky members presented themselves and demanded the right to be sworn in as members of the House under the House rules. But the House refused to permit them to be sworn in on the ground that they had been disloyal; that is to say, on the ground

that they suffered from some ineligibility. This was not an ineligibility created by the Constitution itself, nor created by any existing law of Congress, but because the House held them to be ineligible for the reason that they had been disloyal. The cases were discussed in page after page in the Globe. Report after report was filed in connection with the cases.

The discussion proceeded for some time upon the motion to refuse to administer the oath and to refer the cases to the Committee on Elections.

Representative Bingham, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, on page 472, said:

I submit as a question of order that the resolution by my colleague, Mr. Schenck, is a resolution which goes to the qualification of the member named. The State is entitled to representation upon the presentation of its certificate under its grand seal, and the members are entitled to be sworn in according to the usual precedents of this country, unless special charges be made showing them not entitled or disqualified. They have the right to be sworn in unless there be presented specific cause against them, in which case I say the case ought to be referred to the committee, as proposed by my colleague. I believe my colleague has presented the question exactly according to the established precedents.

Mr. Schenck, on page 477, says:

The House is not asked to declare that John D. Young is not entitled to a seat here, but it is asked to declare upon this showing that he shall not be permitted now to take the oath, but shall stand back until some inquiry shall be made into the truthfulness of these allegation and a report made to the House upon which it can understandingly determine the question ultimately and finally.

On page 479 Mr. Boutwell says:

I think we are justified in taking this position: That when a member rises in his place and states that of his own knowledge or upon information worthy of belief a person presenting himself here for a seat in this House is or has been substantially a traitor to his Government, we have a right to decline to allow that person to take the oath until that matter has been investigated and he has been relieved from the charge.

Many other members made arguments of like character, and it will be difficult to find any serious objection at that time to the action of the House on that ground. The resolution was adopted, and the case went to the Committee on Elections.

On the 5th of July Mr. Marshall rose to a question of privilege, and moved that in the cases of Beck and Grover the Committee on Elections be discharged from further consideration of the question submitted to them. At this time Mr. Dawes, of Massachusetts, entered the discussion. Mr. Dawes was then the oldest member in respect to service in the House, had been chairman of the Committee on Elections for ten years or more, and may safely be said to be as high authority on the law pertaining to this case as any man who has ever sat in the House of Representatives.

He takes occasion in this debate to state in various forms his views, but the shortest statement of the proposition is found on page 502, in answer to a question from Mr. Wood, of New York. He said:

A well-grounded charge made in good faith against any man bringing a certificate here which extends in its scope to his qualification to sit as a member of this House should be heard before he is permitted to take the oath of office or occupy a seat.

Mr. Bingham again, on page 503, reasserts that—

When a charge is made in due form either upon the responsibility of a member or by petition and ex parte affidavit against a person or persons claiming to be elected as members of this House from an organized State, the case ought to be referred to a committee, and the presentation of such a case, going to the qualifications of a person presenting himself as a member, ought to suspend the administration of the oath to him.

Mr. Dawes's contention was sustained by the House (page 514). The committee in that case in its preliminary report held:

That any specific and apparently well-grounded charge of personal disloyalty made against a person claiming a seat as a member of this House ought to be investigated and reported upon before such person is permitted to take the seat.

On the 17th of July Mr. Brooks rose to a question of privilege respecting the same subject. The discussion proceeded as before, but the immediate question was whether the withdrawal of an affidavit by one of the ex parte witnesses affected the case.

Mr. Dawes more than once in this discussion, on page 700, declares the right to refuse to swear in a man against whom a well-grounded charge of disqualification is made. What he said in one instance is especially applicable here:

I submit that that gentleman [referring to another member] has already committed himself to the doctrine that no matter what crime a man may have committed against his country, he has the right to come here and take a seat in this House, to sit here in mockery of the authority of the Government, pretending to make laws in its support.

He says again, on the same page:

When there is presented alongside of the certificate a case which leads members here, clothed by the Constitution with the power and duty of passing upon the qualifications of those who apply for admission—when there is presented alongside of such a certificate such a case as leads us to suppose that there is good reason to believe that the man presenting himself is disqualified, it is the duty of those whom the Constitution requires to pass upon the qualifications of members to stop at this initial point and pass upon that question.

On the 21st of November, 1867 (Globe, volume 64, page 768), the members-elect from Tennessee were called. Mr. Eldredge objected to swearing in of Mr. Stokes, and moved that his credentials be referred to the Committee on Elections.

The only charge against Stokes was that he had written a letter in May, 1861, containing disloyal sentiments, but it was shown that after that he had fought for two years in the Union Army. He was seated, as he ought to have been.

Mr. Brooks objected to the swearing in of Mr. Butler, Mr. Mullen, and Mr. Arnell, of Tennessee. There was an extended discussion, the facts in each case presented, and the House passed the following substitute on a yea-and-nay vote of 117 yeas and 28 nays, as follows:

That the credentials of R. R. Butler, of the First district of Tennessee, be referred to the Committee on Elections, and that he be not sworn in pending the investigation.

On the 21st of November, in the discussion of the Tennessee case, page 774, Mr. Schenck gives his second well-considered approval of the doctrine.

On page 777 Mr. Shellabarger, of Ohio, puts himself on record as sustaining the doctrine of the committee.

On December 3 the committee filed a second report, found in 2 Bartlett's Election Cases, page 138. In this report the committee assert that they adhere to the views expressed in the first report, on the ground that the House is the judge of the qualifications of its members, of which fidelity to the Constitution is one, and that such charge should be investigated before such person is permitted to take the seat.

The committee calls attention to the fact that the House concurred in that view of the committee.

Again, in a report filed January 7, 1868, the committee announces its continued adherence to the rule previously laid down.

In a report made January 21, 1868, by Mr. Dawes (page 405, 2 Bartletts), in the John Young Brown case, a very elaborate report, the same doctrine is laid down, and a resolution was reported that Brown was not entitled to take the oath of office or to hold the seat.

In the case of McKee *vs.* Young (page 434) the same kind of a resolution was presented. This report was made March 23, 1868, and laid down the same doctrine of ineligibility.

On the 31st of January, 1868, the case of Smith *vs.* Brown came up for discussion in the House, and continued for some days.

The questions were elaborately discussed, especially by Mr. Dawes. (See pages 894, 895.)

Of course at that time the immediate question to determine was as to the general right of Brown to take his seat, and not the question as to the right to halt him at the bar of the House during the organization and refuse to administer the oath. Nevertheless the same question is involved in the lengthy discussion which followed.

On page 899 Mr. Shellabarger's views are very succinctly put in a letter which he wrote while absent from Washington.

A very able and instructive discussion is found in the speech of Mr. Cook, especially on page 909.

The final argument made by Mr. Dawes will be found in volume 69, page 149, Appendix, Fortieth Congress.

Then in the same Congress we find also the case of Winchester and Rice. That was in the next Congress, but the time is unimportant. This is the case of Winchester and Rice, from the State of Kentucky, which came up on the credentials in the midst of the organization of the House, when only about one-half of the members had been sworn in. Objection was made to the swearing in of Winchester on the ground that there was an indictment pending against him in the United States court in Kentucky charging him with disloyalty, and a similar charge against Rice.

An effort was made to have them stand aside by consent. They refused to do it. A resolution was offered that their cases be sent to a committee, and pending the examination of the case by the committee that they be not permitted to be sworn in or take seats. The previous question was demanded; the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of the House of 96 to 48, and the main question, which had actually been settled by the calling and settling of the previous question, was about to be put, when Winchester and his companion asked that the case go over until the next day. The next day they came in, and it was apparent from a moment's examination of the testimony that they presented that there was nothing in the charge of disloyalty.

The indictment against Winchester had been dismissed. There was no charge against him; but, nevertheless, the House had taken hold of the question. It had passed upon the question, had assumed and kept jurisdiction of the question, and beyond any sort of controversy would in another instant have sent those cases to the committee had they not voluntarily withdrawn.

Somewhat more in detail the proceedings connected with the organization of the Forty-first Congress are as follows:

At the organization of the House of Representatives in the Forty-first Congress, on the 4th of March, 1869 (Globe, volume 74), after the election of a Speaker, Mr. Butler of Massachusetts, when Maryland was called (page 5), objected to the swearing in of Patrick Hamil, of that State, on a charge of disloyalty. A discussion followed, and pending that the other members who had been called were sworn in.

Finally the Speaker suggested that Mr. Hamil step aside for the present, which was done.

When the State of Kentucky was called (see page 6), Mr. Shanks objected to the swearing in of Boyd Winchester and John M. Rice on the ground that they had been disloyal, and that Winchester was under indictment for disloyalty.

The Speaker suggested that the gentlemen whose right was challenged waive the claim of their right to be sworn in until the other members had taken the oath.

Mr. Eldredge hoped that those gentlemen would not yield their right; thereupon the Speaker said:

Then the question must be decided now. The Clerk will present the resolution of the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Shanks.

The resolution was therefore read, referring the cases to the Committee on Elections, and that pending such inquiry Winchester and Rice should not be sworn in as members.

Mr. Shanks called for the previous question. While the vote was being taken on ordering the previous question, Mr. McCormick raised the point of order that those who had not been sworn in could not vote. The Speaker refused to entertain the point, as the House was dividing.

The question then came up on ordering the main question. Mr. Eldredge called for the yeas and nays, which were ordered.

On ordering the previous question there were yeas 96, nays 48; so the previous question was ordered. Then Mr. Eldredge raised the point of order that none but those sworn in had the right to vote. The Speaker overruled the point of order, and held that those not sworn could vote.

It was not until this point that, at the suggestion of one of the Kentucky members, Messrs. Winchester and Rice withdrew for the time being for the sake of removing any obstacle to the progress of business.

The House, however, having ordered the previous question on the proposition to send their cases to the Committee on Elections before being sworn in, and the Chair having held that all members-elect were entitled to vote on the proposition, it is apparent that it put itself squarely in favor of halting at the bar of the House a person charged with ineligibility, and sending his case at once to the committee.

On the following day (see page 13) a resolution was offered by Mr. Beck that Messrs. Winchester and Rice be now sworn in. He accompanied his resolution with a statement showing that the charges against them were untrue, and that the indictment referred to in the proceedings of the day before had been dismissed.

Mr. Shanks, who made the objection, admitted that there was a fair presumption that there was nothing in the case. The resolution was adopted, and Messrs. Winchester and Rice were sworn in.

Objection was also made on the first day to the right of Vanhorn and Dyer, of Missouri, to be sworn in; but the only reason given for objecting was that they were not actually elected—no question of qualification arising.

Messrs. Vanhorn and Dyer, after a brief discussion, temporarily withdrew.

Mr. Lawrence objected to the swearing in of Mr. Rogers as a member from the Second district of Arkansas, but his statement of the case showed only a claim of unfair election.

Mr. Garfield said:

I desire to ask my colleague if all that he is now reading or suggesting from that paper is not clearly a matter that relates to the contest as to the ultimate right of this gentleman to his seat, and not to the prima facie right on the credentials to be sworn in as a member. It seems to me that this person has a right to be sworn in if his credentials are regularly witnessed and there be no personal objections which would prevent him from taking the oath.

On motion of Mr. Farnsworth, Mr. Lawrence's resolution was laid on the table, and Mr. Rogers was sworn in.

At this point the House adjourned.

On the reassembling of the House a resolution was adopted notifying the Senate that the House had assembled, chosen a Speaker, and that it was ready to proceed to business.

This notwithstanding no other officers of the House had been elected.

Thereupon the cases of Vanhorn and Dyer came up on a resolution that they be sworn in.

Mr. Benjamin observed (see page 10) that in these cases there was no point raised as to the eligibility of these parties to occupy seats in the House. It was a question of election, and of course would go to the Committee on Elections, but they were entitled to be sworn in.

A motion to lay the resolution on the table was defeated by a vote of 4 yeas to 163 nays.

This shows that the House took complete jurisdiction of the subject of swearing in the men, and permitted them to be sworn in upon a manifest theory. It was a question merely as to their election, and not as to their eligibility.

Mr. Butler withdrew his objection to the swearing in of Hamill, of Maryland, because he said he had examined the affidavits and evidence in the case and thought that the prima facie case as made by the certificate ought at this time to prevail.

The case was sent to the Committee on Elections and was never heard of again.

Later, the same day, Mr. Farnsworth (page 18) moved that the members from Georgia be sworn in. After considerable discussion Mr. Farnsworth modified his resolution, ordering a reference of the credentials and papers of the Georgia members to the Committee on Elections when appointed, with directions to report to the House whether their papers present a prima facie right to their seats.

These members were therefore not permitted to be sworn in, but their cases passed over under the resolution.

Thereupon a motion was made that the House now proceed to the election of Clerk, Sergeant-at-Arms, etc.

Before the motion was put Mr. Butler, of Tennessee, rose to a question of privilege and asked leave to present the credentials of Mr. Rogers, of Tennessee, claiming a seat as Representative from that State.

The Speaker refused to entertain it as a question of privilege, holding that it was not as high a question as the election of officers. Thereupon the House proceeded to elect its officers.

I make the following comments on the proceedings connected with the organization of the Forty-first Congress:

(1) After the election of the Speaker, and before all the members were sworn in, the body proceeded to consider questions of the right of members-elect to be sworn in. Some it permitted to be sworn in.

As to Winchester and Rice it practically decided that their cases could be sent to the committee to determine their right to take the oath as well as to seat its members on a question of eligibility, though their credentials were perfect.

(2) In the Georgia case the same thing was done, although it ought to be said that the ground for not settling it at that time was because it was evident that a good deal of time would be spent in the discussion.

(3) The Speaker held that all the members-elect had the right to vote, whether they had been sworn in or not. It is to be presumed that this ruling did not mean that a member-elect had a right to vote on his own case.

(4) Before all the members who had been requested to stand aside had been sworn in, and when the only officer elected was the Speaker, the Senate was notified that the House had chosen the Speaker and was ready to proceed to business.

(5) A committee was appointed to join with a like committee from the Senate to make the usual notification to the President.

(6) The question of the right of the Louisiana members to be sworn in was, before the election of the other officers, referred to the Committee on Elections.

In this case, however, there was question as to whether the credentials on their face were sufficient.

(7) The Speaker refused, on the raising of the question of privilege, to permit Mr. Rogers, of Tennessee, to be sworn in after a motion had been made, but not put, that the House proceed to the election of the other officers.

On the 30th of March, 1870 (Globe, volume 77, page 2299), the credentials of J. C. Connor, claiming a seat as Representative from the State of Texas, were referred to the Committee on Elections.

There seems to have been no demand on the part of Connor to be sworn in.

On page 2322 the Committee on Elections on March 31, 1870, reported in favor of administering the oath to the Representatives-elect from the State of Texas, including Mr. Connor.

Notwithstanding this report on his prima facie right, an effort was made to offer an amendment that Connor be not sworn in, but that his case be referred to the Committee on Elections, with instructions to report both on the prima facie right and on its merits.

The ground for this resolution was stated to be that Connor, whose certificate was in due form, had committed some offense for which he had been tried by a military court of inquiry and acquitted.

Mr. Butler, of Massachusetts, appears in this case as the champion of the proposed amendment and against permitting Connor to be sworn in, notwithstanding the report of the committee.

Mr. Dawes spoke on the question, declaring that this was a very different case from those which came from Kentucky in the Fortieth Congress, and repeated his statement of the right and duty of the House where question is made as to the qualification of a person asking to be sworn in.

Many other members took the same ground, but declared that the rule did not apply, as it certainly did not, to a case such as they had under consideration.

In the discussion over the Connor case no serious question seems to have been raised as to the right to stop a member-elect at the bar and refuse to swear him in if the charge of ineligibility was made.

Mr. Banks, on page 2328, asserted the view that while it was not

wise always to exercise the high prerogative of refusing to swear a man in, yet that the House had the undoubted power, and that it ought not by any decision ever to seem to doubt or deny its existence.

Mr. Garfield took the same view, on page 2326, saying:

My friend will allow me to say that we may go back of the certificate in anything that touches the constitutional right of a member to a seat.

The resolution reported by the committee in the Connor case was adopted.

At the organization of the Forty-second Congress, March 4, 1871 (Globe, volume 85, page 6), when the name of Alfred M. Waddell, of North Carolina, was called, after the election of Speaker, Mr. Maynard objected to his being sworn in on the ground that he was personally disqualified.

The Speaker said:

Following the course adopted in the organization of past Houses, the Chair will first swear in those members against whom no objection whatever is presented,

and the Speaker later on held that Mr. Maynard had the right to make the objection, notwithstanding the fact that he had not been sworn in.

Mr. Waddell accordingly stood aside. No further effort was made in Mr. Waddell's case until after the organization was complete by the election of the other officers.

Accordingly, later in the same day his case was called up and decided on its merits, so that he was permitted to be sworn in.

In the discussion of this case Mr. Maynard, who had objected, said:

As to whether we shall refer his case to the Committee on Elections or whether we will swear him in, I have felt bound from a knowledge of the facts disclosed to me by a gentleman from North Carolina to make presentation of the case to the House that we might follow the same course as in the last Congress and in the Congress before the last, as well as in the Thirty-ninth Congress. It is a safe, prudent, wise, and judicious course, as the experience of the last few years has clearly demonstrated. If this gentleman shall be found able to stand the ordeal of that examination, he can be admitted on the removal of his disabilities.

Although Mr. Maynard grounded his objection on this personal disqualification and the right of the House to administer the oath, no person controverted that position; but the House passed upon the question of his disqualification; consequently he was entitled to be sworn in.

On the same day, after the election of the Speaker and before the other officers had been elected, an objection was made to the swearing in of the Representatives from Tennessee on some ground connected with the validity of the law under which they were elected; but objection was later on withdrawn and the members-elect were sworn in.

Objection was then made to the Mississippi delegation. This involved only the question of manner of election. Mr. Bingham, during the debate (on page 9), says:

I trust, sir, the day is past for challenging the right of any State in this Union to representation on the floor of Congress when her Representatives present themselves with certificates prima facie entitling them to seats, unless the persons so presenting themselves should be challenged as disqualified under the Constitution and laws of the United States.

Again, Mr. Bingham (on page 10) says:

According to the traditions of the Republic, when persons come to the bar of this House as Representatives of organized States with a prima facie case of election, and whose personal qualifications are not challenged, it is not usual to deny their admission for the discharge of their duties upon this floor; but it is usual, on the contrary, to admit them and allow them to be sworn in, and if a question arises such as that suggested by the gentleman from Indiana, to wit, an irregularity in the election, it is referred uniformly to the Committee on Elections to ascertain the facts.

Of course this delegation was sworn in and their credentials referred to the Committee on Elections.

Thus we see the House has explicitly declared that it had the right and that it had the power, and that under certain conditions which then existed it would exercise that right and that power, to refuse to administer the oath.

All through these discussions, which I shall not take time to read from, the statement of law is made, almost without being seriously controverted, as laid down in the text of Judge McCrary's book. Mr. Haskell, who was objecting, for another reason, in the Forty-seventh Congress, in the last Cannon case, to the refusal to permit a man to be sworn, quoted the law against himself in this way: That when there is a prima facie case, but two sets of questions can be considered—first, the face of the certificate and the facts revealed in the certificate, and second, those questions going to show the qualifications of the man certified to, as to whether he can take the oath of office or not, and when those two branches of the subject have been exhausted, the prima facie case ends.

There was an able Representative stating all the case he could state for himself while on the other side of the practical proposition that confronts us here.

Mr. Speaker, we are told that this will make an unhappy precedent. Precedent! Why, what we do here we do before the open and gazing eyes of all the world, and we are at once dragged to the bar of history to answer for our deeds. We are no cloistered court. We are no statute-bound tribunal. We are the servants of the people, empowered, thank God, under the Constitution to do the right as we see the right. That is the law that binds us. The public eye is on us; the public conscience quickens us. In that presence and before such a judge we can do no wrong if we obey it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAYLER] would not enter upon a discussion of the merits of the question involved in this case. The case which I shall attempt to discuss here and present to the House is one which does not in any sense involve the merits of this controversy. The question which we are called upon to consider, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, is the simple one as to whether the member-elect from Utah, with his credentials regular in form, is entitled to be sworn into this House as a member. I say the consideration of that question does not, in my judgment, involve the merits of the controversy—that is, his right to retain his seat as a member. I can not, sir, give my support to the resolution offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAYLER]. I am not willing to reject the Representative of a sovereign State of this Union who presents himself at the bar of the House with a proper certificate of election, duly signed, under the great seal of his State, and demands his seat. I have had the credentials of the member-elect from Utah produced and I now ask the Clerk to read those credentials.

The Clerk read as follows:

STATE OF UTAH, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

I, James T. Hammond, secretary of state of the State of Utah, do hereby certify that on Tuesday, the 8th day of November, A. D. 1898, at the general election held within and for said State, Brigham H. Roberts was duly elected Representative to the Fifty-sixth Congress of the United States of America, from the State of Utah, as appears from the returns of said election, which have been duly canvassed and certified.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Utah this 10th day of December, A. D. 1898.

[SEAL.] J. T. HAMMOND,
Secretary of State.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, these credentials are in due form. The member-elect comes with the same evidence of his rights to a seat that you possess, Mr. Speaker, or as is held by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAYLER] who offers the resolution of exclusion, and for one I say I will not unite in making a precedent which may, and which I predict will, inevitably arise in the future to plague those who come after us.

The right of a member to his seat is an exalted one. The right of a State to representation on this floor has never been denied here when she properly commissions a gentleman who is eligible and sends him here. Now, I notice that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAYLER] in his arguments, if I could understand him aright, presents only one objection which goes to the constitutional right of the member-elect to his seat. He refers to a charge or a record which he says has been produced, which establishes the fact that the member-elect is not a naturalized citizen or a citizen of Utah. But, Mr. Speaker, I ask the attention of the House to the fact that upon this point the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAYLER] does not upon his honor or responsibility as a member charge that this fact is true. I have before me here the statement made by the gentleman from Ohio on yesterday, when he made his objection, in respect to this one constitutional objection to the member-elect from Utah taking his seat. The gentleman uses the following language, which I read from the RECORD:

I ought also to say, in addition to what I have just said, that I have in my possession a certified copy of the court record under which the claimant to this seat was supposed to be naturalized, and that eminent counsel assert that if that be the record in the case—

That if that be the record in the case—

there is grave doubt if the claimant is a citizen of the United States.

It raises a doubt, it seems, in the minds of counsel. But the gentleman adds:

I offer and express no opinion upon that proposition.

The only authority which the gentleman cited which said that you might inquire into the prima facie right of a member who presents himself here to be sworn in related to a constitutional objection and not to other objections such as might justify the expulsion or the exclusion of a member after he was seated.

I undertake to say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not believe there is any precedent which the gentleman can produce which goes to the point of excluding a member-elect or depriving him of his right to be sworn in when he presents himself and demands that right, where there is no constitutional question involved.

The member from Utah, it must be conceded, stands here with credentials regular in every respect, and in so far as any evidence has been adduced he is in every respect eligible and has complied with every constitutional requirement.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman allow me to suggest at this point that he read the certificate, or have read the certificate of naturalization that the gentleman from Utah has in his possession? The original certificate is here and in regular form.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I assume that it is true, and that it is in regular form.

But that question does not arise here now, because no gentleman is alleging here upon his responsibility as a member that the member-elect from Utah has not been regularly naturalized as a citizen.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. The resolution does not raise that question.

Mr. RICHARDSON. And the resolution does not raise that question, as has been suggested to me by the gentleman from Texas.

But, Mr. Speaker, in the discussion of the case by me I do not intend to touch even remotely the merits of the case—that is, the ultimate right of the member to his seat—but to discuss only the prima facie right of the claimant at bar to be sworn and the right of the State to be represented here and now. The merits of the controversy, as I have stated, do not arise in considering this question. The gentleman from Utah may be guilty of the offense and crime intimated and charged; but the fact of his guilt or innocence does not arise in the consideration of the question as to his prima facie right to be sworn as a member, because the investigation into these matters should be made as to his right to hold a seat.

Mr. Speaker, I speak alone for myself in this matter. I do not claim to speak for any party or any organization upon this floor. I have decided and positive convictions upon this question, and I simply want to give utterance to those convictions as I feel I should be bound by them.

I say in the outset, with all the emphasis I can command, if the member from Utah is guilty of the offenses charged against him, he should not be allowed to retain a seat in the House. If there is one thing upon which the American people are one, and upon which they should remain united, it is that the homes of our people and their domestic relations shall be forever preserved in all their loveliness, sweetness, and purity. [Applause.]

But, sir, in considering the pending question these matters do not arise and should not be considered, and no member ought to permit his judgment to be warped by public clamor or by any temporary excitement. I care not what action the House may take after trial has been given to the member. If found guilty as charged, he can be removed from the House in an orderly and becoming fashion; but to condemn him before a hearing is given and to deny him his right to be sworn and to participate in the organization of this House is a condemnation without trial. [Applause.] No severer condemnation can be pronounced against a member, Mr. Speaker, than to deny him the right to be sworn when this House is being organized; and the claimant stands here now, just as he stood on yesterday, by special agreement, when his name was called and he demanded to be sworn as a member to represent his State and participate in the full organization of the House. Mr. Speaker, the act of Congress, as found in section 31 of the Revised Statutes, is as follows, and I ask the attention of members to it. I will read it:

> The Clerk of the last House shall make a roll of the Representatives-elect and place thereon the names of those persons and of such persons only whose credentials show that they were regularly elected in accordance with the laws of their States, respectively, or the laws of the United States.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Tennessee permit me to ask him a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Certainly.

Mr. HEPBURN. Do you think it is necessary that the certificate should show that the claimant was elected in accordance with the laws of the State or the laws of the United States? Is it necessary that the certificate should show that?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I can not quite hear what the gentleman says.

Mr. HEPBURN. Should the certificate recite the fact that the member was elected in accordance with the laws of the State?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think the credentials submitted by the gentleman are in proper form and that they entitle him to a seat. I wish to discuss this question along the lines I have laid out and do not want to be interrupted by questions that interfere with the line of my argument.

Mr. HEPBURN. I understood you to say you were reading——

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the gentleman from Tennessee declines to be interrupted further.

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I can not yield. My time is expiring.

I have read, Mr. Speaker, section 31 of the Revised Statutes. Now, sir, it is made the duty of the Speaker to administer the oath of office to all Members and Delegates present. The statute quoted is mandatory, and it conveys no discretion either to the Clerk or to the Speaker. In the case at bar the Clerk of the last House has discharged his part of the duty, that part enjoined upon him by the section of the statute which I have read. He has examined the credentials of the member from Utah; he has found them in regular and proper form, and, as was his duty, he has placed his name on the roll of Representatives-elect of this House. The Clerk of this House did that on the 4th day of March last, and since that date the member has drawn his salary, has enjoyed the franking privilege, and exercised all other legitimate privileges of a member-elect.

It remains, then, but for the Speaker of this House to comply with the plain provisions of the statute which I have quoted—that is, discharge his duty by administering to the member the oath of office. Any other course will set a most dangerous precedent, and your action will tend inevitably to chaos and revolution.

Mr. Speaker, this body has existed for one hundred and ten years, and for this long and eventful period the certificate of a governor of a State in an unbroken line of precedents has constituted the title of members of this House. The member at the bar holds the title upon which all have been sworn at the beginning of Congress.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAYLER] has presented numerous precedents in support of his resolution, but I say here and now that I have examined these cases, and when properly analyzed and understood they will be found not inconsistent with the contention I make. These precedents, taken from cases which occurred during the war and which arose during the disorganized and chaotic condition for the few years following the war, are for obvious reasons not to be relied upon now. At that time no attention was paid, as we all know, to constitutional qualifications. As suggested by a member near me, it was once said by a distinguished Senator that constitutional amendments were then written with a sword; and so qualifications for members of this House were enforced in the same way.

When the life of the nation was supposed to be at stake, the House cared very little for regularity of proceedings and did not claim that it was controlled by parliamentary precedents. These precedents made during the war have all been overruled, in my judgment, since the passions of war subsided, and can not be depended upon now to sustain the contention of the gentleman from Ohio. The latter cases which have come before the House, where a similar question was raised to the one now pending, have uniformly sustained the contention which I make. They establish the sound doctrine that in all cases like the pending one the member is entitled to be sworn and given his seat. I do not depend upon my own opinion or judgment when I solemnly assert this principle and make this contention. I shall quote briefly some of the ablest and most learned gentlemen who have ever occupied seats on this floor when they were discussing cases similar to the one now pending.

The first case I cite arose in this House during the first session of the Forty-third Congress, December 2, 1873. On that day Mr. Cannon, a Delegate elected from Utah, presented himself at the bar of the House to take the oath of office as Delegate from that Territory. An objection to his doing so was made by a member—I believe Mr. Merriam, of New York. The grounds of objection were substantially the same as those now made against the member-elect from Utah. The question being raised, it was debated by several members of the House who were conspicuous for their ability and patriotism. These gentlemen had long been members of this House, and spoke for the two great parties then as now represented upon this floor.

The Delegate from Utah who presented himself with the proper credentials was a Republican, and the objection made to his being qualified and taking his seat was that he was a polygamist. How history has repeated itself, Mr. Speaker. The first gentleman that spoke upon this question was the Hon. Samuel S. Cox, of New York, and I shall quote briefly what he said. I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 2, 1873, on page 7. Remember, Mr. Speaker, that it was a case exactly on all fours with the case now pending before the House. A Delegate from Utah presented himself to be sworn, and the objection was that he was a polygamist. He was a Republican, which is about the only difference between the two cases as I distinguish them now.

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield a moment?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I hope the gentleman from Iowa will allow me to get along; my time is fast going. I would yield if I could. Mr. Cox said:

> I do not raise any moral question here.

That is our position now. He said:

> I do not care anything about Mormonism; but the point is, that this gentleman has a prima facie right to the seat, and we are setting a precedent that may be dangerous. I know my friend and I should agree in regard to some practices in Utah, but I hope the House will not depart from the regular established custom and break down the prima facie certificate of the governor of the Territory. Let us stand on principle. I move that the Delegate from Utah be sworn in.

Such was the opinion of Mr. Cox, of New York, a leading Democrat, long after the passion of war had subsided and long after the alleged precedent which has been cited by the gentleman from

Ohio. Mr. Cox, I have said, was a Democrat, a leading Democrat, and that was the opinion he expressed at the time. The gentleman whose seat was in controversy was a Republican. But it demonstrates, Mr. Speaker, that a Democrat can rise higher than mere party prejudices when the right of a member to his seat on this floor is affected. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But, sir, other gentlemen spoke on this question. I want to read what Gen. Benjamin F. Butler, of Massachusetts, said. I quote from his remarks on that occasion:

Mr. BUTLER of Massachusetts. I desire to say to the House that I do not believe that when a man comes here with proper credentials from the proper authority it has ever been the custom of the House, or ever ought to be, that he shall not have prima facie his seat, because the moment we break away from that rule, then in high party times the House could never be organized. That is all that any of us have when we come here. While I do not mean to give any opinion or to intimate any as to the merits of this case, of which I know nothing, yet I will say that here is a case where a man holds from the governor of a Territory the proper credentials, and that Territory is entitled to be represented on this floor until something shall be shown to the House to take away that right. I trust, therefore, that my friend from New York [Mr. Merriam], who offered this resolution, will withdraw it and allow Mr. Cannon to be sworn in.

That is not all. Mr. GEORGE F. HOAR, of Massachusetts, one of the most learned men who ever occupied a seat here or in the other end of the Capitol, gave his opinion. Let me read you a sentence or two from his speech on that occasion:

Mr. G. F. HOAR. This precise question came up in the last House in the case of Mr. Clark, of Texas. His credentials were referred to the Committee on Elections, and that committee reported that the only question for the House to consider was, whether Mr. Clark's credentials were regular in form, and whether the officer certifying them was entitled by the law of the State and the usages of the House to give him those credentials. Thereupon the House seated Mr. Clark, though, a few weeks after, the committee reported upon the whole case, and the House decided that Mr. Clark was not entitled to the seat he had been occupying and gave it to his competitor, Mr. Giddings.

I will read briefly now from the remarks of Mr. Potter, of New York, another distinguished Democrat and a man of conspicuous ability:

Mr. POTTER. There is no question about certificates presented in this case. As appeared by the very proper inquiry of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Kellogg], this is the only certificate presented and the only pretense that anybody has to the seat. The resolution of my colleague [Mr. Merriam] goes, by way of objection to this gentleman being sworn in, upon the ground that he is guilty of certain practices contrary to the laws of the United States. Now, the difficulty with my colleague's objection is that the statute has prescribed certain qualifications for the office of Delegate from the Territory, but among those qualifications is not innocency in respect of practices to which my friend alludes.

We had that precise question in the Forty-first Congress, when a gentleman from Virginia was charged with disloyalty and other offenses; and it was agreed, almost without a dissenting voice upon this side of the House, that the House had no power to consider or determine, as a prerequisite to admission, whether or not he had been guilty of those or any other offenses, provided he came here with the constitutional requirements in reference to his qualifications, and provided also he brought prima facie evidence of a right to a seat in a certificate from the governor. Were there two certificates here, or any contest about the office, it would then be proper to refer the question to the Committee on Elections. But when there is no question as to who was elected, we can not now try or even consider the suggestion that this man was guilty of the offenses charged, because that has nothing whatever to do with his right to a seat here.

Then Mr. Maynard, of Tennessee, addressed himself to the question. He was a Republican. Unlike the last gentleman quoted, Mr. Potter, he occupied the same position politically as the gentleman whose seat was in contest. He took the same view, however, as the preceding gentlemen:

Mr. MAYNARD. There is another question in connection with this case to which I desire to call attention. It is that this resolution is introduced with a preamble which asserts certain propositions to be facts. We have no evidence to that effect; we have no documents presented; the mover of the resolution has made no statement upon his own authority or otherwise, and it seems to me that it would be very rash for us to assume the truth of those statements, and to act upon them, so far as to prevent the swearing in of this Delegate.

It is in that aspect of the case that I am prevented from making the motion that I first thought of making—to refer this resolution to the Committee on Elections.

At the conclusion of his remarks Mr. Niblack, a very distinguished lawyer of the State of Indiana, moved that the resolution (a resolution like that proposed by the gentleman from Ohio) be laid on the table. That motion was adopted without a division; and immediately afterwards Mr. Cannon was sworn in and took his seat.

I might add, sir, that, although Mr. Cannon was a Republican, not a member on either side of the House—no member on the Democratic side of the House—raised his voice in opposition to the position which I contend for to-day. No Democrat and no Republican objected to his being sworn in, but the resolution was laid on the table without a division, as I have suggested, and he took his seat.

That is not all. The question was again raised in the Forty-fifth Congress. At that time the House was Democratic, and the member claiming his seat was a colored man from South Carolina whose name was Rainey. Upon the right of this member to take his seat numbers of gentlemen made remarks. He came here with the proper certificate of election and his credentials were regular in form.

In behalf of his right to be sworn Mr. Banks, of Massachusetts, spoke. Mr. Banks was a distinguished Republican. He had been a Speaker and had presided over the deliberations of this House. I will quote a line or two from what Mr. Banks said on that occasion. I will not take the time to read it all. There is a good deal of sound reasoning. He says:

Mr. BANKS. I submit that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rainey] ought to be admitted to take the oath as a member of this House, because he has the certificate of his government that he has been elected according to law. There is no reason why the House should not hereafter inquire into the validity of that election. It may make such inquiry the very moment after Mr. Rainey has been admitted upon the certificate. But the very existence of our Government depends upon our recognition of the certificates of State governments to the election of members of this House. We could never organize this House if any member was permitted upon any opinion of his own to impeach the certificates of the governments under which members of this House are elected. Until the last Congress, the precedents of which have been referred to by the gentleman from Virginia, there has never been a single case where this House has set aside, as to the prima facie case, the certificate of a State government to the election of a member of Congress. In every case where the certificates have been disregarded as prima facie evidence of election it has been where the officer or officers that made the certificate have impeached their own certificate.

I will also read here what I see attributed to ex-Senator Edmunds in a Philadelphia paper:

ROBERTS SHOULD BE SEATED.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *November 28, 1899.*

The Constitution fixes and describes the qualifications necessary for a member of the House of Representatives. I think the House has no constitutional right to add others, either affirmatively or negatively, and, therefore, I think that if Mr. Roberts was regularly elected, was of requisite age, resided in the State of Utah, and is willing to take the oath prescribed by Constitution, the House has no right to refuse to allow him to be sworn in.

It is more dangerous to the rights and liberties of the people for the House to set up standards of admission not prescribed by Constitution than to admit to be sworn any person whom the people of a State choose to elect. That done, the Constitution has itself provided for the House ridding itself of any member who, upon its own conscience, it believes for any reason ought not to continue therein.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to quote also at this point the opinion of possibly the most illustrious gentleman who ever occupied a seat upon the other side, or indeed upon either side of this House, Gen. James A. Garfield, of Ohio. [Applause.] In referring to the contested-election case of Hull against Bisbee, General Garfield said:

I will say this, the certificate was in full legal form, certifying to the legal facts which are ordinarily certified to in certificates that come here. Mr. Belford bore those credentials, and I, in common with my associates on this side of the House, said that he must be sworn in under those credentials.

He said again:

If he brought that certificate here unchallenged by any higher paper, he ought to be sworn in.

But that was not all that Mr. Garfield said. I have here a broader statement from General Garfield, which goes squarely to the point in controversy, that where the credentials of a member-elect are presented, regular in form, there is no power in the House to exclude the member-elect from his seat.

Mr. CARMACK. I will ask the gentleman from what State that contest was.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It was the Rogers case from the State of Arkansas; the first session of the Forty-first Congress.

Mr. Lawrence, of Ohio, at that time submitted a resolution—

that Mr. Rogers shall not be permitted to take the oath of office, or a seat as such Representative, but that his credentials shall be and are hereby referred to the Committee on Elections when appointed.

In the course of the debate General Garfield said:

I desire to ask my colleague if all that he is now reading or suggesting from that paper is not clearly matter that relates to the contest as to the ultimate right of this gentleman to his seat, and not to the prima facie right on the credentials to be sworn in as a member. It seems to me that this person has a right to be sworn in if his credentials are regular, unless there be personal objections which would prevent him from taking the oath.

After debate the member from Arkansas, Mr. Rogers, was admitted and sworn.

Mr. CARMACK. Will my colleague allow me to interrupt him just for a moment?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes.

Mr. CARMACK. Was it not charged in that case that he was not a citizen of the United States?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have that here, and I thank my colleague for calling attention to it, although I intended to mention it. One of the very grounds of objection to the admission of this member-elect, Mr. Rogers, was that it was alleged in the objection that he was not a citizen of the United States or of the State of Arkansas.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. And that he was not of legal age, was it not?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will read what Mr. Lawrence said:

I rise to submit two reasons why Mr. Rogers, claiming to be elected, shall not be sworn into office. They are, first, that he is not a citizen of the State of Arkansas and was not a citizen of that State at the time of his election.

The very constitutional question which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAYLER] does not raise in this case, because he says he will not express an opinion upon it.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield to me?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. Does the Constitution require that a man be a citizen of the State in order that he be eligible as a member of Congress?

Mr. RICHARDSON. The point I want to call to the attention of the gentleman from Ohio and to the House is that, regardless of this charge, General Garfield said it was not to be considered at that time.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. Precisely; there was no question of qualification in the case.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman listen to what was there said? General Garfield said:

I desire to ask my colleague if all that he is now reading or suggesting from that paper is not clearly matter that relates to the contest as to the ultimate right of the gentleman to his seat——

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. Precisely.

Mr. RICHARDSON (reading)—

and not the prima facie right on the credentials to be sworn in? It seems to me that this person has a right to be sworn in if his credentials are regular, unless there are personal objections—

and so forth.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. Precisely; personal objections! [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. But there are no personal objections made.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. Personal objections! [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. Now, then, Mr. Speaker, there were no personal objections made in that case such as Mr. Garfield referred to. The gentleman does not insinuate or mean to say that there are personal objections to this applicant and to this member-elect therefor.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. Well, I do. There are personal objections.

Mr. RICHARDSON. There is nothing stated in this case——

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. Personal disqualifications.

Mr. RICHARDSON. They are not stated in this case, and they were not stated in the Rogers case. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DALZELL. There is no analogy.

Mr. RICHARDSON. But the point I am endeavoring to make is that they could not be considered upon a question of the prima facie right of a member to be sworn.

The gentleman from Ohio quoted from McCrary on Elections. I have myself made an extract from that author. He says:

Where the statute gives the governor of a State the power and makes it his duty to commission the person elected to an office, the issuing of a commission by him confers a vested right upon the person commissioned, which nothing but a judicial decision can take away or authorize the governor to recall.

The certificate of the governor of Utah in the case of the member at bar gives him the right to be sworn until the case is adjudicated, and until the case is adjudicated he has the right to his seat.

Mr. Speaker, I have not cited all the cases, but only a few which have occurred subsequent to those cited by the gentleman from Ohio. They are exactly in accord with the case now at bar, each of them holding that you can not, on the prima facie right of a member to his seat, inquire into the merits of his right to that seat. I think, Mr. Speaker, I will add but little more. I believe, however, I should refer to the opinion of other gentlemen. I have quoted the distinguished gentlemen whose names I have mentioned, men like General Garfield, Senator HOAR, General Butler, Mr. Cox of New York, Mr. Maynard, and other distinguished gentlemen and experienced parliamentarians.

I have seen recently a number of interviews in the papers of this and other cities in respect to the case at bar. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I know that many interviews, or alleged interviews, can not be taken as the solemn judgment of the member who is interviewed. Oftentimes their remarks are unintentionally, of course, incorrectly set down by the intelligent reporter and sometimes exaggerated, and sometimes they are misunderstood; and therefore I do not undertake to say that any gentleman present is bound by an interview in a newspaper if he repudiates that interview. But I have here a statement made by a distinguished gentleman who is now within my vision, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL]. I do not know whether the gentleman gave this interview or not; and if he does not think he has been correctly reported, I am perfectly willing for him to say that he did not say it. I will read it and ask the gentleman if he did not use this language. It is a special dispatch to the Press, of Pittsburg:

PITTSBURG, *November 29, 1899.*

Congressman JOHN DALZELL arrived in the city this morning from Washington. Referring to the Roberts situation, Mr. DALZELL said:

"It is the opinion of many Congressmen who have arrived at Washington that Brigham H. Roberts, Representative-elect from Utah, will eventually be expelled from Congress. I believe that, inasmuch as there is no opponent contesting Mr. Roberts's seat, and as he has the certificate of election, he will be permitted to take his seat when Congress assembles. The case is an important one and will have immediate attention."

Now, then, that is the opinion, you see, that Mr. DALZELL held only a few days ago, unless he is misquoted by this intelligent correspondent.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, there is not a single, solitary word of truth in what the gentleman has read. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. Of course, when the gentleman says there is not a word of truth in what the gentleman says, he means what the correspondent says.

Mr. DALZELL. I understand that is an interview that was alleged to have taken place in Pittsburg.

Mr. RICHARDSON. That is right.

Mr. DALZELL. No such interview ever took place. I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not know whether the gentleman said it or not; but if he says he did not, I take his statement as true. But the gentleman does not state that he did not entertain the opinion ascribed to him. [Laughter.]

Then, my distinguished friend who sits just to the right of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has, since he has come to this city, given an interview—I refer to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. STEELE]—in which he said: "The member-elect from Utah had as much right to be sworn as he had," or words to that effect. That is the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. STEELE. [Laughter.] If he did not say it, let him rise and say so. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. STEELE. I do not think the gentleman can produce any such interview.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Well, if the gentleman says he did not say it, and that he did not entertain such opinions, I will not produce the interview. [Laughter.]

But, Mr. Speaker, I quote another gentleman whom I see [laughter], and I believe the biggest gun on that side of the House—the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. [Laughter.] Now, I hold in my hand an alleged interview given by him. Of course, if the gentleman from Illinois says that he did not have that interview, I accept his statement; but I would like for him to add whether the opinions ascribed to him were entertained by him. [Laughter.] It is in an interview in the Washington Times, a very recent interview.

Mr. CANNON. To save time, I will say to the gentleman that there was an interview in the Washington Post that was in substance what I stated. I have no recollection—in fact I am quite sure that I had no interview with the Washington Times, and have certainly never read any.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Read it now.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will read it, and then the gentleman can repudiate it if he desires.

Mr. CANNON. I will say to the gentleman, however, that I took the oath and there is no allegation that I am not eligible, so that I am not on trial.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will read the interview and make it a part of my remarks.

When asked if Representative Brigham H. Roberts, of Utah, would be sworn in as a member of the House, Representative JOSEPH G. CANNON, of Illinois, who is slated for chairman of the Appropriations Committee, answered by saying, "Why not?"

Mr. CANNON regards as absurd much that has been printed in the newspapers on the Roberts case. In answer to a question asked by a reporter for the Times, Mr. CANNON said that the talk that Roberts would not be permitted to take his seat because some Representatives would object was ridiculous.

"If such a proceeding is attempted," said Mr. CANNON, "it will make the Representative who does it absurd. There seems to be little doubt, however, that a member will come to the front for that purpose on the opening day of the session."

"If, after a member has been sworn in," continued Mr. CANNON, "he can, by objecting, prevent some other member from taking the oath, why it will be seen that it would be in the power of the first few members who are sworn in to tie up the House, and make chaos of the proceedings.

"The name of Roberts was placed on the roll of the Representatives-elect by the Clerk of the House, and that act of that official puts Roberts exactly on the same footing with the other Representatives-elect so far as their right to participate in the organization of the House is concerned."

I think the interview in the Post is substantially the same as this, although I am not certain about that.

Mr. CANNON. By no manner of means. Now, as fair as my friend is, I will state that I have no recollection of such an interview. I can not conceive how I could have given it, and as he has read from that interview, which is alleged to have been with me, I trust that he will give me a sentence right at this point.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Interviews are not very material, but I want now in the House of Representatives, as one of its members, to say that as to a question of election, the number of votes received, it seems to me the member is always sworn in on a proper certificate; but the question of eligibility, whether he is naturalized, whether he is under the constitutional age, or for any other reason going to his eligibility, it is quite competent, as I understand

the precedents and practice, to make the objection now or hereafter.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to reply briefly to the case raised by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAYLER], called the Whittemore case, from South Carolina, charged with selling a cadetship. That case, if I remember correctly—I have not it here—was where Whittemore was charged with selling a cadetship, and resigned to prevent expulsion and went back to his constituents. He ran again and was elected, and then came back after an election by them to the same House of Representatives. He came back with all the knowledge on the part of the members of his guilt, and he returned to an organized House of Representatives. He came here with a certificate of the governor, it is true, but he claimed to seek admission into the House of Representatives six months or longer after the House was organized. He was refused admission to the House.

Then the Winchester case was a case growing out of the war, and is not a proper case to cite here, in view of the feeling and pending conditions at that time. The only question, it seems to me, is whether or not the cases I have quoted, occurring long after the war, long after the cases cited by the gentleman from Ohio, do not in all common justice overrule those cases and give the member-elect who comes with his credentials the prima facie right to be sworn in and take part in the organization of the House and represent the State or Commonwealth which gives him the certificate. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the House for courteous attention. [Applause.]

I now yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Utah, Mr. Roberts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Utah will be heard.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the document which I now send to the Clerk's desk be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Certificate of citizenship, United States of America, Territory of Utah, ss:

Be it remembered, that on the 6th day of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-two, Brigham H. Roberts, late of England, in the Kingdom of Great Britain, at present of Centerville, in the Territory aforesaid, appeared in the first judicial district court of the United States in and for Utah Territory and applied to the said court to be admitted to become a citizen of the United States of America, pursuant to the directions and requirements of the several acts of Congress in relation thereto. And the said Brigham H. Roberts, having thereupon produced to the court such evidence, made such declaration and renunciation and taken such oaths as are by the said acts required, thereupon it was ordered by the said court that the said Brigham H. Roberts be admitted, and he was accordingly admitted by the said court, to be a citizen of the United States of America.

In testimony whereof the seal of the said court is hereunto affixed, this 6th day of September, in the year one thousand eight hundred and eighty-two and in the year of our independence the one hundred and seventh.

[SEAL] A. C. EMERSON, *Clerk.*
By the court.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. In drawing seats some members were unfortunate enough to be called late and, when only a few seats were left, were compelled to take seats in front. Now, if those gentlemen who were more fortunate will take the seats they selected and thus not obscure our view——

The SPEAKER. That is a question of order, and gentlemen will please resume their seats.

Mr. ROBERTS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that the question now before the House is a most extraordinary one, and the discussion has already been remarkable. Already at the Clerk's desk the credentials of the member from Utah have been read. The question of his citizenship having been raised upon the floor of this House, I thought it proper that the prima facie evidence of that citizenship should also be read.

Now, sir, following those two documents, I wish to submit a citation from a recognized authority relative to the rules of the House in such cases, based upon its precedents for more than a hundred years. I read from McCrary's Law of Elections, chapter 4:

SEC. 204. Where two or more persons claim the same office, and where a judicial investigation is required to settle the contest upon the merits, it is often necessary to determine which of the claimants shall be permitted to qualify and to exercise the functions of the office pending such investigation. If the office were to remain vacant pending the contest it might frequently happen that the greater part of the term would expire before it could be filled, and thus the interests of the people might suffer for the want of the services of a public officer. Besides, if the mere institution of a contest was to be deemed sufficient to prevent the swearing in of the person holding the usual credentials, it is easy to see that very great and serious injustice might be done.

If this were the rule, it would only be necessary for an evil-disposed person to contest the right of his successful rival and to protract the contest as long as possible, in order to deprive the latter of his office for at least a part of the term. And this might be done by a contest having little or no merit on his side, for it would be impossible to discover, in advance of an investigation, the absence of merit. And, again, if the party holding the ordinary credentials to an office could be kept out of the office by the mere institution of a contest, the organization of a legislative body, such, for example, as the House of Representatives of the United States, might be altogether prevented by instituting contests against a majority of the members, or, what is more to be apprehended, the relative strength of political parties in such a body might be changed by instituting contests against members of one or the other of such parties. These considerations have made it necessary to adopt, and to adhere to, the rule that the person holding the ordinary credentials shall be qualified and allowed to act pending a contest and until a decision can be had on the merit.

Now, gentlemen, that is the statement of one who is learned in the law of elections, one whose book is authority in this country. And if it is the rule of the House of Representatives in cases that arise to the dignity of a contest, how infinitely more should that rule be observed when only a mere protest is made against a member who presents himself to take his oath of office?

I next proceed to the consideration of the charges that are supposed to justify what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAYLER] himself concedes to be an unusual proceeding, and which my friend on this side, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee, has demonstrated to be an unprecedented proceeding. The gentleman from Ohio bases his charge upon a court record to the effect that some twelve years ago the member from Utah pleaded guilty to the charge of a misdemeanor. The gentleman seems to be oblivious to the fact that since the date of his alleged court record on this subject we have had two Presidential amnesties proclaimed that have been applied to men disqualified under the Edmunds-Tucker Act.

I understand—and gentlemen who are lawyers will certainly appreciate the force of the fact—that the presumption of law is that people keep the law. The presumption is that they are innocent until they are proven to be guilty. This remark, however, will not reach the conscience or the sense of justice of one gentleman upon this floor, and I am rather disappointed to find that the gentleman from Tennessee, in quoting interviews from the press, did not refer to that remark. I refer to a remark made by a gentleman from Iowa, who is quoted in the press of this city as saying that unless the member-elect from Utah proves his innocence, that he should vote against him!

I thought, sir, that the practice under the law, that the rule of the law itself in this country, is that one is regarded as innocent until he is proven to be guilty. But that does not seem to be the case here.

Allow me to say to the gentleman from Ohio that he has no court record to show that I was ever arraigned or condemned for any crime whatsoever since the promulgation of the amnesty proclamations of the Presidents of the United States, and hence no competent grounds for believing me guilty of any offense that disqualifies me for the office to which I was elected. The gentleman seemed also to forget the fact that since the confession to a misdemeanor, to which he has referred, there was passed in this Congress of the United States an enabling act, authorizing the people of the Territory of Utah to form a State government and that that enabling act also had a provision embodied in it that qualified all the male citizens within the limits of said Territory to participate in the election of delegates to form the new State's constitution. That enabling act was particularly framed to remove the disqualifications and disabilities which had been created by the Edmunds-Tucker law.

The gentleman seems also to forget that in addition to that fact we have had a State constitution framed; and evidently the action of the convention framing the State constitution of Utah was satisfactory to the President of the United States and his advisers, since Utah was admitted as a State into the Union upon it and has taken upon itself the responsibilities of a sovereign State, declaring under its constitution who of her citizens should exercise the elective franchise and be qualified for holding office.

All of these things have transpired, Mr. Speaker, since confession to the misdemeanor that is referred to by the gentleman from Ohio; any one of which is sufficient to remove the ineligibility charged. Were it not that I am so limited in the time allotted to me at this stage of the discussion, I should be pleased to enter into the consideration of all the questions which have been raised by the gentleman and read the specific language both of the enabling act and the State constitution of Utah, which will prove beyond question my contention on this point.

The second charge, which is supposed to go to the question of eligibility of the member from Utah, is that upon affidavit and other papers in his possession the gentleman from Ohio is convinced that ever since confession to a misdemeanor—since 1889—the applicant for his seat has been a persistent lawbreaker in the State of Utah. If that be true, let me ask why it is that the gentleman from Utah has not been punished for his lawbreaking?

Certainly there was no lack of disposition to execute the law on the part of those charged with its administration. Its administration was in the hands of non-Mormons. Its administration and all its machinery were in the hands of those who had no sympathy with men of the religious faith of the Representative from Utah. How is it, then, that he could be an open and defiant lawbreaker and yet escape the penalty of the law?

The gentleman's objection, then, is based not upon a court record, but upon affidavits and papers that have been supplied

him by personal enemies of the member-elect from Utah. And now, sir, I wish to turn briefly for a moment to another branch of the crimes charged against the Representative from Utah. There is no charge that has ever been made against him constituting a felony. The only charge, even in the judgment of these people who have been seeking to encompass his expulsion from the House, goes no further than the charge of a misdemeanor—not a charge of felony.

And now, Mr. Speaker, as to the manner in which these charges are made. It has been about fifteen months since they began, since the Representative from Utah was advertised throughout this land as a defiant lawbreaker. And yet, sir, I walked the streets of Salt Lake City in open day, within easy reach of the law, and my faults lay open to the law if I were guilty of transgressing it. Other men charged with the same offense were arrested, pleaded before the courts of Utah, and were fined for the very offense alleged against the member from Utah, and yet no complaint was made against him.

No, it did not suit the purpose of those who had this present agitation in hand to vindicate the law quietly and by the usual methods. They desired particularly to have this case upon which to arouse the sentiment of the country about polygamy. Not until my business called me East did they undertake to make any charges against me. But shortly after my departure for the East they began this agitation, resulting in the present sentiment of the country now aroused against the dominant church in Utah and the State's member-elect.

I understand that the members of Congress are granted certain privileges while in attendance upon this House. It would be impossible to arrest any one of the members upon the charge of a misdemeanor. And yet you would deny me the privilege of being sworn in as a member of this House upon the allegation of some one that I am guilty of a misdemeanor. The thing for which the law itself could not lay a hand on me while in attendance upon this House you propose—that is, the coterie of men who have entered into this conspiracy propose—to crowd this question to a settlement by a majority vote, for the reason that they are fearful that if the matter should be proceeded with in the regular way, under a resolution to expel the member from Utah, they could not marshal the necessary two-thirds vote to accomplish that purpose.

I understand, sir, that these immunities are not given for the benefit of the individual members. They are given rather as a protection to his constituency, who are entitled to his services as their representative. And, therefore, I invoke the protection that is given to the constituency of a sovereign State against the proceedings that are instituted here to deprive me of the privilege of being sworn in as a member of this House. Privilege, did I say? I do not mean that. I am not asking any privilege in this House. I am not begging any favor of the members of this House. Under the shadow of the Constitution of the United States, I demand, both for myself and for the people of my State, the protection that is due to us. It is a demand that I make and not a favor that I ask. [Applause on the Democratic side and in the galleries.]

The SPEAKER. Order must be maintained in the House and in the galleries.

Mr. ROBERTS of Utah. I call attention to one or two, at least, of the precedents that have been referred to by gentlemen on both sides of this Chamber. In the case of Boyd Winchester and John M. Rice, while it is conceded that the charges made against them were flimsy ones, yet those who made them were at least able to say that they made them upon the fact of an indictment against these gentlemen for high treason.

The member from Ohio [Mr. TAYLER] has no indictment against me in his possession upon which to base his objections to my taking my oath of office. I take it there is a wonderful difference between objecting to a member because an indictment is in hand charging treason and an objection based upon certain affidavits of somebody or other expressing the belief that a member is guilty of a misdemeanor.

I call attention to the precedent cited by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] in the Forty-third Congress, the case of Mr. Cannon. I can add nothing to the force of that gentleman's argument except to say that in the case of Mr. Cannon the House was dealing with a Delegate from a Territory, not the Representative of the people of a sovereign State. They were dealing with a Delegate who is created by a statute passed by the Congress of the United States, and throughout the discussion it was alleged that the reason for taking exceptions to him was that they could do so because he was unprotected by the provisions of the Constitution, and yet, sir, notwithstanding he was but a Delegate, still the objection to his taking the oath was tabled and he was permitted to enjoy all the privileges of a Delegate.

It is to be remarked, sir, in this connection, and gentlemen may be astonished at it, that the course of nature was not disturbed by this action of a Republican Congress. Notwithstanding an alleged polygamist was permitted to remain upon the floor of this House. it did not transpire, as it is said to have transpired in ancient Rome a little ere the mighty Julius fell—the graves stood not tenantless. The sheeted dead did not stand and gibber in the streets of Rome. The sun was not darkened nor was the moon turned to blood. Actually, sir, the rain continued to fall upon the just and the unjust alike. [Laughter and applause.]

Gentlemen of the Democratic party, some few of whom may perhaps tremble a little at the monster petition that is to be presented to the House, pretending to voice the sentiment of the country upon the case of the member from Utah, I want to call your attention to another thing, and that is that notwithstanding a Republican Congress seated Cannon, yet the Republican party really survived its action. [Laughter.] Why, it is here to-day, and I believe, gentlemen of the majority, that it could survive even if it should seat the present Representative from the State of Utah now.

I desire now, sir, to call attention——

The SPEAKER. The thirty minutes given to the gentleman have expired.

Mr. ROBERTS of Utah. I am sorry.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to conclude his remarks.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I hope the claimant will be given time enough to at least attempt to make some answer, if he has any, to the indictment brought against him by the people of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say for the information of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] that but ten minutes of his time remains, and thirty-seven minutes of the time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAYLER].

Mr. RICHARDSON. How much time remains to this side?

The SPEAKER. Ten minutes.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. Roberts] be allowed to conclude his remarks, and that the time fixed for the debate be extended to that amount.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. I object to that, Mr. Speaker. There was an hour and a half given to that side. They can use it as they will.

The SPEAKER. What is the pleasure of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think I only used forty-five minutes, and I gave the gentleman from Utah thirty minutes, which would leave fifteen minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee used fifty minutes.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Then, Mr. Speaker, after consultation with gentlemen here to whom I had agreed to yield time, they now prefer not to take it and are perfectly willing to surrender that time to the gentleman from Utah, and I give him the remainder of the time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah has ten minutes. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ROBERTS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I will refer briefly to the Whittemore case, from South Carolina, cited here in point. There is one thing connected with that which is not made apparent by those who have referred to it, and that is that this gentleman from South Carolina was expelled from that Congress and then afterwards returned to the same Congress, and his return was regarded as an affront upon the action of the Congress that had expelled him by a majority of two-thirds.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I refer to another matter connected with this controversy, and that is this: It is not in the indictment drawn on the floor of this House, but in the memorials and protests placed upon the desks of members yesterday. It is charged that the State of Utah has broken her compact with the Government of the United States by the election of one who is alleged to have been guilty of the misdemeanor of unlawful cohabitation. Now, sir, if the State of Utah has broken that compact by the election of a man supposed to be involved in this system of marriage that obtained in Utah, if they have broken the compact by the election of one chargeable with this offense, then, sir, they have but followed the example of the present Administration of the United States Government by ignoring the charges mada against the man whom they wished to represent them.

I affirm that since the admission of Utah as a State, when men were recommended for Federal appointments, the office being within the gift of the President of the United States, to be confirmed by the Senate of the United States, objections were urged against them of the same character as those urged against the member from Utah; but the President of the United States and the Senate committees having the matter in charge ignored those protests and objections, and these men were appointed to the respective offices they sought and obtained.

Mr. HOPKINS. Do you say that the present Administration, when appointing anybody——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Utah yield?

Mr. HOPKINS. I desire to ask the gentleman if he makes the charge——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Utah. I do.

Mr. HOPKINS. I desire to ask the gentleman if he makes the charge that the present Administration has appointed any Federal officer in the State of Utah that at the time of the appointment or now is practicing polygamy?

Mr. GROSVENOR. And that with the knowledge of the President? [Cries of "Oh!" "Oh!" on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ROBERTS of Utah. My answer to the gentleman is that when men were candidates for Federal positions——

Mr. HOPKINS. This is susceptible of an answer, yes or no. It is a fact.

Mr. ROBERTS of Utah. I object to being interrupted. I wish to answer the question in my own way. My affirmation is that when men were presented for Federal appointments, objection was made against them by affidavits presented both to the President of the United States and the appropriate committees of the Senate of the United States and that these men were appointed, notwithstanding the protest and affidavits that they were living in violation of the law.

Mr. HOPKINS. That does not answer my question. The question is as to a matter of fact. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. ROBERTS of Utah. I refuse to be further interrupted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to be interrupted.

Mr. ROBERTS of Utah. So, sir, I take it that the resolution offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] is directly in point, and that it would be better that the entire investigation of this case be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, for I tell you, sir, that making a charge against a sovereign State for breaking its compact with this Government is a very serious matter, especially since it may involve a question in regard to the action of the Executive of this nation in relation thereto; for I assert this, that if the people of Utah were guilty of breaking the compact by electing a man charged with being a violator of these particular laws about unlawful cohabitation, the Administration of the Government may also be charged with breaking that compact by also appointing men to Federal offices against whom like protests supported by affidavits were made. Therefore it is eminently proper that they should go to a committee that we will be assured are men of trained abilities and learned in the law.

One word in relation to the petition of 7,000,000 people that has been rolled up here. I say to the gentleman from Ohio that it would be exceedingly interesting to know how many of these signatures were collected in the Sunday schools.

Mr. FOX. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Utah. I decline to yield. It would be interesting to know, furthermore, how many of the signatures are repetitions, because I find this in an official letter of the National Anti-Polygamy League, sent out throughout the country, from which I read—an official letter, signed by the secretary, Grace J. Cutler. The party to whom this letter is addressed is asked to secure the signatures of 2,000 people to the anti-Roberts petition:

> Get the young people to sign, too, and aid you in securing signatures. It is not necessary that only adults have representation on the petition. A few young ladies could in a very short time secure the necessary 2,000 names if you would interest them in this great moral work. No matter if your friends have signed other Roberts petitions, request them to sign again, as it is absolutely necessary to have one monster national petition large enough to make the members of Congress realize instantly the public demand that Roberts be cast out.

And yet, having collected such a petition as that, and by such methods, you come here and propose to stop a Representative of a sovereign State from taking the oath of office. Do you think that will not establish a precedent that will bring chaos some time on the floor of this House? You can not do evil that good may come.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed twenty minutes within which to conclude his remarks.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. I object. I will, however, yield the gentleman ten minutes of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAYLER] yields ten minutes to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. ROBERTS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio. Since the charge that I made concerning the probable questions that may arise in connection with this question of Utah having broken the compact with the United States is questioned, and as I may have failed to make it plain because hurried by the remembrance that my time was limited, I recur to the matter again and read from a letter of one of the supreme court judges of the State of Utah, Mr. R. N. Boskin, a non-Mormon, addressed to a friend now in the city of Washington, and which I am permitted to use. I read from the original:

> Both Mr. Roberts and myself were overwhelmingly elected by the same constituency and by nearly the same majority. I am not aware of a single instance of a Democratic member of the class which in former days was commonly designated Gentile having voted against Mr. Roberts, notwithstanding the charges so widely spread since his election were currently made against him in the campaign by his Republican opponents.
>
> That the movement against Mr. Roberts is political is shown by the facts that other members of the Mormon Church against whom like charges are made continue to hold important office under the appointment of McKinley. Yet not a single word of objection to their continuance in office is heard from the Republican politicians, who in this State are most active in the effort to array public sentiment throughout the nation against seating Mr. Roberts.
>
> One John C. Graham, the editor of the Provo Enquirer, a rank Hannaite sheet, is postmaster at Provo City, which is among the principal cities of the State. He was appointed by McKinley. One Orson Smith is also postmaster, under an appointment by Mr. McKinley, of Logan, another principal city of the State. These gentlemen's appointment was opposed on the same grounds urged against Mr. Roberts, but the Administration evidently did not consider the objection sufficient grounds for withholding the appointment. Against both of these postmasters informations have been filed and are pending in the district court charging them with the same offense of unlawful cohabitation as Mr. Roberts, by information, is charged with, yet no effort whatever is being made by the Republicans, who are so active against Mr. Roberts, to have Mr. McKinley depose either of these postmasters.

Mr. Speaker, much misrepresentation has taken place over what is called the Roberts case.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman from Utah allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. ROBERTS of Utah. I decline to be interrupted. It is charged that polygamous marriages are now going on in defiance of the laws and the compact between my State and the United States. This supreme court judge in this letter, in continuing, says:

> Another of the misrepresentations made by the Republican politicians of this State to create a public sentiment against the seating of Mr. Roberts is that new polygamous marriages are being covertly formed under the sanction of the Mormon authorities. There is no foundation for such a charge. It was first made by the Salt Lake Tribune (the Republican organ) during the campaign previous to Mr. Roberts's election.
>
> At that time I visited every part of the State, attended many political meetings, and took special pains to inquire of the reputable citizens of both parties with whom I came in contact regarding the truth of this charge, and from the information then and since obtained there is no doubt in my mind but that such marriages since Wilford Woodruff, as president of the Mormon church, issued the manifesto prohibiting polygamy, plural marriages have ceased and the masses of the Mormons understand that such marriages are no longer sanctioned by the church. While such is the case, it is true that some of the old polygamous relations are kept up, not, however, by permission or connivance of the church authorities.
>
> The revolution regarding polygamy which has followed the Edmunds-Tucker law is much more radical and effective than at the time of the passage of said law I imagined it could possibly be. Time was fast obliterating all traces of polygamy, and it was a subject regarding which the people had almost ceased to think or talk about until this crusade was started. Polygamy is doomed in this State and can not be restored by the church, even if it desired so to do. The exceptional cases in which the old relations of polygamy are kept up are coincidents which are of no more significance than the irregular sexual relations among other classes. If instead of cohabitation having been made a misdemeanor, decapitation had been made the penalty, human nature is such that there would have been exceptional violation of the law notwithstanding such a penalty might follow.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I thought it proper that this statement by this reliable man should be made here for the purpose of meeting the accusation so recklessly made. I deny that the State of Utah has broken her compact or has any intention or desire to break the compact with the United States. In asking for my political rights upon the floor of this House I do not champion the cause of polygamy. There is no occasion for championing that cause.

It is a question that is settled, and, sir, I hold it an honor that in the annals of the State of Utah I will be known as one who assisted in bringing about the settlement of that question upon the floor of the constitutional convention of that State. I am not here to represent polygamy, I am not here to advocate it, I am not here to ask a repeal of the provision in the constitution of my State which places that practice now under the ban of constitutional provision as well as under statutory law. I thank the gentleman from Ohio, as well as the members of this House, for their indulgence. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield now three minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE].

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly clear to all that I could say nothing to throw any light on the legal aspect of this question in the short time allotted to me. I shall not, therefore, undertake to discuss the question at length. I confess, frankly, that I occupy the floor for the sole purpose of making my own position and my vote thoroughly understood by the country and by my constituents.

I regret, sir, exceedingly that it did not so happen that the majority in the House should have adopted another procedure in connection with the disposition of the pending question. I may be permitted to say that it was in the air. I have no authority, of course, for speaking for the majority and do not undertake to do so, nor do I undertake to question their action or have anything whatever to say with reference to their caucus, but it was in the air that there was some doubt as to the proper method of procedure in dealing with this case, whether to object to the member from Utah taking the oath of office or to permit him to do so and then to move for his expulsion. But the majority have pursued the course which seemed fit and proper to them, and I have no question to make about it.

Mr. Speaker, I can not vote for the pending resolution. Much as I sympathize with the general purpose it has in view, I can not vote for it for reasons which I wish briefly to state. My own constituents are in full sympathy with the purposes sought to be accomplished here, and if the question arose on a proposition after the swearing in of a member on evidence disclosing the fact that the charges made against him by a member of the House are true I should not have hesitated to cast my vote for his expulsion, because I think if the facts alleged are as stated he would not be fit and would not be allowed to be a member of this body.

I, Mr. Speaker, with my constituents, believe in preserving the purity and the virtue of American homes. We regard with abhorrence the possibility of any man sitting in this body who is a notorious public adulterer, who flagrantly lives in illegal cohabitation with a plurality of women. But in view of the fact that the Constitution of the United States prescribes the conditions of eligibility, namely, that the candidate must be 25 years of age, must be seven years a citizen of the United States, and an inhabitant of the State from which he is chosen, which are the only conditions prescribed that make him eligible, I do not feel that I can go behind them and vote for the adoption of the resolution proposed by the gentleman from Ohio.

I do not believe we have a right to do so, and thereby deny to a sovereign State her representation for a moment, without a fair trial and investigation. My position conforms strictly with the precedents of the House—with every precedent deserving of consideration—and conforms with the opinions of the most learned statesmen and legislators who have occupied seats on both sides of this Chamber. It conforms, as I am told—I can not speak authoritatively—with the opinion of the illustrious counsel employed by the League for the prosecution of this case—two distinguished lawyers, one a Republican and one a Democrat, Mr. Edmunds and Mr. Carlisle, both of whom insist that the proper method is by expulsion and not by the adoption of the course proposed here—that the House has not the power when a member-elect comes with a certificate of election from the proper source, uncontested, to refuse to administer the oath of office.

Mr. Speaker, when I took the oath of office as a member of this House I swore to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. As I have already stated, the Constitution prescribes only three conditions of eligibility—namely, that the member-elect shall be 25 years of age, seven years a citizen of the United States, and shall be an inhabitant of the State from which he is chosen. It may be that he is morally unfit to be a member of this House, but no one, not even the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAYLER], challenges the member from Utah on either of these grounds.

From hearsay evidence, and even from public statements purporting to be made by the member himself, I believe him to be an adulterer and that he lives and has lived in illegal cohabitation with more than one woman; and if this be true, he is unfit to sit in this House. But shall he be adjudged without trial? Shall we accept rumor in his condemnation? To what end? If the charges are true, may we not expel him, and immediately after the House begins the business of the session? Is it not better to do this than to subvert every precedent of the House deserving of respect and to entail upon ourselves the danger of precedents that may arise in the future to vex and harass us when questions of graver import than the one under consideration shall arise?

The people have asked us not to do violence to the time-honored course adopted in proceedings in this House by refusing the defendant the privilege of being sworn in as a member and depriving his State of the privilege of participating in the organization of the House; they have asked us, if the proof shows the man guilty, that we expel him from membership. This I am ready to do, not only in obedience to their behest, but in response to my own love of the purity of the domestic fireside.

How much greater the moral effect if we proceed in a way which will command almost if not entire unanimous vote of the House. Why inject into the consideration of the subject questions of doubt that force members to vote against the pending resolution, when we could proceed by unanimous agreement and in the result of our deliberation impress society with tenfold more of weight and influence? It is a foregone conclusion that this man can not sit in this body. It is a mere question of whether he shall be ejected in a legal, well-recognized, constitutional way or whether he shall be deprived, and his State deprived, of legal guaranties which have hitherto been accorded to every man coming with credentials such as his.

I should be glad to join with the majority in expulsion if the evidence, as I believe it would, should justify such action in placing the condemnation of the House upon conduct such as shocks every precept of virtue and principle of morality. I regret exceedingly that the majority, from some motive unknown to me, has adopted a course rendering it impossible for some of us to join with them in their vote.

Mr. Speaker, I am more than usually impelled to recognize constitutional and legal restrictions and observances at this time, when we are confronted on every hand by a disposition on the part of many to treat the Constitution with contempt and to deride the conservative principles by which our country has acquired its greatness and our people their happiness.

I would refer yet once more to the demand made upon us by the people in this country in their petitions not to refuse Mr. Roberts the privilege of being sworn in, but to eject him for immorality, as we have a right to do after he is sworn in; and to this they were advised by the ablest and most capable of counsel representing the petitioners against him. Even these petitions confess that this position is the correct one. I print in the RECORD a copy of one of the petitions. They read as follows:

FORM OF PETITION.

To the Honorable —— ——, Representative-elect of the —— Congressional district of the State of —— to the Fifty-sixth Congress of the United States of America:

We, the undersigned, legally qualified voters of the said —— Congressional district of the said State of ——, do hereby most respectfully and most earnestly call upon you as our Representative in the Fifty-sixth Congress to use your utmost endeavor and to exhaust all honorable means to secure the prompt expulsion of Mr. B. H. Roberts, of Utah, the avowed polygamist and covenant breaker, from the House of Representatives, in accordance with the provision of the National Constitution in Article I, section 5, paragraph 2, which reads as follows: "Each House (of Congress) may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its members for disorderly behavior, and, with the concurrence of two-thirds expel a member."

We also do most respectfully and most earnestly call upon you to use your utmost endeavor and to exhaust all honorable means to secure action by the Fifty-sixth Congress proposing an amendment to the National Constitution, and submitting the same to the legislatures of the several States, defining legal marriage to be monogamic, and making polygamy, under whatever guise or pretense, a crime against the United States, punishable by severe penalties, including disfranchisement and disqualification to vote or to hold any office of honor or emolument under the United States or any State or Territory therein.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DINSMORE. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I beg to differ with the views which have been expressed upon this question by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, the leader of the Democratic minority.

I am glad that in his statement he asserted that he spoke for himself and not as the representative of the Democratic party.

This is not and can not be made a party question.

The present question before this House is one of the most important that ever faced this body since its beginning. On its proper settlement depends the integrity of the country.

The gentleman from Utah who has just taken his seat has not denied that he is practicing polygamy to-day. In face of this fact I can not see a single reason why he should be permitted to take the oath. He seems to question the fact that the enormous petition containing 7,000,000 names, which has been presented to this House remonstrating against his being seated, is authentic, and quotes the fact that girls and boys in Sunday schools gave their signatures to this document.

Why, Mr. Speaker, I venture to say that nearly every person in my own State, and every State in the Union, would have signed this petition had it been presented to them.

Who should be more alive to the dangers of Mormonism and polygamy than the children in the Sunday schools, who are taught to condemn the practices taught by the people who profess these beliefs?

Polygamy is nothing else, in my judgment, than pure animalism.

Mormonism had nothing of polygamy in it in the first years of its existence.

Polygamy and divorce are twin evils in this country to-day.

When one considers the fact that in this country, which we pride ourselves on being the greatest in the world, that in certain portions of it a man can take as many wives as he wishes and be exempt from punishment, and that in other portions a man and wife, for the slightest cause, or no cause at all, as soon as he or she becomes tired of the other, can secure a divorce, it is time to stop and consider.

Our marriage and divorce laws should be placed upon a solid foundation and should harmonize with the Christian and moral sentiment of the country.

The true idea of the home is where one wife, and one wife only, reigns as the queen of the home.

I do not oppose Mr. Roberts on account of his religious views. Mr. King, who served so ably in the last House, was a Mormon. It is on account of his practices, which are a standing disgrace to American civilization and common decency as regarded by practically the entire American people.

Part of the penalty for living with plural wives, as prescribed by the Edmunds law of 1882 and reaffirmed by the Edmunds-Tucker law of 1887, is disqualification to vote or to hold office as an American citizen. Mr. Roberts admittedly lived with plural wives since 1890, and his election seems to me to be a challenge to the American people.

Mormonism is seeking a hold in every State in the Union. Missionaries are now at work in my own State. It threatens our liberties and is a menace to our homes. It is a vital blow at the purity of womanhood and the sanctity of the home. If Mr. Roberts should be admitted, polygamy would receive new impetus.

Glory of country lies in the purity of American womanhood and sacredness of home.

I do not think Congress can afford even for a minute to clothe this man with the lawmaking power who is himself a lawbreaker.

Mormonism is the curse of this country to-day. It is nothing else than legalized licentiousness and corruption. Every wife, every mother, every daughter in the land is waiting the action of this House to-day. Old couples by the thousands who have wandered up and down the pathway of life for scores of years, happy in the comfort of their own virtuous homes and each other's company, watch with anxious eye the action of the American Congress.

America's future rests upon the preservation of the sanctity of the home. The world is one continuous struggle for existence—man contending against man for supremacy. The hearthstone and the fireside are the only sure resting places and harbors of refuge.

Who in this vast assemblage of men gathered from all parts of the country wishes to go to his home and spend it with his family at the Christmas fireside and explain how it happens that in this enlightened Republic any man can sit, even for a minute, in the greatest lawmaking body in the land, who practices polygamy?

Where army and navy fail the home triumphs. Every house chimney is a monument of the integrity and virtue of the citizen. If the home prospers the country can not but succeed. If the home is invaded by lust, sensuality, and dishonor, God save the Republic.

Numerous precedents have been shown where the House of Representatives has refused in other cases to administer the oath while charges were pending.

The present circumstances justify more than any other instance in the history of this body the refusal of the oath to Mr. Roberts, and I propose, as a friend of American homes, American honor, and American womanhood, to give my vote to the resolution proposed by the gentleman from Ohio. [Loud applause on the Republican side and in the galleries.]

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I am unwilling that the statement made by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. Roberts] shall go to the country to-night unchallenged. I will not challenge the truth of the statement as he made it, but I will point out what a miserable subterfuge he has attempted to practice here. He said, in the first place, before the extension of time, that there had been propositions to appoint certain gentlemen to Federal offices in the State of Utah, and that protests were sent to the President and to the Senate advising them of the fact that these gentlemen were guilty of the same offenses with which he stands charged, and that the President and the Senate brushed aside those charges and appointed the individuals.

A moment of delay and a respite of thought, I hope, led the gentleman to change somewhat his statement, and then he said, and that is the whole of his statement at this time, that against the applicant for the post-office at Provost and against the applicant for an office somewhere else there were statements forwarded here, and affidavits were filed; and there he stopped, excepting to say that they were afterwards appointed.

Does the gentleman suppose that he is dealing with some country justice of the peace somewhere in the back townships of Utah when he makes a statement like that and asks that it shall have some weight in the American Congress and before the American people? If the gentleman wants to state anything, let him state this: Let him state upon his own responsibility that these men were guilty of polygamy or unlawful cohabitation, and that those facts came undisputed to the President and to the Senate, and then he has got a case; but when he stops short of that he finds himself simply appealing to a hope here to create a diversion from himself.

Mr. HOPKINS. He declined to make that statement in answer to my question.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That he declined to do, and refused to be interrupted, notwithstanding that he had, through himself and friends, begged for the time which he was using, and was using the time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAYLER] to make these slanders against the President.

Mr. Roberts of Utah rose.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, Mr. Speaker, a word——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I ask for one minute more.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAYLER] yield to his colleague?

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I deny that it can be shown that the President of the United States knowingly appointed a polygamist to office. [Applause.] I deny it. [Turning to Mr. Roberts of Utah.] You might as well tell the people of the United States that that husband of one wife, that exemplary citizen of this country, had stained his hands in human blood, as to say that he knowingly appointed a man to office who was guilty of the crime which you yourself are charged with and will not deny.

[Applause on the Republican side and in the galleries.]

Mr. ROBERTS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAYLER] yield half a minute?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield half a minute to the gentleman from Utah?

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. ROBERTS of Utah. One minute.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. The gentleman can have it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for one minute.

Mr. ROBERTS of Utah. Then, Mr. Speaker, my charge was intended to be in the second case as it was stated by the gentleman in the first, namely, that the statements or affidavits charging these men with the same crimes alleged against me were filed both before the President and before the Senate committees, and, notwithstanding those affidavits asserting that these men were guilty of these crimes, they were appointed.

Mr. MINOR. Were they really guilty?

Mr. DALZELL. Were they guilty? That is the question.

Mr. ROBERTS of Utah. I can not say that, sir. It does not appear that the member from Utah is guilty. He is only charged.

Mr. BROSIUS. Why, sir, he does not deny it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAYLER] yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. I have no time to yield, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I only wanted to ask him a question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. Will the Chair kindly inform me how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has seventeen minutes remaining.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if I understood the argument of the member-elect from Utah, he exhibited a large incapacity to comprehend the nature of my position and the nature of his position here, and also the spirit of the American people. I am not here asserting that the member-elect from Utah is guilty of any crime; but I indict him upon my responsibility as a member of this House upon the basis of information placed in my hands; I charge him in that sense with this offense, and it is not for the House at this moment to inquire whether those charges be true or false, but only are they made with the solemnity that should lie at the bottom of a charge made under these circumstances at this hour and in this House.

Our friends upon the other side of the House—and I may justly use that term now, "the other side of the House"—are here to-day worshiping as they have ever worshiped under other forms and for other purposes the fetich of a certificate. All sins are covered for them by the certificate of a sovereign State, and no right exists in Congress to make him pause—he comes with a certificate. If the King of the Cannibal Islands, panoplied with his club and with his feathers, marched down the aisle with a certificate of the governor of Tennessee, we must stand here appalled by the spectacle, and say, "Mr. Speaker, swear him in." [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FOX. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has already declined to yield, and so stated to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. I have no time to yield now.

Mr. FOX. I want to ask the gentleman a question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has stated that he will not be interrupted, and so said to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. FOX. I just wanted to ask the gentleman a question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not in order.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. If a boy 10 years old walked down the aisle presenting a certificate as a member-elect from a district in the State of Arkansas, my friend from Arkansas who has just spoken would say, "The absurdity of this certificate is manifest, but we must swear him in." If Li Hung Chang should march down this aisle with a certificate, that certificate must be respected. There is no want of power, there is no absence of propriety in the House ever stopping any man with any certificate for any purpose if it so wills; and always is it its duty, and almost always has it held it to be its duty and its right to pause, to stop at the threshold one whose ineligibility is charged.

Now, my friend from Tennessee told us about the Cannon case. I am grateful for the reference. He quoted from the argument of

Mr. Potter and of Mr. HOAR and of Mr. Maynard. I want to say just this about that discussion: That was a discussion which came on and was conducted not to exceed ten or fifteen minutes, and for one column of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD it contains more inaccurate accounts of what had occurred at other times than any similar statement and page in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Let me give you a brief account of that episode.

The first session of the Forty-third Congress was on the 1st of December, 1873. The Delegates were not called upon to be sworn in until after the complete organization of the House.

Mr. Maynard suggested that the Delegates be sworn in.

Mr. Merriam said:

Before the Delegate from Utah is sworn in I have a resolution which I desire to offer.

The Speaker then directed the Delegate from Utah to stand aside until those who were not objected to should be sworn in. When the other Delegates were sworn in Mr. Merriam offered the following preamble and resolution, on which he demanded the previous question:

Whereas it is alleged that George Q. Cannon, of Utah, has taken oaths inconsistent with the citizenship of the United States and with his obligations as Delegate in this House, and has been, and continues to be, guilty of practices in violation and defiance of the laws of the United States: Therefore,

Resolved, That the credentials of said Cannon and his right to a seat in this House as a Delegate from Utah be referred to the Committee on Elections, and that said Cannon be not admitted to a seat in this House previous to a report from said committee.

It will be noted that at this time there was no law declaring ineligible a person guilty of polygamous practices.

A short discussion followed, participated in by Mr. Butler, of Massachusetts, Mr. G. F. HOAR, Mr. Clarkson N. Potter, and Mr. Maynard.

Mr. Cox took the position that Mr. Cannon had the prima facie right to his seat.

Mr. Butler said:

I do not believe that when a man comes here with proper credentials from the proper authority it has ever been the custom of the House, or ever ought to be, that he shall not have prima facie right to his seat, because the moment we break away from that rule, then in high party times the House could never be organized.

If Mr. Butler meant by this the situation where the legal or constitutional qualifications of the claimant were not questioned, he was probably right. But if he meant by that that in every case the credentials exhibited not only his election, but his qualifications, and that he was entitled to his seat, then he had not only forgotten very recent precedents in the House, but also his own position, especially the position he took in the Connor case, to which I have just referred.

Mr. HOAR said:

This precise case came up in the last House in the case of Mr. Clark, of Texas. His credentials were referred to the Committee on Elections, and that committee reported that the only question for the House to consider was whether Mr. Clark's credentials were regular in form and whether the officer certifying them was entitled by the law of the State and usages of the House to give him those credentials.

Mr. HOAR's parallel is a very unhappy one. Clark's certificate was in perfect form; there was no question of ineligibility or personal disqualification. It is a question solely of election and returns.

Mr. Potter said:

There is no question about certificates presented in this case. The resolution of my colleague goes, by way of objection to this gentleman being sworn in, upon the ground that he is guilty of certain practices contrary to the laws of the United States.

Now, the difficulty with my colleague's objection is that the statute has prescribed certain qualifications for the office of Delegate from that Territory, but among those qualifications is not innocency in respect to practices to which my friend alludes.

We had that precise question in the Forty-first Congress, when a gentleman from Virginia was charged with disloyalty and other offenses, and it was agreed, almost without a dissenting voice upon this side of the House, that this House had no voice to consider or determine, as a prerequisite to admission, whether or not he had been guilty of those or any other offenses, provided he came here with the constitutional requirements in reference to his qualifications.

So we find Mr. Potter admitting that want of constitutional qualifications will bar a man at the threshold, and surely a valid legal disqualification will do the same.

But Mr. Potter's reference to the Virginia case was no happier than Mr. HOAR's in the Texas case.

In the Virginia case referred to the House refused to permit the swearing in of members objected to on the ground of disloyalty until the charge had been examined either by the House or the Committee on Elections.

Mr. Maynard said:

There is another question in connection with this case to which I desire to call attention; it is that this resolution is introduced with a preamble which asserts certain propositions to be facts. We have no evidence to that effect; we have no documents presented. The mover of the resolution has made no statement upon his own authority or otherwise, and it seems to me that it would be very rash for us to assume the truth of those statements, and to act upon them so far as to prevent the swearing in of this Delegate. It is from that aspect of the case that I am prevented from making the motion that I first thought of making—to refer the resolution to the Committee on Elections.

I think it very unsafe to adopt a resolution or any other proceeding in this House reflecting upon a member of the House unless we first have some ground laid, either by documentary evidence introduced or by statements made by the gentleman who introduced the proposition upon his own authority and responsibility.

The House discussed the question and tried it out. So, properly, Mr. Merriam's resolution was laid on the table.

At the time when that objection was made to Mr. Cannon, of Utah, the Edmunds law was in the womb of the future. There was no statutory disqualification, and Mr. Cannon came only as a Delegate. But later on, Mr. Speaker, George Q. Cannon, of Utah, came to the bar of this House. He did not chance to hold a certificate, although he ought to have had a certificate; but if he had come to the bar of the House, he would have been stopped there and, as I gather from the sentiments of that Congress, he would have been held there and not permitted to take the oath, for when the case came up for consideration in his contest against Campbell, in the following May, only six weeks after the Edmunds law was passed, George Q. Cannon, with an incontestable right to a seat as a Delegate on the floor of this House, save that he was a polygamist, was denied a seat because of his polygamy. [Applause on the Republican side.]

There was no ground, claim, or pretense of right to keep him out save that he was a polygamist. Mr. Speaker, we talk about letting this man in and then, perchance, putting him out. I take the liberty to repeat what was repeated before on the floor of this House on a similar occasion, the lines put into the mouth of Colonel Titus, who, more than two hundred years ago, when Charles II was battering at the doors of Parliament and the liberties of the people, demanding entrance, is reported as saying:

> I hear a lion in the lobby roar;
> Say, Mr. Speaker, shall we shut the door
> And keep him there, or shall we let him in
> To try if we can put him out again?

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is upon the substitute offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RIDGELY. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the substitute be again read.

The substitute was again read.

The SPEAKER. The question will be first upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I desire that the original resolution be read.

The original resolution was again read.

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask consent of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAYLER] to add to his resolution the words——

[Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. LENTZ. Then I offer this as an amendment to the resolution offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The SPEAKER. To the original resolution?

Mr. LENTZ. To the original resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas it is charged that Brigham H. Roberts, a Representative-elect to the Fifty-sixth Congress from the State of Utah, is ineligible to a seat in the House of Representatives; and

Whereas such charge is made through a member of this House, on his responsibility as such member and on the basis, as he asserts, of public records, affidavits, and papers evidencing such ineligibility; and

Whereas it is charged and generally believed that John C. Graham, postmaster at Provo City, Utah, a Presidential appointee, is ineligible——

The SPEAKER (interrupting the reading). The Clerk will suspend. This is clearly not an amendment, but a substitute. The Chair rules it out of order. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I demand the previous question on the resolution and the substitute.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee as a substitute.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICHARDSON) there were—ayes 59, noes 247.

So the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the adoption of the original resolution offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAYLER].

Mr. DALZELL, Mr. GROSVENOR, and several others. The yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 304, nays 32, not voting 18; as follows:

YEAS—304.

Acheson,	Dayton,	Lamb,	Robinson, Ind.
Adams,	De Armond,	Landis,	Robinson, Nebr.
Alexander,	Denny,	Lane,	Rodenberg,
Allen, Me.	De Vries,	Lanham,	Rucker,
Atwater,	Dick,	Latimer,	Ruppert,
Babcock,	Dolliver,	Lawrence,	Russell,
Bailey, Kans.	Dougherty,	Lentz,	Ryan, N. Y.
Baker,	Dovener,	Linney,	Ryan, Pa.
Bankhead,	Driggs,	Littauer,	Salmon,
Barber,	Driscoll,	Little,	Scudder,
Barham,	Eddy,	Littlefield,	Shackleford,
Barney,	Elliott,	Livingston,	Shafroth,
Bartholdt,	Emerson,	Lloyd,	Shattuc,
Bell,	Esch,	Long,	Shelden,
Bellamy,	Faris,	Lorimer,	Sheppard,
Benton,	Finley,	Loudenslager,	Sherman,
Berry,	Fitzgerald, Mass.	Lovering,	Showalter,
Bingham,	Fitzgerald, N. Y.	Lybrand,	Sibley,
Bishop,	Fletcher,	McCall,	Sims,
Boreing,	Fordney,	McCleary,	Smith, Ill.
Boutell, Ill.	Foss,	McDowell,	Smith, Ky.
Boutelle, Me.	Foster,	McLain,	Smith, H. C.
Bowersock,	Fowler,	McPherson,	Smith, Samuel W.
Brantley,	Fox,	McRae,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Breazeale,	Freer,	Mahon,	Southard,
Brenner,	Gaines,	Mann,	Spalding,
Brick,	Gamble,	Marsh,	Sparkman,
Bromwell,	Gardner, Mich.	May,	Sperry,
Brosius,	Gardner, N. J.	Meekison,	Spight,
Broussard,	Gibson,	Mercer,	Sprague,
Brown,	Gilbert,	Mesick,	Stark,
Brownlow,	Gill,	Metcalf,	Steele,
Brundidge,	Gillett, Mass.	Miers, Ind.	Stevens, Minn.
Bull,	Glynn,	Miller,	Stewart, N. J.
Burke, S. Dak.	Gordon,	Minor,	Stewart, N. Y.
Burke, Tex.	Graff,	Mondell,	Stokes,
Burkett,	Graham,	Moody, Mass.	Sulloway,
Burleigh,	Green, Pa.	Moody, Oreg.	Sulzer,
Burnett,	Greene, Mass.	Moon,	Sutherland,
Burton,	Griffith,	Morgan,	Talbert,
Butler,	Griggs,	Morris,	Tate,
Calderhead,	Grosvenor,	Mudd,	Tawney,
Caldwell,	Grout,	Mulier,	Tayler, Ohio
Cannon,	Grow,	Naphen,	Taylor, Ala.
Capron,	Hall,	Needham,	Terry,
Chanler,	Hamilton,	Neville,	Thayer,
Chickering,	Harmer,	Noonan,	Thomas, Iowa
Clark, Mo.	Haugen,	Norton, Ohio	Thomas, N. C.
Clarke, N. H.	Hawley,	O'Grady,	Thropp,
Clayton, Ala.	Heatwole,	Olmsted,	Tompkins,
Clayton, N. Y.	Hedge,	Otey,	Tongue,
Cochran, Mo.	Hemenway,	Otjen,	Underhill,
Cochrane, N. Y.	Henry, Conn.	Overstreet,	Vandiver,
Connell,	Henry, Miss.	Packer, Pa.	Van Voorhis,
Cooney,	Henry, Tex.	Parker, N. J.	Vreeland,
Cooper, Wis.	Hepburn,	Payne,	Wachter,
Corliss,	Hill,	Pearce, Mo.	Wadsworth,
Cousins,	Hitt,	Pearre,	Wanger,
Cowherd,	Hoffecker,	Pierce, Tenn.	Warner,
Cox,	Hopkins,	Phillips,	Waters,
Crawford,	Howell,	Polk,	Watson,
Cromer,	Hull,	Powers,	Weaver,
Crowley,	Jack,	Prince,	Weeks,
Crump,	Jenkins,	Pugh,	Weymouth,
Crumpacker,	Jett,	Quarles,	Wheeler, Ky.
Cummings,	Johnston,	Ransdell	White,
Curtis,	Jones, Va.	Ray,	Williams, J. R.
Cusack,	Jones, Wash.	Reeder,	Williams, W. E.
Cushman,	Joy,	Reeves,	Williams, Miss.
Dahle, Wis.	Kahn,	Rhea, Va.	Wilson, N. Y.
Daly, N. J.	Kerr,	Ridgely,	Wilson, S. C.
Dalzell,	Ketcham,	Riordon,	Wright,
Davenport, Samuel	Kleberg,	Rixey,	Young, Pa.
Davenport, Stanley	Kluttz,	Robb,	Young, Va.
Davidson,	Knox,	Roberts, Mass.	Zenor,
Davis,	Lacey,	Robertson, La.	Ziegler.

NAYS—32.

Adamson,	Cooper, Tex.	Lewis,	Rhea, Ky.
Allen, Ky.	Davey,	Loud,	Richardson,
Allen, Miss.	De Graffenreid,	McClellan,	Robbins,
Bailey, Tex.	Dinsmore,	McCulloch,	Slayden,
Ball,	Fitzpatrick,	Maddox,	Small,
Brewer,	Fleming,	Meyer, La.	Snodgrass,
Burleson,	Kitchin,	Newlands,	Stephens, Tex.
Carmack,	Lester,	Norton, S. C.	Turner,

NOT VOTING—18.

Bartlett,	Gaston,	McAleer,	Underwood,
Bradley,	Gillet, N. Y.	Smith, Md.	Wheeler, Ala.
Campbell,	Hay,	Stallings,	Wilson, Idaho
Catchings,	Howard,	Stewart, Wis.	
Epes,	Levy,	Swanson,	

So the resolution was adopted.

Mr. OTEY. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, Mr. HAY and Mr. SWANSON, are unavoidably absent from the House, and have requested me to state that if present they would have voted for the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin, has been called home on account of the dangerous illness of a brother. If present, he would have voted for the resolution.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the preamble will be considered as having been agreed to.

There was no objection.

On motion of Mr. TAYLER of Ohio, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of the following committee in accordance with the vote just taken:

Special committee: Mr. TAYLER of Ohio, Mr. LANDIS of Indiana, Mr. MORRIS of Minnesota, Mr. FREER of West Virginia, Mr. LITTLEFIELD of Maine, Mr. MCPHERSON of Iowa, Mr. DE ARMOND of Missouri, Mr. LANHAM of Texas, Mr. MIERS of Indiana.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, on motion of Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin, leave of absence was granted indefinitely to Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin, on account of dangerous illness in his family.

ADJOURNMENT OVER.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns to-day it be to meet on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to.

DEATH OF HON. EVAN E. SETTLE.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Congressional delegation from Kentucky, I desire to announce the death of our late colleague, Hon. EVAN E. SETTLE, a Representative from the Seventh district of the State of Kentucky in the Fifty-sixth Congress. At a later period in the session it is the purpose of the members from that State to request that a day be set apart to enable those members who desire to do so to pay special tribute to and pronounce eulogies upon the life of our deceased friend.

For the present I desire to ask the adoption of the resolution I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Be it resolved, That the House of Representatives learns with profound sorrow and regret of the death of Hon. EVAN E. SETTLE, late a Representative from the Seventh district of Kentucky in the Fifty-sixth Congress, at his home in Owenton, on Thursday, November 16, 1899.

Be it further resolved, That as a further mark of respect to Mr. SETTLE the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to; and accordingly, in pursuance thereof, the House (at 6 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) adjourned until Thursday next at 12 o'clock m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives, submitting a statement of the sums of money drawn and disbursed by him—to the Committee on Accounts, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Attorney-General, transmitting a list of judgments in Indian depredation claims—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives, transmitting a list of property in his charge—to the Committee on Accounts, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement of the expenditure of the appropriation for "contingent expenses" in his Department—to the Committee on Expenditures in Interior Department, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Librarian of Congress, submitting his annual report—to the Committee on the Library, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting his annual report for the year ended October 31, 1899—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting detailed statement of expenditures for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899, under heads of "International exchanges," "North American Ethnology," etc.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries, transmitting a statement of the expenditures for the propagation of food fishes for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a statement of the expenditures at Springfield Armory and of the arms, etc., fabricated for the year ended June 30, 1899—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of the contingent expenses of the Department for the year ended June 30, 1899—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Chief of Engineers, submitting the report of operations upon the new building for the Government Printing Office up to November 30, 1899—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a report for the year ended June 30, 1899, showing the names of persons employed in the service of the House, the time they were actually employed, the sums paid to them, the expenditures of the contingent fund, and the stationery accounts—to the Committee on Accounts, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, transmitting an inventory of books, maps, and pamphlets in the folding room December 1, 1899—to the Committee on Accounts.

A letter from the superintendent of the Library building and grounds, submitting the annual report of his office—to the Committee on the Library, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, transmitting an inventory of property under his charge—to the Committee on Accounts.

A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a list of the contested-election cases in the Fifty-sixth Congress—ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 862) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to the survivors of the Indian wars of 1832 to 1842, inclusive, known as the Black Hawk war, Creek war, Cherokee disturbances, and the Seminole war," approved July 27, 1892—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 863) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to the survivors of the Indian wars of 1832 to 1842, inclusive, known as the Black Hawk war, Creek war, Cherokee disturbances, and the Seminole war," approved July 27, 1892—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 864) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to settle the mutual account between the United States and the State of Florida, heretofore examined and stated by said Secretary under the authority of the Congress, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 865) in relation to claims arising under the provisions of the captured and abandoned property acts, and for other purposes, and to amend and revive the same—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 866) to modify and simplify the pension laws of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 867) to prevent trespassing upon, and providing for the protection of, the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 868) authorizing the Secretary of War to make certain uses of the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Park, and other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 869) to provide for the erection of a memorial arch at Chattanooga, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 870) for the establishment, control, operation, and maintenance of the Northern Branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers at Hot Springs, in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 871) providing for free homesteads on the public lands for actual and bona fide settlers, and reserving the public lands for that purpose—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 872) for the restoration of annuities to the Sisseton and Wahpeton bands of Dakota or Sioux Indians and the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota (Santee) Sioux Indians, declared forfeited by the act of February 16, 1863—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 873) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Deadwood, in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 874) conferring jurisdiction upon the circuit and district courts for the district of South Dakota in certain cases, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 875) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a post-office building thereon at Cape Charles, in the State of Virginia—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CLAYTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 876) authorizing the Secretary of War to reconstruct the post of Fort Hamilton, N. Y., according to a new and appropriate plan, to purchase or acquire by exchange, or both, the necessary ground adjoining the Government reservation, and to erect buildings—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GAINES (by request): A bill (H. R. 877) to amend an act of March 1, 1895, and other acts relating to the United States courts in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 878) to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims filed in the departments of the Quartermaster-General and the Commissary-General under the act of July 4, 1864, and before the Southern Claims Commission act of March 3, 1871, and have been disallowed, or that are now pending—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 879) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Chillicothe, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A bill (H. R. 880) to amend section 3 of an act "fixing the amount of United States notes, providing for a redistribution of national-bank currency, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1874—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 881) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Grand Haven, in the State of Michigan—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 882) providing for the safety of lives of persons on waters under the jurisdiction of the United States—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 883) creating a national board of pardons—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 884) for the appointment of a commission of experts for the purpose of making investigations relating to the cause and prevention of yellow fever—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 885) to provide a uniform and stable currency for the United States of America—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 886) to improve the postal system of the United States—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 887) to provide for adding to and completing specimens and productions, both natural and manufactured, of the United States and of foreign countries, to be exhibited in the Philadelphia museums, for the purpose of increasing the trade of the United States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KITCHIN: A bill (H. R. 888) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Durham, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 889) to amend sections 3242 and 3281 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 890) to repair, improve, and enlarge the public building at Greensboro, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 891) to place asbestus on the taxable list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 892) to repeal the 10 per cent tax on State bank issues—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 893) to establish a light beacon on the beach at Cape Hatteras, North Carolina—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 894) to establish a light beacon at the Cape Channel in Pamlico Sound—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 895) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to change the material to be used in the construction of a dry dock at the navy-yard, League Island, Pa., from timber to stone and concrete—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 896) to provide for the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River from Washington to Fort Myer and the national cemetery at Arlington—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 897) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Elizabeth, N. J.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 898) for the improvement of the Chattahoochee River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GAINES: A bill (H. R. 899) to construct a road to the national cemetery at Dover, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 900) to provide a snag boat for the Cumberland River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 901) to provide for the purchase of a site and

the erection of a public building thereon at Springfield, Tenn., and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 902) to amend section 21 of "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes," approved May 28, 1896—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 903) donating the old abandoned military reservation known as Fort Bliss, situated in El Paso County, to the county of El Paso for a poor farm and hospital—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 904) to amend the act relating to Indian depredations—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 905) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Comanche, Kiowa, and Apache tribes of Indians in Oklahoma Territory and to open their reservation for settlement—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 906) to amend the jurisdiction act of 1887 so as to abrogate Federal jurisdiction over State corporations—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 907) to amend and construe existing pension laws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 908) donating the abandoned military reservation in Wheeler County, Tex., to the State of Texas for school purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 909) conferring on the Court of Claims jurisdiction with respect to certain claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JONES of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 910) giving to certain States having claims for moneys expended or expenses incurred in defense of the United States during the war of 1812 to 1814 with Great Britain the right to have the same adjudicated by the Supreme Court of the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NORTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 911) to amend section 1176, Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 912) to increase the efficiency of the artillery arm of the Regular Army of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COCHRANE of New York (by request): A bill (H. R. 913) to pension prisoners of war captured by Confederates in war of 1861 to 1865—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 914) to grant a service pension to soldiers in war of 1861 to 1865 at age of 65 years—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 915) to pension United States soldiers and sailors of war of 1861 to 1865—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 916) to increase the pension of United States soldiers and sailors who were prisoners of war in 1861 to 1865—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 917) to pension certain United States soldiers and sailors—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 918) to pension certain totally disabled United States soldiers and sailors—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 919) to prevent pensions being stopped without process of law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 920) to pension certain honorably discharged soldiers and sailors—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 921) to pension certain soldiers and sailors of the war of 1861 to 1865—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 922) to pension disabled soldiers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 923) to increase pensions of soldiers and sailors of the war of 1861 to 1865 who are 70 years old—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 924) to pension disabled soldiers and sailors—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 925) to pension disabled soldiers and sailors of the war of 1861 to 1865—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 926) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States," approved July 24, 1897—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 927) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," approved June 13, 1898, in relation to certain express carriers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 928) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," approved June 13, 1898, in relation to certain express business—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 929) to establish a life-saving station at Swampscott, Mass.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 930) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of telegraphic cables between the United States of America and Hawaii, Guam, and Philippine Islands, and other countries, and to promote commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 931) to amend section 698 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 932) to amend section 997 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 933) to reimburse naval volunteers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 934) making Chester, Pa., a subport of entry—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTEY: A bill (H. R. 935) to complete the execution of the ninth article of the treaty of 1819 between the United States and Spain—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 936) for the erection of an appraiser's warehouse in the city of Boston, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 937) granting thirty days' leave of absence, with pay, to the employees of the Government Printing Office and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing—to the Committee on Printing.

Also, a bill (H. R. 938) to establish the Department of Commerce and Manufactures—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 939) to provide for the collection and return of duties on bicycles brought by travelers into the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 940) for the preservation of the frigate *Constitution*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 941) to prevent the desecration of the American flag—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 942) authorizing the Secretary of War to procure medals for the Sixth Massachusetts Regiment, who were the first fully equipped soldiers to arrive, on April 19, 1861, for the defense of the city of Washington—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 943) for the erection of a public building at Malden, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 944) for the erection of a public building at Atlanta, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 945) to provide a site and erect a public building in Covington, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 946) establishing the Atlanta National Military Park—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 947) to create a new division in the eastern judicial district of the State of Tennessee—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 948) to do justice to men who have been honorably discharged from their last contract of service—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 949) relating to arrears in pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 950) for the improvement of the Missouri River at and near the mouth of Smiths Creek, near Bernheimer, Warren County, Mo.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 951) making an appropriation to improve the harbor of Hermann, on the Missouri River, in Gasconade County, Mo.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 952) for the relief of the contract surgeons of the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 953) to divide the State of West Virginia into two judicial districts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 954) providing for leaves of absence to certain per diem employees of the Government—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 955) granting to the State of Kansas the abandoned Fort Hays Military Reservation in said State for the purpose of establishing western branches of the Kansas Agricultural College and of the Kansas State Normal School thereon, and for a public park—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 956) to authorize the construction of an addition to the public building at Hartford, Conn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DAVIS: A bill (H. R. 957) providing for the erection of

a public building at the city of Gainesville, Fla., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 958) to declare February the 12th a national holiday—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 959) to establish postal savings depositories and subdepositories, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 960) to improve the channel of the Mississippi River in the harbor of St. Louis—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. QUARLES: A bill (H. R. 961) to aid and encourage military training and instruction by donation of public land—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MINOR: A bill (H. R. 962) for the erection of a public building at Green Bay, Wis.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 963) to designate Green Bay, Wis., a subport of entry—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 964) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Littlefalls, in the State of New York—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 965) fixing the compensation of the clerks of the circuit and district courts of the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COONEY: A bill (H. R. 966) for the improvement of the Missouri River at Nigger Bend, in Howard County, Mo.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 967) for the improvement of the Missouri River at and near Huntsdale, in Boone County, Mo.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 968) to aid the State of South Dakota to support a school of mines—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: A bill (H. R. 969) to amend section 5 of an act to relieve certain appointed or enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps from the charge of desertion, approved August 14, 1888—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BARNEY: A bill (H. R. 970) providing for the adjustment of the swamp-land grant to the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BOREING: A bill (H. R. 971) to divide Kentucky into two judicial districts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTEY: A bill (H. R. 972) to provide for the appointment of dental surgeons for service in the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STARK: A bill (H. R. 973) to provide for the revision and adjustment of the sales of the Otoe and Missouria Reservation lands in the States of Kansas and Nebraska, and to confirm the titles under said sales—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 974) granting per diem pension service to honorably discharged officers and enlisted men of the Union Army in the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBBINS: A bill (H. R. 975) to amend an act entitled "An act for the erection of a public building at Anniston, Ala."—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 976) for the erection of a public building at Selma, Ala.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 977) to establish a port of entry and delivery at the city of Selma, Ala.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GORDON: A bill (H. R. 978) for the extension of Le Droit avenue and S street—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 979) for the erection and construction of a public building in the city of Stillwater for the accommodation of the United States post-office and other Government offices—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COWHERD: A bill (H. R. 980) to regulate the practice in United States courts in regard to instructing juries therein—to the Committeee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 981) providing for the marking and monumenting of the battlefield of Massacre Hill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 982) to apply a portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the endowment and support of the mining schools in the several States and Territories, for the purpose of extending similar aid in the development of the mining industries of the nation as already provided for the agricultural and mechanical arts—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 983) providing for the construction of a wagon road through the Yellowstone National Park and the Yellowstone National Park Forest Reserve—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 984) providing for the improvement and repair of the military road between Fort Washakie and Jacksons Lake, Wyoming—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 985) providing that those who have heretofore commuted entries or have not perfected titles to tracts entered as homesteads may avail themselves of the provisions of the homestead laws—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 986) to amend the provisions of section 4 of the act of August 18, 1894, entitled "An act making an appropriation for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 987) reducing the price to be paid for desert lands, and allowing those who have not perfected former entries under the desert-land laws and who have not parted with their claims for a valuable consideration, to make a second entry—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 988) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to appoint commissioners to estimate damages done to planted oysters and oyster beds in Raritan Bay and adjoining waters in New York and New Jersey, and to make compensation therefor—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 989) to amend "An act relating to mortgages in the Indian Territory"—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 990) appropriating $150,000 to improve, deepen, and remove the bars at the mouths of the Neches and Sabine rivers, and to improve and deepen the channel through Sabine Lake, in the State of Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 991) extending the time for the completion of the bridge across the East River between the city of New York and Long Island, now in course of construction as authorized by the act of Congress approved March 3, 1887—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 992) compelling telegraphic companies to pay the 1 cent tax on messages and dispatches—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 993) granting a pension to persons who have become disabled in the Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 994) making additional appropriation for public building in the city of Seattle, State of Washington—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 995) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Spokane Falls, State of Washington—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. EDDY: A bill (H. R. 996) providing for free homesteads on the public lands for actual and bona fide settlers, and reserving the public lands for that purpose—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 997) to provide allotments to Indians on White Earth Reservation, in Minnesota—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 998) providing for the sale of pine timber on White Earth and Red Lake (diminished) reservations, in the State of Minnesota—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 999) to amend sections 4826, 4829, 4830, and 4832 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FREER: A bill (H. R. 1000) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Huntington, in the State of West Virginia—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BROMWELL: A bill (H. R. 1001) to extend the uses of the mail service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. NAPHEN: A bill (H. R. 1002) for the improvement of Town River, Quincy Bay, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 1003) to provide for a road to the Shiloh National Military Park—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LORIMER: A bill (H. R. 1004) for the erection of a public building at Oakpark, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 1005) to provide for the issuing of commissions to warrant officers of the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1006) amending section 1 of an act passed August 5, 1892, entitled "An act granting pensions to army nurses"—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1007) to increase the limit of the appropriation for a public building at Newport, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1008) to require persons who make their residence on boats on the Mississippi and Ohio rivers to obtain license, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1009) granting increase of pension to survivors of Mexican and Indian wars, and to their widows—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 1010) for the erection of a public building in the city of Manchester, State of Virginia—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 1011) to establish a bureau of public health in the Treasury Department of the United States, to establish and maintain a system of quarantine, and to provide measures of security against the introduction and spread of contagious and epidemic diseases—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 1012) to regulate the pay of printers in Navy and Marine Corps—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1013) to amend section 5 of an act to relieve certain appointed or enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps from the charge of desertion, approved August 14, 1888—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1014) to amend an act approved August 1, 1894, entitled "An act relating to the pay and retirement of mates in the United States Navy"—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1015) to grade substitute letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1016) relating to compensation of fourth-class postmasters—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1017) providing for the compensation of fourth-class postmasters for issuing money orders—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 1018) to amend section 3829 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1019) to allow the Postmaster-General to grant leave of absence with full pay (in addition to the leave now granted by law) to any letter carrier or clerk in a post-office who shall be disabled by any casualty while in the performance of his duty, and so forth—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1020) to prevent the establishment of letter boxes for the receipt or delivery of certain mail matter in premises not occupied by post-offices or branch offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1021) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish certified copies of muster rolls—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1022) to amend section 2743 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, concerning the examination of drugs—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 1023) providing for the election of a Delegate from the district of Alaska to the House of Representatives of the United States—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1024) to pay certain bounties to enlisted men afterwards promoted to be commissioned officers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1025) prohibiting the legislatures of the Territories of the United States from creating new counties by special act, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. ADAMS: A bill (H. R. 1026) to increase the efficiency of the foreign service of the United States and to provide for the reorganization of the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 1027) to extend the limits and laws of the Territory of Oklahoma, and to enable the people thereof to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1028) to refund the cotton tax—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1029) designating the officers before whom preliminary affidavits in entries of public lands may be executed—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1030) to revive the right of action under the captured and abandoned property acts, and for other purposes—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1031) to provide for the permanent improvement of the Ouachita River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1032) to prevent the free use of timber or stone on public lands, except by bona fide settlers, miners, residents, and prospectors, for firewood, fencing, building, mining, and other domestic purposes, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1033) to declare a further forfeiture of lands granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1034) to provide for the sale of lands of the United States chiefly valuable for building stone, limestone, sandstone, granite, marble, slate, and lands containing gypsum, mica, asphaltum, borax, fire clay, kaolin, petroleum, salt, chalk, and other like mineral substances, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1035) for the free coinage of gold and silver and for the issue of gold and silver certificates—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1036) to regulate the practice, pleadings, forms, and mode of proceeding in civil causes in equity in the circuit courts of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1037) to define and tax trusts and to authorize the free importation of articles covered by them, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 1038) fixing the times when, regulating the manner in which, and declaring the character of the accounts between the United States and the several public-land States, relative to the net proceeds of the sales, and other disposition of the public lands made and to be made therein by the United States, which shall hereafter be stated and certified to the Treasury Department for payment—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 1039) to amend the war-revenue act, approved June 13, 1898—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINOR: A bill (H. R. 1040) to amend section 4445 of Title LII of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to licensing of officers of steam vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 1041) to grant to the city of Charleston, S. C., the old post-office lot and building for the use of the commercial bodies of the city—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 1042) to provide for the admission of the State of Arizona into the Union, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 1043) authorizing the President to appoint and retire as brigadier-general any colonel who may have commanded a brigade during any portion of the investment of Santiago, although now on the retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MUDD (by request): A bill (H. R. 1044) for the extension of Columbia road east of Thirteenth street—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 1045) authorizing the extension of Wyoming avenue—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 1046) authorizing the extension of Kalorama avenue—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: A bill (H. R. 1047) for the erection of a public building at Manitowoc, Wis.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1048) for the erection of a public building at Fond du Lac, Wis.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1049) to increase the army ration by the addition of pure American cheese—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 1050) to honor the patriotism of certain soldiers who served in the Philippines—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 1051) to grade substitute letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1052) to reduce the postage on fourth-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1053) providing representation in Congress for Alaska—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1054) for the relief of Union soldiers who were confined in Southern prisons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1055) relating to the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1056) for the erection of a public building at Island Pond, Vt.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1057) authorizing the Secretary of War to recognize the organizations of the Sons of Veterans, United States of America, as part of the military provincial reserve of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1058) to amend section 4696 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1059) to enable the people to name their postmasters—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1060) to prevent the sale of beer or other

intoxicating liquors in soldiers' homes, immigrant stations, and other public buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 1061) to authorize the Montgomery, Hayneville and Camden Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Tombigbee River between the northern and southern boundary lines of Clarke County, Ala.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1062) to authorize the Montgomery, Hayneville and Camden Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Alabama River between Claiborne and Lower Peachtree, in Alabama—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 1063) to segregate and return to the unreserved public domain mineral lands upon a reservation for the use of the Metlakahtla Indians in Alaska—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 1064) for a public building for a marine hospital at Pittsburg, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1065) to authorize the construction of bridges across the Ohio, Monongahela, Mississippi, Great Kanawha, Tennessee, Cumberland, and Illinois rivers, and to prescribe the dimensions of the same—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1066) to indemnify the State of Pennsylvania for money expended in 1864 for militia called into the military service by the governor under the proclamation of the President of June 15, 1863—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1067) to incorporate the Lake Erie and Ohio River Ship Canal Company and defining the powers thereof, and to establish the canals and works herein authorized as military post-roads—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. LOVERING: A bill (H. R. 1068) for the erection of a public building at Plymouth, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 1069) to revive and amend and extend the act of Congress of August 15, 1876, to encourage and promote telegraphic communications between America and Asia, across the Pacific Ocean, from the western shores of the United States to the Hawaiian Islands, to Japan and China—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 1070) to provide for medals for volunteer nurses—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1071) relating to public holidays—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1072) as to medals of honor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1073) in relation to contempts of court—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1074) to raise additional revenue for the support of the Government—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 1075) providing for pensions to soldiers, sailors, and marines on account of disability contracted while in the service; also a service pension on the per diem plan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1076) to provide for enlarging and improving the United States Government building at Sandusky, Ohio, and to appropriate $50,000 therefor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 1077) for the erection of a public building at Northampton, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1078) for the admission into the United States of certain works of art free of duty—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1079) to regulate interstate transportation of property owned or manufactured by unlawful combinations—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 1080) to limit United States courts' jurisdiction to $5,000—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1081) to limit the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States in certain cases to $10,000—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1082) to provide for the prosecution of suits in, and appeals and writs of error from, circuit and district courts of the United States by administrators, guardians, and next friend without giving bond for cost—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1083) to provide liens in favor of attorneys at law in original and removed causes to the United States court, and to provide for the enforcement thereof—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1084) to fix the standard of gold and silver coin and the unit of value, and to make all silver coin a full legal tender for all debts, public and private—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1085) for the establishment of an Army post at or near Chattanooga, Tenn., and appropriating $200,000 therefor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1086) to restrict the application of the doctrine of contributory negligence so as to permit persons guilty of negligence which is not the proximate cause of an injury to persons or property to recover damages, and to define the term "proximate cause" and the right of litigants to have the same determined by a jury, and the duties of Federal judges in such cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 1087) to authorize the construction by the Wadley and Mount Vernon Railroad Company of a bridge across the Oconee River, in the State of Georgia—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRUMP: A bill (H. R. 1088) making an appropriation for a steam fog whistle at Ottawa Point, entrance to Tawas Bay, Lake Huron—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1089) for the erecting of a public building at Alpena, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1090) for the erection of a public post-office building at West Bay City, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 1091) for the payment of claims of citizens of the State of Virginia—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1092) to set apart a portion of the Arlington estate for experimental agricultural purposes, and to place said portion under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture and his successor in office—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 1093) to authorize the exploration and purchase of mines within the boundaries of private land claims—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1094) to amend section 2323 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to tunnel rights—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1095) withdrawing the right of the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1096) to provide for the securing to the State of Colorado full title to all mineral lands, and so forth—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1097) to amend section 2323 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to tunnel rights—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1098) prohibiting the Secretary of the Treasury from owning any interest in any association issuing national currency at the time of his appointment, and so forth—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1099) requiring all exchanges of gold bars for gold coin to be by weight—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1100) to make laws for taking evidence, affidavits, and so forth, in homestead claims applicable to timber and stone claims—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1101) for privilege of mayor of Ouray, Colo., to enter additional town-site lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1102) to provide for the sale of United States internal-revenue stamps by all United States postmasters, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1103) to maintain the parity between the coins of the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1104) to restore the bimetallic system of the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1105) to coin the silver bullion in the Treasury, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1106) to amend section 2323 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to tunnel rights—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1107) for making the criminal laws of the United States applicable to Indians in the Indian schools—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1108) to fix times and places of holding United States circuit and district courts in Colorado—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1109) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Glenwood Springs, in the State of Colorado—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1110) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish books of military instruction published by the War De-

partment to the organized militia and volunteer forces of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1111) to furnish the military tactics to the National Guard and other military organizations—to the Committee on the Militia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1112) to fix times and places of holding United States circuit and district courts in Colorado—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1113) to restore medical freedom to the people of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NAPHEN: A bill (H. R. 1114) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Quincy, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1115) to provide for the establishing of a steam tug in connection with City Point life-saving station, Dorchester Bay, Massachusetts, and the placing of a searchlight at said station—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 1116) to provide trial by jury in contempt cases when such alleged contempts are not committed in presence of court—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1117) to establish a military post in or near Columbia, in Maury County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1118) for the better control of and to promote the safety of national banks—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 1212) to authorize the Secretary of War to cause to be investigated and to provide for the payment of all claims presented on behalf of churches, schools, libraries, hospitals, and establishments conducted for the benefit of churches, or for charitable purposes, arising from the occupation and use of buildings, grounds, and other property of various kinds occupied, used, taken away, injured, consumed, or destroyed by the United States or its Army during the civil war, or for its benefit in any way—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 1549) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the bonds issued under the contract of the Secretary of the Treasury with August Belmont & Co. and others, bearing date February 8, 1895, interest and principal, in not less than one half in standard silver dollars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 1608) to extend the free-delivery system of the Post-Office Department, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1618) appropriating $25.000 to the Franklin Institute, of Philadelphia, and the Purdue University, of Lafayette, Ind., for the purpose of determining the quantity of the so-called "hammer blows," "centrifugal lift, and tangental throw" of locomotive driving wheels in use on American railroads—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 1714) to change the names of certain streets in the city of Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 2081) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reexamine and resettle the accounts of certain States and the city of Baltimore growing out of moneys expended by said States and the city of Baltimore for military purposes during the war of 1812—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 2153) authorizing the Alaskan Navigation and Development Company, of Camden, N. J., United States of America, to own and navigate boats and vessels, and to improve rivers, creeks, inlets, bays, and gulfs in Alaska, and to dredge, excavate, and blast in any of said waters, and to fully and completely exercise in Alaska and in Alaskan waters all the rights and privileges they exercise by virtue of their charter—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 2201) to establish a military post at or near Indianapolis, Ind.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2206) authorizing an increase of pensions in certain cases—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 2296) to pay to the Mount Vernon Avenue Association, as assignee of the State of Virginia, the amount loaned by said State to the General Government, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 2326) for the relief of the State of New York—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TATE: A bill (H. R. 2532) to amend section 3331 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2533) to provide to whom contracts for carrying mails shall be awarded—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2534) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a post-office building thereon at Gainesville, in the State of Georgia—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2535) to give jurisdiction to try and dispose of all cases punishable by fine and imprisonment for less than one year—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 2536) to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LLOYD: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 34) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of Senators by direct vote of the people—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. STARK: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 35) authorizing the Secretary of War to exchange a battery and equipments with the governor of the State of Nebraska—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 36) proposing an amendment to Article III, section 1, of the Constitution of the United States of America—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZENOR: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 37) construing the act approved June 27, 1890, entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents"—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McRAE: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 38) directing the executive department to exercise the legal right to pay the obligations of this Government in either silver or gold coin, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 39) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FREER: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 40) asking permission for the use of the United States court-house at Parkersburg, W. Va., by the circuit and criminal courts of Wood County, W. Va., while constructing a new court-house for said county—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LOVERING: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 41) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 42) proposing an amendment to the Constitution giving Congress jurisdiction over divorce—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIXEY: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 43) asking for estimates for the improvement of Quantico Creek, in Prince William County, Va.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 44) asking for estimates for the improvement of upper Machodoc Creek, in King George County, Va.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GROUT: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 45) constitutional amendment to prohibit polygamy or polygamous cohabitation in the United States and all territory subject to its jurisdiction, and to prohibit all persons guilty of polygamy or polygamous cohabitation from holding offices of trust—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COX: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 46) to print maps of island of Cuba—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 47) granting permission for the erection of a bronze statue in Washington, D. C., in honor of Gen. Francis E. Spinner, late Treasurer of the United States—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 48) to authorize the purchase of the painting by Victor Nehlig representing Pocahontas saving the life of Capt. John Smith—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BELL: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 49) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of Senators by the votes of the qualified electors of the States—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. DALZELL: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 50) granting permission for the erection of a monument in Washington, D. C., for the ornamentation of the national capital and in honor of Samuel Hahnemann—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BERRY: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 51) tendering the thanks of Congress to Commodore Schley, United States Navy, and the officers and men under his command—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 52) tendering the thanks of Congress to the National Relief Commission and its contributors for humane and beneficent services in the late war with Spain—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 53) to authorize the appointment of George Izard Middleton an ensign in the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LAMB: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 54) directing a

suitable shaft to be placed at the grave of John Tyler—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 1) directing the Secretary of War to make and submit an estimate of the cost of cutting and dredging a channel across the bar below Fort Morgan, at Mobile Harbor, Alabama—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. NAPHEN: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 2) requesting Secretary of War to submit plan and estimate of deepening and widening channels at Boston Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A resolution (H. Res. 11) requesting Secretary of State to report correspondence between Germany and United States respecting adulteration of German wines—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 12) relating to a conference to be held in Washington between Mexico, Central and South America, and United States, touching the arbitration of disputed matters—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 13) requesting Secretary of State to report to the House the status of an agreement between United States and Great Britain, relating to war vessels on Great Lakes—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 14) requesting Secretary of the Interior to inform the House as to certain payments to the Pottawatomie Indians of Michigan of money appropriated for them—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A resolution (H. Res. 15) providing for the printing and binding of 1,000 copies of the History of Navy-Yard at Boston, Mass.—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A resolution (H. Res. 16) amending the rules of the House, providing for a committee on insular affairs—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McRAE: A resolution (H. Res. 17) amending the rules of the House—Rule XXIV—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A resolution (H. Res. 18) amending the rules of the House—Rule XXVI—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GROUT: A resolution (H. Res. 19) authorizing the appointment of a committee on the Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 20) authorizing the printing of the work known as Hawks and Owls—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BERRY: A resolution (H. Res. 21) for the benefit of Samuel Lee—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BELL: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Colorado, favoring the return to the Republic of Mexico of cannon and other trophies of war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring the naming one of United States war vessels *Milwaukee*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MINOR: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring the naming of one of the United States war vessels *Milwaukee*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring legislation favorable to American shipping—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OTJEN: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring the naming one of United States war vessels *Milwaukee*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Massachusetts, favoring the placing of a steam launch and searchlight at the life-saving station in Dorchester Bay—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: A bill (H. R. 1119) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant a medal to Edward Giles, late color sergeant of First New York Cavalry, United States Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 1120) granting a pension to John McMichael—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 1121) for the relief of the Protestant Episcopal Church of St. Paul, at Franklin, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1122) for the relief of the estate of J. A. Milhous, deceased, late of Giles County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1123) for relief of S. E. Johnson, heir of John W. Johnson, deceased, late of Wayne County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1124) for the relief of George W. Davis by removing charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1125) for the relief of W. H. Felker, of Giles County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1126) to authorize the Quartermaster-General to investigate the claim of the representatives of Robert T. Williams, deceased, against the United States—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1127) for the relief of Rhoda Rucker, of Tennessee—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1128) for the relief of the estate of William Grigsby, deceased, late of Giles County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1129) for the relief of John E. Horton, Sims, Wayne County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1130) for the relief of John D. Reed, administrator of J. P. C. Reed, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1131) for the relief of Thomas J. Lawson, sr.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1132) to remove charge of desertion against W. J. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1133) for relief of F. M. Fitsgerald, administrator of John Chandler, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1134) for the relief of William Whitaker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1135) to grant an honorable discharge to T. J. Murphy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1136) for the relief of parties for property taken from them by military forces of the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1137) for the relief of William J. Hines—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1138) to remove charge of desertion standing against William M. Anderson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1139) for the relief of James Few and to remove charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1140) for relief of the estate of Henry C. Sinclair, late of Williamson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1141) to remove the charge of desertion against W. A. Kilburn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1142) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. E. M. Booker, deceased, late of Columbia, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1143) to erect a monument to the memory of Meriwether Lewis—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1144) for the relief of the estate of N. E. Perkins, deceased, late of Williamson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1145) for the relief of W. S. Reid, administrator of Mrs. F. M. Harris, deceased, late of Franklin, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CRUMP: A bill (H. R. 1146) amending the military record of Albert E. Pringle, and granting his aged and dependent mother a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1147) granting an increase of pension to Dr. Luke H. Cooper, now totally blind—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1148) to increase the pension of Capt. Isaac D. Toll—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1149) granting a pension to Erasmus L. Wenz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1150) pensioning Mrs. Kate Crawford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1151) granting an increase of pension to Charles Howell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1152) for the relief of Henry Schindehette—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1153) to correct the military record of George H. Keating—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1154) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles D. Tifft—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1155) to remove charge of desertion from the military record of John Leroy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1156) amending the military record of Louis P. Kleine and granting his widow, Sade P. Kleine, a pension—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1157) giving military record to Francis Volk—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1158) for the relief of William H. Hardy, who served in Company A, First Regiment Michigan Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1159) to remove charge of desertion from the military record of Adolphus Fritch—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1160) to remove the charge of desertion from

the military record of John B. Elliott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1161) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Oliver C. Rouse—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1162) giving military record to Peter Parker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1163) giving military record to Thomas Wakeley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1164) giving military record to Jacob S. Coons—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1165) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas J. Shaw—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1166) to remove charge of desertion from the military record of John Wilson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 1167) for the relief of Twyman O. Abbott—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1168) for the relief of the heirs of the late Charles P. Culver—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COUSINS: A bill (H. R. 1169) to authorize the President to correct the record of Andrew Geddes and to place him on the retired list with the rank of captain—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1170) granting an increase of pension to Titus K. Cone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1171) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Henry E. Cady—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1172) granting a pension to Mrs. Rebecca J. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1173) granting an increase of pension to Wyatt Botts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1174) granting an increase of pension to Ephriam E. Blake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1175) granting a pension to Mrs. Huibertje Niermeyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1176) granting a pension to Justus Canfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1177) granting a pension to Alexander M. Proctor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1178) granting an increase of pension to J. W. Byers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1179) granting a pension to Mrs. D. M. Morgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1180) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Wilson Certain—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1181) granting an honorable discharge to Stillman Stotts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 1182) for the relief of Sylvester W. Quackenbush—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 1183) to assist in the erection of a monument and statue to the memory of the late Capt. Samuel Chester Reid—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1184) for the relief of Thomas K. Hughes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1185) to correct the military record of Reinhard Schneider—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1186) to regulate the pay of printers in the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1187) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against Edward Troy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1188) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to establish a fog signal at or near the Battery, New York—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1189) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen O'Rorke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1190) granting thirty days' leave of absence with pay to the compositors and pressmen employed in the awards division of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Treasury Department—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1191) for the relief of James M. Willbur—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1192) for the relief of Charles Gallagher, of New York, and to refer his claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1193) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to adjust and settle the account of the heirs of Alfred G. Benson with the United States—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1194) for the relief of William P. Wood, of Washington City, in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1195) to reimburse the mayor, aldermen, and commonalty of the city of New York for moneys expended for the United States in raising, equipping, supplying, and arming militia and volunteer forces, and in other ways to aid in suppressing the rebellion—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1196) for relief of George C. Ellison—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1197) for the relief of Edward Kershner—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1198) for the relief of Baine C. Dent, ensign, United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COONEY: A bill (H. R. 1199) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James M. Murphy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1200) granting a pension to Margret Raney—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1201) granting to James McNutt a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1202) granting to George S. McClellan a pension at the rate of $30 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1203) for the relief of Daniel Bentley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1204) to pension Martha McSwain, widow of William McSwain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1205) to pension Felix G. Sitton at the rate of $30 per month—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1206) to pension Alfred Adams at the rate of $12 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1207) to pension George W. Drake at the rate of $30 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1208) to pension Henry Esser at the rate of $30 per month—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1209) to pension Mrs. A. M. Runyan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1210) for the relief of the Christian Church of Marshall, Saline County, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1211) to remove the charge of desertion from the service record of John R. Killingsworth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COWHERD: A bill (H. R. 1213) for the relief of John F. Neil—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1214) for the relief of John Jefferson Wilson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1215) for relief of Charles M. Neet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1216) for the relief of Margaret O'Brien, widow of James O'Brien—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1217) for the relief of James Brice—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1218) for the relief of John S. McBride—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1219) to remove charge of desertion and grant honorable discharge to Peter C. O'Neill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1220) granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims in the case of the scow *Rowena*—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1221) to correct the records of Cass County Regiment, Missouri Home Guards, so as to place the name of the late Irwin Malley on grade as captain of scouts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1222) for the relief of the legal representatives of A. L. H. Crenshaw—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1223) granting a pension to Maj. Moses Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1224) for the relief of the heirs of Alexander Bradshaw—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1225) for the relief of William K. Trabue—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1226) for the relief of Frank B. Case, late a midshipman in the Navy of the United States—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1227) for the relief of the heirs of Andrew J. Surber—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1228) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge to Benjamin Meyers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1229) for the relief of Milo B. Ward—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1230) for the relief of Hannah Kennedy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1231) for the relief of Margaret Luttrell—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 1232) for the relief of Peter Meyers, Jacob R. Hiller, and William Brandle, bondsmen of the Steelville Distilling Company, and James M. Key, its successor—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1233) granting an increase of pension to Clark W. Harrington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1234) for the relief of St. Charles College—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1235) granting a pension to Chamness S. Burks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1236) granting an increase of pension to George Whitehead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1237) granting an increase of pension to William H. Dyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1238) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Ziegler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1239) granting an increase of pension to John Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1240) granting a pension to Mrs. Louvina Mays—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1241) for the relief of A. F. Fleet, formerly superintendent of the Missouri Military Academy, Mexico, Mo.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1242) granting a pension to Frederick W. Tappmeyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1243) granting a pension to Mrs. Lydia Lollar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1244) granting a pension to Orison Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1245) granting a pension to George N. Warfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1246) granting a pension to James A. Terry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1247) granting an increase of pension to Uriah H. Owings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1248) granting a pension to Silas A. Elkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1249) for the relief of W. D. McLean, alias Donald McLean—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1250) for the relief of Mrs. Catharine Bedell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1251) granting a pension to Edward W. Nichols—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1252) granting a pension to John McCann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1253) granting a pension to John H. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1254) granting a pension to Jeremiah Milroy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1255) granting a pension to Martha A. Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1256) granting a pension to William Toedtmann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1257) for the relief of Ralls Lodge, No. 33, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1258) for the relief of the heirs of the late William H. Finch—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1259) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Craddock—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1260) for the relief of John Harper, Alexander Hammontree, and others, trustees of the Methodist Church at Warrenton, Mo.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1261) for the relief of Elenor W. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1262) for the relief of the heirs of the late Joseph M. Carrico—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1263) for the relief of Edwin F. Mathews—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1264) granting a pension to Friedrich Schmied—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1265) granting a pension to Benjamin Haggard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1266) granting a pension to John J. Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1267) granting a pension to John D. Reeds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1268) granting a pension to Levi Maule—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1269) granting a pension to Thomas C. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1270) granting a pension to Cyrus Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1271) granting a pension to Henry Porter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1272) granting a pension to Absalom Howell Eggers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1273) granting a pension to Jeremiah Romans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1274) granting a pension to Prudence E. Wyatt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1275) granting a pension to Jeptha D. Newman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1276) granting an increase of pension to John E. Ball—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1277) granting a pension to Joseph Hazelton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1278) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of David Gibson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1279) granting a pension to Samuel S. Grimmett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1280) granting a pension to John H. Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1281) granting a pension to Spotwell E. Page—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1282) granting an increase of pension to Edward J. Preston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1283) granting a pension to Johnson W. Eubanks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1284) granting a pension to Mrs. Susan L. Brimer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1285) granting an increase of pension to John M. Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1286) granting an increase of pension to James M. Shippee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1287) granting a pension to Maj. Louis Dieckgraefe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1288) granting a pension to Cornelius W. Roberts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 1289) for the relief of William S. Cloud—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1290) for the relief of Oscar Heath—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1291) to amend the record of Capt. Thomas H. Reeves, United States Army, retired—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1292) for the relief of William P. McMurtry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1293) for the relief of William M. Henry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1294) for the relief of Elbert S. Shanks—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1295) for the relief of Robert Williams—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1296) for relief of Walter W. Baker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1297) to correct the military record of Nelson Stover—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1298) for the relief of James M. Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1299) for the relief of William Jones—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1300) for the relief of E. S. Parrott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1301) to correct the military record of William Carder—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1302) to correct the military record of William Miller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1303) to correct the military record of Jacob Linebaugh—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1304) to correct the military record of John Hickman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1305) for the relief of John M. Morrison—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1306) for the relief of Riley Day—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1307) for the relief of William Moyers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1308) for the relief of John G. Williams—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1309) for the relief of W. R. Sentell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1310) for the relief of Joseph Fawbush—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1311) for the relief of John Wells—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1312) for the relief of Wiley Wolf—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1313) for the relief of Jesse B. Mitchell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1314) to correct the military record of George W. Wilson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1315) for the relief of William A. Morgan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1316) to correct the military record of Joseph Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1317) to correct the military record of James H. Beal—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1318) for the relief of Ezekiel T. Delph—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1319) for the relief of William Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1320) for the relief of Levi Viles—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1321) for the relief of James Mills—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1322) for the relief of Stephen Wilbourne—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1323) to correct the military record of William Goins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1324) for the relief of Richard M. Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1325) for the relief of George Shults—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1326) for the relief of Ruben S. Sea—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1327) for the relief of Ruben S. Sea—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1328) to correct the military record of James M. Mace—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1329) for the relief of William B. Jenkins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1330) for the relief of W. E. Peirce—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1331) to correct the military record of Madison Trent and others—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1332) for the relief of Alfred T. Moreland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1333) for the relief of Samuel S. Caldwell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1334) to correct the military record of John Clark—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1335) for the relief of Allen Bruner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1336) for the relief of W. A. Spears—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1337) for the relief of John H. Dickenson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1338) for the relief of Lincoln S. Jones—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1339) for the relief of W. P. McNulty—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1340) for the relief of James H. Hall—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1341) for the relief of Thomas Colyer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1342) for the relief of James B. Leedy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1343) to grant an honorable discharge to Canada Peck, late private, Company I, Third Tennessee Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1344) to correct the military record of Mat Elliot McLain—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1345) for the relief of Jacob Hybarger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1346) for the relief of W. G. McKenzie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1347) for the relief of Homer Sheldon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1348) for the relief of Joshua Richardson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1349) for the relief of John G. Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1350) for the relief of Samuel Babb—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1351) to correct the military record of Daniel W. Ellis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1352) to correct the military record of Robert B. Williams—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1353) to correct the military record of Henry C. Coleman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1354) for the relief of William Buttery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1355) for the relief of Willis M. Kent—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1356) for the relief of Andrew Cutshal—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1357) to correct the military record of William Kelly—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1358) for the relief of David Roberts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1359) for the relief of Jackson Harris—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1360) to correct the military record of Daniel K. Self—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1361) for the relief of Dulaney P. Harmon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1362) for the relief of Thomas Sutton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1363) to correct the military record of Robert Burchfield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1364) to correct the military record of Jesse B. Mitchell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1365) to correct the military record of Thomas Brackins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1366) for the relief of Alfred Green—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1367) to correct the military record of Cleaveland Creech—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1368) for the relief of Alexander Harmon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1369) to pension Oliver L. Burnett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1370) to grant a pension to Zachariah Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1371) to grant a pension to Mrs. Susan Fields—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1372) granting a pension to Peter Guinn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1373) granting a pension to Daniel Fugate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1374) to grant a pension to John D. Cary—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1375) to pension Samuel Ball—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1376) granting a pension to Samuel M. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1377) granting a pension to Sarah Bowers, widow of Joseph R. Bowers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1378) to pension George W. Oliver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1379) to pension William Hale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1380) to pension Nathan B. Simpson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1381) granting a pension to J. J. Angel—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1382) for the relief of Conrad Bashor—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1383) for the relief of Alfred McKinney—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1384) for the relief of Albert W. Perry—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1385) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Ann E. Timberlake—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1386) for the relief of Henry C. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1387) for the relief of John Butler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1388) to correct the military record of Charles H. Piper—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1389) for the relief of William Burton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1390) to correct the military record of William A. Cope—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1391) to correct the military record of Charles Birchfield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1392) to remove the charge of desertion against William H. Wheatley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1393) to remove the charge of desertion against William Mullins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1394) for the relief of David Foster—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1395) for the relief of John Butler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1396) for the relief of David Roberts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1397) for the relief of Henry Poe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1398) to correct the military record of Ellis Carter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1399) for the relief of Pleasant Haun—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1400) for the relief of Jacob Barkley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1401) for the relief of James McDonald—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1402) for the relief of James Vandergriff—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1403) for the relief of Solomon Q. Dugger—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1404) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of William Irwin, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1405) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of William Wallace, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1406) granting a pension to Ruetha Moran—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1407) to grant a pension to Charles H. Lipps—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1408) for the relief of the heirs of James A. Galbreith—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1409) for the relief of Robert A. Ragan—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1410) for the relief of J. J. Starnes—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1411) for the relief of John Walker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1412) for the relief of Charles H. Adams—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1413) for the relief of John Scott Payne—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1414) for relief of the heirs of William M. Piper, late provost-marshal with the rank of captain—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1415) for the relief of Clara L. Sheffield—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1416) for the relief of the estate of David L. Ripley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1417) for the relief of the estate of Joseph Worley, deceased, late of Hamblen County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1418) for the relief of Thomas J. Powell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1419) for the relief of William Ridens—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1420) for the relief of Jethro Hill, of Hamblen County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1421) for the relief of Lewis White—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1422) for the relief of the estate of William J. Middleton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1423) for the relief of D. A. Harvey—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1424) for the relief of estate of D. W. F. Peoples, deceased, late of Jonesboro, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1425) for the relief of Daniel B. Bowman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1426) for the relief of Lewis Atkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1427) granting a pension to William H. Pierre—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1428) for the relief of W. H. Fitzgerald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1429) for the relief of Sarah M. Dove, widow of the late Benjamin M. Dove, commander, United States Navy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1430) for the relief of Louisa Harwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1431) to restore certain enlisted or appointed men to the Army, Navy, and so forth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1432) to grant a pension to Mrs. Bettie Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1433) to grant a pension to William H. Chambers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1434) to correct the military records of W. J. Whitson and Sidney Whitson, and grant their dependent father, Isaac Whitson, a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1435) to grant a pension to Mary Gilbert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1436) to grant a pension to Frank Bible—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1437) granting a pension to John B. Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1438) for the relief of Lizzie M. McDougal, daughter of private soldier who died as a prisoner of war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1439) granting a pension to Sarah Cupp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1440) granting a pension to Mrs. Elizabeth Herron, of Silverpoint, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1441) granting a pension to George W. Gabey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1442) to grant a pension to George W. Oliver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1443) to grant a pension to Peter Spurgeon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1444) to pension Martin Click and four others—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1445) granting a pension to William C. Tilley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1446) granting a pension to Martha L. Reams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1447) to grant a pension to Strawberry B. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1448) to grant a pension to Hartwell B. Whittle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1449) granting a pension to Joseph Branscom—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1450) to grant a pension to William Branscom—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1451) for the relief of the heirs of Lemuel Cox, deceased, late of Jefferson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 1452) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge to John C. Weckler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 1453) for the relief of John C. White—to the Committee on Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 1454) for the relief of William L. Orr—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BAKER: A bill (H. R. 1455) for the relief of Charles M. Forrest—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 1456) for the relief of James H. Huston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1457) for the relief of Amos Abbott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1458) for the relief of John E. Whinnery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1459) for the relief of William N. Kerr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1460) for the relief of Elizabeth Felton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1461) for the relief of J. H. McDaniel, of Florence, Colo.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1462) for the relief of Hannah Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1463) for the relief of George F. McReynolds, late of Company B, Tenth Illinois Cavalry—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1464) granting an honorable discharge to Rollan Prentice—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1465) granting a pension to Michael Devine, of La Junta, Colo., late of Company L, Second New York Artillery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1466) granting a pension to Charles F. Holly, of Pueblo, Colo., late captain of Company H, Second Regiment Colorado Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1467) for the relief of Thomas S. Kirker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1468) for the relief of Thomas H. Breen—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1469) granting a pension to T. R. Le Tellier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1470) for the relief of S. H. Caldwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1471) for the relief of M. D. Crow—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1472) for the relief of G. W. Seaman, late postmaster at Red Mountain, Colo.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1473) for the relief of Irving W. Stanton—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1474) for the relief of D. H. Dickason—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1475) for the relief of C. M. Reed—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1476) for the relief of Gerald Russell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1477) for the relief of O. E. Noland, of Mancos, Colo.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1478) for the relief of Joseph Clucas—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1479) for the relief of Willbert Bowen, of Cripple Creek, Colo.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1480) for the relief of Oscar Rankin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1481) for the relief of Mary McClellan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1482) for the relief of Emma J. Boyden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1483) for the relief of D. P. Owen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1484) for the relief of settlers in Greer County, Okla.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1485) for the relief of Barbary Brooks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1486) for the relief of Patrick Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1487) granting an honorable discharge to John Holderby—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1488) for the relief of Joseph B. Presdee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1489) granting an increase of pension to Henry Logan, of Buenavista, Colo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1490) granting a pension to Simon D. Kohl—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1491) granting an increase of pension to Lloyd Beall—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1492) for the relief of Jose Benito Atencio—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1493) for the relief of Darius Minier—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1494) for the relief of Mary McClelland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1495) for pension to Joseph N. Nash, late corporal, Company A, Thirty-seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1496) granting an increase of pension to Alvin F. Kimball—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1497) for the relief of Harlan P. Ordendorff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1498) for the relief of Henry G. Mechling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1499) for the relief of Minor A. Foster—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1500) for the relief of Jose Manuel Valdez—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1501) for the relief of Jose Fabian Baca—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1502) for the relief of Antonio J. Archuleta—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1503) granting an honorable discharge to W. G. Neeley, of Canyon City, Colo.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1504) for the relief of Jose Ramon Trujillo—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1505) for the relief of Susan Saunders—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1506) for the relief of Sisto Martinez—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1507) for the relief of William H. La Count—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1508) granting an increase of pension to Henry Logan, of Buenavista, Colo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1509) for the relief of John Cox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1510) for payment of $54 to V. Baldwin Johnson for 15 tons of coal—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1511) to provide for the reinstatement in the Railway Mail Service of C. W. Merrick, of Pueblo, Colo.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1512) for payment of $54 to V. Baldwin Johnson for 15 tons of coal—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1513) for the relief of Mary McClellan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1514) granting a pension to Lemuel Kingsbury, of Denver, Colo., and late of Company A, Twelfth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1515) for the relief of Nathan C. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1516) for the relief of Olive M. Hechtman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1517) for the relief of Sylvester W. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1518) for the relief of Henry C. Smith, late of Company B, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1519) for the relief of George McCracken—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1520) for the relief of Sarah S. Baker, of Montrose, Colo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1521) for the relief of William J. Goss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1522) granting an honorable discharge to Andrew J. Branson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1523) granting an honorable discharge to Thomas B. Hanoum—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1524) for the relief of Drury Shrewsbury—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1525) for the relief of Elizabeth Felton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1526) for the relief of J. H. Daniel, of Florence, Colo.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1527) granting a pension to Stephen B. Yeoman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1528) for the relief of John Warner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1529) granting a pension to Thomas B. Roark—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1530) to pension James N. Livengood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1531) granting a pension to John J. Lockrey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1532) for the relief of Daniel Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1533) for the relief of Peter T. Norris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1534) for the relief of W. J. Kendall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1535) for the relief of Joseph H. Woodruff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1536) granting an honorable discharge to W. G. Neeley, of Canyon City, Colo.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1537) for the relief of F. A. Land—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1538) for the relief of Amos B. Niles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1539) for the relief of Abram J. Kenison—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1540) for the relief of Eliza A. Walker—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1541) for the relief of William L. McClure—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1542) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. John Fay, of Pueblo, Colo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1543) granting an honorable discharge to Harrison S. Crites—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1544) for the relief of John H. Shaw, of Del Norte, Colo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1545) granting a pension to George E. Tuttle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1546) granting a pension to Lemuel Kingsbury, of Denver, Colo., and late of Company A, Twelfth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1547) granting a pension to Reuben Balinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1548) for the relief of William Morehead, of Lake City, Colo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 1550) for the relief of certain officers and men of the Mississippi Marine Brigade, and so forth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1551) for the relief of Francis Paul—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1552) granting a pension to Charles C. Kilbourn, late master United States naval dispatch boat *Jessie*—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1553) for the benefit of Joseph W. Pomfrey, of Covington, Ky.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1554) for the benefit of H. Spillman, of Covington, Ky.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1555) granting a pension to I. W. Hardeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1556) for the relief of J. W. Knox, of Carroll County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1557) for the relief of the Forty-first Kentucky Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1558) granting a pension to Charles C. Kilburn, late master United States tug *Jesse*—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1559) to place Col. M. A. Cochran, of the

United States Army, upon the retired list with the rank of brigadier-general—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1560) granting pension to Ellen Morris, widow of Timothy Morris, late fireman, United States steamer *Susquehanna*, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1561) for the relief of Rebekah Wilkins, widow of Jesse Wilkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1562) to remove the charge of desertion against John Crawford, and so forth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1563) for the relief of John Riley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1564) to remove the charge of desertion against James Murphy and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1565) for the relief of John Ellis of Kenton County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1566) for the benefit of Mary J. Connery, of Falmouth, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1567) for the benefit of John W. Kirby, late sheriff of Gallatin County, Ky.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1568) granting a pension to Hans Castor, of Newport, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1569) granting a pension to Henrietta S. Cummings, widow of James P. Cunmings, late lieutenant of Company E, Eighth Kentucky Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1570) granting a pension to Susie Margarite Landrum, of Warsaw, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1571) to correct the military record of Jesse Closser, and so forth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1572) for the benefit of John M. Hart, of Bourbon County, Ky.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1573) for the benefit of J. D. Thompson, of Trimble County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1574) to remove charge of desertion from the military record of John Richmond, and so forth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1575) for the benefit of James W. Hall, of Grant County, Ky.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1576) for the relief of William Bramble, and so forth, of Kenton County, Ky.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1577) for the benefit of Thomas F. Beach, a soldier of the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1578) for the relief of Henry Cook, of Covington, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1579) to remove the charge of desertion against Joseph B. Kennedy and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1580) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth W. Sutherland—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1581) for the benefit of Ira E. Neville, of Dayton, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1582) for the relief of Fannie Bostwick, widow of Martin B. Strader—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1583) for the relief of N. C. Pettit, of Campbell County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1584) for the relief of Richmond L. Steers, of Kenton County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1585) for the relief of John W. Ray—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1586) granting a pension to Annie M. Sweet, of Newport, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1587) for the benefit of Theadore Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1588) for the benefit of Francis M. Faront, of Bellevue, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1589) for the benefit of George W. Henderson, of Campbell County, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1590) for the relief of R. F. Harrison—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1591) for the relief of Charlotte H. Fenton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1592) granting a pension to Christian Hohn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1593) for the benefit of Richard Gallivan—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1594) to correct the military record of Mathew C. Lyons—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1595) for the benefit of George Turner, of Newport, Ky.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also a bill (H. R. 1596) for the benefit of Ellen Steevers, of Covington, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1597) granting a pension to David E. Redmon, of Pendleton County, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1598) granting a pension to Milton C. Tully—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1599) for the relief of Lewis Stephens—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1600) granting a pension to Lucy B. Bryson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1601) for the relief of John Armstrong, jr.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1602) for the relief of James M. Blackburn, of Covington, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1603) to remove the charge of desertion from the name of Turner Rodgers, of Frankfort, Ky.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1604) for the benefit of Joel H. Hallowell, of Covington, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 1605) for the relief of The William Cramp & Sons Ship and Engine Building Company, of Philadelphia, Pa.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1606) to promote Commodore Louis C. Sartori, now on the retired list of the Navy, to be rear-admiral on said list, in accordance with his original position on the Navy Register—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1607) making appropriation for site and pedestal of a statue of the late Maj. Gen. George G. Meade in the city of Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1609) for the correction of muster of Adolph Von Haake, late major Sixty-eighth Regiment Veteran Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1610) fixing the salary of the postmaster at Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1611) granting a pension to Rebecca Paulding Meade, widow of Rear-Admiral Richard W. Meade, late of the United States Navy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1612) authorizing the President to appoint and retire David McMurtrie Gregg, late captain, Sixth United States Cavalry, and brevet major-general of volunteers, with the rank and grade of captain—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1613) for the relief of the Corn Exchange National Bank, of Philadelphia, Pa.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1614) for the relief of the Potomac Steamboat Company—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1615) granting a pension to Moses E. Osborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1616) to correct the naval record of Joseph Pitt, alias Joseph Marr, and to erase the name of Joseph Marr and substitute the name of Joseph Pitt on the records of the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1617) for the relief of the legal representatives and devisees of James W. Schaumburg—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 1619) to correct the military record of Capt. Henry Troll—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1620) to correct the military record of Julius H. Rogge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1621) to correct the military record of Charles Burswitz—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1622) for the relief of Capt. John Schwab's company, of Pilotknob, Mo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1623) for the relief of James H. Birch—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1624) granting a pension to Peter J. Osterhaus, a major-general in the Union Army in the late rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STANLEY W. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 1625) for the relief of Mary B. Douglass, widow of the late Col. Henry Douglass, Tenth United States Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 1626) for the relief of Forrest W. Brown, administrator of the estate of Bushrod W. Herbert, deceased, late of Jefferson County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1627) for the relief of the estate of Madison Daniels, deceased, late of Randolph County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1628) for the relief of Enos and J. Daniel Dinkle, of Jefferson County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1629) for the relief of Thomas D. Hawker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1630) for the relief of James Evans—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1631) for the relief of Lewis Beckman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1632) for the relief of Robert S. Moss, administrator of James A. Moss, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1633) for the relief of Nancy A. E. Hoffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1634) for the relief of James V. Moore—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1635) for the relief of Daniel K. Shields—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1636) for the relief of George Koonce, of Jefferson County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1637) for the relief of A. B. Rohrbough—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1638) for the relief of Dennis A. Litzinger—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1639) for the relief of Jacob Shank—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1640) for the relief of Harmon Snyder—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1641) for the relief of John W. Smith, of West Virginia—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1642) for the relief of Catharine L. Chaney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1643) for the relief of the estate of John Hutton, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1644) for the relief of the estate of Daniel Ott, deceased, late of Jefferson County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1645) for the relief of John Viands, of Jefferson County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1646) for the relief of William Norris—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1647) for the relief of John A. Stuart, alias John Vanderpool, first-class boy in United States Navy, on sloop of war *Saratoga*, war with Mexico—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1648) for the relief of the county court of Randolph County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1649) for the relief of Mary E. Buckey, of Randolph County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1650) for the relief of Randolph Custer—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1651) for the relief of Mrs. Anna E. Heiskell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1652) for the relief of Stephen R. Stafford, captain, Fifteenth Infantry, United States Army—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1653) for the relief of Justus M. Curtis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1654) for the relief of George W. Graham—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1655) for the relief of the estate of Jeremiah Kibler, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1656) for the relief of John C. Felton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1657) for the relief of Thomas B. Scott—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1658) for the relief of George F. Anderson, of Jefferson County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1659) for the relief of Henry Gettle—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1660) for the relief of Mary E. Stalcup, widow of Joshua Stalcup—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1661) for the relief of Mary C. Hoffman—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1662) granting an increase of pension to Silas H. Mickey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1663) granting a pension to Deborah J. Fogle, of Terra Alta, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1664) granting pension to Martin Hope—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1665) granting a pension to Henrietta B. Lee, surviving child of Daniel Bedinger, a soldier in the Revolutionary war—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1666) granting a pension to Jane Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1667) granting an increase of pension to James L. T. Sharp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1668) granting an increase of pension to Robert L. Boseley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1669) granting arrears of pension to Jane Stonebreaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1670) granting a pension to George A. Liston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1671) granting a pension to Catharine Hey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1672) granting an increase of pension to David T. Sipe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1673) granting a pension to James Ryan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1674) granting a pension to Francis M. Cain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1675) granting a pension to Isaac D. Caldwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1676) granting an increase of pension to Wesley C. Pryor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1677) granting an increase of pension to Missouri B. Ross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1678) granting a pension to Sarah J. Pugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1679) granting a pension to James W. Wentz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1680) granting a pension to Arabella Downey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1681) granting an increase of pension to Isaac M. Lock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1682) granting an increase of pension to Isaac H. Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1683) granting a pension to George W. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1684) granting an increase of pension to William R. Huffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1685) granting a pension to Edgar Travis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1686) for the relief of the trustees of Tuscarora Lodge, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Martinsburg, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1687) for the relief of the trustees of the German Evangelical Church of Martinsburg, W. Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1688) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Webster, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1689) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Martinsburg, W. Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1690) for the relief of Wildey Lodge, No. 27, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Harpers Ferry, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1691) for the relief of the county court of Upshur County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1692) for the relief of Richard W. Heafer, Company K, First Regiment Virginia Infantry, war with Mexico—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1693) for the relief of the trustees of St. Joseph's Catholic Church at Martinsburg, W. Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1694) for the relief of the estate of William Smallwood, deceased, late of Jefferson County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1695) for relief of John Edwards, alias John D. Edwards, late Company A, Cole's Battalion Potomac Home Brigade Cavalry, Maryland Volunteers, for removal of the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1696) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas G. Flagg, deceased, late of Berkeley County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1697) for the relief of the trustees of Trinity Episcopal Church of Martinsburg, W. Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1698) for the relief of volunteer officers and enlisted men in the war with Spain—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1699) to remove the charge of absence without leave from the military record of John Frederick—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1700) to relieve Ludwig Rupprecht of the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1701) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Hall—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1702) to relieve Eli Shuman from the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1703) to remove charge of desertion from John Lyons—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1704) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of James W. Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1705) to remove the charge of desertion from the naval record of Charles Thompson—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1706) to correct the naval record of George W. Sherrard—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1707) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of James M. Westfall—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1708) authorizing the President of the United States to nominate Lieut. Commander R. M. G. Brown, now on the retired list, to be a commander on the retired list—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 1709) for the relief of the heirs of George W. Welsh—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1710) for the relief of Martha E. Berger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1711) for the relief of the estate of M. J. Grealish, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1712) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Francis Reilly—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1713) granting an increase of pension to George W. Reisinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1715) for the relief of William L. Jones, of Pittsburg, Pa., and others—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1716) for the relief of Warren Hall—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1717) for the relief of J. D. Golden—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1718) granting a pension to David S. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1719) for the relief of S. N. Young and wife—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1720) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1721) for the relief of the heirs of certain seamen lost in the foundering of light vessel No. 37—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1722) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William H. Corless—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1723) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Sarah B. Leet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1724) for the relief of David A. McKnight—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1725) for the relief of Calvin Nelson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1726) granting an increase of pension to George W. Garrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1727) granting a pension to A. C. Litchfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1728) granting a pension to Mary A. Colhoun—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1729) granting a pension to Carrie A. Moody—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1730) granting an increase of pension to Alfred H. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1731) granting a pension to Mrs. Emma J. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1732) granting an increase of pension to Edwin S. Osborne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: A bill (H. R. 1733) to grant a pension to Anna Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1734) to grant a pension to Mary A. Whitmore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1735) granting a pension to Laurenz Hegel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1736) to grant a pension to Maurice Moriarty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1737) to grant a pension to Cora I. Cromwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1738) to grant an honorable discharge to Joseph Scharbonaugh—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1739) to grant an honorable discharge to Claus Maxfield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1740) for the relief of John M. Park—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1741) to grant an honorable discharge to F. C. Kruschke—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1742) to remove the charge of desertion against Patrick Fox—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1743) to grant an honorable discharge to Seneca K. Bentley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: A bill (H. R. 1744) to pension Garrett H. Wilber—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1745) granting a pension to Margaret Newcomb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1746) for the relief of Mary E. Cross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1747) for the relief of Nancy Jane Stevens—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1748) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen V. McCleery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1749) for the relief of Ira K. Eaton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1750) for the relief of Shadrack S. Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1751) for the relief of Cordelia Sessions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1752) for the relief of Michael Garst—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1753) to pension Mrs. Ann Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1754) for the relief of Mrs. Helen M. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1755) for the relief of Catherine E. West—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1756) to increase the pension of Oscar W. Lowery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1757) for the relief of the heirs of Edwin D. Breed—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 1758) for the relief of Joseph Fitzpatrick, of Glenville, Gilmer County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1759) for the relief of the heirs of Moses Cunningham, deceased, of Braxton County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1760) for the relief of Benjamin F. Harrison, of Company H, Forty-Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1761) for the relief of Alexander Lucas, of Viola, Marshall County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1762) to increase the pension of Amelia Hutchinson, widow of W. J. Hutchinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1763) to pension Ella F. Sydnor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1764) for the relief of John W. Kennedy, of Wheeling, Ohio County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1765) granting a pension to Ralph Whitehead, of Wheeling, W. Va.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1766) for the relief of H. H. John, of Weston, Lewis County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1767) authorizing additional compensation to the assistant commissioners to the industrial exhibition at Melbourne, Australia—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1768) granting an increase of pension to George J. Stealy, of Clarksburg, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1769) granting an increase of pension to I. H. Duval, of Wellsburg, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1770) for the relief of Henry Snider, of Moundsville, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1771) for the relief of the widow and heirs of William J. Cunningham, deceased, of Vancamp, Wetzel County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1772) for the relief of Robert R. Furbey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1773) granting relief to the heirs of the late J. M. Doddridge, of Wheeling, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1774) for the relief of the executor of William Dillon, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1775) for the relief of Oakley Randall, of Farnum, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1776) for the relief of Jehu Gum, of Churchville, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1777) granting an increase of pension to William L. Alley, of Lynncamp, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1778) granting a pension to Charles W. W. Haney, of Pinegrove, Wetzel County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1779) for the relief of George W. Sullivan, of Centerpoint, Doddridge County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1780) for the relief of Robert Longwell, of Earnshaw, Wetzel County, W. Va., late private of Company C, Twenty-fifth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1781) granting a pension to Mary E. Radcliffe, of Wheeling, Ohio County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1782) for the relief of D. B. Clark, of Wheeling, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1783) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Batten, late private, Company B, Tenth West Virginia Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1784) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George Herrman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1785) for the relief of Nathaniel Bush, of Weston, Lewis County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1786) for the relief of Maramon A. Martin, late private of Company A, Sixth Regiment of West Virginia Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1787) for the relief of George W. Frush, late of Company B, Third West Virginia Infantry, and later of Company B, Sixth West Virginia Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1788) granting a pension to Nicholas C. Wilson, of Braxton County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1789) for the relief of the heirs of James A. Smith, deceased, of Wheeling, Ohio County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1790) for the relief of John P. Fox, of Adamston, Harrison County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1791) to pension Isaac D. Winters, of Sandhill, Marshall County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1792) to grant a pension to Andrew McMorrow, of Morley, Braxton County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1793) granting a pension to Rachel E. Newell, of Chapel, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1794) granting a pension to Abner Robinson, of Sardis, Harrison County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1795) granting a pension to F. M. Davidson, late private, Company G, Third West Virginia Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1796) to grant a pension to Andrew Carr, of Tanner, Gilmer County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 1797) granting a pension to Mrs. Jane Lucas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDDY: A bill (H. R. 1798) to refer the claim of Frank C. Darling, for Indian war depredations, to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1799) for the relief of Martha Bottineau, widow of Pierre Bottineau, late scout and guide to various military officers—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1800) granting a pension to Hulda L. Maynard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1801) granting a pension to Elijah Biddle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1802) to refer the claim of the heirs of Matthew Wright, for Indian war depredations, to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1803) granting a pension to Julia E. G. Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1804) for the relief of Charles Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLEMING: A bill (H. R. 1805) for the relief of the estate of Edward Gallaher, deceased, late of Richmond County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FOX: A bill (H. R. 1806) for the relief of W. W. Riley—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of New York: A bill (H. R. 1807) granting an honorable discharge to John B. Tredenick—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 1808) for the relief of William P. Barry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1809) for the relief of Wallace S. Winter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FREER: A bill (H. R. 1810) to restore the name of Adam J. Brannan to the pension roll, and to allow him a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1811) to pension William Hurd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1812) recognizing Company A of the Eleventh West Virginia Militia as United States soldiers, and so forth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1813) recognizing Company B of the Eleventh West Virginia Militia as United States soldiers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1814) for the relief of Crispen M. Stone—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1815) for the relief of William H. Jordan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1816) for the relief of William Lloyd—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1817) for the relief of Preston H. Turly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1818) for the relief of Allen Greenleaf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1819) for the relief of Capt. C. Fuller's company of West Virginia Militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1820) for the relief of Joseph E. Insco—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1821) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Nelson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1822) for the relief of Adolphus P. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1823) for the relief of J. A. Newbrough—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1824) granting a pension to Charles H. Dollman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1825) to pension John Greer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1826) for the relief of Mrs. Druzilla Stump—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1827) for the relief of the trustees of the Baptist Church of Guyandotte, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1828) for the relief of Mrs. Catharine Childers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1829) for the relief of John O. McGrew—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1830) for the relief of Rudolph Staats—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1831) for the relief of Capt. Sidney F. Shaw—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1832) granting relief to West Virginia State troops—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1833) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Guyandotte, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1834) for the relief of Amos Dyke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1835) for the relief of James M. Clouston—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1836) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Point Pleasant, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1837) for the relief of Andrew J. Riggs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1838) for the relief of James M. Stephenson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1839) to pension William M. Cheuvront—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1840) to pension Willoughby M. Park for services rendered and disabilities contracted in the late war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1841) for the relief of Thomas Matheny—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1842) to pension Allan C. Vickars—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1843) for the relief of F. F. Morris—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 1844) granting a pension to William Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1845) granting pensions to William Allen and Isaac Garman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1846) granting a pension to Andrew L. Anderson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1847) granting a pension to Mary A. Bird, of Fox, Sevier County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1848) to pension John S. Boling, of Sevier County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1849) for the relief of Mrs. Isabella R. Boyd, of Knox County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1850) for the relief of the personal representatives of Horace L. Bradley, deceased, of Knoxville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1851) for the relief of Eli H. Bright—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1852) for the relief of Ellkenney Broglin—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1853) for the relief of John T. Brown—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1854) for the relief of Joseph A. Brown, of Anderson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1855) for relief of John C. Buckner, of Union County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1856) for the relief of James H. Bunn, of Oliver Springs, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1857) to grant a pension to William B. Caldwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1858) for the relief of William B. Caldwell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1859) for the relief of Campbell County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1860) for the relief of the trustees of Carson-Newman College, at Mossycreek, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1861) to pension Giles M. Caton, of Sevier County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1862) for the relief of William Cecill, of Scott County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1863) to grant a pension to William Cecill, of Scott County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1864) granting a pension to Mary Chambers, of Scott County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1865) to grant a pension to Rebecca L. Chambers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1866) for the relief of William C. Chandler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1867) for the relief of the personal representatives of Mitchell J. Childress—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1868) for the relief of Dr. Thomas J. Coward—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1869) for the relief of H. T. Cox—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1870) for the relief of Mrs. Sarah E. Cox—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1871) for the relief of E. B. Crozier, executrix of the last will of Dr. C. W. Crozier, of Tennessee—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1872) for the relief of P. C. Culvahouse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1873) to grant a pension to Mary E. Daugherty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1874) granting a pension to William P. Douglas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1875) for the relief of R. A. Driskill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1876) for the relief of Isaac A. Duncan, of Jefferson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1877) for the relief of James R. Edwards, of Chattanooga, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1878) to correct the military record of John Ervin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1879) to increase the pension of John W. Fielden, of Newmarket, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1880) for the relief of Jacob S. Fritts—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1881) granting a pension to William M. Fritts, of Wartburg, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1882) granting a pension to Isaac Garman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1883) for the relief of William M. Goforth, of Sevier County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1884) for the relief of Jason R. Gossett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1885) to pension Harvey Grant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1886) to grant a pension to Martha M. Helton, of Sevier County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1887) for the relief of Jacob Henry—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1888) for the relief of James W. Holt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1889) for the relief of the trustees of Holston Seminary, at Newmarket, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1890) to increase the pension of John Houk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1891) to pension Eli Huffstetler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1892) to grant a pension to Dicey Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1893) for the relief of Henry B. Jones—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1894) to pension John Alexander Kelly, of Knox County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1895) to grant a pension to Hugh Kline—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1896) to increase the pension of Jordan A. Lively—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1897) for the relief of the Presbyterian Church of Loudon, Loudon County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1898) for the relief of Michael Low—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1899) for the relief of S. M. McGuire, of Whitepine, Jefferson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1900) to increase the pension of Michael Low—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1901) for the relief of Samuel McKamey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1902) for the relief of Calvin Mallacote—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1903) granting a pension to Samuel McKamey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1904) for the relief of John B. Malone, of Union County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1905) to correct the military record of William B. Malone—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1906) for the relief of Sarah E. Massey, of Sevier County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1907) to grant a pension to Robert A. Mee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1908) for the relief of Herman J. Miller, of Union County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1909) to restore the pension of Robert W. Mills—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1910) to pension the National Guards of East Tennessee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1911) for the relief of Robert E. Newman, late a second lieutenant in the Ninth Tennessee Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1912) for the relief of James A. Ogg—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1913) for the relief of Wesley C. Owens—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1914) to pension Sophia Ownby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1915) for the relief of Kate K. Parsons, of Mayo, Knox County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1916) granting a pension to Lewis Perkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1917) to pension John W. Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1918) to grant a pension to Milton Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1919) for the relief of George W. Qualls—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1920) to pension Nancy A. Robbs, of Roane County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, (H. R. 1921) to correct the military record of John W. Robinson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1922) for the relief of David Hampton Rosier—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1923) for the relief of Miller E. Rosier—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1924) to pension A. D. Rutherford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1925) to restore the pension of David M. Sartain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1926) for the relief of Philip Schlosshan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1927) to restore the name of Pleasant Sharp to the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1928) granting a pension to William H. Shillings, of Roane County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1929) for the relief of Milton Shootman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1930) to pension Elizabeth Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1931) for the relief of William Stephenson Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1932) to do justice to the survivors of the shipwreck of the *Sultana*—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1933) for the relief of George W. Swanay—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1934) for the relief of Alexander L. Taylor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1935) to correct the military record of George A. Tillett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1936) to grant a pension to George A. Tillett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1937) for the relief of George Tucker, of Jefferson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1938) to grant a pension to George Tucker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1939) to pension Jane Turner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1940) for the relief of Robert A. Turner—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1941) for the relief of Thomas J. Wear, of Sevier County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 1942) for the relief of Henry Grebe—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1943) granting an increase of pension to Simon Price—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1944) granting an increase of pension to Eli C. Walton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 1945) for the relief of Dr. W. S. Hosack—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1946) granting a pension to Jane F. Chalmers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 1947) for the relief of the heirs of Erskine S. Allin and the United States Regulation Firearms Company, respectively—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1948) granting a pension to Edmund C. Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1949) authorizing the payment of the amount due Stella J. Coolbroth—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1950) granting increase of pension to Henry Dyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1951) granting arrearages of pay to Edmund C. Bailey—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1952) to rerate the pension allowed to J. H. Braynard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 1953) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Calvin C. Stebbins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1954) for the relief of Alexander Wilkie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1955) to increase the pension of James Evans, of Northfield, Vt., late a member of Company E, Forty-first Ohio Volunteers, and of Company D, Fifth United States Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1956) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Alexander Sleight, of West Haven, Vt.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1957) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of Norris W. Silver, alias Charles W. Nichols—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1958) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Chamberlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1959) for the relief of the heirs of George W. Saulpaw—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1960) granting a pension to Nelson Morse, of Coventry, Vt.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1961) for relief of Benjamin Burrows—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1962) for the relief of the heirs of Daniel Reed, deceased—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1963) granting an increase of pension to Dana Cook, of Barton, Vt.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1964) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Page, of Newport Center, Vt.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1965) granting a pension to John Lonergan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1966) granting a pension to Harriett E. Pope, of West Brookfield, Vt.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1967) granting a pension to Lydia Maria Davis, of Proctorsville, Vt.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1968) to grant a pension to Valencourt C. Johnston, of West Berlin, Vt.—to the Committee Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1969) to grant a pension to Elizabeth Barnum, of Johnson, Vt.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1970) for relief of Julius A. Morrill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1971) for the relief of Charles F. Sanborn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1972) to correct the military record of Henry L. Franklin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1973) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas W. O'Brien—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1974) granting a pension to Hannah M. Cheney, of Springfield, Vt.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1975) granting a pension to Lucinda Andrews, of Essex, Va.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1976) granting a pension to Caroline H. Hatch, of Worcester, Vt.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1977) granting a pension to Frank W. Gold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1978) to pension Harriet Woodbury, of Windsor, Vt.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1979) to pension Sophronia Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1980) granting a pension to Fanny E. Alexander—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1981) granting a pension to Harriet M. Scott, an army nurse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1982) granting a pension to Emeline Hancock—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1983) granting a pension to Maria Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1984) granting relief to H. R. Sturtevant, postmaster at Hartland, Vt.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1985) for the relief of Henry C. La Point, late a first lieutenant in the Second United States Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1986) for the relief of L. A. Noyes—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1987) for the relief of Robert J. Humphrey—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 1988) for the relief of Daniel Kuhn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1989) for the relief of Marie Wiersang—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1990) for the relief of Julia A. Heath—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1991) for the relief of Robert McFarland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1992) for the relief of Mathias Pederson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 1993) granting an increase of pension to James C. Jennings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1994) to correct the military record of John McCarthy, late of Company B, Eleventh Connecticut Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1995) granting an increase of pension to Frederick O. Lathrop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1996) granting compensation to Joseph Dawson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1997) to correct the military record of Richard Clifford, late of Company I, One hundred and twenty-first New York Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1998) granting an increase of pension to William E. Austin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1999) granting an increase of pension to John E. Higgins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 2000) for the relief of Thomas Paul—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2001) for the relief of Thomas H. Burns—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOY: A bill (H. R. 2002) granting an increase of pension to Wallace G. Bone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSTON (by request): A bill (H. R. 2003) for the relief of Mattie R. Fredeking, of West Virginia—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 2004) to increase the pension of Robert Wilkinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2005) granting a pension to Catharine Coughlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 2006) to grant honorable discharge to William A. Treadwell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2007) to grant a pension to John Egner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 2008) granting a pension to Emma C. Nudd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2009) granting a pension to Emma A. Andrews, widow of Daniel W. Andrews—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2010) to increase the pension of Michael Lahey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2011) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against Daniel Walsh—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2012) granting a pension to Pena Adler, daughter of Christian G. Adler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2013) for the relief of Ellen S. Witter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2014) granting a pension to Rhoda Chick—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2015) to relieve Calvin Mears of the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2016) granting a pension to Michael Griffin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2017) granting a pension to Lydia G. Cate—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2018) granting a pension to Maria L. Philbrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2019) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Lawrence Kennedy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2020) granting a pension to Clarissa Carruth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2021) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against the record of Henry C. Bliss—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: A bill (H. R. 2022) to amend the military record of Moses Gokey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2023) to amend the military record of C. F. Clark—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2024) to amend the military record of Edwin F. Vinton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2025) to amend the military record of Alexander Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 2026) granting a pension to James R. Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2027) for the relief of the trustees of St. Philip's Church, of Atlanta, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2028) for the relief of Michael Kries—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2029) for the relief of Elsas, May & Co., of Atlanta, Ga.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2030) for the relief of Samuel I. Gustin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2031) for the relief of the estate of Frank H. Nichols—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2032) for the relief of James Condon—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2033) for the relief of Mira M. Harbin, administratrix of Nathaniel P. Harbin, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2034) for the relief of Miss Honora Ryan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2035) for the relief of Mrs. Emily Evans—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2036) for the relief of Mark Miller—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2037) for the relief of the estate of Leander C. McLellan, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2038) for the relief of the legal representatives of Needham Bullard, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2039) for the relief of Edman Green, of Jonesboro, Clayton County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2040) for the relief of Ambrose Chewning—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2041) for the relief of George T. Reeves—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2042) for the relief of Charles L. Bradwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2043) for the relief of Mrs. Sarah E. Youngblood, of Atlanta, Fulton County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2044) for the relief of John J. Hart—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2045) for the relief of Benjamin F. Rogers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2046) for the relief of William Ellis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2047) granting a pension to William Barrett—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2048) granting a pension to George D. Boyd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2049) for the relief of W. J. Fletcher, of Georgia—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2050) for the relief of Stafford, Seymour & Co., for Indian depredations—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2051) for the relief of Mrs. M. A. Cook, widow of James S. Cook, a soldier in the Indian wars of 1826 and 1827—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2052) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Elizabeth Overby Williams—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: A bill (H. R. 2053) for relief of Anna M. Orne, administratrix of Henry A. Orne, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 2054) granting a pension to Lydia F. Wiley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2055) for the relief of the heirs of certain seamen lost in the foundering of light vessel No. 37—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2056) for the relief of Isaac N. Forrester—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2057) for the relief of the legal representatives of James R. Thompson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2058) for the relief of Joseph Curriden—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LANE: A bill (H. R. 2059) granting a pension to John Ashworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOVERING: A bill (H. R. 2060) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Timothy Reed—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2061) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Sanford K. Knox—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2062) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Fred A. Miller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2063) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Chamberlain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2064) granting an increase of pension to James Cushing Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2065) granting arrears of pension to H. Morris Husband—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2066) granting increase of pension to Charles W. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2067) granting a pension to Penny T. Stephens—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2068) for the relief of Hudson Maxim and W. H. Graham, in connection with various inventions—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2069) to reimburse Charles W. Turner, late postmaster at Middleboro, Mass., for money expended by him for the United States—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2070) granting an increase of pension to Capt. Charles E. Churchill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2071) granting a pension to Louisa Stafford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2072) granting an increase of pension to Orange S. Pratt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2073) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Lovejoy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2074) granting a pension to James E. Bates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2075) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Samuel Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2076) granting an increase of pension to Horace N. Brackett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2077) granting an increase of pension to Albert S. Shepard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2078) for the relief of Charles Speare—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 2079) for the promotion and retirement of P. A. Surg. John F. Bransford, of the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2080) for the relief of the estate of Dennis O'Dea, late of Richmond, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2082) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen H. Smith, of King William County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2083) for the relief of William W. Mantlo, of New Kent County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2084) for the relief of the heirs of Samuel Ayers, of Virginia—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2085) for the relief of Jane Womack—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2086) for the relief of Charles S. Mills—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2087) granting a pension to Fannie W. Williams—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2088) for the relief of Isaac Davenport and others, citizens of Virginia—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2089) for the relief of Richmond College, located at Richmond, Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2090) for the relief of Mrs. C. N. Graves—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 2091) for the relief of Larrabee & Allen—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 2092) granting an increase of pension to Madison McCollister—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2093) granting an increase of pension to Jacob McAfee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2094) granting an increase of pension to Barney Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2095) granting an increase of pension to John Olinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2096) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Fike—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2097) removing the charge of desertion against Martin Conway—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 2098) for the relief of Hattie A. Phillips—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MUDD (by request): A bill (H. R. 2099) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds to Albert V. Conway, substituted trustee, for certain registered United States bonds redeemed or assigned by the Government upon forged assignments—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 2100) for the relief of Simeon Austin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: A bill (H. R. 2101) to compensate the Baptist Church at Helena, Ark., for destruction of its building during the late war by the Federal Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2102) for the relief of the heirs of Mark W. Izard, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2103) for the relief of John J. Govan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2104) to place the name of Little Berry Sullivan on the pension roll—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2105) for the relief of Dr. J. H. Seegraves, surgeon, United States Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2106) for the relief of Mrs. S. C. Davis and Duren Lurry—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2107) for the relief of Thomas Y. Huddleston—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2108) for the relief of Henry P. Grant, of Phillips County, Ark.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2109) for the relief of the Old School Presbyterian Church, of Helena, Phillips County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2110) for the relief of Clarrissa E. McCormick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2111) for the relief of Thomas J. Harris and others, heirs of Manning Harris, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2112) for the relief of Richard Gable—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 2113) to complete the military record of Daniel Cook, deceased, and for an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2114) for the relief of William A. Goodwin, of Warren County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2115) granting a pension to Thomas L. Cate, of Cleveland, Bradley County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2116) for relief of John V. Brown, of Washington County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2117) for relief of James F. Campbell, of Charleston, Bradley County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2118) for the relief of Timothy S. Hixon, of Hamilton County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2119) for relief of William M. White, of James County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2120) for the relief of Howard Bonner, late of Company K, First Regiment United States Colored Troops—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2121) for the relief of C. W. Biese—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2122) for the relief of John Long, of Joshua, McMinn County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2123) for the relief of Thomas Caldwell, of Bradley County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2124) for the relief of Cumberland Female College, of McMinnville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2125) for relief of Thomas Robert Harris, of Marion County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2126) for relief of William H. Capehart, of Warren County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2127) for relief of Sampson D. Bridgeman, of Hamilton County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2128) for relief of Mary Ann Smith, of Sequatchie College, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2129) for the relief of Rachael C. Stiefvater, of Chattanooga, Tenn., to reimburse for the use and destruction of property by United States Army in 1864—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2130) appropriating $248 and interest from May 10, 1864, to pay William D. Humberd as scout, guide, and so forth—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2131) granting a pension of $12 per month to Matilda Witt, widow of J. Burgess Witt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2132) for the relief of David Baudy, late a private in Company L, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2133) for the relief of Hugh J. Brady—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2134) for the relief of P. R. Albert and I. Noa, of Chattanooga, Tenn.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2135) for the relief of John Redden, late of Company D, Tenth Tennessee Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2136) for the relief of A. J. Shell, of Avondale, Hamilton County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2137) for relief of Jesse C. Allen, of Polk County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2138) to remove the charge of desertion against McDonald Bryan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2139) for relief of William Miller, of Walker County, Ga.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2140) for relief of John Weeks, of Big Springs, Meigs County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2141) for the relief of Julia W. Outland—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2142) for the relief of Samuel McJunkin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2143) for the relief of Thomas Hardin, late of Company F, Fifth Tennessee Volunteers, Mexican war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2144) for relief of Jacob Cross, of Benton, Polk County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2145) to muster in and muster out Milroy Home Guards, United States troops, citizens of Warren and Grundy counties, Tenn., in the war of the rebellion, 1861 to 1865—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2146) to complete the military record of Theo W. Gambee and to pay him for military services performed—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2147) for the relief of Charles W. Wiseman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2148) for the relief of James Nipper, of Cleveland, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2149) for relief of James A. Lance, of Warren County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2150) for relief of William R. Rogers, of James County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2151) for the relief of R. H. Sively, late first lieutenant Company G, Fifth Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2152) for the relief of Lydia A. Newby, of Hamilton County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MINOR: A bill (H. R. 2154) granting an honorable discharge to John P. Chesley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 2155) for the relief of Alexander Sutherland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 2156) for the relief of Oliver M. Blair, administrator of Thomas P. Blair, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NAPHEN: A bill (H. R. 2157) to remove the charge of desertion from Thomas J. Foley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2158) for the relief of Charles Erskine—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2159) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the military record of Michael Sweeny—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2160) to remove the charge of desertion from Charles Ambsler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 2161) granting a pension to Andrew H. Vorderman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2162) granting a pension to Frances J. Manley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2163) granting a pension to Mary L. Cramer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2164) granting a pension to Sarah A. Bish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2165) granting a pension to Barbara A. Bauman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2166) to provide for the better protection of railroad employees and others—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2167) granting a pension to Sarah A. Murchant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2168) granting a pension to Morgan Anway—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2169) granting a pension to Nelson B. Lutes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2170) granting a pension to Angeline Eyestone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2171) granting a pension to Frances Delaplane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2172) for the relief of Thomas J. Sheppard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2173) for the relief of Charles R. Van Houten—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2174) for the relief of Anderson H. Ash—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2175) for the relief of Harry S. Kellogg, administrator of the estate of Lyman M. Kellogg—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2176) for the relief of Henry Alstaetter and others, members of Company K, Sixty-sixth Illinois Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2177) for the relief of the heirs at law and legal representatives of Asahel Bliss—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2178) granting a pension to James Beistle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2179) granting a pension to Robert Stoner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2180) granting an honorable discharge to Jeremiah Morgan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2181) granting an honorable discharge to Peter Lauterbur—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2182) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Charles Dawley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2183) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Edward Devene—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2184) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John Pifher—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2185) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Benjamin F. Womer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2186) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Charles W. Creager—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2187) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Charles F. Dietsch—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2188) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Charles G. Aldrich—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2189) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of William H. Stoke—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2190) to remove the charge of absent without leave, in desertion, from the record of Erwin M. Bergstresser—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2191) granting an honorable discharge to John Walsh—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2192) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Samuel Cole—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2193) to correct and amend the military record of Harrison Wagner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2194) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John J. Boston—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2195) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of James Burrows—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2196) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of George Gardener—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2197) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Valentine Zellers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2198) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Aaron Baughman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 2199) appropriating money to pay the claim of the Western Paving and Supply Company for paving streets adjacent to the post-office and court-house of the United States at Indianapolis, Ind.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2200) for the relief of Thomas F. Ryan—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2202) for the relief of William Allen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2203) to increase the pension of John M. Garrett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2204) for the relief of William O. Eagle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2205) providing procedure in certain pension cases—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 2207) for the relief of J. L. Combs—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2208) for the relief of John McKeon, of Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2209) for the relief of the estate of Catharine Crittenden, deceased, late of Culpeper County, Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2210) for the relief of the trustees of Ebenezer Methodist Episcopal Church, of Culpeper County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2211) for the relief of the estate of James T. Ball, deceased, late of Alexandria County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2212) for the relief of the vestry of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, of Culpeper County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2213) for the relief of Mrs. Lucy B. La grande—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2214) for the relief of the estate of Dr. Bailey Shumate, of Fauquier County, Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2215) for the relief of Basil W. Shoemaker, of Loudoun County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2216) for the relief of Mrs. T. V. Grasty—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2217) for the relief of the Accotink Home Guards—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2218) for the relief of the heirs of Tilghman Weaver, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2219) for the relief of Joseph C. Boxley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2220) for the relief of John H. Hammill, Prince William County, Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2221) for the relief of the trustees of Black Lick Church, in Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2222) for the relief of the trustees of Hartwood Presbyterian Church, of Stafford County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2223) for the relief of Catharine Makely—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2224) for the relief of Fairfax Lodge, No. 43, of Culpeper, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2225) for the relief of the estate of Francis and Thomas Coffer, deceased, late of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2226) to refer the claim of the heirs of Mrs. Sarah E. Smith, deceased, late of Stafford County, Va., to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2227) for the relief of James L. Carter—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2228) for relief of Sarah A. Skinner—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2229) for the relief of the trustees of Grove Presbyterian Church, of Fauquier County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2230) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Agnes B. Jeter—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2231) for the relief of the trustees of Berea Baptist Church, of Stafford County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2232) for the relief of Louis Weber—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2233) for the relief of the estate of William Smallwood, of Loudoun County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2234) for the relief of the heirs of Samuel Craig, deceased, late of Fauquier County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2235) for the relief of the trustees of Calvary Protestant Episcopal Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2236) for the relief of the First Baptist Church, of Alexandria, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2237) for relief of Sewell B. Corbett—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2238) for the relief of the Culpeper Baptist Church, at Culpeper, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2239) for the relief of James Q. Smith—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2240) for the relief of the trustees of the First Baptist Church, of Alexandria, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2241) for the relief of Thomas Lee—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2242) to correct the military record of William W. Giles, of Prince William County, Va.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2243) for the relief of Edgar E. Matthew—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2244) for the relief of the vestry of the Episcopal Church of Remington, Fauquier County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2245) for the relief of Mrs. Elvira Moore, executrix of J. L. Moore—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2246) for the relief of Paris Simms and others—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2247) to increase the pension of Mary Tate—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2248) for the relief of the heirs of James Broadus, of the Second Regiment of the Virginia Continental Line, in the war of the Revolution—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2249) to increase the pension of John J. Beauford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2250) for the relief of Malvina Maxwell, administratrix of John Churchman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2251) for the relief of John W. Beekley and others—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2252) for the relief of Charles H. Stunkle—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2253) for the relief of Sarah Summerson and Nancy J. Curley—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2254) for the relief of Thomas Antisell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2255) for the relief of the personal representative of William R. Soutter, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2256) for the relief of Granville J. Kelly—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2257) for the relief of Virginia E. Ficklin and James W. Ficklin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2258) for relief of the vestry of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, of Alexandria, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2259) to correct the military record of William F. Baldridge, of Culpeper County, Va.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2260) for the relief of Newton Woodyard—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2261) for the relief of James F. Arrington, of Staffords Store, Stafford County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2262) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of William N. Hough, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2263) to increase the pension of William Hall—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2264) for the relief of estate of Amos Jones, deceased, late of Stafford County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2265) for the relief of Seth R. Cooper, of Stafford County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2266) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas Tinder, deceased, late of Orange County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2267) for the relief of Mrs. Marian W. Pollard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2268) for relief of Miss L. E. Bowen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2269) for the relief of Rachel Dyer, of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2270) for the relief of the vestry of St. Stephen's Protestant Episcopal Church, of Culpeper, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2271) for the relief of the estate of J. R. Perry, deceased, late of Stafford County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2272) for the relief of Mrs. Fanny I. Grymes—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2273) for the relief of the heirs of Alexander Poland, late of Virginia—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2274) for the relief of Anna S. Froebel and Elizabeth D. Froebel—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2275) for the relief of the estate of Emanuel Wenner, deceased, late of Loudoun County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2276) for the relief of the trustees of New Salem Baptist Church, of Culpeper County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2277) for the relief of the heirs of Martin Matthew, deceased, late of Prince William County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2278) of Thomas and Savilla Denton Sherman for reference to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2279) for the relief of Septimus Brown—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2280) for the relief of John W. Fairfax—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2281) for the relief of the Presbyterian Church at Warrenton, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2282) for the relief of the vestry of Aquia Protestant Episcopal Church, of Stafford County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2283) granting a pension to Hannah Connor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2284) for the relief of the estate of Catharine Crittenden, deceased, late of Culpeper County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2285) for the relief of the estate of Maria Gibson, deceased, late of Culpeper County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2286) for the relief of Martin Maddux—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2287) for relief of Paris Simms and others—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2288) for the relief of the trustees Calvary Protestant Episcopal Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2289) for the relief of the trustees of the Grove Baptist Church, in Fauquier County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2290) for the relief of trustees of Mount Holly Baptist Church, of Fauquier County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2291) for the relief of the estate of Jane Taylor, of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2292) to compensate Arthur M. Chichester and W. B. Chichester, heirs of Mary Chichester, for her house burned by Federal troops in 1862—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2293) for the relief of George S. Ayre—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2294) for the relief of J. V. Davis, of Alexandria, Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2295) for the relief of the trustees of Fletcher Chapel, in King George County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2297) for the relief of William Knight, of Stafford County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2298) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Tate—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2299) for the relief of George O. Dixon and Ella Thomas Dixon, Arthur Dixon and Fannie Dixon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2300) for the relief of the heirs of Silas Burke, deceased, late of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2301) for the relief of the board of trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Arlington Heights, known as Hunter's Chapel—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2302) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Cawood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2303) to increase the pension of Mrs. L. M. Payne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2304) for the relief of the heirs of the late Mrs. Mary Ann Randolph Custis Lee, of Fairfax County, Va.—to ths Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2305) for the relief of Silas Grayson, late of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2306) for the relief of the estate of John Poland, deceased, late of Prince William County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2307) for the relief of Mrs. Lavinia M. Payne—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2308) for the relief of Melvina Maxwell, administratrix of John Churchman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2309) for the relief of John H. Redman, a citizen of King George County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2310) for the relief of the personal representative of Powhatan Perkins, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2311) for the relief of Isaac L. McInturf—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2312) for the relief of Mrs. Willie Belger Morse—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2313) to pension David McGee, of Louisa County, Va., alias David Woolfalk, late of Company I, Seventy-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, claim No. 1130952—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2314) for the relief of Amelia A. H. Richards, of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2315) for the relief of Mrs. Kate C. Rose, of King George County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2316) for the relief of Mrs. R. C. Jones, of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2317) for the relief of Charles H. Janney, administrator de bonis non of the estate of Joseph H. Maddox, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2318) for the relief of Stonewall Cockrill, of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2319) for the relief of legal representatives of James B. McNair, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2320) for the relief of Andrews Chapel, of Stafford County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 2321) granting an increase of pension to Horatio H. Warren—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SALMON: A bill (H. R. 2322) for the relief of Joshua Bishop—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 2323) for the relief of Cynthia Davis, dependent mother of Edger Davis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2324) removing the charge of desertion from the record of James Larkin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2325) for the relief of John H. Fralick—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2327) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Henry C. Tracy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2328) to remove charge of desertion standing against Ramsom Brodock—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2329) for the relief of Austin A. Yates—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIBLEY: A bill (H. R. 2330) for the recognition of the military services of the officers and enlisted men of certain Pennsylvania military organizations—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 2331) to increase the pension of Festus Dickinson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2332) for the relief of J. V. Worley—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2333) for the benefit of H. C. Ruth—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2334) to remove the charge of desertion against Elias C. Phillips—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2335) for the relief of James Kirby, late of Company B, Sixth Tennessee Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2336) for the relief of B. F. Walpole—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2337) for the relief of Cullen C. Argo—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2338) to remove charge of desertion against John Riggs, and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2339) to pension Robert M. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2340) to amend the military record of John H. Skinner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2341) to muster William H. Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2342) for the relief of James M. Brandon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2343) for the relief of E. A. Clark—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2344) for the relief of Charles M. Kennerly—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2345) for the relief of Zylpha Watson, widow of James M. Hays, late a private in Company C, Seventh Tennessee Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2346) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James Quinn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2347) for the relief of J. M. Elston, of Madison County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2348) for the relief of the estate of John Richards, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2349) for the relief of Benjamin F. Bennett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2350) to pension James M. Adair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2351) for relief of John Wade—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2352) to muster in certain members of Col. Frank W. Harrison's regiment of West Tennessee recruits and to grant them an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2353) for the relief of Thomas Cary—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2354) for the relief of M. Robison, administrator of T. E. Robison, deceased, late of Henderson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2355) to amend the military record of John H. Skinner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2356) for the relief of Hiram Johnson and others—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 2357) for the relief of A. T. Hensley, survivor of Fulton & Hensley, doing business under the name of Lavaca Wharf Company—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2358) for the relief of D. W. Hatch, of San Antonio, Tex.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 2359) granting a pension to John Logsdon, of Kentucky—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2360) granting a pension to Rufus Helms, of Kentucky—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A bill (H. R. 2361) granting a pension to Matthew Bier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPALDING: A bill (H. R. 2362) granting a pension to B. H. Brasted—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2363) authorizing the restoration of the name of Thomas H. Carpenter, late captain, Seventeenth United States Infantry, to the rolls of the Army, and providing that he be placed on the list of retired officers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPRAGUE: A bill (H. R. 2364) for the relief of the First National Bank of Newton, Mass.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2365) granting a pension to Mrs. Clifford Neff Fyffe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2366) granting an increase of pension to Dexter B. Freeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2367) for the relief of Agnes W. Hills and Sarah J. Hills—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2368) for the relief of George P. Wood—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2369) to provide for promoting Capt. John C. White, late of the First United States Artillery, now on the retired list, to the rank of major in the same—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2370) granting a pension to Mrs. Caroline Vincent—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2371) for the relief of Carl B. Peterson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2372) granting a pension to David Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2373) for the relief of Horace P. Williams—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2374) granting a pension to Mary Richard Gore—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2375) for the relief of Richard Flaherty—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2376) for the relief of James A. Stewart—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2377) granting a pension to Mathilda Swenson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2378) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of Samuel Svenson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2379) for the relief of Winslow Warren—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STARK: A bill (H. R. 2380) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Lewis, of Stockham, county of Hamilton, Nebr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 2381) for the relief of Edgar Carson, private and sergeant, Company E, Fifty-eighth Indiana Volunteers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2382) granting a pension to Eli Overhultz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2383) for the relief of the Miami Indians of Indiana—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 2384) for the restoration to the Navy of Frederick Swanstrom—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2385) for the relief of William N. Carey—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 2386) for the relief of Alphonso M. Potvin, late of Colon, Republic of Colombia—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2387) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Chick and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2388) granting a pension to Ellen M. Gray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2389) granting an increase of pension to Edward Boyle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2390) granting a pension to Helen B. Putnam—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2391) granting a pension to Elizabeth R. Holt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2392) granting a pension to Daniel Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2393) granting a pension to Samuel A. Page—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2394) to restore Edward L. Bailey to the United States Army and to place him on the retired list with the rank of captain of infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2395) granting an increase of pension to Mathew McDonald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2396) granting an increase of pension to Francis H. Pike—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2397) granting a pension to Eliza S. Redfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2398) granting a pension to Andrew Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2399) granting an increase of pension to Edward McDuffey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2400) granting an increase of pension to George W. Carr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2401) granting an increase of pension to Maggie Black—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2402) granting an increase of pension to Norman C. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2403) granting a pension to Charles W. Bean—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2404) granting a pension to Maria A. Watson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2405) granting an increase of pension to James G. McClure—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2406) granting an increase of pension to David H. Bean—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2407) granting a pension to Samantha B. Van Brocklin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2408) granting a pension to Emma L. Worthly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2409) granting an increase of pension to Frank C. Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 2410) to complete the record of John T. Nagle, late assistant surgeon of the One hundred and ninety-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2411) to grant John T. Nagle the privilege of applying for a medal of honor for conspicuous bravery in action while serving as an acting assistant surgeon of the United States Army with troops in the field during the late civil war, under the orders of commanding officers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2412) to reappoint S. A. Russel a captain in the Army, and to place him on the retired list, in addition to the number now authorized—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2413) for the relief of Frank Cox—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2414) for the relief of John A. Mason, collector of internal revenue, second district of New York, for value of stamps destroyed by fire—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 2415) for the relief of John Peterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2416) for the relief of Abram Hammond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2417) granting a pension to Christena Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2418) for the relief of John H. Cliffton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2419) to correct the military record of John Minahan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2420) for the relief of Josephus Merritt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2421) to correct the military record of Nathan Monroe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2422) for the relief of William Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2423) for the relief of Daniel F. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2424) for the relief of William S. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2425) to correct the military record of William M. McElvain—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2426) for the relief of Henry B. Simons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2427) to correct the military record of James H. Foland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2428) to increase the pension of Anthony Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2429) for the relief of William B. Parsons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2430) for the relief of Jacob L. Hanger, alias William T. Graham—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2431) to correct the military record of C. W. Noell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2432) granting a pension to Elizabeth Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TERRY: A bill (H. R. 2433) for the relief of the administrator of Mr. W. R. Wooten, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2434) for the relief of estate of Reese Pritchard—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2435) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of Powell E. Hogue, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2436) for the relief of James M. Wright, of Logan County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2437) to correct the muster rolls of Company K, Second Arkansas Cavalry, as concerns Isaac Thompson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2438) granting a pension to William H. Ledford—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2439) for the relief of Mrs. Sallie Brown, of Johnson County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2440) to correct the military record of William B. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2441) for relief of estate of Joshua Hill—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2442) for the relief of the estate of John A. McDaniel, of Pulaski County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2443) to amend the military record of J. R. Utley, late private of Company D, Third Arkansas Cavalry, United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2444) for the relief of the estate Elias N. Conway, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2445) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of Warren Drake, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2446) granting a pension to William J. Bristow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2447) for relief of the estate of Charles Labell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THAYER: A bill (H. R. 2448) granting arrears of pension to William H. Cummings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2449) granting an increase of pension to Cutler D. Sanborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2450) granting a pension to William T. Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2451) for the relief of Charlotte L. Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TATE: A bill (H. R. 2452) for the relief of Alexander M. Mauldin, of Georgia—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2453) to increase the pension of Bedney F. McDonald, of Hall County, Ga.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2454) to pension John C. Chastain—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 2455) for the relief of W. C. Taylor, of Mobile, Ala.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2456) for the relief of the heirs and assignees of Philip McLoskey and John Hagan—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: A bill (H. R. 2457) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Alfred Hall—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2458) granting a pension to Charles F. Hamme—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2459) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George Anderson Casedy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2460) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Porcella—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2461) to remove the charge of desertion from the naval record of James A. McElroy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2462) for the relief of Theodore D. McCaddon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2463) to grant an honorable discharge to John A. White—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2464) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Nicholas Swingle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2465) to grant an honorable discharge to George W. Shank—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2466) for the relief of D. M. Sprague and William Tilton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2467) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Christopher Parish—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2468) granting an honorable discharge to John A. Young—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2469) for the relief of Guernsey County, Ohio—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2470) granting a pension to Francis R. Barthalow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2471) for the relief of Columbus F. Hayward and the executor of Charlotte G. Hayward—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2472) to correct the military record of John H. Finfrock—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2473) granting a pension to Mary J. Fouts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 2474) providing for the adjudication of certain claims by the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2475) granting a pension to Hannah R. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZENOR: A bill (H. R. 2476) granting a pension to Lucinda Heith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2477) granting an increase of pension to George H. Pennington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2478) for the relief of Aaron M. Applegate—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2479) to reimburse the city of New Albany, Ind.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2480) granting a pension to William W. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2481) for the relief of John R. Watson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2482) granting a pension to George Washington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2483) to relieve Alice Utz, heir and legatee of Joshua Wiley, and to give the Court of Claims jurisdiction, and to remove the bar of statute of limitations—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2484) to restore the pension of Robert E. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2485) granting a pension to Joseph Verney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2486) to correct the military record of William F. Songer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2487) granting a pension to Mrs. Nancy Thurman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2488) for the relief of James J. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2489) granting a pension to John Stephens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2490) granting an increase of pension to Wiley R. Reeves—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2491) granting a pension to Mrs. Ellen Quinn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2492) for the relief of William H. Pfrimmer—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2493) to grant a pension to Philip H. Odell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2494) for the relief of Hugh J. Needham—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2495) for the relief of the nonenlisted officers and members of the crews of the Mississippi Ram Fleet and Marine Brigade—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2496) granting a pension to David Melton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2497) granting a pension to Franklin McCabe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2498) granting a pension to John McIntyre—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2499) to grant a pension to Nathan N. Morgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2500) granting a pension to Louisa Marsh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2501) granting a pension to William Mathers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2502) granting an increase of pension to James W. Manly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2503) to grant a pension to Philo Lynch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2504) granting a pension to James H. Land—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2505) granting a pension to Mrs. Abby Kent—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2506) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Kemper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2507) for the relief of the legal representatives of Hicks King, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2508) granting a pension to William R. Knibbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2509) granting a pension to Hugh Kelly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2510) granting a pension to Hardin Howe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2511) granting a pension to William Howell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2512) granting a pension to Elizabeth Hollis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2513) granting a pension to Catherine Hogg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2514) granting a pension to John Hammond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2515) granting a pension to Henry T. Hatfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2516) granting an increase of pension to John Hoffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2517) for the relief of George Heishman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2518) granting a pension to Elias W. Gresham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2519) granting a pension to Henry Graybrook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2520) granting a pension to James Faulkenborough—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2521) to grant a pension to Capt. Richard F. Fuller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2522) granting a pension to Wilson Daniel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2523) to grant a pension to Henry W. Conrad—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2524) granting a pension to James Condra—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2525) to correct the military record of James Colvin, late a first lieutenant in Company C, Thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteers, and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2526) granting a pension to Margaret Bomke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2527) granting an increase of pension to David Briggs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2528) granting pension to Martha Brisco—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2529) granting a pension to Andrew P. Batson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2530) granting a pension to Henry Bott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2531) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Beeler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMB: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 54) directing a suitable shaft to be placed at the grave of John Tyler—to the Committee on the Library.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: Petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, for the establishment of an American merchant marine to promote commerce and increase the foreign trade of the United States—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the clerks of the Railway Mail Service of the Second Congressional district of Pennsylvania, for the reclassification of the Railway Mail Service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BELL: Petition of Elbert County Cattle Growers' Association and other citizens of the State of Colorado, against the passage of the bill ceding arid lands to Colorado—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: Petition of the heirs of Fannie Allen, of Cross County, Ark., praying reference of her war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Robert G. Netherland, of Hawkins County, Tenn., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DALZELL: Paper to accompany House bill for the erection of a statue to Samuel Hahneman—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolutions of the Southern Cotton Spinners' Association, in favor of the construction of a cable from the Pacific coast to Hawaii, Japan, China, the Philippines, and oriental points, and other measures—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., urging the promotion of the ocean carrying trade in vessels under the American flag—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petition of the survivors of the One hundred and sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, praying for the enactment of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Petition of Sylvanus Mallette and 10 citi-

zens of Bridgman, Mich., in favor of the passage of a pure-food bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of railway postal clerks asking for the reclassification of the Railway Mail Service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. McCLEARY: Paper relating to a constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOON: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Thomas Hardin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill to muster and muster out home guards—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Jacob Cross—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIXEY: Papers to accompany House bill relating to the claim of Stonewall Cockrill—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Cynthia Davis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Mrs. H. B. Case and 25 others, of Rome, N. Y., relating to the sale and importation of cigarettes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Utica, N. Y., with reference to the tariff between the United States and the Dominion of Canada—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHOWALTER: Paper relating to a constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of A. T. Hensley—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEELE: Petition of the Society of Christian Endeavor of Grant County, Ind., in favor of international arbitration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Holiday & Richards, in behalf of the Scripps-McRae Press Association, for representation on the floor of the House and Senate for news-gathering purposes—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Petition of citizens of St. Croix Valley, Minn., praying for an appropriation of $35,000 for the improvement of the St. Croix River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of the St. Paul Chamber of Commerce, in regard to freedom of private property on the sea from capture in time of war—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *December 6, 1899.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899; which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the annual report of the Attorney-General for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899; which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS BY COURT OF CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a statement of all judgments rendered by that court for the year ended November 29, 1899; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

INDIAN DEPREDATION CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Attorney-General, transmitting, pursuant to the provision of section 8 of the act of March 3, 1891, a list of judgments rendered in favor of claimants and against the United States and defendant Indian tribes not heretofore appropriated for; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations, and ordered to be printed.

THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, transmitting a report on the new building for the Government Printing Office; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF PUBLIC PRINTER.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Public Printer, transmitting the annual report of the operations of the Government Printing Office for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899; which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF THE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the annual report of the Librarian of Congress for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899; which was referred to the Committee on the Library, and ordered to be printed.

THE CONGRESSIONAL LIBRARY BUILDING.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the annual report of the superintendent of the Library building and grounds for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899; which was referred to the Committee on the Library, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF SECRETARY OF SENATE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the annual report of the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting a full and complete statement of the receipts and expenditures of the Senate and the exact condition of all public moneys received, paid out, and remaining in his possession from July 1, 1898, to June 30, 1899; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting a full and complete account of all the property, including stationery, belonging to the United States in his possession on the 4th day of December, 1899; which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

REPORTS OF SERGEANT-AT-ARMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate, giving a full and complete account of all property belonging to the United States in his possession December 4, 1899; which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate, transmitting a statement of all receipts from sale of condemned property in his possession; which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

EXPENDITURES AT SPRINGFIELD ARMORY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a statement of the expenditures at the Springfield Armory, Springfield, Mass., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF FISH AND FISHERIES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the annual report of the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899; which was referred to the Committee on Fisheries, and ordered to be printed.

ARMOR FOR NAVAL VESSELS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy relative to the procurement of armor for naval vessels, inclosing certain data and information collated and arranged by the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance; which, on motion of Mr. HALE, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and, with the accompanying papers, ordered to be printed.

SENATOR FROM WEST VIRGINIA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented the depositions of R. W. Morrow and sundry other citizens of West Virginia, witnesses on behalf of John T. McGraw, against the title of Hon. NATHAN B. SCOTT to a seat in the United States Senate; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a petition of the legislative assembly of the Territory of Arizona, praying that that Territory be admitted into the Union as a State; which was referred to the Committee on Territories, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TERRITORY OF ARIZONA, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Territory of Arizona, ss:

I, Charles H. Akers, secretary of the Territory of Arizona, do hereby certify that the annexed is a true and complete transcript of the house memorial No. 2 of the legislative assembly of the Territory of Arizona, praying for statehood, which was filed in this office the 11th day of March, A. D. 1899, at 4 o'clock p. m., as provided by law.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal. Done at the city of Phœnix, the capital, this 11th day of March, A. D. 1899.

[SEAL.] CHARLES H. AKERS,
Secretary of the Territory of Arizona.

House memorial No. 2.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the twentieth legislative assembly of the Territory of Arizona in session, respectfully beg leave to re-present to your honorable bodies:

That Arizona has been in Territorial vassalage for nearly thirty-five years; that it has the wealth, the population, and that the population has the intelligence requisite to self-government; that the people of this Territory without regard to political affiliation or association are in favor of early admission to statehood, and your memorialists earnestly pray that Arizona be speedily admitted to statehood.

That the secretary of the Territory is hereby directed to forward a copy of this memorial, one to the honorable President of the Senate, one to the honorable Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and one to our Delegate in Congress.

E. M. WILLIAMS,
Speaker of the House pro tempore.
MORRIS GOLDWATER,
President of the Council.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a petition of the legislative assembly of the Territory of Arizona, praying for the enactment of legislation increasing the per diem of legislators in that Territory from $4 to $8; which was referred to the Committee on Territories, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TERRITORY OF ARIZONA, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *Territory of Arizona, ss:*

I, Charles H. Akers, secretary of the Territory of Arizona, do hereby certify that the annexed is a true and complete transcript of the House memorial No. 6, of the legislative assembly of the Territory of Arizona, asking for increase per diem of legislators from $4 to $8, which was filed in this office the 11th day of March, A. D. 1899, at 4 o'clock p. m., as provided by law.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal. Done at the city of Phœnix, the capital, this 11th day of March, A. D. 1899.

[SEAL.] CHARLES H. AKERS,
Secretary of the Territory of Arizona.

House memorial No. 6.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

Your memorialist, the legislative assembly of the Territory of Arizona, most respectfully represent that—

Since June 19, 1878, the date at which the compensation of members of the legislative assembly of this Territory was fixed at $4 per day, the population and business of the Territory have doubled many times, and the legislative business of the Territory has so increased, and the work of the legislators has also so much increased and the need for legislation so enlarged that it has become absolutely burdensome to members to do the legislative work and defray their expenses meantime as the same is demanded; that those who accept the position to serve as a member of that body do it at a loss, and in consequence thereof it has become hard to induce people to accept the position. Therefore, for future legislation in this Territory, your memorialists would most respectfully ask your honorable body to raise the per diem of legislators in this Territory from $4 to $8, as the necessity now so demands; and in duty bound your memorialists will ever be to you etc.

That the Secretary of the Territory is hereby directed to forward a copy of this memorial, one to honorable President of the Senate, one to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and one to our Delegate in Congress.

E. H. WILLIAMS,
Speaker of the House pro tempore.
MORRIS GOLDWATER,
President of the Council.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a petition of the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, praying that an appropriation of $25,000 be made annually for the establishment of a school of mines situate at Socorro in that Territory; which was referred to the Committee on Territories, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TERRITORY OF NEW MEXICO, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

CERTIFICATE.

I, George H. Wallace, secretary of the Territory of New Mexico, do hereby certify there was filed for record in this office, at — o'clock — m. on the 16th day of March, A. D. 1899, council joint memorial No. 6 of the Thirty-third legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, and also that I have compared the following copy of the same with the original thereof now on file and declare it to be a correct transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal this 17th day of May, A. D. 1899.

[SEAL.] GEO. H. WALLACE,
Secretary of New Mexico.

Council joint memorial No. 6.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Whereas the mining and mineral resources of the Territory of New Mexico have not heretofore received the attention which they should have received, for the want of sufficient funds for the proper scientific investigation of the same; and

Whereas the Territory of New Mexico has a well-established school of mines, with proper buildings and appliances, situate at the city of Socorro, in said Territory: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico:

SECTION 1. That Congress is hereby memorialized to appropriate and set aside the sum of $25,000 annually, to be expended under and by direction of the said New Mexico School of Mines, in scientific research, investigation, and development of all the mining resources of whatsoever kind within the Territory of New Mexico; and that said sum of $25,000 be so set aside and appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the board of trustees of said school of mines, in connection with any and all appropriations made for similar purposes, to said school of mines, by the Territory of New Mexico.

SEC. 2. That the secretary of the Territory of New Mexico is hereby directed to transmit authenticated copies of this memorial to the Secretary of the Interior, to the President of the Senate of the United States, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved this 16th day of March, A. D. 1899.

MIGUEL A. OTERO,
Governor of the Territory of New Mexico.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a petition of the legislative assembly of the Territory of Arizona, praying that an appropriation be made for continuing the work of ascertaining the depth of bed rock at a place on the Gila River known as the Buttes, in that Territory; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TERRITORY OF ARIZONA, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Territory of Arizona, ss:

I, Charles H. Akers, secretary of the Territory of Arizona, do hereby certify that the annexed is a true and complete transcript of the memorial No. 7 of the twentieth legislative assembly of the Territory of Arizona to the Congress of the United States, which was filed in this office the 13th day of March, A. D. 1899, at 3 o'clock p. m., as provided by law.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal. Done at the city of Phœnix, the capital, this 13th day of March, A. D. 1899.

[SEAL.] CHARLES H. AKERS,
Secretary of the Territory of Arizona.

No. 7.

To the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialist, the twentieth legislative assembly of the Territory of Arizona, respectfully represent—

That your memorialist greatly appreciate the action of your honorable body in appropriating the sum of $20,000, or so much thereof as might be necessary, to ascertain the depth of bed rock at a place on the Gila River in Arizona known as the Buttes, and to ascertain the feasibility and ascertaining in detail the cost of the construction of a dam across the river at that point as prayed for by a memorial of the nineteenth legislative assembly of this Territory.

Your memorialist further represents that work under that appropriation (Fifty-fifth Congress, section 2, chapter 545) is now in active progress, and that the results therefrom are of the most satisfactory and gratifying character.

That for the purpose of continuing such work, your memorialist prays that your honorable body will make all necessary appropriations.

Your memorialist respectfully refers your honorable body to the memorial of the nineteenth session of the legislative assembly of the Territory of Arizona, to Senate Document No. 27, Fifty-fourth Congress, second session, and to the reports of those having charge of the work now in progress.

Resolved, That the secretary of the Territory be, and is hereby, instructed to transmit a copy of the foregoing memorial to our Delegate in Congress, and also a copy each to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

HENRY F. ASHURST,
Speaker of the House.
MORRIS GOLDWATER,
President of the Council.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a petition of the legislature of Wisconsin, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to give to Congress concurrent jurisdiction with the several States for the suppression of trusts and other combinations to control production, stifle competition, and to regulate for their own benefit the price of products and the wages of labor; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the legislative assembly of the Territory of Oklahoma, praying for the enactment of legislation granting to the city of Elreno, in that Territory, certain lands to be used by the people of Canadian County as a public burial ground; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented memorials of the Deutscher Turn Verein of Grand Rapids, Mich.; of the Aurora Turn Verein of Chicago, Ill., and of the Harlem Turn Verein of New York, remonstrating against the continuance of the war in the Philippines; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Encampment No. 1, Union Veteran Legion, of Pittsburg, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to control or abolish trusts and combinations; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry members of the congregation of the Central Presbyterian Church of Lebanon, Ohio, expressing their abhorrence of war and praying for the enactment of legislation making war impossible; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the memorial of J. Edward Buckley, exacting United States vice-consul-general, of New Orleans, La., remonstrating against the unpardonable wrongs committed against American citizens in a foreign country; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented sundry petitions of citizens of Salina, Beaver, Salt Lake City, Ephraim, Richfield, Logan, Mendon, Provo, Spanish Fork, Springville, Murray, and Salem, all in the State of Utah, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petitions of Rev. S. H. Beale and 12 other

citizens of Camden; of Rev. A. K. Bryant and 80 other citizens of Sanford; of Rev. Henry M. Perkins and 34 other citizens of Union; of John R. Clifford and 75 other citizens of Woodford, and of A. L. Struthers and 47 other citizens of South Gardiner, all in the State of Maine, and of the General Missionary Committee of the Methodist Episcopal Church, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McMILLAN presented a concurrent resolution of the legislature of Michigan, relative to the treatment of the Finnish people by the Russian Government; which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

MICHIGAN, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, LANSING.

I, Justus S. Stearns, secretary of state of the State of Michigan, do hereby certify that the annexed copy of a concurrent resolution of the legislature of 1899 is a true and correct transcript of the original, which is on file in the department of state.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Michigan, at Lansing, this 12th day of June, in the year of our Lord 1899.

[SEAL.] J. S. STEARNS, *Secretary of State.*

Concurrent resolution.

Whereas the American people remain unalterably and uncompromisingly opposed to all forms of oppression and political usurpation; and

Whereas the American people have always entertained the most profound sympathy for every people of whatever race, nationality, or creed, in their efforts to secure and preserve self-government and to maintain inviolate all their civil, political, and religious liberties; and

Whereas upon the conquest of Finland by Russia in 1809, in the "act of assurance," Alexander I most solemnly and sacredly promised "to conform and ratify the religion and fundamental laws of the country (Finland), together with the privileges and rights according to the constitution" and "to rule this honest people according to their laws and to the inviolable order of eternal justice;" and as solemnly and sacredly pledged himself and his successors to preserve to the people of Finland the full measure of autonomy and local self-government then enjoyed; and furthermore at each succeeding coronation. Nicholas I, Alexander II, Alexander III, and the present Nicholas II, upon taking the title of Grand Duke of Finland, have respectively ratified and reaffirmed in every particular the said act of assurance; and

Whereas under the union consummated by the act of assurance the prosperity and advancement of the Finnish people in material well-being and civilization, with its accompanying sciences, arts, and moral culture, has not only surpassed that of any other portion of the Russian Empire, but has been the wonder, the marvel, and the admiration of the civilized world; and

Whereas within a few months from the date on which Czar Nicholas II promulgated to the world the now famous peace message, the Russian Government, by a special ukase, abrogated the act of assurance, abolished the Finnish constitution, and destroyed the autonomy of the Grand Duchy of Finland, and now proposes to extend the term of military service and to increase the quota of Finnish conscript for the standing army fourfold and proportionately augment the Finnish military budget: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That we express our profound and heartfelt sympathy for the downtrodden people of Finland in their present hour of darkest trouble, and with admiration approve their efforts to preserve to themselves and to their posterity inviolate and undiminished their hereditary and fundamental rights and privileges—the proud heritage of seven centuries of progressive development; and be it further

Resolved, That in view of the fact that the whole purpose and tenor of the ukase and proposed legislation for Finland respecting military affairs is incompatible and irreconcilable with the professed purpose and spirit of the peace conference to be held at The Hague, we respectfully but urgently request President McKinley to instruct our commissioners to the peace conference to express, in case the opportunity presents itself, the disapproval of the people of the United States of the policy of the Russian Government in its present administration of civil and military affairs in Finland; and be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully but earnestly and urgently request President McKinley, through our duly accredited representative at the Court of St. Petersburg, if not inconsistent with public interest, to express to the Government of the Czar the serious concern of the Government of the United States because of the abrogation of the act of assurance of Alexander I, sacredly ratified and reaffirmed by each of his successors, the abolition of the ancient Finnish constitution, and the consequent destruction of Finnish autonomy; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit a certified copy of these resolutions to President McKinley and our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

ORRIN W. ROBINSON,
President of the Senate.
E. J. ADAMS,
Speaker of the House.

Approved June 7, 1899.
H. S. PINGREE, *Governor.*

Mr. McMILLAN presented a petition of the city council of Traverse City, Mich., praying that an appropriation be made providing for the erection of a breakwater at that city; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Union Farmers' Club, of Union City, Mich., praying for the adoption of a rural free mail delivery system; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented sundry petitions of the humane societies of Kalamazoo, Detroit, and Kent County, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the passage of a bill prohibiting vivisection in the District of Columbia and the Territories; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented petitions of the White Leake Farmers' Club, of Rose; of sundry citizens of New Haven, and of sundry other citizens, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Ministerial Association of Saginaw, Mich., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit polygamy, and also that the sale of intoxicating liquors be forbidden in premises used for military purposes in the United States; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented the petitions of J. A. Rogers and 67 other citizens of Greensburg, C. S. Minter and 19 other citizens of Evansville, W. L. Sullivan and 78 other citizens of Evansville, J. N. King and 75 other citizens of Topeka, Dr. E. E. Long and 67 other citizens of Shoals, T. J. Reder and 39 other citizens of Avon, M. F. Warner and 31 other citizens of Round Grove, W. D. Wallace and 20 other citizens of Lafayette, George W. Bass and 30 other citizens of Mooresville, E. R. Brown and 147 other citizens of Monticello, Edward Campbell and 41 other citizens of Ossian, and of the Methodist Ministerial Association of Indianapolis, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FOSTER presented a petition of the legislature of Washington, praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the Upper Columbia River; which was read and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

House memorial No. 9.

To the honorable the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the house of representatives and the senate of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent:

Whereas the question of transportation of cereals and other products of the farm, mines, and pastoral pursuits and fruit culture of all that section of our State in the north central portion thereof east of the Cascade range is of very great importance; and

Whereas the Columbia River can be made navigable for more than 100 miles by the expenditure of a small amount of money at Priest Rock Island, Orondo, and Methon Rapids; and

Whereas a great demand exists for the improvement of said river at said places: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That your memorialists most respectfully and earnestly urge that your honorable bodies favor such legislation as will hasten the opening of said river to navigation by removing natural obstructions at said rapids, which will greatly aid transportation of persons and products in a territory three times as large as the State of Connecticut.

Resolved further, That your memorialists request of our Senators and Representatives in the national Senate and House of Representatives to press this matter before our National Legislature, and urge upon it the necessity of immediate legislation that will afford the long-prayed-for relief sought, and that a copy of this memorial be sent to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress and to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House.

And this your memorialists ever pray.

Passed the house February 25, 1899.

E. HEISTER GULL,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate March 3, 1899.

THURSTON DANIELS,
President of the Senate.

Mr. PENROSE presented petitions of 20 citizens of Catasauqua 125 citizens of Sandy Lake, 54 citizens of Abington, 68 citizens of Downingtown, 28 citizens of Leasuresville, 48 citizens of Centerville, 22 citizens of Glen Hazel, 190 citizens of Philadelphia, 71 citizens of Harrisburg, 60 citizens of Northeast, 42 citizens of Wellsboro, 60 citizens of North Clarendon; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the First Presbyterian Church, the congregation of the United Brethren Church, the Young People's Christian Union, members of the Methodist Episcopal Church and of the Epworth League, all of Rixford; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of East Stroudsburg; of the Preachers' Meeting of York; of 300 members of the Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, of Warren; of 1,980 citizens of Philadelphia; 600 citizens of Indiana, 410 citizens of Altoona, 345 citizens of Troy, 325 citizens of Washington, 313 citizens of Alexandria, 295 citizens of Tyrone, 255 citizens of Phillipsburg, 249 citizens of New Wilmington, 212 citizens of West Grove, 200 citizens of Sigel, 200 citizens of Columbia, 200 citizens of Claysville, 169 citizens of Swickley, 161 citizens of West Newton, 156 citizens of Wilmerding, 125 citizens of Reedsville, 125 citizens of McKeesport, 131 citizens of Harford, 126 citizens of Penfield, 120 citizens of Ulysses, 120 citizens of Rock Spring, 120 citizens of Shickshinny, 115 citizens of Carbondale, 112 citizens of Leraysville, 111 citizens of Apollo, 110 citizens of Stoneboro, 110 citizens of Elkland, 101 citizens of Butler, 92 citizens of Slipperyrock, 92 citizens of Johnstown, 89 citizens of Mahanoy, 85 citizens of Mount Union, 81 citizens of Shippensville, 80 citizens of Reading, 71 citizens of Sinking Valley, 60 citizens of Norrisville, 54 citizens of Narberth, 70 citizens of Kane, 66 citizens of Fredonia, 57 citizens of Pen Argyl, 50 citizens of Centerville, 48 citizens of Tioga, 43 citizens of Rebersburg, 40 citizens of Harlansburg, 85 citizens of Mount Carmel, 20 citizens of Cannonsburg, 20 citizens of Catasauqua, 20 citizens of Danville, 19 citizens of Pittsburg, 18 citizens of Upland, 13 citizens of Oakmont, 11 citizens of Rochester, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DAVIS presented the petitions of W. G. Hazelton and sundry other citizens of Richwood, P. J. McRea and sundry other citizens of Harrison, A. L. Bryant and sundry other citizens of Anoka, Edwin Deacon and sundry other citizens of Kimball, Rev. H. A. Ackerman and sundry other citizens of Delavan, H. S. Curry and sundry other citizens of Hutchinson, C. Gertson and sundry other citizens of Hutchinson, Wilbur Fish and sundry other citizens of Freeborn, J. S. Taylor and sundry other citizens of Minneapolis, T. D. Pierce and sundry other citizens of Minneapolis, J. F. Kates and sundry other citizens of Winona, Adolph Gillerson and sundry other citizens of Canby, Rev. D. L. Schrode and sundry other citizens of Kenyon, A. B. Robbins and sundry other citizens of Robbinsdale, E. W. Day and sundry other citizens of Edgerton, J. F. Tainter and sundry other citizens of Rochester, A. D. Hopkins and sundry other citizens of Buffalo, H. L. Merrill and sundry other citizens of Hutchinson, and Rev. Fred W. Hart and sundry other citizens of Hutchinson, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committeee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GALLINGER presented the petitions of Charles W. Hubbard and sundry other citizens of East Sullivan; of S. S. White and sundry other citizens of Sullivan; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Charlestown; the Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Lancaster; Charles S. Murkland and sundry other citizens of Durham; Lyman D. Bragg and sundry other citizens; Rev. G. H. French and sundry other citizens of West Moreland; Rev. John S. Curtis and sundry citizens of Hopkinton; C. H. Fox and sundry other citizens; Horatio E. Wilson and sundry other citizens of Rochester, and of S. McLaughlin and sundry other citizens of Manchester, all in the State of New Hampshire; of the Woman's Missionary Home Association of Jamaica Plain, Mass.; and of the General Missionary Committee of the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of North Charlestown, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to restore prohibition to Alaska and to extend it to our dependencies; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of North Charlestown, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Soldiers' Homes, immigrant stations, and other public buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented sundry petitions of citizens of Brooklyn, New York, Poughkeepsie, Babylon, Victory, Eden, Cherry Creek, Webster, Penfield, Pelham Manor, Rochester, Oneonta, Orchard Park, Mount Vernon, Utica, Crary Mills, East Aurora, Auburn, Bedford, Spencer, Olean, Fleming, Kendaia, Owasco Lake, Mapleton, Sherburne, Troy, Howlett Hill, Irvington on the Hudson, Palmyra, West Chazy, Lima, Worcester, Conden, Tully, Seneca Castle, Howard, Florida, Nichols, Stamford, McGrawville, Ovid, Spencerport, Arkport, Turin, Syracuse, East Groveland, Richfield Springs, Johnsonville, Westfield, Ledyard, Virgil, Clifton Springs, Groton, Croton Falls, Chester, Bay Shore, Owego, Carmel, Ogdensburg, Brooklyn, Perry, Cayuga, Milton, Skaneateles, Morris, Utica, Rockland County, Brockport, Johnstown, Elbridge, Downsville, Fulton, North Bergen, Verona, Franklinville, Olean, Canaan, Collamer, Sherman, Sunside, East Durham, Cairo, Acra, Frumansburg, Sands Lake, Palisades, and Sennet, of the congregations of the West Presbyterian Church of Binghamton and of the Emmanuel Baptist Church of Buffalo, and of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Auburn, all in the State of New York, and of the general committee of the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. THURSTON presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Jamestown, of sundry citizens of Mapleville, and of members of the Union Sunday School of Jamestown, all in the State of Nebraska, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Soldiers' Homes and buildings and grounds owned by the Government; which were referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented petitions of 57 citizens of Aurora, 153 citizens of Adams, 77 citizens of Indianola, 63 citizens of Minden, 40 citizens of University Place, 20 citizens of Wakefield, 55 citizens of Wayne, 105 citizens of Humboldt, 87 citizens of Clay Center, 101 citizens of Chambers, 22 citizens of Benedict, 51 citizens of Peru, 43 citizens of Cambridge, 57 citizens of Palmyra, 61 citizens of Nebraska, 29 citizens of Tekamah, 81 citizens of Norman, 73 citizens of Ragan, 34 citizens of Pawnee, 160 citizens of Kearney, 122 citizens of Omaha, 63 citizens of Ord and Mira Creek, 133 citizens of Fairmont, 52 citizens of Hendley, 47 citizens of Colon, 47 citizens of Mount Clare and Lawrence, 110 citizens of North Platte, 103 citizens of Lexington, 16 citizens of Bertrand, 38 citizens of Bookwalter, 54 citizens of Odell, 42 citizens of Holdrege, and of 23 citizens of Lyons, all in the State of Nebraska, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HOAR presented sundry petitions of citizens of Massachusetts, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the National Business Men's League, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a gold income and to strengthen the public credit to meet all emergencies; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation making the act of lynching a crime against the United States; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the National Business Men's League, praying for the enactment of legislation declaring that the sovereignty of the United States over the Philippine Islands should be maintained until such a time as Congress may determine, in the interests of the United States, while preserving American free institutions unsullied and in strict justice to the people of those islands, with a view of erecting a government by the people with a protectorate of the United States or final admission to the Union; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petition of Ellis Norris, of Cambridge, Mass., praying that he be granted a pension on account of injuries received while acting as steward on the steamer *John Hunter*; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Revere, of sundry citizens of Cambridgeport, Roslindale, South Amherst, Halifax, Monterey, Holden, West Medford, Andover, Chelsea, Falmouth, Chesterfield, Easthampton, Norfolk, City Mills, Rockwell, Sandwich, and Leominster; of Francis S. Davis and sundry other citizens of Acton; of George L. Richmond and sundry other citizens of Amesbury, and of the congregation of the Congregational Church and members of the Christian Endeavor Society of North Middleboro, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURROWS presented the petitions of Rev. John C. Beach and 118 other citizens of Lake City; of A. M. Williams and 109 other citizens of Sturgis; of William P. Hayn, of Wheatland, and 39 other citizens of Hillsdale County; of J. E. Messner and 72 other citizens of Irving; of George F. Mount and 44 other citizens of Concord; of J. H. Marsh and 13 other citizens of Grand Rapids, Paris, and Wyoming townships, in the county of Kent; of W. P. Stiles and 79 other citizens of Mulliken and Hoytville; of Addison Childs and 51 other citizens of Lansing; of E. Gilbert and 121 other citizens of Wexford County; of William N. Waldron and 27 other citizens of St. Johns, and of Dr. J. R. Kay and 110 other citizens of Charlevoix County, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NELSON presented the petitions of J. H. Taylor and sundry other citizens of Minneapolis, of Frank Doran and sundry other citizens of Rochester, of James Oakey and sundry other citizens of Robbinsdale, of H. S. Curry and sundry other citizens of Hutchinson, D. L. Shrode and sundry other citizens of Kenyon, Rev. H. F. Ackerman and sundry other citizens of Delaware, Robert L. Wilson and sundry other citizens of Moorhead, W. G. Hazelton and sundry other citizens of Richmond, E. L. Brooks and sundry other citizens of Detroit City, Peter Gunderson and sundry other citizens of Hendrum, Carl Nelson and sundry other citizens of Hutchinson, Adolph Gilberson and sundry other citizens of Canby, T. D. Price and sundry other citizens of Minneapolis, H. M. Lovell and sundry other citizens of Rochester, E. W. Day and sundry other citizens of Edgton, and of A. D. Hopkins and sundry other citizens of Buffalo, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SHOUP presented a petition of the legislature of Idaho, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the creation of another judicial circuit, to be known as the Tenth judicial circuit, to include Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, Idaho, and Montana; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, SECRETARY'S OFFICE, STATE OF IDAHO.

I, M. Patrie, secretary of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of senate joint memorial No. 7, by Watts, memorializing Congress to pass and enact as a law the bill introduced into the Senate by United States Senator WOLCOTT, Colorado, providing for the creation of another judicial circuit, to be known as the Tenth circuit, such new court established to have jurisdiction in Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, Idaho, and Montana.

Which was filed in this office the 28th day of February, A. D. 1899, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 4th day of March, A. D. 1899.

[SEAL.] M. PATRIE, *Secretary of State.*

Senate joint memorial No. 7, by Watts, memorializing Congress to pass and enact as a law the bill introduced into the Senate of the United States by United States Senator WOLCOTT, Colorado, providing for the creation of another judicial circuit, to be known as the Tenth circuit, such new court established to have jurisdiction in Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, Idaho, and Montana.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the governor and the legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent—

That some time ago United States Senator WOLCOTT, Colorado, introduced in the Senate of the United States a bill for an act establishing another judicial circuit of the United States, to be known as the Tenth circuit, and to have jurisdiction in and over the States of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, Idaho, and Montana.

That the bill is of great importance to the State of Idaho.

That the people of Idaho who have business in the circuit court of the United States in order to be heard must travel to San Francisco, a distance of about 1,300 miles, and then be subject to indefinite delays because of the crowded state of business in the ninth circuit.

That the distance to be traveled by counsel at present to appear before the circuit court of appeals is so great and the expense is so enormous that litigants of limited means in many cases would better suffer injustice and defeat rather than pursue their litigation in that court.

That the ninth circuit, comprising the States of California, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Nevada, Montana, and the Territory of Arizona, is so large and the amount of business is so great that much delay is necessarily caused in the dispatch of business, and tardy justice is frequently the greatest injustice.

That Idaho is becoming a great mining and irrigation State, and many foreign corporations have been and are being organized by resident and nonresident citizens for the transaction of business in this State, and many foreign corporations are doing business in the State of Idaho.

That the large amount of legal business arising within this State is between citizens of different States, and such business appears to be constantly increasing.

That the business which would fall within the jurisdiction of the proposed circuit in the main is peculiar to this intermountain region and is wholly different from that arising on the Pacific coast, and it is of paramount importance that the laws should be administered by judges who are not only learned in the law in general, but who are also familiar with the conditions of this region, and by reason of experience specially fitted to make the new application of the laws made necessary because of the difference. This is specially so as to mining and irrigation, which are the principal industries of the people within this region.

That the circuit courts exert a wholesome influence over the communities and ought to be nearer the homes of the people.

That owing to the large and constantly increasing business arising within the State of Idaho, every alternate term of the circuit court of appeals should be held in Salt Lake City, the nearest and most convenient point for citizens of Idaho.

That on account of the large number of questions of the greatest importance respecting mining and irrigation which arise within the limits of the proposed circuit, not less than three judges should constitute the circuit court of appeals.

Your memorialists therefore respectfully memorialize your honorable bodies to pass and enact said bill introduced by Senator WOLCOTT, so as to provide for the creation of said proposed tenth circuit, with jurisdiction as above indicated.

And your memorialists will ever pray.

This senate joint memorial passed the senate on the 16th day of February, 1899.

JOSEPH H. HUTCHINSON,
President of the Senate.

This senate joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 23d day of February, 1899.

D. L. EVANS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within senate joint memorial No. 7, entitled "Memorializing Congress to pass and enact as a law the bill introduced into the Senate of the United States by United States Senator WOLCOTT, Colorado, providing for the creation of another judicial circuit, to be known as the tenth circuit, such new court established to have jurisdiction in Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, Idaho, and Montana," originated in the senate of the State of Idaho during the fifth session.

HARRY L. DAY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Received and filed in the department of state on the 28th day of February, 1899.

M. PATRIE, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. SHOUP presented a petition of the legislature of Idaho, praying for the enactment of legislation to amend the land laws of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
STATE OF IDAHO.

I, M. Patrie, secretary of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of house joint memorial No. 8, by Ellsworth and Averitt, a memorial petitioning Congress to amend land laws of the United States, which was filed in this office the 28th day of February, A. D. 1899, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State.

Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 1st day of March, A. D. 1899.

[SEAL.] M. PATRIE, *Secretary of State.*

House joint memorial No. 8, by Ellsworth and Averitt. A memorial petitioning Congress to amend land laws of the United States.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America:

We, your memorialists, the senate and house of representatives of Idaho in regular session assembled and convened, do most respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States, and to your honorable bodies represent—

That inasmuch as recent investigation and actual experience upon extensive scale have demonstrated that large tracts of land upon which no water can be had on account of its elevation can be utilized for successful farming, and that what is commonly known as "dry farming" has proven a great success in many of the said districts of the West; and inasmuch as the extent of such lands is unlimited; and inasmuch as same are so great in elevation that water can not be run upon the same, and hence proof under the desert laws can not be made thereof; and inasmuch as the said lands are so great in altitude that water for domestic purposes can not be had, making it impossible to live upon the same, and hence impossible to comply with the homestead laws of the United States; that it is therefore of the greatest interest and importance to the Government and the people that there be some change or revision in the law that will enable your citizens to locate and make proof on said lands, either under the desert or homestead laws of the United States. We, your memorialists, therefore pray you that some suitable change in the law be at once made; and your memorialists will ever pray.

This joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 20th day of February, 1899.

D. L. EVANS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This joint memorial passed the senate on the 25th day of February, 1899.

JOSEPH H. HUTCHINSON,
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial No. 8 originated in the house of representatives of the legislature of the State of Idaho at the fifth session.

JAMES A. KEAT,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Received and filed in the department of state, February 28, 1899.

M. PATRIE,
Secretary of State.

Mr. PETTIGREW presented a petition of sundry citizens of Meckling, S. Dak., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SPOONER presented a petition of the legislature of Wisconsin, praying for the enactment of legislation giving to American shipbuilders and American steamship owners such encouragement as to cause them to build and maintain such a merchant marine as will successfully compete with all foreign nations for the carrying trade on the high seas; which was read and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

Memorial to Congress, No. 1 A.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America assembled:

Whereas our American merchant marine during the past forty years has so declined that at the present time less than 10 per cent of our exports are carried abroad under our own flag, instead of 90 per cent being so carried, as was the fact at the beginning of this period; and

Whereas our iron and steel industries have reached such a stage of development that we can now furnish the raw material for shipbuilding at as low a cost as any nation; and

Whereas the State of Wisconsin is dependent upon foreign markets for the disposition of its surplus grain, stock, and dairy products: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That for the benefit of our farmers, miners, and manufacturers and for the prosperity of our whole State, as well as the nation, we hereby petition Congress now in Washington assembled to speedily enact such laws as will give American shipbuilders and American steamship owners such encouragement as to cause them to build and maintain such a merchant marine as will successfully compete with all foreign nations for the carrying trade on the high seas and be an honor to our nation.

Resolved, That the governor is requested immediately to transmit a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives, and to our Wisconsin Senators and Representatives in Congress.

GEO. H. RAY,
Speaker of the Assembly.
JESSE STONE,
President of the Senate.

Mr. SPOONER presented the petition of the legislature of Wisconsin, praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to name one of the three armored cruisers "Milwaukee," after the capital of that State; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution.

Whereas the Secretary of the Navy has asked the Congress for authority to build three armored cruisers for service in the Navy; and

Whereas most of the greater cities of the United States are represented among the ships of the new Navy: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly and the senate of the State of Wisconsin, That all the Senators and Representatives of the State of Wisconsin in the Congress of the United States be, and are hereby, requested to present to the Secretary of the Navy as a suitable name for one of these armored cruisers the name of the metropolis of our State, Milwaukee; and furthermore be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of the Representatives and Senators of the State of Wisconsin in the Congress of the United States immediately upon its adoption.

JESSE STONE,
President of the Senate.
GEORGE H. RAY,
Speaker of the Assembly.

Mr. SPOONER presented a petition of the legislature of Wisconsin, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to give to Congress concurrent jurisdiction with the several States for the suppression of trusts and other combinations to control production, stifle competition, and to regulate, for their own benefit, the price of products and the wages of labor; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Memorial to Congress for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to give to Congress concurrent jurisdiction with the several States for the suppression of trusts and other combinations to control production, stifle competition, and to regulate for their own benefit the price of products and the wages of labor.

The memorial of the legislature of Wisconsin to the Congress of the United States respectfully shows that in the opinion of the legislature the multiplicity and growing power of trusts and other combinations of capital for the

purpose of controlling the markets for various products, including the necessaries of life, is not only a menace to the interests of the people, but is the cause of widespread popular discontent. The evil is almost universally admitted, as is the difficulty of devising methods for its eradication. The Congress is limited in its legislation to subjects confessedly within the Federal jurisdiction. There is, in the nature of things, no uniformity in the legislation of the States upon the subject. Indeed some of the States, it is believed, are entirely without adequate legislation for the protection of their citizens in this respect. The act passed by Congress some years ago has been pronounced by the Attorney-Generals of the United States to be inadequate. The great trust or combination prosecuted in one State, by legislative investigation or otherwise, seeks and finds refuge in another. It is believed that the only sure remedy for this evil will be found in giving to Congress of the United States power to legislate upon the subject, to provide for civil suits in the name of the United States and in the courts of the United States, and for such criminal prosecutions as may be found necessary, even if these corporations are State corporations, and even if they adopt devices, as they have in the past, to carry on their large commerce, keeping technically beyond the pale of interstate commerce and the Federal jurisdiction.

It is not the purpose of this memorial to ask that any State be deprived of jurisdiction which it now possesses in this behalf, but it is respectfully prayed that there shall be promptly submitted to the legislatures of the respective States an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which shall give Congress full and complete concurrent jurisdiction to enact legislation for the suppression of this evil regardless of State lines.

Resolved, That the governor be, and he is hereby, requested to transmit a copy of this memorial to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Wisconsin.

JESSE STONE,
President of the Senate.
GEO. H. RAY,
Speaker of the Assembly.

STATE OF WISCONSIN, *ss:*

This memorial to Congress originated in the senate.

W. L. HOUSER, *Chief Clerk.*

Mr. SPOONER presented the petitions of W. B. Millard and 28 other citizens of New London, R. L. Cheney and 30 other citizens of Endeavor, Rev. William Moore and 89 other citizens of Clinton, F. A. Nelson and 51 other citizens of Fennimore, Samuel T. Kidder and 59 other citizens of Ripon, F. W. Kingsley and 156 other citizens of Sun Prairie, James Jefferson and 38 other citizens of Wisconsin, Jenner Pynch and 16 other citizens of Wisconsin, L. E. Osgood and 111 other citizens of Sturgeon Bay, J. K. Kilbourn and 24 other citizens of Pewaukee, J. A. Thomas and 112 other citizens of Wisconsin, Rev. George E. Plant and 50 other citizens of Arena, Charles E. Butters and 23 other citizens of Tomah, J. Anderick and 16 other citizens of Juda, M. C. Miner and 13 other citizens of Evansville, J. C. Button and 50 other citizens of Wisconsin, James Churn and 101 other citizens of Waupun, N. Matheson and 24 other citizens of Clintonville, N. H. Brokaw and 16 other citizens of Kaukauna, and B. F. Hanks and 88 other citizens of Waupaca, all in the State of Wisconsin, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KYLE. I present sundry petitions, signed by citizens of Revillo, Redfield, Yankton, Meckling, and Groton, all in the State of South Dakota, praying that a constitutional amendment be adopted making polygamy a crime against the laws of the United States.

I wish to state in this connection that some eight years ago I introduced a constitutional amendment to this end. It has not been acted upon as yet, though I think I introduced it in two different Congresses. I shall reintroduce the same amendment early in the present session and have it referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I move that the petitions be referred to that committee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of the general assembly of the State of Missouri, praying that an appropriation be made for the dredging and improving of St. Francis and Black rivers in Arkansas and Missouri; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MISSOURI, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
CITY OF JEFFERSON.

SIR: I have the honor of transmitting to you resolution passed by the house on the 9th day of March, 1899, and concurred in by the senate on the 13th day of March, 1899, as directed by said resolution.

Very respectfully,

H. A. NEWMAN,
Chief Clerk Fortieth General Assembly.

Whereas the State of Missouri and the counties lying in the southeastern part of said State are now engaged in draining the low lands of the St. Francis basin by cutting a system of ditches and canals to the line between the States of Arkansas and Missouri, and an outlet to the Mississippi River must be provided for this vast volume of water, else larger overflows in northeast Kansas are to be expected; and

Whereas the St. Francis and Black rivers having their source in Missouri, flowing south through the district in Missouri to be drained and through the State of Arkansas are choked up and greatly in need of dredging and improvement, and if dredged and improved will furnish an outlet for the overflow water from southeast Missouri and northeast Arkansas and are declared by Congress as waters of the nation and greatly lessen the danger and damage of overflow in said territory: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives of the State of Missouri (the senate concurring therein), That we do respectfully ask and recommend to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Missouri that they join with the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Arkansas in an effort to have St. Francis and Black rivers dredged and improved so as to properly drain St. Francis basin in Arkansas and Missouri.

Resolved further, That the clerk of this house be required to furnish a copy of these resolutions to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Missouri and a copy to the governor of Missouri, to be by him transmitted to the general assembly of said State of Arkansas.

Mr. COCKRELL presented resolutions adopted by the Missouri Bankers' Association at its last convention, praying that our consular system be established upon a permanent basis regardless of politics and that our Government establish an academy for the special training of those who wish to enter the consular service; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Union Soldiers of the Gentry County Missouri Home Guards, praying for the correction of the rolls of their regiments so as to show their muster in to have been June 1, 1861, instead of August 28, 1861, as reported by the Hawkins Taylor Congressional Commission, together with the affidavits of Joseph Margason and Thomas Grantham, of B. McClellan and E. Clagdill, of W. P. Cobbs and J. O. Long, of Sidney Wilson and Samuel Stinson, and of W. H. Cranor and Samuel Sale; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented the petition of Lieut. M. E. Saville, first lieutenant, Tenth Infantry, United States Army, praying that certain moneys be refunded him covered into the Treasury of the United States by reason of the embezzlement of Government funds by a civilian employee while he was quartermaster of the post of Fort Sill, Okla., in 1897; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented the petition of Daniel M. Page, of Missouri, praying that he be reinstated as first lieutenant in the United States Army; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented the petition of Frank E. Kellogg, collector of internal revenue of the Sixth district of Missouri, praying that indemnity be granted to him for the loss of a retail liquor dealer's special-tax stamp book; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of Isaac Patterson, private, Company C, Third Regiment Kentucky Infantry Volunteers, praying that he be granted an increase of pension; which, with the accompanying affidavits of Dr. G. W. Gregory, John Willis, and Harry Moreland and a report from General Ainsworth giving his military record, was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of Dr. Franklin Cooley, surgeon, Fourteenth Missouri Home Guards, praying that he be granted a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of Levi C. Faught, formerly of Company B, Greene County Missouri Home Guards, praying that he be granted a pension; which, with the accompanying affidavits of John W. Keltner, H. W. Keltner, J. W. Faught, I. W. Edwards, and Jacob Stephenson and with letters of General Ainsworth and Dr. G. P. S. Brown, was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of William H. Miller, late of Company C, Second Battalion, Ohio Cavalry, praying that he be granted a pension; which, with the accompanying affidavits of J. P. Ring, Jacob Nicholas, and Dr. James Evans and military record and Pension Office letter showing rejection of claim for pension, was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry petitions of citizens of Noble, Clearmont, Eldon, Wellsville, Breckenridge, Moberly, and Jacksonville, all in the State of Missouri, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KENNEY presented sundry petitions of citizens of Newcastle and Wilmington, all in the State of Delaware, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McLAURIN presented the petition of Thomas J. Mackey, of Palmetto Regiment, Mexican war, a citizen of South Carolina, praying that he be restored to the pension roll; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

He also presented the petition of Eugenia A. Stone, of Greenville, S. C., praying that she be reimbursed for damages done to her property by the Volunteer Army during the war with Spain; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MONEY presented the petition of John L. Record, of Marshall County, Miss., praying that his claim for stores and supplies taken from him during the civil war be referred to the Court of Claims; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CULLOM presented sundry petitions of citizens of Onarga, Morris, Hinsdale, Fosterburg, Springfield, Marseilles, Enfield, Towanda, Bradford, Tonica, Oswego, Mount Carroll, Dixon, Sheridan, Green Valley, Edinburg, Oakland, Boston, Ashland, Pawpaw, East Pawpaw, Chicago, Marsville, Fisher, Rankin, Girard, Winnebago, Myrtle, Bowen, Chesterfield, Keithsburg, Gifford, Amboy, Brighton, Dundee, Athens, Manhattan, Wenona, Bement, Paloma, Rardin, Lockport, Catlin, and Peoria, and of the congregations of the Presbyterian and Methodist churches of Dunlap, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the

Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GEAR presented the petition of Rev. E. M. Vittum and 2,755 other citizens of Iowa, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HALE presented the petitions of Rev. M. F. Bridgham and sundry other citizens of Milltown, of Rev. Henry M. Perkins and sundry other citizens of Union, of John R. Clifford and sundry other citizens of Woodfords, and of A. H. Struthers and sundry other citizens of South Gardiner, all in the State of Maine, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KEAN presented the petitions of W. G. Stevenson and 16 other citizens of Allentown, H. A. Grissener and 225 other citizens of Haddonfield, W. Howard Gulick and 53 other citizens of the Second Congressional district of New Jersey, James M. Lanning and 30 other citizens of Marsboro, John N. Collins and 20 other citizens of Bayonne, P. V. Bergen and 40 other citizens of Boundbrook, W. S. Hutchinson and 28 other citizens of Plainfield, Rev. L. B. Hafer and 40 other citizens of Friesburg, James A. Webb and 150 other citizens of Madison, Henry S. White, the Woman's Missionary Society of the First Presbyterian Church, 105 other citizens of Redbank, J. M. Steffer and 30 other citizens of Westfield, Thomas R. Carter and 98 other citizens of Montclair, Henry P. Condit and 75 other citizens of Westfield, Samuel K. Remington and 120 other citizens of Clinton, W. S. Stevenson and 101 other citizens of Roselle, William Hoppaugh and 40 other citizens of Springfield, A. G. Sanderson and 30 other citizens of Flemington, Edward King Moore and 35 other citizens of Clayton, Henry M. Miller and 85 other citizens of Flemington, R. P. J. Kennon and 150 other citizens of Mount Freedom, George Nutt, jr., and 60 other citizens of Rolston, Rev. J. N. Ferguson and 50 other citizens of Hanover, W. S. Potter and 22 other citizens of Union, David O. Irving and 50 other citizens of New Jersey, Henry C. Baldwin and 150 other citizens of Boonton, J. J. Urmston and sundry other citizens of New Jersey, G. H. Ingram and sundry other citizens of Trenton, Fred C. Clough and sundry other citizens of Garfield, J. W. Albertson and sundry other citizens, C. L. Williamson and sundry other citizens of Hopewell, W. J. Leddell and sundry other citizens of Oakridge, H. G. Drinkwater and sundry other citizens of New Vernon, Samuel Brant and 40 other citizens of Madison, Charles Townsend and sundry other citizens of Orange, J. S. Chamberlain and 120 other citizens of Cranbury, W. Warren Giles and 20 other citizens of Summit, Orville E. Hoyt and sundry other citizens; of the General Missionary Committee of the Methodist Episcopal Church of New Jersey, John M. Thomas and sundry other citizens, George Mollin and 28 other citizens of Boundbrook, Downing Vaux and 20 other citizens of Alpine, L. W. Kingsley and 41 other citizens of Elizabeth, Rev. J. B. Hopwood and sundry other citizens of Newark, and of the Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WOLCOTT presented sundry petitions of citizens of Monument, Ward, Buena Vista, Pueblo, Orchard, Fort Morgan, Monte Vista, Timnath, and of Rev. A. E. Chase, of Timnath, stated clerk of the Presbytery of Boulder, all in the State of Colorado, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas presented the petition of Isparhecher, principal chief of the Creek Nation of Indians, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the payment of awards made to Creek Indians who enlisted in the Federal Army, loyal refugees, and freedmen; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented the petition of Rev. W. A. Fitzgerald and sundry other citizens of Beebe, Ark., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HARRIS presented the petitions of Anna B. Kolachny and 158 other citizens of Ellsworth, S. L. Fox and 72 other citizens, C. Q. Chandler and 99 other citizens, Hubert Lardner and 102 other citizens of Fort Scott, Rev. W. R. Smith and 60 other citizens of Udall, Rev. Abraham L. Hanberg and 302 other citizens of Independence, Aaron Breck and 43 other citizens of Partridge, William Asper and 78 other citizens of Downs, J. E. Kirkpatrick and 42 other citizens of Alma, and J. J. Mickey and 99 other citizens of Plainville, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SEWELL presented the petitions of John M. Thomas and 43 other citizens of East Orange, G. H. Ingram and 31 other citizens of Trenton, C. L. Williamson and 75 other citizens of Hopewell, Rev. H. A. Griesemer and 102 other citizens of Haddonfield, W. Y. Isaac and 51 other citizens of Elmer, J. G. Sanderson and 22 other citizens of Flemington, John Van Mester and 21 other citizens of Bound Brook, Rev. J. O. Bayles and 22 other citizens of Spotswood, W. W. C. Know and 20 other citizens of Newark, Rev. J. B. Hopwood and 54 other citizens of Newark, Charles Townsend and 41 other citizens of Orange, A. W. Kellogg and 32 other citizens of Elizabeth, Henry M. Melton and 31 other citizens of New Jersey, H. G. Drentwater and 91 other citizens of New Vernon, George Nuett, jr., and 68 other citizens, Richard W. Burch and 34 other citizens, J. W. Davis and 10 other citizens of New Jersey, B. Underwood and 14 other citizens of Summit, Rev. Thomas Tyack and 34 other citizens of Mercer County, J. H. Chamberlain and 100 other citizens of Cranberg, S. Miles and 21 other members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Hackensack, of the Auxiliary of the Woman's Home Mission Society of Boonton, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Burlington County, of the Ladies' Home and Missionary Society of the Presbyterian Church of Hanover, of the Woman's Missionary Society of the First Presbyterian Church, and of 124 other citizens of Red Bank, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATOR FROM MONTANA.

Mr. CHANDLER. I desire to present certain exhibits in connection with the contest against the right of Senator W. A. CLARK, of the State of Montana, to a seat in this body, which belong with the remonstrance presented on Monday. I ask that they may be received and printed with the remonstrance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection, the papers will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. ALDRICH introduced a bill (S. 1) to affirm the existing standard of value, to maintain the parity in value of all forms of money, to refund the public debt, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 2) to provide for the construction, maintenance, and operation, under the management of the Navy Department, of a Pacific cable; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 3) for the relief of Egbert C. Sammis, administrator of the estate of John S. Sammis, deceased, late of Duval County, Fla.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4) for enlarging the public building at Hartford, Conn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 5) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas Lee;

A bill (S. 6) for the relief of James H. Latham (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 7) to fix the rank of military attachés (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 8) for the correction of muster of Adolph von Haake, late major Sixty-eighth Regiment New York Veteran Volunteer Infantry (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 9) to remove the charge of desertion against Henry L. Snow;

A bill (S. 10) granting an honorable discharge to George A. Daniels;

A bill (S. 11) for the relief of the heirs of the late Col. Israel C. Woodruff;

A bill (S. 12) to correct the military record of William Murphy;

A bill (S. 13) to correct the military record of Edwin T. Leach;

A bill (S. 14) for the relief of certain enlisted men of the Twentieth Regiment of New York Volunteer Infantry; and

A bill (S. 15) to simplify the system of making sales in the Subsistence Department to officers and enlisted men of the Army (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 16) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Deadwood, in the State of South Dakota; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 17) to provide free homes on the public lands for actual and bona fide settlers, and reserve the public lands for that purpose; which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I should like to have it referred to the

Committee on Indian Affairs. The bill has always gone to that committee. It relates to Indian reservations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it will be so referred.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 18) for the establishment, control, operation, and maintenance of the Northern Branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, at Hot Springs, in the State of South Dakota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 19) for the relief of the Sisseton and Wahpeton and the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota bands of Sioux or Dakota Indians; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 20) making an appropriation to enlarge the military post of Fort Meade, near the city of Sturgis, in the State of South Dakota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 21) for the relief of Clara H. Fulford; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 22) to declare the proper construction of the act of March 3, 1891, entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 23) to reimburse certain Lower Brule Sioux Indians of South Dakota for property destroyed; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 24) for the establishment of a national system of post roads, and for the extension of the Post-Office Department to cover the entire business of public transportation; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 25) to preserve the public lands for the people; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 26) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Nashua, in the State of New Hampshire; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 27) for the erection of an equestrian statue of Maj. Gen. John Stark in the city of Manchester, N. H.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 28) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James H. Waters;

A bill (S. 29) for the relief of Corinne Strickland; and

A bill (S. 30) for the relief of Bvt. Lieut. Col. J. Madison Cutts.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 31) to refer to the Court of Claims the war claims of the State of New Hampshire;

A bill (S. 32) for the relief of George W. Weston; and

A bill (S. 33) for the relief of Elias E. Barnes.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 34) for the further prevention of cruelty to animals in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 35) granting a pension to Louise Donath;

A bill (S. 36) granting an increase of pension to Emma G. Sargent;

A bill (S. 37) granting an increase of pension to Charles D. Hanscom;

A bill (S. 38) granting an increase of pension to Wallace G. Bone; and

A bill (S. 39) granting an increase of pension to Caroline V. English, widow of Lieut. Col. Thomas C. English.

Mr. GEAR introduced a bill (S. 40) fixing times when, regulating the manner in which, and declaring the character of the accounts between the United States and the several public-land States, relative to the net proceeds of the sales and other disposition of the public lands made and to be made therein by the United States, which shall hereafter be stated and certified to the Treasury Department for payment; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 41) to authorize the President to place Andrew Geddes on the retired list with the rank of captain; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. KYLE introduced a bill (S. 42) to reimburse the Sioux Indians of the Crow Creek Reservation, in South Dakota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

A bill (S. 43) to provide free homes for bona fide settlers within the bounds of the Sisseton and Wahpeton reservations; and

A bill (S. 44) granting honorably discharged soldiers of the late civil war privileges under the land laws of the United States.

Mr. KYLE introduced a bill (S. 45) for the erection of a public building at Deadwood, S. Dak.; which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 46) to correct the military record of John Gifford;

A bill (S. 47) for the relief of Walter Masten;

A bill (S. 48) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John W. Alloway; and

A bill (S. 49) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jerome J. Lee, alias Elihu Brown.

Mr. KYLE introduced a bill (S. 50) to establish a branch mint of the United States at Deadwood, in the State of South Dakota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 51) regulating the procedure in criminal causes in the States of North and South Dakota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 52) to establish a university of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee to Establish the University of the United States.

He also introduced a bill (S. 53) to establish postal savings banks and to encourage the saving of money in small amounts; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 54) to provide for a governmental telegraph system; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 55) establishing additional regulations concerning immigration into the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 56) granting a pension to Sayer Jensen;

A bill (S. 57) granting a pension to Joshua B. Harris;

A bill (S. 58) granting a pension to Harry J. Hall;

A bill (S. 59) granting a pension to Emma E. Mowrey;

A bill (S. 60) granting a pension to Michael Handlin;

A bill (S. 61) granting a pension to George Bunce;

A bill (S. 62) granting a pension to Robert Black;

A bill (S. 63) granting a pension to Cyrus A. B. Fox; and

A bill (S. 64) granting a pension to Freeman H. Farr.

Mr. KYLE introduced a bill (S. 65) for the relief of Priscilla J. Shipman, administratrix of the estate of John J. Shipman, deceased, for work done and materials furnished to the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 66) for the relief of the heirs of Margaret Kennedy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BERRY introduced a bill (S. 67) for the relief of the legal representatives of Calvin B. Cunningham; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HARRIS introduced a bill (S. 68) granting to the State of Kansas the abandoned Fort Hays Military Reservation, in said State, for the purpose of establishing western branches of the Kansas Agricultural College and of the Kansas State Normal School thereon, and for a public park; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 69) providing for the adjustment and payment of the accounts of laborers and mechanics arising under the eight-hour law; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also introduced a bill (S. 70) for the relief of David H. Lewis, of Lawrence, Kans.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 71) for the relief of John Carrington;

A bill (S. 72) for the relief of the heirs of Lawrence D. Bailey;

A bill (S. 73) for the relief of David Hogan;

A bill (S. 74) for the relief of Simeon Motz, Nathaniel Robbins, and William J. Sloan;

A bill (S. 75) for the relief of the estate of James A. Gregory; and

A bill (S. 76) for the relief of the University of Kansas.

Mr. McLAURIN introduced a bill (S. 77) for the relief of Eugenia A. Stone; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HEITFELD introduced a bill (S. 78) granting a pension to Samuel W. Childs; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BATE introduced a bill (S. 79) to construct a road to the national cemetery at Dover, Tenn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 80) authorizing the appointment of Benjamin Wright ensign in the United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 81) for the relief of Howard Lodge, No. 13, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Gallatin, Tenn;

A bill (S. 82) for the relief of Stewart College (now the Southwestern Presbyterian University), located at Clarksville, Tenn;

A bill (S. 83) for the relief of the Presbyterian Church of Loudon, Loudon County, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 84) for the relief of the trustees of Carson-Newman College, at Mossycreek, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 85) for the relief of the Protestant Episcopal Church of St. Paul, at Franklin, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 86) for the relief of Mary Sharp College, of Winchester, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 87) for the relief of the trustees of McDaniel's Chapel, Methodist Episcopal Church South, at Shellmound, Marion County, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 88) for the relief of the estate of Andrew J. Duncan, deceased; and

A bill (S. 89) for the relief of Cumberland Female College, of McMinnville, Tenn.

Mr. RAWLINS introduced a bill (S. 90) for the establishment of an assay office at Salt Lake City, Utah; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 91) granting a pension to J. J. Groff; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 92) granting a pension to William M. Ferry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 93) setting aside certain lands within the Uintah Indian Reservation, in Utah, for the use of the Indians thereon, and providing for the sale or disposition of the residue of the lands therein for the benefit of said Indians; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 94) authorizing the selection of lands within abandoned military or other reservations to satisfy grants of lands to the States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 95) to provide for the refunding of certain moneys illegally assessed and collected in the district of Utah; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 96) to confer additional jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims for property of residents of the United States taken or destroyed by Indians, and for services rendered and property used in defending such residents against Indian depredations; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 97) for the relief of Edward Byrne; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TURNER introduced a bill (S. 98) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Spokane, in the State of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 99) to establish a mint of the United States at Tacoma, in the State of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 100) for the relief of Twyman O. Abbott; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 101) for the relief of Clinton F. Pulsifer, of the State of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 102) for the relief of John O'Keane, of the State of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 103) granting an increase of pension to Charles Critzer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PRITCHARD introduced a bill (S. 104) to regulate internal-revenue assessments, and to modify the law so as to leave assessments in certain cases to the court; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ELKINS introduced a bill (S. 105) to amend section 4136, Revised Statutes of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

A bill (S. 106) to provide for a municipal building and courthouse in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 107) to establish a board of charities for the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 108) for a municipal hospital for the District of Columbia;

A bill (by request) (S. 109) for the extension of Le Droit avenue and S street NW.;

A bill (S. 110) to amend the charter of the Capital Traction Company, of the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 111) to incorporate the Frederick Douglass Memorial and Historical Association;

A bill (S. 112) to change the name of Four-and-a-half street, in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 113) to designate distinctively parcels of land in the District of Columbia for the purposes of assessments and taxation;

A bill (S. 114) regulating the exemption of church and school property in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 115) for the relief of John A. Narjes;

A bill (S. 116) for the relief of Christiana Dengler;

A bill (S. 117) to establish a municipal court for the District of Columbia, to abolish the offices of justice of the peace and constable, and for other purposes;

A bill (by request) (S. 118) for the extension of Wyoming avenue;

A bill (by request) (S. 119) for the extension of Columbia road east of Thirteenth street;

A bill (by request) (S. 120) for the extension of Kalorama avenue;

A bill (S. 121) to exempt from taxation certain property of the Young Men's Christian Association of Washington, D. C.;

A bill (S. 122) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the criminal laws of the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1898;

A bill (S. 123) for the relief of Margaretha Riehl;

A bill (S. 124) regulating permits for private conduits in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 125) to refund certain taxes to Minnie J. Hunt;

A bill (S. 126) to provide for the compulsory support of children by parents in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 127) to quiet title to lot 11, block 12, South Brookland, District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 128) to amend section 5 of an act approved July 22, 1892, entitled "An act to provide for the opening of alleys in the District of Columbia;"

A bill (S. 129) to regulate insurance in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 130) relating to the names of streets in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 131) concerning land titles in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 132) to provide for the appointment of a collector of fines in the police court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 133) for the relief of Francesco Perna.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 134) granting an increase of pension to William N. Carlisle;

A bill (S. 135) granting a pension to Mrs. Frances C. De Russy (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 136) granting a pension to Harriet Clarissa Mercur, widow of James Mercur, late professor of civil and military engineering in the United States Military Academy at Westpoint, N. Y. (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 137) granting a pension to Jane S. Tuttle;

A bill (S. 138) to increase the pension of John H. Bieling, of Detroit, Mich.;

A bill (S. 139) granting a pension to Adelaide Sessions (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 140) to increase the pension of Mrs. Annie Gibson Yates, widow of Capt. George W. Yates, Seventh United States Cavalry; and

A bill (S. 141) granting an increase of pension to Julia De Quindre.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 142) for the relief of Frederick K. Carlisle; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 143) for the relief of the administrators of William B. Moses, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 144) for the relief of Walter S. Kimmel; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 145) for the relief of Thomas Antisell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 146) for the relief of Thomas Chambers; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 147) for the relief of Eunice Tripler, widow of Charles S. Tripler (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 148) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Elias B. Bell (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 149) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Almond H. McNinch.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 150) to provide for the appointment of honorary attachés of legation, to serve without compensation; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 151) to provide for the publication of the Revolutionary archives in the Department of State; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

A bill (S. 152) to provide for the erection of a house for the keeper of the Grosse Isle, Michigan, light-house (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 153) to establish wind-signal display stations at South Manitou Island, Lake Michigan (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 154) to provide for the erection of a bridge across the Detroit River at Detroit, in the State of Michigan (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 155) granting a pension to Mrs. Elizabeth H. David; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

A bill (S. 156) to amend sections 2304 and 2305 of the Revised Statutes, relating to soldiers' and sailors' homesteads;

A bill (S. 157) providing for the selection of the lands within Fort Pembina Military Reservation, N. Dak., by the State of North Dakota; and

A bill (S. 158) granting to the State of North Dakota 30,000 acres of land to aid in the maintenance of a school of forestry.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a bill (S. 159) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Grand Forks, N. Dak.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 160) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Red River of the North, at Drayton, N. Dak.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 161) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Turtle Mountain band of Chippewa Indians in the State of North Dakota, and to make appropriations for carrying the same into effect; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 162) for the relief of the heirs of Aaron Van Camp and Virginius P. Chapin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 163) granting an increase of pension to Dwight D. Wilber; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WOLCOTT introduced a bill (S. 164) authorizing the Postmaster-General to maintain a "key-deposit fund," and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 165) for the relief of Robert J. Spottswood and the heirs of William C. McClellan, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 166) to create a circuit court of the United States for the tenth circuit, and to create a court of appeals of the United States for the tenth circuit; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 167) for the relief of the legal representatives of A. G. Boone; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 168) granting a pension to John C. Reed;

A bill (S. 169) granting a pension to George E. Tuttle;

A bill (S. 170) granting an increase of pension to Octavia F. Crews;

A bill (S. 171) granting a pension to Edgar L. Beckwith;

A bill (S. 172) granting a pension to Elias Veatch;

A bill (S. 173) granting a pension to John H. Morrison;

A bill (S. 174) granting a pension to William Fernsworth;

A bill (S. 175) granting a pension to Jeremiah Gordy;

A bill (S. 176) granting a pension to George Hanna;

A bill (S. 177) granting a pension to John Warman; and

A bill (S. 178) for the relief of Joseph B. Presdee.

Mr. WOLCOTT introduced a bill (S. 179) authorizing the sale of all public lands belonging to the United States situated in the county of Baca and State of Colorado; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. STEWART introduced a bill (S. 180) to amend section 15, Title II, chapter 1, of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to the election of United States Senators; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also introduced a bill (S. 181) to amend chapter 6 of Title XXXII of the Revised Statutes, relating to mineral lands and mining resources; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

He also introduced a bill (S. 182) for the erection of a public building in Reno, Nev.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 183) granting lands to the public-land States to aid them in the reclamation of the desert lands therein; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 184) prohibiting allotments to Indians of lands outside of reservations; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He afso introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committe on Claims:

A bill (S. 185) for the relief of Jewett W. Adams;

A bill (S. 186) for the relief of John L. Smithmeyer and Paul J. Pelz;

A bill (S. 187) for the relief of William J. Murtagh, late proprietor of the National Republican, of Washington, D. C.;

A bill (S. 188) for the relief of the estate of Charles M. Roberts, deceased; and

A bill (S. 189) for the relief of the owners of the British ship *Foscolia* and cargo.

Mr. STEWART introduced a bill (S. 190) authorizing and requiring certain extensions to be made to the lines of the Capital Traction Company, of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 191) to provide for the inspection of the boilers of the *Alvena* and *Ailsa;* which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 192) granting a pension to H. Butterfield; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 193) granting a pension to Charles F. J. Stein; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WARREN introduced a bill (S. 194) providing for a monument to mark the site of the Fort Phil Kearny massacre; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 195) for the relief of Louis Miller; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 196) for the relief of William B. Reaney, surviving partner of the firm of Reaney, Son & Archbold; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 197) for the relief of Hattie A. Phillips; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 198) to reimburse the State of Wyoming for money expended by the Territory of Wyoming in

protecting and preserving the Yellowstone National Park during the years 1884, 1885, and 1886; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 199) for the promotion on the retired list of Commander George T. Davis, United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

A bill (S. 200) granting to the State of Wyoming 50,000 acres of land to aid in the continuation, enlargement, and maintenance of the Wyoming State Soldiers and Sailors' Home;

A bill (S. 201) for the relief of persons who made the first payment for desert lands under the act of March 3, 1877, but who were unable to perfect entry thereof;

A bill (S. 202) to make grants of land to the several States of the Union for State normal schools, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 203) providing for an adjustment with the public-land States for lands in sections 16 and 36, sold as coal lands; and

A bill (S. 204) providing that those who have commuted homesteads may avail themselves of the provisions of the homestead act.

Mr. WARREN introduced a bill (S. 205) granting lands to the public-land States to aid them in the reclamation of the desert lands therein; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 206) providing that the circuit court of appeals of the eighth judicial circuit of the United States shall hold at least one term of said court annually in the city of Denver, in the State of Colorado, or in the city of Cheyenne, in the State of Wyoming, on the first Monday in September in each year; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 207) granting a pension to Mrs. J. J. Van Horn;

A bill (S. 208) granting a pension to Josephine I. Offley;

A bill (S. 209) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia De Peyster Black;

A bill (S. 210) granting a pension to Mrs. Maria N. Flint; and

A bill (S. 211) granting an increase of pension to Arthur Mahar.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 212) for the relief of Mrs. S. F. Pemberton; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 213) for the relief of Bvt. Capt. James D. Vernay; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 214) for the relief of Charles H. Cotton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 215) to recognize the gallant conduct and meritorious services of Francis M. Charles as a volunteer aid in the late war;

A bill (S. 216) to correct the record of certain soldiers of the United States (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 217) awarding a medal of honor to John W. Ayers (with accompanying papers).

Mr. CULLOM introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 218) granting a pension to Florence Tate (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 219) for the relief of John M. Palmer;

A bill (S. 220) to increase the pension of Samuel Miller from $17 per month to $36 per month (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 221) to pension war veterans over 70 years of age.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 222) to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. CULLOM. I desire to have the bill referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, because it was formerly before that committee and reported by it, and two of the commissioners who were appointed to visit the Hawaiian Islands are members of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I make this statement frankly. I should like to have the bill referred to the same committee that considered it heretofore.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I wish to have the reference of the bill delayed for a while. Let it lie on the table for the present.

Mr. CULLOM. I have no objection, if the Senator from Connecticut is anxious that that course shall be pursued.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill, at the request of the Senator from Connecticut, and without objection, will lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 223) for the relief of Charles Speare;

A bill (S. 224) for the relief of Joseph F. Travers;

A bill (S. 225) for the relief of the Atlantic Works;

A bill (S. 226) for relief of heirs of Philip C. Rowe; and

A bill (S. 227) for the relief of the Continental Fire Insurance Company and others.

Mr. LODGE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 228) granting a pension to Mrs. Hannah B. Whistler;

A bill (S. 229) granting a pension to Mrs. Emeline M. Stoddard;

A bill (S. 230) granting a pension to Miss M. Jennie Miles; and

A bill (S. 231) granting a pension to Irena Wilkinson Gibson, only child of David Wilkinson, of the Revolutionary army.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 232) to improve the methods of printing and binding the public documents; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also introduced a bill (S. 233) to amend the immigration laws of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also introduced a bill (S. 234) for the relief of Frank D. Allen; which was read twice by its title, and referred, with the accompanying paper, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 235) authorizing the President to place on the retired list of the Navy, as an ensign, the name of Benjamin Franklin Jacobs; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. HOAR introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 236) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ellen Lauriat;

A bill (S. 237) granting an increase of pension to Cutler D. Sanborn;

A bill (S. 238) granting a pension to Joseph M. Wright;

A bill (S. 239) granting a pension to Rhoda A. Foster;

A bill (S. 240) granting a pension to Nancy Ellen Bessom (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 241) granting a pension to Patrick Lahee (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 242) granting a pension to Emma L. O'Brien (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 243) granting a pension to Mattie Otis Dickinson; and

A bill (S. 244) granting a pension to Mary Jane McLaughlin.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 245) for the relief of Edward P. Bliss; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 246) for the erection of a public building at Marblehead, Mass.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 247) relating to the election of Senators; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also introduced a bill (S. 248) for the relief of Winslow Warren; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 249) fixing the salaries and compensation of the chief justices and associate justices of the supreme courts in the Territories of Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma, and making appropriations to pay the same; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 250) to grant medals to the officers of the Fifty-fourth Regiment Infantry, Massachusetts Volunteers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 251) for the relief of James Grace; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SHOUP introduced a bill (S. 252) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Moscow, in the State of Idaho; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

A bill (S. 253) to provide for the payment to the heirs of Darius B. Randall, deceased, for certain improvements relinquished to the United States for the use of the Nez Perce Indians;

A bill (S. 254) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mary Campbell, a Nez Perce Indian allottee; and

A bill (S. 255) to ratify an agreement with the Indians of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, in Idaho, and making appropriations to carry the same into effect.

Mr. SHOUP introduced a bill (S. 256) for the relief of Albert C. Brown; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 257) for the relief of Gilman Sawtelle; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 258) granting a pension to Coryden Bevans;

A bill (S. 259) granting a pension to Lizzie Breen;

A bill (S. 260) granting a pension to James Harrington;

A bill (S. 261) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie H. Hyndman;

A bill (S. 262) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Irvin;

A bill (S. 263) granting a pension to Nancy A. Ratcliff;

A bill (S. 264) granting an increase of pension to James Smith;

A bill (S. 265) granting an increase of pension to Jane McMahon; and

A bill (S. 266) granting an increase of pension to William Hamley.

Mr. SHOUP introduced a bill (S. 267) concerning carriers engaged in interstate commerce and their employees; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PLATT of New York introduced a bill (S. 268) to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the northern district of New York, to divide the same into two districts, and provide for the terms of court to be held therein and the officers thereof, and the disposition of pending causes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 269) amending the statutes relating to patents, relieving medical and dental practitioners from unjust burdens imposed by patentees holding patents covering methods and devices for treating human diseases, ailments, and disabilities; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 270) to reimburse John Waller, former postmaster at Monticello, N. Y., for moneys expended in carrying the mail;

A bill (S. 271) for the relief of Secor & Co., Perine, Secor & Co., and the executors of Zeno Secor;

A bill (S. 272) for the relief of James E. Simpson, jr., Alfred H. Simpson, and Willie E. Simpson, surviving copartners of the firm of J. E. Simpson & Co. (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 273) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to adjust and settle the account of the heirs of Alfred G. Benson with the United States; and

A bill (S. 274) for the relief of Mary E. Huestis, executrix of the estate of David Huestis, deceased, late of Cold Spring, Putnam County, in the State of New York.

Mr. PLATT of New York introduced a bill (S. 275) for the relief of the heirs of Myra Clark Gaines, deceased, of the parish of Orleans, La.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 276) for the erection of a public building at Kingston, N. Y.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 277) to amend the act of June 13, 1898, entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes;" which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 278) increasing the salary of C. H. Knight, United States customs gauger at the port of New York, from $2,000 per annum to $2,500 per annum; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 279) to refund duties paid by the State of New York on arms imported in 1863; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 280) to increase the pension of Ruth A. Carleton; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 281) to restore Benjamin W. Loring to the Revenue-Cutter Service; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 282) extending the time for the completion of the bridge across the East River, between the city of New York and Long Island, now in course of construction, as authorized by the act of Congress approved March 3, 1887; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 283) in reference to the civil service and appointments thereunder; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee to Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service.

Mr. PETTUS introduced a bill (S. 284) to repeal the stamp tax so far as that tax was levied or increased by the act entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," approved June 13, 1898; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 285) for the relief of the Mobile Marine Dock Company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 286) to provide for the removal of the law books of the Congressional Library into the Congressional Library building; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 287) relieving Oscar D. Hendershott of the charge of desertion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 288) granting an honorable discharge and status of pilot in United States service to Oscar B. Jolly; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 289) granting a pension to John B. Turchin;

A bill (S. 290) granting a pension to Mrs. Augusta E. Kellogg;

A bill (S. 291) granting a pension to Ida J. Rannells;

A bill (S. 292) granting an increase of pension to Martha G. D. Lyster; and

A bill (S. 293) to increase the pension of Mrs. Isabel B. Hamilton.

Mr. LINDSAY introduced a bill (S. 294) for the relief of Rosa Vestner Jeffrey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 295) for the relief of those suffering from the destruction of the salt works near Manchester, Ky., pursuant to the orders of Maj. Gen. Carlos Buell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CLAY introduced a bill (S. 296) to establish the Atlanta National Military Park in Fulton County, Ga.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 297) for the relief of James and William Crooks, of Canada; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 298) for the relief of Elizabeth B. Eddy, widow of Charles G. Eddy, of New York City, N. Y.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 299) granting a pension to Susanna Marion; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MONEY introduced a bill (S. 300) to authorize the purchase of the manuscript of William Vans Murray; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 301) to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Indianapolis, Ind.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 302) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to try and render final judgment in certain claims of the State of Indiana; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 303) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to try and render final judgment in certain claims of States for interest paid, and so forth; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FOSTER introduced a bill (S. 304) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Tacoma, in the State of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 305) making an additional appropriation for a public building at the city of Seattle, State of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 306) granting an increase of pension to Warren L. Eaton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 307) for the establishment of joint light-houses and fog-signal stations on the coast of the district of Alaska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BAKER introduced the following bills; which were severally read by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 308) for the relief of George W. Brown;

A bill (S. 309) for the relief of Peter Heck, alias Louis Heck; and

A bill (S. 310) granting an honorable discharge to W. J. Gardner, of Wellington, Kans., and correcting the date of his muster out from the service.

Mr. BAKER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 311) granting a pension to J. W. Phillips;

A bill (S. 312) granting an increase of pension to Joseph R. Martin;

A bill (S. 313) granting a pension to Thomas B. Roark;

A bill (S. 314) granting a pension to Rosa L. Couch, of Leavenworth, Kans.;

A bill (S. 315) granting a pension to Josiah C. Ury;

A bill (S. 316) granting an increase of pension to Louann A. Perry, of Wallace, Kans.;

A bill (S. 317) granting an increase of pension to Joseph P. Howe;

A bill (S. 318) granting a pension to Sophia F. Twist, of Leavenworth, Kans.;

A bill (S. 319) granting an increase of pension to James K. Proudfit, of Kansas City, Kans.;

A bill (S. 320) granting an increase of pension to Allen Buckner, of Baldwin, Kans.; and

A bill (S. 321) granting an increase of pension to John J. Sears, of Oakley, Kans. (with accompanying paper).

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 322) for the relief of Northrup & Chick, and also of Thomas N. Stinson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming introduced a bill (S. 323) granting homesteaders on abandoned military reservations the right to enter one quarter section of public land on said reservations as pasture or grazing land; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 324) granting a pension to William Freeland; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 325) granting a pension to William H. Walton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 326) in relation to contempts of court; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 327) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Carroll; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 328) for the relief of Richard King; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 329) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Evanston, in the State of Wyoming; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 330) to restore to their original status as to promotion officers of the Navy and Marine Corps losing numbers by reason of the advancement of other officers for exceptional and meritorious service during the war with Spain; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 331) to erect a statue or monument in honor of George Henry Ellis, late chief yeoman in the United States Navy on the cruiser *Brooklyn;* which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 332) for the relief of Lieut. Jerome E. Morse, of the United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 333) prohibiting Senators and Representatives from exercising executive functions; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 334) prohibiting the appointment or employment of Senators and Representatives to perform executive functions; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also introduced a bill (S. 335) for the collection of revenue within the island of Porto Rico; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 336) for the collection of revenue within the island of Cuba during its occupation by the military forces of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 337) to amend the postal laws relating to first and second class mail matter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 338) to prohibit the giving of free railroad passes contrary to provisions of section 22 of the act to regulate commerce; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 339) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. McBRIDE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 340) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to the survivors of the Indian wars of 1832 to 1842, inclusive, known as the Black Hawk war, Creek war, Cherokee disturbances, and the Seminole war," approved July 27, 1892;

A bill (S. 341) extending the privilege of bounty land to persons who served in the Indian wars of the United States subsequent to March 3, 1855;

A bill (S. 342) granting a pension to Eleanor McDevitt;

A bill (S. 343) granting a pension to Mary J. Freeman;

A bill (S. 344) granting a pension to Nancy A. Dowell;

A bill (S. 345) granting a pension to Catherine L. Nixon;

A bill (S. 346) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Arethusa Wright, of Sheridan, Oreg.;

A bill (S. 347) for the relief of Margaret C. McKay, widow of the late Dr. William C. McKay, of Oregon;

A bill (S. 348) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Hayburn;

A bill (S. 349) granting an increase of pension to James H. Coventon;

A bill (S. 350) granting pensions to certain officers and enlisted men of the Life-Saving Service and to their widows and minor children;

A bill (S. 351) to increase the pension of Samuel S. White;

A bill (S. 352) to increase the pension of Catherine A. Young;

A bill (S. 353) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Fellows;

A bill (S. 354) granting a pension to Vincent de Frietas;

A bill (S. 355) to amend an act approved January 29, 1887, entitled "An act granting pensions to the soldiers and sailors of the Mexican war, and for other purposes;"

A bill (S. 356) granting a pension to De Witt Putnam;

A bill (S. 357) granting a pension to G. W. Morris; and

A bill (S. 358) granting a pension to William P. Arble.

Mr. McBRIDE introduced a bill (S. 359) to extend the privilege of immediate transportation of dutiable goods to the port of Astoria, Oreg.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 360) to establish an assay office at Baker City, in the State of Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 361) to establish an assay office at the city of Portland, in the State of Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 362) to reimburse S. R. Green, postmaster at Oregon City, Oreg., for moneys lost by burglary; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 363) to amend section 1754 of the Revised Statutes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also introduced a bill (S. 364) to appropriate funds for investigations and tests of American timber; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 365) for the relief of Harvey W. Gillingham;

A bill (S. 366) for the relief of Orville T. Porter;

A bill (S. 367) for the relief of John Thurman, of Portland, Oreg.;

A bill (S. 368) for the relief of Thomas J. Miller;

A bill (S. 369) for the relief of Francis M. Tompkins, of Oregon;

A bill (S. 370) for the relief of Robert Smith, of Portland, Oreg.;

A bill (S. 371) for the relief of James Q. Shirley and the estate of Francis De Long, deceased;

A bill (S. 372) for the relief of John Kelly;

A bill (S. 373) for the relief of Avery D. Babcock and wife, of Oregon;

A bill (S. 374) for the relief of William A. Starkweather, of Oregon; and

A bill (S. 375) to reimburse the States of California, Oregon, and Nevada for moneys by them expended in the suppression of the rebellion.

Mr. McBRIDE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

A bill (S. 376) for the relief of the citizens of the States of Oregon, Idaho, and Washington who served with the United States troops in the war against the Nez Perce and Bannock and Shoshone Indians; and for the relief of the heirs of those killed in such service, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 377) providing for the payment of claims arising out of the Cayuse Indian war in Oregon in 1847 and 1848; and

A bill (S. 378) to amend "An act to provide for the allotment of lands in severalty to Indians on the various reservations, and to extend the protection of the laws of the United States and the Territories over the Indians, and for other purposes," approved February 8, 1887.

Mr. McBRIDE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 379) entitling veterans of Indian wars to admission to the Soldiers' Homes in the United States on the same terms as veterans of the late war of the rebellion;

A bill (S. 380) to remove the charge of desertion from Maurice D. Roberts, deceased;

A bill (S. 381) authorizing the adjustment and payment of the claim for longevity service of Capt. James Halloran, of the Twelfth Infantry, United States Army;

A bill (S. 382) for the relief of M. J. Gilstrap;

A bill (S. 383) for payment of balance unpaid on Oregon and Washington Territory Indian war claims for suppression of Indian hostilities in 1855 and 1856, as found due by commission appointed by Secretary of War, consisting of Gen. Rufus Ingalls, Capt. A. J. Smith, and Hon. L. F. Grover, pursuant to act of Congress, and disallowed by Third Auditor of the Treasury, as per his report of February 7, 1860;

A bill (S. 384) removing the charge of desertion from the name of Edward Hughes, who served as a private in Company C, Fifth United States Volunteers, and also as a private in Company D, Thirty-eighth United States Volunteers; and

A bill (S. 385) removing the charge of desertion from the name of James K. Parker, who served as a private in Company B, Third East Tennessee Infantry, and also as a private in Company B, Ninth Tennessee Cavalry Volunteers.

Mr. McBRIDE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

A bill (S. 386) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers on the public lands, and to provide for the repayment of certain fees, purchase money, and commissions paid on void entries of public lands;"

A bill (S. 387) for the relief of certain settlers on lands within the limits of railroad land grants;

A bill (S. 388) authorizing the issuance to Charles F. Beebe of patents for certain mineral lands, and mill sites appurtenant thereto, in the State of Washington;

A bill (S. 389) fixing times when, regulating the manner in which, and declaring the character of the accounts between the United States and the several public-land States, relative to the net proceeds of the sales and other disposition of the public lands made and to be made therein by the United States, which shall hereafter be stated and certified to the Treasury Department for payment;

A bill (S. 390) to regulate the taking of proofs and filings in certain land cases; and

A bill (S. 391) for the relief of D. J. Holmes, of Portland, Oreg.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 392) to pay the General Marine Insurance Company of Dresden the sum of $1,434.12 for certain coupons detached from United States bonds, which said coupons were lost on the Cunard steamship *Oregon*, sunk at sea March 14, 1886; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 393) to construe an act entitled "An act to authorize a retired list for privates and noncommissioned officers of the United States Army, and so forth;"

A bill (S. 394) for the recognition of the military service of the officers and enlisted men of certain Pennsylvania military organizations;

A bill (S. 395) to authorize the President to revoke the order dismissing William T. Godwin, late first lieutenant, Tenth Infantry, United States Army, and to place the said William T. Godwin on the retired list with the rank of first lieutenant (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 396) to correct the military record of Max Muller (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 397) to correct the military record of Theodore W. Dunham (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 398) to correct the military record of George Moltz;

A bill (S. 399) to correct the military record of Levi C. Cummings; and

A bill (S. 400) to remit the sentence of general court-martial against Franklin J. Myers, late private, Company C, Two hundred and thirteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and grant him an honorable discharge (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

A bill (S. 401) for the relief of the Corn Exchange National Bank, of Philadelphia, Pa.;

A bill (S. 402) to provide for the appointment of warrant pay clerks in the United States Navy;

A bill (S. 403) for the relief of Theodore J. Arms, assistant paymaster in the United States Navy;

A bill (S. 404) for the relief of James E. Cann, paymaster in the United States Navy;

A bill (S. 405) for the relief of Asst. Engineer (retired) Henry E. Rhoades, United States Navy;

A bill (S. 406) to amend section 17 of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1899, entitled "An act to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States;"

A bill (S. 407) to promote the efficiency of the clerical service in the Navy of the United States, to organize a clerical corps of the Navy of the United States, to define its duties, and regulate its pay;

A bill (S. 408) for the relief of Julius A. Kaiser; and

A bill (S. 409) to correct the naval record of Joseph Pitt, alias Joseph Marr, of the United States steamers *Princeton* and *Sassacus*, and to erase the name of Joseph Marr and substitute the name of Joseph Pitt on the records of the United States Navy (with accompanying papers).

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 410) granting a pension to Harriet V. Gridley;

A bill (S. 411) granting a pension to Samuel S. Boyer;

A bill (S. 412) granting a pension to Francis Fox (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 413) granting a pension to Albert S. Cummings;

A bill (S. 414) granting a pension to Laura S. Pontious (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 415) granting a pension to John Roop, late engineer, United States Navy; and

A bill (S. 416) granting a pension to Alice Hartz (with accompanying papers).

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 417) to provide for adding to and completing specimens and productions, both natural and manufactured, of the United States and of foreign countries, to be exhibited in the Philadelphia museums for the purpose of increasing the trade of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 418) to amend section 4445 of Title LII of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to licensing officers of steam vessels; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. VEST introduced a bill (S. 419) amending the act providing for the appointment of a "Mississippi River Commission," and so forth, approved June 28, 1879; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. McBRIDE introduced a bill (S. 420) for the relief of the legal representatives of Chauncey M. Lockwood; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 421) for the relief of Napoleon B. Giddings;

A bill (S. 422) for the relief of George A. Orr;

A bill (S. 423) for the relief of Joseph W. Carmack;

A bill (S. 424) for the relief of John S. Neet, jr.;

A bill (S. 425) for the relief of John M. Davis;

A bill (S. 426) for the relief of Ezra S. Havens;

A bill (S. 427) for the relief of A. F. Fleet, superintendent of the Missouri Military Academy, Mexico, Mo.;

A bill (S. 428) for the relief of Laura S. Gillingwaters, widow of J. E. Gillingwaters;

A bill (S. 429) for the relief of Jacob Swofford;

A bill (S. 430) for the relief of Charles Wagemann;

A bill (S. 431) for the relief of Gottlieb C. Rose;

A bill (S. 432) for the relief of James W. Howell, late of Company H, Fifty-fourth Regiment Illinois Infantry Volunteers;

A bill (S. 433) for the relief of Richard C. Silence;

A bill (S. 434) for the relief of Charles Phillips, private of Company A, Second Regiment of Colorado Volunteer Cavalry;

A bill (S. 435) to provide for certificates of honorable service to the officers and men of Foster's Cavalry Battalion, Missouri Volunteers, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 436) to correct the military record of Perry J. Knoles;

A bill (S. 437) for the relief of Isaac McConnaughay, private, Company H, Fortieth Iowa Infantry Volunteers;

A bill (S. 438) for the correction of the military record of James M. Crabtree;
A bill (S. 439) for the correction of the military record of John R. Leonard;
A bill (S. 440) for the relief of David D. Johnson, first lieutenant in United States Army, retired;
A bill (S. 441) for the relief of Daniel M. Page; and
A bill (S. 442) for the relief of M. E. Saville.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 443) for the relief of Frank E. Kellogg; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 444) for the relief of Francis M. Owens; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 445) to remove the charge of desertion from the naval record of Reuben E. Lawrence; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:
A bill (S. 446) for the relief of St. Charles College;
A bill (S. 447) to permit Anna M. Colman, a widow, to prosecute a claim;
A bill (S. 448) to permit W. W. Wheeler to prosecute a claim;
A bill (S. 449) for the relief of E. B. Bailey;
A bill (S. 450) for the relief of the legal representatives of Hampton L. Lee, deceased;
A bill (S. 451) for the relief of William H. Beck, assignee of A. Burwell;
A bill (S. 452) for the relief of Michael Dittlinger;
A bill (S. 453) to refer the claim of David C. Allen to the Court of Claims;
A bill (S. 454) for the relief of William M. Pleas;
A bill (S. 455) for the relief of Mary J. Bealmear;
A bill (S. 456) for the relief of James Price;
A bill (S. 457) for the relief of D. K. Ponder, of Ripley County, Mo.;
A bill (S. 458) for the relief of William Phipps, William Blankenship, and the legal representatives of Moses Summers, deceased;
A bill (S. 459) for the relief of Edwin F. Mathews;
A bill (S. 460) for the relief of John S. Logan;
A bill (S. 461) for the relief of Aaron Bell;
A bill (S. 462) for the relief of Joseph Diehl, of Moniteau County, Mo.;
A bill (S. 463) for the relief of L. W. Pritchett;
A bill (S. 464) for the relief of J. C. Irwin & Co. and Charles A. Perry & Co.;
A bill (S. 465) for the relief of the legal representatives of Douglas Dale, deceased;
A bill (S. 466) for the relief of James A. McCullah;
A bill (S. 467) for the relief of the estate of Thomas B. English; and
A bill (S. 468) for the relief of the Catholic Church at Macon City, Mo.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:
A bill (S. 469) to authorize and empower the Secretary of the Interior to adjust and settle the accounts of the Kaskaskia, Peoria, Piankeshaw, and Wea Indians;
A bill (S. 470) to grant the right of way through the Indian Territory to the Gulf, Chickasaw and Kansas Railway Company for the purpose of constructing a railway, and for other purposes;
A bill (S. 471) to put in force in the Indian Territory certain provisions of the laws of Arkansas relating to corporations, and to make said provisions applicable to said Territory;
A bill (S. 472) to extend the time for the construction of the Arkansas and Choctaw Railway in the Choctaw Nation, and for other purposes; and
A bill (S. 473) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for allotment of land in severalty to United Peorias and Miamies in Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1889.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:
A bill (S. 474) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Patterson;
A bill (S. 475) granting a pension to William H. Miller;
A bill (S. 476) granting a pension to Dr. Franklin Cooley;
A bill (S. 477) granting a pension to Levi C. Faught;
A bill (S. 478) to increase the pension of Edward W. Nortoni;
A bill (S. 479) granting a pension to John Deming;
A bill (S. 480) granting an increase of pension to Juliet Gregory;
A bill (S. 481) granting a pension to Perry Harter;
A bill (S. 482) granting a pension to James M. Ray;
A bill (S. 483) granting a pension to Samuel K. Williams;
A bill (S. 484) granting a pension to Henry Sands;
A bill (S. 485) granting a pension to Joseph Vanderpool;
A bill (S. 486) granting a pension to Thomas L. Crowell;
A bill (S. 487) restoring a pension to Mills T. Redmon;
A bill (S. 488) to extend the privileges of the act of January 5, 1893, to certain persons specified and described;
A bill (S. 489) for the relief of Dicey Bobbitt;
A bill (S. 490) granting a pension to Melissa Dooley;
A bill (S. 491) granting a pension to John Vogt;
A bill (S. 492) granting an increase of pension to William Carothers;
A bill (S. 493) granting a pension to Charles F. Berger;
A bill (S. 494) to increase the pension of Edmund Woog;
A bill (S. 495) granting a pension to Ambrose J. Vanarsdel;
A bill (S. 496) for the relief of Zerelda Cobb;
A bill (S. 497) to increase the pension of Mary A. Wilkins;
A bill (S. 498) granting a pension to Mary G. Isbell, widow of David S. Isbell;
A bill (S. 499) granting a pension to Sarah Bailey, late widow of Isaac Long, deceased;
A bill (S. 500) granting a pension to Christ Hahman;
A bill (S. 501) granting a pension to John A. Pitts;
A bill (S. 502) granting a pension to John Bartmann;
A bill (S. 503) restoring a pension to Alvin Rine;
A bill (S. 504) granting an increase of pension to Zebedee Parrett;
A bill (S. 505) granting a pension to Isaac Gann;
A bill (S. 506) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Catlett;
A bill (S. 507) granting a pension to Christ Bueltemann;
A bill (S. 508) granting a pension to Calvin K. Bynum;
A bill (S. 509) for the relief of Elizabeth Dickerhoff, widow of Louis Dickerhoff, deceased, of Company A, Cape Girardeau (Missouri) Home Guards;
A bill (S. 510) granting a pension to Henry Hahman;
A bill (S. 511) granting a pension to Margaret Garrison, widow of James S. Garrison;
A bill (S. 512) granting a pension to John G. Hanna;
A bill (S. 513) granting a pension to James F. Crump;
A bill (S. 514) granting a pension to Eli Browning;
A bill (S. 515) granting a pension to Dora Sauer, widow of Peter Sauer, deceased;
A bill (S. 516) for the relief of R. W. Barber;
A bill (S. 517) granting a pension to Nancy E. Neely;
A bill (S. 518) granting a pension to E. C. Curtis;
A bill (S. 519) for the relief of the heirs of Catherine E. Nelson;
A bill (S. 520) granting a pension to Thomas J. Reid;
A bill (S. 521) granting a pension to Myra Freeman;
A bill (S. 522) granting a pension to Anderson Morton;
A bill (S. 523) granting a pension to William H. Shivers;
A bill (S. 524) to increase the pension of Louis Ische;
A bill (S. 525) granting an increase of pension to James E. McNair;
A bill (S. 526) granting a pension to Joseph M. Waddell;
A bill (S. 527) granting increase of pension to survivors of the Mexican and Indian wars and to their widows;
A bill (S. 528) granting an increase of pension to William Wheeler;
A bill (S. 529) granting a pension to Hugh L. Jones;
A bill (S. 530) granting a pension to Mrs. Ann M. Smith, widow of the late Maj. Gen. Andrew J. Smith;
A bill (S. 531) granting a pension to Henrietta Cummins;
A bill (S. 532) to increase the pension of Mary A. Moore, widow of Col. David Moore, late of the Twenty-first and Fifty-first Regiments Missouri Volunteers;
A bill (S. 533) granting a pension to John C. Vanpool;
A bill (S. 534) granting a pension to the minor children of John L. Webb, deceased;
A bill (S. 535) for the relief of George W. Cotner;
A bill (S. 536) to grant a pension to Mrs. B. C. Lowe;
A bill (S. 537) granting a pension to Thompson B. Moore;
A bill (S. 538) granting a pension to Frank Schnider;
A bill (S. 539) granting a pension to Fielding L. Rutherford;
A bill (S. 540) granting a pension to Oscar F. Renick;
A bill (S. 541) granting a pension to William Sackmann, sr.;
A bill (S. 542) granting a pension to Ellen A. King, widow of William King, deceased;
A bill (S. 543) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary E. Hamilton, widow of Wilson A. Hamilton, deceased;
A bill (S. 544) granting a pension to Capt. Charles F. Hinrichs;
A bill (S. 545) granting an increase of pension to Edward Thompson;
A bill (S. 546) granting a pension to Charles Jones;
A bill (S. 547) granting an increase of pension to John H. Herod;
A bill (S. 548) granting an increase of pension to John F. McMahon;

A bill (S. 549) granting an increase of pension to Michael Herbst;
A bill (S. 550) granting a pension to Angeline Reyling; and
A bill (S. 551) granting a pension to Michael Connor.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 552) for the relief of S. S. Robinson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:
A bill (S. 553) to authorize W. W. Wheeler to prosecute a claim;
A bill (S. 554) for the relief of Hiram K. Hazlett;
A bill (S. 555) for the relief of J. H. Sanders; and
A bill (S. 556) for the relief of Montgomery Patton.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 557) for the relief of Thomas Rosbrugh; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 558) to make disposition of the increment and accretions upon the sums reserved by the Department of State from the fund received by the United States upon the account of the payment of the awards of the late Spanish and American Claims Commission and to pay and distribute the same; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 559) for the investigation of pollution of water supplies; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also introduced a bill (S. 560) to amend section 4386 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, striking out "twenty-eight consecutive hours" and "twenty-eight hours" and inserting "forty consecutive hours" and "forty hours;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 561) extending the time for the commencement and completion of the railroad bridge across the Illinois River, near Grafton, Ill., by the St. Louis, Perry and Chicago Railroad; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 562) to provide for the revision and consolidation of the statute laws of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the United States.

He also introduced a bill (S. 563) for the erection of a public building at Carthage, Mo.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. McENERY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:
A bill (S. 564) for the relief of Simon Witkowski, of Ashton, La., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883;
A bill (S. 565) for the relief of Mrs. Martha E. Templeton and Mrs. Emma T. Wood;
A bill (S. 566) for the relief of Mrs. Charlotte C. Leathers;
A bill (S. 567) for the relief of the legal representatives of Alfred Duplantier, deceased;
A bill (S. 568) for the relief of the heirs of the late Richard Terrill, of New Orleans, in the State of Louisiana;
A bill (S. 569) for the relief of Anna Elisabeth Jamison, executrix of the estate of Samuel Jamison, deceased;
A bill (S. 570) for the relief of Mrs. Eliza E. Hebert;
A bill (S. 571) for the relief of Mrs Laura J. Bemiss;
A bill (S. 572) for the relief of the estate of Isadore Daigle, deceased, late of West Baton Rouge Parish, La.;
A bill (S. 573) for the relief of E. A. Givens, sr., Arcadia, La.;
A bill (S. 574) for the relief of Mrs. Ozeine Boudreau, of St. Martin Parish, La.;
A bill (S. 575) for the relief of A. E. and M. E. Goodrich;
A bill (S. 576) for the relief of the State National Bank of New Orleans, La.;
A bill (S. 577) for the relief of Lemuel Tanner, of Lafourche Parish, La.;
A bill (S. 578) for the relief of the estate of James R. Young, deceased, late of New Orleans, La.;
A bill (S. 579) for the relief of Mrs. Matilda M. Fairex, administratrix of Daniel Fairex, deceased;
A bill (S. 580) for the relief of John F. Kranz;
A bill (S. 581) for the relief of Bertrand and Gaudin Cazes;
A bill (S. 582) for the relief of Mrs. Mary I. Holland;
A bill (S. 583) for the relief of Emma C. Lovelace and Stephen D. Clark;
A bill (S. 584) for the relief of Mrs. Eliza E. Hebert;
A bill (S. 585) for the relief of Augustin Broussard, of Vermilion Parish, La.;
A bill (S. 586) for the relief of Arvillien Broussard, of Vermilion Parish, La.;
A bill (S. 587) for the relief of the heirs of Pierre Sauvé;
A bill (S. 588) for the relief of Catherine M. Pritchard or her legal representatives;
A bill (S. 589) for the relief of James W. Person and Isabella M. Person;
A bill (S. 590) for the relief of Eugene Augustin Bourcy;
A bill (S. 591) for the relief of the New Orleans and Bayou Sara Mail Company, of New Orleans, La.;
A bill (S. 592) for the relief of John A. Sigur; and
A bill (S. 593) for the relief of Mrs. Joseph Kittredge.

Mr. McENERY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Commerce:
A bill (S. 594) to provide for the maintenance of the channel between South Pass of the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico during the construction of the work of improving the navigation of the Southwest Pass;
A bill (S. 595) for the construction of a wide deep channel from deep water of the Mississippi River to deep water of the Gulf of Mexico, by way of Southwest Pass;
A bill (S. 596) granting authority to the Orleans levee board to move, without cost to the United States, the existing line of levee in front of the United States marine-hospital property in New Orleans, La.; and
A bill (S. 597) to provide for a public building at New Orleans, La.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 598) making further provision for a civil government for Alaska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also introduced a bill (S. 599) to amend "An act granting increase of pensions to soldiers of the Mexican war in certain cases," approved January 5, 1893; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 600) to extend the laws regulating immigration over the Hawaiian Islands ceded to the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also introduced a bill (S. 601) to amend the laws relating to obstructions to navigation and for the protection of life and property from dangerous practices; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. DAVIS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:
A bill (S. 602) to revive and amend an act to provide for the collection of abandoned property and the prevention of frauds in insurrectionary districts within the United States, and acts amendatory thereof;
A bill (S. 603) for the relief of Anna W. Osborne;
A bill (S. 604) for the relief of Henry Hoover;
A bill (S. 605) for the relief of Dr. John Benjamin; and
A bill (S. 606) for the relief of Peter Guttormson.

Mr. DAVIS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:
A bill (S. 607) to authorize the restatement, readjustment, settlement, and payment of dues to Army officers in certain cases;
A bill (S. 608) for the relief of Herbert Cushman;
A bill (S. 609) for the remuster of Francisco V. De Coster as captain of Companies A and D, Mississippi Marine Brigade Cavalry Volunteers;
A bill (S. 610) granting an honorable discharge to Michael Waller;
A bill (S. 611) for the relief of Lieut. Col. Edward Simonton;
A bill (S. 612) to correct the military record of Patrick Hanley;
A bill (S. 613) to relieve Jacob Wolhart of the charge of desertion;
A bill (S. 614) for the relief of William Stanley;
A bill (S. 615) to correct the military record of Reese P. Peoples;
A bill (S. 616) for the relief of the legal representatives of Joseph A. Mower;
A bill (S. 617) for the relief of John Berrisford;
A bill (S. 618) for the relief of Capt. William Fletcher, United States Army;
A bill (S. 619) for the relief of Richard W. Johnson;
A bill (S. 620) for the relief of Christopher Ellis;
A bill (S. 621) for the relief of Charles T. Trowbridge, George D. Walker, and John A. Trowbridge; and
A bill (S. 622) for the relief of Jeremiah Sullivan from the charge of desertion.

Mr. DAVIS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:
A bill (S. 623) for the relief of Rev. J. A. Gilfillan;
A bill (S. 624) referring the claim of the Turtle Mountain band of Chippewa Indians to the Court of Claims under the provisions of the Bowman Act, approved March 3, 1883;
A bill (S. 625) for the relief of the estate of Ramsay Crooks;
A bill (S. 626) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for

the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891;

A bill (S. 627) to refer certain claims for Indian depredations to the Court of Claims;

A bill (S. 628) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to fulfill certain treaty stipulations with the Chippewa Indians of Lake Superior and the Mississippi, and making appropriation for the same; and

A bill (S. 629) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 630) for the relief of Mrs. Harriet D. Newson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 631) for the relief of James and William Crooks, of Canada; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 632) for the relief of Judson Jones; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also introduced a bill (S. 633) to erect a monument on Lundys Lane battlefield; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. DAVIS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

A bill (S. 634) to amend an act entitled "An act to refer the claim of Jessie Benton Frémont to certain lands and improvements thereon in San Francisco, Cal., to the Court of Claims," being chapter 80 of the Private Acts of the Twenty-seventh United States Statutes at Large, approved February 10, 1893;

A bill (S. 635) to amend the act creating the circuit court of appeals in regard to fees and costs, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 636) fixing salaries for the clerks of the United States circuit and district courts for the district of Minnesota;

A bill (S. 637) to amend chapter 132, United States Statutes, second session Fifty-third Congress; and

A bill (S. 638) amending chapter 304 of the laws of 1876, entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of commissioners for taking affidavits, and so forth, for the courts of the United States," passed August 15, 1876.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 639) for the relief of applicants to purchase public lands under the timber and stone act; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 640) to amend section 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to mining claims; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

He also introduced a bill (S. 641) to repeal certain provisos in an act of Congress entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for other purposes," approved June 7, 1897; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 642) to make Commodore William P. McCann, of the Navy, a rear-admiral on the retired list; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. DAVIS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 643) granting a restoration and increase of pension to John J. Boyd;

A bill (S. 644) granting a pension to Joseph Koehler;

A bill (S. 645) granting a pension to David Hunter;

A bill (S. 646) granting a pension to Bartlett Minot;

A bill (S. 647) granting an increase of pension to John Sirrine (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 648) granting an increase of pension to Margaret G. White;

A bill (S. 649) granting an increase of pension to Martha Maddocks;

A bill (S. 650) granting a pension to William Stansberry;

A bill (S. 651) granting a pension to George N. Morgan;

A bill (S. 652) granting a pension to Louis W. Bucklen;

A bill (S. 653) granting a pension to Phebe L. Peyton;

A bill (S. 654) granting a pension to Thomas Holmes;

A bill (S. 655) granting a pension to Jesse Branham;

A bill (S. 656) granting a pension to Mrs. Kate Yeager;

A bill (S. 657) granting a pension to Matthew Redmond;

A bill (S. 658) granting a pension to Martha A. McWhorter;

A bill (S. 659) granting a pension to Hans Johnson;

A bill (S. 660) for the relief of Jean Louis Legare, of the Dominion of Canada;

A bill (S. 661) granting a pension of $50 a month to C. L. Alden;

A bill (S. 662) granting a pension to Mary J. Hill;

A bill (S. 663) granting a pension to William Brown;

A bill (S. 664) granting a pension to Adoniram C. Harper;

A bill (S. 665) granting a pension to John S. Beaty;

A bill (S. 666) granting an increase of pension to Laura M. Allen;

A bill (S. 667) granting a pension to B. H. Randall;

A bill (S. 668) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Kate K. Michaelis;

A bill (S. 669) granting a pension to Mrs. Carrie B. Thomas;

A bill (S. 670) granting a pension to Mrs. Delia Elizabeth Woodward;

A bill (S. 671) granting an increase of pension to Don A. Daniels;

A bill (S. 672) granting a pension to Albert H. Sperry;

A bill (S. 673) granting a pension to Agnes M. Shepard, widow of Cleveland E. Shepard, late private in Company H, Forty-second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteers;

A bill (S. 674) granting a pension to John Benjamin;

A bill (S. 675) for the relief of John Donnelly, dependent father of Frank Donnelly;

A bill (S. 676) granting a pension to John Heinz;

A bill (S. 677) granting a pension to Jerusha Sturgis, widow of Brig. Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis;

A bill (S. 678) extending the benefits of the act of June 27, 1890, to certain persons;

A bill (S. 679) granting an increase of pension to John Shannon;

A bill (S. 680) granting a pension to Neil McNeil;

A bill (S. 681) granting a pension to Julia D. Richardson;

A bill (S. 682) granting a pension to Wilhelmina Hippler;

A bill (S. 683) granting a pension to Ann Connolly;

A bill (S. 684) granting a pension to Sarah E. Boyd; and

A bill (S. 685) to grant a pension to Charlotte O. Van Cleve, widow of Gen. Horatio P. Van Cleve.

Mr. BACON introduced a bill (S. 686) for the relief of the estate of John W. Anderson, deceased, late of Savannah, Ga.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas (by request) introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 687) for the relief of the estate of J. H. Moseby, deceased;

A bill (S. 688) for the relief of the estate of William B. Pool, late of Jefferson County, Ark.;

A bill (S. 689) for the relief of the estate of Samuel J. Jones, deceased;

A bill (S. 690) for the relief of the estate of Holliday S. Ravell;

A bill (S. 691) for the relief of James R. Lafferry;

A bill (S. 692) for the relief of Henry M. Stone; and

A bill (S. 693) for the relief of Margaret E. Watkins, of White County, Ark.

Mr. THURSTON introduced a bill (S. 694) for the erection of a public building at Hastings, Nebr.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 695) granting a pension to Thomas Bennett; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 696) to remove the charge of desertion from the name of James Plymate; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CHILTON introduced a bill (S. 697) to grant a pension to Mrs. Susan S. Rayner; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 698) in relation to contempts of court; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SIMON introduced a bill (S. 699) to authorize the purchase of certain lands in the district of Alaska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 700) for the relief of Clement Marciel, of Portland, Oreg.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CARTER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 701) for the relief of Joel S. Shropshire, of Butte City, Mont.;

A bill (S. 702) setting apart a portion of Fort Keogh Military Reservation, in the State of Montana, for the purpose of an industrial school for Indian children; for the establishment of such school; for an appropriation for its establishment and maintenance, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 703) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William T. Dawe, alias William Clark; and

A bill (S. 704) for the relief of the county of Custer, State of Montana.

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (S. 705) for the relief of certain citizens of Montana claiming the benefit of the homestead laws; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 706) granting to the State of Montana 50,000 acres of land to aid in the establishment and maintenance of an asylum for the blind; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 707) for the relief of Charles T. Rader; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 708) to reimburse the State of Montana the sum of $120 for fees erroneously expended in certain land selections; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 709) for the relief of William Flannery; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 710) making further provision for a civil government for Alaska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also introduced a bill (S. 711) for the relief of Andrew Lindsay, of Rancher, Custer County, Mont.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 712) granting a pension to Nellie L. Groshon;

A bill (S. 713) granting a pension to Elizabeth W. Walker;

A bill (S. 714) to increase the pension of Odilia Logan;

A bill (S. 715) granting a pension to Fidillar White; and

A bill (S. 716) granting a pension to Susan Buck.

Mr. SCOTT introduced a bill (S. 717) to provide for the purchase of a site and for the erection of a public building thereon at the city of Wheeling, State of West Virginia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 718) to authorize the President of the United States to cause certain lands heretofore withdrawn from market for reservoir purposes to be restored to the public domain, subject to entry under the homestead law with certain restrictions; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 719) subjecting national banks to the usury laws of the States where they are located; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 720) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Benjamin H. Stewart;

A bill (S. 721) to reopen and adjust the account for service of Lieut. Col. W. A. Jones, Corps of Engineers; and

A bill (S. 722) for the relief of Charles T. Trowbridge, George D. Walker, and John A. Trowbridge.

Mr. NELSON introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 723) for the relief of the next of kin of Christian Reimers;

A bill (S. 724) for the relief of Ole Larson;

A bill (S. 725) for the relief of Peter Guttormson; and

A bill (S. 726) for the relief of Alice Walsh.

Mr. FRYE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

A bill (S. 727) to promote the commerce and increase the foreign trade of the United States and to provide auxiliary cruisers, transports, and seamen for Government use when necessary;

A bill (S. 728) to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service;

A bill (S. 729) to extend the laws relating to commerce, navigation, and merchant seamen over the Hawaiian Islands ceded to the United States;

A bill (S. 730) to extend the laws relating to commerce, navigation, and merchant seamen over the island of Porto Rico ceded to the United States;

A bill (S. 731) to amend section 4290 of the Revised Statutes, relating to log entry of collisions;

A bill (S. 732) relating to lights on steam pilot vessels;

A bill (S. 733) concerning the boarding of vessels;

A bill (S. 734) relating to Cuban vessels;

A bill (S. 735) providing for the collection of fees for furnishing certificates of title to vessels;

A bill (S. 736) making Rockland, Me., a subport of entry;

A bill (S. 737) for the establishment of a light and fog signal on Duck Island, Maine; and

A bill (S. 738) to establish the department of commerce and industries.

Mr. FRYE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 739) for the relief of the estate of George W. Lawrence;

A bill (S. 740) for the relief of the Portland Company, of Portland, Me.;

A bill (S. 741) for the relief of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada; and

A bill (S. 742) for the relief of Larrabee & Allen, of Bath, Me.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 743) to relieve Benjamin F. Burgess of the charge of desertion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 744) for the relief of John Emerson, late a private in Company I, Nineteenth Maine Infantry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 745) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Maj. Gen. Henry Knox at Thomaston, Me.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 746) to authorize C. R. Dobbins to accept a gold watch awarded to him by the government of the Dominion of Canada in recognition of his humane and gallant services to the shipwrecked crew of the British schooner *Ashton*, of Weymouth, Nova Scotia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 747) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Ward (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 748) granting a pension to Burnett Leavitt (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 749) granting an increase of pension to Dana B. Grant (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 750) granting a pension to Sarah T. Usher;

A bill (S. 751) granting an increase of pension to Mathew T. Jones (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 752) granting an increase of pension to Isaac W. Comery (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 753) granting a pension to John F. Scribner; and

A bill (S. 754) granting an increase of pension to Marcus A. Hanna (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 755) granting a pension to Hannah R. Johnson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 756) granting a pension to Lydia F. Wiley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 757) granting increase of pension to William C. Stockton; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 758) for the relief of Sarah E. E. Perine, widow and administratrix of William Perine, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 759) to quiet the title of certain lands in the State of Mississippi, and for the relief of Eli Ayres or his legal representatives, and so forth; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 760) to reimburse the State of South Dakota the expenses incurred by that State in repelling a threatened invasion and raid by the Sioux in 1890 and 1891; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 761) to reimburse excessive demands from preemption and homestead settlers on annulled railroad subsidy grants; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 762) granting settlers the right to make second homestead entries; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 763) to aid the State of South Dakota to support a school of mines; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 764) fixing times when, regulating the manner in which, and declaring the character of the accounts between the United States and the several public-land States, relative to the net proceeds of the sales and other disposition of the public lands made and to be made therein by the United States, which shall hereafter be stated and certified to the Treasury Department for payment; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 765) to extend the provisions of section

4, chapter 301, laws of 1894, approved August 18, 1894; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 766) to amend an act entitled "An act to prevent the extermination of fur-bearing animals in Alaska," and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 767) conferring jurisdiction upon the circuit and district courts for the district of South Dakota in certain cases, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 768) to provide for the submission of certain questions to the legal voters of the United States of America, and to provide for an election thereon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 769) confirming the title of mixed-blood Indians to their lands and allowing the same to be alienated under certain circumstances; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 770) extending relief to Indian citizens, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 771) to authorize the Postmaster-General to acquire title to any new device or method for rapid telegraphing; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 772) to restore the coinage of silver dollars, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 773) to remove the charge of desertion from Augustus C. Pettengill; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DANIEL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 774) to complete the execution of the ninth article of the treaty of 1819 between the United States and Spain; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 775) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Portsmouth, in the State of Virginia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 776) to erect monuments in honor of Gen. Joseph Warren in the city of Boston, Mass., and in honor of Gen. Hugh Mercer in the city of Fredericksburg, Va., as provided for in the resolution of the Continental Congress of April 8, 1777; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 777) for the relief of the trustees of the Norfolk Academy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 778) for the relief of the trustees of St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church at Norfolk, Va.;

A bill (S. 779) for the relief of the Potomac Steamboat Company;

A bill (S. 780) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of John Kelly, deceased;

A bill (S. 781) for the relief of John H. Eggborn, of Culpeper County, Va.;

A bill (S. 782) for the relief of the Baptist Church in Williamsburg, Va.;

A bill (S. 783) for the relief of the board of trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Arlington Heights, known as Hunter's Chapel;

A bill (S. 784) for the relief of the estate of William G. Birchett, deceased, late of Prince George County, Va.;

A bill (S. 785) for the relief of the trustees of St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church at Norfolk, Va.;

A bill (S. 786) for the relief of Pohick Church in Fairfax County, Va.;

A bill (S. 787) for the relief of Thomas D. Gold, administrator of Zebedee Gray, of Clarke County, State of Virginia;

A bill (S. 788) for the relief of George S. Ayre;

A bill (S. 789) for the relief of James A. Johnston; and

A bill (S. 790) to pay the sum of $1,028 to the heirs at law of James Cornick, late a surgeon in the United States Navy.

Mr. PETTUS introduced a bill (S. 791) to repeal section 3412 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 792) for the relief of William H. Hugo; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SPOONER introduced a bill (S. 793) providing for the adjustment of the swamp-land grant to the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 1) authorizing the creation of the Hoff memorial fund; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States respecting an establishment of religion or the free exercise thereof; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 3) granting permission for the erection of a monument in Washington, D. C., for the ornamentation of the national capital and in honor of Samuel Hahnemann; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. KYLE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 4) providing for the translation and publication of a work entitled The American Workingman, by Emile Levasseur; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 5) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to marriage and divorce; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HARRIS introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 6) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 7) proposing an amendment to the Constitution authorizing a tax upon incomes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PRITCHARD introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 8) construing the act approved June 27, 1890, entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 9) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to have a monument erected in the Arlington National Cemetery to the memory of Capt. Charles Vernon Gridley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. WARREN introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 10) providing for the printing of 3,000 copies of House Document No. 141, relating to the preliminary examination of reservoir sites in Wyoming and Colorado; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. CLAY introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 11) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of Senators by the votes of the qualified electors of the States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 12) to amend the Constitution of the United States, giving Congress the power to lay and collect income taxes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 13) for the removal of the bones of John Paul Jones from Paris, France, and their reinterment in Arlington Cemetery; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 14) providing for the restoration to the Navy of Richard Warren Barkley, a graduate of the Naval Academy, discharged in pursuance of the act of August 5, 1882; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 15) for the relief of Charles W. Hazeltine; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. LODGE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 16) to authorize Capt. N. M. Brooks, Superintendent of Foreign Mails, Post-Office Department, to accept decorations from the Governments of Liberia and Venezuela; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 17) for the erection of a triumphal arch in the city of Washington in commemoration of the war with Spain; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 18) to correct an omission relative to signal officers on the staff of corps commanders; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 19) authorizing the wearing of the distinctive badge adopted by the Sons of Veterans, United States Army, upon all occasions of ceremony; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 20) directing issue

of Sioux scrip in certain cases; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 21) directing the Public Printer to supply the Senate and House libraries each with twenty additional copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. CARTER introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 22) to amend the Constitution of the United States relating to uniform marriage and divorce laws and the enforcement thereof by adequate penalties; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NELSON introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 23) to extend the time of payment to settlers on the ceded agricultural lands of the Chippewa Indian reservations in the State of Minnesota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. FRYE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 24) recognizing the able and gallant services of Capt. Francis Tuttle, Revenue-Cutter Service, his officers and men of the *Bear;* also the heroic services of Lieuts. David H. Jarvis, Ellsworth P. Bertholf, and Dr. Samuel J. Call, composing the overland expedition to Point Barrow, Arctic Ocean, for the relief of imperiled whalers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 25) recognizing the gallantry of Frank H. Newcomb, commanding the revenue cutter *Hudson;* of his officers and men; also retiring Capt. Daniel B. Hodgsdon, of the Revenue-Cutter Service, for efficient and meritorious services in command of the cutter *Hugh McCulloch* at Manila; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SCOTT introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 26) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the use of the United States post-office and court-house building at Parkersburg, W. Va., by the circuit and criminal court of Wood County, W. Va., sitting at Parkersburg; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

MEDICAL SERVICE OF GERMAN ARMY.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, requested to transmit to the Senate the report of Dr. John M. G. Woodbury on the medical service of the German army.

PROPOSED SALE OF GALAPAGOS ISLANDS.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the President be requested to inform the Senate, if not inconsistent with the public interests, whether this Government has any information as to the proposed sale of the Galapagos Islands by the Republic of Ecuador to Great Britain or to any European power, and if such report be well founded, what steps, if any, have been taken by the United States with reference to it.

STATUE OF DANIEL WEBSTER.

Mr. CHANDLER submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a committee consisting of three members from the Senate and three members from the House of Representatives be appointed to make arrangements for the reception and unveiling on January 18, 1900, of the statue of Daniel Webster presented to the United States by Mr. Stilson Hutchins and erected on Massachusetts avenue, in the city of Washington.

DESERTIONS FROM THE ARMY.

Mr. PETTIGREW submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to send to the Senate a statement giving the number of desertions each month from the United States Army (regular and volunteer separately) since the 1st day of February, 1899.

SENATOR FROM WEST VIRGINIA.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections:

Resolved, That NATHAN B. SCOTT, now occupying a seat as a Senator from West Virginia, is not entitled to a seat in the Senate.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I ask that the memorial of John T. McGraw, which was presented to the Senate during the last Congress by Senator Faulkner, of West Virginia, may be taken from the files and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections in connection with the resolution which has just been referred to that committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That order will be made, in the absence of objection.

PRACTICE OF POLYGAMY, ETC.

Mr. RAWLINS. I submit the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Be it resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the Committee on the Judiciary is hereby instructed to inquire into and to report to the Senate—

First. To what extent polygamy is practiced or polygamous marriages entered into in the United States or in places over which they have jurisdiction.

Second. Have polygamists or persons reputed to have more than one wife been elected to office by the people of Utah, and, if so, has such election been for the purpose of encouraging polygamy or in violation of any compact between said State and the United States?

Third. Have polygamists or persons reputed to have more than one wife been appointed to office by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, or in cases where the concurrence of the Senate is not required; and, if so, have such appointments been made in aid of polygamy or in violation of the compact between the United States and the State of Utah with reference to that subject?

Fourth. What, if any, steps should be taken or measures enacted for the prevention of polygamy in the United States and in places over which they have jurisdiction?

Mr. WOLCOTT. What was the request in connection with that resolution, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That the Senate proceed to its present consideration.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I move the reference of the resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado objects to the present consideration of the resolution and moves its reference to the Committee on the Judiciary. The question is on that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

FINANCIAL STATISTICS.

Mr. COCKRELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to make to the Senate a report showing the number of ounces and the coining value of all the silver bullion purchased under the act of July 14, 1890; the coining value of the seigniorage thereon; the amount of Treasury notes issued in payment therefor; the amount of silver dollars coined therefrom to March 4, 1897; the seigniorage thereon; the amount of Treasury notes redeemed in silver dollars and retired to March 4, 1897; the amount of silver dollars coined therefrom from March 4, 1897, to December 1, 1899; the seigniorage thereon; the amount of Treasury notes redeemed in silver dollars and retired from March 4, 1897, to December 1, 1899; and the amount of Treasury notes outstanding December 1, 1899, and the amount of such silver dollars remaining unused in such redemption.

IMPROVEMENT OF TACOMA HARBOR.

Mr. FOSTER submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be directed to cause a survey to be made and an estimate submitted of the cost of dredging and otherwise improving the harbor of the city of Tacoma, in the State of Washington, in accordance with the recommendations filed in the War Department.

SOUTH AFRICAN REPUBLIC.

Mr. MASON. I offer a resolution, which I ask to have laid upon the table for the present, to be hereafter referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution submitted by Senator from Illinois will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas from the hour of achieving their own independence the people of the United States have regarded with sympathy the struggles of other people to free themselves from European domination: Therefore,

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That we watch with deep and abiding interest the heroic battle of the South African Republic against cruelty and oppression, and our best hopes go out for the full success of their determined contest for liberty.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the resolution be printed.

Mr. MASON. Let the resolution lie on the table and be printed, to be hereafter referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I desire on some convenient day to occupy about ten minutes of the time of the Senate on the resolution before it is referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of objection, the resolution will be printed and lie on the table subject to the call of the Senator from Illinois.

APPOINTMENTS OF COMMISSIONERS OR AGENTS.

Mr. VEST. I submit a resolution which I ask to have referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The resolution was read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved, That in order to maintain the absolute independence of the various departments of the Government, as intended by the Constitution, no person while holding a judicial or legislative office under the United States should be appointed by the President commissioner or agent of the Government, nor in any department thereof.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask that the resolution may be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That order will be made, in the absence of objection.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. There is a vacancy in the minority representation upon the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and in view of the business before that committee, I think it proper to have that vacancy temporarily filled. It is understood, of course, by members of the Senate that there is an arrangement in

process for the reorganization of the committees, but, pending that, this vacancy should be filled. I therefore move that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. HARRIS] be put on that committee to fill such vacancy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas moves that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. HARRIS] be made a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. COCKRELL. Temporarily.

Mr. CHANDLER. There is no objection to filling the vacancy temporarily, as moved by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That is the motion—that the vacancy be filled temporarily.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There being no objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CARTER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After thirty minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 2 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, December 7, 1899, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 6, 1899.

SECRETARY OF WAR.

Elihu Root, of New York, to be Secretary of War, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Russell A. Alger, resigned.

LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS.

Herbert Putnam, of Massachusetts, to be Librarian of Congress, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice John Russell Young, deceased.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSIONER.

Joseph W. Fifer, of Illinois, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term ending March 9, 1904, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice William J. Calhoun, resigned.

THIRD ASSISTANT POSTMASTER-GENERAL.

Edwin C. Madden, of Michigan, to be Third Assistant Postmaster-General, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice John A. Merritt, appointed postmaster at Washington.

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF THE CENSUS.

Frederick H. Wines, of Springfield, Ill., who was appointed March 6, 1899, during the recess of the Senate, to be Assistant Director of the Census, to fill an original vacancy.

ENVOYS EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTERS PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Bellamy Storer, of Ohio, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Spain, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Stewart L. Woodford, resigned.

Lawrence Townsend, of Pennsylvania, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Belgium, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Bellamy Storer, appointed envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Spain.

John N. Irwin, of Iowa, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Portugal, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Lawrence Townsend, appointed envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Belgium.

William P. Lord, of Oregon, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to the Argentine Republic, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice William I. Buchanan, resigned.

Arthur S. Hardy, of New Hampshire, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Greece, Roumania, and Servia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice William Woodville Rockhill, resigned.

MINISTER RESIDENT AND CONSUL-GENERAL.

Herbert W. Bowen, of New York, to be minister resident and consul-general of the United States to Persia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Arthur S. Hardy, appointed envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Greece, Roumania, and Servia.

SECRETARY OF LEGATION AND CONSUL-GENERAL.

Arthur M. Beaupré, of Illinois, to be secretary of the legation and consul-general of the United States at Bogotá, Colombia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice James C. McNally, appointed secretary of legation to Guatemala and Honduras and consul-general to Guatemala.

SECRETARIES OF LEGATIONS.

Lloyd Carpenter Griscom, of Pennsylvania, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at Constantinople, Turkey, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice John W. Riddle, resigned.

James C. McNally, of Pennsylvania, to be secretary of the legation of the United States to Guatemala and Honduras and consul-general to Guatemala, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Arthur M. Beaupré, appointed secretary of legation and consul-general at Bogotá.

SECRETARIES OF EMBASSIES.

Second secretary of legation.

Spencer F. Eddy, of Illinois, to be second secretary of the embassy of the United States at Paris, France, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Edgar T. Scott, resigned.

Third secretary of legation.

Joseph H. Choate, jr., of New York, to be third secretary of the embassay of the United States at London, England, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Spencer F. Eddy, appointed second secretary of the embassy at Paris.

CONSULS-GENERAL.

John G. Long, of Florida, to be agent and consul-general of the United States at Cairo, Egypt, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Thomas S. Harrison, resigned.

Julius G. Lay, of the District of Columbia, to be consul-general of the United States at Barcelona, Spain, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Herbert W. Bowen, appointed minister resident and consul-general to Persia.

Philip C. Hanna, of Iowa, to be consul-general of the United States at Monterey, Mexico, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice John K. Pollard, deceased.

CONSULS.

William P. Atwell, of the District of Columbia, to be consul of the United States at Roubaix, France, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to fill the vacancy caused by the changing of the grade of the office from a commercial agency to a consulate.

Solomon Berliner, of New York, to be consul of the United States at Teneriffe, Canary Islands, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to fill a vacancy. Mr. Berliner was lately consul at Teneriffe, and his exequatur was canceled by the war between the United States and Spain.

Richard M. Bartleman, of Massachusetts, to be consul of the United States at Malaga, Spain, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to fill a vacancy. Mr. Bartleman was lately consul at Malaga, and his exequatur was canceled by the war between the United States and Spain.

Harlan W. Brush, of New York, to be consul of the United States at Niagara Falls, Canada, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate. Mr. Brush was lately consul at the same city, which was then known as Clifton.

Max J. Baehr, of Nebraska, to be consul of the United States at Santos, Brazil, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Frank D. Hill, appointed consul at Amsterdam.

Joseph Bowron, of Carthagena, to be consul of the United States at Carthagena, Spain, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Cirilo Molina, resigned.

Martin J. Carter, of Pennsylvania, to be consul of the United States at St. Johns, Newfoundland, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to fill the vacancy caused by the nonaction of the Senate upon the nomination of Mr. Carter, which was made during its last session.

John Howell Carroll, of Maryland, to be consul of the United States at Cadiz, Spain, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to fill a vacancy. Mr. Carroll was lately consul at Cadiz, and his exequatur was canceled by the war between the United States and Spain.

Henry W. Diederich, of the District of Columbia, to be consul of the United States at Bremen, Germany, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Louis Lange, jr., resigned.

William Ross Davis, of Ohio, to be consul of the United States at Alexandretta, Turkey, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Horace L. Washington, appointed consul at Valencia.

Adelbert S. Hay, of New Hampshire, to be consul of the United States at Pretoria, South African Republic, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Charles E. Macrum, recalled.

Julio Harmony, of New York, to be consul of the United States at Corunna, Spain, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to fill a vacancy. Mr. Harmony was lately consul at Corunna, and his exequatur was canceled by the war between the United States and Spain.

Frank D. Hill, of Minnesota, to be consul of the United States at Amsterdam, Netherlands, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice George J. Corey, resigned.

Jesse H. Johnson, of Texas, to be consul of the United States at Coaticook, Canada, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Joel Linsley, deceased.

Daniel S. Kidder, of Florida, to be consul of the United States at Algiers, Africa, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Charles T. Grellet, recalled.

Peter Lieber, of Indiana, to be consul of the United States at Düsseldorf, Germany, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice George P. Pettit, deceased.

Robert E. Mansfield, of Indiana, to be consul of the United States at Zanzibar, Zanzibar, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice John C. Billheimer, resigned.

Hugh C. Morris, of Michigan, to be consul of the United States at Windsor, Ontario, Canada, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Julius G. Lay, appointed consul-general at Barcelona.

Jay White, of Michigan, to be consul of the United States at Hanover, Germany, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice William K. Anderson, resigned.

Ethelbert Watts, of Pennsylvania, to be consul of the United States at Kingston, Jamaica, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Louis A. Dent, resigned.

Alexander Wood, of Pennsylvania, to be consul of the United States at Kehl, Germany, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Max J. Baehr, appointed consul at Santos.

Horace L. Washington, of Texas, to be consul of the United States at Valencia, Spain, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to fill an original vacancy.

Heaton W. Harris, of Ohio, to be consul of the United States at Mannheim, Germany, vice Walter J. Hoffman, resigned.

SURVEYOR-GENERAL.

Edward P. Kingsbury, of Centralia, Wash., who was appointed October 19, 1899, during the recess of the Senate, to be surveyor-general of Washington, vice William McMicken, deceased.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Alfred Cypreansen, of Eau Claire, Wis., who was appointed June 10, 1899, during the recess of the Senate, to be register of the land office at Eau Claire, Wis., vice John B. Fleming, term expired.

Charles T. Duke, of Monticello, Ark., who was appointed September 14, 1899, during the recess of the Senate, to be register of the land office at Camden, Ark., vice Jacob B. Freidheim, deceased.

Albert E. Rose, of Fargo, N. Dak., who was appointed May 27, 1899, during the recess of the Senate, to be register of the land office at Peavy, Alaska, vice Boetious H. Sullivan, declined.

Lee Stover, of Watertown, S. Dak., who was appointed September 30, 1899, during the recess of the Senate, to be register of the land office at Watertown, S. Dak., vice Hobart A. Babcock, removed.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Albert J. Apperson, of McMinnville, Oreg., who was appointed May 3, 1899, during the recess of the Senate, to be receiver of public moneys at Sitka, Alaska, vice Roswell Shelley, resigned.

David W. Eastman, of Emporia, Kans., who was appointed October 4, 1899, during the recess of the Senate, to be receiver of public moneys at Enid, Okla., vice John J. S. Hassler, deceased.

Frank M. Foote, of Evanston, Wyo., who was appointed October 19, 1899, during the recess of the Senate, to be receiver of public moneys at Evanston, Wyo., vice Benjamin M. Ausherman, resigned.

Charles J. Greene, of Ruston, La., who was appointed April 1, 1899, during the recess of the Senate, to be receiver of public moneys at Natchitoches, La., vice Jared S. Dixon, removed.

Joel R. Scott, of Newkirk, Okla., who was appointed April 22, 1899, during the recess of the Senate, to be receiver of public moneys at Perry, Okla., vice James J. Power, deceased.

Othello Scribner, of Fresno, Cal., who was appointed May 17, 1899, during the recess of the Senate, to be receiver of public moneys at Visalia, Cal., vice Charles H. Norris, deceased.

INDIAN AGENTS.

Alonzo A. Armstrong, of Phœnix, Ariz., who was appointed March 4, 1899, during the recess of the Senate, to be agent for the Indians of the Fort Apache Agency, in Arizona, vice Charles D. Keyes, deceased.

John E. Edwards, of Junction, Mont., who was appointed June 3, 1899, during the recess of the Senate, to be agent for the Indians of the Crow Agency, in Montana, vice Edward H. Becker, removed.

Ira A. Hatch, of Mound City, S. Dak., who was appointed October 4, 1899, during the recess of the Senate, to be agent for the Indians of the Cheyenne River Agency in South Dakota, vice James G. Reid, removed.

George W. Hayzlett, of Laporte City, Iowa, who was appointed August 10, 1898, but whose nomination failed of confirmation during the last session of the Senate, and was again appointed March 4, 1899, during the recess, to be agent for the Indians of the Navajo Agency in New Mexico, vice Maj. Constant Williams, United States Army, relieved from duty as acting Indian agent.

William R. Honnell, of Horton, Kans., who was appointed April 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate, to be agent for the Indians of the Pottawatomie and Great Nemaha Agency in Kansas, vice George W. James, resigned.

Louis A. Knackstedt, of Ignacio, Colo., who was appointed June 30, 1899, during the recess of the Senate, to be agent for the Indians of the Southern Ute Agency in Colorado, vice William H. Meyer, resigned.

William R. Logan, of Alhambra, Mont., who was appointed June 3, 1899, during the recess of the Senate, to be agent for the Indians of the Blackfeet Agency in Montana, vice Thomas P. Fuller, deceased.

Charles S. McNichols, of Parker, Ariz., who was appointed July 27, 1897, and July 9, 1898, but whose nominations failed of confirmation by the Senate, and who was again appointed March 4, 1899, during the recess, to be agent for the Indians of the Colorado River Agency in Arizona, vice Charles E. Davis, resigned.

Lieut. Col. James F. Randlett, United States Army, retired, of La Mesa, Cal., who was appointed May 13, 1899, during the recess of the Senate, to be agent for the Indians of the Kiowa Agency in Oklahoma Territory, vice William T. Walker, removed.

J. Blair Sboenfelt, of Douglas, Wyo., who was appointed April 3, 1899, during the recess of the Senate, to be agent for the Indians of the Union Agency in the Indian Territory, vice Dew M. Wisdom, resigned.

Clinton T. Stranahan, of Lewiston, Idaho, who was appointed June 3, 1899, during the recess of the Senate, to be agent for the Indians of the Nez Perces Agency in Idaho, vice Stanton G. Fisher, resigned.

Fred B. Spriggs, of Utica, N. Y., who was appointed October 9, 1897, and July 9, 1898, but whose nominations failed of confirmation by the Senate, and who was again appointed March 4, 1899, during the recess, to be agent for the Indians of the Nevada Agency in Nevada, vice Isaac J. Wootten, removed.

REGISTER OF WILLS.

Louis A. Dent, of the District of Columbia, who was appointed September 19, 1899, during the recess of the Senate, to be register of wills for the District of Columbia, vice J. Nota McGill, resigned.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

GENERAL OFFICERS.

To be brigadier-generals.

Col. Edgar R. Kellogg, Sixth United States Infantry, December 5, 1899, vice Burke, retired from active service.

Col. Gilbert S. Carpenter, Eighteenth United States Infantry, December 5, 1899, vice Henry, deceased.

Col. Edwin V. Sumner (since retired from active service), Seventh Cavalry, March 27, 1899, vice Miller, retired from active service.

Col. Thomas M. Anderson, Fourteenth Infantry, March 31, 1899, vice Sumner, retired from active service.

Col. Alexander C. M. Pennington (since retired from active service), Second Artillery, October 16, 1899, vice Shafter, retired from active service.

Col. Royal T. Frank (since retired from active service), First Artillery, October 17, 1899, vice Pennington, retired from active service.

Col. Louis H. Carpenter (since retired from active service), Fifth Cavalry, October 18, 1899, vice Frank, retired from active service.

Col. Samuel Ovenshine (since retired from active service), Twenty-third Infantry, October 19, 1899, vice Carpenter, retired from active service.

Col. Daniel W. Burke (since retired from active service), Seventeenth Infantry, October 20, 1899, vice Ovenshine, retired from active service.

PAY DEPARTMENT.

To be Paymaster-General, with the rank of brigadier-general.

Col. Alfred E. Bates, assistant paymaster-general, July 12, 1899, vice Carey, retired from active service.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

To be Chief of Ordnance, with the rank of brigadier-general.

Col. Adelbert R. Buffington, Ordnance Department, April 5, 1899, vice Flagler, deceased.

To be first lieutenant.

First Lieut. Edward P. O'Hern, Third Artillery, October 23, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

QUARTERMASTER'S DEPARTMENT.

To be assistant quartermasters with the rank of captain.

First Lieut. George McK. Williamson, Eighth Cavalry, July 21, 1899, vice Hyde, promoted.

First Lieut. Robert Sewell, First Cavalry, September 1, 1899, vice Quay, resigned.

First Lieut. Thomas H. Slavens, Fourth Cavalry, November 13, 1899, vice Howard, killed in action.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

To be assistant surgeons with the rank of first lieutenant.

Otway W. Rash, of Kentucky, June 14, 1899, vice Wyeth, promoted.

Benjamin J. Edger, jr., of Pennsylvania, June 14, 1899, vice Porter, retired from active service.

PAY DEPARTMENT.

To be paymasters with the rank of major.

Harry L. Rees, of Oregon, March 2, 1899, vice Mosher, retired from active service.

Webster Vinson, of Virginia, April 3, 1899, vice Sniffen, promoted.

Capt. John Murphy (since retired from active service), Fourteenth Infantry, July 12, 1899, vice Baird, promoted.

Charles Newbold, of District of Columbia, July 22, 1899, vice Murphy, retired from active service.

Hamilton S. Wallace, of District of Columbia, September 9, 1899, vice Witcher, retired from active service.

To be chaplains.

The Rev. John A. Randolph, of Massachusetts, March 6, 1899, vice Ritner, retired from active service.

The Rev. William D. McKinnon, of California, October 27, 1899, vice Seibold, retired from active service.

The Rev. Rowland Stuart Nichols, of Massachusetts, November 27, 1899, vice Hall, retired from active service.

TRANSFERS IN THE ARMY.

Second Lieut. Charles P. Faulkner, from the artillery arm to the infantry arm, March 9, 1899, with rank from July 9, 1898.

Second Lieut. Earle W. Tanner, from the artillery arm to the infantry arm, April 4, 1899, with rank from March 23, 1899.

Second Lieut. Harold P. Goodnow, from the artillery arm to the infantry arm, September 23, 1899, with rank from September 10, 1899.

Second Lieut. Percy W. Arnold, from the artillery arm to the cavalry arm, March 29, 1899, with rank from June 23, 1898.

Second Lieut. Rush S. Wells, from the artillery arm to the cavalry arm, March 29, 1899, with rank from July 9, 1898.

Second Lieut. Herbert J. Brees, from the artillery arm to the cavalry arm, March 29, 1899, with rank from July 9, 1898.

Second Lieut. Ward B. Pershing, from the artillery arm to the cavalry arm, April 3, 1899, with rank from July 9, 1898.

Second Lieut. Robert R. Wallach, from the artillery arm to the cavalry arm, March 29, 1899, with rank from July 9, 1898.

Second Lieut. George Williams, from the artillery arm to the cavalry arm, March 29, 1899, with rank from July 9, 1898.

Second Lieut. Charles S. Haight, from the artillery arm to the cavalry arm, March 29, 1899, with rank from July 9, 1898.

Second Lieut. Ben H. Dorcy, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, May 10, 1899, with rank from April 5, 1899.

Second Lieut. Clark D. Dudley, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, May 10, 1899, with rank from April 5, 1899.

Second Lieut. Hamilton Foley, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, May 10, 1899, with rank from April 10, 1899.

Second Lieut. Edwin A. Hickman, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, May 10, 1899, with rank from April 10, 1899.

Second Lieut. Warren W. Whitside, from infantry arm to the cavalry arm, May 10, 1899, with rank from April 10, 1899.

Second Lieut. Godwin Ordway, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, May 10, 1899, with rank from April 10, 1899.

Second Lieut. Samuel A. Purviance, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, May 10, 1899, with rank from April 10, 1899.

Second Lieut. Guy Cushman, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, May 10, 1899, with rank from April 10, 1899.

Second Lieut. James D. Tilford, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, May 10, 1899, with rank from April 10, 1899.

Second Lieut. Guy S. Norvell, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, May 10, 1899, with rank from April 10, 1899.

Second Lieut. John McClintock, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, May 15, 1899, with rank from April 11, 1899.

INFANTRY ARM.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. John W. French, Twenty-third Infantry, March 26, 1899, vice Egbert, Twenty-second Infantry, killed in action.

Lieut. Col. Aaron S. Daggett, Twenty-fifth Infantry, March 31, 1899, vice Anderson, Fourteenth Infantry, appointed brigadier-general, United States Army.

Lieut. Col. Chambers McKibbin, Twenty-first Infantry, April 1, 1899, vice Andrews, Twelfth Infantry, retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. Emerson H. Liscum, Twenty-fourth Infantry, April 25, 1899, vice Powell, Ninth Infantry, retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. Charles C. Hood, Nineteenth Infantry, May 5, 1899, vice Bailey, Sixteenth Infantry, retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. Ezra P. Ewers, Ninth Infantry, May 16, 1899, vice Pearson, Tenth Infantry, retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. William H. Bisbee, First Infantry, June 16, 1899, vice Smith, Thirteenth Infantry, retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. Gilbert S. Carpenter, Seventh Infantry, June 20, 1899, vice Van Valzah, Eighteenth Infantry, retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. Abram A. Harbach, Third Infantry, July 19, 1899, vice Miles, First Infantry, retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. Daniel W. Burke (since appointed brigadier-general, United States Army), Eleventh Infantry, September 8, 1899, vice Powell, Seventeenth Infantry, retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. George W. Davis, Fourteenth Infantry, October 19, 1899, vice Ovenshine, Twenty-third Infantry, appointed brigadier-general, United States Army.

Lieut. Col. Jacob H. Smith, Twelfth Infantry, October 20, 1899, vice Burke, Seventeenth Infantry, appointed brigadier-general, United States Army.

To be lieutenant-colonels.

Maj. Richard I. Eskridge, Tenth Infantry, March 26, 1899, vice French, Twenty-third Infantry, promoted.

Maj. Stephen P. Jocelyn, Nineteenth Infantry, March 31, 1899, vice Daggett, Twenty-fifth Infantry, promoted.

Maj. William H. Clapp, Eleventh Infantry, April 1, 1899, vice McKibbin, Twenty-first Infantry, promoted.

Maj. Charles Keller, Eighteenth Infantry, April 25, 1899, vice Liscum, Twenty-fourth Infantry, promoted.

Maj. William F. Spurgin, Twenty-third Infantry, May 4, 1899, vice McLaughlin, Sixteenth Infantry, retired from active service.

Maj. William H. Boyle, Twenty-first Infantry, May 5, 1899, vice Hood, Nineteenth Infantry, promoted.

Maj. Egbert B. Savage (since transferred to the Thirteenth Infantry and retired from active service), Eighth Infantry, May 14, 1899, vice Smith, Tenth Infantry, retired from active service.

Maj. Charles A. Coolidge, Seventh Infantry, May 16, 1899, vice Ewers, Ninth Infantry, promoted.

Maj. Wilson T. Hartz, Fifteenth Infantry, May 25, 1899, vice Humphrey, Twenty-second Infantry, retired from active service.

Maj. Charles A. Dempsey, Second Infantry, June 16, 1899, vice Bisbee, First Infantry, promoted.

Maj. William E. Dougherty, First Infantry, June 20, 1899, vice Carpenter, Seventh Infantry, promoted.

Maj. Sumner H. Lincoln, Tenth Infantry, July 12, 1899, vice Coe, Thirteenth Infantry, retired from active service.

Maj. Greenleaf A. Goodale, Twenty-third Infantry, July 19, 1899, vice Harbach, Third Infantry, promoted.

Maj. Cyrus S. Roberts, Seventeenth Infantry, August 14, 1899, vice Savage, Thirteenth Infantry, retired from active service.

Maj. Henry R. Brinkerhoff, Third Infantry, September 8, 1899, vice Burke, Eleventh Infantry, promoted.

Maj. J. Milton Thompson, Twenty-fourth Infantry, October 19, 1899, vice Davis, Fourteenth Infantry, promoted.

Maj. John W. Bubb, Fourth Infantry, October 20, 1899, vice Smith, Twelfth Infantry, promoted.

To be majors.

Capt. David B. Wilson, Twenty-fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. Walter T. Duggan, Tenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. Leon A. Matile, Fourteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. Butler D. Price, Fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. John G. Leefe, Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. Henry H. Adams, Eighteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. Owen J. Sweet, Twenty-fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. Albert L. Myer, Eleventh Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. Charles A. Vernon (since retired from active service), Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. John W. Hannay, Third Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. John J. O'Connell, First Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. Samuel R. Whitall, Sixteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. James Regan, Ninth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. John B. Rodman, Twentieth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. Harry L. Haskell, Twelfth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. Daniel Cornman, Twenty-first Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. Charles B. Hall, Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. Joseph W. Duncan, Twenty-first Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. Henry Wygant, Twenty-fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. George O. Webster (since retired from active service), Fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. Robert F. Bates (since retired from active service), Eighteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. Frank H. Edmunds, First Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. Francis W. Mansfield, Eleventh Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. Frederick M. H. Kendrick, Seventh Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. P. Henry Ray, Eighth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. Benjamin C. Lockwood, Twenty-second Infantry, March 13, 1899, vice Quinby, First Infantry, retired from active service.

Capt. Charles M. Rockefeller, Ninth Infantry, March 16, 1899, vice Wilhelm, Twenty-first Infantry, retired from active service.

Capt. Charles B. Hinton (since retired from active service), Eighteenth Infantry, March 26, 1899, vice Eskridge, Tenth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Philip Reade, Third Infantry, March 31, 1899, vice Jocelyn, Nineteenth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. John T. Van Orsdale, Seventh Infantry, April 1, 1899, vice Clapp, Eleventh Infantry, promoted.

Capt. William Gerlach (since retired from active service), Third Infantry, April 25, 1899, vice Keller, Eighteenth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. James A. Buchanan, Eleventh Infantry, May 4, 1899, vice Spurgin, Twenty-third Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Joseph F. Huston, Twentieth Infantry, May 5, 1899, vice Boyle, Twenty-first Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Willis Wittich, Twenty-first Infantry, May 14, 1899, vice Savage, Eighth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. William H. W. James, Twenty-fourth Infantry, May 16, 1899, vice Coolidge, Seventh Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Ralph W. Hoyt, Eleventh Infantry, May 16, 1899, vice Brown, Twelfth Infantry, retired from active service.

Capt. George A. Cornish, Fifteenth Infantry, May 25, 1899, vice Hartz, Fifteenth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. John A. Baldwin, Ninth Infantry, June 2, 1899, vice Bates, Twenty-second Infantry, retired from active service.

Capt. Charles A. Williams, Twenty-first Infantry, June 8, 1899, vice Vernon, Seventeenth Infantry, retired from active service.

Capt. Marion P. Maus, First Infantry, June 16, 1899, vice Dempsey, Second Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Frederick A. Smith, Twelfth Infantry, June 20, 1899, vice Dougherty, First Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Thomas C. Woodbury, Sixteenth Infantry, July 8, 1899, vice Ebstein, Nineteenth Infantry, retired from active service.

Capt. George Le R. Brown, Eleventh Infantry, July 12, 1899, vice Lincoln, Tenth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Edward B. Pratt, Twenty-third Infantry, July 19, 1899, vice Goodale, Twenty-third Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Calvin D. Cowles, Twenty-third Infantry, August 14, 1899, vice Roberts, Seventeenth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. George P. Borden, Fifth Infantry, September 8, 1899, vice Brinkerhoff, Third Infantry, promoted.

Capt. William B. Wheeler, Eighteenth Infantry, September 8, 1899, vice Webster, Fourth Infantry, retired from active service.

Capt. Walter S. Scott, Twenty-fifth Infantry, September 8, 1899, vice Hinton, Eighteenth Infantry, retired from active service.

Capt. Cornelius Gardener, Nineteenth Infantry, September 16, 1899, vice Cavenaugh, Thirteenth Infantry, retired from active service.

Capt. Alfred Reynolds, Twentieth Infantry, September 20, 1899, vice Parker, Twenty-second Infantry, retired from active service.

Capt. Leven C. Allen, Sixteenth Infantry, October 10, 1899, vice Seton, Twelfth Infantry, retired from active service.

Capt. James E. Macklin, Eleventh Infantry, October 19, 1899, vice Thompson, Twenty-fourth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. William L. Pitcher, Eighth Infantry, October 20, 1899, vice Bubb, Fourth Infantry, promoted.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Frederick V. Krüg, Twentieth Infantry, February 27, vice Forbes, Fifth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. William N. Blow, jr., Fifteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Manning, Fourteenth Infantry, retired from active service.

First Lieut. Everett E. Benjamin, First Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Wilson, Twenty-fifth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. William J. Pardee, Twenty-fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Duggan, Tenth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. William M. Wright, Second Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Matile, Fourteenth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. André W. Brewster, Ninth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Price, Fourth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Charles H. Muir, Second Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Leefe, Nineteenth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Austin H. Brown, Fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Adams, Eighteenth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Almon L. Parmerter, Twenty-first Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Sweet, Twenty-fifth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Frank De W. Ramsey, Ninth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Myer, Eleventh Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Henry P. McCain, Fourteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Vernon, Nineteenth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. William S. Biddle, jr., Fourteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Hannay, Third Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. George S. Cartwright, Twenty-fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice O'Connell, First Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Samuel E. Smiley, Fifteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Whithall, Sixteenth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Daniel B. Devore, Twenty-third Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Regan, Ninth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Beaumont B. Buck, Sixteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Ritzius, Twenty-fifth Infantry, retired from active service.

First Lieut. William F. Martin, Fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Rodman, Twentieth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Edward P. Lawton, Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Haskell, Twelfth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Evan M. Johnson, jr., Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Cornman, Twenty-first Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Frank McIntyre, Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Hall, Nineteenth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Harry Freeland, Third Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Duncan, Twenty-first Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. David J. Baker, jr., Twelfth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Wygant, Twenty-fourth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Benjamin A. Poore, Sixth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Webster, Fourth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Edward W. McCaskey, Twenty-first Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Bates, Eighteenth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Chauncey B. Baker, Seventh Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Edmunds, First Infantry promoted.

First Lieut. James H. McRae, Third Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Mansfield, Eleventh Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Amos B. Shattuck, Twenty-fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Kendrick, Seventh Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. William M. Swaine, Twenty-second Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Ray, Eighth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Walter H. Gordon, Eighteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Armand I. Lasseigne, Fourteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. James H. Frier, Seventeenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. George J. Godfrey, Twenty-second Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Henry C. Keene, jr., Twenty-fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Frank L. Winn, Twelfth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Charles C. Ballou, Twelfth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Erneste V. Smith, Fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. George B. Duncan, Fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Lucius L. Durfee, Seventeenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Charles D. Dwyer, Third Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Julius A. Penn, Second Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Edward M. Lewis, Twentieth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Richard C. Croxton, First Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Edward N. Jones, jr., Eighth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Dwight E. Holley, Fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Arthur Johnson, Seventeenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Odon Gurovits, Eleventh Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Stephen M. Hackney, Fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. George E. French, Fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. George W. Martin, Eighteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Harry D. Humphrey, Twentieth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Harry E. Wilkins, Second Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Charles H. Martin, Fourteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. William Weigel, Eleventh Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. John C. Gregg (since killed in action), Fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Thomas G. Hanson, Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Herman Hall, Twenty-second Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Arthur B. Foster, Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Marcus D. Cronin, Twenty-fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Charles S. Farnsworth, Seventh Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Charles Gerhardt, Eighth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Samuel Seay, jr., Fourteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. James T. Dean, Fourteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Ulysses G. McAlexander, Thirteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Edson A. Lewis, Eighteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. William K. Jones, Sixth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Edmund Wittenmyer, Fifteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Michael J. Lenihan, Second Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Mark L. Hersey, Twelfth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Samuel A. Smoke, Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Frank H. Albright, Twenty-fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Frederic D. Evans, Eighteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. James Baylies, Tenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. George A. Detchmendy, First Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Earl C. Carnahan, Fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Archibald A. Cabaniss, Twenty-fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Thomas M. Moody, Twentieth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Charles E. Tayman, Twenty-fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. James W. McAndrew, Third Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. John S. Grisard, Seventh Infantry, March 13, 1899, vice Lockwood, Twenty-second Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Edward R. Chrisman, Sixth Infantry, March 16, 1899, vice Burns, Seventh Infantry, retired from active service.

First Lieut. Peter C. Harris, Thirteenth Infantry, March 16, 1899, vice Rockefeller, Ninth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Munroe McFarland, Thirteenth Infantry, March 26, 1899, vice Hinton, Eighteenth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. William T. Wilder, Twenty-fifth Infantry, March 31, 1899, vice Reade, Third Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. William H. Wilhelm, Fourteenth Infantry, March 31, 1899, vice Gregg, Twenty-first Infantry, killed in action.

First Lieut. William R. Sample, Thirteenth Infantry, April 1, 1899, vice Van Orsdale, Seventh Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. William R. Dashiell, Twenty-fourth Infantry, April 25, 1899, vice Gerlach, Third Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Eli A. Helmick, Tenth Infantry, May 4, 1899, vice Buchanan, Eleventh Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Charles G. French, Fifteenth Infantry, May 5, 1899, vice Huston, Twentieth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Robert W. Rose, Seventeenth Infantry, May 14, 1899, vice Wittich, Twenty-first Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. William C. Bennett, Sixth Infantry, May 16, 1899, vice James, Twenty-fourth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. William A. Campbell, Twenty-second Infantry, May 16, 1899, vice Hoyt, Eleventh Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Frederic H. Sargent, Eighth Infantry, May 19, 1899, vice McFarland, Sixteenth Infantry, retired from active service.

First Lieut. Harold L. Jackson, Twenty-second Infantry, May 25, 1899, vice Cornish, Fifteenth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. John M. Sigworth, Ninth Infantry, June 2, 1899, vice Baldwin, Ninth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Percival G. Lowe, Eighteenth Infantry, June 8, 1899, vice Ord, Twenty-fifth Infantry, retired from active service.

First Lieut. Wilson Chase, Twenty-second Infantry, June 8, 1899, vice Williams, Twenty-first Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Charles B. Hagadorn, Twenty-third Infantry, June 16, 1899, vice Maus, First Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Harry R. Lee, Eleventh Infantry, June 20, 1899, vice Smith, Twelfth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Edwin V. Bookmiller, Ninth Infantry, July 8, 1899, vice Woodbury, Sixteenth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Edward T. Winston, Nineteenth Infantry, July 11, 1899, vice Woodruff, Fifth Infantry, deceased.

First Lieut. Edwin T. Cole, Fourth Infantry, July 12, 1899, vice Brown, Eleventh Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. William A. Phillips, Second Infantry, July 15, 1899, vice Seyburn, Tenth Infantry, resigned.

First Lieut. John R. M. Taylor, Twenty-third Infantry, July 17, 1899, vice Murphy, Fourteenth Infantry, appointed paymaster.

First Lieut. George W. Kirkman, Eighth Infantry, July 19, 1899, vice Pratt, Twenty-third Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Francis E. Lacey, jr., First Infantry, August 14, 1899, vice Cowles, Twenty-third Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Sydney A. Cloman, Fifteenth Infantry, September 7, 1899, vice Collins, Twenty-third Infantry, deceased.

First Lieut. Charles Crawford, Twenty-first Infantry, September 8, 1899, vice Borden, Fifth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. William S. Graves, Seventh Infantry, September 8, 1899, vice Guard, retired from active service.

First Lieut. Frank D. Webster, Twentieth Infantry, September 8, 1899, vice Wheeler, Eighteenth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Joseph D. Leitch, Twenty-fourth Infantry, September 8, 1899, vice Scott, Twenty-fifth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Samuel Burkhardt, jr., Tenth Infantry, September 16, 1899, vice Gardener, Nineteenth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. James E. Normoyle, Fifth Infantry, September 20, 1899, vice Reynolds, Twentieth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Robert Alexander, Eleventh Infantry, October 2, 1899, vice Eldridge, Fourteenth Infantry, died of wounds received in action.

First. Lieut. Frederick S. Wild, Twelfth Infantry, October 8, 1899, vice Saffold, Thirteenth Infantry, killed in action.

First. Lieut. William O. Johnson, Second Infantry, October 10, 1899, vice Allen, Sixteenth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. James R. Lindsay, Eighth Infantry, October 11, 1899, vice Geary, Thirteenth Infantry, died from wounds received in action.

First Lieut. Hiram McL. Powell, First Infantry, October 19, 1899, vice Macklin, Eleventh Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Fred W. Sladen, Fourth Infantry, October 20, 1899, vice Pitcher, Eighth Infantry, promoted.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Preston Brown, Second Infantry, February 27, 1899, vice Krüg, Twentieth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. William D. Conrad, Twenty-third Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Blow, Fifteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Thomas Franklin, Twenty-third Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Benjamin, First Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. George H. Steel (since resigned), Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Pardee, Twenty-fifth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Paul Giddings, Third Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Wright, Second Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. George L. Byroade, Third Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Brewster, Ninth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Ira L. Reeves, Seventeenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Muir, Second Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edward S. Walton, Eighteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Brown, Fourth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Alfred T. Smith, Twelfth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Parmerter, Twenty-first Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Bert H. Merchant, Eighth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Ramsey, Ninth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Fred L. Munson, Ninth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice McCain, Fourteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Thomas M. Anderson, jr., Thirteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Biddle, Fourteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. John E. Hunt, Twenty-fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Cartwright, Twenty-fourth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Charles D. Roberts, Seventeenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Smiley, Fifteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. John K. Moore, Fifteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Devore, Twenty-third Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Claude H. Miller, Twenty-fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Buck, Sixteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Harold B. Fiske, Eighteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Martin, Fifth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. John H. Hughes, Fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Lawton, Nineteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. George W. Helms, Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Johnson, Nineteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Rufus E. Longan, Eleventh Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice McIntyre, Nineteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Frank M. Savage, Fifteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Freeland, Third Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Thomas T. Frissell, Third Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Baker, Twelfth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edward A. Roche, Fifteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Poore, Sixth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. William M. Fassett, Twenty-first Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice McCaskey, Twenty-first Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Henry M. Dichmann, Seventh Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Baker, Seventh Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Halstead Dorey, Fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice McRae, Third Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. George F. Baltzell, Fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Shattuck, Twenty-fifth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edgar T. Conley, Twenty-first Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Swaine, Twenty-second Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edgar T. Collins, Eighth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Gordon, Eighteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Seaborn G. Chiles, Eleventh Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Lasseigne, Fourteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Lyman M. Welch, Twentieth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Frier, Seventeenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Warren S. Barlow, Fifteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Godfrey, Twenty-second Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. John G. Workizer, Second Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Keene, Twenty-fourth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Charles H. Bridges, Twenty-second Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Winn, Twelfth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. John Robertson, Sixth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Ballou, Twelfth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. James V. Heidt, Sixth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Smith, Fourth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Charles S. Lincoln, Twenty-fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Duncan, Fourth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Patrick H. Mullay, Fourteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Williams, Fifteenth Infantry, retired from active service.

Second Lieut. Robert McCleave, Second Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Durfee, Seventeenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Monroe C. Kerth, Twenty-third Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Dwyer, Third Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Charles H. Munton, Twenty-third Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Penn, Second Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Curtis W. Otwell, Seventh Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Lewis, Twentieth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Francis K. Meade, Twenty-first Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Croxton, First Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Lambert W. Jordan, jr., First Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Jones, Eighth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. William F. Nesbitt, Sixth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Holley, Fourth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. James B. Gowan, Sixteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Johnson, Seventeenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Harvey W. Miller, Thirteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Gurovits, Eleventh Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edwin D. Bricker, Seventeenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Hackney, Fifth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Thomas F. Maginnis, Eleventh Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice French, Fourth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. William W. Fiscus, jr., Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Martin, Eighteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Daniel G. Berry, First Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Humphrey, Twentieth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Harold Hammond, Ninth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Wilkins, Second Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Ralph E. Ingram, Fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Martin, Fourteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Robert C. Davis, Seventh Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Weigel, Eleventh Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Joseph F. Janda, Eighth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Gregg, Fourth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Alvan C. Read, Thirteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Hanson, Nineteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Ira C. Welborn, Ninth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Hall, Twenty-second Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. David E. W. Lyle, Eighteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Foster, Nineteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Alexander E. Williams, Second Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Cronin, Twenty-fifth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Romulus F. Walton, Tenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Farnsworth, Seventh Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Charles W. Exton, Twentieth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Gerhardt, Eighth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. David P. Wheeler, Twenty-third Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Seay, Fourteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edgar Ridenour, Sixteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Dean, Fourteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Chauncey B. Humphrey, Third Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice McAlexander, Thirteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Berkeley Enochs, Twenty-fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Lewis, Eighteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. William L. Murphy, Twenty-fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Jones, Sixth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Robert J. Maxey, Sixth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Wittenmeyer, Fifteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. G. Maury Crallé, Twentieth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Lenihan, Second Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Joseph F. Gohn, Fourteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Hersey, Twelfth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. James H. Bradford, jr., Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Smoke, Nineteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. David L. Stone, Twenty-second Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Albright, Twenty-fifth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Patrick A. Connolly, Twenty-first Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Evans, Eighteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Ralph A. Clay (since deceased), Thirteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Baylies, Tenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. John B. Schoeffel, Ninth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Detchmendy, First Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Walter T. Bates, Seventeenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Carnahan, Fifth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Englebert B. Ovenshine, Sixteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Cabaniss, Twenty-fourth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Percy M. Cochran, Seventh Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Moody, Twentieth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. George N. Bomford, Fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice Tayman, Twenty-fourth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Benjamin P. Nicklin, Ninth Infantry, March 2, 1899, vice McAndrew, Third Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. John W. French, Eleventh Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. Cromwell Stacey, Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. William A. Cavenaugh, Twentieth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. George M. Grimes, Twentieth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. William C. Geiger, Fourteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. Thomas R. Harker, Fifteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. John F. Wilkinson, Fifteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. Frank D. Wickham, Sixteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. William B. Folwell, First Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. William K. Naylor, Ninth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Bryan Conrad, Eighteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. William H. Oury, Twenty-third Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Harry A. Eaton, Eighth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Campbell King, First Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Tenney Ross, Third Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. George C. Martin, Twenty-first Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Edward E. Downes, First Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Robert O. Van Horn, Seventeenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Ezekiel J. Williams, Fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Moor N. Falls, Eighteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Edgar A. Macklin, Eleventh Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Joseph W. Glidden, Fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. John R. R. Hannay, Third Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Henry S. Wygant, Third Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. James M. Graham, Eleventh Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Joseph L. Gilbreth, Fourteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Charles F. Humphrey, jr., Seventeenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Willey Howell, Fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Benjamin J. Tillman, Seventh Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. George J. Holden, Tenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. William R. Webb (since deceased), Sixteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Harry E. Whitney (since deceased), First Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Arthur Cranston, Seventeenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Charles F. Bates, Twenty-fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Charles C. Todd, Third Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. John J. Toffey, jr., Sixteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Carl A. Martin, Twenty-first Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. George D. Arrowsmith, Thirteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Mark Wheeler, Fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. G. Soulard Turner, Eighth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. William H. Williams (since deceased), Twelfth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Watts C. Valentine, Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Ivers W. Leonard, Twenty-second Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Philip E. M. Walker, Sixteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Robert W. Barnett, Twelfth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. David B. Mulliken, Sixteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Pearl M. Shaffer, Thirteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Laurence A. Curtis, Twelfth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Peyton G. Clark, Thirteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. William H. Jordan, jr., Eighteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Courtland Nixon, First Infantry, March 9, 1899, vice Webb, Twenty-fifth Infantry, deceased.
Second Lieut. Augustus C. Ledyard, Second Infantry, March 13, 1899, vice Grisard, Seventh Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. Irving J. Carr, Seventeenth Infantry, March 16, 1899, vice Chrisman, Sixth Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. Easton R. Gibson, Ninth Infantry, March 16, 1899, vice Harris, Thirteenth Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. Henry C. Bonnycastle, Twentieth Infantry, March 26, 1899, vice McFarland, Thirteenth Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. Edward Croft, Nineteenth Infantry, March 31, 1899, vice Wilder, Twenty-fifth Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. Adolphe H. Huguet, Twenty-first Infantry, March 31, 1899, vice Wilhelm, Fourteenth Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. Raymond Sheldon, Seventeenth Infantry, April 1, 1899, vice Sample, Thirteenth Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. James D. Taylor, jr., Twentieth Infantry, April 25, 1899, vice Dashiell, Twenty-fourth Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. Frank Halstead, Fourth Infantry, May 4, 1899, vice Helmick, Tenth Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. Harry E. Knight, First Infantry, May 5, 1899, vice French, Fifteenth Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. Campbell E. Babcock, Twelfth Infantry, May 13, 1899, vice Whitney, Second Infantry, deceased.
Second Lieut. Harry R. Campbell, Twenty-second Infantry, May 14, 1899, vice Rose, Seventeenth Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. Daniel F. Keller, Twenty-fourth Infantry, May 16, 1899, vice Bennett, Sixth Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. Archie J. Harris, Second Infantry, May 16, 1899, vice Campbell, Twenty-second Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. Alexander J. Macnab, Twenty-third Infantry, May 19, 1899, vice Sargent, Eighth Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. Frank S. Burr, Third Infantry, May 25, 1899, vice Jackson, Twenty-second Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. Ward Cheney, Fourth Infantry, June 2, 1899, vice Sigworth, Ninth Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. Stanley Howland, Twenty-fourth Infantry, June 8, 1899, vice Lowe, Eighteenth Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. Ralph B. Parrott, Twenty-second Infantry, June 8, 1899, vice Chase, Twenty-second Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. Stanley H. Ford, Sixteenth Infantry, June 16, 1899, vice Hagadorn, Twenty-third Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. James McD. Comer, Sixteenth Infantry, June 20, 1899, vice Lee, Eleventh Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. Benjamin H. Watkins, Second Infantry, June 30, 1899, vice Murdock, Twenty-fifth Infantry, resigned.
Second Lieut. Robert M. Brambila, Twenty-third Infantry, June 30, 1899, vice Steel, Nineteenth Infantry, resigned.
Second Lieut. Edward A. Bumpus, Twenty-first Infantry, July 8, 1899, vice Bookmiller, Ninth Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. Louis E. Hill, Fourth Infantry, July 11, 1899, vice Piper, Fifteenth Infantry, retired from active service.
Second Lieut. Harry F. Dalton, Ninth Infantry, July 11, 1899, vice Winston, Nineteenth Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. John N. Straat, jr., Twenty-fifth Infantry, July 12, 1899, vice Cole, Fourth Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. George De G. Catlin, Tenth Infantry, July 15, 1899, vice Phillips, Second Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. Donald McNulta, Fourteenth Infantry, July 17, 1899, vice Taylor, Twenty-third Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. Charles P. Faulkner, Fourteenth Infantry, July 19, 1899, vice Kirkman, Eighth Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. Edward W. Perkins, Eighth Infantry, August 14, 1899, vice Lacey, First Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. Marshall Childs, Sixth Infantry, August 19, 1899, vice Drew, Twelfth Infantry, killed in action.
Second Lieut. Henry S. Wagner, Eighth Infantry, August 30, 1899, vice Clay, Fourteenth Infantry, deceased.
Second Lieut. Frederick G. Knabenshue, Fourth Infantry, September 7, 1899, vice Cloman, Fifteenth Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. Archibald I. Harrison, Twenty-fifth Infantry, September 8, 1899, vice Crawford, Twenty-first Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. George H. Knox, Twentieth Infantry, September 8, 1899, vice Graves, Seventh Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. Thomas J. Powers, jr., Twenty-fifth Infantry, September 8, 1899, vice Webster, Twentieth Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. William A. Lieber, Twenty-third Infantry, September 8, 1899, vice Leitch, Twenty-fourth Infantry, promoted.
Second Lieut. James E. Bell, Second Infantry, September 9, 1899, vice Donworth, Seventeenth Infantry, resigned.
Second Lieut. Charles R. Ramsay, Twenty-first Infantry, September 16, 1899, vice Burkhardt, Tenth Infantry, promoted.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. Henry Carroll (since retired from active service), Sixth Cavalry, March 29, 1899, vice Sumner, Seventh Cavalry, appointed brigadier-general, United States Army.
Lieut. Col. Theodore A. Baldwin, Tenth Cavalry, May 6, 1899, vice Carroll, Seventh Cavalry, retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. Adna R. Chaffee, Third Cavalry, May 8, 1899, vice Bacon, Eighth Cavalry, retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. Michael Cooney (since retired from active service), Seventh Cavalry, June 9, 1899, vice Compton, Fourth Cavalry, retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. Charles D. Viele, First Cavalry, September 14, 1899, vice Cooney, Fourth Cavalry, retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. William A. Rafferty, Second Cavalry, October 18, 1899, vice Carpenter, Fifth Cavalry, appointed brigadier-general, United States Army.

To be lieutenant-colonels.

Maj. Charles S. Ilsley (since retired from active service), Ninth Cavalry, March 29, 1899, vice Carroll, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.

Maj. Theodore J. Wint, Tenth Cavalry, April 8, 1899, vice Ilsley, Sixth Cavalry, retired from active service.

Maj. Francis Moore, Fifth Cavalry, May 6, 1899, vice Baldwin, Tenth Cavalry, promoted.

Maj. Henry W. Wessells, jr., Third Cavalry, May 8, 1899, vice Chaffee, Third Cavalry, promoted.

Maj. James N. Wheelan, Eighth Cavalry, June 9, 1899, vice Cooney, Seventh Cavalry, promoted.

Maj. Edward M. Hayes, Seventh Cavalry, July 1, 1899, vice, Wagner, Fourth Cavalry, retired from active service.

Maj. Thomas C. Lebo, Sixth Cavalry, September 14, 1899, vice Viele, First Cavalry, promoted.

Maj. William M. Wallace, Second Cavalry, October 18, 1899, vice Rafferty, Second Cavalry, promoted.

To be majors.

Capt. Martin B. Hughes, Ninth Cavalry, March 29, 1899, vice Ilsley, Ninth Cavalry, promoted.

Capt. Clarence A. Stedman, Ninth Cavalry, April 8, 1899, vice Wint, Tenth Cavalry, promoted.

Capt. Henry W. Sprole, Eighth Cavalry, May 6, 1899, vice Moore, Fifth Cavalry, promoted.

Capt. Edgar Z. Steever, Third Cavalry, May 8, 1899, vice Wessells, Third Cavalry, promoted.

Capt. William Stanton, Sixth Cavalry, June 9, 1899, vice Wheelan, Eighth Cavalry, promoted.

Capt. Edward A. Godwin, Eighth Cavalry, July 1, 1899, vice Hayes, Seventh Cavalry, promoted.

Capt. Frederick K. Ward, First Cavalry, July 11, 1899, vice Fowler, Tenth Cavalry, deceased.

Capt. Alexander Rodgers, Eight Cavalry, September 14, 1899, vice Lebo, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.

Capt. Walter S. Schuyler, Fifth Cavalry, October 18, 1899, vice Wallace, Second Cavalry, promoted.

To be captains.

First Lieut. John W. Heard, Third Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Stephen L'H. Slocum, Eighth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Eugene F. Ladd, Ninth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. William W. Forsyth, Sixth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. William F. Flynn, Eighth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Francis G. Irwin, jr., Second Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. John M. Neall (since dismissed), Fourth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Carter P. Johnson, Tenth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Herbert H. Sargent, Second Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Roger B. Bryan, Second Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. J. Franklin Bell, Seventh Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. William S. Scott, First Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Daniel L. Tate, Third Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. George W. Goode, First Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. John C. Waterman, Eighth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Robert J. Duff, Eighth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Godfrey H. Macdonald, First Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Matthew F. Steele, Eighth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. George H. Cameron, Fourth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Robert D. Walsh, Fourth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. George W. Read, Fifth Cavalry, March 29, 1899, vice Hughes, Ninth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. James A. Cole, Sixth Cavalry, April 8, 1899, vice Stedman, Ninth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. De Rosey C. Cabell, Eighth Cavalry, April 23, 1899, vice Stotsenberg, Sixth Cavalry, killed in action.

First Lieut. Farrand Sayre, Eighth Cavalry, May 6, 1899, vice Sprole, Eighth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Hugh J. Gallagher, Sixth Cavalry, May 8, 1899, vice Steever, Third Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Grote Hutcheson, Ninth Cavalry, June 9, 1899, vice Stanton, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. George O. Cress, Fourth Cavalry, July 1, 1899, vice Godwin, Eighth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. James B. Hughes, Tenth Cavalry, July 11, 1899, vice Ward, First Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Richard B. Paddock, Sixth Cavalry, July 15, 1899, vice Neall, Fourth Cavalry, dismissed.

First Lieut. Robert A. Brown, Fourth Cavalry, September 14, 1899, vice Rodgers, Eighth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Willard A. Holbrook, Seventh Cavalry, October 18, 1899, vice Schuyler, Fifth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Lewis M. Koehler, Ninth Cavalry, November 7, 1899, vice McGrath, Fourth Cavalry, died from wounds received in action.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Edmund M. Leary, Second Cavalry, March 2, 1899, vice Heard, Third Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Julius T. Conrad, Third Cavalry, March 2, 1899, vice Slocum, Eighth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Howard R. Hickok, Ninth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, vice Ladd, Ninth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Samuel B. Arnold, First Cavalry, March 2, 1899, vice Forsyth, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Samuel McP. Rutherford, Fourth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, vice Flynn, Eighth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. George W. Kirkpatrick, Eighth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, vice Irwin, Second Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Cornelius C. Smith, Second Cavalry, March 2, 1899, vice Neall, Fourth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Joseph E. Cusack, Fifth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, vice Johnson, Tenth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Walter M. Whitman, First Cavalry, March 2, 1899, vice Sargent, Second Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Lincoln C. Andrews, Third Cavalry, March 2, 1899, vice Bryan, Second Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. William R. Smedberg, jr., Fourth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, vice Bell, Seventh Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. John M. Morgan, Eighth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, vice Scott, First Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Andrew E. Williams, Third Cavalry, March 2, 1899, vice Tate, Third Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Walter C. Babcock, Eighth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, vice Goode, First Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. William Yates, First Cavalry, March 2, 1899, vice Waterman, Eighth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Herbert B. Crosby, Eighth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, vice Duff, Eighth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Benjamin B. Hyer, Sixth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, vice Macdonald, First Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Mathew C. Smith, Second Cavalry, March 2, 1899, vice Steele, Eighth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edward B. Cassatt, Fourth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, vice Cameron, Fourth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Kenzie W. Walker, Ninth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, vice Walsh, Fourth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Harry H. Pattison, Third Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. Edward E. Hartwick (since resigned), Ninth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. Charles G. Sawtelle, jr., Second Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. Francis Le J. Parker, Fifth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. George F. Hamilton, Ninth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. William H. Paine, Second Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. John W. Craig, Fifth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. Hugh D. Berkeley, First Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. Albert E. Saxton, Eighth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. Hamilton S. Hawkins, Fourth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. Frank Parker, Fifth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. Thomas G. Carson, Fourth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. George Vidmer, Tenth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. Casper H. Conrad, jr., Fifth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. Herbert A. White, Sixth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. Nathan K. Averill, Seventh Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. Harry La T. Cavenaugh, Ninth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. Mortimer O. Bigelow, Eighth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. William G. Sills, Second Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. August C. Nissen, Sixth Cavalry, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

Second Lieut. Clyde E. Hawkins, Third Cavalry, March 29, 1899, vice Read, Fifth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. James S. Parker, Fourth Cavalry, April 8, 1899, vice Cole, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Joseph S. Herron, First Cavalry, April 23, 1899, vice Cabell, Eighth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Henry B. Dixon, Tenth Cavalry, May 6, 1899, vice Sayre, Eighth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. George B. Pritchard, jr., Ninth Cavalry, May 8, 1899, vice Gallagher, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Alvord Van P. Anderson, Sixth Cavalry, June 9, 1899, vice Hutcheson, Ninth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Herman A. Sievert, Ninth Cavalry, July 1, 1899, vice Cress, Fourth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Eugene P. Jervey, jr., Fifth Cavalry, July 11, 1899, vice Hughes, Tenth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Le Roy Eltinge, Fourth Cavalry, July 15, 1899, vice Paddock, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. John B. Christian, Second Cavalry, August 31, 1899, vice Hartwick, Ninth Cavalry, resigned.

Second Lieut. George W. Moses, Third Cavalry, September 14, 1899, vice Brown, Fourth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Charles E. Stodter, Ninth Cavalry, October 18, 1899, vice Holbrook, Seventh Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Alexander M. Miller, jr., Tenth Cavalry, November 7, 1899, vice Koehler, Ninth Cavalry, promoted.

ARTILLERY ARM.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. Jacob B. Rawles, First Artillery, February 23, 1899, vice Miller, Third Artillery, appointed brigadier-general, United States Army.

Lieut. Col. William L. Haskin, Second Artillery, October 16, 1899, vice Pennington, Second Artillery, appointed brigadier-general, United States Army.

Lieut. Col. Wallace F. Randolph, Third Artillery, October 17, 1899, vice Frank, First Artillery, appointed brigadier-general, United States Army.

To be lieutenant-colonels.

Maj. David H. Kinzie, Third Artillery, February 23, 1899, vice Rawles, First Artillery, promoted.

Maj. John R. Myrick, Fifth Artillery, October 16, 1899, vice Haskin, Second Artillery, promoted.

Maj. Edward Field, Second Artillery, October 17, 1899, vice Randolph, Third Artillery, promoted.

To be majors.

Capt. Abner H. Merrill, First Artillery, February 23, 1899, vice Kinzie, Third Artillery, promoted.

Capt. William Ennis, Fourth Artillery, March 18, 1899, vice Grugan, Sixth Artillery, retired from active service.

Capt. George S. Grimes, Second Artillery, March 31, 1899, vice Dillenback, Second Artillery, retired from active service.

Capt. John M. K. Davis, First Artillery, October 16, 1899, vice Myrick, Fifth Artillery, promoted.

Capt. Benjamin K. Roberts, Fifth Artillery, October 17, 1899, vice Field, Second Artillery, promoted.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Hamilton Rowan, Second Artillery, February 23, 1899, vice Merrill, First Artillery, promoted.

First Lieut. David Price, First Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Frank S. Harlow, First Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Samuel E. Allen, Fifth Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Edward H. Catlin, Second Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Walter S. Alexander, Fourth Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Edward St. J. Greble, Second Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Frederick S. Strong, Fourth Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Albert C. Blunt, Fifth Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. William C. Rafferty, First Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. John L. Chamberlain, First Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Warren P. Newcomb, Fifth Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Charles L. Phillips, Fourth Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Charles J. Bailey, First Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Clarence P. Townsley, Fourth Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Harvey C. Carbaugh, Fifth Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. George F. Barney, Second Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. David J. Rumbough, Third Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Millard F. Harmon, First Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Adelbert Cronkhite, Fourth Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Charles H. Hunter, First Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Charles G. Treat, Fifth Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Stephen M. Foote, Fourth Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. George W. Van Deusen, First Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. John C. W. Brooks, Fourth Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. William F. Hancock, Sixth Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. George T. Bartlett, Third Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Charles A. Bennett, Third Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First Lieut. Edward A. Millar, Sixth Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

First. Lieut. Henry C. Davis, Seventh Artillery, March 15, 1899, vice Everett, Fourth Artillery, deceased.

First Lieut. Thomas Ridgway, Fifth Artillery, March 18, 1899, vice Ennis, Fourth Artillery, promoted.

First Lieut. John W. Ruckman, Seventh Artillery, March 31, 1899, vice Grimes, Second Artillery, promoted.

First Lieut. William P. Stone, Seventh Artillery, April 20, 1899, vice Lemly, Seventh Artillery, retired from active service.

First Lieut. Ira A. Haynes, Fourth Artillery, July 10, 1899, vice Satterlee, Sixth Artillery, deceased.

First Lieut. Willoughby Walke, Seventh Artillery, August 28, 1899, vice Eastman, Second Artillery, deceased.

First Lieut. Louis Ostheim, Sixth Artillery, October 16, 1899, vice Davis, First Artillery, promoted.

First Lieut. John Conklin, jr., Second Artillery, October 17, 1899, vice Roberts, Fifth Artillery, promoted.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Arthur W. Chase, Second Artillery, February 23, 1899, vice Rowan, Second Artillery, promoted.

Second Lieut. Frank W. Coe, First Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Price, First Artillery, promoted.

Second Lieut. William R. Smith, First Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Galbraith, Fifth Artillery, retired from active service.

Second Lieut. Henry H. Whitney, Fourth Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Harlow, First Artillery, promoted.

Second Lieut. Samuel A. Kephart, Fourth Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Allen, Fifth Artillery, promoted.

Second Lieut. Louis R. Burgess, Fifth Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Catlin, Second Artillery, promoted.

Second Lieut. James A. Shipton, First Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Alexander, Fourth Artillery, promoted.

Second Lieut. William Chamberlaine, First Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Greble, Second Artillery, promoted.

Second Lieut. Charles P. Summerall, Fifth Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Strong, Fourth Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. William M. Cruikshank, First Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Blunt, Fifth Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. Gordon G. Heiner, Fourth Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Rafferty, First Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. George H. McManus, Third Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Chamberlain, First Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. Edward J. Timberlake, jr., Second Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Newcomb, Fifth Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. Samuel C. Hazzard, First Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Phillips, Fourth Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. Otho W. B. Farr, Second Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Bailey, First Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. William P. Pence, Fifth Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Townsley, Fourth Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. James M. Williams, Seventh Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Carbaugh, Fifth Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. Edward P. O'Hern (since appointed first lieutenant in the Ordnance Department), Third Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Barney, Second Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. Dwight E. Aultman, Second Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Rumbough, Third Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. Alston Hamilton, First Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Harmon, First Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. John C. Gilmore, jr., Fourth Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Cronkhite, Fourth Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. Rogers F. Gardner, Third Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Hunter, First Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. Harry E. Smith, First Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Treat, Fifth Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. Joseph L. Knowlton, Second Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Foote, Fourth Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. Conway H. Arnold, jr., Fifth Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Van Deusen, First Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. Joseph Wheeler, jr., Fourth Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Brooks, Fourth Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. Adrian S. Fleming, Sixth Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Hancock, Sixth Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. Brooke Payne, Fifth Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Bartlett, Third Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. Harry F. Jackson, Second Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Bennett, Third Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. Robert E. Callan, Fifth Artillery, March 2, 1899, vice Millar, Sixth Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. William S. Guignard, Fourth Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Edwin Landon, Second Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Clarence H. McNeil, Fifth Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Joseph P. Tracy, Fifth Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Lloyd England, Third Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. James W. Hinkley, jr., Fifth Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Percy M. Kessler, Third Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Johnson Hagood, First Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. George T. Patterson, Third Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Frank K. Fergusson, First Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Robert S. Abernethy, Third Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Edwin O. Sarratt, Third Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Albert J. Bowley, Fourth Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Bertram C. Gilbert, Second Artillery, March 2, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.
Second Lieut. Lawrence S. Miller, Fourth Artillery, March 14, 1899, vice Squire, Third Artillery, appointed first lieutenant in the United States Signal Corps.
Second Lieut. Winfield S. Overton, Third Artillery, March 15, 1899, vice Davis, Seventh Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. Mervyn C. Buckey, Fifth Artillery, March 18, 1899, vice Ridgway, Fifth Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. Frederick E. Johnson, Seventh Artillery, March 26, 1899, vice Krayenbuhl, Third Artillery, killed in action.
Second Lieut. Earle D'A. Pearce, Sixth Artillery, March 31, 1899, vice Ruckman, Seventh Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. Arthur S. Conklin, Seventh Artillery, April 20, 1899, vice Stone, Seventh Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. Benjamin M. Koehler, Sixth Artillery, July 10, 1899, vice Haynes, Fourth Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. James F. Brady, Seventh Artillery, August 28, 1899, vice Walke, Seventh Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. Hugh La F. Applewhite, Seventh Artillery, September 19, 1899, vice Miley, Second Artillery, deceased.
Second Lieut. Roderick L. Carmichael, Seventh Artillery, October 16, 1899, vice Ostheim, Sixth Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. Harry G. Bishop, Sixth Artillery, October 17, 1899, vice Conklin, Second Artillery, promoted.
Second Lieut. Andrew Moses, Seventh Artillery, November 9, 1899, vice O'Hern, Third Artillery, appointed first lieutenant in the Ordnance Department.

QUARTERMASTER'S DEPARTMENT.

To be deputy quartermaster-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel.

Maj. Charles A. H. McCauley, quartermaster, July 13, 1899, vice Smith, deceased.

To be quartermaster with the rank of major.

Capt. John McE. Hyde, assistant quartermaster, July 13, 1899, vice McCauley, promoted.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

To be surgeons with the rank of major.

Capt. Marlborough C. Wyeth, assistant surgeon, June 8, 1899, vice De Loffre, retired from active service.
Capt. Richard W. Johnson, assistant surgeon, November 6, 1899, vice Robinson, deceased.

PAY DEPARTMENT.

To be assistant paymasters-general with the rank of colonel.

Lieut. Col. Alfred E. Bates (since appointed Paymaster-General), deputy paymaster-general, March 31, 1899, vice Glenn, deceased.
Lieut. Col. Charles I. Wilson, deputy paymaster-general, July 12, 1899, vice Bates, appointed Paymaster-General.

To be deputy paymasters-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel.

Maj. Culver C. Sniffen, paymaster, March 31, 1899, vice Bates, promoted.
Maj. George W. Baird, paymaster, July 12, 1899, vice Wilson, promoted.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

To be captain.

First Lieut. Robert McGregor, Corps of Engineers, September 29, 1899, vice Carter, dismissed.

To be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Frederick W. Altstaetter, Corps of Engineers, September 29, 1899, vice McGregor, promoted.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

To be colonel.

Lieut. Col. Lawrence S. Babbitt, Ordnance Department, April 7, 1899, vice Buffington, appointed Chief of Ordnance.

To be lieutenant-colonel.

Maj. James W. Reilly, Ordnance Department, April 7, 1899, vice Babbitt, promoted.

To be major.

Capt. David A. Lyle, Ordnance Department, April 7, 1899, vice Reilly, promoted.

To be captains.

First Lieut. George W. Burr, Ordnance Department, April 7, 1899, vice Lyle, promoted.
First Lieut. Colden L'H. Ruggles, Ordnance Department, April 29, 1899, vice Stuart, deceased.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

GENERAL OFFICERS.

To be major-general.

Brig. Gen. Leonard Wood, United States Volunteers, December 5, 1899.

To be brigadier-generals.

Col. William A. Kobbé, Thirty-fifth Regiment of Infantry, United States Volunteers, December 5, 1899.
Col. J. Franklin Bell, Thirty-sixth Regiment of Infantry, United States Volunteers, December 5, 1899.

TO BE COLONEL TWENTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Maj. Edmund Rice, Third United States Infantry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL TWENTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. William P. Duvall, First United States Artillery.

TO BE MAJORS, TWENTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Joseph T. Dickman, Eighth United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. Edward D. Anderson, Tenth United States Cavalry.
Frank A. Cook, of Rhode Island.

TO BE CAPTAINS, TWENTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Second Lieut. Guy V. Henry, jr., First United States Cavalry.
Cornelius M. Brownell, of Vermont.
Frank H. Peck, of New York.
Alvin A. Barker, of Rhode Island.
John Bordman, jr., of Massachusetts.
William Tutherly, of New Hampshire.
Reuben A. Whipple, of Massachusetts.
Alexander Greig, jr., of Massachusetts.
John Hickey, of Connecticut.
William F. Meeks, of New York.
Thomas Talbot, of Massachusetts.
Harris Pendleton, of Connecticut.
George O. Hubbard, of Maine.
Fred McDonald, of Massachusetts.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, TWENTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Duncan Elliot, of New York.
Alfred M. Mason, of Vermont.
William H. Plummer, of Massachusetts.
Alfred Hasbrouck, of New York.
Granville R. Fortescue, of New York.
James R. Goodale, of New York.
William M. Connell, of New York.
Frank E. Edwards, of Massachusetts.
Henry G. Crockett, of Maine.
George D. Rice, of Massachusetts.
Solomon Avery, jr., of New York.
Philip Golderman, of New York.
Henry M. Fales, of New York.
William Sullivan, of New Hampshire.
Daniel J. Moynihan, of Massachusetts.
James P. Clare, of Massachusetts.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, TWENTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Sanford E. Worthington, of Vermont.
Homer B. Grant, of Massachusetts.
Robert H. Sillman, of New York.
Garrison Ball, of New York.
Timothy M. Coughlan, of New York.
John T. Ryan, of New York.
Hilden Olin, of New York.
John J. Byrne, of New York.
Max Wagner, of Massachusetts.
Roy L. Fernald, of Maine.
E. Alexis Jeunet, of Pennsylvania.
Harry E. Comstock, of Connecticut.

TO BE COLONEL TWENTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Maj. James M. Bell, First United States Cavalry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL TWENTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Albert S. Cummins, Fourth United States Artillery.

TO BE MAJORS, TWENTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

First Lieut. George L. Byram, First United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. Edward B. Cassatt, Fourth United States Cavalry.
Capt. Clyde D. V. Hunt, assistant quartermaster, United States Volunteers.

TO BE CAPTAINS, TWENTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

First Lieut. Louis C. Scherer, Fourth United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. George C. Langhorne, First United States Cavalry.
Frank L. Graham, of the District of Columbia.
Howard Atkinson, of West Virginia.
George W. Brandle, of Ohio.
Eastman G. Currey, of Tennessee.
William F. Judson, of New York.
William B. Gracie, of New York.
Walter F. Randall, of New York.
Delphey T. E. Casteel, of West Virginia.
Richard H. Savage, of New York.
Albert B. Sloan, of Missouri.
Charles Becht, of Ohio.
Dexter Sturges, of New York.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, TWENTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

J. Howard Griffiths, of the District of Columbia.
Zan F. Collett, of West Virginia.
Charles G. McDonald, of Maryland.
James D. Fauntleroy, of Virginia.
Edwin S. Hartshorne, of New York.
George B. Rodney, of Delaware.
Oscar D. Weed, of New York.
John J. Kennedy, of New York.
James G. Hannah, of New York.
Theodore B. Taylor, of New York.
Julien E. Gaujot, of West Virginia.
William J. Sewell, jr., of New Jersey.
Clayton J. Bailey, of New Jersey.
Dexter Sturges, of New York.
Thomas G. Bradley, late first lieutenant, First United States Volunteer Cavalry.
Edward O'Flaherty, late sergeant, Sixteenth United States Infantry.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, TWENTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Richard H. Brewer, of the District of Columbia.
Daniel Hyman, of New York.
John Oliver, of the District of Columbia.
George A. Vernon, of Nebraska.
Albert U. Faulkner, of New York.
Robert S. Knox, of Virginia.
Louie St. Clair Munford, of Virginia.
Francis W. Griffin, of Virginia.
Frederick H. Plummer, of Virginia.
John C. Cassels, of Pennsylvania.
David M. Gregg, of Pennsylvania.
George C. Shaw, late first lieutenant, First District of Columbia Volunteers.

TO BE COLONEL TWENTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. William E. Birkhimer, Third United States Artillery.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL TWENTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Robert W. Leonard, of New York.

TO BE MAJORS, TWENTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. George H. Morgan, Third United States Cavalry.
Capt. Elmore F. Taggart, Sixth United States Infantry.
John B. Porter, of Pennsylvania.

TO BE CAPTAINS, TWENTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

First Lieut. Charles R. Howland, Twentieth United States Infantry.
Charles G. Bickham, of Ohio.
Charles S. Campbell, of Pennsylvania.
Frank F. Crenshaw, of Georgia.
Claude S. Fries, of New Jersey.
Samuel D. Crawford, of Pennsylvania.
Peter Vredenburgh, of New Jersey.
Samuel A. Price, of Pennsylvania.
John D. Croasmun, of Pennsylvania.
Adam C. Carson, of Virginia.
William C. King, of Pennsylvania.
George W. Biegler, of Indiana.
Edward H. D. Couch, of Illinois.
John H. Dunn, of Massachusetts.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, TWENTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Leonard T. Waldron, of New York.
Edgar S. Stayer, of Pennsylvania.

John P. Teagarden, of Pennsylvania.
Alpha T. Easton, of Pennsylvania.
Samuel Willits, of Pennsylvania.
Charles C. Allen, of Pennsylvania.
Harry A. Porter, of Pennsylvania.
Charles W. Barber, of New Jersey.
John M. Dunn, of Delaware.
Frederick B. Neilson, of Pennsylvania.
Charles H. Boice, of New York.
Daniel H. Geinty, of New Hampshire.
George H. Wood, of Ohio.
Henry S. Terrell, of Connecticut.
Charles L. Beatty, of the District of Columbia.
Bradley J. Wootten, of North Carolina.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, TWENTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Robert D. Russell, of New York.
Hugh Carlyle Young, of Pennsylvania.
Marion B. Mabson, of Alabama.
Lewis M. Clark, of Pennsylvania.
Robert S. Hansbury, of Pennsylvania.
George T. Newhall, of Pennsylvania.
Ralph M. Mitchell, of Pennsylvania.
C. Rodman Jones, of Pennsylvania.
George W. Warner, of Pennsylvania.
Joseph C. Wilson, of Pennsylvania.
William H. Lyons, of West Virginia.
James D. Danner, of Pennsylvania.

TO BE COLONEL TWENTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Edward E. Hardin, Seventh United States Infantry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL TWENTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Herbert H. Sargent, Second United States Cavalry.

TO BE MAJORS, TWENTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Evan M. Johnson, jr., Nineteenth United States Infantry.
First Lieut. Harry L. Hawthorne, Sixth United States Artillery.
David B. Case, of Pennsylvania.

TO BE CAPTAINS, TWENTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

George E. Lovell, of Florida.
Cleveland Willcoxon, of Georgia.
Owen T. Kenan, of Georgia.
Harry T. Thompson, of South Carolina.
James M. Liddell, of Mississippi.
Devereux Shields, of Mississippi.
Philip H. Stern, of Alabama.
Charles G. McGhee, of Mississippi.
William A. Paul, of Maine.
Frank S. Whitman, of New York.
Holman G. Purinton, of Illinois.
Joseph H. Grant, of South Carolina.
William S. Faulkner, of Virginia.
Albert S. Williams, late sergeant, Second Alabama Volunteers.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, TWENTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Madison H. Wilson, of Florida.
Walter K. Wheatley, of Georgia.
Blanton Winship, of Georgia.
Edward H. Almand, of Georgia.
Robert J. Arnold, of Tennessee.
William P. Screws, of Alabama.
Thomas H. Underwood, of Louisiana.
Stephen O. Fuqua, of Louisiana.
James Longstreet, jr., of Georgia.
James H. Blount, jr., of Georgia.
James M. Kimbrough, jr., of Georgia.
William P. Clark, of Georgia.
Edward Hill, of North Carolina.
James R. Rash, of Kentucky.
Lawrence S. Carson, of South Carolina.
Robert E. Grinstead, late first lieutenant, Third Kentucky Volunteers.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, TWENTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Joseph W. Avery, of North Carolina.
John J. Miller, of Georgia.
Robert O. Patterson, of North Carolina.
Rowland S. Pike, of Florida.
George M. Holley, of Georgia.
William S. Wells, jr., of Alabama.
Holmes Conrad, jr., of North Carolina.
Vincent M. Elmore, jr., of Alabama.
Albert J. Dillon, of Florida.
Thomas S. Moorman, jr., of South Carolina.
Milton H. Hollingsworth, of Tennessee.
Sergt. Edward O. Perkins, United States Marine Corps.

TO BE COLONEL THIRTIETH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Cornelius Gardener, Nineteenth United States Infantry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL THIRTIETH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

James R. Campbell, of Illinois.

TO BE MAJORS, THIRTIETH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Matthew F. Steele, Sixth United States Cavalry.
Capt. Leonard A. Lovering, Fourth United States Infantry.
Thomas L. Hartigan, of Illinois.

TO BE CAPTAINS, THIRTIETH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Frank H. Burton, of Michigan.
Charles E. Reese, of Indiana.
Frank W. Latimer, of Illinois.
Gilmore G. Scranton, of Michigan.
Charles P. Newberry, of Michigan.
Frank D. Newberry, of Michigan.
Merrell E. Webb, of Michigan.
John F. Ryan, of Illinois.
Harrison S. Kerrick, of Illinois.
George F. Connolly, of Illinois.
Edward Y. Miller, of Illinois.
E. Ross Smith, of Indiana.
Edwin H. Fitzgerald, of Indiana.
Kenneth M. Burr, of Indiana.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, THIRTIETH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Frank D. Buckingham, of Michigan.
Harry D. Blasland, of Illinois.
Walter P. Corbett, of Georgia.
Joseph W. Porterfield, of Illinois.
Charles S. Tarlton, of Indiana.
Edmond R. Tompkins, of South Carolina.
Frederick J. Barrows, of Minnesota.
Kaolin L. Whitson, of Maryland.
Virden C. Peckenpaugh, of Illinois.
Harry R. Chadwick, of Ohio.
Albert C. McMillan, of New York.
Daniel Wells, of Michigan.
John McBride, jr., of Michigan.
Albert E. McCabe, of Michigan.
Edward H. Andres, of Michigan.
John J. Foley, of Wisconsin.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, THIRTIETH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

William F. Pack, of Michigan.
Charles U. Bear, of Illinois.
John W. C. Abbott, of Michigan.
A. Holt Bradford, of Illinois.
George W. Cochnower, of Illinois.
Guy A. Boyle, of Indiana.
John N. Wright, of South Dakota.
Guilford S. Garber, of Indiana.
Charles H. Errington, of Illinois.
Francis W. Ralston, jr., of Pennsylvania.
Robert H. Gulick, of Ohio.
Francis J. Ellison, of New York.

TO BE COLONEL THIRTY-FIRST INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. James S. Pettit, First United States Infantry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL THIRTY-FIRST INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Webb C. Hayes, of Ohio.

TO BE MAJORS, THIRTY-FIRST INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Hunter Liggett, Fifth United States Infantry.
Capt. Lloyd M. Brett, Second United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. John E. McMahon, Fourth United States Artillery.

TO BE CAPTAINS, THIRTY-FIRST INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

William E. Cabell, of Kentucky.
Paul C. Galleher, of Kentucky.
Lucius C. Bennett, of Ohio.
William H. Gillenwater, of Tennessee.
William M. Scofield, of Ohio.
Charles P. Stivers, of Ohio.
William J. White, of Ohio.
Arthur G. Sharpley, of Kentucky.
James L. Burchfield, of Kentucky.
Charles A. Reynolds, of Ohio.
Ellison L. Gilmer, of North Carolina.
John A. Wagner, of North Carolina.
James B. Adams, late first lieutenant, Fourth United States Volunteer Infantry.
John Van Ness Philip, late first lieutenant, Fourth United States Volunteer Infantry.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-FIRST INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Albert C. Thompson, jr., of Ohio.
Kent Browning, of Ohio.
William M. Meek, of Tennessee.
Benjamin Stark, jr., of Connecticut.
Arthur T. Balentine, of Ohio.
William O. Reed, of Kentucky.
Hugh C. Preston, of Virginia.
Frank S. Lowry, of Ohio.
William A. Castle, of Ohio.
Marion B. Wilhoit, of Kentucky.
Percy H. Hawkins, of Ohio.
De Witt W. Chamberlin, of Illinois.
Charles F. Richmond, of Illinois.
John B. Fonner, of Indiana.
Charles O. Thomas, jr., of Ohio.
Robert C. Payne, of Kentucky.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-FIRST INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Watson Lindsey, of Kentucky.
Walter O. Bowman, of Indiana.
Wilford Twyman, of Kentucky.
William H. Monroe, of West Virginia.
Henry Gibbins, of Tennessee.
John P. Spurr, of Tennessee.
James A. Simpson, of Kentucky.
William B. Eulass, of Ohio.
Answell E. Deitsch, of Ohio.
David A. Snyder, of Ohio.
Harry D. Mitchell, of Ohio.
Albert H. Stevens, late of the District of Columbia Volunteers.

TO BE COLONEL THIRTY-SECOND INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Louis A Craig, Sixth United States Cavalry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL THIRTY-SECOND INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Lewis H. Strother, Twenty-second United States Infantry.

TO BE MAJORS, THIRTY-SECOND INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

First Lieut. Robert E. L. Spence, Sixteenth United States Infantry.
Charles E. Cabell, of Virginia.
Morton J. Henry, of Pennsylvania.

TO BE CAPTAINS, THIRTY-SECOND INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Second Lieut. George T. Summerlin, Eighth United States Cavalry.
Edwin J. Griffith, of Missouri.
Thomas R. Hayson, of Kansas.
Jacob H. Culver, of Nebraska.
Lanier Cravens, of Missouri.
John H. Goldman, of Missouri.
Frank M. Rumbold, of Missouri.
Granville Sevier, of Tennessee.
Frank W. Eckers, of Iowa.
Amos W. Brandt, of Iowa.
Henry A. Peed, of Missouri.
Charles D. Comfort, of Missouri.
John P. Grinstead, of Kansas.
Harry J. Collins, of Colorado.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-SECOND INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Grant Gillespie, of Missouri.
Charles A. Phillips, of Kansas.
Robert T. Crawford, of Iowa.
William S. Mapes, of Nebraska.
Henry M. Morrow, of Nebraska.
George P. Whitsett, of Missouri.
James C. Hixson, of Alabama.
James L. Long, of Arkansas.
George A. Densmore, of Iowa.
Arthur B. Shaeffer, of Kansas.
William S. Weaver, of Kansas.
John M. Shook, of Kansas.
George S. Ralston, of Nebraska.
George H. Caldwell, of Indiana.
Charles C. Smith, of Indiana.
Ambrose C. G. Williams-Foote, late first lieutenant, Eighth United States Volunteer Infantry.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-SECOND INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

William H. Clopton, jr., of Missouri.
George R. Crawford, of Kansas.
Henry K. Love, of Wisconsin.
Philip Mowry, of Pennsylvania.
Charles H. Wilson, of Nebraska.
Archie Miller, of Missouri.
Benjamin R. Wade, of Missouri.
George H. Armitage, of Iowa.
William A. James, of Illinois.
Charles R. W. Morison, of Maryland.
George E. Goodrich, of Indiana.
Roy T. Ballard, of Ohio.

TO BE COLONEL THIRTY-THIRD INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Luther R. Hare, Seventh United States Cavalry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL THIRTY-THIRD INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. John J. Brereton, Twenty-fourth United States Infantry (since deceased).

TO BE MAJORS, THIRTY-THIRD INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Marcus D. Cronin, Twenty-fifth United States Infantry.
First Lieut. Peyton C. March, Fifth United States Artillery.
John A. Logan, of Illinois (since killed in action).

TO BE CAPTAINS, THIRTY-THIRD INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Second Lieut. Edgar A. Sirmyer, Third United States Cavalry.
Second Lieut. Thomas Q. Ashburn, Seventh United States Artillery.
Edmund G. Shields, of Texas.
James S. Butler, of Mississippi.
Godfrey R. Fowler, of Texas.
James M. Burroughs, of Texas.
John A. Hulen, of Texas.
Charles W. Van Way, of Kansas.
Henry L. Jenkinson, of New Jersey.

Edward Davis, of Illinois.
Samuel W. Belford, of Colorado.
Edward H. Loffhagen, of Missouri.
John F. Green, of Texas.
Arthur L. B. Davies, of Colorado.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-THIRD INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Lindsey P. Rucker, of Texas.
Theodore Schultz, of Missouri.
Wilson B. Strong, of Massachusetts.
Solomon L. Jeffers, of Arkansas.
Henry Stroup, of Arkansas.
Edgar N. Coffey, of Mississippi.
Grant A. White, of Arkansas.
Carroll Power, of Kentucky.
Jesse L. Hall, of Texas.
Frank D. Tompkins, of Texas.
William S. Cunningham, of Texas.
William L. Lowe, of Texas.
John W. Ward, of Arkansas.
Tilman Campbell, of Arkansas.
Richard T. Ellis, late first lieutenant, Fourth United States Volunteer Infantry.
Corp. Albert P. Morrow, Sixth United States Cavalry.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-THIRD INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Charles L. Willard, of Texas.
George L. Febiger, of Louisiana.
Arthur N. Pickel, of Tennessee.
Frank L. Case, of Tennessee.
Henry J. McKenney, of Maryland.
Donald C. McClelland, of New York.
Thomas L. Sherburne, of Louisiana.
Richard P. Cordill, of Louisiana.
Earle Edmundson, late captain, First Territorial Volunteer Infantry.
John W. Healey, late first lieutenant, Sixth Virginia Volunteers.
Hugh Williams, late an enlisted man, Texas volunteers.
John J. Lipop, late second lieutenant, Fifth United States Volunteer Infantry.

TO BE COLONEL THIRTY-FOURTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Lyman W. V. Kennon, Sixth United States Infantry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL THIRTY-FOURTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

First Lieut. Robert L. Howze, Sixth United States Cavalry.

TO BE MAJORS, THIRTY-FOURTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Julius A. Penn, Seventh United States Infantry.
Capt. William A. Shunk, Eighth United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. Joseph Wheeler, jr., Fourth United States Artillery.

TO BE CAPTAINS, THIRTY-FOURTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

First Lieut. Charles Miller, Sixteenth United States Infantry.
First Lieut. Edward C. Carey, Sixteenth United States Infantry.
Second Lieut. Willard D. Newbill, Seventh United States Artillery.
William E. Dame, of New Mexico.
Frank G. Russell, of Arizona.
Frank A. Sullivan, of Wisconsin.
Charles A. Green, of Wisconsin.
Frank L. French, of Wisconsin.
Christopher J. Rollis, of Wisconsin.
Alfred S. Morgan, of Minnesota.
Robert Calverley, of Wyoming.
Clark M. Carr, of Missouri.
Frederick Goedecke, of Iowa.
William C. Wyman, of Iowa.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-FOURTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Maximiliano Luna, of New Mexico (since drowned).
Richard C. Day, of Indian Territory.
Greenville D. Montgomery, of New Mexico.
Stewart McC. Decker, of Minnesota.
Wilson G. Heaton, of Iowa.
John V. Green, of Wisconsin.
Harry W. Newton, of Wisconsin.
Charles J. Geishbush, of Wisconsin.
Cushman A. Rice, of Minnesota.
George E. Gibson, of Minnesota.
Robert B. Cramer, of Georgia.
Harry C. Barnes, of Oklahoma.
Leonard L. Deitrick, of Wyoming.
Joseph Matson, of Iowa.
Edwin J. Bracken, of Wisconsin.
Sherrard Coleman, late first lieutenant, First United States Volunteer Cavalry.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-FOURTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Robert C. Corliss, of Michigan.
Charles P. Hirst, of California.
Cleveland C. C. Lansing, of Maryland.
De Witt C. Lyles, of Maryland.
Samuel D. McAlister, of Tennessee.
Ordnance Sergt. Thomas J. Shaw, United States Army.
Sergt. John H. Neff, First United States Artillery.
Arthur G. Duncan, late private, First United States Volunteer Cavalry.
John T. Dunn, late an enlisted man, Eighth United States Infantry.
Denny Verdi, late sergeant, Troop M, Eighth United States Cavalry.
Lafayette A. Dorrington, late second lieutenant, Second United States Volunteer Infantry.
Private Basil N. Rittenhouse, Company L, Twenty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers.

TO BE COLONEL THIRTY-FIFTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Maj. William A. Kobbé, Third United States Artillery.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL THIRTY-FIFTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Edward H. Plummer, Tenth United States Infantry.

TO BE MAJORS, THIRTY-FIFTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Robert D. Walsh, Ninth United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. Walter C. Short, Tenth United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. Albert Laws, Twenty-fourth United States Infantry.

TO BE CAPTAINS, THIRTY-FIFTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

First Lieut. William Brooke, Fourth United States Infantry.
First Lieut. Thomas W. Darrah, Twentieth United States Infantry.
First Lieut. Charles D. Roberts, Seventeenth United States Infantry.
Second Lieut. Earle W. Tanner, Seventeenth United States Infantry.
Second Lieut. Edward W. Robinson, Twenty-third United States Infantry.
Henry T. Matthews, of California.
William G. Schreiber, of California.
Samuel R. Langworthy, of California.
William L. Geary, of Washington.
Austin F. Prescott, of Oregon.
Albert J. Brazee, of Oregon.
Eugene P. Crowne, of Oregon.
James H. Aldrich, of California.
Arthur F. Halpin, of California.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-FIFTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

John L. Hughes, of California.
George I. Becker, of Minnesota.
John H. Lewis, of Wisconsin.
James M. McManus, of Iowa.
Bissell Thomas, of Illinois.
Alvin C. Voris, of Illinois.
Theophilus B. Steele, of New York.
James A. Ruggles, of Illinois.
Grover Flint, of New York.
William F. Godson, of Massachusetts.

Leonard T. Baker, of Texas.
Harry N. Cootes, of Virginia.
Asa F. Fisk, of Montana.
Jack E. Harding, of Washington.
Francis H. Cameron, late captain, Tenth United States Volunteer Infantry.
Sergt. Perry W. Vandervoort, Sixth United States Artillery.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-FIFTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Carl B. Hard, of Utah.
Clark R. Elliott, of Minnesota.
William C. Tremaine, of California.
Louis S. Chappelear, of California.
Samuel M. English, of California.
Robert W. Collins, of South Carolina.
Gordon N. Kimball, of Utah.
John F. McCarthy, of Iowa.
Post Q. M. Sergt. Benjamin Kossman, United States Army.
Corpl. John A. Degen, Company M, Seventh United States Infantry.
Corpl. John P. Hasson, Company C, Fourteenth United States Infantry.
Private Allan Lefort, Battery N, Third United States Artillery.

TO BE COLONEL THIRTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. J. Franklin Bell, Seventh United States Cavalry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL THIRTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Maj. William R. Grove, First Colorado Volunteers.

TO BE MAJORS, THIRTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Maj. William H. Bishop, Twentieth Kansas Volunteers.
First Lieut. John Q. A. Braden, First South Dakota Volunteers.
First Lieut. William L. Luhn, First Washington Volunteers.

TO BE CAPTAINS, THIRTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

First Lieut. Robert S. Abernethy, Sixth United States Artillery.
Capt. Ewing E. Booth, First Colorado Volunteers.
First Lieut. Charles W. Mead, First Montana Volunteers.
First Lieut. Charles French, First Montana Volunteers (since deceased).
Capt. Henry Steere, First California Artillery.
Capt. Daniel F. Craig, Twentieth Kansas Volunteers.
Capt. Harry A. Hegeman, First South Dakota Volunteers.
Capt. Warren H. Ickis, Fifty-first Iowa Volunteers.
Second Lieut. Carl L. Stone, Thirteenth Minnesota Volunteers.
Second Lieut. Frederick R. Dodge, Twentieth Kansas Volunteers.
Capt. Edgar A. Fry, Twentieth Kansas Volunteers.
Sergt. Maj. Harry Bell, Twentieth United States Infantry.
Corpl. Smith K. Fitzhugh, First Washington Volunteers.

To rank from July 26, 1899.

First Lieut. Will H. Point, Thirty-sixth Infantry, United States Volunteers.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

First Lieut. Will H. Point, Fifty-first Iowa Volunteers.
First Lieut. Cornealiaus F. O'Keefe, First Colorado Volunteers.
Second Lieut. Loren E. Cheever, Wyoming Battalion, Volunteers.
Second Lieut. Fred E. Smith, First North Dakota Volunteers.
Second Lieut. Ben Lear, jr., First Colorado Volunteers.
First Lieut. Milo C. Corey, First Washington Volunteers.
First Sergt. Alexander H. Davidson, Troop E, Fourth United States Cavalry.
Post Q. M. Sergt. Alexander Goehr, United States Army.
Sergt. Winfield Harper, Battery L, Third United States Artillery.
First Sergt. Albert J. Erickson, First Montana Volunteers.
Sergt. Christian A. Bach, Thirteenth Minnesota Volunteers.
Sergt. Roscoe Treadwell, First Idaho Volunteers.
Corpl. Arthur M. Ferguson, Twentieth Kansas Volunteers.
Corpl. Thomas B. Crockett, First Washington Volunteers.
Corpl. Samuel W. Widdifield, First California Volunteers.
Sergt. Oscar A. McGee, First Washington Volunteers.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

William B. Graham, of Ohio.
Eugene G. Wing, of Alabama.
Julian L. Davis, of Arkansas (since killed in action).
James P. Toncray, of Tennessee.
William F. Gwynne, of Mississippi.
Edward McGowan, of Mississippi.
Frank T. McNarney, of Pennsylvania.
George T. Bowman, of New York.
James M. Petty, late corporal, First District of Columbia Volunteers.
Lyle H. Pedlar, late an enlisted man, Sixth United States Artillery.
Edwin E. Mann, late sergeant, First South Dakota Volunteers.
David H. Biddle, at large.

TO BE COLONEL THIRTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

First Lieut. Robert B. Wallace, Second United States Cavalry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL THIRTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Lieut. Col. Thomas R. Hamer, First Idaho Volunteers.

TO BE MAJORS, THIRTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Second Lieut. Charles T. Boyd, Fourth United States Cavalry.
Maj. Benjamin F. Cheatham, First Tennessee Volunteers.
Capt. Henry B. Orwig, Twentieth Kansas Volunteers.

TO BE CAPTAINS, THIRTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

First Lieut. David E. W. Lyle, Eighteenth United States Infantry.
First Lieut. Benjamin M. Koehler, Fourth United States Artillery.
Second Lieut. Ernest D. Scott, Sixth United States Artillery.
Capt. Nick K. Givens, First Tennessee Volunteers.
Capt. Sam Van Leer, First Tennessee Volunteers.
Capt. Henry R. Richmond, First Tennessee Volunteers.
Capt. Hu B. Myers, First Tennessee Volunteers.
First Lieut. William B. Hanna, First Montana Volunteers.
First Lieut. Leo F. Foster, First South Dakota Volunteers.
Capt. John E. Moran, First Montana Volunteers.
First Lieut. Charles M. Clark, Thirteenth Minnesota Volunteers.
First Sergt. Michael Flaherty, Company C, Eighteenth United States Infantry.
Sergt. Henry A. Hutchings, Company E, Fourteenth United States Infantry.

To rank from August 3, 1899.

First Lieut. Albert J. Erickson, Thirty-sixth Infantry, United States Volunteers.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

First Lieut. John C. Patton, First Tennessee Volunteers.
Second Lieut. Ernest Van D. Murphy, First Montana Volunteers.
First Lieut. Robert O. Ragsdale, First Tennessee Volunteers.
First Lieut. Albert J. Bright, First Tennessee Volunteers.
First Lieut. Granville Chapman, First Tennessee Volunteers.
Second Lieut. Charles M. McLester, First Tennessee Volunteers.
First Lieut. Charles H. Sleeper, First Colorado Volunteers.
Second Lieut. William T. Vaughan, First Tennessee Volunteers.
Sergt. Edward T. Balch, Troop L, Fourth United States Cavalry.
Corpl. Jesse G. Lowenberg, Battery D, Sixth United States Artillery.
Sergt. Maj. John S. E. Young, Twelfth United States Infantry.
Q. M. Sergt. Rufus B. Clark, First Washington Volunteers.
Private Daniel T. Bowman, First Montana Volunteers.
Sergt. John L. Russell, First South Dakota Volunteers.
Sergt. Ira Keithley, Twentieth Kansas Volunteers.
Sergt. Frank Auswald, Twentieth Kansas Volunteers.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Second Lieut. Joe B. Cocke, First Tennessee Volunteers.
Second Lieut. Alvin K. Baskette, First Tennessee Volunteers.
First Lieut. Winston Pilcher, First Tennessee Volunteers.

Robert M. Shearer, of Kentucky.
William G. Miles, of Indiana.
Harry J. O'Brien, of Illinois.
Samuel B. McIntyre, of Tennessee.
William B. Aiken, of Tennessee.
Lewis W. Cass, of Missouri.
Reuben V. Baskette, of Tennessee.
John T. Fuller, of Tennessee.
Thomas F. Peck, of Tennessee.

TO BE COLONEL THIRTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Maj. George S. Anderson, Sixth United States Cavalry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL THIRTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Charles J. Crane, Twenty-fourth United States Infantry.

TO BE MAJORS, THIRTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

First Lieut. Willard A. Holbrook, Seventh United States Cavalry (now captain, Fifth United States Cavalry).
Capt. Charles H. Muir, Second United States Infantry.
Lewis E. Goodier, of New York.

TO BE CAPTAINS, THIRTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

William H. Collier, of Kentucky.
Claude E. Sawyer, of South Carolina.
John L. Jordan, of Tennessee.
William G. Fleischhauer, of Michigan.
John S. Powell, of Georgia.
Ross A. Nichols, of Iowa.
John E. Weber, of Missouri.
William J. Vaiden, of Alabama.
John W. Moore, of Texas.
Paul B. Lino, of Illinois.
David F. Allen, of Indiana.
Beverly A. Read, of Texas.
Robert M. Nolan, of Louisiana.
Clarence L. Grinstead, of Kentucky.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Thandeus B. Seigle, of South Carolina.
Andrew J. Brown, jr., of Tennessee.
Frank S. Krebs, of Missouri.
William A. Covington, of Tennessee.
Douglas H. Jacobs, of Pennsylvania.
Louie D. Howard, of Missouri.
Fred A. Thompson, of Missouri.
Henry V. Stevens, of Tennessee.
Robert F. Woods, of South Carolina.
Amzi B. Kelly, of Texas.
Neil P. Pavey, of Illinois.
William G. Doane, of Nebraska.
Reuben D. Blanchard, of Wisconsin.
Ira I. Morrison, of Ohio.
John E. Morris, of Louisiana.
Joseph L. Kraemer, of Michigan.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

William O. Thornton, of Georgia.
John R. Maxwell, of Mississippi.
Fred Bury, of Michigan.
Walter C. Hudson, of Arkansas.
Samuel G. Shartle, of Pennsylvania.
Frederick C. Husman, of Missouri.
Elisha G. Abbott, of Texas.
Daniel R. Johnson, of North Carolina.
Rowland B. Ellis, of California.
Daniel G. Mendel, of West Virginia.
Private Charles J. Weinheimer, Twenty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers.
Private Albert C. Allen, Company H, Twenty-first United States Infantry.

TO BE COLONEL THIRTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Robert L. Bullard, commissary of subsistence, United States Army.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL THIRTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Maj. Enoch H. Crowder, judge-advocate, United States Army.

TO BE MAJORS, THIRTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

First Lieut. George T. Langhorne, First United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. John H. Parker, Twenty-fifth United States Infantry.
Col. Harry B. Mulford, First Nebraska Volunteers.

TO BE CAPTAINS, THIRTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

First Lieut. William L. Murphy, Twenty-fourth United States Infantry.
Noel Gaines, of Kentucky.
Frank S. Long, of Iowa.
George W. Green, of Tennessee.
Mack Richardson, of Missouri.
Thomas Hardeman, of Alabama.
Augustus F. W. Macmanus, of Texas.
Joseph B. Caughey, of Illinois.
William T. Ranke, of Indiana.
Wallace C. Taylor, of Nebraska.
Edward A. Kreger, of Iowa.
Charles H. Hilton, jr., of Colorado.
John L. Thorburn, of Michigan.
Andrew J. Burt, of Utah.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Albert M. Petite, of Iowa.
Grant T. Trent, of Tennessee.
Frank Maloney, of Tennessee.
Robert S. Welsh, of Michigan.
Perrin L. Smith, of Minnesota.
Alexander B. Coxe, of Minnesota.
Ellis Cromwell, of Mississippi.
Albert J. Merklin, of Missouri.
Thomas M. Cobb, jr., of Missouri.
Hiram C. Baker, of Texas.
Frederick Boyer, of Illinois.
Laurin L. Lawson, of Washington.
George M. Apple, of Colorado.
Harry E. Courtney, of Arkansas.
Howard K. Bane, of Nevada.
George M. Lee, of Virginia.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Lewis W. Dillion, of Kentucky.
Charles R. Wood, of Indiana.
John R. Waugh, of Nebraska.
Nathan J. Shelton, of Nebraska.
Arthur W. Orton, of Michigan.
Gideon H. Williams, of Tennessee.
W. Frank Mohr, of Pennsylvania.
John H. Vickers, jr., of Texas.
Edward H. White, of Illinois.
Charles W. Bowdle, of Ohio.
Frank C. Burnett, of Iowa.
Sergt. Charles S. Frank, Third United States Cavalry.

TO BE COLONEL FORTIETH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Maj. Edward A. Godwin, Seventh United States Cavalry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL FORTIETH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Bernard A. Byrne, Sixth United States Infantry.

TO BE MAJORS, FORTIETH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. William E. Craighill, Corps of Engineers, United States Army.
First Lieut. Michael M. McNamee, Ninth United States Cavalry.
James F. Case, of Oregon.

TO BE CAPTAINS, FORTIETH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

William J. Kendrick, of Georgia.
Walter B. Elliott, of Missouri.
Charles M. Wing, of Arkansas.
James C. France, of Iowa.
James J. Mayes, of Missouri.
Paul Smith, of Hawaii.
William McK. Lambdin, of Texas.
Thomas L. McGirr, of Illinois.
Charles H. Marple, of Nebraska.
Thomas Millar, of Wyoming.
John W. Green, of New Mexico.
Albert W. Lilienthal, late captain, Seventh United States Volunteer Infantry.
Luther S. Kelly, late captain, Seventh United States Volunteer Infantry.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, FORTIETH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Richard K. Cravens, of Indian Territory.
John B. Galleher, of Kentucky.
Hal Sayre, jr., of Colorado.
William J. Watson, of Kansas.
Henry P. Fletcher, of Pennsylvania.
David M. Dodge, of Missouri.
Hamilton Bowie, of Alabama.
James M. Wheeler, of Oklahoma Territory.
William P. Crawford, of South Carolina.
John Crotty, of Texas.
Eugene E. Barton, of Illinois.
Quincy E. McDowell, of Indiana.
James R. Pourie, of Missouri.
Kenneth C. Masteller, of California.
Charles C. Pulis, of Nebraska.
First Sergt. Thomas Ryan, Troop K, First United States Cavalry.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, FORTIETH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Fred W. Bugbee, of Arizona.
Burton J. Mitchell, of Kansas.
Robert B. Mitchell, of Kansas.
John M. Kelso, jr., of Arkansas.
Joseph C. Righter, jr., of Pennsylvania.
Cullen C. Mitchell, of Mississippi.
William E. Utterback, of Mississippi.
William C. Fitzpatrick, of Texas.
Nathaniel M. Cartnell, jr., of Virginia.
James W. Le Crone, of Washington.
Sergt. Davis C. Anderson, Troop C, Fourth United States Cavalry.
Edmund T. Paterson, late sergeant, Battery K, Sixth United States Artillery.

TO BE COLONEL FORTY-FIRST INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Ephraim T. C. Richmond, Second United States Artillery.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL FORTY-FIRST INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. John S. Mallory, Second United States Infantry.

TO BE MAJORS, FORTY-FIRST INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Palmer G. Wood, Twelfth United States Infantry.
First Lieut. Guy H. Preston, Ninth United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. John H. Wholley, Twenty-fourth United States Infantry.

TO BE CAPTAINS, FORTY-FIRST INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

First Lieut. Francis P. Siviter, Eleventh United States Infantry.
First Lieut. James A. Shipton, First United States Artillery.
Charles W. Wadsworth, of Tennessee.
John C. Hegarty, of New York.
George L. Baker, jr., of New York.
Harry L. Bishop, of Pennsylvania.
James H. Martin, of West Virginia.
James Clark, of Illinois.
Charles W. Jackson, of Maryland.
Carl K. Mower, of Ohio.
Fred L. Davidson, of Ohio.
Clarence S. Nettles, of South Carolina.
Richard J. Fanning, of Ohio.
Robert Sewell, of New Jersey.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-FIRST INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

William R. Standiford, of West Virginia.
William M. Goodale, of Ohio.
John H. Boston, jr., of Georgia.
Arthur B. Christey, of New York.
Charles A. Cumings, of Pennsylvania.
Albert W. Foreman, of Delaware.
Louis T. Boiseau, of the District of Columbia.
Ernest A. Greenough, of New York.
Brady G. Ruttencutter, of West Virginia.
Clarence A. McIntosh, of Illinois.
John S. Johnston, of Indiana.
Walter Harvey, of Ohio.
Joshua Jagmetty, of New Jersey.
First Sergt. John E. Hemphill, Troop F, Seventh United States Cavalry.
Commissary Sergt. John Kennedy, United States Army.
First Sergt. Frederick Koch, Military Academy Detachment of Cavalry.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-FIRST INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

William R. Taylor, of New York.
Benjamin L. Towson, of Tennessee.
Frank J. Miller, of New York.
Henry T. Mitchell, of New York.
Edwin J. Nowlen, of Pennsylvania.
Horace N. Claxton, of Pennsylvania.
Frank W. Glover, of Alabama.
Consuelo A. Seoane, of Virginia.
George F. Bailey, of Vermont.
Russell Beall, of Pennsylvania.
Lawrence P. Butler, late first lieutenant, Third United States Volunteer Engineers.
Private Howard L. Landers, Troop A, Fifth United States Cavalry.

TO BE COLONEL FORTY-SECOND INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Maj. J. Milton Thompson, Twenty-fourth United States Infantry (now lieutenant-colonel Fourteenth United States Infantry).

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL FORTY-SECOND INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. John H. Beacom, Sixth United States Infantry.

TO BE MAJORS, FORTY-SECOND INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. William C. Brown, First United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. Edward C. Carey, Sixteenth United States Infantry.
John R. Prime, of Iowa.

TO BE CAPTAINS, FORTY-SECOND INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

First Lieut. George De G. Catlin, Second United States Infantry.
Duncan Henderson, of Michigan.
Edmund Du Bois, of New Jersey.
Frank Keck, of New York.
Joseph V. Cunningham, of Pennsylvania.
Charles S. Burns, of New York.
James E. Hill, of Illinois.
Fred J. Herman, of Ohio.
James M. Shallenberger, of Ohio.
Peter T. Riley, of California.
Worthington Kautzman, of Ohio.
Louis M. Lang, of New York.
Alfred W. Bjornstad, of Minnesota.
Harry W. Hamilton, of Ohio.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-SECOND INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Arthur Poillon, of New York.
William R. Molinard, of New York.

George H. White, of Michigan.
Theodore C. Reiser, of New Jersey.
Fred W. Stopford, of Massachusetts.
Harry C. McCool, of Georgia.
James H. Little, of New York.
Charles H. Roessing, of Pennsylvania.
Charles T. Beale, of West Virginia.
Joseph R. McAndrews, of Illinois.
Henry F. McFeely, of Indiana.
Robert K. Spiller, of Virginia.
Francis H. Lomax, of New York.
Robert B. Hargis, of Florida.
Walter H. Johnson, of Minnesota.
Ord. Sergt. Philip Powers, United States Army.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-SECOND INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Edward F. Hackett, jr., of New York.
Louis P. Weber, of New York.
Bruce N. Judd, of Ohio.
Franklin P. Jackson, of New York.
Horace Webster, of New York.
Augustus P. Warfield, of New York.
Morris M. Keck, of Pennsylvania.
James E. Abbott, of Maryland.
Private Robert A. Caldwell, Troop C, Fourth United States Cavalry.
Sergt. Martin Novak, Battery C, Fifth United States Artillery.
William P. Kitts, late corporal, Company D, Twenty-second New York Volunteers.
R. Howard Williams, late second lieutenant, Fourth New Jersey Volunteers.

TO BE COLONEL FORTY-THIRD INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Arthur Murray, First United States Artillery.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL FORTY-THIRD INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Wilber E. Wilder, Fourth United States Cavalry.

TO BE MAJORS, FORTY-THIRD INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Henry T. Allen, Sixth United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. John C. Gilmore, jr., Fourth United States Artillery.
First Lieut. Lincoln C. Andrews, Third United States Cavalry.

TO BE CAPTAINS, FORTY-THIRD INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17 1899.

Linwood E. Hanson, of Massachusetts.
Michael J. Spellman, of New York.
John S. Fair, of Pennsylvania.
William R. Beavers, of North Carolina.
William B. Preston, of Virginia.
Washington L. Goldsborough, of New York.
Tiffin Gilmore, of Ohio.
John Cooke, of California.
George O. Duncan, of California.
William Elliott, of California.
Frank C. Prescott, of California.
Harry M. Dey, of New Jersey.
Lucius E. Polk, of Pennsylvania.
Ernest R. Tilton, late captain, Twelfth New York Volunteers.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-THIRD INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Michael E. Morris, of Massachusetts.
Henry J. Stewart, of Georgia.
Edward T. Donnelly, of New York.
William S. Conrow, of New York.
Edward O. Power, of New York.
Claudius M. Seaman, of Pennsylvania.
James W. Dutton, of Maine.
Delbert R. Jones, of Connecticut.
Robert Le Masurier, of Virginia.
Lorenzo D. Gasser, of Ohio.
Albert E. Phillips, of Louisiana.
William C. Dow, of Massachusetts.
Corpl. Lewis H. Forsyth, Eighth United States Cavalry.
Sergt. Maj. Jonathan Cilley, Seventh United States Infantry.
Sergt. John H. Evens, Battalion of Engineers, United States Army.
Frank Gordon, late major, Third United States Volunteer Infantry.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-THIRD INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Gordon Johnston, of New York.
William H. Wilson, of New York.
Henry A. Thayer, of Massachusetts.
Harold S. Swann, of New Jersey.
Joseph T. Sweeney, of New York.
Morton L. Avery, of Pennsylvania.
Louis H. Leaf, of Pennsylvania.
Walter S. Price, of Pennsylvania.
William H. Burt, of Vermont.
Robert Sterrett, of the District of Columbia.
Q. M. Sergt. Fred W. Mills, jr., Battery O, Seventh United States Artillery.
Sergt. Charles F. Andrews, Fourth United States Artillery.

TO BE COLONEL FORTY-FOURTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Edward J. McClernand, Second United States Cavalry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL FORTY-FOURTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. William S. Scott, First United States Cavalry.

TO BE MAJORS, FORTY-FOURTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Harry C. Hale, Twentieth United States Infantry.
First Lieut. Charles C. Walcutt, jr., Eighth United States Cavalry.
Henry B. McCoy, of Colorado.

TO BE CAPTAINS, FORTY-FOURTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

George D. Lee, of Kentucky.
Frank R. Curtis, of New York.
Orlando F. Guthrie, of Missouri.
Samuel C. Samuels, of Alabama.
Edward A. Stuart, of Texas.
James L. Malley, of Illinois.
James L. Anderson, of Indiana.
John L. Ketcham, jr., of Indiana.
Dana R. Weller, of California.
Eugene V. N. Bissell, of New York.
Amasa S. Crossfield, of Minnesota.
James K. Wiggins, of Illinois.
Thomas Leonard, of Minnesota.
First Sergt. Kirwin T. Smith, Company L, Tenth United States Infantry.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-FOURTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Fred L. Wilson, of Kentucky.
Clyde B. Parker, of Kansas.
Stephen H. Mould, of New York.
Lewis H. Levens, of Missouri.
Ralph Ingalls, of Missouri.
Richard B. Going, of Alabama.
Frederick S. Young, of Texas.
Marion C. Raysor, of Texas.
Orville R. Perry, of Nebraska.
Alfred V. Brown, of North Carolina.
Herbert L. Evans, of Ohio.
Richard W. Buchanan, of Indiana.
William J. White, of West Virginia.
Frank E. Lynch, of Alabama.
John B. Heyburn, of Washington.
Q. M. Sergt. Michael H. Barry, First United States Cavalry.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-FOURTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

William A. Haycraft, of Kentucky.
Howard M. Koontz, of Kansas.
Arthur J. Cadden, of Kansas.
Theodore Levack, of Arkansas.
Leo L. Thomas, of Michigan.
Gustav F. Schlachter, of Pennsylvania.
Benjamin R. Hall, of Illinois.
Richard H. Sutherland, of Illinois.

William E. Parsons, of Indiana.
William S. Blair, of Iowa.
Alton B. Cusick, of Ohio.
Frederick E. Dengler, late first lieutenant, First Arkansas Volunteers.

TO BE COLONEL FORTY-FIFTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Maj. Joseph H. Dorst, Second United States Cavalry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL FORTY-FIFTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. James Parker, Fourth United States Cavalry.

TO BE MAJORS, FORTY-FIFTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Daniel A. Frederick, Seventh United States Infantry.
Capt. Edwin T. Cole, Eleventh United States Infantry.
Theodore K. Birkhaeuser, of Wisconsin.

TO BE CAPTAINS, FORTY-FIFTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Percy Willis, of Oregon.
Elmer O. Worrick, of Oregon,
Nathan F. Simpson, of Michigan.
Albert Steinhauser, of Minnesota.
Eugene C. Montfort, of Minnesota.
W. Lee Capps, of Illinois.
Benjamin F. Patrick, of Illinois.
Orison P. Lee, of Indiana.
Thomas J. Rogers, of Wisconsin.
Adelbert W. Cogswell, of North Dakota.
Daniel W. Hand, of Minnesota.
James Ross, of Washington.
George W. Rickeman, of Wisconsin.
John N. Loye, of Minnesota.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-FIFTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

William Brown, of Montana.
George E. Kumpe, of Montana.
Milosh R. Hilgard, of Illinois.
Fred W. Morrison, of Michigan.
William A. Edwards, of Minnesota.
Willard M. Flynn, of Iowa.
George P. Tyner, of Illinois.
Alfred L. Castle, of Illinois.
David I. McCormick, of Indiana.
Lewis S. Ryan, of Nebraska.
Frederick P. Cook, of Wisconsin.
Arthur S. Tibbitts, of Wisconsin.
Charles G. Lawrence, of Ohio.
Temple H. Owens, of Indiana.
Allan G. Blaker, of Minnesota.
First-Class Sergt. James D. Watson, Signal Corps, United States Army.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-FIFTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Arthur R. Jones, of Illinois.
William E. W. MacKinlay, of Illinois.
Roy I. Taylor, of Michigan.
Charles E. N. Howard, of Minnesota.
Edwin C. Long, of Pennsylvania.
Edgar W. Mumford, of Illinois.
John B. Shuman, of Wisconsin.
Edward P. Barber, of Ohio.
First Sergt. Michael J. Mender, Company F, Eleventh United States Infantry.
Private Grier P. Mobley, Company A, Twenty-second United States Infantry.
Frederic G. Kellond, late corporal, Company E, First Kentucky Volunteers.
Albert S. Odell, late battalion sergeant-major, Third United States Volunteer Engineers.

TO BE COLONEL FORTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Maj. Walter S. Schuyler, Second United States Cavalry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL FORTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Maj. Edward B. Pratt, Twenty-third United States Infantry.

TO BE MAJORS, FORTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Samuel W. Miller, Fifth United States Infantry.
Capt. William H. Johnston, Sixteenth United States Infantry.
First Lieut. William Brooke, Fourth United States Infantry.

TO BE CAPTAINS, FORTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

First Lieut. Joseph W. Glidden, Fourth United States Infantry.
First Lieut. Frank B. McKenna, Fifteenth United States Infantry.
Second Lieut. John McClintock, Fifth United States Cavalry.
Samuel S. O'Connor, of New York.
Robert J. Reaney, of Pennsylvania.
Isaiah H. Baker, of Maine.
Lewis Patstone, of Rhode Island.
Thomas I. Mair, of Illinois.
David Conner, of Connecticut.
George T. McConnell, of Ohio.
Joseph S. Hardin, of South Carolina.
John H. Baker, of Wisconsin.
William B. Thomas, late captain, Third United States Volunteer Engineers.
Archibald F. Commiskey, late private, Troop C, New York Volunteer Cavalry.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Frank E. Hopkins, of Rhode Island.
Fred T. Austin, of Massachusetts.
Harry A. Ely, of New Jersey.
Terence E. Murphy, of New Jersey.
Charles F. Wonson, of Massachusetts.
James B. Webb, of New York.
Leopold Thun, of Austria.
John G. Constable, of Maryland.
Henry H. Sheen, of Virginia.
Edward E. Philbrook, of Maine.
William F. Herringshaw, of Ohio.
Benjamin P. Lukens, of Ohio.
Wallace N. Batchelder, of Vermont.
Charles D. Wood, late captain, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry.
Sergt. Philip K. Sweet, Troop K, First United States Cavalry.
Sergt. Maj. Conant S. Buttrick, Eighth United States Infantry.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Carlos W. Pierce, of Vermont.
Richard B. Kavanagh, of Illinois.
William A. Austin, of Ohio.
Edward D. Powers, of Massachusetts.
Hugh J. B. McElgin, of New York.
George W. Earl, of Pennsylvania.
Frank S. Leisenring, of Pennsylvania.
Theodore Gruener, of Connecticut.
Solomon B. West, of New Hampshire.
James H. Johnston, of New Hampshire.
Moses R. Rosa, of Pennsylvania.
Troup Whitehead, of Georgia.

TO BE COLONEL FORTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Walter Howe, Fourth United States Artillery.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL FORTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Clarence R. Edwards, Tenth United States Infantry.

TO BE MAJORS, FORTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Henry W. Hubbell, First United States Artillery.
First Lieut. Hugh D. Wise, Ninth United States Infantry.
Keller Anderson, of Tennessee.

TO BE CAPTAINS, FORTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Harry Walsh, of the District of Columbia.
Charles C. McLain, of Pennsylvania.
Lester H. Simons, of Pennsylvania.
Samuel S. Houston, of Illinois.
Stephen O. Smith, of North Carolina.
George H. Bentley, of Virginia.
Arlington U. Betts, of Ohio.
Augustus C. Hart, of Florida.
George W. Bristol, of Illinois.
Edward W. Terry, of Louisiana.
John M. Field, of Connecticut.
Charles H. Gordon, late first lieutenant, Volunteer Signal Corps.
Robert B. Huston, late additional paymaster, United States Volunteers.
John G. Livingston, late captain, First United States Volunteer Infantry.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Oscar Bishop, of Kentucky.
Hugh H. Pitcairn, of Pennsylvania.
William T. Bishop, of New Jersey.
A. La Rue Christie, of New Jersey.
Lorenzo D. Dyer, of New Jersey.
Harry T. Gray, of Massachusetts.
Casper W. Cole, of New York.
Jesse S. Garwood, of Illinois.
Samuel Riggs, of Maryland.
John W. Gulick, of North Carolina.
Edward N. Meekins, of Virginia.
Philip Yost, of Ohio.
Leonard S. Goddard, of Tennessee.
Sergt. Jens E. Stedje, Troop A, Second United States Cavalry.
George W. England, late captain, First District of Columbia Volunteers.
Thomas R. J. Campbell, late first lieutenant, Volunteer Signal Corps.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Charles H. Morrow, of Kentucky.
Walter T. Slack, of Kentucky.
Charles L. Lanham, of Maryland.
William R. Harrison, of the District of Columbia.
Paul W. Harrison, of Georgia.
Harvey Garrison, of New York.
Thomas P. Murphy, of Pennsylvania.
George L. Jackson, of Pennsylvania.
Henry F. Egle, of Pennsylvania.
Rudolph E. Smyser, of Pennsylvania.
Patrick H. Devine, of New Jersey.
Allan L. Briggs, late an enlisted man, First United States Cavalry.

TO BE COLONEL FORTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

Capt. William P. Duvall, First United States Artillery.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL FORTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

Capt. Thaddeus W. Jones, Tenth United States Cavalry.

TO BE MAJORS, FORTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

First Lieut. Sedgwick Rice, Seventh United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. Alexander L. Dade, Third United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. John Howard, Nineteenth United States Infantry.

TO BE CAPTAINS, FORTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

Robert R. Rudd, of Ohio.
James E. Hamlin, of North Carolina.
William A. Hankins, of Virginia.
Leon W. Denison, of Illinois.
James W. Smith, of Ohio.
William H. Jackson, of Massachusetts.
Aaron D. Bright, of Tennessee.
Thomas Grant, late first lieutenant, Tenth United States Volunteer Infantry.
Stephen Starr, late second lieutenant, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry.
Alexander V. Richardson, late first lieutenant, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry.
John J. Oliver, late second lieutenant, Tenth United States Volunteer Infantry.
First Sergt. John Buck, Troop B, Tenth United States Cavalry.
Sergt. Maj. William H. Brown, Ninth United States Cavalry.
Post Q. M. Sergt. Frederick A. Clayton, United States Army.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

Jerry M. White, of Kansas.
James F. Powell, of Indiana.
Harrison B. Brown, of North Carolina.
Hammond J. Parker, of Georgia.
Charles C. Caldwell, of Ohio.
Walter G. Gatchell, of Rhode Island.
Frank W. Cheek, of Michigan.
Jacob C. Smith, late second lieutenant, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry.
John W. Brown, late second lieutenant, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry.
Hugh Thomason, late sergeant, Sixth United States Cavalry.
First Sergt. Lewis M. Smith, Troop M, Tenth United States Cavalry.
Sergt. William A. Allen, Troop A, Ninth United States Cavalry.
Squadron Sergt. Maj. John H. Anderson, Ninth United States Cavalry.
First Sergt. Peter McCown, Troop E, Tenth United States Cavalry.
Com. Sergt. George Webber, United States Army (retired).

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

Joseph Moore, of Ohio.
James B. Coleman, of Missouri.
David B. Jeffers, of Ohio.
Wilson Ballard, of Ohio.
Joseph C. Andrews, of Massachusetts.
Frank R. Chisholm, of Massachusetts.
John K. Rice, of Virginia.
George W. Taylor, of North Carolina.
Green F. Marion, of Alabama.
First Sergt. Walter Green, Troop K, Tenth United States Cavalry.
Com. Sergt. Charles B. Turner, Tenth United States Cavalry.
Sergt. Maj. Lincoln Washington, Ninth United States Cavalry.

TO BE COLONEL FORTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

Capt. William H. Beck, Tenth United States Cavalry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL FORTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

Capt. Arthur C. Ducat, Twenty-fourth United States Infantry.

TO BE MAJORS, FORTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

Capt. George W. Kirkman, Twenty-third United States Infantry.
Capt. Carter P. Johnson, Tenth United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. Ernest Hinds, Second United States Artillery.

TO BE CAPTAINS, FORTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

Emmanuel D. Bass, of Ohio.
William M. Hawkins, of Kansas.
Robert Gage, of Alabama.
Gilbert C. Smith, of Missouri.
Thomas Campbell, of Missouri.
Floyd H. Crumbly, late first lieutenant, Tenth United States Volunteer Infantry.
John C. Proctor, late first lieutenant, Eighth United States Volunteer Infantry.
Frank R. Steward, late second lieutenant, Eighth United States Volunteer Infantry.
Robert G. Woods, late second lieutenant, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry.
Sergt. William D. Edwards, Tenth United States Cavalry.

First Sergt. Charles W. Jefferson, Troop B, Ninth United States Cavalry.
Sergt. Maj. Edward L. Baker, jr., Tenth United States Cavalry.
Sergt. Maj. William R. Staff, Twenty-fourth United States Infantry.
First Sergt. Lewis W. McNabb, Company D, Twenty-fourth United States Infantry (since deceased).

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

James H. Thomas, of Indiana.
David J. Gilmer, of North Carolina.
Robert Blakeman, of Illinois.
Hamilton H. Blunt, of Louisiana.
Robert C. Gregg, of Pennsylvania.
William D. Pritchard, of North Carolina.
Isaac W. Moloney, of Ohio.
William H. Butler, of Missouri.
Leon H. Jordan, late first lieutenant, Seventh United States Volunteer Infantry.
Thomas C. Butler, late second lieutenant, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry.
Macon Russell, late second lieutenent, Eighth United States Volunteer Infantry.
Lafayette A. Tillman, late quartermaster-sergeant, Seventh United States Volunteer Infantry.
First Sergt. Charles Perry, Troop L, Tenth United States Cavalry.
Sergt. Charles Spurlock, Troop E, Ninth United States Cavalry.
Sergt. Ebbert W. Maden, Troop E, Ninth United States Cavalry.
Com. Sergt. Fred Dobler, United States Army.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

Horace F. Wheaton, of Massachusetts.
George E. Payne, of Kansas.
Leander W. Hayes, of North Carolina.
Guilford E. Campbell, of Illinois.
Wyatt Huffman, late second lieutenant, Eighth United States Volunteer Infantry.
Beverly Perea, late first lieutenant, Seventh United States Volunteer Infantry.
William Blaney, late second lieutenant, Tenth United States Volunteer Infantry.
Sergt. Alfred M. Ray, Troop F, Tenth United States Cavalry.
Corpl. Robert L. Gough, Company D, Twenty-fourth United States Infantry.
Commissary Sergt. Henry F. Walls, Ninth United States Cavalry.
Sergt. Edward B. Johnson, Tenth United States Cavalry.
Sergt. Maj. William McBryar, Twenty-fifth United States Infantry.

TO BE COLONEL ELEVENTH CAVALRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 10, 1899.

Capt. James Lockett, Fourth United States Cavalry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL ELEVENTH CAVALRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 10, 1899.

Capt. Charles G. Starr, First United States Infantry.

TO BE MAJORS, ELEVENTH CAVALRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 12, 1899.

First Lieut. Thomas G. Carson, Fourth United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. Dennis E. Nolan, Thirteenth United States Infantry.
Maj. Hugh T. Sime, First California Volunteers.

TO BE CAPTAINS, ELEVENTH CAVALRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 10, 1899.

Capt. Edward L. Glasgow, Twentieth Kansas Volunteers.
Capt. Joseph T. Davidson, Fifty-first Iowa Volunteers.
Lieut. Evan E. Young, First South Dakota Volunteers.
Post Q. M. Sergt. Alvin Arndt, United States Army.

To rank from August 11, 1899.

Capt. Edward A. Sturges, First Washington Volunteers.
Second Lieut. Edward L. King, Eighth United States Cavalry.
Lieut. Samuel G. Larson, First South Dakota Volunteers.
Lieut. Russell T. Hazzard, First Washington Volunteers.
Lieut. William A. Green, Twentieth Kansas Volunteers.
Capt. Frank E. Green, First Montana Volunteers.
Ernest H. Agnew, late Twentieth Kansas Volunteers.

To rank from August 12, 1899.

First Lieut. Lloyd England, Third United States Artillery.
First Lieut. William J. Kipp, First Idaho Volunteers.
Lieut. James O. Ross, Fifty-first Iowa Volunteers.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, ELEVENTH CAVALRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 10, 1899.

Private George W. Winterburn, Eleventh Cavalry, United States Volunteers.

To rank from August 11, 1899.

Lieut. James O. Ross, Fifty-first Iowa Volunteers.
Lieut. Frederick E. Gignoux, Nevada Volunteer Cavalry.
Lieut. Morrow C. Gustin, First Washington Volunteers.
Lieut. Charles R. Trowbridge, Thirteenth Minnesota Volunteers.
Lieut. Fred H. Parks, First South Dakota Volunteers.
Second Lieut. Walter V. Cotchett, First Washington Volunteers.
Second Lieut. Charles C. Winnia, First Tennessee Volunteers.
Sergt. Lindzy E. Cheatham, Battery K, Third United States Artillery.
Private George M. Wray, Eleventh Cavalry, United States Volunteers.
Sergt. Francis H. Lincoln, Company A, Fifty-first Iowa Volunteers.
Private Joseph W. Morris, Eleventh Cavalry, United States Volunteers.
Private Raymond S. Enslow, Eleventh Cavalry, United States Volunteers.
Corpl. Oliver P. M. Hazzard, Company M, First Washington Volunteers.
Sergt. Holly V. Hill, Company H, First Washington Volunteers.
Sergt. Lewis Foerster, Troop K, Fourth United States Cavalry.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, ELEVENTH CAVALRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 11, 1899.

First Sergt. John Holtman, Troop G, Fourth United States Cavalry.
Private Leo M. Cutts, Thirteenth Minnesota Volunteers.
Private Charles H. Burritt, Eleventh Cavalry, United States Volunteers.
Private Emory S. West, Company G, First South Dakota Volunteers.
Sergt. Maj. Dennis P. Quinlan, Eleventh Cavalry, United States Volunteers.
Private Otto W. Rethorst, Eleventh Cavalry, United States Volunteers.
Hugh Kirkman, at large.
Alexander C. McKelvey, of Massachusetts.
George Curry, of New Mexico.
Charles L. Ballard, of New Mexico.
Henry C. White, jr., of Ohio.
James D. Keene, of the District of Columbia.

TO BE SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF MAJOR.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Charles F. Mason, assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Capt. Ogden Rafferty, assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Capt. Paul F. Straub, assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Charles L. G. Anderson, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
John R. McDill, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
James E. Shallenberger, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Francis A. Winter, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Thomas C. Chalmers, of New York.
Frank C. Armstrong, of Kansas.
B. Albert Lieberman, of Missouri.
Joseph N. Henry, of Pennsylvania.
Julius A. Schuelke, of Wyoming (since honorably discharged).

To rank from August 10, 1899.

Capt. George D. De Shon, assistant surgeon, United States Army.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. James D. Glennan, assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Capt. Philip G. Wales, assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Capt. Thomas U. Raymond, assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Capt. Allen M. Smith, assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Capt. Walter D. McCaw, assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Capt. Henry D. Snyder, assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Capt. William F. Lippitt, jr., assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Capt. Merritte W. Ireland, assistant surgeon, United States Army.

Capt. Joseph T. Clarke, assistant surgeon, United States Army.
William Cogswell, of Massachusetts.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

Capt. Charles F. Kieffer, assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Thomas E. Evins, of Alabama.

To rank from November 11, 1899.

Capt. Eugene L. Swift, assistant surgeon, United States Army.

TO BE ASSISTANT SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF CAPTAIN.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

John R. Hereford, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Frank W. Foxworthy, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Luther B. Grandy, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
George W. Matthews, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Thomas B. Anderson, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Frederic A. Washburn, jr., of Massachusetts.
William Bowen, of Tennessee.
S. Chase de Krafft, of Maryland.
James C. Minor, of Arkansas.
James J. Erwin, of Ohio.
Abram L. Haines, of New York.
Frederick Hadru, of Texas.

To rank from August 10, 1899.

Alexander D. Ghiselin, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Frederick S. Dewey, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Seaton Norman, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Edward A. Romig, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Thomas R. Marshall, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Charles L. Furbush, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Frank E. Artaud, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Robert P. Robins, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
William D. Bell, of New York.
Walter D. Webb, of New York.
Henry H. Lee, of Vermont.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

Robert Burns, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Howard A. Grube, of Michigan.

TO BE ASSISTANT SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF FIRST LIEUTENANT.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

William H. Cook, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
John A. Metzger, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Isaac W. Brewer, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Edward D. Sinks, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Lomax S. Anderson, late assistant surgeon, Fifth United States Volunteer Infantry (since honorably discharged).
Richard S. Griswold, of Connecticut.
Leonard K. Graves, of New York.
George P. Peed, of Virginia.
Albert H. Eber, of Michigan.
Ralph S. Porter, of Illinois.
John C. Greenewalt, of Pennsylvania.
Frank Donaldson, of New York (since honorably discharged).
Patrick J. McKenna, of Utah (since honorably discharged).

To rank from August 10, 1899.

Shadworth O. Beasley, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.

To rank from August 15, 1899.

Joseph L. Sanford, of Virginia.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

George L. Hicks, jr., acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Edward G. Beeson, of Iowa.
Easton Burchard, of Missouri.
Edward J. Barrett, of the District of Columbia.
Lewie A. Griffith, of South Carolina.
Dudley W. Welch, of Ohio.
Thomas T. Jackson, of Texas.
Robert W. Andrews, of New York.
Charles M. Galbraith, of Illinois.

To rank from September 8, 1899.

Joseph L. Bell, of Illinois.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

William W. Purnell, of the District of Columbia.
William C. Warmsley, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.

To rank from October 17, 1899.

William C. Berlin, of Ohio.

INFANTRY ARM.

To be second lieutenants.

John McClintock, of New York, March 22, 1899.
John W. Wright, of District of Columbia, April 10, 1899.
Ralph McCoy, of Michigan, April 10, 1899.
Edwin A. Hickman, of Missouri, April 10, 1899.
James Dean Tilford, of New York, April 10, 1899.
Guy Cushman, of Missouri, April 10, 1899.
Godwin Ordway, of District of Columbia, April 10, 1899.
Samuel A. Purviance, of Pennsylvania, April 10, 1899.
Hamilton Foley, of New York, April 10, 1899.
Guy S. Norvell, of District of Columbia, April 10, 1899.
Warren W. Whitside, of District of Columbia, April 10, 1899.
Frederick R. De Funiak, jr., of Kentucky, April 10, 1899.
Grosvenor L. Townsend, of New York, April 10, 1899.
George Rutledge Armstrong, of Tennessee, April 10, 1899.
George S. Richards, jr., of New York, April 10, 1899.
James K. Parsons, of Alabama, April 10, 1899.
Nathaniel R. Chambliss, of Alabama, April 10, 1899.
Walter G. Penfield, of Connecticut, April 10, 1899.
Thomas Leverett Brewer, of Maryland, April 10, 1899.
John Fred James, of Virginia, April 10, 1899.
Reuben Smith, of Minnesota, April 10, 1899.
George E. Ball, of Michigan, April 10, 1899.
Dan Tyler Moore, of New York, April 10, 1899.
Clarence B. Smith, of South Carolina, April 10, 1899.
Russell P. Reeder, of Ohio, April 10, 1899.
Eldred Dudley Warfield, of Maryland, April 10, 1899.
Howard Campbell Price, of Pennsylvania, April 10, 1899.
Chase Doster, of Kansas, April 10, 1899.
Oliver H. Dockery, jr., of North Carolina, April 10, 1899.
John R. Thomas, jr., of Illinois, April 10, 1899.
Walter Bogardus McCaskey, of Pennsylvania, April 10, 1899.
Frank R. Lang, of Maine, April 10, 1899.
Milton Artello Elliott, jr., of Arkansas, April 10, 1899.
Robert F. McMillan, of New York, April 10, 1899.
George D. Freeman, jr., of Ohio, April 10, 1899.
William E. Hunt, of New Hampshire, April 10, 1899.
Ernest Eddy Haskell, of Massachusetts, April 10, 1899.
William Shubrick Bradford, of Delaware, April 10, 1899.
Jack Hayes, at large, April 10, 1899.
William H. Waldron, of West Virginia, April 10, 1899.
Joseph K. Partello, of Georgia, April 10, 1899.
Leon L. Roach, of Ohio, April 10, 1899.
Horace Potts Hobbs, of Pennsylvania, April 10, 1899.
Louis J. Van Schaick, of New York, April 10, 1899.
George Stanton Tiffany, of District of Columbia, April 10, 1899.
Edgar A. Myer, of New York, April 10, 1899.
Arthur Morson Shipp, of Virginia, April 10, 1899.
Joseph W. Beacham, jr., of New York, April 10, 1899.
Francis J. McConnell, of Delaware, April 10, 1899.
Rhinelander Waldo, of New York, April 10, 1899.
Richard P. Rifenberick, jr., of Ohio, April 10, 1899.
Wallace Macdonald Craigie, of Pennsylvania, April 10, 1899.
Graham Ligon Johnson, of Georgia, April 10, 1899.
Charles E. Hay, jr., of Illinois, April 10, 1899.
Walter E. Stewart, jr., of New Jersey, April 10, 1899.
Robert H. Wescott, of Wisconsin, April 10, 1899.
George W. Wallace, of Colorado, April 10, 1899.
Harry Adsit Woodruff, of New York, April 10, 1899.
Paul Hurst, of District of Columbia, April 10, 1899.
Kurtz Eppley, of New Jersey, April 10, 1899.
Edward W. Robinson, of Washington, April 10, 1899.
Israel Putnam, of New York, April 10, 1899.
Allen Parker, of Indiana, April 10, 1899.
Charles B. Stone, jr., of California, April 10, 1899.
Allen Smith, jr., of Washington, April 10, 1899.
Fred W. Hershler, of District of Columbia, April 10, 1899.
Howard Stanbery Avery, of California, April 10, 1899.
Charles Smith Foster, of North Dakota, April 10, 1899.
Neil A. Campbell, of Rhode Island, April 10, 1899.
John B. Sanford, of Vermont, April 10, 1899.
Frank B. Hawkins, of Pennsylvania, May 1, 1899.
Joseph B. Morse, of California (since deceased), May 1, 1899.
Howard Gilman Young, of Pennsylvania, May 1, 1899.
G. Arthur Hadsell, of Connecticut, May 1, 1899.
George I. Feeter, of New York, May 1, 1899.

Wait C. Johnson, of Vermont, May 1, 1899.
J. Millard Little, of Georgia, May 1, 1899.
John L. Bond, of Ohio, May 1, 1899.
Joseph S. Cecil, of Tennessee, May 1, 1899.
Edward R. Stone, of Massachusetts, May 1, 1899.
Albert R. Dillingham, of Pennsylvania, May 1, 1899.
William Richie Gibson, of Iowa, June 1, 1899.
Henry M. Bankhead, of Alabama, June 1, 1899.
Henry A. Ripley, of Michigan, June 1, 1899.
William A. Kent, of District of Columbia, June 1, 1899.
Raymond W. Hardenbergh, of Pennsylvania, June 1, 1899.
Maxwell Keyes, of Texas (since killed in action), June 1, 1899.
Walter C. Sweeney, of West Virginia, June 1, 1899.
Alfred McCalmont Wilson, of Pennsylvania, June 1, 1899.
Charles McClure, jr., of Minnesota, June 1, 1899.
Samuel Wheelan Noyes, of California, June 1, 1899.
Frederick Wilson Benteen, of Georgia, June 1, 1899.
Charles W. Weeks, of Nebraska, June 1, 1899.
Knud Knudson, of Wisconsin, June 1, 1899.
James Thornton Watson, at large, June 1, 1899.
George B. Sharon, of Nevada, June 1, 1899.
William Wallace McCammon, jr., at large, June 1, 1899.
Henry Watterson, jr., of Kentucky, June 1, 1899.
Cyrus A. Dolph, of Oregon, June 1, 1899.
Francis W. Healey, of Idaho, June 1, 1899.
Willis P. Coleman, of Louisiana, July 1, 1899.
William D. Pasco, of Florida, July 1, 1899.
Dupont B. Lyon, of Texas, July 1, 1899.
William Stanley Sinclair, of Texas, July 1, 1899.
Richmond Smith, of Wisconsin, July 1, 1899.
Charles Maurice Smith, of District of Columbia (since died of wounds received in action), July 1, 1899.
Arthur P. Watts, of Texas, July 1, 1899.
Eli Lewis Admire, of Oklahoma Territory, July 1, 1899.
Augustus Hall Bishop, of Delaware, July 1, 1899.
Austin Allen Parker, of Indiana, July 22, 1899.
William E. Mould, of Michigan, July 24, 1899.
Rhees Jackson, of Oregon, August 1, 1899.
Charles E. Kilbourne, jr., of Oregon, August 1, 1899.
Charles M. Gordon, jr., of Missouri, August 1, 1899.
Fred Van S. Chamberlain, of Illinois, August 1, 1899.
William N. Hughes, jr., of Pennsylvania, August 1, 1899.
Sylvester Bonnaffon, 3d, of Pennsylvania, August 1, 1899.
Robert C. Humber, of Georgia, August 1, 1899.
Hunter Kinzie, of California, August 1, 1899.
Paul Devereux Stockley, of New York, August 22, 1899.
George A. Cooper, of Louisiana, September 1, 1899.
Joseph C. Brady, of Missouri, September 1, 1899.
William K. Armstrong, of Alabama, September 1, 1899.
Robert S. Clark, of New York, September 1, 1899.
William O. Smith, of Missouri, September 1, 1899.
John Henry Page, jr., at large, September 1, 1899.
Parker Hitt, of Indiana, September 1, 1899.
Palmer G. Wood, jr., of California, September 1, 1899.
Paul Ward Beck, of Colorado, September 1, 1899.
John W. Norwood, of North Carolina, September 1, 1899.
Harold Dever Coburn, of Wyoming, October 5, 1899.
Robert Whitfield, of Georgia, October 5, 1899.
Allen J. Greer, of Tennessee, October 5, 1899.
Edwin E. Carroll, of Kansas, October 5, 1899.
Louis McLane Hamilton, of New York, October 5, 1899.
Harry Craig Williams, of Mississippi, October 5, 1899.
Albert B. Donworth, of Maine (late first lieutenant, Seventeenth United States Infantry), November 2, 1899.

INFANTRY ARM.

To be second lieutenants.

Corpl. Henry A. Hanigan, Troop G, Eighth United States Cavalry, April 5, 1899.
Q. M. Sergt. Thomas A. Vicars, Company A, Twenty-first United States Infantry, April 5, 1899.
Acting Hosp. Steward William L. Reed, United States Army, April 5, 1899.
Sergt. Charles L. McKain, Battery B, Fourth United States Artillery, April 5, 1899.
Corpl. James D. Reams, Company D, Battalion of Engineers, United States Army, April 5, 1899.
Sergt. Andrew J. Dougherty, Troop B, Third United States Cavalry, April 5, 1899.
Sergt. Oliver S. Eskridge, Company E, Eighteenth United States Infantry, April 5, 1899.
Hospital Steward Joel R. Lee, United States Army, April 5, 1899.
Private George E. Stewart, Battery A, Fifth United States Artillery, April 5, 1899.
Sergt. Bernard Sharp, Battery L, Third United States Artillery, April 5, 1899.
Battalion Sergt. Maj. Alden C. Knowles, Thirteenth United States Infantry, April 5, 1899.
Sergt. Earnest M. Reeve, Troop A, Sixth United States Cavalry, April 5, 1899.
Private Olin R. Booth, general service, United States Army, April 5, 1899.
Sergt. Ernst Hagedorn, Company E, Eighth United States Infantry, April 5, 1899.
First Sergt. Hjalmer Erickson, Troop M, Eighth United States Cavalry, April 5, 1899.
Corpl. James W. Furlow, United States Signal Corps, April 5, 1899.
Sergt. Joseph Herring, Battery E, Third United States Artillery, April 5, 1899.
Sergt. Clark D. Dudley, Battery H, Sixth United States Artillery, April 5, 1899.
Corpl. Ben Holladay Dorcy, Battery G, Fourth United States Artillery, April 5, 1899.
Corpl. Robert I. Rees, Battalion of Engineers, United States Army, October 1, 1899.
Corpl. Paul A. Barry, Company L, Twentieth United States Infantry, October 1, 1899.
Sergt. Albert C. Osborn, Company E, United States Infantry, October 1, 1899.
Sergt. Paul Draper, Company D, Sixteenth United States Infantry, October 1, 1899.
Corpl. Frank W. Ball, Company A, Seventeenth United States Infantry, October 1, 1899.
Private George Deiss, Battery D, Sixth United States Artillery, October 1, 1899.
Private Adrian V. L. R. de Beaumont, Company C, Seventh United States Infantry, October 1, 1899.
First Sergt. Hugh K. Taylor, Battery O, Fourth United States Artillery, October 1, 1899.
Sergt. Jesse M. Cullison, Battery C, Fifth United States Artillery, October 1, 1899.
Sergt. William H. Noble, Company E, Battalion of Engineers, October 1, 1899.
Sergt. Andrew C. Wright, Battery C, Fifth United States Artillery, October 1, 1899.
Sergt. Evert R. Wilson, Battery I, Seventh United States Artillery, October 1, 1899.
Sergt. Haywood Robbins, Battery L, Fifth United States Artillery, October 1, 1899.
Corpl. Edward C. Bolton, Company H, Nineteenth United States Infantry, October 1, 1899.
Sergt. Sidney S. Burbank, Company H, Nineteenth United States Infantry, October 1, 1899.
Sergt. Clenard McLaughlin, Company H, Nineteenth United States Infantry, October 1, 1899.
Sergt. Maj. Lynn S. Edwards, Second United States Artillery, October 1, 1899.
Private Edward B. Mitchell, Hospital Corps, United States Army, October 1, 1899.
First-Class Sergt. Clarence N. Jones, Signal Corps, United States Army, October 1, 1899.
Corpl. James H. Como, Battery I, Third United States Artillery, October 1, 1899.
Sergt. George M. Brooke, Battery O, First United States Artillery, October 1, 1899.
Battalion Sergt. Maj. William E. Bennett, jr., Sixth United States Infantry, October 1, 1899.
Corpl. Wilbur A. McDaniel, Company G, Sixth United States Infantry, October 1, 1899.

CAVALRY ARM.

To be second lieutenants.

Corpl. Henry W. Parker, Troop K, Sixth United States Cavalry, October 1, 1899.
Private Charles E. McCullough, Troop A, Sixth United States Cavalry, October 1, 1899.
Corpl. William H. Winters, Troop B, Sixth United States Cavalry, October 1, 1899.
Sergt. Douglas McCaskey, Troop K, Sixth United States Cavalry, October 1, 1899.
Sergt. Samuel B. Pearson, Troop I, First United States Cavalry, October 1, 1899.
Sergt. Albert A. King, Troop I, First United States Cavalry, October 1, 1899.
Sergt. Dorsey Cullen, Troop B, Third United States Cavalry, October 1, 1899.
Freeborn P. Holcomb, Troop L, Eighth United States Cavalry, October 1, 1899.
Frederick C. Johnson, of Illinois, April 10, 1899.
Paul T. Hayne, jr., of South Carolina, May 1, 1899.
Roger Stanley Fitch, of New York, June 1, 1899.
Eurubian H. Rubotton, of California, June 1, 1899.

William B. Cowin, of Nebraska, June 1, 1899.
Fred E. Buchan, of Kansas, July 1, 1899.
Leslie A. I. Chapman, of Iowa, July 1, 1899.
Aubrey Lippincott, of Colorado, August 1, 1899.

POSTMASTERS.

Theophilus G. Fowler, to be postmaster at Uniontown, in the county of Perry and State of Alabama, in the place of J. J. Brown, whose commission expired December 21, 1897. Mr. Fowler is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Wiley F. Kennamer, to be postmaster at Demopolis, in the county of Marengo and State of Alabama, in the place of Leonard Cornish, whose commission expired March 8, 1898. Mr. Kennamer is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

George B. Hanlin, to be postmaster at Avondale, in the county of Jefferson and State of Alabama, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1899. Mr. Hanlin is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Dallas B. Smith, to be postmaster at Opelika, in the county of Lee and State of Alabama, in the place of John T. Gorman, whose commission expired September 23, 1897. Mr. Smith is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Lansing T. Smith, to be postmaster at Anniston, in the county of Calhoun and State of Alabama, in the place of George S. Lee, removed. Mr. Smith is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William B. Sampson, to be postmaster at Skagway, in the Territory of Alaska, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1899. Mr. Sampson is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Joseph P. Balmat, to be postmaster at Conway, in the county of Faulkner and State of Arkansas, in the place of G. W. Chisler, whose commission expired October 20, 1897. Mr. Balmat is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Edward S. Parnell, to be postmaster at Junction, in the county of Union and State of Arkansas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Parnell is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Nannie H. Savage, to be postmaster at Monticello, in the county of Drew and State of Arkansas, in the place of A. M. Bell, whose commission expired March 5, 1899. Nannie H. Savage is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Charles S. Graham, to be postmaster at Pleasanton, in the county of Alameda and State of California, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1898. Mr. Graham is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Madison Thornburg, to be postmaster at Santa Maria, in the county of Santa Barbara and State of California, in the place of J. H. Haydon, whose commission expired February 6, 1899. Mr. Thornburg is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Frank E. Baker, to be postmaster at Fort Morgan, in the county of Morgan and State of Colorado, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Baker is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Charles A. Huxley, to be postmaster at Goldfield, in the county of Teller and State of Colorado, in the place of M. D. Vincent, resigned. Mr. Huxley is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Frederick G. McHarg, to be postmaster at Walsenburg, in the county of Huerfano and State of Colorado, in the place of J. S. McHarg, deceased. Frederick G. McHarg is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Daniel M. Sullivan, to be postmaster at Cripple Creek, in the county of Teller and State of Colorado, in the place of A. R. Kennedy, deceased. Mr. Sullivan is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John C. Twombley, to be postmaster at Denver, in the county of Arapahoe and State of Colorado, in the place of H. A. W. Tabor, deceased. Mr. Twombley is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William C. Barhite, to be postmaster at Ridgefield, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut, in the place of D. S. Sholes, whose commission expired July 10, 1898. Mr. Barhite is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William H. Brown, to be postmaster at Jewett City, in the county of New London and State of Connecticut, in the place of J. H. Finn, whose commission expired January 21, 1899. Mr. Brown is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Charles A. Potter, to be postmaster at Danielson, in the county of Windham and State of Connecticut, in the place of M. V. Woodworth, whose commission expired February 22, 1899. Mr. Potter is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

George E. Scofield, to be postmaster at Greenwich, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut, in the place of H. M. Fitzgerald, whose commission expired February 14, 1899. Mr. Scofield is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Arthur J. Kinney, to be postmaster at Harrington, in the county of Kent and State of Delaware, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1899. Mr. Kinney is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John A. Merritt, to be postmaster at Washington, in the county of Washington and District of Columbia, in the place of James P. Willett, whose commission expired December 11, 1898. Mr. Merritt is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Henry C. Groves, to be postmaster at Ocala, in the county of Marion and State of Florida, in the place of J. M. Martin, whose commission expired August 4, 1898. Mr. Groves is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William A. Murat, to be postmaster at Apalachicola, in the county of Franklin and State of Florida, in the place of F. Vincent, resigned. Mr. Murat is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

George B. Patterson, to be postmaster at Key West, in the county of Monroe and State of Florida, in the place of Lewis Otto, removed. Mr. Patterson is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Albert T. Williams, to be postmaster at Port Tampa City, in the county of Hillsboro and State of Florida, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Williams is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Alexander Zipperer, to be postmaster at Madison, in the county of Madison and State of Florida, in the place of W. J. Witherspoon, whose commission expired January 10, 1899. Mr. Zipperer is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Oscar T. Adams, to be postmaster at Fort McPherson, in the county of Fulton and State of Georgia, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Adams is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William A. Chapman, to be postmaster at Cedartown, in the county of Polk and State of Georgia, in the place of A. J. Tomlinson, removed. Mr. Chapman is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Clark Grier, to be postmaster at Dublin, in the county of Laurens and State of Georgia, in the place of Vivian L. Stanley, whose commission expired January 10, 1899. Mr. Grier is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Mattie H. Hanson, to be postmaster at Forsyth, in the county of Monroe and State of Georgia, in the place of L. A. Wilder, whose commission expired January 11, 1899. Mattie H. Hanson is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Fred S. Stevens, to be postmaster at Blackfoot, in the county of Bingham and State of Idaho, in the place of C. B. Wheeler, resigned. Mr. Stevens is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William J. Turner, to be postmaster at Mountain Home, in the county of Elmore and State of Idaho, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Turner is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

David H. Baker, to be postmaster at Tiskilwa, in the county of Bureau and State of Illinois, in the place of J. M. Mills, resigned. Mr. Baker is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Thomas E. Ballinger, to be postmaster at Chenoa, in the county

of McLean and State of Illinois, in the place of Spencer Van Petten, whose commission expired February 13, 1899. Mr. Ballinger is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Putnam Beckwith, to be postmaster at Wenona, in the county of Marshall and State of Illinois, in the place of F. M. Moulton, whose commission expired March 2, 1899. Mr. Beckwith is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Thomas S. Green, to be postmaster at Gardner, in the county of Grundy and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1899. Mr. Green is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

David Herriott, to be postmaster at Morgan Park, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois, in the place of R. B. Stephenson, whose commission expired January 18, 1899. Mr. Herriott is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Samuel Mather, to be postmaster at Naperville, in the county of Dupage and State of Illinois, in the place of S. A. Ballou, deceased. Mr. Mather is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Lewis H. Miner, to be postmaster at Springfield, in the county of Sangamon and State of Illinois, in the place of W. B. Ridgely, resigned. Mr. Miner is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Sealy B. Moody, to be postmaster at Lagrange, in the county o, Cook and State of Illinois, in the place of J. P. Weatherstone whose commission expired August 2, 1898. Mr. Moody is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Chauncey H. Parmely, to be postmaster at Dundee, in the county of Kane and State of Illinois, in the place of J. E. Kelly, whose commission expired February 25, 1899. Mr. Parmely is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Richard R. Puffer, to be postmaster at Odell, in the county of Livingston and State of Illinois, in the place of J. A. Hunter, deceased. Mr. Puffer is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Harry E. Spear, to be postmaster at Polo, in the county of Ogle and State of Illinois, in the place of H. H. Thomas, removed. Mr. Spear is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Robert B. Thomas, to be postmaster at Lacon, in the county of Marshall and State of Illinois, in the place of H. J. DePue, removed. Mr. Thomas is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William T. Thorp, to be postmaster at Litchfield, in the county of Montgomery and State of Illinois, in the place of C. R. Brandon, resigned. Mr. Thorp is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

David F. Wilcox, to be postmaster at Quincy, in the county of Adams and State of Illinois, in the place of C. A. Wilcox, deceased. David F. Wilcox is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

James L. Bradford, to be postmaster at Marion, in the county of Grant and State of Indiana, in the place of J. M. Ballard, removed. Mr. Bradford is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Edgar H. Cole, to be postmaster at Knightstown, in the county of Henry and State of Indiana, in the place of W. K. Deem, removed. Mr. Cole is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William N. Conn, to be postmaster at Winamac, in the county of Pulaski and State of Indiana, in the place of W. E. Jackson, whose commission expired March 6, 1898. Mr. Conn is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Floyd E. Farley, to be postmaster at Crown Point, in the county of Lake and State of Indiana, in the place of A. A. Maynard, resigned. Mr. Farley is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Charles C. Fesler, to be postmaster at Clay City, in the county of Clay and State of Indiana, in the place of J. M. Long, resigned. Mr. Fesler is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William H. H. Pitman, to be postmaster at Hagerstown, in the county of Wayne and State of Indiana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1899. Mr. Pitman is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Arthur H. Rockafellar, to be postmaster at Brookville, in the county of Franklin and State of Indiana, in the place of L. L. Burke, resigned. Mr. Rockafellar is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John C. Row, to be postmaster at Osgood, in the county of Ripley and State of Indiana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1899. Mr. Row is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Thompson Turner, to be postmaster at Walkerton, in the county of St. Joseph and State of Indiana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1899. Mr. Turner is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Frank D. Ungles, to be postmaster at Hartshorne, in the Choctaw Nation of Indian Territory, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1899. Mr. Ungles is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Joseph L. Worthington, to be postmaster at Tahlequah, in the Cherokee Nation of Indian Territory, in the place of W. A. Thompson, whose commission expired January 10, 1899. Mr. Worthington is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Will B. Barstow, to be postmaster at Manilla, in the county of Crawford and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Barstow is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Frank V. D. Bogert, to be postmaster at Paullina, in the county of O'Brien and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Bogert is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Simon D. Breuning, to be postmaster at Ackley, in the county of Hardin and State of Iowa, in the place of August Neuman, whose commission expired February 13, 1899. Mr. Breuning is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William D. Jacobsen, to be postmaster at Lyons, in the county of Clinton and State of Iowa, in the place of M. D. Madden, whose commission expired January 10, 1899. Mr. Jacobsen is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William A. Kelley, to be postmaster at Story City, in the county of Story and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1899. Mr. Kelley is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Charles F. Le Compte, to be postmaster at Corydon, in the county of Wayne and State of Iowa, in the place of John Stirling, removed. Mr. Le Compte is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

James W. Miller, to be postmaster at Winterset, in the county of Madison and State of Iowa, in the place of A. L. Wood, removed. Mr. Miller is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Charles W. Rhinesmith, to be postmaster at Harlan, in the county of Shelby and State of Iowa, in the place of J. W. French, resigned. Mr. Rhinesmith is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Hamline W. Robinson, to be postmaster at Colfax, in the county of Jasper and State of Iowa, in the place of J. M. Topper, resigned. Mr. Robinson is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Edward A. Snyder, to be postmaster at Cedar Falls, in the county of Blackhawk and State of Iowa, in the place of H. H. Markley, whose commission expired February 5, 1899. Mr. Snyder is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William F. Stahl, to be postmaster at Lisbon, in the county of Linn and State of Iowa, in the place of E. F. Wenger, removed. Mr. Stahl is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Clarence P. Swarm, to be postmaster at Oakland, in the county of Pottawattamie and State of Iowa, in the place of J. H. McArthur, deceased. Mr. Swarm is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Benjamin C. Wise, to be postmaster at Cascade, in the county of Dubuque and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1899. Mr. Wise is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Harry C. Achenbach, to be postmaster at Clay Center, in the county of Clay and State of Kansas, in the place of G. A. Van Atta, removed. Mr. Achenbach is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Jacob B. Boyer, to be postmaster at Baxter Springs, in the

county of Cherokee and State of Kansas, in the place of J. C. Haskett, removed. Mr. Boyer is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Frank J. Brettle, to be postmaster at Ellis, in the county of Ellis and State of Kansas, in the place of J. W. Cox, whose commission expired February 14, 1899. Mr. Brettle is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Jesse S. Carpenter, to be postmaster at Council Grove, in the county of Morris and State of Kansas, in the place of W. F. Shamleffer, whose commission expired January 15, 1899. Mr. Carpenter is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

James H. Downing, to be postmaster at Hays, in the county of Ellis and State of Kansas, in the place of John Schlyer, resigned. Mr. Downing is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Charles S. Hutchison, to be postmaster at Wilson, in the county of Ellsworth and State of Kansas, in the place of M. H. Alderson, whose commission expired February 16, 1899. Mr. Hutchison is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Madge E. Long, to be postmaster at Belleville, in the county of Republic and State of Kansas, in the place of C. P. Baldwin, removed. Madge E. Long is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Joseph E. Stone, to be postmaster at Caney, in the county of Montgomery and State of Kansas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Stone is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Joseph S. Stone, to be postmaster at Burrton, in the county of Harvey and State of Kansas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1899. Mr. Stone is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Albert M. Wasser, to be postmaster at Girard, in the county of Crawford and State of Kansas, in the place of L. B. Davidson, removed. Mr. Wasser is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Colmore L. Barnes, to be postmaster at Elizabethtown, in the county of Hardin and State of Kentucky, in the place of F. W. Joplin, removed. Mr. Barnes is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Thomas Boggess, jr., to be postmaster at Ashland, in the county of Boyd and State of Kentucky, in the place of W. S. Boggess, removed. Mr. Boggess is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

George W. Hutcheson, to be postmaster at Lawrenceburg, in the county of Anderson and State of Kentucky, in the place of T. N. Edwards, removed. Mr. Hutcheson is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Ethel E. Johnson, to be postmaster at Vanceburg, in the county of Lewis and State of Kentucky, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1899. Ethel E. Johnson is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Coleman C. Wallace, to be postmaster at Richmond, in the county of Madison and State of Kentucky, in the place of J. B. Willis, removed. Mr. Wallace is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Leon M. Carter, to be postmaster at Shreveport, in the county of Caddo and State of Louisiana, in the place of Andrew Currie, whose commission expired July 18, 1898. Mr. Carter is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Louis Desmarais, to be postmaster at Opelousas, in the county of St. Landry and State of Louisiana, in the place of Minnie Pulford, whose commission expired November 1, 1897. Mr. Desmarais is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John M. Haggerty, to be postmaster at Houma, in the county of Terrebonne and State of Louisiana, in the place of John R. Grinage, removed. Mr. Haggerty is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

George H. Woolman, to be postmaster at Lake Charles, in the county of Calcasieu and State of Louisiana, in the place of J. M. Mason, removed. Mr. Woolman is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

James H. De Coster, to be postmaster at Mechanic Falls, in the county of Androscoggin and State of Maine, in the place of L. W. Mason, whose commission expired December 13, 1898. Mr. De Coster is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Sidney G. Haley, to be postmaster at Phillips, in the county of Franklin and State of Maine, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Haley is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Guy W. McAlister, to be postmaster at Bucksport, in the county of Hancock and State of Maine, in the place of C. C. Homer, removed. Mr. McAlister is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Charles B. Woodman, to be postmaster at Westbrook, in the county of Cumberland and State of Maine, in the place of E. T. Mayberry, removed. Mr. Woodman is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Marcelene Lucas, to be postmaster at Chestertown, in the county of Kent and State of Maryland, in the place of J. N. Wheatley, removed. Marcelene Lucas is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Nicholas N. Nock, to be postmaster at Bel Air, in the county of Harford and State of Maryland, in the place of Alexander Norris, whose commission expired January 14, 1899. Mr. Nock is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

S. Davies Warfield, to be postmaster at Baltimore, in the county of Baltimore and State of Maryland, in the place of S. Davies Warfield, whose commission expired May 9, 1899. (Reappointment.) Mr. Warfield is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John E. Wilson, to be postmaster at Centerville, in the county of Queen Anne and State of Maryland, in the place of Blanchard Emory, jr., removed. Mr. Wilson is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Paul R. Bridgman, to be postmaster at Ware, in the county of Hampshire and State of Massachusetts, in the place of F. P. Clark, resigned. Mr. Bridgman is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William L. Nickerson, to be postmaster at Chatham, in the county of Barnstable and State of Massachusetts, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Nickerson is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Grenville G. Redding, to be postmaster at West Medford, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts, in the place of M. M. Grimes, whose commission expired February 14, 1898. Mr. Redding is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Calvin W. Smith, to be postmaster at Wellesley Hills, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Smith is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William H. Sprague, to be postmaster at Stoneham, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts, in the place of C. F. Blodgett, removed. Mr. Sprague is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William C. Stoddard, to be postmaster at Fairhaven, in the county of Bristol and State of Massachusetts, in the place of J. I. Bryant, whose commission expired January 21, 1899. Mr. Stoddard is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Charles E. Wallace, to be postmaster at Fitchburg, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts, in the place of T. H. Mann, resigned. Mr. Wallace is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Charles H. Baird, to be postmaster at Holly, in the county of Oakland and State of Michigan, in the place of E. R. Lacy, whose commission expired February 6, 1899. Mr. Baird is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Burton F. Browne, to be postmaster at Harbor Beach (late Sand Beach), in the county of Huron and State of Michigan, in the place of Burton F. Browne. (Reappointed by reason of change in name of office.) Mr. Browne is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Willard C. Brown, to be postmaster at Brighton, in the county of Livingston and State of Michigan, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Brown is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

George Burkhart, to be postmaster at Saline, in the county of Washtenaw and State of Michigan, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Burkhart is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Charles A. Cline, to be postmaster at West Branch, in the

county of Ogemaw and State of Michigan, in the place of M. H. French, removed. Mr. Cline is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Huston B. Colman, to be postmaster at Kalamazoo, in the county of Kalamazoo and State of Michigan, in place of James Monroe, deceased. Mr. Colman is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Edward F. Evarts, to be postmaster at Chesaning, in the county of Saginaw and State of Michigan, in the place of C. C. Tubbs, whose commission expired February 2, 1899. Mr. Evarts is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William McGillivray, to be postmaster at Oscoda, in the county of Iosco and State of Michigan, in the place of Charles S. Pierce, resigned. Mr. McGillivray is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Charles Quick, to be postmaster at Lowell, in the county of Kent and State of Michigan, in the place of M. N. Hine, whose commission expired December 12, 1898. Mr. Quick is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Gerrit Van Schelven, to be postmaster at Holland, in the county of Ottawa and State of Michigan, in the place of Cornelius De Keyzer, removed. Gerrit Van Schelven is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Loren A. Sherman, to be postmaster at Port Huron, in the county of St. Clair and State of Michigan, in the place of John Murray, removed. Mr. Sherman is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

George Wever, to be postmaster at Marlette, in the county of Sanilac and State of Michigan, in the place of M. L. Seibert, whose commission expired February 6, 1899. Mr. Wever is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Justin Berkin, to be postmaster at Morris, in the county of Stevens and State of Minnesota, in the place of F. E. Newell, deceased. Mr. Berkin is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John Frisch, to be postmaster at St. Charles, in the county of Winona and State of Minnesota, in the place of C. W. Parrott, whose commission expired February 16, 1899. Mr. Frisch is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Barker C. Grover, to be postmaster at Zumbrota, in the county of Goodhue and State of Minnesota, in the place of C. B. Anderson, whose commission expired February 13, 1899. Mr. Grover is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Eilert Koefod, to be postmaster at Glenwood, in the county of Pope and State of Minnesota, in the place of W. O. Wallace, resigned. Mr. Koefod is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Theodore H. Sorlien, to be postmaster at Granite Falls, in the county of Yellow Medicine and State of Minnesota, in the place of George Lien, whose commission expired February 13, 1899. Mr. Sorlien is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Fred E. Wheeler, to be postmaster at Appleton, in the county of Swift and State of Minnesota, in the place of J. S. Ewers, whose commission expired December 12, 1898. Mr. Wheeler is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Katie Edwards, to be postmaster at Laurel, in the county of Jones and State of Mississippi, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1899. She is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Irene Frazee Elliott, to be postmaster at Okolona, in the county of Chickasaw and State of Mississippi, in the place of W. D. Frazee, resigned. Mrs. Elliott is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Andrew J. Hyde, to be postmaster at Meridian, in the county of Lauderdale and State of Mississippi, in the place of E. J. Martin, removed. Mr. Hyde is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Thomas F. Logan, to be postmaster at Friar Point, in the county of Coahoma and State of Mississippi, in the place of W. A. Sessions, whose commission expired December 27, 1898. Mr. Logan is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John R. Matthews, to be postmaster at Wesson, in the county of Copiah and State of Mississippi, in the place of Louvenia Matthews, deceased. Mr. Matthews is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

August Bierwirth, to be postmaster at Cape Girardeau, in the county of Cape Girardeau and State of Missouri, in the place of W. V. Leech, deceased. Mr. Bierwirth is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Columbia Drew, to be postmaster at Appleton City, in the county of St. Clair and State of Missouri, in the place of G. A. Pratt, removed. Columbia Drew is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Charles L. Gray, to be postmaster at Carterville, in the county of Jasper and State of Missouri, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Gray is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Benjamin C. Klusmeier, to be postmaster at Lagrange, in the county of Lewis and State of Missouri, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Klusmeier is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Charles L. Mowder, to be postmaster at Braymer, in the county of Caldwell and State of Missouri, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1899. Mr. Mowder is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

James C. Robertson, to be postmaster at Mountain Grove, in the county of Wright and State of Missouri, in the place of W. C. Ellis, removed. Mr. Robertson is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Lawrence Hauck, to be postmaster at Phillipsburg, in the county of Granite and State of Montana, in the place of A. P. Bowie, removed. Mr. Hauck is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

George H. Keep, to be postmaster at Missoula, in the county of Missoula and State of Montana, in the place of W. E. Dowell, removed. Mr. Keep is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John C. Burch, to be postmaster at Wymore, in the county of Gage and State of Nebraska, in place of A. G. Rodgers, resigned. Mr. Burch is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Joseph Crow, to be postmaster at Omaha, in the county of Douglas and State of Nebraska, in the place of Euclid Martin, whose commission expired February 12, 1899. Mr. Crow is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Samuel B. Hall, to be postmaster at Ashland, in the county of Saunders and State of Nebraska, in the place of Katharine Du Bois, removed. Mr. Hall is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Leander H. Jewett, to be postmaster at Broken Bow (late Brokenbow), in the county of Custer and State of Nebraska, in the place of Leander H. Jewett. (Reappointed by reason of change in name of post-office.) Mr. Jewett is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John M. Jones, to be postmaster at Clay Center, in the county of Clay and State of Nebraska, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1899. Mr. Jones is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Henry C. Russell, to be postmaster at Schuyler, in the county of Colfax and State of Nebraska, in the place of M. M. Huck, removed. Mr. Russell is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Charles L. Broy, to be postmaster at Eureka, in the county of Eureka and State of Nevada, in the place of Luther Clarke, deceased. Mr. Broy is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John H. Bartlett, to be postmaster at Portsmouth, in the county of Rockingham and State of New Hampshire, in the place of W. O. Sides, deceased. Mr. Bartlett is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Charles Eaton, to be postmaster at Littleton, in the county of Grafton and State of New Hampshire, in the place of A. W. Bingham, whose commission expired March 1, 1899. Mr. Eaton is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Prescott B. Kinsman, to be postmaster at Somersworth, in the county of Strafford and State of New Hampshire, in the place of Samuel Welch, whose commission expired January 15, 1899. Mr. Kinsman is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Natt F. Roberts, to be postmaster at Farmington, in the county of Strafford and State of New Hampshire, in the place of E. E. Carlton, whose commission expired August 10, 1898. Mr. Roberts is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Henry Robinson, to be postmaster at Concord, in the county of Merrimack and State of New Hampshire, in the place of Byron Moore, whose commission expired May 22, 1898. Mr. Robinson is

now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

George F. Breder, to be postmaster at Egg Harbor City, in the county of Atlantic and State of New Jersey, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having by law become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1899. Mr. Breder is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

George W. Cooper, to be postmaster at Somerville, in the county of Somerset and State of New Jersey, in the place of A. A. Clark, resigned. Mr. Cooper is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Adam Dealaman, to be postmaster at Dunellen, in the county of Middlesex and State of New Jersey, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Dealaman is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

James L. Hays, to be postmaster at Newark, in the county of Essex and State of New Jersey, in the place of D. D. Bragaw, deceased. Mr. Hays is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Lawrence W. Sickler, to be postmaster at Glassboro, in the county of Gloucester and State of New Jersey, in the place of B. F. Sweeten, removed. Mr. Sickler is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

George W. Smith, to be postmaster at Hackettstown, in the county of Warren and State of New Jersey, in the place of J. J. Rusling, deceased. Mr. Smith is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Henry R. Tatem, to be postmaster at Collingswood, in the county of Camden and State of New Jersey, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Tatem is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Joseph D. Whitaker, to be postmaster at Penn Grove, in the county of Salem and State of New Jersey, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Whitaker is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Lewis O. Fullen, to be postmaster at Carlsbad (late Eddy), in the county of Eddy and Territory of New Mexico, in the place of Lewis O. Fullen. (Reappointed on change in name of office.) Mr. Fullen is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Stephen P. Barker, to be postmaster at Richfield Springs, in the county of Otsego and State of New York, in the place of W. P. Borland, whose commission expired March 2, 1899. Mr. Barker is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Henry R. Bryan, to be postmaster at Hudson, in the county of Columbia and State of New York, in the place of Willard Peck, removed. Mr. Bryan is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

George L. Carver, to be postmaster at Lyons, in the county of Wayne and State of New York, in the place of D. V. Teller, whose commission expired December 11, 1898. Mr. Carver is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

George D. Davis, to be postmaster at Mount Kisco, in the county of Westchester and State of New York, in the place of C. S. Ware, removed. Mr. Davis is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Samuel G. Dorr, to be postmaster at Buffalo, in the county of Erie and State of New York, in the place of H. H. Baker, whose commission expired June 15, 1898. Mr. Dorr is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Delevan C. Ford, to be postmaster at Mohawk, in the county of Herkimer and State of New York, in the place of D. D. Morgan, whose commission expired December 11, 1898. Mr. Ford is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Harry M. Glen, to be postmaster at Seneca Falls, in the county of Seneca and State of New York, in the place of Henry Stowell, removed. Mr. Glen is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Alonzo E. Hadley, to be postmaster at Springville, in the county of Erie and State of New York, in the place of G. A. Richmond, removed. Mr. Hadley is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Henry E. Harms, to be postmaster at Allegany, in the county of Cattaraugus and State of New York, in the place of John Laubenthal, removed. Mr. Harms is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

George B. Harmon, to be postmaster at Brockport, in the county of Monroe and State of New York, in the place of J. E. Conley, whose commission expired March 2, 1899. Mr. Harmon is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Alexander M. Harriott, to be postmaster at Rye, in the county of Westchester and State of New York, in the place of Disbrow Budd, removed. Mr. Harriott is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William Haynes, to be postmaster at Hoosick Falls, in the county of Rensselaer and State of New York, in the place of Francis Riley, removed. Mr. Haynes is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John C. Horrigan, to be postmaster at Depew, in the county of Erie and State of New York, in the place of Robert Hunter, removed. Mr. Horrigan is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Charles C. Johnson, to be postmaster at Antwerp, in the county of Jefferson and State of New York, in the place of Richard Gleeson, whose commission expired February 25, 1899. Mr. Johnson is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Clarence L. King, to be postmaster at Tupper Lake, in the county of Franklin and State of New York, in the place of E. T. Fletcher, removed. Mr. King is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Milton A. Le Cluse, to be postmaster at Great Neck, in the county of Nassau and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Le Cluse is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Aloysius McArdle, to be postmaster at West Seneca, in the county of Erie and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1899. Mr. McArdle is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Thomas A. McWhinney, to be postmaster at Lawrence, in the county of Nassau and State of New York, in the place of M. A. S. Kavanagh, removed. Mr. McWhinney is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Elbert E. Makepeace, to be postmaster at Alexandria Bay, in the county of Jefferson and State of New York, in the place of W. E. McDonell, removed. Mr. Makepeace is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Charles G. Norton, to be postmaster at Bainbridge, in the county of Chenango and State of New York, in the place of A. D. Payne, whose commission expired February 8, 1899. Mr. Norton is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Samuel H. Parsons, to be postmaster at East Hampton, in the county of Suffolk and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Parsons is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John Remers, to be postmaster at Lancaster, in the county of Erie and State of New York, in the place of F. H. Maute, whose commission expired April 14, 1898. Mr. Remers is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Webster M. Richardson, to be postmaster at Mexico, in the county of Oswego and State of New York, in the place of J. E. Baker, removed. Mr. Richardson is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Alexander Ross, to be postmaster at Sherburne, in the county of Chenango and State of New York, in the place of W. M. Bullis, whose commission expired December 12, 1898. Mr. Ross is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Willard F. Sherwood, to be postmaster at Hornellsville, in the county of Steuben and State of New York, in the place of W. H. Murray, whose commission expired March 2, 1899. Mr. Sherwood is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Frank F. Simpson, to be postmaster at Highland, in the county of Ulster and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1899. Mr. Simpson is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Orlando W. Sutton to be postmaster at Bath, in the county of Steuben and State of New York, in the place of W. G. Crum, removed. Mr. Sutton is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Melvin H. Taylor, to be postmaster at Fredonia, in the county

of Chautauqua and State of New York, in the place of A. R. Moore, removed. Mr. Taylor is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Mortimer R. Tefft, to be postmaster at Greenwich, in the county of Washington and State of New York, in the place of J. H. Mealey, whose commission expired February 25, 1899. Mr. Tefft is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

De Witt C. Titus, to be postmaster at Hempstead, in the county of Nassau and State of New York, in the place of N. B. Mulliner, removed. Mr. Titus is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John N. Van Antwerp, to be postmaster at Fultonville, in the county of Montgomery and State of New York, in the place of J. C. Marlette, whose commission expired March 1, 1899. Mr. Van Antwerp is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Mary C. Darby, to be postmaster at Wilmington, in the county of New Hanover and State of North Carolina, in the place of W. H. Chadbourn, resigned. Mary C. Darby is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Emily W. Fagan, to be postmaster at Plymouth, in the county of Washington and State of North Carolina, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1899. Emily W. Fagan is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Philip H. Lybrook, to be postmaster at Winston-Salem (late Winston), in the county of Forsyth and State of North Carolina, in the place of Philip H. Lybrook. (Reappointed on change in name of office.) Mr. Lybrook is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Henry C. Dana, to be postmaster at Bottineau, in the county of Bottineau and State of North Dakota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Dana is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Wallace Galehouse, to be postmaster at Carrington, in the county of Foster and State of North Dakota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Galehouse is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William G. Mitchell, to be postmaster at Minto, in the county of Walsh and State of North Dakota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Mitchell is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John A. Regan, to be postmaster at Fessenden, in the county of Wells and State of North Dakota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1898. Mr. Regan is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Chandler W. Carroll, to be postmaster at St. Clairsville, in the county of Belmont and State of Ohio, in the place of J. F. Charlesworth, whose commission expired February 25, 1899. Mr. Carroll is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John R. Crain, to be postmaster at Jamestown, in the county of Greene and State of Ohio, in the place of G. A. McLaughlin, deceased. Mr. Crain is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Charles C. Dewstoe, to be postmaster at Cleveland, in the county of Cuyahoga and State of Ohio, in the place of J. C. Hutchins, removed. Mr. Dewstoe is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Martin B. Edwards, jr., to be postmaster at Toronto, in the county of Jefferson and State of Ohio, in the place of Benjamin Dennie, whose commission expired January 28, 1899. Mr. Edwards is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Jennie L. Gardner, to be postmaster at Ripley, in the county of Brown and State of Ohio, in the place of James D. Gardner, deceased. Jennie L. Gardner is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Andrew J. Heinlein, to be postmaster at Bridgeport, in the county of Belmont and State of Ohio, in the place of R. B. Mitchell, whose commission expired February 16, 1899. Mr. Heinlein is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Samuel Hilles, to be postmaster at Barnesville, in the county of Belmont and State of Ohio, in the place of Hamilton Eaton, whose commission expired March 1, 1899. Mr. Hilles is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Vernie E. Humphrey, to be postmaster of Fayette, in the county of Fulton and State of Ohio, in the place of Frank Verrier, removed. Vernie E. Humphrey is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Charles W. Jones, to be postmaster at Waverly, in the county of Pike and State of Ohio, in the place of A. F. Greenbaum, removed. Mr. Jones is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Alfred H. McCline, to be postmaster at Calla, in the county of Mahoning and State of Ohio, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1899. Mr. McCline is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

David M. McConnell, to be postmaster at Osborne, in the county of Greene and State of Ohio, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1899. Mr. McConnell is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William N. Peirce, to be postmaster at Glenville, in the county of Cuyahoga and State of Ohio, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1897. Mr. Peirce is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Charles S. Putnam, to be postmaster at Conneaut, in the county of Ashtabula and State of Ohio, in the place of L. C. Atwood, whose commission expired February 16, 1899. Mr. Putnam is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Charles B. Saxby, to be postmaster at Weston, in the county of Wood and State of Ohio, in the place of Bernard Indlekofer, removed. Mr. Saxby is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Elta H. Jayne, to be postmaster at Edmond, in the county of Edmond and Territory of Oklahoma, in the place of J. D. Leonard, resigned. Mr. Jayne is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Emily McKinley, to be postmaster at Kingfisher, in the county of Kingfisher, Okla., in the place of William McKinley, deceased. Mrs. McKinley is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Thomas J. Palmer, to be postmaster at Medford, in the county of Grant, Okla., the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1899. Mr. Palmer is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Edward B. Roll, to be postmaster at Woodward, in the county of Woodward, Okla., the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1899. Mr. Roll is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William M. Yates, to be postmaster at Hood River, in the county of Wasco and State of Oregon, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Yates is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Luther M. Alleman, to be postmaster at Littlestown, in the county of Adams and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of W. F. Rittase, removed. Mr. Alleman is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Andrew C. Bailey, to be postmaster at Ford City, in the county of Armstrong and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1899. Mr. Bailey is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Andrew L. Bolger, to be postmaster at Philipsburg, in the county of Center and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of J. A. Walton, removed. Mr. Bolger is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Harry L. Cooper, to be postmaster at Edinboro, in the county of Erie and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of H. E. Culbertson, whose commission expired February 13, 1899. Mr. Cooper is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William H. Flora, to be postmaster at Wrightsville, in the county of York and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of R. S. Magee, removed. Mr. Flora is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John H. Glasser, to be postmaster at Monaca, in the county of Beaver and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1899. Mr. Glasser is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Granville F. Heathcote, to be postmaster at Glen Rock, in the county of York and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the

President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Heathcote is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William Krause, to be postmaster at Richland Center, in the county of Bucks and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of M. C. Detweiler, removed. Mr. Krause is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Julius R. Langner, to be postmaster at Birdsboro, in the county of Berks and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Benjamin Steward, deceased. Mr. Langner is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Charles Lattimore, to be postmaster at Milford, in the county of Pike and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of J. S. Gale, deceased. Mr. Lattimore is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Emma Lobb, to be postmaster at Luzerne, in the county of Luzerne and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of E. W. Roberts, removed. Emma Lobb is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Edwin F. Luckenbach, to be postmaster at Mauch Chunk, in the county of Carbon and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of G. W. Esser, whose commission expired January 21, 1899. Mr. Luckenbach is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William M. McKim, to be postmaster at Oil City, in the county of Venango and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of J. H. Payne, whose commission expired March 14, 1898. Mr. McKim is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Samuel Masters, to be postmaster at Johnstown, in the county of Cambria and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of L. D. Woodruff, whose commission expired January 14, 1899. Mr. Masters is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

James Nash, to be postmaster at Rankin Station, in the county of Allegheny and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1899. Mr. Nash is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Peter M. Newman, to be postmaster at Hughesville, in the county of Lycoming and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of A. H. Hill, whose commission expired January 10, 1899. Mr. Newman is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Henry W. Nichols, to be postmaster at Vandergrift, in the county of Westmoreland and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1898. Mr. Nichols is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Susanne E. Nicholson, to be postmaster at Monongahela, in the county of Washington and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of J. F. Nicholson, deceased. Susanne E. Nicholson is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Minard E. Northam, to be postmaster at Galeton, in the county of Potter and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of R. L. Clark, removed. Mr. Northam is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Will E. Olmsted, to be postmaster at Coudersport, in the county of Potter and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of George Clark, removed. Mr. Olmsted is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Frank G. Pennell, to be postmaster at Mount Joy, in the county of Lancaster and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Henry Miller, deceased. Mr. Pennell is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

David W. Prosser, to be postmaster at Bedford, in the county of Bedford and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of S. S. Metzger, whose commission expired February 25, 1899. Mr. Prosser is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Perry A. Sandborn, to be postmaster at North East, in the county of Erie and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of F. J. Smedley, whose commission expired February 25, 1899. Mr. Sandborn is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Gustavus C. Schrink, to be postmaster at Pottsville, in the county of Schuylkill and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Louis Stoffregen, whose commission expired January 17, 1899. Mr. Schrink is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Georgie E. Shaw, to be postmaster at New Kensington, in the county of Westmoreland and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of D. H. McCarty, whose commission expired March 19, 1898. Georgie E. Shaw is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

W. Scott Stoner, to be postmaster at Gallitzin, in the county of Cambria and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of J. J. Kinney, whose commission expired January 24, 1899. Mr. Stoner is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Irving W. Tyson, to be postmaster at Schuylkill Haven, in the county of Schuylkill and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of H. I. Moser, whose commission expired January 10, 1899. Mr. Tyson is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Daniel Williams, to be postmaster at Sharon, in the county of Mercer and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of James Carnes, removed. Mr. Williams is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William M. Gorham, to be postmaster at Bristol, in the county of Bristol and State of Rhode Island, in the place of C. F. Easterbrooks, whose commission expired February 22, 1899. Mr. Gorham is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Benjamin B. Martin, to be postmaster at Warren, in the county of Bristol and State of Rhode Island, in the place of Martin J. Conley, whose commission expired February 25, 1899. Mr. Martin is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Benjamin P. Chatfield, to be postmaster at Aiken, in the county of Aiken and State of South Carolina, in the place of L. E. Norris, whose commission expired May 16, 1898. Mr. Chatfield is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Alfred R. N. Folger, to be postmaster at Gaffney, in the county of Cherokee and State of South Carolina, in the place of T. H. Littlejohn, whose commission expired January 10, 1899. Mr. Folger is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Leonard R. Owens, to be postmaster at Marion, in the county of Marion and State of South Carolina, in the place of Douglas McIntyre, whose commission expired February 5, 1898. Mr. Owens is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Joshua E. Wilson, to be postmaster at Florence, in the county of Florence and State of South Carolina, in the place of J. S. McKenzie, whose commission expired May 11, 1898. Mr. Wilson is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William T. Ellis, to be postmaster at Salem, in the county of McCook and State of South Dakota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Ellis is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Victor C. Wass, to be postmaster at Centerville, in the county of Turner and State of South Dakota, in the place of F. M. Stover, whose commission expired December 12, 1898. Mr. Wass is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William M. Bray, to be postmaster at Henderson, in the county of Chester and State of Tennessee, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1899. Mr. Bray is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William O. Douglas, to be postmaster at Jellico, in the county of Campbell and State of Tennessee, in the place of D. D. Scott, removed. Mr. Douglas is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Leander W. Dutro, to be postmaster at Memphis, in the county of Shelby and State of Tennessee, in the place of W. M. Farrington, removed. Mr. Dutro is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Asa H. Faulkner, to be postmaster at McMinnville, in the county of Warren and State of Tennessee, in the place of D. F. Wallace, whose commission expired January 24, 1899. Mr. Faulkner is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

David W. Barnhill, to be postmaster at Uvalde, in the county of Uvalde and State of Texas, in the place of O. D. Baker, removed. Mr. Barnhill is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Carl E. Ericson, to be postmaster at El Campo, in the county of Wharton and State of Texas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1899. Mr. Ericson is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

James Gipson, to be postmaster at Coleman, in the county of Coleman and State of Texas, in the place of Julia C. Polk, whose

commission expired February 13, 1899. Mr. Gipson is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William H. King, to be postmaster at Whitewright, in the county of Grayson and State of Texas, in the place of O. Y. Rathbun, removed. Mr. King is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Frederick C. Grothaus, to be postmaster at Victoria, in the county of Victoria and State of Texas, in the place of C. A. Wertheimer, whose commission expired March 5, 1898. Mr. Grothaus is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Andrew J. Harrison, to be postmaster at Goldthwaite, in the county of Mills and State of Texas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1898. Mr. Harrison is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Hermann C. Heilig, to be postmaster at Lagrange, in the county of Fayette and State of Texas, in the place of C. H. Helmcamp, removed. Mr. Heilig is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William C. Hurley, to be postmaster at Sulphur Springs, in the county of Hopkins and State of Texas, in the place of E. M. Tate, removed. Mr. Hurley is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Julius Laux, to be postmaster at Flatonia, in the county of Fayette and State of Texas, in the place of O. P. Basford, whose commission expired January 12, 1898. Mr. Laux is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William N. Merritt, to be postmaster at Nocona, in the county of Montague and State of Texas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1899. Mr. Merritt is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Paul Neubauer, to be postmaster at Floresville, in the county of Wilson and State of Texas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Neubauer is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Mary S. Parish, to be postmaster at Huntsville, in the county of Walker and State of Texas, in the place of J. M. Parish, deceased. Mary S. Parish is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Frank H. Pierce, to be postmaster at Laredo, in the county of Webb and State of Texas, in the place of C. W. McNeil, removed. Mr. Pierce is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Isham Russell, to be postmaster at Winnsboro, in the county of Wood and State of Texas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1899. Mr. Russell is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Philemon A. Schaefer, to be postmaster at Georgetown, in the county of Williamson and State of Texas, in the place of J. L. Brooks, removed. Mr. Schaefer is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Joel B. Sharpe, to be postmaster at Brownsville, in the county of Cameron and State of Texas, in the place of Adolph Ashheim, resigned. Mr. Sharpe is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John S. Snook, to be postmaster at Caldwell, in the county of Burleson and State of Texas, in the place of B. F. Delamater, whose commission expired February 5, 1899. Mr. Snook is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

George H. Sparenberg, to be postmaster at Big Spring, in the county of Howard and State of Texas, in the place of C. W. Willis, removed. Mr. Sparenberg is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Charles Meighan, to be postmaster at Ogden, in the county of Weber and State of Utah, in the place of G. H. Islaub, whose commission expired December 17, 1898. Mr. Meighan is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William C. Ellett, to be postmaster at Blacksburg, in the county of Montgomery and State of Virginia, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1899. Mr. Ellett is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Benjamin P. Gay, to be postmaster at Smithfield, in the county of Isle of Wight and State of Virginia, in the place of G. W. Parker, deceased. Mr. Gay is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Charles R. Bell, to be postmaster at Aberdeen, in the county of Chehalis and State of Washington, in the place of P. F. Clark, removed. Mr. Bell is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John B. Cromwell, to be postmaster at Tacoma, in the county of Pierce and State of Washington, in the place of O. B. Hayden, resigned. Mr. Cromwell is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

George W. France, to be postmaster at Hoquiam, in the county of Chehalis and State of Washington, in the place of John Richardson, removed. Mr. France is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John Stack, to be postmaster at Republic, in the county of Ferry and State of Washington, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Stack is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John B. McNally, to be postmaster at Wellsburg, in the county of Brooke and State of West Virginia, in the place of Emery Jacobs, whose commission expired February 5, 1899. Mr. McNally is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Ralph E. Arnold, to be postmaster at Fairchild, in the county of Eauclaire and State of Wisconsin, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899. Mr. Arnold is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William W. Clarke, to be postmaster at Milton, in the county of Rock and State of Wisconsin, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1899. Mr. Clarke is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Emile C. Duval, to be postmaster at West De Pere, in the county of Brown and State of Wisconsin, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1899. Mr. Duval is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Frederic A. Meyer, to be postmaster at Boscobel, in the county of Grant and State of Wisconsin, in the place I. C. Kratochwill, resigned. Mr. Meyer is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Elmer E. Waite, to be postmaster at Newcastle, in the county of Weston and State of Wyoming, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1899. Mr. Waite is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *December 7, 1899.*

Prayer by Rev. STOWELL L. BRYANT, of the city of Washington.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the Journal is simply a record of bills introduced and other routine business. It is very long, and I ask that the further reading be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the further reading is dispensed with. The Journal will stand approved.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. HALE. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

MARITIME CANAL COMPANY OF NICARAGUA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual report of the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Select Committee on the Construction of the Nicaragua Canal, and ordered to be printed.

FRENCH SPOLIATION CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to the order of the court, the conclusions of fact and of law decided under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims, set out in the annexed findings by the court, relating to the vessel *Brig Sally*, Samuel Stacy, master; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

CENTENNIAL MEMORIAL SERVICES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication from the Great Council of the United

States Improved Order of Red Men; which was read and ordered to lie on the table:

[Telegram.]

NEW YORK, *December 4, 1889.*

Hon. WILLIAM PITT FRYE,
President pro tempore U. S. Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Great Council of the United States Improved Order of Red Men, representing more than 200,000 members, presents its compliments to the Senate of the United States and extends a cordial invitation to attend the centennial memorial services commemorative of the life and death of George Washington, at Convention Hall, Washington, Thursday evening, December 14, on which occasion a member of your honorable body, Senator CHAUNCEY M. DEPEW, will deliver the oration and other prominent speakers will participate.

GEORGE E. GREENE,
Great Incahonee.
C. CONLEY,
Great Chief of Records.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a petition of 76 citizens of Gorham, Me., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BERRY presented the petitions of William Berry and 17 other citizens of Settlement, of G. C. Covington and 17 other citizens of Turnip, of J. T. Phillips and 18 other citizens of Boydsville, of Dan Cowling and 18 other citizens of Rogers, and of J. W. Garrett and 8 other citizens of Boydsville, all of the State of Arkansas, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COCKRELL presented the petitions of James L. Wilson and sundry other citizens of Liberal, D. M. Hazlett and 15 other citizens of St. Louis, Rev. J. M. Ragan and 74 other citizens of Chula, W. G. Beasley and 13 other citizens of Gilliam, C. L. Goodale and 18 other citizens of Meadville, M. L. Bibb and 17 other citizens of Odessa, George W. Petty and 25 other citizens of Rushhill, Leslie Rodgers and 34 other citizens of Osceola, J. W. Gassett and 50 other citizens of Warrensburg, J. H. Thompson and 48 other citizens of Moberly, William T. Vaughn and 57 other citizens of Joplin, and of H. T. Ballard and 51 other citizens of College Mount, all in the State of Missouri, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Harrisburg, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation granting permission to the Commercial Cable Company to land and operate its cable in Cuba; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of 40 citizens of Wissahicken, 20 citizens of Oakmont, and 6 citizens of Bustleton, and of the Ministerial Association of Reading, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McMILLAN presented the petitions of Fred. Ingram and sundry other citizens of North Irving, J. C. Kern and sundry other citizens of Deckerville, T. Brusse and 17 other citizens of Grand Haven, John Pearson and 33 other citizens of Prescott, Nicholas J. De Vries and 16 other citizens of Hopkins, Charles E. Fife and 18 other citizens of Yuba, Benjamin H. Burtt and 15 other citizens of Ludington, P. P. Mason and 11 other citizens of Ypsilanti, O. W. Thompson and 54 other citizens of Ransom, W. R. Anderson and 40 other citizens of Calumet, Rev. Hiram Hayward and 39 other citizens of Ludington, Duncan Warren and 23 other citizens of Detroit, J. M. Coyne and 100 other citizens of Detroit, Oscar Knudsen and 17 other citizens of Ludington, W. A. Pogue and 17 other citizens of Redford, Theodore D. Bacon and 127 other citizens of Detroit, F. W. Bush and 33 other citizens of Hopkins, George W. Johnson and 40 other citizens of Battlecreek, and of the Adrian Woman's Club, of Adrian, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WELLINGTON presented sundry petitions of citizens of Chesapeake City, Mount Vernon, Lutherville, Sherwood, Nanticoke, Royaloak, Bellevue, Crisfield, Bloomington, Westport, Baltimore, and West Arlington, of the Ministerial Association of Frostburg, the congregation of the Congregational Church of Frostburg, the congregation of the Salem Reformed Church of Frostburg, the congregation of the Baptist Church of Frostburg, of St. Paul's Lutheran Church, of Frostburg, of the Presbyterian Church of Frostburg, of the First Presbyterian Church of Lord, of the German Evangelical Zion Congregation of Frostburg, and of the Ladies' Missionary Society of Frostburg, all in the State of Maryland, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut presented sundry petitions of citizens of Bridgeport, Plainville, Fairfield, Southbury, New Canaan, Willington, Nepaug, Andover, Danielson, Mansfield, Watertown, Southington, Kent, Bolton, Collinsville, South Norwalk, Norfolk, Manchester, and Montville, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of the Universalist Ministers' Association, of the Methodist Episcopal Ministers' Association, and of the Congregational Ministers' Association, all of Boston, in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of legislation to extend the circulation of choice literature and for the reduction of postage on books of public and incorporated libraries; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the general committee of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Massachusetts and a petition of 1,454 citizens of Massachusetts, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HANSBROUGH presented the petition of H. L. Hart and 30 other citizens of Inkster, N. Dak., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURROWS presented the petitions of J. C. Kern and 70 other citizens of Bay County, Fred Ingrom and 75 other citizens of Kent County, W. F. Shedd and 32 members of the East Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Grand Rapids, Rev. H. H. Andrews and 54 other citizens of Sanilac County, Rev. Frank Blomfield and 5 other members of the Highland Park Congregational Church, of Muskegon, Theodore D. Bacon and 11 other citizens of Detroit, Rev. A. Roedel and 78 other citizens of Durand, of the Pengelly Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Kalamazoo, J. R. Plummer and 34 other citizens of Van Buren and Allegan counties, W. A. Briggs and 24 other citizens of Big Rapids, J. F. Farnham and 51 other citizens of Prattville, David E. Reed and 9 other citizens of Howard City, George C. McClure and 19 other citizens of St. Louis, Archibald Hadden and 35 other citizens of Muskegon, John B. Lash and 24 other citizens of Stoddard, A. E. Mosher and 32 other citizens of Hillsdale County, F. A. Votey and 13 other citizens of Benton Harbor, George R. Warner and 13 other citizens of Adamsville, Ernest Draper and 32 other citizens of Prescott, Ben H. Burtt and 15 other citizens of Ludington, F. W. Bush and 32 other citizens of Hopkins Station, Rev. A. A. Rose and 45 other citizens of Grass Lake, A. H. Bennett and 35 other citizens of Greenville, Tom Wilkinson and 11 other citizens of Kalamazoo, S. H. Hogle and 37 other citizens of Burr Oak, Rev. H. Vanderploeg and 27 other citizens of New Era, Rev. J. E. Little and 17 other members of the First Baptist Church of Allegan, and of John Fletcher and 49 other citizens of Plainwell, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DEPEW presented the petitions of Theodore A. Leggett and sundry other citizens of Richmond, of B. W. Robinson and sundry other citizens of Worcester, and 179 petitions of sundry citizens of New York City and Brooklyn, all in the State of New York, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SULLIVAN presented the petition of J. W. McLaurin and sundry other citizens of Canton, Miss., and the petition of Rev. B. H. Rawls and sundry other citizens of Tylertown, Miss., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KENNEY presented the petition of Mary S. Howland and sundry other members of the New Century Woman's Club of Delaware, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PERKINS presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., remonstrating against any reduction of the tariff on citrus fruits; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the board of trustees of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to secure the restoration of our merchant marine on the lines recently reported favorably by both Houses of Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented sundry petitions of citizens of Beaumont, Paso Robles, Escondido, Alhambra, Eureka, El Monte, Corona, Rincon, Los Angeles, Riverside, Susadena, South Pasadena, North Pasadena, Villa Park, San Bernardino, Gardena, Rio Vista, Alameda, Kellogg, St. Helena, Calistoga, Grass Valley, San Jacinta, Wemet, Lakeview, Redlands, Sacramento, Platte Valley, and Pomo, all in the State of California, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SCOTT presented the petitions of John A. Pierson and

sundry other citizens of Nicholas County, John D. Culbertson and sundry other citizens of Wheeling, Rev. G. W. Brent and sundry other citizens of Benwood, J. W. Claypool and sundry other citizens of Nicholas County, Martin Talbott and sundry other citizens of West Union, Jennings M. King and sundry other citizens of Terra Alta, George E. Fuller and sundry other citizens of Mason County, J. H. Hawley and sundry other citizens of Wellsburg, Joseph S. Pomeroy and sundry other citizens of Fairview, O. W. O. Hardman and sundry other citizens of Middlebourne, A. M. Grimes and sundry other citizens, C. Collins and sundry other citizens of Pennsboro, B. S. Welch and sundry other citizens of Harrisville, S. B. Archer and sundry other citizens of Wilding, B. D. Mahone and 97 other citizens of Mason County, C. W. Fox and sundry other citizens of Evansville, and Eugene Huggins and sundry other citizens of Newburg, all in the State of West Virginia, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ALLISON presented the petitions of J. W. Bailey and 102 other citizens of Hampton, George W. Tingle and 74 other citizens of Gilbert Station, R. E. Harvey and 37 other citizens of Orient, A. M. Ball and 16 other citizens of Ames, J. C. Coles and 94 other citizens of Riceville, J. F. Bowman and 92 other citizens of Mitchellville, S. A. Martin and 55 other citizens of Wright County, J. S. Bargelt and 65 other citizens of Clarence, J. H. Noyes and 65 other citizens of Ogden, S. F. Millikan and 80 other citizens of Anamosa, W. E. Ross and 33 other citizens of Walker, A. Palmer and 44 other citizens of Iowa Falls, C. A. Carpenter and 79 other citizens of De Moines, J. E. Brereton and 140 other citizens of Waverly, J. W. Bott and 83 other citizens of Humeston, N. C. Harvey and 28 other citizens of Annieville, G. R. Struble and 35 other citizens of Toledo, A. D. Welch and 19 other citizens of Dubuque, R. Breeden and 56 other citizens of Amish, J. M. Williams and 132 other citizens of Cambridge, D. P. Gelman and 45 other citizens of Newell, J. N. Green and 19 other citizens of New Haven, H. Bissell and 23 other citizens of Tama, C. L. Baxter and 137 other citizens of Dexter, John B. Williams and 100 other citizens of Dyersville, R. H. Griffith and 81 other citizens of Stuart, J. R. A. Hanner and 35 other citizens of Sheffield, Edwin Collins and 10 other citizens of Northwood, W. M. Lemen and 28 other citizens of Rockford, and John Dance and 133 other citizens of Lisbon, all in the State of Iowa, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LINDSAY presented the petitions of Mason Jany and 28 other citizens, J. N. Mater and 18 other citizens of Frankfort, J. W. Lykins and 18 other citizens of Crum, D. D. Taylor and 18 other citizens of Lexington, W. R. Crisp and 17 other citizens, J. R. Stewart and 37 other citizens of Stewart, J. A. Chandler and 22 other citizens of Kirkmansville, J. H. Sloan and 18 other citizens of Susie, Arthur Yager and 65 other citizens of Georgetown, Will H. Leslie and 47 other citizens of Havilandsville, J. C. Willett and 18 other citizens of Groveland, S. H. Jackson and sundry other citizens, John G. Fee and 46 other citizens of Berea, J. N. Bazorth and 19 other citizens of Garfield, Rev. A. P. Hurst and 18 other citizens, and R. G. Bryant and 66 other citizens, all in the State of Kentucky, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GALLINGER presented the petitions of I. J. Dunn and 53 other citizens of Keene, of Edwin S. Tasker and 15 other citizens of Sunapee, of M. L. Waller and 18 other citizens of Cornish, and of E. E. Thoits and 12 other citizens of Conway, all in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MASON presented the petitions of M. M. Marling and 44 other citizens of Carlock, of P. Brereton and 15 other citizens of Huey, of A. E. Dunlop and 16 other citizens of Blackstone, of Rev. John E. Funk and 18 other citizens of Harper Ogle, of A. T. Corbin and 58 other citizens of Plainfield, and sundry petitions of citizens of Leaf River, German Valley, Forreston, Hampshire, Galesburg, Brimfield, Chicago, Terre Haute, Providence, Grandview, Ashton, Pearl City, Eylar, Rockford, Morris, Fisher, Marseilles, Cropsey, Pawpaw, Tonica, Elwood, Morrisonville, Carbon Cliff, Dana, Elkhart, Moweaqua, Sheridan, Edinburg, Cordora, Green Valley, Benton, Manhattan, of the First Congressional district of Illinois, Oakland, Buda, Dixon, Winnebago, Chesterfield, Bowen, Aurora, Girard, Rankin, Mount Carroll, Rardin, Bernard, Lockport, Amboy, Grand Ridge, Reynolds, Henry, Concord, White Heath, Fairmount, Magnolia, Raritan, Rockford, Augusta, Batavia, and of Warrensburg, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DAVIS presented the petitions of Edson S. Gaylor and sundry other citizens of Minneapolis, of G. A. Cahoon and 38 other citizens, of W. S. Frear and 48 other citizens, of T. G. Bolton and 34 other citizens, of Albert W. Ryan and 18 other citizens, of Charles E. Stephens and 111 other citizens, of E. M. Chilson and 49 other citizens, of George T. Carritt and 229 other citizens, and of H. J. Harrington and 18 other citizens, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MORGAN presented the petitions of Rev. T. Y. Abernathy and 68 other citizens of Union Springs, William Gantt and 59 other citizens of Hamptonville, P. E. Montgomery and 17 other citizens of Springville, J. J. Harlan and 37 other citizens of Dadeville, W. A. Bibb and 27 other citizens of New Decatur, Rev. T. B. Drake and 35 other citizens of Brownsboro, George Williams and 40 other citizens of Huntsville, of sundry citizens of Tinela, of sundry citizens of Nesmith, and of sundry citizens of Whatley, all in the State of Alabama, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of sundry authors and publishers of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of a perpetual copyright law; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented the petitions of P. H. Hodgman and 13 other citizens of Medford, of Elbert W. Whitney and 11 other citizens of Milford, of Elliott F. Studley and 14 other citizens of Mansfield, J. M. Rockwood and 17 other citizens of Bellingham, E. N. Smith and 16 other citizens of North Falmouth, James N. Moore and 10 other citizens of Malden, Percy B. Richmond and 101 other citizens of Foxboro, A. H. Knowlten and 14 other citizens of Littleton, S. E. Ellis and 14 other citizens, Arthur Truslon and 17 other citizens of Hingham, N. S. Sanford and 9 other citizens of Wollaston, Walter H. Ashley and 18 other citizens of Manchester, George S. Shaw and 9 other citizens, C. R. Hill and 108 other citizens of Douglass, Richard Goodman and 17 other citizens, George Skene and 19 other citizens of Boston, George H. Pratt and 46 other citizens of Sterling, Edwin D. Bowers and 25 other citizens of East Norton, J. Clements and 43 other citizens of Wellesley, Nelson Eastberg and 12 other citizens of Millville, Harry M. Faxon and 17 other citizens of Quincy, Pitman Webber and 14 other citizens of Wakefield, A. H. Fuller and 27 other citizens of Easton, H. C. Meserve and 3 other citizens of Springfield, Frederick W. Robinson and 18 other citizens of Charlestown, and of Daniel H. Dickinson and 102 other citizens of Howard, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CARTER presented the petition of Henry G. Cope and 37 other citizens of Dillon, Mont., and the petition of L. H. Mickel and 18 other citizens of Livingston, Mont., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. THURSTON presented petitions of 13 citizens of Genoa, of 25 citizens of Minden, 19 citizens of McCook, 38 citizens of Waterloo, 31 citizens of Oakland, 414 citizens of Beatrice, 139 citizens of Bancroft, 101 citizens of Friend, 21 citizens of Verdon, 71 citizens of Lincoln, 79 citizens of Ewing, 9 citizens of Holdrege, and of 778 citizens of Omaha, all in the State of Nebraska, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McBRIDE presented a petition of the city council of Lagrande, Oreg., and a petition of the city council of Dallas City, Oreg., praying that an appropriation be made for the immediate construction of a portage railway at The Dalles, to facilitate the navigation of the Columbia River; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented sundry petitions of citizens of Lebanon and Albany, of 19 citizens of Salem, 24 citizens of The Dalles, 28 citizens of Gaston, of sundry citizens of Union and Grants Pass, and of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Ashland, all in the State of Oregon, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas presented the petition of D. H. Colquette, chaplain of the house of representatives of the thirty-second general assembly of Arkansas, and sundry other citizens of Arkansas, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CULLOM presented the petitions of Rev. E. B. Stewart and 13 other citizens of Chicago, Rev. A. C. Bunker and 19 other citizens of Marengo, F. J. Fellman and 18 other citizens of Fillmore, Albert Johnson and 12 other citizens of Geneva, C. H. Davis and 27 other citizens of Aurora, C. M. Corlies and 55 other citizens of McLeansboro, L. H. Wikoff and 18 other citizens of Emington, William E. Cole and 17 other citizens of Mechanicsburg, W. P. Akers and 19 other citizens of Casner, Eri Bogardus and 12 other citizens of Morton, W. A. Brubaker and 51 other citizens of Peoria,

Rev. Elias Thompson and 182 other citizens of Taylorville, W. S. Ellison and 28 other citizens of Prophetstown, J. H. Crowder and 44 other citizens of Bethany, W. A. Sugee and 43 other citizens of Sidell, Thomas B. Greenlee and 11 other citizens of Illinois, J. C. Fowler and 19 other citizens of Tuscola, F. C. Oetzler and 18 other citizens of Moro, Edward Beach and 18 other citizens of Mattoon, W. P. Smith and 32 other citizens of Cary, C. E. Hays and 43 other citizens of Danvers, Frank Dell and 22 other citizens of Wellington, Charles Diehl and 36 other citizens of Lancaster, Martin Kopel and 16 other citizens of Chicago, A. A. Bornton and 35 other citizens of Woodstock, James Tweddle and 23 other citizens of Washburne, Mayo Barnes and 19 other citizens of Fayette, E. M. Bently and 22 other citizens of West Jersey, Rev. R. D. Scott and 25 other citizens of Chicago, Rev. L. A. Townsend and 17 other citizens of Chicago, G. E. Young and 16 other citizens of Piper City, J. A. Hanna and 35 other citizens of Elgin, John Bloss and 49 other citizens of Pocahontas, Charles G. Brown and 28 other citizens of Divernon, W. A. Chambers and 35 other citizens of Oakdale, Leslie J. Owen and 44 other citizens of Le Roy, J. J. Broadhead and 18 other citizens of Forrest, E. O. Williams and 7 other citizens of Evanston, J. P. Wentworth and 40 other citizens of Dover, J. E. Muller and 72 other citizens of Chicago, J. W. Jones and 16 other citizens of Farmington, W. A. Crowder and 74 other citizens of Rankin, Rev. J. C. Daxey and 18 other citizens of Amawan, J. M. Fox and 58 other citizens of Forrest, H. G. Corbin and 58 other citizens of Plainfield, W. A. Clarke and 64 other citizens of Scottville, B. F. Winters and 4 other citizens of Stonington, F. J. King and 17 other citizens of Kings, W. S. Dewey and 14 other citizens of Cairo, M. W. Storey and 138 other citizens of Sledo, B. A. Schudel and 70 other citizens of Macon, Rev. J. E. Mercer and 71 other citizens of Brimfield, Vincent Aten and 30 other citizens of Buda, M. P. Poynton and 36 other citizens of Chicago, Samuel Gordon and 19 other citizens of Hamilton, Ira J. O'Hara and 23 other citizens of Macon, and F. B. Hamilton and 27 other citizens of Palatine, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MONTANA SENATORIAL INVESTIGATION.

Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized and directed to investigate the right and title of WILLIAM A. CLARK to a seat as Senator from the State of Montana; and said committee is authorized to sit during the sessions of the Senate, to employ a stenographer, to send for persons and papers, and to administer oaths, and that the expenses of the inquiry shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the committee.

WEST VIRGINIA SENATORIAL INVESTIGATION.

Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized and directed to investigate the right and title of NATHAN B. SCOTT to a seat as Senator from the State of West Virginia; and said committee is authorized to sit during the sessions of the Senate, to employ a stenographer, to send for persons and papers, and to administer oaths, and that the expenses of the inquiry shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the committee.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. KYLE introduced a bill (S. 794) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of William E. Woodbridge for compensation for the use by the United States of his invention relating to projectiles, for which letters patent were ordered to issue to him March 25, 1852; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 795) for the relief of the William Cramp & Sons Ship and Engine Building Company, of Philadelphia, Pa.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 796) granting a pension to Mary A. Woods;

A bill (S. 797) granting a pension to William Ogden; and

A bill (S. 798) granting a pension to Jacob Witmer.

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 799) to correct the military record of John Scanlin (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 800) to correct the military record of Daniel M. Witmyer (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 801) to correct the military record of William Clapper (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 802) to correct the military record of James Hagerty (with accompanying papers).

Mr. HARRIS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 803) for the relief of George F. Huestis (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 804) removing the charge of desertion from the name of Alfred Rebsamen, of Olathe, Kans.;

A bill (S. 805) to remove the charge of desertion from the name of David Dunwoody;

A bill (S. 806) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William H. Linton;

A bill (S. 807) authorizing the Secretary of War to grant an honorable discharge to Michael McGrath, of Salina, Kans.;

A bill (S. 808) to remove the charge of desertion from the name of Byron Van Walker;

A bill (S. 809) removing the charge of desertion from the name of Benjamin Walker, of Ottawa, Kans.;

A bill (S. 810) for the relief of Ralph W. Botkin;

A bill (S. 811) for the relief of George W. Collins (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 812) for the relief of Daniel W. Light;

A bill (S. 813) to restore the rights of certain militiamen and nonenlisted persons to present claims on account of disabilities or wounds received in the military or naval service of the United States; and

A bill (S. 814) authorizing and directing the return to the State of Kansas of the arms and equipments of the Twentieth Regiment of Kansas Volunteer Infantry.

Mr. HARRIS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 815) granting a pension to William McCauley;

A bill (S. 816) granting a pension to Hugh Brady, Yates Center, Kans.;

A bill (S. 817) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Taylor, of Pratt, Kans.;

A bill (S. 818) granting a pension to Mrs. Lucy Pratt Estabrook, of Lawrence, Kans.;

A bill (S. 819) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Bourne;

A bill (S. 820) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Anna M. Deitzler;

A bill (S. 821) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hughes, of Tucson, Arizona Territory;

A bill (S. 822) granting a pension to Mary A. Wampler;

A bill (S. 823) granting a pension to Brice Davis, of Howard, Kans.;

A bill (S. 824) granting a pension to Anna B. Gillette;

A bill (S. 825) granting an increase of pension to J. B. Coons;

A bill (S. 826) granting a pension to Elizabeth Norton;

A bill (S. 827) granting a pension to Alfred D. Johnson, of Independence, Kans.;

A bill (S. 828) granting a pension to C. A. Howke;

A bill (S. 829) granting an increase of pension to Elijah A. Gilbert;

A bill (S. 830) granting a pension to Christian Snyder, of Paola, Kans.;

A bill (S. 831) granting an increase of pension to T. J. Owens, of Blue Mound, Kans.;

A bill (S. 832) granting an increase of pension to Albertus B. Chaffee;

A bill (S. 833) granting an increase of pension to Henry Atkinson;

A bill (S. 834) granting a pension to Charles E. Jones;

A bill (S. 835) granting a pension to Jesse L. Knight;

A bill (S. 836) granting an increase of pension to James Bliss;

A bill (S. 837) granting a pension to Alexander Miller, of Eudora, Kans.;

A bill (S. 838) granting a pension to Louisana H. Delahay;

A bill (S. 839) granting a pension to Mrs. Jane Caton;

A bill (S. 840) granting a pension to Jacob C. Martin (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 841) granting an increase of pension to Robert S. Clark (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 842) to authorize the pensioning of persons who, having served in the army or navy of the Confederate States of America, afterwards served in the Army or Navy of the United States, and were honorably discharged.

Mr. CULLOM introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 843) granting a pension to Albert Hammer (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 844) increasing the pension of Jonathan R. Miles, late

a colonel of the Twenty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteers (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 845) to pension E. Laurence Herriott;

A bill (S. 846) to increase the pension of Miles A. Barber, late a private of Company C, Ninety-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteers (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 847) granting a pension to James B. Logan, formerly captain of Company K, Tenth Missouri Infantry (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 848) authorizing the placing of the name of Joseph Hooker Wood upon the retired list of the United States Army with the rank of first lieutenant of cavalry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WELLINGTON introduced a bill (S. 849) for the relief of George E. W. Sharretts; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 850) for the relief of Mrs. A. M. Hollingsworth, of Ocean, Allegany County, State of Maryland; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 851) to redeem certain outstanding certificates of the board of audit of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. STEWART introduced a bill (S. 852) to purchase the submarine torpedo boat *Holland* for the Navy; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. STEWART. I present with the bill certain reports with regard to this submarine torpedo boat. Having witnessed its wonderful performance last fall, I think it is a matter which will interest the committee, and particularly will the documents which I present interest them. I move that the bill and accompanying papers be printed and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 853) granting a pension to Jane E. Augur; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 854) for the relief of Lieut. Horace P. McIntosh; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 855) for the relief of Mary A. Coulson, executrix of Sewell Coulson, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BATE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 856) authorizing Musadora, Victoria, Ella, and Frank Wasson, of Tennessee, to present their claim to the Court of Claims;

A bill (S. 857) for the relief of the estate of William Crutchfield, deceased, late of Chattanooga, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 858) for the relief of the heirs of J. W. Cloyd, of Wilson County, Tenn.:

A bill (S. 859) for the relief of the heirs of J. L. Kirkpatrick, of Wilson County, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 860) for the relief of Thomas J. Powell;

A bill (S. 861) for the relief of the legal representatives of P. M. Craigmiles, deceased;

A bill (S. 862) authorizing the heirs of Benjamin Lillard, of Tennessee, to present their claims to the Court of Claims;

A bill (S. 863) for the relief of J. E. Dromgoole, of Tennessee;

A bill (S. 864) for the relief of John L. Rhea, executor of Samuel Rhea, deceased, and John Anderson, administrator of Joseph R. Anderson, deceased;

A bill (S. 865) for the relief of Sarah McClay, administratrix of Robert McClay, deceased, late of Davidson County, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 866) for the relief of Payne, James & Co.;

A bill (S. 867) for the relief of W. J. Smith and D. M. Wisdom;

A bill (S. 868) for the relief of Mary J. Roberts and her children, to wit, John Joseph Stansifer, Eva May Deakins, Octavia Baker, Annie M. Gledhill, Ida Belle Stansifer, and Charles L. Stansifer, all of Hamilton County, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 869) for the relief of John Zimmerman, of Madison County, Tenn.; and

A bill (S. 870) for the relief of M. Robison, administrator of T. E. Robison, deceased, late of Henderson County, Tenn.

Mr. FORAKER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 871) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Lynch;

A bill (S. 872) granting an increase of pension to William H. H. Nevitt (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 873) granting a pension to Wilson W. Brown and others;

A bill (S. 874) increasing the pension of W. D. Sigler;

A bill (S. 875) restoring the pension of Daniel Oberly; and

A bill (S. 876) for the relief of John E. Welch.

Mr. FORAKER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 877) for the relief of estate of George H. Wells;

A bill (S. 878) for the relief of Arthur L. Flint; and

A bill (S. 879) for the relief of Levi Stoltz.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 880) for the relief of L. O. Maddux, doing business as Maddux, Hobart & Co.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 881) for the relief of Henry Halteman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 882) to amend an act entitled "An act for the erection of a public building at Anniston, Ala.;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. BACON introduced a bill (S. 883) for the erection of a public building at Atlanta, Ga.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. McENERY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 884) for the relief of Emilie L. Major;

A bill (S. 885) for the relief of Odile Deslende;

A bill (S. 886) for the relief of the estate of S. S. Simmons, deceased, late of Natchitoches, La.;

A bill (S. 887) for the relief of Elizabeth A. Netterville;

A bill (S. 888) for the relief of Amire R. Hertzog, of Natchitoches, La., for stores and supplies taken from her by the military forces of the United States during the war for the suppression of the rebellion;

A bill (S. 889) for the relief of Eliza M. Parrott, of St. Landry Parish, La., for supplies taken from her by the military forces of the United States for their use during the war for the suppression of the rebellion;

A bill (S. 890) for the relief of David Lanaux;

A bill (S. 891) for the relief of the estate of Phillip McGuire, deceased, late of New Orleans, La., and Catherine McGuire, of New Orleans, La.;

A bill (S. 892) for the relief of the estate of William P. Williamson, deceased, late of Iberville Parish, La.;

A bill (S. 893) for the relief of the heirs of J. Madison Wells;

A bill (S. 894) for the relief of Gertrude Nolasco; and

A bill (S. 895) for the relief of William W. Handlin (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. McENERY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 896) granting a pension to Mrs. Adonia Huard, of New Orleans, La., widow of Hypolite Huard, deceased (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 897) granting a pension to Bowman H. Peterson;

A bill (S. 898) granting a pension to Peter Browman;

A bill (S. 899) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. M. A. Dennis;

A bill (S. 900) granting a pension to Martha M. Howard;

A bill (S. 901) for the relief of Agustin Wilson; and

A bill (S. 902) granting a pension to Eveline Cranch Dunbar.

Mr. McENERY introduced a bill (S. 903) authorizing the President to place on the retired list of the Navy, as chief engineer, the name of P. J. McMahon, late chief engineer in the United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 904) confirming land title to Leon Godchaux and Arthur Legendre; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 905) for the relief of William H. Wilder, testamentary executor of the succession of Myra Clark Gaines, deceased, late of the parish of Orleans, in the State of Louisiana; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 906) to provide an American register for the steamer *Esther*, of New Orleans; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SPOONER introduced a bill (S. 907) for the relief of the legal devisees of James W. Schaumburg; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 908) for the relief of William P. Cockey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced the following bills; which were

severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

A bill (S. 909) to reimburse certain settlers upon lands in Gregory County, S. Dak., for abandoned improvements;

A bill (S. 910) for the relief of the Dakota Cattle Company;

A bill (S. 911) for the relief of Catherine Howard;

A bill (S. 912) for the relief of James H. Owen and Charles H. Hille, of Minneapolis, Minn.; and

A bill (S. 913) to reward certain Sioux Indians for the rescue of white captives and their compensatory payment of ponies.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 914) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Summers;

A bill (S. 915) granting an increase of pension to William W. Daniels;

A bill (S. 916) granting a pension to Peter Lynch;

A bill (S. 917) granting a pension to Sarah E. Campbell;

A bill (S. 918) granting a pension to Jessie K. Chandler;

A bill (S. 919) granting a pension to James Ballard;

A bill (S. 920) granting an increase of pension to Sparhawk Hutchins;

A bill (S. 921) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Howard;

A bill (S. 922) granting a pension to Henry R. Draper;

A bill (S. 923) granting a pension to Martin G. Sands;

A bill (S. 924) granting a pension to Newman C. Nash;

A bill (S. 925) granting an increase of pension to John A. Hughes;

A bill (S. 926) granting an increase of pension to Horace H. Warren (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 927) granting a pension to John W. Elliott;

A bill (S. 928) granting an increase of pension to William H. Clark;

A bill (S. 929) granting an increase of pension to John Cook;

A bill (S. 930) granting an increase of pension to Eli C. Walton; and

A bill (S. 931) to extend the provisions of the pension laws of the United States.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 932) to correct the military record of Henry G. Dow;

A bill (S. 933) for the relief of John H. McLaughlin;

A bill (S. 934) for the relief of Wallace Wellar;

A bill (S. 935) for the relief of Levi Carnrike;

A bill (S. 936) for the relief of John Cashner;

A bill (S. 937) to remove the charge of desertion from Ebenezer Dailey; and

A bill (S. 938) for the relief of William Duncan.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 939) to permit C. R. S. Nichols to make a second homestead entry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 940) to reimburse the estate of Henry Hayward, deceased, for losses incurred in business transactions with the United States Treasury Department;

A bill (S. 941) for the relief of Stanley J. Morrow; and

A bill (S. 942) for the relief of W. L. Hall.

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (S. 943) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Great Falls, Mont.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. DAVIS (by request) introduced a bill (S. 944) to carry into effect the stipulations of Article VII of the treaty between the United States and Spain concluded on the 10th day of December, 1898; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. McBRIDE introduced a bill (S. 945) for the purchase or construction of a launch for the customs service at and in the vicinity of Astoria, Oreg.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MASON introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 946) granting a pension to Stephen Johnson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 947) granting a pension to Turner J. Bowling;

A bill (S. 948) granting a pension to Andrew J. Lee;

A bill (S. 949) granting a pension to Salem Rice;

A bill (S. 950) granting a pension to Sarah Ann Fletcher;

A bill (S. 951) granting an increase of pension to George Richard;

A bill (S. 952) granting a pension to Francis M. Porter;

A bill (S. 953) granting an increase of pension to George W. Cone;

A bill (S. 954) granting an increase of pension to William Rolley; and

A bill (S. 955) to grant a pension to Elizabeth Sadler.

Mr. MASON introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 956) to correct the military record of Bernhard Franz;

A bill (S. 957) to correct the military record of Jaques Roellinger, alias Jaques Cerman;

A bill (S. 958) to amend the record of Maj. John Murphy;

A bill (S. 959) to correct the record of Stephen W. Conkley;

A bill (S. 960) for the relief of George Isenstein;

A bill (S. 961) to place John M. Cunningham on the active list;

A bill (S. 962) directing the Secretary of War to investigate the claim of John C. Phillips;

A bill (S. 963) for the relief of Peter Casey;

A bill (S. 964) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Andrew Edgar;

A bill (S. 965) placing the name of Joseph Hooker Wood on the retired list;

A bill (S. 966) to place Louis J. Sacriste on the retired list of the Army; and

A bill (S. 967) authorizing the placing of the name of Joseph Hooker Wood upon the retired list of the United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant-colonel.

Mr. MASON introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 968) for the relief of Lina Hennig;

A bill S. 969) for the relief of P. J. Sexton, Ezekiel Smith, and Frank Jubin;

A bill (S. 970) for the relief of F. J. Bissell;

A bill (S. 971) for the relief of the owners and occupants of Camp Tyler, in Cook County, Ill.;

A bill (S. 972) for the relief of Sarah Friedman;

A bill (S. 973) for the relief of Mary E. Squire;

A bill (S. 974) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph Anderson;

A bill (S. 975) for the relief of Augustus E. Gans;

A bill (S. 976) to relieve the heirs of Leon Frank, deceased, and to give the Court of Claims jurisdiction, and to remove the bar of statute of limitations; and

A bill (S. 977) providing for the hearing, trial, and adjudication by the United States Court of Claims of the claim of Albert Wood, and removing the same from the operations of the United States statute of limitations.

Mr. MASON introduced a bill (S. 978) to remove the charge of desertion from John Marks; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 979) to correct the military record of John J. Phelan, of Chicago, Ill.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 980) to increase the efficiency of the West Point Military Academy and the Annapolis Naval Academy, and to qualify and stimulate the American youth for actual military and naval service by suitable physical training instead of excessive mental education; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. HALE. I do not know anything about the bill, but from its title it is something relating to the Military and Naval Academies. Will the Senator from New Hampshire state why it should go to the Committee on Education and Labor?

Mr. CHANDLER. It has direct reference to those two Academies, and proposes to substitute suitable courses of athletic instruction for the higher mathematics and the languages. Neither the Military Committee nor the Naval Committee, I assume, would like to take the bill, because it concerns both Academies, and it is preeminently a subject that the Committee on Education and Labor should deal with, because it concerns both education and labor; that is, athletics form a species of labor.

I am not unwilling that the Senator from Maine, who is chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, shall take the bill if he insists upon it, but the bill has been conceived from a desire to increase the efficiency of the cadets at the two Academies, and I think the Committee on Education and Labor is the best committee to take up the subject seriously and dispose of it.

Mr. HALE. After the Senator's explanation I certainly do not want the bill in the Naval Committee. That is, I judge, from what the Senator has said, it is a bill providing for and encouraging football and games of the kind that are popular in college life, and where excellence in studies, in the old-fashioned pursuits of a student at college, is shoved to one side in favor of excellence at football and baseball.

I should hardly go as far as the Senator, for I presume that, as

sponsor of the bill, he is in favor of it. I should hardly be in favor of any legislation to stimulate that form of training, all the more because I do not think it needs stimulating. The Naval Academy and the Military Academy evidently must go through the same course with the colleges of the country, where the prominent men in the classes are not the men who are excellent in studies, but in athletic games. The tendency is that way undoubtedly with the Military and the Naval Academies. I look to see the time when the famous men of those two Academies will not be the students, but the good players at athletic games; and there is a large element in the country who believe that that is better than to spend the time on books, in which, as has been said long ago, there is a dull and endless strife.

Under these circumstances I am entirely willing, representing the Naval Committee, that the bill shall go to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will say in reply to the Senator from Maine that if baseball is to be made a part of the training of the youth of the two Academies and contests are to be had at convenient localities in the United States, the proceedings should be legalized instead of going on without authority of law. The proposition I present is that the courses in athletics shall be regulated by law; that national contests shall take place at various points in the United States, and that the railroads shall run free trains, in order that there may be a full attendance at those contests, without violating the existing interstate-commerce law.

I present that proposition to the Committee on Education and Labor for their consideration, with the permission of the Senators upon the two committees, the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Hampshire goes on much longer in this vein, people will think he is in earnest, which would be bad for him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 981) for the relief of the estate of William W. Burns, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 982) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to examine certain claims of persons who owned or occupied buildings on the Hot Springs Mountain Reservation, which had been condemned by the Hot Springs Commission and afterwards burned, and to fix a reasonable value thereof, and making appropriation for the payment of said claims; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. KENNEY introduced a bill (S. 983) for the relief of Lindley C. Kent and Joseph Jenkins, as the sureties of Frank A. Webb; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 984) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to issue to captains or masters of steam pilot vessels certain life-saving apparatus; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 985) for the relief of Thomas Draper;

A bill (S. 986) for the relief of George T. Hamilton; and

A bill (S. 987) for the relief of the widows and children of William Ryan and John S. Taylor, deceased.

Mr. KENNEY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 988) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William H. Dennis;

A bill (S. 989) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John R. Scaggs;

A bill (S. 990) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to have prepared and issue a "service medal of honor" to certain officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Union Army, Navy, and Marine Corps; and

A bill (S. 991) to authorize the Secretary of War to remove the charge of desertion and issue to William H. Fairlamb, deceased, Company D, Eighty-eighth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, an honorable discharge.

Mr. KENNEY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 992) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Auer;

A bill (S. 993) granting an increase of pension to Edwin S. Anderson; and

A bill (S. 994) granting an increase of pension to Casper Miller, jr.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 995) granting an increase of pension to Nelly Young Egbert, widow of Harry Clay Egbert, late colonel, United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 996) fixing the times when, regulating the manner in which, and declaring the character of, the accounts between the United States and the several public-land States relative to the net proceeds of the sale and other disposition of the public lands made and to be made therein by the United States, which shall hereafter be stated and certified to the Treasury Department for payment; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 997) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Jacob C. Breyfogle;

A bill (S. 998) for the promotion on the retired list of First Lieut. Asa T. Abbott, United States Army;

A bill (S. 999) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Thomas B. Peterson; and

A bill (S. 1000) to remove the charge of desertion against the record of Lorenzo A. Paddock.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 1001) to remove the charge of desertion against the record of Daniel Haley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1002) granting a pension to Laura E. Curtis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1003) granting a pension to Julia M. Johnson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CHILTON introduced a bill (S. 1004) to amend the act relating to Indian depredations; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. WARREN introduced a bill (S. 1005) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut introduced a bill (S. 1006) granting a pension to Margaret M. Badger, widow of the late Commodore Oscar C. Badger, United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1007) granting a pension to Mary E. Fenn; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1008) for the relief of William C. Dodge;

A bill (S. 1009) for the relief of the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company; and

A bill (S. 1010) to pay certain judgments against John C. Bates and Jonathan A. Yeckley, captain and first lieutenant in the United States Army, for acts done by them under orders of their superior officers.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut introduced a bill (S. 1011) for the erection of a public building at Waterbury, Conn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 1012) granting a pension to Julia A. Powell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PETTUS introduced a bill (S. 1013) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to adjudicate the claim of Thomas W. McDonald, as administrator of the estates of James M. and Timothy Meaher, and to remove the bar of the statute of limitations therefrom; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. COCKRELL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1014) for the relief of George McGuire; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1015) granting a pension to Rhoda Burnham; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1016) for the relief of James Brice; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. In connection with this bill I present the petition and affidavits of the claimant, together with the affidavits of Judge J. E. Guinotte, Col. R. T. Van Horn, Judge John W. Henry, a copy of the decision of the Court of Claims, affidavits of John W. Moore, Patterson Stewart, William R. Barnard, and Amazon Hays, with items of receipts and expenditures. I move that the bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Claims.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TILLMAN introduced a bill (S. 1017) for the relief of John M. Guyton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1018) to establish a Branch Home of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers at Castle Pinckney, in Charleston Harbor, South Carolina, or some other eligible site in or near that city, for the use of disabled officers and enlisted men of the Volunteer Army and Navy of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BERRY introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 27) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of Senators of the United States; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. BERRY. I ask that the joint resolution may lie on the table, with a view of calling it up at a later day to make some remarks upon it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution will lie on the table.

Mr. SPOONER introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 28) relating to the use of the rooms lately occupied by the Congressional Library in the Capitol; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HARRIS introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 29) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of members of the House of Representatives of the United States every four years; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 30) providing that the Constitution of the United States be so amended that the President shall hold his office for one term of six years and shall not be eligible for reelection; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. TILLMAN introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 31) to authorize the appointment of George Izard Middleton an ensign in the Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 32) concerning the preference for appointment or employment under the Government of those who served in the military or naval service of the United States during the Spanish-American war; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

GEORGE W. ALLEN.

Mr. LINDSAY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

Whereas, heretofore, to wit, on or about the 15th day of January, 1892, George W. Allen, after having passed the required examination and found to be in all respects worthy and capable, and having served the required probationary term of service, was duly appointed superintendent of the national cemetery known as the Fort McPherson National Cemetery, and located at Fort McPherson, in the State of Nebraska; and

Whereas the said George W. Allen, having served as such superintendent until on or about the 14th day of October, 1895, when, by order of the War Department, for his honesty, efficiency, and good management of all matters of business pertaining to the keeping and caring for said cemetery, he was promoted in the service and transferred to a national cemetery in Pulaski County, State of Kentucky, and known and designated as Mill Springs National Cemetery; and

Whereas, in pursuance of said order of promotion, the said George W. Allen proceeded to take charge of, and did take charge of, and to diligently, honestly, and faithfully perform all the duties of a superintendent of the said national cemetery at Mill Springs, in the State of Kentucky, in conformity with the rules and regulations of the service, and to the best of his judgment, skill, and ability; and

Whereas the said George W. Allen was, on or about the 27th day of March, 1896, summarily dismissed from the superintendency of said last-mentioned cemetery, without any fault upon his part, upon a naked charge, unsupported by a single witness, and without the privilege of a hearing or of an investigation of said charge; and

Whereas the said George W. Allen did, on or about the —— day of June, 1896, file his application in the War Department for his reinstatement as superintendent of the said national cemetery at Mill Springs, in the State of Kentucky; and

Whereas the said George W. Allen has filed in the War Department from time to time for the last two years affidavits, sworn statements, and depositions of many creditable and respectable persons of the State of Nebraska in support of said application and in refutation of each and every charge against him; and

Whereas the War Department has refused and still refuses to consider said application, affidavits, and depositions, and to open and consider the matter of the reinstatement of the said George W. Allen: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the honorable Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, requested and directed to transmit without delay to the Senate of the United States all the documents, records, and papers pertaining to said case now on file in the War Department.

PERMANENT SEAT OF GOVERNMENT.

Mr. HOAR. I ask unanimous consent for the printing of a document. It is the report of the committee of the Columbia Historical Society upon the removal of the permanent seat of government to the District of Columbia in 1800. It is not very long; perhaps fifteen letter-press pages. It has been prepared by Mr. A. R. Spofford, of the Congressional Library, and it would be exceedingly convenient to the committee who are acting in regard to a suitable celebration of that event to have this report in the form of a Senate document. The Senate is aware that under a resolution passed last winter the President has appointed the governors of all the States in the Union, with some other persons, I think, as a committee on that subject. They are to have a meeting in Washington within a few weeks, and I ask unanimous consent that this paper may be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and the order for the printing of the document named by him will be made.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eighteen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, December 11, 1899, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 7, 1899.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

SIGNAL CORPS.

To be lieutenant-colonel.

Maj. James Allen, Signal Corps, December 1, 1899, vice Craig, retired from active service.

To be major.

Capt. Richard E. Thompson, Signal Corps, December 1, 1899, vice Allen, promoted.

PROMOTIONS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

THIRTY-THIRD INFANTRY.

Maj. Marcus D. Cronin, to be lieutenant-colonel, December 2, 1899, vice Brereton, deceased.

Capt. Thomas Q. Ashburn, to be major, December 2, 1899, vice Cronin, promoted.

First Lieut. Lindsey P. Rucker, to be captain, December 2, 1899, vice Ashburn, promoted.

Second Lieut. Charles L. Willard, to be first lieutenant, December 2, 1899, vice Rucker, promoted.

THIRTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY.

First Lieut. Neil P. Pavey, to be captain, December 1, 1899, vice Lino, discharged.

Second Lieut. Daniel R. Johnson, to be first lieutenant, December 1, 1899, vice Pavey, promoted.

FORTY-FOURTH INFANTRY.

Second Lieut. Howard M. Koontz, to be first lieutenant, November 29, 1899, vice Brown, discharged.

ELEVENTH CAVALRY.

Second Lieut. Charles H. Burritt, to be first lieutenant, September 5, 1899, vice Ross, promoted.

TWENTY-SIXTH INFANTRY.

Maj. Joseph T. Dickman, to be lieutenant-colonel, September 13, 1899, vice Duvall, vacated.

Capt. Guy V. Henry, jr., to be major, September 13, 1899, vice Dickman, promoted.

First Lieut. William M. Connell, to be captain, September 13, 1899, vice Henry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Harry E. Comstock, to be first lieutenant, September 13, 1899, vice Connell, promoted.

TWENTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Theodore B. Taylor, October 21, 1899, vice Randall, discharged.

First Lieut. Julien E. Gaujot, November 2, 1899, vice Langhorne, vacated.

First Lieut. James D. Fauntleroy, December 1, 1899, vice Savage, discharged.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Francis W. Griffin, September 5, 1899, vice Sewell, discharged.

Second Lieut. Frederick H. Plummer, September 8, 1899, vice Sturges, vacated.

Second Lieut. Robert S. Knox, September 12, 1899, vice Bradley, discharged.

Second Lieut. George C. Shaw, September 12, 1899, vice McDonald, discharged.

Second Lieut. Louie St. Clair Munford, October 21, 1899, vice Taylor, promoted.

Second Lieut. Albert U. Faulkner, November 2, 1899, vice Gaujot, promoted.

Second Lieut. John C. Cassels, December 1, 1899, vice Fauntleroy, promoted.

TWENTY-NINTH INFANTRY.

First Lieut. James R. Rash, to be captain, July 29, 1899, vice Thompson, discharged.

Second Lieut. William S. Wells, jr., to be first lieutenant, July 29, 1899, vice Rash, promoted.

THIRTIETH INFANTRY.

First Lieut. Joseph W. Porterfield, to be captain, August 22, 1899, vice Ryan, discharged.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. John N. Wright (since discharged), August 22, 1899, vice Porterfield, promoted.

Second Lieut. John W. C. Abbott, October 20, 1899, vice Wright, discharged.

THIRTY-FIRST INFANTRY.

First Lieut. Robert C. Payne, to be captain, August 30, 1899, vice Adams, discharged.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. William H. Monroe, August 30, 1899, vice Payne, promoted.

Second Lieut. Watson Lindsey, November 20, 1899, vice Meek, discharged.

THIRTY-SECOND INFANTRY.

Second Lieut. George E. Goodfich, to be first lieutenant, October 25, 1899, vice Phillips, discharged.

THIRTY-THIRD INFANTRY.

Capt. Edgar A. Sirmyer, to be major, November 12, 1899, vice Logan, killed in action.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Richard T. Ellis, September 12, 1899, vice Loffhagen, discharged.

First Lieut. Theodore Schultz, September 13, 1899, vice Belford, discharged.

First Lieut. William S. Cunningham, November 12, 1899, vice Sirmyer, promoted.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. George L. Febiger, August 24, 1899, vice Morrow, discharged.

Second Lieut. Frank L. Case, September 12, 1899, vice Ellis, promoted.

Second Lieut. Earle Edmundson, September 13, 1899, vice Schultz, promoted.

Second Lieut. Thomas L. Sherburne, September 13, 1899, vice Stroup, discharged.

Second Lieut. John J. Lipop, October 31, 1899, vice Strong, discharged.

Second Lieut. John W. Healey, November 12, 1899, vice Cunningham, promoted.

THIRTY-FOURTH INFANTRY.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Cushman A. Rice, September 8, 1899, vice Wyman, discharged.

First Lieut. George E. Gibson, September 24, 1899, vice Carey, vacated.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Lafayette A. Dorrington, September 8, 1899, vice Rice, promoted.

Second Lieut. Samuel D. McAlister, September 24, 1899, vice Gibson, promoted.

Second Lieut. Arthur G. Duncan, November 15, 1899, vice Luna, deceased.

THIRTY-FIFTH INFANTRY.

First Lieut. George I. Becker, to be captain, September 22, 1899, vice Brooke, vacated.

Second Lieut. Robert W. Collins, to be first lieutenant, September 22, 1899, vice Becker, promoted.

THIRTY-SIXTH INFANTRY.

First Lieut. Cornealiaus F. O'Keefe, to be captain, October 31, 1899, vice French, deceased.

Second Lieut. James P. Toncray, to be first lieutenant, October 31, 1899, vice O'Keefe, promoted.

THIRTY-NINTH INFANTRY.

First Lieut. Hiram C. Baker, to be captain, October 13, 1899, vice Ranke, discharged.

Second Lieut. Arthur W. Orton, to be first lieutenant, October 11, 1899, vice Baker, promoted.

FORTIETH INFANTRY.

First Lieut. William J. Watson, to be captain, November 13, 1899, vice Wing, discharged.

Second Lieut. William C. Fitzpatrick, to be first lieutenant, November 11, 1899, vice Watson, promoted.

FORTY-FIRST INFANTRY.

To be captains.

First Lieut. William R. Standiford, September 1, 1899, vice Sewell, vacated.

First Lieut. Ernest A. Greenough, October 28, 1899, vice Jackson, discharged.

First Lieut. Brady G. Ruttencutter, November 2, 1899, vice Shipton, vacated.

First Lieut. Albert W. Foreman, November 18, 1899, vice Bishop, discharged.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Lawrence P. Butler, September 1, 1899, vice Standiford, promoted.

Second Lieut. Frank W. Glover, October 28, 1899, vice Greenough, promoted.

Second Lieut. Frank J. Miller, November 2, 1899, vice Ruttencutter, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edwin J. Nowlen, November 18, 1899, vice Foreman, promoted.

FORTY-SECOND INFANTRY.

First Lieut. Fred W. Stopford, to be captain, October 24, 1899, vice Hamilton, discharged.

Second Lieut. Horace Webster, to be first lieutenant, October 24, 1899, vice Stopford, promoted.

FORTY-THIRD INFANTRY.

First Lieut. William C. Dow, to be captain, November 8, 1899, vice Gilmore, discharged.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Joseph T. Sweeney, October 26, 1899, vice Forsyth, discharged.

Second Lieut. Henry A. Thayer, November 8, 1899, vice Dow, promoted.

Second Lieut. Harold S. Swann, November 30, 1899, vice Gordon, discharged.

FORTY-FOURTH INFANTRY.

First Lieut. Marion C. Raysor, to be captain, November 30, 1899, vice Guthrie, discharged.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Theodore Levack, November 10, 1899, vice Ingalls, discharged.

Second Lieut. Benjamin R. Hall, November 30, 1899, vice Raysor, promoted.

FORTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Oscar Bishop, October 30, 1899, vice Houston, discharged.

First Lieut. Jesse S. Garwood, November 1, 1899, vice Smith, discharged.

First Lieut. John W. Gulick, November 9, 1899, vice Bristol, discharged.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Thomas P. Murphy, October 30, 1899, vice Bishop, promoted.

Second Lieut. Charles H. Morrow, November 1, 1899, vice Garwood, promoted.

Second Lieut. Harvey Garrison, November 9, 1899, vice Gulick, promoted.

FORTY-NINTH INFANTRY.

First Lieut. Hamilton H. Blunt, to be captain, November 7, 1899, vice McNabb, deceased.

Second Lieut. William Blaney, to be first lieutenant, November 7, 1899, vice Blunt, promoted.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Capt. George W. Melville, United States Navy, to be Engineer in Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear-admiral, from the 3d day of March, 1899, until the 16th day of January, 1900.

Naval Constructor Philip Hichborn, United States Navy, to be Chief Constructor and Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear-admiral, from the 3d day of March, 1899, until the 18th day of December, 1901.

Capt. Arent Schuyler Crowninshield, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear-admiral, from the 3d day of March, 1899, until the 8th day of April, 1901.

Capt. Charles O'Neil, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear-admiral, from the 3d day of March, 1899, until the 1st day of June, 1901.

Capt. Royal B. Bradford, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Equipment, in the Department of the Navy, with

the rank of rear-admiral, from the 3d day of March, 1899, until the 18th day of December, 1901.

Medical Director William K. Van Reypen, United States Navy, to be Surgeon-General and Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear-admiral, from the 3d day of March, 1899, until the 18th day of December, 1901.

Civil Engineer Mordecai T. Endicott, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear-admiral, from the 3d day of March, 1899, until the 4th day of April, 1902.

Pay Director Albert S. Kenny, United States Navy, to be Paymaster-General and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear-admiral, for a term of four years.

Commander George E. Ide, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 25th day of March, 1899, vice Capt. William C. Buehler, retired.

Lieut. Clifford J. Boush, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 25th day of March, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander Nathan E. Miles, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William H. Buck, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 25th day of March, 1899, vice Lieut. Clifford J. Boush, promoted.

Capt. Benjamin F. Day, to be a rear-admiral in the Navy, from the 29th day of March, 1899, vice Rear-Admiral Henry B. Robeson, retired.

Commander George M. Book, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 29th day of March, 1899, vice Capt. Benjamin F. Day, promoted.

Lieut. James H. Sears, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 29th day of March, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander Thomas H. Stevens, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) George W. Williams, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 29th day of March, 1899, vice Lieut. James H. Sears, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Claude B. Price, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 2d day of April, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Lieut. Philip V. Lansdale, deceased.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Montgomery M. Taylor, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 2d day of June, 1899, vice Lieut. George W. Danforth, retired.

Lieut. Abraham E. Culver, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 4th day of June, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander Wainwright Kellogg, deceased.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Henry S. Ritter, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 4th day of June, 1899, vice Lieut. Abraham E. Culver, promoted.

Commander Thomas Perry, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 11th day of June, 1899, vice Capt. Henry E. Nichols, deceased.

Lieut. Commander Julien S. Ogden, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 11th day of June, 1899, vice Commander Thomas Perry, promoted.

Lieut. Henry T. Mayo, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 11th day of June, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander Julien S. Ogden, promoted.

Asst. Surg. Reginald K. Smith, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, from the 3d day of April, 1898, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade.

Asst. Surg. Jacob C. Rosenbleuth, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, from the 14th day of October, 1898, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade.

Medical Inspector Abel F. Price, to be a medical director in the Navy, from the 9th day of April, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Medical Director George A. Bright, retired.

Surg. James R. Waggener, to be a medical inspector in the Navy, from the 9th day of April, 1899, vice Medical Inspector Abel F. Price, promoted.

P. A. Surg. Thomas A. Berryhill, to be a surgeon in the Navy, from the 9th day of April, 1899, vice Surg. James R. Waggener, promoted.

Medical Inspector Michael C. Drennan, to be a medical director in the Navy, from the 16th day of April, 1899, vice Medical Director John H. Clark, retired.

Surg. Thomas H. Streets, to be a medical inspector in the Navy, from the 16th day of April, 1899, vice Medical Inspector Michael C. Drennan, promoted.

P. A. Surg. Eugene P. Stone, to be a surgeon in the Navy, from the 16th day of April, 1899, vice Surg. Thomas H. Streets, promoted.

Asst. Surg. Robert S. Blakeman, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, from the 27th day of May, 1899, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade.

Asst. Surg. George D. Costigan, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, from the 11th day of August, 1899, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade.

P. A. Surg. George Pickrell, to be a surgeon in the Navy, from the 19th day of September, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Surg. Lloyd B. Baldwin, retired.

Medical Inspector James A. Hawke, to be a medical director in the Navy, from the 24th day of September, 1899, vice Medical Director James Rufus Tryon, retired.

Surg. Manly H. Simons, to be a medical inspector in the Navy, from the 24th day of September, 1899, vice Medical Inspector James A. Hawke, promoted.

Medical Inspector Robert A. Marmion, to be a medical director in the Navy, from October 25, 1899, vice Medical Director Michael C. Drennan, retired.

Surg. John C. Boyd, to be a medical inspector in the Navy, from the 25th day of October, 1899, vice Medical Inspector Robert A. Marmion, promoted.

Medical Inspector Dwight Dickinson, to be a medical director in the Navy, from the 11th day of November, 1899, vice Medical Director Christ J. Cleborne, retired.

Surg. George E. H. Harmon, to be a medical inspector in the Navy, from the 11th day of November, 1899, vice Medical Inspector Dwight Dickinson, promoted.

Pay Inspector George W. Beaman, to be a pay director in the Navy, from the 9th day of April, 1899, vice Pay Director Rufus Parks, retired.

Paymaster William J. Thomson, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 9th day of April, 1899, vice Pay Inspector George W. Beaman, promoted.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Henry E. Jewett, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 9th day of April, 1899, vice Paymaster William J. Thomson, promoted.

Assistant Paymaster William T. Gray, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 9th day of April, 1899, vice Passed Assistant Paymaster Henry E. Jewett, promoted.

Paymaster Henry G. Colby, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 23d day of April, 1899, vice Pay Inspector Charles W. Slamm, promoted.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Ziba W. Reynolds, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 23d day of April, 1899, vice Paymaster Henry G. Colby, promoted.

Assistant Paymaster George P. Dyer, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 23d day of April, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Passed Assistant Paymaster Ziba W. Reynolds, promoted.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Eugene D. Ryan, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 3d day of May, 1899, vice Paymaster Ambrose K. Michler, resigned.

Assistant Paymaster Robert H. Woods, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 3d day of May, 1899, vice Passed Assistant Paymaster Eugene D. Ryan, promoted.

Pay Inspector Arthur Burtis, to be a pay director in the Navy, from the 5th day of May, 1899, vice Pay Director Edwin Stewart, retired.

Paymaster John B. Redfield, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 5th day of May, 1899, vice Pay Inspector Arthur Burtis, promoted.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Samuel McGowan, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 5th day of May, 1899, vice Paymaster John B. Redfield, promoted.

Assistant Paymaster Robert H. Orr, to be a passed assistant paymaster, from the 5th day of May, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Passed Assistant Paymaster Samuel McGowan, promoted.

Pay Inspector Edwin Putnam, to be a pay director in the Navy, from the 7th day of May, 1899, vice Pay Director George W. Beaman, retired.

Paymaster Ichabod G. Hobbs, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 7th day of May, 1899, vice Pay Inspector Edwin Putnam, promoted.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Henry A. Dent, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 7th day of May, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Paymaster Ichabod G. Hobbs, promoted.

Assistant Paymaster William A. Merritt, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 7th day of May, 1899, vice Passed Assistant Paymaster Henry A. Dent, promoted.

Pay Inspector Robert P. Lisle, to be a pay director in the Navy, from the 6th day of June, 1899, vice Pay Director Thomas T. Caswell, retired.

Paymaster Joel P. Loomis, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 6th day of June, 1899, vice Pay Inspector Robert P. Lisle, promoted.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Walter L. Wilson, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 6th day of June, 1899, vice Paymaster Joel P. Loomis, promoted.

Assistant Paymaster Franklin W. Hart, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 6th day of June, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Passed Assistant Paymaster Walter L. Wilson, promoted.

Pay Inspector Leonard A. Frailey, to be a pay director in the Navy, from the 29th day of August, 1899, vice Pay Director James E. Tolfree, retired.

Paymaster Henry T. B. Harris, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 29th day of August, 1899, vice Pay Inspector Leonard A. Frailey, promoted.

John Clyde Sullivan, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 16th day of June, 1899, to take rank next after Paymaster William W. Galt, pursuant to an act of Congress approved March 3, 1899.

Pay Inspector George E. Hendee, to be a pay director in the Navy, from the 1st day of September, 1899, vice Pay Director Joseph A. Smith, retired.

Paymaster Stephen Rand, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 1st day of September, 1899, vice Pay Inspector George E. Hendee, promoted.

Passed Assistant Paymaster William J. Littell, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 1st day of September, 1899, vice Paymaster Stephen Rand, promoted.

Assistant Paymaster Harrison L. Robins, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 1st day of September, 1899, vice Passed Assistant Paymaster William J. Littell, promoted.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Philip V. Mohun, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 15th day of September, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Paymaster William W. Barry, retired.

Assistant Paymaster Webb V. H. Rose, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 15th day of September, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Passed Assistant Paymaster Philip V. Mohun, promoted.

Paymaster Lawrence G. Boggs, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 12th day of November, 1899, vice Pay Inspector George H. Griffing, deceased.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

To be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy.

George Brown, jr.
Walter B. Izard.
David Potter (subject to examination).
Samuel Bryan (subject to examination).
George M. Lukesh (subject to examination).
John W. Morse (subject to examination).
Arthur F. Huntington.
Harry H. Balthis.
Charles Conard.

To be assistant paymasters in the Navy.

George R. Venable, a citizen of Virginia, from the 6th day of March, 1899.

Howard P. Ash, a citizen of Pennsylvania, from the 6th day of March, 1899.

Hugh R. Insley, a citizen of California, from the 6th day of March, 1899.

James S. Barber, a citizen of Ohio, from the 6th day of March, 1899.

George M. Stackhouse, a citizen of South Carolina, from the 13th day of April, 1899.

Grey Skipwith, a citizen of Virginia, from the 13th day of April, 1899.

Trevor W. Leutze, a citizen of New York, from the 15th day of April, 1899.

McGill R. Goldsborough, a citizen of Maryland, from the 25th day of April, 1899.

David V. Chadwick, a citizen of West Virginia, from the 25th day of April, 1899.

Eugene C. Tobey, a citizen of Maine, from the 28th day of April, 1899.

Arthur H. Cathcart, a citizen of Minnesota, from the 15th day of May, 1899.

Jonathan Brooks, a citizen of Massachusetts, from the 22d day of May, 1899.

Eugene F. Hall, a citizen of Kentucky, from the 27th day of May, 1899.

Dexter Tiffany, jr., a citizen of Missouri, from the 31st day of May, 1899.

Franklin P. Sackett, a citizen of Rhode Island, from the 3d day of June, 1899.

David M. Addison, a citizen of Kansas, from the 3d day of June, 1899.

William T. Wallace, a citizen of Pennsylvania, from the 3d day of June, 1899.

Victor S. Jackson, a citizen of Indiana, from the 9th day of June, 1899.

John R. Sanford, a citizen of New York, from the 9th day of June, 1899.

Herbert E. Stevens, a citizen of Massachusetts, from the 5th day of July, 1899.

Charles R. O'Leary, a citizen of Pennsylvania, from the 18th day of September, 1899.

Charles W. Eliason, a citizen of the District of Columbia, from the 18th day of September, 1899.

Cuthbert J. Cleborne, a citizen of New Hampshire, from the 18th day of September, 1899.

Philip Delano, a citizen of the District of Columbia, from the 1st day of December, 1899.

To be assistant surgeons.

Barton L. Wright, a citizen of Pennsylvania, from the 13th day of May, 1899.

Ralph W. Plummer, a citizen of Illinois, from the 17th day of June, 1899.

Olin Martin Eakins, a citizen of New Jersey, from the 21st day of October, 1899.

Henry E. Odell, a citizen of Ohio, from the 8th day of November, 1899.

James S. Taylor, a citizen of New Jersey, from the 8th day of November, 1899.

Edwin Davis, a citizen of Kentucky, from the 21st day of November, 1899.

To be assistant naval constructors.

Naval Cadets William G. Du Bose, of Georgia; Ernest F. Eggert, of Michigan, and Ensign Joseph W. Powell, of New York, from the 1st day of July, 1899.

To be professor of mathematics.

Milton Updegraff, a citizen of Iowa, from the 5th day of June, 1899, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade.

To be chief boatswains in the Navy.

Charles F. Pierce, from the 7th day of May, 1899.

Henry Hudson, from the 27th day of August, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law).

Hugh Sweeney, from the 27th day of August, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law).

Michael Wogan, from the 21st day of October, 1899.

To be a chief carpenter in the Navy.

Edward W. Smith, from the 7th day of May, 1899.

To be ensigns in the Navy.

Harry E. Yarnell, Iowa.
Harlan P. Perrill, Indiana.
David E. Theleen, Wisconsin.
Daniel S. Mahony, Michigan.
Arthur J. Hepburn, Pennsylvania.
Needham L. Jones, Mississippi.
Thomas C. Hart, Michigan.
Alfred W. Pressey, Nebraska.
William H. Reynolds, Georgia.
Cyrus R. Miller, California.
Orin G. Murfin, Ohio.
Leonard R. Sargent, Minnesota.
Luther M. Overstreet, Nebraska.
William R. White, Arizona.
Henry L. Collins, Pennsylvania.
Victor S. Houston, South Dakota.
David F. Boyd, Alabama.
Gilbert Chase, Virginia.
Louis C. Richardson, South Carolina.
Walton R. Sexton, Illinois.
Walter M. Falconer, Ohio.
Joseph W. Graeme, Pennsylvania.
Albert H. McCarthy, Iowa.
Frederic R. Holman, Iowa.
Henry N. Jenson, Wisconsin.
William D. Leahy, Wisconsin.
Andrew T. Graham, Illinois.
Arthur St. C. Smith, Iowa.
Peter L. Pratt, at large.
Oscar D. Duncan, Alabama.
Willis McDowell, Pennsylvania.
Austin Kautz, Washington.
Charles T. Owens, Pennsylvania.
Hilary Williams, Indiana.
Robert W. Henderson, Ohio.
William C. Asserson, New York.
Clarence S. Kempff, California.
Alfred C. Owen, District of Columbia.
Samuel G. Magill, jr., North Dakota.
Irwin F. Landis, Kansas.
Ernest C. Keenan, New York.

To be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps.

George Van Orden, Michigan.

To be passed assistant engineers.

John R. Brady, formerly assistant engineer, United States Navy, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy, from the 10th day

of February, 1899, to the 3d day of March, 1899, vice former Passed Assistant Engineer Harold P. Norton, promoted.

Allen M. Cook, formerly assistant engineer, United States Navy, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy, from the 24th day of February, 1899, to the 3d day of March, 1899, vice former Passed Assistant Engineer Clarence A. Carr, promoted.

Emmet R. Pollock, formerly assistant engineer, United States Navy, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy, from the 28th day of February, 1899, to the 3d day of March, 1899, vice former Passed Assistant Engineer Edward H. Scribner, promoted.

To be chief engineers.

Clarence A. Carr, formerly passed assistant engineer, United States Navy, to be a chief engineer in the Navy, from the 24th day of February, 1899, to the 3d day of March, 1899, vice Chief Engineer Albert C. Engard, retired.

Edward H. Scribner, formerly passed assistant engineer, United States Navy, to be a chief engineer in the Navy, from the 28th day of February, 1899, to the 3d day of March, 1899, vice Chief Engineer Augustus H. Able, retired.

PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE CORPS.

Capt. Cyrus S. Radford, United States Marine Corps, to be an assistant quartermaster in said corps, from the 8th day of March, 1899, to fill an existing vacancy.

First Lieut. Robert P. Faunt Le Roy, United States Marine Corps, to be an assistant quartermaster in said corps, with the rank of captain, from the 27th day of May, 1899, to fill an existing vacancy.

First Lieut. William B. Lemly, to be an assistant quartermaster, with the rank of captain, in said corps, from the 27th day of May, 1899, to fill an existing vacancy.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS IN THE MARINE CORPS.

From the 8th day of April, 1899.

George C. Thorpe, a citizen of Maine.
Smedley D. Butler, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
William B. Lemly, a citizen of North Carolina.
Henry Leonard, a citizen of the District of Columbia.
Charles S. Hill, a citizen of New Hampshire.
Robert M. Gilson, a citizen of Vermont.
Robert P. Faunt Le Roy, a citizen of Virginia.
David D. Porter, a citizen of the District of Columbia.
Frederick L. Bradman, a citizen of Montana.
Henry C. Davis, a citizen of the District of Columbia.
George C. Reid, a citizen of Ohio.
Robert H. Dunlap, a citizen of the District of Columbia.

From the 13th day of April, 1899.

Henry W. Carpenter, a citizen of Virginia.
Randolph C. Berkeley, a citizen of Virginia.
Arthur J. Matthews, a citizen of Rhode Island.
Charles G. Andresen, a citizen of New York.
Charles S. Hatch, a citizen of the District of Columbia.
James C. Breckinridge, a citizen of Arkansas.
Arthur T. Marix, a citizen of Illinois.
Philip S. Brown, a citizen of Maine.
Harry Lee, a citizen of the District of Columbia.

From the 26th day of May, 1899.

John F. McGill, a citizen of Virginia.
Frederic H. Delano, a citizen of New York.
Louis M. Gulick, a citizen of New York.
Hiram I. Bearss, a citizen of Indiana.
William H. Parker, a citizen of the District of Columbia.
Robert F. Wynne, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Edwin A. Jonas, a citizen of Louisiana.
Benjamin F. Rittenhouse, a citizen of Virginia.

From the 8th day of June, 1899.

Thomas F. Lyons, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

From the 1st day of July, 1899.

James T. Bootes, a citizen of Delaware.
Ernest E. West, a citizen of Georgia.
William G. Powell, appointed at large.
Logan Feland, a citizen of Kentucky.
William H. Clifford, jr., a citizen of Maine.
John H. A. Day, a citizen of New Jersey.
John S. Bates, appointed at large.
James W. Broatch, a citizen of Nebraska.
Benjamin B. Woog, appointed at large.
William Hopkins, a citizen of the District of Columbia.
Dickinson P. Hall, a citizen of Ohio.
Arthur E. Harding, a citizen of Illinois.
William W. Low, a citizen of Connecticut.
James W. Lynch, a citizen of Maine.
Charles H. Lyman, appointed at large.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS IN THE MARINE CORPS.

From the 1st day of July, 1899.

Charles C. Carpenter, a citizen of New Hampshire.
Norman G. Burton, a citizen of Massachusetts.
Louis M. Little, a citizen of Rhode Island.
Leof M. Harding, a citizen of Missouri.
Frederic M. Wise, jr., appointed at large.
Richard M. Cutts, a citizen of California.
Stephen Elliott, a citizen of South Carolina.
Harold C. Snyder, a citizen of Virginia.

From the 27th day of July, 1899.

Wirt McCreary, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

From the 2d day of October, 1899.

Richard P. Williams, a citizen of Arizona.
Wade L. Jolly, a citizen of Iowa.
Alexander S. Williams, a citizen of New York.
John N. Wright, a citizen of South Dakota.
Olof H. Rask, a citizen of Minnesota.
Richard G. McConnell, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Julius S. Turrill, a citizen of Vermont.
Lee B. Purcell, a citizen of Indiana.
James M. Huey, a citizen of Louisiana.

Capt. Thomas N. Wood, United States Marine Corps, to be a major in said Corps, from the 18th day of June, 1899, to fill an existing vacancy.

Capt. Littleton W. T. Waller, United States Marine Corps, to be a major in said Corps, from the 25th day of July, 1899, vice Maj. Richard Wallach, retired.

Maj. George F. Elliott, United States Marine Corps, to be a lieutenant-colonel in said Corps, from the 11th day of September, 1899, vice Lieut. Col. Carlile P. Porter, retired.

Capt. Harry K. White, United States Marine Corps, to be a major in said Corps, from the 11th day of September, 1899, vice George F. Elliott, promoted.

SUPERVISORS OF CENSUS.

Joel W. Goldsby, of Mobile, Mobile County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Alabama. Appointed October 21, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Daniel S. Jones, of Moody, St. Clair County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Alabama. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

John B. Long, of Jasper, Walker County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Alabama. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Jefferson J. Sims, of Silver Run, Talladega County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Alabama. Appointed September 29, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Rufus B. Smyer, of Birmingham, Jefferson County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Alabama. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Albert Steinhart, of Greenville, Butler County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Alabama. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Asa E. Stratton, of Troy, Pike County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Alabama. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Walter U. Simmons, of Courtland, Lawrence County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of Alabama. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Frederick A. Tritle, of Prescott, Yavapai County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of Arizona. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

William F. Avera, of Camden, Ouachita County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Arkansas. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

James B. Baker, of Melbourne, Izard County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Arkansas. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

James T. O'Hair, of Little Rock, Pulaski County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Arkansas. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

William B. Moss, of Jasper, Newton County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Arkansas. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Cage Rembert, of Helena, Phillips County, to be a supervisor

of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Arkansas. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Frank F. Davis, of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of California. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Alexander M. Drew, of Fresno, Fresno County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of California. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

John D. Mackenzie, of San Jose, Santa Clara County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of California. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Thomas W. O'Neil, of Sacramento, Sacramento County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of California. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Stephen H. Olmsted, of San Rafael, Marin County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of California. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Carl C. Plehn, of Berkeley, Alameda County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of California. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

William H. Brisbane, of Leadville, Lake County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Colorado. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Frank S. Tesch, of Denver, Arapahoe County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Colorado. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Samuel A. Eddy, of Canaan, Litchfield County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of Connecticut. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Jonathan S. Willis, of Milford, Kent County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of Delaware. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Harrison Dingman, of Washington, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of District of Columbia. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

John M. Cheney, of Orlando, Orange County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Florida. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Richard Turnbull, of Monticello, Jefferson County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Florida. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Alexander Akerman, of Dublin, Laurens County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eleventh supervisor's district of Georgia. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

George D. Anderson, of Marietta, Cobb County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Georgia. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

James W. Anderson, of Covington, Newton County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Georgia. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Henry Blun, jr., of Savannah, Chatham County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Georgia. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Elbert L. Campbell, of Eudora, Jasper County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of Georgia. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Melville L. Covington, of Carrollton, Carroll County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Georgia. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Henry W. Hopkins, of Thomasville, Thomas County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Georgia. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Judson M. Strickland, of Thomaston, Upson County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Georgia. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Edward D. Smythe, of Augusta, Richmond County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Tenth supervisor's district of Georgia. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Henry Wetteroth, of Americus, Sumter County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Georgia. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

John H. Witzel, of Blue Ridge, Fannin County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of Georgia. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

William H. Savidge, of Boise, Ada County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of Idaho. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

William E. Birkenbeuel, of La Salle, La Salle County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Illinois. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Edward D. Blinn, of Lincoln, Logan County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eleventh supervisor's district of Illinois. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Horatio C. Burchard, of Freeport, Stephenson County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Illinois. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Fenton W. Booth, of Marshall, Clark County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Thirteenth supervisor's district of Illinois. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Gerald M. Finlay, of Augusta, Hancock County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of Illinois. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

John B. Fithian, of Joliet, Will County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Illinois. Appointed October 21, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

William C. Galloway, of Aledo, Mercer County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Illinois. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

George F. Gilbert, of Chicago, Cook County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Illinois. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

William Jackson, of Shabbona, Dekalb County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Illinois. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Garrett DeF. Kinney, of Peoria, Peoria County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of Illinois. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Theodore G. Risley, of Mount Carmel, Wabash County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourteenth supervisor's district of Illinois. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Henry J. Schmidt, of Nashville, Washington County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifteenth supervisor's district of Illinois. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Edwin S. Swigart, of Champaign, Champaign County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Illinois. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

James M. Truitt, of Hillsboro, Montgomery County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Twelfth supervisor's district of Illinois. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Thomas Worthington, of Jacksonville, Morgan County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Tenth supervisor's district of Illinois. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Jonathan C. Willis, of Metropolis, Massac County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixteenth supervisor's district of Illinois. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Arthur E. Bradshaw, of Delphi, Carroll County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of Indiana. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

John C. Bilheimer, of Washington, Daviess County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Indiana. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Vincent G. Clifford, of Indianapolis, Marion County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Indiana. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Charles G. Covert, of Evansville, Vanderburg County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Indiana. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Charles W. Lee, of Sugar Branch, Switzerland County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Indiana. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Eli N. Norris, of Valparaiso, Porter County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Tenth supervisor's district of Indiana. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Joseph D. Poutch, of New Albany, Floyd County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Indiana. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

David B. J. Schafer, of South Bend, St. Joseph County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Thirteenth supervisor's district of Indiana. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Arthur L. Sharpe, of Bluffton, Wells County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of Indiana. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Orlando A. Somers, of Kokomo, Howard County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eleventh supervisor's district of Indiana. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

John F. Thompson, of Newcastle, Henry County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Indiana. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Isaac L. Wimmer, of Rockville, Parke County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Indiana. Appointed September 23, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Sol. A. Wood, of Angola, Steuben County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Twelfth supervisor's district of Indiana. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

William H. Darrough, of Wyandotte, Crawford County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of Indian Territory. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

John T. Drug, of Stratford, Hamilton County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Tenth supervisor's district of Iowa. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Jacob W. Doxsee, of Monticello, Jones County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Iowa. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Clinton D. Eaton, of Wilton Junction, Muscatine County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Iowa. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Frank F. Everest, of Council Bluffs, Pottawattamie County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of Iowa. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Albert H. Fortune, of Bloomfield, Davis County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Iowa. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

William E. Hamilton, of Odebolt, Sac County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eleventh supervisor's district of Iowa. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

John W. Krapfel, of Waterloo, Blackhawk County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Iowa. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Francis M. Kyte, of Osceola, Clark County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of Iowa. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

George H. Markley, of Lansing, Allamakee County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Iowa. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

John W. Rowley, of Keosauqua, Van Buren County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Iowa. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Samuel C. Smith, of Winterset, Madison County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Iowa. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Charles S. Briggs, of Carbondale, Osage County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Kansas. Appointed September 29, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

James M. Humphrey, of Fort Scott, Bourbon County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Kansas. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Charles W. Landis, of Osborne, Osborne County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Kansas. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

James C. O. Morse, of Hutchinson, Reno County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Kansas. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

William H. Smith, of Marysville, Marshall County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Kansas. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Asa Smith, of Parsons, La Bette County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Kansas. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Charles K. Caron, of Louisville, Jefferson County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Kentucky. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Robert H. Elliston, of Williamstown, Grant County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Kentucky. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Erastus Bainbridge, of Owenton, Owen County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Kentucky. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

John Bright, of Stanford, Lincoln County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of Kentucky. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Jeremiah G. Forester, of Harlan, Harlan County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eleventh supervisor's district of Kentucky. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Elisha M. Flack, of Hopkinsville, Christian County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Kentucky. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

William N. Foster, of Greensburg, Green County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Kentucky. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Henry S. Howes, of Paintsville, Johnson County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Tenth supervisor's district of Kentucky. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Clarence G. McAlister, of Owingsville, Bath County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of Kentucky. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Alfred C. Moore, of Marion, Crittenden County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Kentucky. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

William B. Peyton, of Keatchie, De Soto Parish, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Louisiana. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Charles W. Phillips, of Lonewa, Ouachita Parish, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Louisiana. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Peter H. Segura, of New Iberia, Iberia Parish, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Louisiana. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

John Yoist, of New Roads, Pointe Coupee Parish, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Louisiana. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

William Clegg, of Lafayette, Lafayette Parish, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Louisiana. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Albert E. Livandais, of New Orleans, Orleans Parish, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Louisiana. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

James A. Place, of South Berwick, York County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Maine. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Elmer P. Spofford, of Deer Isle, Hancock County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Maine. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Adolphus H. Harrington, of Frederick, Frederick County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Maryland. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Oscar L. Quinlan, of Baltimore, Baltimore County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Maryland. Appointed September 13, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

William T. S. Rollins, of Seat Pleasant, Prince George County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Maryland. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

B. Gootee Stevens, of Williston, Caroline County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Maryland. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Horace G. Wadlin, of Boston, Suffolk County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of Massachusetts. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Ethel M. Allen, of Portland, Ionia County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Michigan. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Robert J. Bates, of Ironwood, Gogebic County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Twelfth supervisor's district of Michigan. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Flavius L. Brooke, of Detroit, Wayne County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Michigan. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

George H. Brown, of Port Huron, St. Clair County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Michigan. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Elbert V. Chilson, of Lansing, Ingham County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Michigan. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

James K. Flood, of Hart, Oceana County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of Michigan. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Charles H. Gurney, of Hillsdale, Hillsdale County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Michigan. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Charles R. Jackson, of East Tawas, Iosco County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Tenth supervisor's district of Michigan. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Festus R. Metcalf, of Adrian, Lenawee County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Michigan. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Charles L. Rarden, of Greenville, Montcalm County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eleventh supervisor's district of Michigan. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Otto L. Sprague, of Owosso, Shiawassee County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of Michigan. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Benjamin S. Wing, of Hastings, Barry County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Michigan. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Elmer E. Adams, of Fergus Falls, Otter Tail County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Minnesota. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Charles S. Cairns, of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Minnesota. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Arthur N. Dare, of Elk River, Sherburne County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Minnesota. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Lewis D. Frost, of Winona, Winona County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Minnesota. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

James G. Hamlin, of Blue Earth City, Faribault County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Minnesota. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Harry B. Wakefield, of Hutchinson, McLeod County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Minnesota. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Edward Yanish, of St. Paul, Ramsey County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Minnesota. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Charles Banks, of Clarksdale, Coahoma County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Mississippi. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Robert M. Bourdeaux, of Meridian, Lauderdale County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Mississippi. Appointed September 23, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Harvey E. Fitts, of Aberdeen, Monroe County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Mississippi. Appointed October 21, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Gines E. Galcerau, of Sturgis, Oktibbeha County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Mississippi. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

William A. McDonald, of Ashland, Benton County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Mississippi. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

William H. Mounger, of Enterprise, Clarke County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Mississippi. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Willis E. Mollison, of Vicksburg, Warren County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Mississippi. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

George J. Baer, of Kansas City, Jackson County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Missouri. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Jo Broaddus, of Chillicothe, Livingston County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Missouri. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Charles A. Davault, of Farber, Audrain County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of Missouri. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Samuel J. Harrison, of Hannibal, Marion County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Missouri. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Jerome S. Higgins, of St. Louis, St. Louis County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eleventh supervisor's district of Missouri. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Elmer E. E. McJimsey, of Maryville, Nodaway County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Missouri. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Barton J. Morrow, of Neosho, Newton County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Thirteenth supervisor's district of Missouri. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Harry H. Parsons, of Marshall, Saline County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Missouri. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Joseph M. Pidcock, of Greenfield, Dade County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Missouri. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Frank W. Rauchenstein, of Clayton, St. Louis County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Tenth supervisor's district of Missouri. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

James F. Reed, of Liberty, Clay County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Missouri. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Benjamin T. Walker, of Dexter, Stoddard County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Twelfth supervisor's district of Missouri. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

John W. Vosholl, of Linn, Osage County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of Missouri. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

John E. Rickards, of Butte, Silver Bow County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of Montana. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Richard S. Berlin, of Omaha, Douglas County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Nebraska.

Isaiah D. Evans, of Kenesaw, Adams County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Nebraska. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Thomas E. Hibbert, of Adams, Gage County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Nebraska. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Frederick W. Miller, of Falls City, Richardson County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Nebraska. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

John T. Mallalieu, of Kearney, Buffalo County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of

Nebraska. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

William E. Peebles, of Pender, Thurston County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Nebraska. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Earl W. Tremont, of Eureka, Eureka County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of Nevada. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

John Blowe, of Camden, Camden County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of New Jersey. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

James M. Denton, of Paterson, Passaic County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of New Jersey. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

William L. James, of Riverton, Burlington County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of New Jersey. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Samuel A. Smith, of Newark, Essex County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of New Jersey. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Charles S. Tunis, of Imlaystown, Monmouth County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of New Jersey. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

John H. Weastell, of Jersey City, Hudson County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of New Jersey. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Pedro Sanchez, of Santa Fe, Santa Fe County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of New Mexico. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Walter B. Atterbury, of Brooklyn, Kings County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of New York. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

John Batchelor, of Utica, Oneida County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Thirteenth supervisor's district of New York. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Frank D. Cole, of Cairo, Greene County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of New York. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

William B. Collins, of Gloversville, Fulton County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of New York. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Edgar M. Gordon, of Port Jervis, Orange County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Tenth supervisor's district of New York. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Warren S. Hodgman, of Painted Post, Steuben County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifteenth supervisor's district of New York. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Matthew A. Heeran, of Rensselaer, Rensselaer County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of New York. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

John W. Hannan, of Rochester, Monroe County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Nineteenth supervisor's district of New York. Appointed September 23, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

John T. Roberts, of Syracuse, Onondaga County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Twelfth supervisor's district of New York. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Joseph Schnell, of Binghamton, Broome County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eleventh supervisor's district of New York. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

James R. Stevens, of Cohoes, Albany County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of New York. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Frank S. Steenberge, of North Bangor, Franklin County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of New York. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Charles S. Wilbur, of New York, New York County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of New York. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

James L. Williams, of Poughkeepsie, Dutchess County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of New York. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Frederic A. Weed, of Potsdam, St. Lawrence County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of New York. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Reuben J. Myers, of Auburn, Cayuga County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourteenth supervisor's district of New York. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

John A. Warren, of Fredonia, Chautauqua County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixteenth supervisor's district of New York. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

James A. Hamilton, of Buffalo, Erie County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventeenth supervisor's district of New York. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Albert J. Slaight, of West Sparta, Livingston County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighteenth supervisor's district of New York. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Gustavus A. Bingham, of Salisbury, Rowan County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of North Carolina. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

John T. B. Hoover, of Hillsboro, Orange County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of North Carolina. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Joseph J. Jenkins, of Pittsboro, Chatham County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of North Carolina. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

John A. Hendricks, of Marshall, Madison County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of North Carolina. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Wheeler Martin, of Williamston, Martin County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of North Carolina. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Augustus M. Moore, of Greenville, Pitt County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of North Carolina. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Osmund F. Pool, of Taylorsville, Alexander County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of North Carolina. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Walter B. Steele, of High Point, Guilford County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of North Carolina. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Andrew H. Laughlin, of Lisbon, Ransom County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of North Dakota. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

William Binkley, of Sidney, Shelby County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Ohio. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Edwin Batt, of Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Nineteenth supervisor's district of Ohio. Appointed November 22, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Charles F. Brotherton, of Ashtabula, Ashtabula County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighteenth supervisor's district of Ohio. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Edward Q. Crane, of Batavia, Clermont County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Ohio. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Sylvester W. Durflinger, of London, Madison County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Ohio. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Frank M. Martin, of Caldwell, Noble County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourteenth supervisor's district of Ohio. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Louis B. Fauver, of Elyria, Lorain County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Thirteenth supervisor's district of Ohio. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Isaac H. Gaston, of St. Clairsville, Belmont County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifteenth supervisor's district of Ohio. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

William T. Hoopes, of Marysville, Union County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Ohio. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

William M. Hostetter, of Lisbon, Columbiana County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventeenth supervisor's district of Ohio. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Urban H. Hester, of Van Wert, Van Wert County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Ohio. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Alexander Kiskadden, of Tiffin, Seneca County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Twelfth supervisor's district of Ohio. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Winfield S. Lambert, of South Webster, Scioto County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of Ohio. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Frank P. Richter, of Hamilton, Butler County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Ohio. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

George Stoddard, of Wyoming, Hamilton County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Ohio. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Otto E. Vollenweider, of McArthur, Vinton County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Tenth supervisor's district of Ohio. Appointed September 13, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Henry A. Williams, of Columbus, Franklin County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eleventh supervisor's district of Ohio. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Robert J. West, of Toledo, Lucas County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of Ohio. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Ivan G. Conkling, of Enid, Garfield County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of Oklahoma. Appointed September 29, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

George F. Telfer, of Portland, Multnomah County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Oregon. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Curtis B. Winn, of Albany, Linn County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Oregon. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

James L. Allison, of Punxsutawney, Jefferson County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourteenth supervisor's district of Pennsylvania. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Charles H. Ainey, of Montrose, Susquehanna County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Pennsylvania. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Harry D. Beaston, of Philadelphia, Philadelphia County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Pennsylvania. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

James M. Barnett, of New Bloomfield, Perry County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of Pennsylvania. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Charles A. Durant, of Wilkesbarre, Luzerne County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Pennsylvania. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

James M. Esler, of Tarentum, Allegheny County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighteenth supervisor's district of Pennsylvania. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

John R. Edwards, of Scranton, Lackawanna County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Pennsylvania. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Frank M. Fuller, of Uniontown, Fayette County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventeenth supervisor's district of Pennsylvania. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

James A. McMillin, of Harlansburg, Lawrence County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Nineteenth supervisor's district of Pennsylvania. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Henry A. Reed, of Sunbury, Northumberland County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Tenth supervisor's district of Pennsylvania. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Howard G. Reitzel, of Mahanoy City, Schuylkill County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Pennsylvania. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Albert F. Shenck, of Lancaster, Lancaster County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of Pennsylvania. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

George R. Scull, of Somerset, Somerset County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Thirteenth supervisor's district of Pennsylvania. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Henry G. Seip, of Easton, Northampton County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Pennsylvania. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Milford H. Stebbins, of Wellsboro, Tioga County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eleventh supervisor's district of Pennsylvania. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

William B. Sterrett, of Titusville, Crawford County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifteenth supervisor's district of Pennsylvania. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

D. Smith Talbot, of West Chester, Chester County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Pennsylvania. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

George W. Youngson, of Parnassus, Westmoreland County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixteenth supervisor's district of Pennsylvania. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Charles A. Zerbe, of Lewistown, Mifflin County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Twelfth supervisor's district of Pennsylvania. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

George H. Webb, of Providence, Providence County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of Rhode Island. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Lindsey J. Breeden, of Bennettsville, Marlboro County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of South Carolina. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Thomas J. Cunningham, of Clowney, Chester County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of South Carolina. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Samuel A. Pearce, of Columbia, Richland County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of South Carolina. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

David H. Russell, of Anderson, Anderson County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of South Carolina. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

George W. Shell, of Laurens, Laurens County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of South Carolina. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Jonathan W. Wheeler, of Charleston, Charleston County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of South Carolina. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

John L. Burke, of Hot Springs, Fall River County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of South Dakota. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

David Williams, of Webster, Day County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of South Dakota. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Judson S. Hill, of Morristown, Hamblen County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Tennessee. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Archelaus M. Hughes, of Columbia, Maury County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Tennessee. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Joel J. Jones, of Fayetteville, Lincoln County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Tennessee. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Daniel A. McDougal, of Savannah, Hardin County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of Tennessee. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Elwood W. Mattson, of Chattanooga, Hamilton County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Tennessee. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

George H. Morgan, of Cookeville, Putnam County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Tennessee. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

James R. Penland, of Sevierville, Sevier County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Tennessee. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Peter P. Pickard, of Waverly, Humphreys County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Tennessee. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

James D. Senter, of Humboldt, Gibson County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of Tennessee. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Thomas F. Tobin, of Memphis, Shelby County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Tenth supervisor's district of Tennessee. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

William D. Bell, of Quanah, Hardeman County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Texas. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Jeff D. Burns, of Tyler, Smith County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Texas. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Thomas H. Dwyer, of Brenham, Washington County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Twelfth supervisor's district of Texas. Appointed November 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Dunn R. Emerson, of Marlin, Falls County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of Texas. Appointed November 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Kennan S. Fisher, of Ennis, Ellis County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Texas. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Robert M. Kelso, of Denton, Denton County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Texas. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Edward R. McLean, of Austin, Travis County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Tenth supervisor's district of Texas. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

James O. Luby, of San Diego, Duval County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Thirteenth supervisor's district of Texas. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Willis G. Robinson, of San Antonio, Bexar County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Texas. Appointed October 21, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Hart Settle, of Galveston, Galveston County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eleventh supervisor's district of Texas. Appointed November 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Emmett W. Smith, of Nacogdoches, Nacogdoches County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of Texas. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

John B. Stephens, of Mount Pleasant, Titus County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Texas. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Samuel M. Vernon, of Brownwood, Brown County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Texas. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Arthur Pratt, of Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of Utah. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Walter B. Gates, of Burlington, Chittenden County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the —— supervisor's district of Vermont. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

George W. Blankenship, of Jonesville, Lee County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of Virginia. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Robert R. Campbell, of Warrenton, Fauquier County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of Virginia. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Charles C. Carrington, of Houston, Halifax County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Virginia. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Charles M. Hirt, of Rocky Mount, Franklin County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Virginia. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Robert T. Hubard, of Bolling, Buckingham County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Tenth supervisor's district of Virginia. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Francis R. Lassiter, of Petersburg, Dinwiddie County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Virginia. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

George T. Scarburgh, of Accomack, Accomack County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Virginia. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Henning E. Smith, of Suffolk, Nansemond County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Virginia. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Chapman P. Snead, of Etna Mills, King William County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Virginia. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

John M. Steck, of Winchester, Frederick County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Virginia. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Joseph B. McMillan, of Fairhaven, Whatcom County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Washington. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Austin Mires, of Ellensburg, Kittitas County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Washington. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Thomas A. Brown, of Elizabeth, Wirt County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of West Virginia. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Edmund L. Dunn, of Red Sulphur Springs, Monroe County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of West Virginia. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Harvey W. Harner, of Clarksburg, Harrison County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of West Virginia. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Lamar C. Powell, of Fairmont, Marion County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of West Virginia. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Frank S. Baldwin, of Waupaca, Waupaca County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Wisconsin. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Jens B. Jensen, of Ellsworth, Pierce County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of Wisconsin. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Alonzo A. Loper, of Ripon, Fond du Lac County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Wisconsin. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Eugene McIntyre, of Waldo, Sheboygan County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Wisconsin. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

John W. Miller, of Wausau, Marathon County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of Wisconsin. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Richard Meyer, jr., of Lancaster, Grant County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Wisconsin. Appointed September 9, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Andrew J. Turner, of Portage, Columbia County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Wisconsin. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Charles W. Riner, of Cheyenne, Laramie County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of Wyoming. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Charles S. Van Auken, of La Crosse, La Crosse County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Wisconsin. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Alfred G. Wright, of Milwaukee, Milwaukee County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Wisconsin. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate December 6, 1899.

SECRETARY OF WAR.

Elihu Root, of New York, to be Secretary of War.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 7, 1899.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSIONER.

Joseph W. Fifer, of Illinois, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term ending March 9, 1904.

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF THE CENSUS.

Frederick H. Wines, of Springfield, Ill., to be Assistant Director of the Census.

REGISTER OF WILLS.

Louis A. Dent, of the District of Columbia, to be register of wills of the District of Columbia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *December 7, 1899.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday last was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that two members are present ready to be sworn in.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hawley, a member-elect from the State of Texas, is ready to be sworn in.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Howard, of Georgia, Mr. Speaker, is also ready to be sworn in.

Mr. Hawley, of Texas, and Mr. Howard, of Georgia, having presented themselves at the bar of the House, were duly qualified, taking the oath of office prescribed by law.

COMMITTEE ON RULES.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will direct the Clerk to announce the following Committee on Rules.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMITTEE ON RULES.

The Speaker; Mr. DALZELL of Pennsylvania, Mr. GROSVENOR of Ohio, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee, Mr. BAILEY of Texas.

SPECIAL EMPLOYEES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer the resolution which I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read.

Mr. SULZER. I suppose the resolution will be read for information?

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read, after which the Chair will ask if there be objection to its consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That during the Fifty-sixth Congress, and until the organization of the Fifty-seventh Congress, Isaac R. Hill be authorized to act as special employee of the House of Representatives and receive a compensation at the rate of $1,500 per annum.

That Ewing C. Bland and Felton B. Knight be authorized to act as special messengers of the House of Representatives, each to receive a compensation at the rate of $1,200 per annum; and

That James F. English be authorized to act as special chief page of the House of Representatives, at the rate of $800 per annum.

The compensation of said employees to be paid from the contingent fund until otherwise provided.

That John T. Chancey be continued during the Fifty-sixth Congress as a special employee of the House at the annual compensation of $1,500.

Said officers shall at all times be under the direction and control of the Speaker of the House, and they shall be subject to removal for cause at any time by him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution just reported?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY], this resolution is exactly in accordance with the resolution passed at the beginning of each session.

Mr. TAWNEY. It is. The first four named in the resolution are the officers assigned to the minority, and they are the ones selected by the minority caucus. The other (Mr. Chancey) has been selected by the caucus of the Republicans. The resolution does not increase the number of employees of the House at all.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Does the resolution provide for the pages?

Mr. TAWNEY. It does.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, upon that point I want to say a word. We have about 175 members occupying seats on this side of the Chamber and about the same number on the other side. If I am correctly informed, in the division of the pages, 10 have been assigned to that side of the House and 5 to this side.

Mr. TAWNEY. I did not understand the gentleman's inquiry. I understood him to ask if the resolution provided for the pay of these officers. There is nothing stated in the resolution in respect to the pages, except as to Mr. English, the chief page on that side. It has never been the custom heretofore to divide the pages by resolution.

Mr. RICHARDSON. No, I know that is not the custom, and I shall not insist upon that; but I did want to give expression to what I have already said, Mr. Speaker, and that is, it seems to me that we ought to have a better division of the pages, for we find in our efforts to be waited upon here that it is impossible, with the small number assigned to this side, to get fair service.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will say to the gentleman that the present division is nine upon this side of the House and seven upon that side of the House; but I understand that it is the intention, as soon as the House is organized, to make a more equal division, owing to the increased number upon that side. There will be no trouble upon that score at all.

Mr. RICHARDSON. That will be satisfactory.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the resolution just reported?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Speaker, I desire to see if an amicable arrangement can not be made on the part of the House for the consideration of the finance bill, which is now known as House bill No. 1. Some gentlemen on both sides have made inquiry as to when debate on that bill may be begun. I learn that there is quite a general feeling, shared at least by the members on this side of the Chamber, in favor of an immediate consideration of that bill; and I trust that some arrangement may be made with members on the other side of the Chamber whereby that proposition may be taken up soon. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in Committee of the Whole, beginning immediately after the reading of the Journal on Monday next.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will yield to me for a moment.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this is a most unusual proposition. Here is a great financial measure presented to the House. It has never been considered by any committee of the House. We learn from the press that the bill has been matured, carefully prepared, carefully considered during the vacation, by a committee selected by the majority to prepare this bill. It has been put in shape, it seems, after the amplest consideration by that committee, in this city and in other cities, the committee having sat, if we are correctly informed, at various places in the United States. I do not object to that, but I do think that when they come here with a bill carefully prepared, deliberately arranged, carefully studied in all its details by that committee and by gentlemen on that side of the House who have had access to—I do not say it offensively—the secret consultations and deliberations of that committee, we on this side are placed at a very serious disadvantage.

No member on this side of the House even knows the contents of the bill we will be called upon to consider. No committee on this side of the House has had an opportunity to analyze its provisions, to be able to state to this House and to this country what we think of it. So, Mr. Speaker, when we are confronted here by a proposition to grant unanimous consent that such a financial measure, of the gravity and importance of this bill, shall be taken up after two intervening week days, on next Monday, and then to be considered, it seems to me it is utterly unreasonable to suppose that we can be expected to agree to such a proposition. We insist that the bill shall be introduced; that it shall be referred to a regular committee of this House appointed by the Speaker, which shall act upon it as committees act upon other great measures and even the smallest measures that come before this House for consideration. There is no immediate necessity for the passage of this bill in a few hours.

There is no financial trouble ahead of us, it seems to me, for the next ten days, two weeks, or a month. We want to consider it; and I insist that instead of taking it up without any kind of an investigation by gentlemen on this side of the House, that it should go to a committee, and that committee should be composed of members of the majority and members of the minority, that they may carefully scan the bill and learn something of its details, and that it may be presented as every great measure and as all small

measures are presented to this House. That is the position that I take, and that is the only position I am authorized to take. I shall have to object to unanimous consent.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Tennessee if he would object to printing in the Record a statement prepared by myself relative to the provisions of the bill?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Why, Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman objects to the request for unanimous consent for the consideration of bill No. 1. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement touching the provisions of the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I suppose the gentleman would print the bill we are to consider.

Mr. OVERSTREET. The bill is already printed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The bill, you say, is printed?

Mr. OVERSTREET. The bill has been introduced and has been printed, and is known as House bill No. 1. I want to ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a statement concerning the provisions of the bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I conferred, Mr. Speaker, with the gentleman from Indiana, and he told me that he had prepared something of a nonpartisan statement, analyzing the bill that he asks us to give unanimous consent to consider.

Mr. TERRY. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Indiana if his request covers anything but the printing of the bill?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Oh, the bill has been printed already. The bill is introduced.

Mr. TERRY. What else do you want to print?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I ask for order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Let there be order in the House, so that gentlemen may hear.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the gentleman from Arkansas, I will say that the bill has been regularly introduced and is now in print, the same as any other bill before the House.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I desire to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. OVERSTREET. The request which I want to make is that I may be permitted to print in the RECORD a statement in the nature of an analysis of that bill.

Mr. TERRY. I understand, then, that you want, in substance, to print in the RECORD of this Congress a stump speech in favor of that bill. I object. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. OVERSTREET. Not at all. I was making an inquiry of the gentleman from Tennessee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas objects.

Mr. MADDOX. I would like to ask the gentleman a question before he takes his seat.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I yield.

Mr. MCCULLOCH rose.

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I yield to the gentleman who rose to ask me a question.

Mr. MADDOX. I hear it stated around me——

Mr. McCULLOCH. I desire to say to the gentleman from Indiana that I am informed by friends around me that none of those bills can be had. They have been exhausted, and I suggest that more bills be printed.

Mr. MADDOX. That is the question I was about to ask.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I would suggest that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. OVERSTREET. The bill and statement. I then renew the request, at the suggestion of my friend from New York, that the bill and statement be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I hope the gentleman from Arkansas will withdraw his objection.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest, if that be done, that there be some statement with reference to the size of the type. The type that the RECORD is usually printed in is too small for convenient reading and making any comment on. I think there should be twenty or thirty thousand copies of the bill itself, printed in the usual bill form, because if you take the bill in its regular form you can make such comment and annotation indicating such amendment as you desire to offer, whereas if you print the bill in the RECORD it is closely printed, in small type, difficult to read, and impossible to annotate.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I would like to ask the gentleman——

Mr. RICHARDSON. Let the gentleman make the request to print 5,000 copies of the bill.

Mr. OVERSTREET. The bill itself?

Mr. RICHARDSON. In bill form, to be distributed through the folding room, instead of going to the document room, where one or a dozen members may go and get the whole number that have been printed. Let it be divided among the members evenly.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I approve that request of the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend until the House is in order.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Say 10,000 copies.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Well.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana will suspend until there is order in the House.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Speaker, at the suggestion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], which I approve, I request that 10,000 copies of the bill be printed and distributed through the folding room in the ordinary pro rata to members.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that 10,000 copies of the House bill No. 1 be printed and distributed to members pro rata through the folding room.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Let me conclude my request. And an equal number——

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Then I request that an equal number of the statement be printed and distributed in like manner.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I do.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Is the bill in the hands of the House, bill No. 1, the one you expect to pass in the House, or are there amendments which you propose to offer?

Mr. OVERSTREET. The bill known as House bill No. 1 is the bill we desire to be considered.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Have there not been amendments agreed upon which you expect to offer?

Mr. OVERSTREET. No amendments to the bill; this is the bill in its entirety.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I have no objection, Mr. Speaker, to the printing of the statement. I would like, however, to ask the gentleman if he knows whether there will be any amendments presented?

Mr. OVERSTREET. That is something I can not answer.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Will the gentleman from Indiana present any amendments?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I have no amendments myself to present.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I want to say that the difficulty in getting consent to print the statement is the difficulty I presented a moment ago. This is the statement of the majority. In all cases where bills are considered there is a minority representation. Before any statement is printed that minority has a right to submit its views, and those views are printed, and they go out with the report or argument of the majority in the case. Now, in this case there would nothing go out except the ex parte argument or statement of the majority. For that reason I object.

Mr. OVERSTREET. If the gentleman will pardon me a moment, I have no objection in the world that a reasonable time, such as the gentleman shall name, shall be granted within which the minority, if it so chooses, may prepare a statement containing their views on this identical proposition, and that they shall have accorded to them the same privilege of printing a number of copies equal to the request I make.

Mr. TERRY. We want to start out together.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT FROM UTAH.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the special committee appointed to investigate into the right of Brigham H. Roberts to a seat in the House of Representatives be authorized to sit during the sessions of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. TAYLER of Ohio, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

ADDYSTON PIPE COMPANY ET AL. AGAINST THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the Addyston Pipe Company against the United States, decided during this week. It is an opinion upon the subject of trusts and the application of the so-called Sherman law to the trusts of the country. As the House knows, these printed copies are not furnished to the House, and there is only a very limited number of them printed. I have secured one copy, and I offer a resolution that 5,000 copies of this opinion be printed for the use of the House

of Representatives as a document, to be delivered, through the folding room, to the members of the House under existing rules.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Who delivered the opinion of the court?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Judge Peckham, of New York.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to hear what the gentleman from Ohio is saying.

The SPEAKER. The point is well taken. In matters of unanimous consent it is due to both sides of the House that they may distinctly hear what request is being made. The Chair appeals to members to observe order.

Mr. HULL. Will not the gentleman from Ohio make the request for distribution through the folding room?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have already made that request.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] send his resolution to the Clerk's desk, and then members will understand what it is? The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That 5,000 copies of the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of The Addyston Pipe and Steel Company et al., appellants, *vs.* The United States, case No. 51, October 7, 1899, be printed for the use of the House, and be distributed to the members through the folding room under existing practice.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio how long this opinion is. I have not seen it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Twenty pages of this size.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The object of my inquiry is that if it should cost more than $500 to print it the House can not pass a resolution to that effect.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am not a printer, but I am quite sure that it will not cost one-quarter of it.

Mr. TERRY. What is the object of having this printed?

Mr. GROSVENOR. The object is to give the members of this House certain copies of this opinion for their own use, in such manner as they may see fit, and if they wish, to send to the various business associations in their districts.

Mr. TERRY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio, before consent is given, if that opinion is for or against trusts and combines?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is very decidedly and far-reachingly opposed to trusts. [Laughter.]

Mr. TERRY. With that assurance on the part of the gentleman from Ohio, I do not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

DEATH OF HON. WILLIAM L. GREENE.

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Speaker, I have been delegated by the Congressional delegation from the State of Nebraska to announce to this body the death of our late colleague, Hon. William L. Greene, a Representative-elect from the Sixth district of the State of Nebraska.

At some future time the delegation from our State will ask the House to set apart a day for the purpose of paying proper tribute to the memory of our deceased colleague.

For the present I desire to offer the resolutions which I send to the desk and ask their immediate adoption.

The SPEAKER. The resolutions will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. William L. Greene, late a Representative from the State of Nebraska.
Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.
Resolved, That as a mark of respect to his memory, the House do now adjourn.

The resolutions were unanimously adopted; and accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting 926 reports of inspections of disbursements by officers of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Chicago River, in Illinois—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of the mouth of the Columbia River, Oregon and Washington—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting certain data and information relating to armor plate—to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of that Department—to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a combined statement of the receipts and expenditures of the Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting an additional estimate of appropriation for the light-ship service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, relating to the annual report of the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the case of the brig *Sally* (French spoliation claim) against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Dunkirk Harbor, New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Quincy, Ill.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Pull-and-be-damned Point, Portsmouth, N. H.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Tangier Sound, Virginia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of St. François River, Virginia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Brunswick, Ga., inner harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Powells River, Virginia and Tennessee—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Port Chester Harbor, New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of harbor at Oconto, Wis.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Richland River, Tennessee—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Napa River, California—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Suisun Creek, California—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Sonoma Creek, California—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Kenosha Harbor, Wisconsin—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of harbor at Two Rivers, Wis.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Port Washington, Wis.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Bay Shore, Long Island, New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Beverly Harbor, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Red River, Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Kenduskeag River, Maine—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Ocklockonne River, Florida—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Muskegon River, Michigan—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Colorado River, Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Middle Ground Bar, Hampton Roads, Virginia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Queenstown Harbor, Maryland—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Delaware River, from Trenton to its mouth—to the Committee on River and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of the Mississippi River at or near Beechridge, Ill.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of the channel between the Straits of Carquinez and the Golden Gate (California), off Point Pinole, Point Wilson, and Lone Tree Point—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, with accompanying papers, relative to the occupation of public river and harbor works by private individuals—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of harbor at Brazos, Santiago, off Point Isabel, Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of the receipts and expenditures on account of the appropriation for contingent expenses for the War Department for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899—to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of survey of West Fork River, West Virginia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Penobscot River, Maine—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of survey of Elk River in Tennessee and Alabama—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Copper Harbor, Michigan—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of the Mississippi River at or near Wagners Landing, in Jackson County, below Rockwood, Ill.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of the waterway between Charleston Harbor and Alligator Creek, South Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of survey of the Mississippi River at Bellevue, Iowa—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Threemile Harbor, Long Island—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of the Youghiogheny River at McKeesport, Pa.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of East Pass, at the entrance of Carrabelle Harbor, Florida—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Claiborne Harbor, Maryland—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of a harbor of refuge near Cape Lookout, North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of a harbor at Hyannis, Mass.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Guyandotte River, West Virginia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Current River, Missouri—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Vineyard Haven, Mass.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of the Red River of the North, Minnesota and Dakota—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Crescent Bay, California—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Westport Point Harbor, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of a canal connecting Lake Superior and the Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Elk River, West Virginia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of the Minnesota River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Sag Harbor, N. Y.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Boca Grande and Charlotte Harbor, Florida—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of a portion of Snake River, extending from the town of Asotin, Wash., to Pittsburg Landing, Oreg.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Commissioner of Labor, transmitting a statement of all moneys expended under his direction during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Alligator Head, in Matagorda Bay, Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 2537) to create the central division of the southern district of Iowa for judicial purposes, and to fix the time and place for holding court therein—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2538) to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 2539) to fix the salaries of the several chief justices and associate justices of the supreme court of the Territories of Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma at the rate now paid to the judges of the United States courts in the Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 2540) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce"—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 2541) to provide for the readjustment and payment of dues to Army officers in certain cases—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 2542) to authorize the Cambridge bridge commission to construct a drawless bridge across the Charles River, in the State of Massachusetts—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPRAGUE: A bill (H. R. 2543) relative to the retirement of officers of the Army below the rank of brigadier-general, and pay therefor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LATIMER: A bill (H. R. 2544) to abolish the office of justice of the peace within and for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2545) for the extension of New Hampshire avenue—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2546) to equalize the several States of the Union in the grant of lands for school purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2547) relating to the distribution of seeds, bulbs, and so forth—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 2548) to authorize the Secretary of War to cause to be investigated and to provide for the payment of all claims for the use and occupation of church and school buildings and grounds for Government purposes by the United States military authorities, and all claims for damages resulting from the appropriation to Government use of any of the furnishings or materials in said class of buildings—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: A bill (H. R. 2549) for the erection of a public building at Holyoke, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 2550) fixing the salaries and compensation of the chief justices and associate justices of the supreme courts in the Territories of Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma, and making appropriations to pay the same—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 2551) to provide for the further distribution of the Reports of the Supreme Court—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTEY: A bill (H. R. 2552) for the relief of soldiers and sailors—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 2553) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to contract for the building of new lock and dam at or near the mouth of Green River, State of Kentucky, and making appropriations therefor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2554) for the erection of a public building in the city of Hopkinsville, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 2555) to change the rules of evidence and amend section 878, Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 2556) to enable the people of Oklahoma to form a constitution and State government, and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. DALY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 2557) to provide for the erection of a public building at Jersey City, N. J.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEVY: A bill (H. R. 2558) to provide for and regulate the issue of circulating notes by banks and banking associations of deposit and discount organized and doing business under general incorporation acts of any State or Territory in the United States—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GAINES: A bill (H. R. 2559) for the purchase, by the United States, of land near the city of Nashville, Tenn., for a military post—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2560) to prevent the demonetization of or discrimination between, and to encourage a uniform purchasing power and sustain an even debt-paying quality of, the legal-tender standard money of the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROSIUS: A bill (H. R. 2561) for preventing the adulteration, misbranding, and imitation of foods, beverages, candies, drugs, and condiments in the District of Columbia and the Territories, and for regulating interstate traffic therein, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 2562) making appropriation to pay the judgment of the Court of Claims in favor of the New York Indians, and providing for distribution of same—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 2563) providing for public building at Tacoma, Wash.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2564) to establish a mint of the United States at Tacoma, in the State of Washington—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. STOKES: A bill (H. R. 2565) to extend free delivery of mail along star routes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2566) relating to future contracts in agricultural products—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2567) prohibiting the issue and use of free transportation in certain cases—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2568) to reduce the expenditures of the Government and equalize the burden of an appreciating money standard—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KLEBERG: A bill (H. R. 2569) making appropriation for Aransas Pass, and providing for improvement of said harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2570) to further define connecting lines of common carriers, their relationship to each other, and to those dealing with them, and to prescribe a rule of evidence as to such relationship, and to further prescribe their duties and liabilities when engaged in interstate commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 2571) to authorize the erection of a flagstaff in United States Capitol Park—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: A bill (H. R. 2572) to provide for the erection of a public building at Waltham, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2573) to provide for the erection of a public building at Marlboro, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 2574) for the improvement of Flint River, in Georgia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2575) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Americus, Ga., and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 2576) granting land warrants to soldiers and sailors of the Spanish-American war—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 2577) to preserve Fort Griswold property, in Groton, Conn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 2578) to reimburse the depositors of the Freedman's Savings and Trust Company for losses incurred by the failure of said company—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2579) to refund duties paid by the State of New York upon arms imported in 1863—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 2580) to subject the mineral lands on the Indian reservations in the Territory of Arizona to location, operation, development, and entry, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BREWER: A bill (H. R. 2581) to amend section 4716 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2582) to repeal "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," approved June 13, 1898—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 2583) in reference to civil service and appointments thereunder—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. BURKETT: A bill (H. R. 2584) to divide the district of

Nebraska into two divisions, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 2585) to provide for the erection of an armor-plate factory—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2586) to establish an arsenal at Birmingham, Ala.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2587) to amend section 858 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 2588) authorizing the Court of Claims to adjudicate certain claims arising under the provisions of the act of March 12, 1863, entitled "An act to provide for the collection of abandoned property and for the prevention of frauds in insurrectionary districts within the United States"—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GAINES: A bill (H. R. 2660) to amend the war-revenue act approved June 13, 1898, so as to exempt benevolent orders from its operation—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 2680) extending relief to Indian citizens, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: A bill (H. R. 2727) for the erection of a statue of the late Robert Dale Owen, of Indiana, to be placed in the grounds of the Smithsonian Institution—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 2776) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Maj. Gen. Henry Knox at Thomaston, Me.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 2825) making appropriation for a statue of the late Maj. Gen. John Sedgwick, in the city of Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 2844) to reduce letter postage to 1 cent per one-half ounce—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 2864) to create a commission to make settlement and adjustment with the Sioux City and Pacific Railroad Company of its indebtedness to the Government of the United States—to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 2914) to subject the Atlantic and Pacific Railroad, now the Santa Fe Pacific Railroad, passing through Arizona, to taxation—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 55) directing the Secretary of War to submit plans and estimates for the removal of rock obstructions from the south branch of the St. Lawrence River, at the head of Long Sault Island—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. NAPHEN: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 56) amending the Constitution of the United States and providing for uniform laws on the subject of marriage and divorce—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 57) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to suppress combinations and transactions in restraint of trade, and prescribing the terms and conditions upon which corporations may transact business outside of the State granting their charters—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 58) to repeal the joint resolution in reference to the Free Zone—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KITCHIN: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 59) to carry into effect two resolutions of the Continental Congress directing monuments to be erected to the memory of Gens. Francis Nash and William Lee Davidson, of North Carolina—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. STOKES: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 61) proposing an amendment to the Constitution authorizing a tax upon incomes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 62) authorizing the printing of 35,000 copies of Bulletin No. 24 of the Division of Forestry, Department of Agriculture—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 63) directing the Secretary of War to submit plans and estimates for the improvement of the Grasse River from its confluence with the St. Lawrence River to Massena, St. Lawrence County, N. Y.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 64) providing for the distribution of a complete set of Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies to duly organized Grand Army posts and associations of Confederate veterans in the United States—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. NAPHEN: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 3) requesting the Secretary of War to submit plans and estimate of deepening and widening Governors Island Channel at Boston Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A resolution (H. Res. 22) providing for a rule for the consideration of House bill No. 1, entitled "A bill to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BULL: A resolution (H. Res. 23) authorizing the Doorkeeper of the House to appoint 15 additional folders in the folding room of the House—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. COCHRANE of New York: A resolution (H. Res. 26) directing the Clerk of the House to pay S. D. Newcomb, from the contingent fund of the House, salary July, 1899, until said salary is provided for in the annual appropriation bill—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. ESCH: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Wisconsin, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a member of Congress from the State of Utah—to the Special Committee on the Roberts Case.

By Mr. SPERRY: A memorial of the general assembly of the State of Connecticut, praying for the exclusion of polygamists from membership in Congress—to the Special Committee on the Roberts Case.

By Mr. OTJEN: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Wisconsin, protesting against seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative from the State of Utah—to the Special Committee on the Roberts Case.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Wisconsin, protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative from the State of Utah—to the Special Committee on the Roberts Case.

By Mr. JENKINS: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Wisconsin, protesting against seating B. H. Roberts as a Representative from the State of Utah—to the Special Committee on the Roberts Case.

By Mr. MINOR: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Wisconsin, protesting against seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative from the State of Utah—to the Special Committee on the Roberts Case.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 2589) for increase of pension of Andrew J. Baldwin, of Providence, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2590) for the relief of Elizabeth Fulwiler—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2591) to pension Georgia Moseley, widow of John W. Moseley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2592) for the relief of A. B. Gilliland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BREWER: A bill (H. R. 2593) for the relief of A. W. Davis, of Autauga County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2594) granting a pension to Nancy McGuire—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2595) granting a pension to W. C. Griffin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2596) for the relief of John W. Martin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARNEY: A bill (H. R. 2597) to increase the pension of Charles Kauffung—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 2598) to remove the charge of desertion against William H. Springer, late a private in Battery H, First Rhode Island Light Artillery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRENNER: A bill (H. R. 2599) granting pension to Philip Yoe, late of Company C, Third Maryland Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2600) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Joseph G. Denius, late Company B, One hundred and twelfth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2601) granting a pension to Louisa A. Ritchey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELL (by request): A bill (H. R. 2602) for the relief of the heirs of Margaret Kennedy—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARKE of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 2603) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Colby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLAYTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 2604) for the relief of John P. Murphy—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 2605) granting a pension to Green H. Honeycutt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2606) granting a pension to John T. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2607) granting a pension to Jo. W. James—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas (by request): A bill (H. R. 2608) for the relief of Charles Gallagher, and to refer his claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLAYTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 2609) to grant a pension to Kate M. A. Mortensen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COCHRANE of New York: A bill (H. R. 2610) for the relief of Bridget McGrane—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2611) granting arrears of pension to Pauline M. Beach, widow of Henry S. Beach, deceased, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment Michigan Infantry Volunteers, and First Regiment Michigan Heavy Artillery Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2612) for the relief of Peter J. Van Zandt, Company F, Second New York Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2613) to remove charges of desertion, and so forth, against certain veterans of the late civil war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUSACK: A bill (H. R. 2614) granting a pension to Harriet E. Gates—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: A bill (H. R. 2615) to correct military record of Joseph Bence—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2616) to correct military record of Elbert Sutton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2617) for the relief of the legal representatives of Edwin De Leon, for $8,000 due him for judicial services—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2618) for the relief of the legal representatives of Edwin De Leon, deceased, late consul-general of the United States to Egypt—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2619) for the relief of Agnes and Maria De Leon—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 2620) for the relief of David A. McKnight—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. S. A. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 2621) granting a pension to Ida Wiederhold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2622) for the relief of Henry Ester—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2623) for the relief of Melville Oliphant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2624) for the relief of Frank Murphy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 2625) for the relief of Laura A. Willett, widow of James P. Willett, deceased, late postmaster of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EDDY: A bill (H. R. 2626) for the relief of John K. Arnold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 2627) to authorize the Secretary of War to convey certain Government land to the city of Waukegan, Ill.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2628) for relief of Ezekiel Downey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2629) for the relief of Peter Casey, late captain Company H, Nineteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2630) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Friedrich Bertram—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2631) for the correction of the record of and for the remuster of George W. Smith, late of Battery D, Third United States Colored Heavy Artillery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2632) for the relief of George Isenstein—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2633) for the relief of Charles Sommer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2634) to increase the pension of Erasmus Darwin Steen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2635) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against John O'Keefe—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2636) to increase the pension of Maurice F. Ellsworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 2637) granting a pension to Albert Hammer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2638) granting a pension to Hezekiah Faubian—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2639) granting a pension to Josiah D. Ditto—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREER: A bill (H. R. 2640) for the relief of Andrew J. Holley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2641) for the relief of James Burnett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2642) to pension Elizabeth Short—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2643) for the relief of John W. Trader—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2644) to pension John Cumpston for services in the late war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2645) for the relief of Hiram and Hatcher Short—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2646) for the relief of John H. Forbush—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2647) for the relief of David W. Harrison—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2648) to pension John Parsons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2649) for the relief of Thomas B. Kirk—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2650) for the relief of Benjamin Stribling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2651) granting an increase of pension to John S. Hall—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2652) to pension William J. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2653) to pension Elizabeth Hyman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2654) for the relief of Wilson S. Nugent—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2655) for the relief of Benjamin F. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2656) for the relief of John H. Gardner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2657) for the relief of Hiram Stewart—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GAINES: A bill (H. R. 2658) for the relief of Walter Scott—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2659) for the relief of Meriwether Snuff and Tobacco Company, at Clarksville, Tenn.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2661) for the relief of the estate of William H. Gill, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2662) for the relief of Mary B. Winbourn and James R. Winbourn—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2663) for the relief of William J. Thomas, of Springfield, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2664) for the relief of Tennessee Centennial Exposition Company—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2665) for the relief of Henry Langford, of Davidson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GORDON: A bill (H. R. 2666) for the relief of John M. Laughlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2667) granting an honorable discharge to Ferdinand Tobe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2668) granting an honorable discharge to Frank Chronabery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2669) for the relief of Levi Stoltz—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2670) for the relief of George S. Simon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2671) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary A. Lipps—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2672) for the relief of De Witt C. Nash—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2673) granting a pension to Eliza Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2674) for the relief of John Howell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2675) for the relief of George R. Gary—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2676) granting an honorable discharge to James Kelly—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2677) granting an honorable discharge to William H. H. Reppeto—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2678) granting a pension to Joseph B. Arbaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2679) granting an honorable discharge to John Norris—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 2681) granting a pension to Calista F. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2682) granting a pension to Mary J. Lawrence—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 2683) removing the charges of desertion from the records of the War Department from James Magee, Company A, Sixteenth Illinois Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2684) removing charge of desertion from John H. Jaques, member Company K, Seventh Regiment Iowa Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2685) for the relief of Henry H. Wright—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2686) to remove the charges of desertion against John Evans—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2687) to place on the muster roll the name of Francis M. Miller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2688) to remove the charges of desertion against David A. Wiles—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2689) removing the charges of desertion against Howard Hazen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2690) granting a pension to Mary Douglass—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2691) granting a pension to Eli Weathers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2692) granting a pension to Abbie L. Godfrey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2693) granting a pension to Elizabeth Rickey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2694) granting a pension to Maggie D. Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2695) granting a pension to James Birchard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2696) appropriating $50 to redeem a promise made by the Continental Congress to David Hart, a soldier of the Revolution—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2697) granting a pension to Albert M. Cox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2698) granting a pension to Albert Russell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2699) granting a pension to David A. Wiles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2700) granting a pension to Martha E. James, widow of Peter O. James, of Company G, Fourth Regiment Iowa Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2701) granting a pension to Thomas M. Bird—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2702) granting an increase of pension to Elijah N. Parkhurst—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2703) granting a pension to Moses Gibbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2704) to pension Hiram C. Rogers, of Allerton, Iowa—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2705) granting an increase of pension to Creed Bobbitt, late of Company C, Fifth Kansas Regiment Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2706) granting a pension to Mrs. Sarah J. Boles, widow of William H. Boles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 2707) to increase pension of Adele W. Elmer—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2708) for the relief of Cecelia B. Chauncey—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 2709) increasing the pension of Frederick William Becker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2710) to amend the military record of Henry Keeler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2711) to increase the pension of Morgan R. Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 2712) for the relief of Robert Orrick, of Winchester, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2713) for the relief of John Mann Methodist Episcopal Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2714) for the relief of James W. Nickens, of Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2715) for the relief of the heirs of John B. Almond, deceased, late of Page County, Va.—to the Commtitee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2716) for the relief of the trustees of Braddock Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Winchester, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2717) for the relief of Thomas E. Gold, of Clarke County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2718) for the relief of Branon Thatcher, of Frederick County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 2719) granting a pension to Albert C. Sheldon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2720) granting a pension to Louise S. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2721) for the relief of Myron Powers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2722) for the relief of James and William Crooks, of Canada—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2723) granting pensions to soldiers, sailors, and marines confined in so-called Confederate prisons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARMER: A bill (H. R. 2724) for the relief of William B. Reaney, surviving partner of the firm of Reaney, Son & Archbold—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: A bill (H. R. 2725) to correct the military record of James A. Root—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2726) to pension James A. Root—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2728) to pension Thomas T. Garrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2729) to pension Robinson C. Grable—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 2730) for the relief of Mary E. Gray, of Canton, Madison County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2731) for removal of charge of desertion of Samuel T. Loftin, Company E, First Louisiana Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2732) for the relief of the estate of William E. Bolls, deceased, late of Jefferson County, Miss.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2733) for the relief of the estate of Wirt Adams, deceased, late of Hinds County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2734) granting an increase of pension to Dolly L. Harrell, of Hinds County, Miss.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 2735) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie A. Barnes, widow of Nathan H. Barnes—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 2736) to change the name of the Potomac Insurance Company of Georgetown, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JACK: A bill (H. R. 2737) granting a pension to Hannah Osborne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2738) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Hoffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2739) granting a pension to Agnes Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2740) increasing the pension of Franklin Eckenroade, Company E, Sixty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2741) granting a pension to David Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2742) granting a pension to Margaret E. Guthrie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2743) to correct the military record of George H. Warren—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2744) to correct the military record of Aaron Loughner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2745) granting an increase of pension to John A. M. Seitz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2746) for the relief of Susan Coho—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2747) to pension Peter Lapoleon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2748) granting an increase of pension to Henry Schnettberg, of Indiana, Pa.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 2749) granting a pension to Susan Garrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2750) granting an increase of pension to Sarah K. Joice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 2751) for relief of Mrs. —— Tilton—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 2752) granting a pension to Edmund P. Tierney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2753) granting a pension to Patrick Bogan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2754) to grant a pension to Helen G. Hibbard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2755) granting a pension to Mrs. Annie Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2756) granting a pension to Fanny Hallett—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2757) to authorize the purchase of certain lands in the district of Alaska—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 2758) for the relief of the estate of William B. Todd, deceased—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2759) for the relief of the residuary legatees of Mark Davis, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2760) for increase of pension of James A. King, a veteran of the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2761) for the relief of the estate of Charles M. Roberts, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2762) for relief of Mary S. Graves—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 2763) granting a pension to Ada Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2764) granting a pension to Jane E. Auger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2765) to increase the pension of William Green—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: A bill (H. R. 2766) to increase the pension of Charles Weed from $17 to $30 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2767) increasing the pension of F. K. Sheldon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2768) to amend the military record of James H. Allen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2769) to amend the military record of Benjamin A. Viner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2770) amending the military record of James Sullivan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2771) to amend the military record of Nelson Vever—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2772) to amend the military record of Alexander Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2773) to amend the military record of C. F. Clark—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2774) to amend the naval record of Albert Burlingham, alias Albert Ward—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 2775) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Martha E. Jordan—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KLEBERG: A bill (H. R. 2777) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the heirs of Peter Johnson certain money due him for carrying the mail—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2778) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Trinidad Uribe certain money due him, held in the registry of the circuit court of the United States for the western district of Texas, but never paid over to him—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2779) for the relief of John G. Fawkner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LORIMER: A bill (H. R. 2780) for the relief of C. C. Roberts—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 2781) to correct the military record of John Bass—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2782) to grant a pension to Rachael McCord—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2783) to grant a pension to Felix G. Hendrickson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2784) to grant a pension to William H. Godwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2785) to grant a pension to Elizabeth C. Alexander—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2786) to grant a pension to William Burch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2787) to grant a pension to Manda B. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2788) to increase pension of James R. Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2789) to grant a pension to William H. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2790) granting an increase of pension to Hester A. Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2791) to increase the pension of Edward Dickerson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 2792) for the relief of Peter Cummings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 2793) for the relief of Joshua Fairclough, alias Joseph Whittle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 2794) for the relief of Virginia I. Mullan, of Annapolis, Md.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2795) for the relief of Milton F. Colburn, administrator of the estate of Gilbert Colburn, deceased, late of Annapolis, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2796) providing for reference to the Court of Claims of the claim of Albert Wood—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2797) for the relief of Gotlieb Feldmeyer, of Annapolis, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2798) to incorporate the Columbia Telephone Company—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NAPHEN: A bill (H. R. 2799) for the relief of McHenry Robinson, executor of the estate of Elizabeth S. Cushing—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2800) to correct the naval record of John L. King—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. OTEY: A bill (H. R. 2801) for the relief of Dr. W. E. Pittman—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 2802) granting an increase of pension to John W. Brisbois—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2803) to refund to city of Milwaukee money expended by said city in paving Wisconsin street in front of United States Government property—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBB: A bill (H. R. 2804) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary C. Woodmansee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2805) granting a pension to Rhoda Burnham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2806) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John T. Robertson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2807) for the relief of William Berry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2808) for the correction of the military record of John R. Leonard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2809) granting a pension Moses F. Woods—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2810) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joseph Lacomb—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2811) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James D. Dellinger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2812) granting a pension to George W. McCinston—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2813) granting a pension to George W. Baker—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 2814) granting a pension to Lucy Stanton Wheeler—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2815) granting a pension to Mary J. Robbins—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2816) granting a pension to Annie C. Collier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2817) granting a pension to Lydia A. Taft—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2818) granting a pension to Caroline Freeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2819) granting an honorable discharge to George A. Daniels—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2820) to remove the charge of desertion against Henry L. Snow—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2821) to remove the charge of desertion against Robert Burnett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2822) to remove the charge of desertion against John J. Doyle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2823) for the relief of George O. Donnell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2824) to pay certain judgments against John C. Bates and Jonathan A. Yeckley, captain and first lieutenant in the United States Army, for acts done by them under orders of their superior officers—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 2826) authorizing and requiring certain extensions to be made to the lines of the Capital Traction Company, of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 2827) for the relief of the Atlantic Works—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A bill (H. R. 2828) granting a pension to Mary E. Wilkinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 2829) granting a pension to Mrs. Anna B. Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 2830) for the relief of the First Colorado Mounted Militia—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 2831) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Stephen J. Simpson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2832) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of James W. Cline, alias Eugene L. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2833) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Frank Clemens, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Heavy Artillery (Colored), Kentucky Volunteers, in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2834) granting an increase of pension to Ira A. Milliorn—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2835) granting an increase of pension to David Horn—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2836) granting a pension to Jacob F. Blessing, late a private of Company H, Thirty-first Regiment of Illinois Volunteers, in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2837) granting an increase of pension to Rev. Christopher C. Cash—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2838) granting a pension to William H. Sharp, late a private in Company K, One hundred and twentieth Regiment of Illinois Infantry Volunteers, in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2839) to compensate George K. Kirchner for his stock of goods taken and destroyed by Federal soldiers in the year A. D. 1862—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2840) for the relief of the city of Cairo, in the State of Illinois—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2841) for the relief of Edward A. Buder—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2842) for the relief of James B. Phillips—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2843) for the relief of the heirs of James Goodloe, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2845) for the relief of Jasper N. Elder, of Saline County, Ill.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2846) for the relief of John J. Vincent—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2847) for the relief of William Roark—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2848) for the relief of Emeline E. Musgrave—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2849) granting a pension to Mary A. Hanson, of Jackson County, Ill.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2850) granting a pension to Mrs. Susan A. Minnis, widow of Charles M. Minnis, late a captain Company A, Sixty-fifth Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2851) to increase the pension of John O. McDonald, alias William Barnes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2852) granting a pension to Malinda Kelly, of Jackson County, Ill.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2853) granting a pension to Isaac N. Phillips, late provost-marshal in and for the Thirteenth district of Illinois, in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2854) for the relief of Richard Thieke—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2855) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Henry Casey, late a private in Company K, Ninth Regiment of Illinois Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also a bill (H. R. 2856) to place John M. Cunningham on the active list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2857) for the relief of Alfred McNeely—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2858) for the relief of Joseph F. Bryant—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2859) for the relief of Curtis P. Wise—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2860) for the relief of John R. Nelson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 2861) authorizing the presentation of medals to the members of the First Battalion, United States Marine Corps, who fought at Guantanamo, Cuba—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2862) to increase the pension of William M. Horton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 2863) to remove the charge of desertion against Jacob L. Lynn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 2865) to grant increase of pension to Louis H. Gein, Company F, Fifty-fifth New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2866) for the relief of Secor & Co., Perine, Secor & Co., and the executors of Zeno Secor—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 2867) fixing the compensation of the commissioners of the United States in Alabama, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2868) for the relief of W. F. Eggleston as executor of S. O. Eggleston—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2869) for the relief of William M. Lindsay—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2870) for the relief of Maria S. Poe, and to have her name put on pension roll—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2871) for the relief of the personal representatives of James Rhodes, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2872) for the relief of Mary Latham, of Brooksville, Blount County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: A bill (H. R. 2873) for the relief of Susan Elizabeth Laughren—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2874) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against Charles G. Brigham—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2875) granting an increase of pension to John Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2876) for the relief of Egbert Stricksma—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2877) granting a pension to Lydia W. Handley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2878) granting an increase of pension to Carleton A. Trundy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2879) granting an increase of pension to Michael Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2880) granting a pension of $50 per month to Cordice R. Sprague—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2881) to restore William F. Peck to the rolls of the Navy, and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2882) to pension Mary D. Jackson and Rebecca F. Dinsmore—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2883) to pension Nancy E. Hardy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2884) granting a pension to Miss M. Jennie Miles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2885) for the relief of Sarah S. Mulcahy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2886) granting a pension to Havilah Flint Libby—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2887) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against Stedman W. Piper—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2888) granting a pension to Abraham Bigelow, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2889) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against Cornelius O'Callaghan, alias William Blake—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2890) granting a pension to Mary M. Hitchcock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2891) to increase the pension of George Milton Frye—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2892) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Chase—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 2893) for the relief of Frederick Rhine—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2894) for the relief of James Sertelle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2895) to increase the pension of William Hulsizer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2896) to increase the pension of John V. Sullivan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2897) to increase the pension of John Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2898) granting an increase of pension to John H. Crawford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2899) granting a pension to Eliza Rosenfelt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2900) to increase the pension of William Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2901) to pension Mrs. Amanda M. Morse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2902) to pension Caroline Minnich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2903) to increase the pension of Elmer W. Welsheimer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2904) to correct the military record of Jesse Brenner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2905) to pension George W. West—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2906) to increase the pension of William W. McClain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2907) granting an increase of pension to James Allison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2908) to pension Frances A. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 2909) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Hardy Spencer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2910) to relieve the heirs of Leon Frank, deceased, and to give the Court of Claims jurisdiction, and to remove the bar of statute of limitations—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 2911) for the relief of woolgrowers and stockmen in the northern counties of Arizona—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2912) for the relief of the executrix of George W. Curtis, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ZIEGLER: A bill (H. R. 2913) removing the charge of

desertion from the military record of William Lehman—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 2915) for the relief of the occupants of the town of Flagstaff, Coconino County, Ariz.—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2916) to grant right of way over Government lands for a pipe line for the conveyance of water to Flagstaff, Ariz.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 60) directing the presentation of a first-class life-saving medal to Lieut. Fidelio S. Carter, United States Navy—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 65) for the relief of K. H. Beshgetour—to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of the general missionary committee of the Methodist Episcopal Church, expressing disapproval, etc., of the election of B. H. Roberts, of Utah, to a seat in the House of Representatives; also numerous petitions of citizens against seating him—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. ADAMS: Petitions of citizens of Philadelphia and others, praying for the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Petition of voters of Erie County, Orchard Park, Buffalo, East Aurora, and others of the Thirty-third Congressional district of New York, against the admission of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BABCOCK: Petitions of citizens of Bloomington, North Freedom, Fennimore, Arena, Richland Center, and Mount Tabor, and of the West Wisconsin Conference, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Petitions of citizens and organized societies of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Howland, Christian Endeavorers, Home Missionary Society, and citizens of Bangor, Harrington, Woman's American Baptist Home Missionary Society, and others of the Fourth Congressional district of Maine, protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: Petitions of citizens of the Second Congressional district of Kansas, protesting against the admission of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BRENNER: Protests of citizens of the Third Congressional district of Ohio, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BROMWELL: Petitions of the Evangelical Alliance, churches, and numerous citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, relating to the rejection of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BULL: Petitions of citizens of Providence, Middletown, and others in the State of Rhode Island, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Sundry petitions of citizens of the State of Maine, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Gustav Cooley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON: Petitions of citizens of Cleveland and vicinity and others, of Parma and Mayfield, Ohio, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petitions of numerous citizens of the Sixth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, protesting against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. CANNON: Petitions of citizens of the Twelfth district, State of Illinois, against the admission of Brigham H. Roberts as a member of the House—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. CAPRON: Protests of the Rhode Island Christian Endeavor Union, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, churches and societies in the State of Rhode Island, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. CLARKE of New Hampshire: Numerous petitions of citizens of Dover, Jefferson, Lancaster, Franklin, Franconia, West Unity, Derry, Woodsville, Nashua, Grantham, East Haverhill, and others of the Second Congressional district in the State of New Hampshire, urging the rejection of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. COCHRANE of New York: Paper to accompany House bill in behalf of the claim of Bridget McGrane—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CONNELL: Petition of citizens of Dunmore, Pa., and certain societies and churches in the State of Pennsylvania for the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. COUSINS: Petitions of citizens of the Fifth Congressional district of Iowa, favoring the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Papers to accompany House bill No. 1187, to remove the charge of desertion against Edward Troy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAYTON: Petition of the heirs of John A. Hutton, of Randolph County, W. Va., praying for the reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the heirs of Madison Daniels, of Randolph County, W. Va., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the heirs of John T. Shaull, of Jefferson County, W. Va., asking reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of James Bane, of Jefferson County, W. Va., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. S. A. DAVENPORT: Petition of citizens of Erie County, Pa., in opposition to the admission of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. DE VRIES: Sundry petitions of citizens of Sacramento, Ripon, and other towns in the State of California, in relation to polygamy and for an amendment to the Constitution—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: Petition of numerous citizens of Jefferson, Ellsworth, and of the Tenth Congressional district of Iowa, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: Protests of citizens of the First Congressional district of South Carolina against the admission of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: Petitions of the Baptist Social Union, the New Church Club, and the Home Missionary Association of Boston, Mass., against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Resolutions of the Synod of Minnesota and the Diocese of Minnesota and petitions of citizens of Bloomington, Robinsdale, and Excelsior, and Christian Endeavorers and citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., for the rejection of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of citizens of Oklahoma Territory, for the relief of C. A. Calhoun—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GAMBLE: Petitions of citizens of Meekling and Parker, Congregational churches and missionary societies, Woman's Christian Temperance unions, and numerous citizens in the State of South Dakota, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petitions of the Hiland Presbyterian Church, of Perrysville, Pa., New Century Club, of Philadelphia, Preachers' Association of Pittsburg, Woman's Synodical Society of Pennsylvania, and Presbytery of Pittsburg, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Home Missionary Society, churches, and citizens of the State of Massachusetts, urging the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petitions of citizens of Middleport, Athens, Pomeroy, Rutland, Nelsonville, and Kingston, Ohio, and of the counties of Ross, Perry, and Vinton, Ohio; also of the Eleventh Congressional district of Ohio, protesting against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. GROW: Paper to accompany House bill in behalf of the claim of Samuel Tewksbury—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Ganges, Lawrence, and certain societies and citizens of various towns in the State of Michigan, in opposition to the seating of Brigham H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. HAY: Petition of George Perkins and other citizens of

Albemarle County, Va., for the establishment of a district court for the western district of Virginia at Charlottesville, Va.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEATWOLE: Petitions of numerous citizens of the State of Minnesota, protesting against the admission of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. HILL: Petitions of citizens of Bridgeport, Danbury, Norwalk, Sound Beach, and other towns in the State of Connecticut, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. HITT: Petitions of citizens of Rockford, Amboy, Dover, Belvidere, Pawpaw, Forrester, Dixon, and other towns in the State of Illinois, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. HOPKINS: Petitions of numerous citizens of the State of Illinois, favoring an amendment to the Constitution defining marriage—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. HULL: Sundry petitions of citizens of the State of Iowa, against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. JENKINS: Protests of citizens of Louisville, Chippewa Falls, and Trade Lake, Wis., in opposition to the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. JOY (by request): Petition of the wives of many Representatives, and of churches, societies, and citizens of St. Louis, Mo., against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Petitions of citizens of the Eighteenth Congressional district of New York, for the reclassification of the Railway-Mail Service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petitions of various church organizations, societies, and citizens of the State of New York, protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. LACEY: Petitions of the Quarterly Meeting of Friends, and citizens of Oskaloosa and others, of the Sixth Congressional district of Iowa, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. LENTZ: Petitions of numerous citizens of the Twelfth Congressional district of the State of Ohio, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. LEWIS: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Martha E. Jordan—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: Paper to accompany House bill No. 944, relating to a public building at Atlanta, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, paper to accompany House bill in behalf of Michael Kries—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LONG: Petitions of citizens and of the Methodist Episcopal Church and Epworth League of Freeport, Kans., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. LORIMER: Petitions of citizens of Oak Park and others of the Second Congressional district of Illinois, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petitions of numerous citizens of the First Congressional district of New Jersey and resolutions of certain societies, urging the rejection of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. MAHON: Petitions of 973 voters of Huntingdon County, Christian Endeavor Societies of Union County, citizens of Waynesboro, Williamsburg, Robertsdale, Malta, East Waterford, Mount Union, Chambersburg, and other towns, in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Peter Cummings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of citizens of the First Congressional district of Illinois, favoring the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. MARSH: Sundry petitions of citizens of the State of Illinois, against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. MESICK: Petitions of citizens of the Eleventh Congressional district of Michigan, urging the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of William H. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to Edward Dickerson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of James A. Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Manda B. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of William Burch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Elizabeth C. Alexander—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to William H. Goodwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Felix G. Hendrickson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Rachel McCord—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill to correct the military record of John Bass—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Hester A. Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MINOR: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Stephensville, Wis., relating to the importation of cigarettes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Stephensville, Wis., relating to the sale of intoxicating liquors in Government buildings, etc.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MOODY: Petitions of citizens of the Sixth Congressional district and others in the State of Massachusetts, against the admission of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petitions of citizens of Riverside, Orange, Elsmore, and various other towns in the State of California, asking for the rejection of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. NEVILLE: Resolutions of the Ministerial Association of Lincoln, Nebr., and citizens of the Sixth Congressional district of Nebraska, opposing the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. OTJEN: Petitions of churches and citizens of the Fourth Congressional district of Wisconsin, against the admission of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. PAYNE: Numerous petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of the State of New York, various churches, societies, and citizens, for the rejection of B. H. Roberts and for an amendment to the Constitution relating to polygamy—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. POWERS: Protests of citizens of Winhall, Bristol, Manchester, Fairfax, and other towns in the State of Vermont, against the right of B. H. Roberts to a seat in the House of Representatives—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. RAY of New York: Petitions of citizens of Downsville, Stamford, Davenport, Groton, Trumansburg, Newark, Roxbury, Owego, Tompkins, New Berlin, Guilford, Sherburne, and many other citizens of the Twenty-sixth Congressional district of New York, urging the rejection of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. ROBB: Papers in support of House bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary C. Woodmansee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petitions of citizens of Fremont and Topeka, Ind., against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Nebraska: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions and Sunday schools of Mapleville and Jamestown, Nebr., relating to the sale of liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Papers to accompany House bill to increase the pension of William M. Horton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: Petitions of surfmen and citizens of Ottawa County, Ohio, relating to surfmen of the United States life-saving station—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petitions of numerous citizens of Wood County, Ohio, urging the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petitions of citizens of New Haven, Watertown, East Haven, Derby, Ansonia, Chester, Meriden, and 282 citizens of the Second Congressional district of the State of Connecticut, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SPRAGUE: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions, missionary associations, churches, and citizens of the State of Massachusetts, protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. STARK: Protests of Rev. F. Deal and other citizens of the Fourth Congressional district of Nebraska, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. STEELE: Petitions of citizens of North Manchester, Huntington, and various churches and societies in the State of Indiana, against the admission of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 628, relating to the claim of Hamilton L. Sailor—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of citizens of Wise, Wichita, and Mitchell counties, Tex., against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Various petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions, churches, Sunday schools, societies, and citizens of the State of New Hampshire, protesting against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. TAYLER of Ohio: Petition of William R. Hearst and 7,000,000 other citizens, urging the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: Petitions of citizens of Zanesville and Muskingum County, Ohio, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petitions of voters of the Thirtieth Congressional district of New York and citizens of Lima, Byron, Medina, Olcott, Groveland, Pekin, and other towns in the State of New York, against the seating of B. H. Roberts and in regard to the suppression of polygamy—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. WEAVER: Petitions of numerous citizens of the Seventh Congressional district of Ohio, for a constitutional amendment making polygamy a crime and against the seating of B. H. Roberts in the House of Representatives—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Petitions of citizens of the Fifteenth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: Petitions of numerous citizens of the city of Philadelphia, Pa., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *December 8, 1899.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Concurrent resolution No. 1.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a committee consisting of three members from the House of Representatives be appointed to make arrangements for the reception and unveiling on January 18, 1900, of the statue of Daniel Webster, presented to the United States by Mr. Stilson Hutchins and erected on Massachusetts avenue, in the city of Washington.

Concurrent resolution No. 2.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be directed to cause a survey to be made and an estimate submitted of the cost of dredging and otherwise improving the harbor of the city of Tacoma, in the State of Washington, in accordance with recommendations heretofore made and filed in the War Department.

ADJOURNMENT OVER.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns to day it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. The report will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to whom was referred House Resolution No. 16, report the following substitute therefor:

"*Resolved*, That the rules of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-sixth Congress be, and are hereby, amended as follows:

"Amend Rule X in the following paragraphs:

"In the paragraphs relating to the Committee on Foreign Affairs strike out the word 'fifteen' and insert 'seventeen;' so as to read as follows: 'On Foreign Affairs, to consist of seventeen members.'

"In the paragraph relating to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries strike out the word 'thirteen' and insert 'seventeen;' so as to read as follows: 'On the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to consist of seventeen members.'

"In the paragraph relating to the Committee on the Public Lands strike out the word 'fifteen' and insert 'seventeen;' so as to read as follows: 'On the Public Lands, to consist of seventeen members.'

"In the paragraph relating to the Committee on Military Affairs strike out the word 'fifteen' and insert 'seventeen;' so as to read as follows: 'On Military Affairs, to consist of seventeen members.'

"In the paragraph relating to the Committee on Naval Affairs strike out the word 'fifteen' and insert 'seventeen;' so as to read as follows: 'On Naval Affairs, to consist of seventeen members.'

"In the paragraph relating to the Committee on the Territories strike out the word 'thirteen' and insert 'fifteen;' so as to read as follows: 'On the Territories, to consist of fifteen members.'

"In the paragraph relating to the Committee on the District of Columbia strike out the word 'fifteen' and insert 'seventeen;' so as to read as follows: 'On the District of Columbia, to consist of seventeen members.'

"After the paragraph relating to the Committee on the Territories insert the following: 'On Insular Affairs, to consist of seventeen members.'

"Amend Rule XI as follows:

"After section 17 insert the following:

"'18. To all matters (excepting those affecting the revenue and the appropriations) pertaining to the islands which came to the United States through the treaty of 1899 with Spain, and to Cuba: to the Committee on Insular Affairs.'

"In the present section 18 strike out '18' and insert '19,' and so, through the succeeding sections, strike out the number of each section and insert the number next higher."

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is to provide for conditions that have recently arisen and to accomplish two things: First, to increase the number of members of some of the already established committees of the House—from 13, in one case, to 17 members, as in the case of Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and from 15 to 17 in a number of other committees. This increase has been deemed desirable owing to the great mass of business that must of necessity come before the House. It is believed that the increased membership will be necessary to meet this constantly growing business.

The other provision embodied in the resolution is for the creation of a new committee, called for by the new conditions prevailing by reason of the acquisition of the Philippine Islands and the island of Porto Rico under our recent treaty with Spain. It is proposed to care for these islands and their management by the creation of a new committee, to be known as the Committee on Insular Affairs, to consist of 17 members.

The only other changes are in the phraseology of the rule as it exists, which changes are made necessary by the modifications here proposed.

Mr. CANNON. Would the gentleman have the grant of jurisdiction to this new committee again read from the desk?

Mr. DALZELL. I will ask to have read again the paragraph covering the grant of jurisdiction to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

The Clerk read as follows:

After section 17 insert the following: "18. To all matters (excepting those affecting the revenue and appropriations) pertaining to the islands which came to the United States through the treaty of 1899 with Spain, and to Cuba—to the Committee on Insular Affairs."

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] permit a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I merely desire a moment or two.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas five minutes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman from Texas yield for a moment to permit me to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a questi n?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. TAWNEY. Does this give to the new committee jurisdiction of the island of Samoa?

Mr. DALZELL. It does not.

Mr. TAWNEY. I know that we have none, except so far as the ratification of the treaty is concerned.

Mr. DALZELL. It does not. It was thought best to leave that just as it is.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say first that as to the increase in the various committees named in the resolution I think it entirely proper, though I do not concede that the Committee on Rules was authorized at this time to report that proposition. I merely state that for the purpose of saving the point if it should arise hereafter, though neither my friend from Tennessee nor myself would hesitate to say that it would be assented to on a request for unanimous consent.

I desire further to say that as to the new committee there is no difference of opinion as to the propriety of its creation, but we do not assent to the suggestion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] that it is created for the purpose of permanently dealing with these possessions. Gentlemen on that side, of course, intend that they shall become permanent possessions of the United States. Gentlemen on this side entertain a different view; but

we are agreed that whether they are to be permanent or temporary, the questions concerning them ought to go to a separate committee, and that committee ought to be composed of those who are among the best men in the House, because the committee is certain to become one of the most important during the present session of Congress.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I expressed no opinion as to whether or not the Philippines would have to be dealt with temporarily or permanently, nor is there anything in the rule that indicates any opinion on that subject. The rule simply relates——

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will examine the stenographic report I think he will find it as I have said, and until that expression came from him I did not even intend to say a word.

Mr. DALZELL. Well, I misunderstood the gentleman, then.

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield for a question?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes.

Mr. LACEY. Did you consider the question as to whether the affairs of Hawaii should also go to this same committee?

Mr. DALZELL. We did. The rule does not cover Hawaii at all.

Mr. LACEY. Why should it not? The situation is very largely the same and the problems are the same in many respects, excepting the mere Spanish part.

Mr. DALZELL. Well, the problems are not exactly the same, and the Committee on Rules thought that the present rules were sufficient to cover the case of Hawaii.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the reading of the resolution again.

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection, the resolution will be again read.

There was no objection, and the resolution was again read.

Mr. DALZELL. I ask for the previous question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks for the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. DALZELL, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following report from the Committee on Rules.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That on Monday, December 11, immediately after the reading of the Journal, the House shall resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. No. 1, entitled "A bill to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes;" general debate thereon shall continue to not later than 5 o'clock p. m. of Friday, the 15th day of December, and thereafter debate under the five-minute rule until 5 o'clock p. m. of Saturday, the 16th day of December, at which time the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House, with any amendments adopted by the committee, and a vote shall be taken on the bill and amendments, if any, without intervening motion, to final passage, immediately after the reading of the Journal on Monday, the 18th day of December.

And during said debate the House shall on each day adjourn not later than 5 o'clock p. m.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this rule is to provide——

Mr. RICHARDSON. I hope the gentleman will not discuss the rule so as to cut off the forty minutes for debate.

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly not; I have no intention of that kind.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I hope the gentleman will not do that.

Mr. DALZELL. I was simply going to explain the rule.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman understands if there is debate on the proposition, it cuts off the forty minutes' debate.

Mr. DALZELL. I would not take advantage of that fact.

Mr. RICHARDSON. But some other gentleman might.

The SPEAKER. There will be twenty minutes' debate on either side.

Mr. DALZELL. There will be twenty minutes' debate on either side. I had no intention of interfering with that.

The bill referred to in the rule is what is popularly known as the currency bill. It is desired on this side of the House that we get to work as promptly as possible; and yet there is no disposition—I think I speak for every member on this side of the House—to unduly press matters so as to cut off reasonable debate. The bill is a comparatively short one. It covers substantially only two subjects—securing and maintaining the gold standard and some necessary legislation in connection with national banks which logically follows thereon.

There is nothing in this bill that has not been in some shape or other heretofore presented to this House or to Congress by committees the membership of which, in part, was constituted from gentlemen upon the other side of the Chamber; so that it seems that the time allowed for debate under the rule is generous, when it gives a week—five days for general debate and one day for debate under the five-minute rule, with an opportunity to offer and vote upon amendments, the final vote to be taken on the following Monday, after the reading of the Journal; that is to say, on Monday a week from next Monday.

Now, as I say, there is no disposition to unduly press matters, or to cut off reasonable debate, and the Committee on Rules are of opinion that this rule embodies a reasonable time. Having explained the rule, I have nothing further to say at this time. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee for his twenty minutes under the rule.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, those of us on this side of the Chamber dissent radically from the statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania when he says there is nothing new in this bill. For the first time in our history, Mr. Speaker, a proposition is presented to us here to fasten upon this country by statutory enactment the single gold standard. That is something new in this country; and it is something on which gentlemen on that side of the House, almost without exception, if it had been laid up against them by specific charge two or three years ago, would have felt outraged, and would have resented the charge with righteous and just indignation. It is a new thing. I think that under all the circumstances it is unusual and unjust for us to be called upon to take up this bill on Monday, with only one week day remaining within which to prepare for the discussion of the measure. And, as I said on yesterday, gentlemen on that side of the House have had six months or a year to prepare themselves to enter upon the discussion of this great question, which is to uproot all the financial conditions of this country that have existed, some of them, for more than a hundred years.

I said on yesterday that we objected because this measure had not been submitted to any committee, a provision which time has proven wise and proper upon the part of this House. No question, great or small, is considered until it has been submitted to a committee composed of majority and minority members, in order that both sides of the question may be first considered in committee and the views of both sides submitted in a formal printed report to the House and to the country. In this case we are called upon to take up this bill on Monday. I asked on yesterday that the bill be regularly referred to an appropriate committee, that the Speaker announce the committee, and that that committee consider the question and then let us enter upon the discussion of the measure.

Some of us sought to have the House postpone taking up the measure until next Wednesday, only two days longer, and then give us an opportunity to take it up Wednesday and discuss it on until the 22d day of the month, about eight days, and then we would be prepared to vote upon it. They said, "No, we will not do that;" but they come in here—I do not wish to use a harsh or unparliamentary word—and crowd it through by taking it up on Monday and then call upon the House to vote upon it the following Monday.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Bulldozing.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said on yesterday, there is no emergency on the subject. The bill says we are living under the gold standard. If that be so, there can be no need for haste in regard to this measure. There is no emergency for any proposed provision in this bill, and therefore we might have taken a little while longer in order that members on this side and the press of the country and intelligent men everywhere might have an opportunity to analyze and dissect this measure in every respect in order that we might vote for it or amend it if we saw fit to do so and deemed it wise to do so in some of its provisions.

Why, Mr. Speaker, take the time allowed us for discussion of this measure; and I venture to say that if you will undertake to call upon gentlemen who now occupy seats on that side of the House, much less other prominent gentlemen of this country, commencing with the President himself and coming on down through the line of gentlemen possibly not quite so illustrious but prominent in the history; if we should undertake to stand here and give those gentlemen time to make formal apologies to the House and to the country for their change of base on this proposition, you would not have time during the week to afford one-half of them an opportunity to do so. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] One week would not suffice; one day would not be enough for my learned friend the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to make his explanations for his sudden change of base. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON rose.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I wish the gentleman would not interrupt me; he shall have his time.

Mr. CANNON. I only want to say to my friend that I never apologize. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman is not as conscionable as I supposed he was. [Laughter.] The President of the United States himself, and nearly all the long line of illustrious men on that side of the House who now hold seats there, or have occupied seats there, must apologize to the country for this sudden and radical change of base on this great money question. It is too late for

many to make apologies who have paid the debt to time and mortal custom and crossed over the river, but you gentlemen will have to make apologies for them before we get through this discussion. I do not want to take any more time now, but I will yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, nothing could better illustrate the difference between the two great political parties of this country than the resolution which has just been reported by the majority of the Committee on Rules. For this extraordinary proposition there is neither precedent nor defense, and yet I shall not, as some of our friends do, contend that it is a mere arbitrary and wanton exercise of power. The Republican majority have determined to proceed in this way because, having taken sufficient time to satisfy themselves, they care nothing about this side or the balance of the country. The Democratic members insist that there shall be a fair and thorough discussion of the bill to be considered, although we indulge no possible hope that any kind of a discussion will change the vote of any man in this Chamber.

But we look beyond this Chamber, and in that we differ from our friends across the aisle. They are content whenever the men charged with the immediate decision of a question are sufficiently informed to act. We look farther than the representatives of the people assembled here, back to the people themselves; and we believe that it is infinitely more important that the great masses of the voters shall understand this question at the end than it is that their representatives shall understand it to-day.

Our friends on the other side believe that when they declare that the representatives who decide all questions must answer on their responsibility they end all argument. We believe that the highest responsibility on the men who sit in this Chamber is to satisfy the people who send them here that they have wisely decided every question.

Our opponents frequently taunt us on this side with a desire to draw the debates out to an indefinite length; and I heard one of the most distinguished of them declare that nobody ever reads the speeches after they were delivered on the floor or printed in the RECORD. That may be true of his constituents and it may be true of yours, but it is not true of ours. Your people may confide in your wisdom unquestioningly and be content with your decision, but ours are not so easy to satisfy. They demand to know, and they have a right to know, the reason for our action. I undertake to say that there is scarcely a gentleman on this side of the House who, if he delivered a speech upon this subject and circulated it among the people of his district, would not be reasonably sure of having it read carefully by a majority of those who received a copy of it.

There are 25,000 Democrats in the district I have the honor to represent, and I do not believe that I state an exceptional case when I declare that if I should put into the hands of every Democratic voter in that district a copy of an interesting and instructive speech upon this subject, nine-tenths of them would find the leisure and the inclination to read it. Among such a people these speeches become an educational agency of incalculable value. The people hire us and pay us a salary not only to decide these questions as they arise, but to study them, and the people, whose representatives we are, are entitled to the benefit of our studies upon every subject.

It is the duty of every gentleman who occupies a seat—I was about to say in this Hall, but I will not assume to speak for gentlemen on the other side—but speaking for this side alone, it is a duty felt, appreciated, and performed by almost every member who has studied these questions to speak upon them and to send their speeches to their constituents. The difference between you and us is that you believe in the power of the Representative, we believe in the power of the people. While we have no hope, no expectation, of being able to persuade you, either by the old arguments which you once advanced or by the new ones which we may be able to advance, to vote against this measure, yet we simply desire the opportunity to prepare an appeal from your decision here to that greater tribunal, composed of the whole American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is not, Mr. Speaker, that we desire to speak simply for the sake of speaking. It is not that we desire to encumber the RECORD of the House with our opinions and remarks for the sake of persuading our constituents at home to believe that we are faithfully attending to the duties intrusted to us. But, sir, it is for the higher and more impersonal reason that we believe our constituents are entitled to the benefit of such arguments as we may be able to make, and it is for them, and not for ourselves, that we ask the opportunity to present our objections against the pending bill.

The time allowed before entering upon the consideration of the bill is totally insufficient. No gentleman on this side has prepared, even for a day, for that contest. And yet the gentleman in charge of the bill on yesterday asked permission to print an elaborate statement in vindication of it in the RECORD—a statement that has been already prepared and which I venture to assert is already in the printer's hands. Not only was that gentleman prepared to submit what was in the nature of a committee report, but the gentlemen who have cooperated with him in the consideration and preparation of the bill, each and every one of them, is ready to take the floor in support of it.

But, sir, they have not even stopped with insufficient time allowed us in which to prepare for the discussion of the matter. They have also refused a sufficient time for the consideration of it in the House, and to complete their utter disregard of our rights they have reported a rule that I believe is without precedent in the history of the House. This rule absolutely denies us the right to make a motion to recommit the bill.

Under the rules, which were adopted in such a hurry a few days ago, as administered by a man whose iron will gave them his name we were never denied the right to move to recommit a bill with or without instructions; but I warn you, gentlemen on this side, that if this present report from the Committee on Rules shall be adopted by the House, after you have occupied one day in a vain attempt to offer an amendment which shall save the greenbacks to the people of the United States, whose faithful and efficient servant they have been for the past twenty years, you will not be permitted to bring that question to a direct issue by the usual motion to recommit, for that right has been deliberately denied you by this rule. [Applause on Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DRIGGS].

Mr. DRIGGS. Mr. Speaker, it matters not what may be my convictions upon the pending bill, and possibly it matters less what my vote will be when the matter is to be finally determined by this House; but I desire at this time simply to record my protest against the rule submitted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. First, because I believe in the old doctrine of American fair play; and secondly, as a Democratic member of the House of Representatives, I believe that the rights of the minority should be considered on this floor. I believe that this bill should have first been submitted to a committee appointed by the Speaker of the House, and go through the regular routine provided by the rule, and then that our Democratic Representatives should have been given an opportunity to prepare such statement as they might desire to make in connection with it in explanation of its provisions, in order that their statements might be placed not only before the House, but also before their constituents throughout the country.

What has become of the sense of fair play on the other side of the House? It has disappeared like the mists before the summer's sun; and that side will have to answer, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] has said, to the American people for their lack of consideration for the rights of the minority.

In the last House it is true that the majority on the other side was much larger than it is here to-day. But in this House, with the opposition majority so much smaller, we, by the voice and vote of the Democratic minority, are speaking the wishes and voicing the interests of almost thirty millions of the people of the United States.

I simply desired, then, in the brief time allotted to me to record my protest in their name against this rule and in the interest of fair play to the rights of the minority. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield now two minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY].

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say in the beginning that the introduction of this bill marks the absolute and complete surrender of this Administration to the gold syndicate of the world. [Applause on Democratic side.] It is turning back upon the traditions and principles of the plain people of America, and is toadying to the aristocrats and to the men who "turn up their pants" in America when it is raining in England. [Laughter and applause.]

No darker conspiracy against the rights of the plain people of America was ever shadowed than in this bill. All the fight against free silver in the past was but the preliminary skirmish to the battle that is now before the American people to determine whether or not we shall surrender to the banking interest of the world. It is the same old fight that was waged in the days of Jackson, and it is a fight, sir, that will be continued to the bitter end, no matter what this Congress may do. It will be continued in behalf of the plain people of the country as long as they have representative on this floor. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] has eighteen minutes remaining.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield ten minutes to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, it was not the purpose of the Committee on Rules in reporting the resolution now pending

before the House to curtail proper debate upon the pproosed measure. Nor do I think that it can be justly said that there is such a limitation of time as will work an injustice.

Here is a proposition that has been printed in the newspapers with the report of the caucus that framed the bill, which has been in the hands of the readers of the public press for many days. And then what is more significant than that is the fact that every question involved here has been the subject-matter of the discussions between the political parties of the country for the past twenty or twenty-five years. Time after time bills have been introduced in Congress, and there is not one distinct proposition in the bill now under consideration that has not been reported favorably from the committees of this House already and filed for the consideration of the House to which they belonged.

Is it possible that there is to be something new said about this question? I think not. I call the attention of the gentleman to my suggestion when I say I think that next Monday and next Tuesday and Wednesday it will be difficult for gentlemen managing the debate upon that side of the House to supply the men as rapidly as the time will be accorded to them to occupy their share of the time in the debate. Not one question here but is an old question which has been thrashed over upon every stump, in every newspaper, and in this body for all the years to which I have referred.

Now, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] says that it will be difficult for this side of the House to explain their changes of front. Well, let me say to the gentleman that it is one of the proudest boasts of the Republican party and of its individual members that they are wiser now than they were a good many years ago. I do not know a public man in this House, nor in any other House, who holds upon every question of the day the identical position which he held at some former period of his life. I should be sorry for a public man coming into public life a young man and staying in it until he is an old man if he found himself at the later period of his life not knowing any more than he did when he first started out. The Democratic party is the only well-recognized demonstration of the fact that a great organization in this country can survive for a long period of years and learn nothing by experience. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

The Republican party has learned a great deal. It has met the emergencies that have arisen. It has adjusted itself to the conditions that grew out of legislation. It has been the leader of the great development of public sentiment. It has not been the master with a whip, driving public sentiment, but it has been the guide of public sentiment into the proper channels of execution.

Let me say to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], in all kindness and with my congratulations upon the position which he occupies in the House, that while some of our friends on this side may want to apologize—I think there are none, but if there are, it will be a very small matter in importance as compared with the necessity for gentlemen on that side to be able to hold themselves together upon the questions involved right here. Our past is behind us. Our present conditions we are proud of. Our future we feel to be assured. Will the gentleman from Tennessee say that much?

Mr. RICHARDSON. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly.

Mr. RICHARDSON. He was not sure of the position of gentlemen on that side until his caucus of last week, was he? [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, now, I might retaliate upon my friend by reference to some recent votes in the House. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] But I would scorn to do such a thing as that. There never was held in this House a caucus that came together with the unanimity of purpose which characterized the caucus of the Republican party upon this measure. [Applause upon the Republican side.]

There never was a difference of opinion upon the ultimate purpose of this bill between any one member of the majority of this House and the balance of the members. There may have been differences of opinion about the road to travel to reach the goal. But I do not want to be turned aside. I want to warn my friend from Tennessee to be looking out for the future. Turn your face to the front and see the disintegration going on in your party in the country, and be careful that you do not too vigorously and too emphatically emphasize your views upon the 16 to 1 idea of the Democratic party of four years ago. [Applause on the Republican side.] The Republican party will have to turn aside from nothing it advocated in 1896. But, Mr. Speaker, all this is for the future.

The members of the House will appreciate that there is no purpose here to stifle debate and that in six long days there is ample opportunity for the fullest debate upon these questions involved; and therefore it was thought that, inasmuch as the Christmas holidays ought to begin as early as Wednesday week after next, to give the whole of next week to debate and place the vote on Monday, with the probability of a practical adjournment of the House as early as Wednesday, was the best that could be done.

Mr. TERRY. If the gentleman from Ohio desires to proceed in order, why did he not let this bill be introduced and referred to a committee, as has been the precedent in this House for a century?

Mr. GROSVENOR. There are two subdivisions to my answer. The first is that "the gentleman from Ohio" does not control this side, and in the second place, the action of "the gentleman from Ohio" is abundantly approved by the gentlemen who sit around him.

Mr. TERRY. I perceive that the gentleman from Ohio is in all things an opportunist.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has five minutes remaining.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. In that time, Mr. Speaker, I will state that I should not have said a word had not the gentleman from Tennessee done me the honor to refer to me personally. I am for this rule. It is true that I voted in 1877 or 1878, before resumption, for the free coinage of silver. [Applause on the Democratic side.] There were but eight points between gold and silver at that time. At that time, with resumption approaching, the Democracy mainly took the ground for fiat money. I believed then, under those conditions, that the free coinage of silver would overcome the eight points. Since that time we have had resumption, and practically a gold standard for twenty years. Now, my friend from Tennessee, with all the equities between debtors and creditors on contracts made since 1870, amounting to fifty or seventy-five billions of dollars and contracted upon the present basis, wants to journey halfway to fiat money—to the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1. Conditions have changed and I have progressed. He lives with the changed conditions of thirty years ago; I live in the present, without pride of opinion, ready to meet the present emergencies, and he dwells with the ghouls in the ancient graveyards. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I should be disposed to leave this debate without another word did I not want to call the attention of my friend from Texas and my friend from Tennessee to some Democratic rules that have been introduced into this House which seem to have escaped their memory. My friend from Texas says that this rule is unprecedented, both as respects time and as respects the provision which calls for a vote without any intervening motion. But his memory is unfortunate. The memory of my friend from Tennessee is unfortunate. On the 13th day of August, 1894, in a Democratic Congress, on a tariff bill which the greatest Democrat since Andrew Jackson—Grover Cleveland—[cries of "Oh!" "Oh!" on the Democratic side, and laughter and applause on the Republican side] proclaimed to be a measure of "perfidy and dishonor," and which was not then in the custody of this House, but in the custody of the Senate, a Democratic Committee on Rules, in violation of every parliamentary precedent, brought a rule into this House that vi et armis took that bill not in its custody, but in the custody of the Senate, placed it before this House, and upon two hours of debate forced it to passage; and that is notall.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him? The gentleman ought to state that there is no comparison between this bill and that which was pending in conference, and you can not amend or recommit a conference report, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania very well knows.

Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman is perfectly well aware of the facts in the case.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It could not be recommitted and could not be amended.

Mr. DALZELL. It could have been brought in here under regular parliamentary procedure, and not by rape, as was done by a Democratic committee.

Mr. RICHARDSON. But the gentleman knows that a conference report can not be recommitted or amended.

Mr. DALZELL. That is not all. A bill that had never been printed, a bill that had never been referred to a committee, that put in jeopardy the great coal interests of this country, was authorized to be passed in this House with fifteen minutes' debate on either side by a rule which provided—notwithstanding the mistaken memory of my friend from Texas—that "the previous question shall be considered as ordered thereon and without delay or other motion the vote shall be taken."

Not only that, but a bill, never printed, nor even typewritten, never referred to any committee of this House, although committees were then in session, putting the great interests of iron ore upon the free list, was passed through this House under a gag rule that only allowed fifteen minutes' debate.

Bills affecting other interests of this country, involving great investments of capital, were passed through under the same rule on written bills, written at the desks of the members—referred to no committee, with fifteen minutes' debate on either side; and yet, notwithstanding that action of that Democratic House, my friends upon the other side rise to-day in their places, old and experienced members as they are, and assert that this rule is without precedent

or justification. It is without precedent in a Democratic House, because it is drawn in the interest of free debate, and with a regard for the rights of the minority. In that respect it is a Republican and not a Democratic rule.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for the previous question. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The previous question was ordered.

The question was taken on the adoption of the resolution, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Let us have a division.

Mr. DALZELL. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 164, nays 144, answered "present" 4, not voting 42; as follows:

YEAS—164.

Acheson,	Davenport, S. A.	Jones, Wash.	Prince,
Alexander,	Davidson,	Kahn,	Pugh,
Allen, Me.	Dayton,	Kerr,	Ray,
Babcock,	Dick,	Knox,	Reeder,
Bailey, Kans.	Dolliver,	Lacey,	Reeves,
Baker,	Dovener,	Landis,	Roberts, Mass.
Barham,	Eddy,	Lane,	Rodenberg,
Barney,	Esch,	Lawrence,	Russell,
Bartholdt,	Faris,	Linney,	Shattuc,
Bingham,	Fletcher,	Littlefield,	Shelden,
Bishop,	Fordney,	Long,	Showalter,
Boreing,	Foss,	Lorimer,	Smith, Ill.
Bouteil, Ill.	Fowler,	Loud,	Smith, H. C.
Boutelle, Me.	Freer,	Lybrand,	Smith, Samuel W.
Bowersock,	Gamble,	McCall,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Brick,	Gardner, Mich.	McCleary,	Southard,
Bromwell,	Gardner, N. J.	McPherson,	Spalding,
Brosius,	Gibson,	Mahon,	Sperry,
Brown,	Gill,	Marsh,	Sprague,
Bull,	Gillett, Mass.	Mercer,	Steele,
Burke, S. Dak.	Graff,	Mesick,	Stevens, Minn.
Burkett,	Graham,	Metcalf,	Stewart, N. J.
Burleigh,	Greene, Mass.	Miller,	Sulloway,
Burton,	Grosvenor,	Minor,	Tawney,
Butler,	Grout,	Mondell,	Tayler, Ohio
Calderhead,	Grow,	Moody, Mass.	Thomas, Iowa
Cannon,	Hamilton,	Moody, Oreg.	Thropp,
Capron,	Haugen,	Morgan,	Tongue,
Clarke, N. H.	Hawley,	Morris,	Van Voorhis,
Cochrane, N. Y.	Heatwole,	Mudd,	Vreeland,
Connell,	Hemenway,	Needham,	Wachter,
Cooper, Wis.	Henry, Conn.	O'Grady,	Wadsworth,
Corliss,	Hepburn,	Olmsted,	Warner,
Cousins,	Hill,	Otjen,	Waters,
Cromer,	Hitt,	Overstreet,	Watson,
Crump,	Hoffecker,	Packer, Pa.	Weaver,
Crumpacker,	Hopkins,	Parker, N. J.	Weeks,
Curtis,	Howell,	Payne,	Weymouth,
Cushman,	Hull,	Pearce, Mo.	White,
Dahle, Wis.	Jack,	Phillips,	Wright,
Dalzell,	Jenkins,	Powers,	Young, Pa.

NAYS—144.

Allen, Ky.	De Armond,	Little,	Ryan, N. Y.
Allen, Miss.	De Graffenreid,	Livingston,	Ryan, Pa.
Atwater,	Denny,	Lloyd,	Salmon,
Bailey, Tex.	De Vries,	McClellan,	Shackleford,
Ball,	Dinsmore,	McCulloch,	Shafroth,
Bankhead,	Dougherty,	McDowell,	Sheppard,
Barber,	Elliott	McLain,	Sibley,
Bell,	Epes,	McRae,	Sims,
Bellamy,	Finley,	Maddox,	Small,
Benton,	Fitzgerald, N. Y.	May,	Smith, Ky.
Berry,	Fleming,	Meekison,	Snodgrass,
Brantley,	Foster,	Meyer, La.	Sparkman,
Breazeale,	Fox,	Miers, Ind.	Spight,
Brenner,	Gaines,	Moon,	Stark,
Brewer,	Gaston,	Neville,	Stephens, Tex.
Broussard,	Gilbert,	Newlands,	Stokes,
Brundidge,	Glynn,	Noonan,	Sulzer,
Burke, Tex.	Gordon,	Norton, S. C.	Sutherland,
Burleson,	Green, Pa.	Otey,	Talbert,
Caldwell,	Griffith,	Pierce, Tenn.	Tate,
Carmack,	Griggs,	Polk,	Taylor, Ala.
Chanler,	Hall,	Quarles,	Terry,
Clark, Mo.	Hay,	Ransdell,	Thayer,
Clayton, Ala.	Henry, Tex.	Rhea, Ky.	Thomas, N. C.
Clayton, N. Y.	Howard,	Rhea, Va.	Turner,
Cochran, Mo.	Johnston,	Richardson,	Underwood,
Cooney,	Kitchin,	Ridgely,	Vandiver,
Cooper, Tex.	Kleberg,	Riordon,	Wheeler, Ky.
Cowherd,	Klutta,	Rixey,	Williams, J. R.
Crawford,	Lamb,	Robb,	Williams, W. E.
Crowley,	Lanham,	Robertson, La.	Williams, Miss.
Cummings,	Latimer,	Robbins,	Wilson, Idaho
Cusack,	Lentz,	Robinson, Ind.	Wilson, S. C.
Davenport, S. W.	Lester,	Robinson, Nebr.	Young, Va.
Davey,	Levy,	Rucker,	Zenor,
Davis,	Lewis,	Ruppert,	Ziegler.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Cox,	Driggs,	Henry, Miss.	Jett.

NOT VOTING—42.

Adams,	Emerson,	Lovering,	Stallings,
Adamson,	Fitzgerald, Mass.	McAleer,	Stewart, N. Y.
Bartlett,	Fitzpatrick,	Mann,	Stewart, Wis.
Bradley,	Gillet, N. Y.	Muller,	Swanson,
Brownlow,	Harmer,	Naphen,	Tompkins,
Burnett,	Hedge,	Norton, Ohio	Underhill,
Campbell,	Jones, Va.	Pearre,	Wanger,
Catchings,	Joy,	Scudder,	Wheeler, Ala.
Chickering,	Ketcham,	Sherman,	Wilson, N. Y.
Daly, N. J.	Littauer,	Slayden,	
Driscoll,	Loudenslager,	Smith, Md.	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. GILLET of New York with Mr. BARTLETT.

Mr. KETCHAM with Mr. COX.

Mr. EMERSON with Mr. MULLER.

Mr. HEDGE with Mr. HENRY of Mississippi.

Mr. HARMER with Mr. SWANSON.

Mr. LOVERING with Mr. NAPHEN.

Mr. PEARRE with Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts.

Mr. CHICKERING with Mr. STALLINGS.

Mr. LITTAUER with Mr. JONES of Virginia.

Mr. WANGER with Mr. ADAMSON.

Mr. SHERMAN with Mr. DRIGGS.

Mr. TOMPKINS with Mr. DALY of New Jersey.

Mr. ADAMS with Mr. BERRY.

For this day:

Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. BURNETT.

Mr. JOY with Mr. CATCHINGS.

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey with Mr. BRADLEY.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER with Mr. SMITH of Maryland.

Mr. BROWNLOW with Mr. NORTON of Ohio.

Mr. MORRIS with Mr. WILSON of New York.

Until Wednesday next:

Mr. STEWART of New York with Mr. SCUDDER.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from New York, Mr. KETCHAM. If he were present, he would vote "aye" and I would vote "no."

Mr. HENRY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. HEDGE. If he were present, he would vote "aye" and I would vote "no."

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. ADAMS. If he were present, he would vote "aye" and I would vote "no."

Mr. DRIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from New York, Mr. SHERMAN. I voted "no" under a misapprehension, and I now withdraw my vote. I would like to say that one of my colleagues, Mr. WILSON, was called home on account of sickness.

Mr. JETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask if the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MANN, has voted?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk says that he is not recorded.

Mr. JETT. Then I desire to withdraw my vote. If he were present, he would vote "aye," and I would vote "no."

Mr. RIXEY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. JONES, is absent. He desired me to state that if he were here he would vote "no" on this proposition. Mr. LITTAUER, with whom he is paired, would vote "aye."

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. STEWART, my colleague, is absent on account of sickness in the family. If present, he would vote "aye."

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. DALZELL, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to, was laid on the table.

PRINTING REPORT OF BOARD OF MANAGERS OF SOLDIERS' HOME.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed of the Report of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, in addition to the usual number, 500 copies of the report proper, 500 copies of the report of the assistant inspector-general on the State homes, and 150 copies of the record of members, for the use of the home.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana if there is any particular reason why this matter should be hurried and not take the usual course and go to the Committee on Printing?

Mr. STEELE. The only reason is this: I consulted with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], a leading member on the committee, and he says that if we have the report printed now the additional copies will cost very little. If we wait until after the type is distributed it will cost a great deal. It will now cost but a small sum to get the 500 additional copies.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Do I understand that these copies are for the House?

Mr. STEELE. No; we print a certain number of copies for the House that go with the report. These additional copies we propose to print are required for the use of the State Homes and the National Homes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My question is this: Is the Public Printer engaged now in printing the edition of this work?

Mr. STEELE. No; the report has just been handed in by the Speaker and ordered to be printed. Now, while this is being done for the House, I want the additional copies for the use of the Homes. That is all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. COWHERD. I want to ask the gentleman from Indiana a question with re erence to the concluding sentence of the resolution. It refers to 150 copies of the report. What report is proposed to be printed?

Mr. STEELE. This is the report of the Managers of the Soldiers' Homes, showing the names of the members, etc.

The resolution was considered, and agreed to.

DEATH OF HON. SAMUEL T. BAIRD.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my painful duty to announce to the House the death of the Hon. SAMUEL T. BAIRD, a Representative in the Fifty-fifth Congress and a member-elect to this Congress from the State of Louisiana.

At some future day we shall ask the House to set apart a time to pay fitting tribute to the character of the deceased.

I offer now the resolutions I send to the desk, and ask their immediate adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That this House has heard with deep regret and profound sorrow of the death of Hon. SAMUEL T. BAIRD, a member of the Fifty-fifth Congress and a member-elect to this Congress from the State of Louisiana.

Resolved further, That the Clerk of the House notify the Senate of the passage of these resolutions; and that as a further mark of respect to the memory of our deceased colleague the House do now adjourn.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to; and in accordance therewith (at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Saugerties Harbor, New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the journals of the council and house proceedings of the Fifth legislative assembly of Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Territories.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Providence River and Harbor, Rhode Island—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Tyaskin Creek, Maryland—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Yaquina Bay, Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Weschester Creek, New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Jackson Creek, Middlesex County, Va.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Rock Hall Harbor, Maryland—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of east shore of Lake Pepin, Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of proposed channel through Sabine Lake, Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of harbor of South San Francisco, San Mateo County, Cal.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Pawtucket River, Rhode Island—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of harbor at Portwing (mouth of Flag River), Wis.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Assonet River, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Green River, Kentucky—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of St. Croix River from Stillwater Harbor to Taylors Falls, Minn.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Elk River, Maryland—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the president of the Board of Managers for the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, transmitting the report of the board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899—to the Committees on Military Affairs and Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS: A bill (H. R. 2917) to further provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 2918) to regulate the employment and fix the period of service and fix the salary and pay of men employed in the Life-Saving Service on the rivers and lakes of the United States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McLAIN: A bill (H. R. 2919) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Natchez, Miss.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GASTON: A bill (H. R. 2920) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Meadville, Pa., and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 2921) in regard to a monumental column to commemorate the battle of Princeton, and appropriating $30,000 therefor—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2922) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Atlantic City, in the State of New Jersey—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 2923) to amend "An act defining cheese, and also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of 'filled cheese'"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 2924) revising and amending the statutes relating to patents—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut (by request): A bill (H. R. 2925) for the establishment of a national system of post roads, and for the extension of the Post-Office Department to cover the entire business of public transportation—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. KLUTTZ: A bill (H. R. 2926) for the construction of a driveway and approaches to the national cemetery at Salisbury, N. C.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 2927) to establish a court at Claremore, Cherokee Nation, Indian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2928) to establish a United States court at Sallisaw, Cherokee Nation, Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2929) providing for representation in the Congress of the United States of American citizens residing in the Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2930) to prevent monopoly and trusts, and to secure free competition in trade among the States and Territories of the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2931) to provide for submitting to the Court of Claims for determination the rights of the Delaware Indians in the Cherokee Nation, the Mississippi Choctaws in the Choctaw Nation, the Chickasaw freedmen in the Chickasaw Nation, and intermarried persons in the Choctaw, Chickasaw, and Cherokee nations, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2932) to regulate the practice of dentistry in the Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2933) to declare certain lands in the State of Arkansas subject to cash entry—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2934) to provide for the free coinage of gold and silver and the maintenance of the reserve fund, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2935) to provide a public building for the use of the post-office and other civil offices of the city of Pine Bluff, Ark.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2936) changing place of holding court in the central division of the Indian Territory from Cameron to Poteau, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2937) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to examine certain claims of persons who owned or occupied buildings on the Hot Springs Mountain Reservation which had been condemned by the Hot Springs Commission and afterwards burned, and to fix a reasonable value thereof, and making appropriation for the payment of said claims—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2938) to create a board of health and to regulate the practice of medicine and surgery in the Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2939) donating certain lands to town of Crystal Springs for the purpose of a public cemetery—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 2940) to amend section 4832 of the Revised Statutes of the United States so as to admit the officers and soldiers of the war with Spain to the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers at Dayton, Ohio—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REEVES: A bill (H. R. 2941) to amend the patent laws of the United States so as to allow the more reasonable use of inventions and discoveries by the people of the United States and to protect the patentee—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. CLAYTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 2942) to adjust the pension of those who have lost limbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 2943) to make goods, wares, and merchandise made in whole or in part by the labor of convicts subject to the laws of the State or Territory into which they may be transported—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WACHTER (by request): A bill (H. R. 2944) to permit the Washington Telephone and Telegraph Company to install, maintain, and operate a telephone and telegraph plant and exchanges in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 2945) for the erection of a public building at Allentown, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 2946) granting additional homestead rights to the soldiers and sailors of the Spanish and Philippine wars—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 2947) to provide for raising, organizing, and maintaining the Volunteer Army of the United States—to the Committee on the Militia.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 2948) amendatory of section 2 of the act of June 27, 1890, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2949) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," and for other purposes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 2950) to provide for an additional associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Arizona—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2951) to provide for local government of Arizona and the election of certain officers therein—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. CLARKE of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 2952) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Nashua, in the State of New Hampshire—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BURKETT: A bill (H. R. 2953) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Plattsmouth, Nebr., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2954) for the erection of a public building in the city of Falls City, Nebr.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2955) providing for the resurvey of township No. 8, of range No. 30 west of the sixth principal meridian, in Frontier County, State of Nebraska—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 2956) to extend the time for the completion of the incline railway on West Mountain, Hot Springs Reservation—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MOODY of Oregon: A bill (H. R. 2957) to establish an assay office at Baker City, Oreg.—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 2958) to grant lands to the State of Alabama for the use of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Alabama, for negroes, and the State Normal College, at Florence, Ala.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 2959) to authorize the purchase of a steam launch for use in the customs collection district of New London, Conn.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 2960) to extend the privileges of the act approved June 10, 1880, to the ports of Eastport and Calais, in the State of Maine—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEBERG: A bill (H. R. 2961) directing the Secretary of War to open up navigation between Corpus Christi and Point Isabel, Texas, and making appropriation therefor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 2962) fixing a rule of evidence in certain pension cases and providing pensions for increased disabilities—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2963) making all pensions of minors commence with the accrual of the right—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 2964) to provide for the erection of a bridge across the Detroit River at Detroit, in the State of Michigan—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 2965) to complete the establishment and erection of a military post near the city of Sheridan, in the State of Wyoming, and making an appropriation therefor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 2966) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Pekin, in the State of Illinois—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 2967) for the establishment, control, operation, and maintenance of the Northern Branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers at Hot Springs, in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 2968) to authorize national banking associations to organize branches in Cuba, Porto Rico, the Philippines, and any foreign country, and to issue letters of credit—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOY (by request): A bill (H. R. 2969) granting the right to the United States and West Indies Direct Telegraph Company to lay and operate cables between the United States and the islands of Cuba and Porto Rico and such other West Indies Islands that the United States has sovereignty over—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 2970) authorizing the West Indies Development Company to acquire, lease, sell, and convey rights, franchises, and concessions from the local governments of Cuba, Porto Rico, and such other island possessions that the United States has sovereignty over—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 2971) to extend the anticontract-labor laws of the United States to Hawaii—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 2972) to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. McDOWELL: A bill (H. R. 2973) authorizing the renewal of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the war with Spain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 2974) granting certain privileges to soldiers, sailors, or marines—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. EDDY: A bill (H. R. 2975) for the erection of a public building at Crookston, Minn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TONGUE: A bill (H. R. 2976) reserving from the public lands in the State of Oregon, as a public park for the benefit of the people of the United States, and for the protection and preservation of the game, fish, timber, and all other natural objects therein, a tract of land herein described, and so forth—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2977) to amend "An act to provide for the allotment of lands in severalty to Indians on the various reservations, and to extend the protection of the laws of the United States and the Territories over the Indians, and for other purposes," approved February 8, 1887—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2978) providing for a life-saving station at the entrance to Tillamook Bay, in Oregon, and for life-saving crew, and so forth—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2979) to establish an assay office at the city of Portland, in the State of Oregon—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 2980) to provide for telegraphic communication between the United States of America, the Hawaiian Islands, Guam, the Philippine Islands, Japan, and China, and to promote commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TONGUE: A bill (H. R. 2981) to enable the Secretary of the Interior to pay to the Indians upon Siletz Reservation, Oreg., the amounts due them under treaty stipulation in full—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2982) to establish an assay office at the city of Portland, in the State of Oregon—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. MOODY of Oregon: A bill (H. R. 2983) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers on the public lands, and to provide for the repayment of certain fees, purchase money, and commissions paid on void entries of public lands"—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TONGUE: A bill (H. R. 2984) to provide for the examination and classification of certain lands in the State of Oregon—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RIDGELY (by request): A bill (H. R. 2985) to encourage the employment of the American merchant marine, and to regulate the international carrying trade of the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: A bill (H. R. 2986) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to try and render final judgment in certain claims of the State of Indiana—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HALL: A bill (H. R. 2987) to amend the act entitled "An act for the granting of pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for manual labor," and approved June 27, 1890—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2988) authorizing the payment of pensions to teamsters in employ of the Quartermaster's Department during the late war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 2989) to provide for the erection of a public building at San Angelo, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SIBLEY: A bill (H. R. 2990) to amend section 17 of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1899, entitled "An act to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States"—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 2991) to create a commission to adjudicate claims of citizens of the United States growing out of the late war with Spain—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 2992) to amend an act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations, approved March 3, 1891—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 2993) to amend the laws relating to obstructions to navigation, for the protection of life and property from dangerous practices—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 2994) to authorize the construction of a regulating dam at the foot of Lake Erie, for the purpose of controlling the level of the lake and improving the harbors and waterways of Lake Erie, Detroit River, Lake St. Clair, St. Clair River, and to promote commerce—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 3056) to provide for military, naval, and industrial insurance, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS (by request): A bill (H. R. 3086) to redeem certain outstanding certificates of the board of audit of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LITTLE: a bill (H. R. 3141) for the repair of certain dikes at Pine Bluff, Ark.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3152) to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Capitol building, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TONGUE: A bill (H. R. 3295) for payment of balance unpaid on Oregon and Washington Territory Indian war claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LESTER: A bill (H. R. 3328) to establish a marine hospital at Savannah, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3329) to repeal sections 3412 and 3413 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 66) providing for the translation and publication of a work entitled The American Workingman, by Emile Levasseur—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. WHITE: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 67) for the purpose of making use of certain moneys now idle in the Treasury, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEVY: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 68) to grant a permit to the Commercial Cable Company of Cuba to lay and operate a submarine cable—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HEATWOLE: A resolution (H. Res. 28) to make arrangements for the celebration of the centennial anniversary of the establishment of the national capital in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LENTZ: A resolution (H. Res. 31) to provide committee to investigate conduct of United States Army officers in Idaho—to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 2995) to remove the record of dishonorable discharge from the military record of John Shamburger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 2996) granting a pension to John Laughlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2997) granting a pension to Elam Kirk—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2998) granting a pension to Francina Huntley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 2999) granting an increase of pension to George M. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKETT: A bill (H. R. 3000) granting a pension to Kate E. Buckham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 3001) for relief of the legal representatives of Leo L. Johnson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3002) for the relief of the heirs of B. H. Sowder—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRICK: A bill (H. R. 3003) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to loan naval equipment to certain military schools—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 3004) to correct the military record of Daniel R. Anderson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3005) for the relief of Eliza A. Leffler—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3006) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Robert P. Horn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3007) for the relief of John Ritter and others—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3008) for the relief of William Copp—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3009) to correct the naval record of John O'Conner—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3010) to correct the military record of George W. Johnston, deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3011) granting an honorable discharge to Jacob Lamont—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3012) granting a pension to Sarah Claggett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROWLEY: A bill (H. R. 3013) granting a pension to Theodore Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3014) granting a pension to Levi Goens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3015) to grant an honorable discharge to John Cheyne, for the benefit of Martha Ann Cheyne, his widow—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3016) to grant an increase of pension to Mary A. Ryon, widow of John W. Ryon, Company H, Fourth Illinois Infantry Volunteers, war with Mexico—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3017) to grant a pension to Martha A. Cheyne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLAYTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 3018) to remove the charge of desertion against the name of George W. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3019) granting a pension to Helen Raymond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 3020) for the relief of Rev. William T. McElroy—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLARKE of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 3021) granting a pension to Eliza H. Getchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3022) granting an increase of pension to Solon Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 3023) for the relief of Frank M. Dooley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHICKERING: A bill (H. R. 3024) to correct the relative rank of Edson A. Lewis, captain, Eighteenth Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3025) to remove the charge of desertion from Francis W. Osterhout, Company F, Sixteenth United States Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3026) for the relief of J. L. Pede—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3027) to pay Orville J. Jennings, of Fulton, N. Y., for work done under contract of March 25, 1889—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3028) to remove the charge of desertion from James W. Penny, alias Frederic Stanley, Company F, Second Regiment United States Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3029) for the relief of Henry P. Burns—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3030) to amend the military record of Herbert J. Bailey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3031) granting a pension to Polina Pierce, a daughter of John Erskine, who served in the war of the Revolution—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3032) for the relief of George W. Smith, late a private in Company B, Thirty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3033) for the relief of Joseph D. Grinnell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3034) for the relief of De Estang Shepard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3035) for the relief of Adolphus Sterling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3036) granting an honorable discharge to Charles King, late of Company C, Seventy-sixth Regiment New York Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3037) for the relief of men who enlisted in the United States Army or Navy prior to July 1, 1861—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3038) for the relief of Charles Lamar—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3039) granting a pension to Mary Danahay, invalid sister of Daniel Danahay, late a private in Company H, Eighteenth New York Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3040) to restore Ellen R. Klock, mother of Gleason R. Wellington, late of Company A, Twelfth New York Volunteer Cavalry, to the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3041) for the relief of Hugh Brady, alias Hugh Smith, late a private in Company K, Eleventh Connecticut Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3042) for the relief of Charles D. Lucas—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STANLEY W. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 3043) for the relief of Col. Charles B. Dougherty and other members of the Ninth Regiment of Pennsylvania Infantry—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DAVIS: A bill (H. R. 3044) for the relief of John M. Martin, of Ocala, Fla.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3045) increasing the pension of Esther A. C. Hardee—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DENNY: A bill (H. R. 3046) for the relief of representatives of James Hooper—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 3047) to remove charge of desertion from military record of John Faulds, Company G, Thirty-first Wisconsin Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3048) to correct military record of Shubal H. Breed, late a private of Company K, Second Wisconsin Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3049) to correct military record of Ira Pollock, private, Company C, Twenty-ninth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLEMING: A bill (H. R. 3050) granting a pension to Joseph P. Gibbs—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3051) for the relief of Henry B. King, of Richmond County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 3052) for the relief of J. A. Courtney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FARIS: A bill (H. R. 3053) for relief of Mary A. Coulson, widow of Sewell Coulson, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 3054) for the relief of Emma R. Rusling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3055) for the relief of Meta R. M. Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3057) for the relief of John H. Anderson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3058) granting a pension to Surg. Harvey E. Bowles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3059) for the relief of Horace J. Rowell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3060) granting an increase of pension to David A. Maple—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3061) for the relief of Henry Lane—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3062) for the relief of Joseph Stevenson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3063) granting an increase of pension to Lewis H. Cresse, late private, Company A, Seventh Regiment New Jersey Volunteers, to $20 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3064) to pension William F. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3065) to increase the pension of George R. Shebbard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3066) for the relief of William Ottmer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3067) granting a pension to Melvina Bottles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3068) for the relief of Evan M. Woodward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3069) for the relief of Foster W. Van Kirk—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3070) to extend letters patent No. 183716, for improvements in water-closets, granted October 24, 1876, to William Smith—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. GASTON: A bill (H. R. 3071) to increase the pension of Capt. John F. Nelson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3072) to increase the pension of William W. Wharton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 3073) for the relief of Bvt. Capt. James D. Vernay—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 3074) granting an increase of pension to Michael Ackerman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILL: A bill (H. R. 3075) to restore Capt. William Welsh, of Cadiz, Ohio, to the active list of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3076) granting a pension to George Edward Littleton, late pilot of steam vessels of United States—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3077) to pension David Reese, late of Company K, Third Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3078) to pension Amanda W. Clancy, widow of Col. C. W. Clancy, late Fifty-second Ohio—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 3079) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Winchester, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3080) for the relief of George W. Rosenberger—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HALL: A bill (H. R. 3081) for the relief of John Wassum, of Clarion County, Pa.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3082) granting a pension to J. H. Sparks, of Clearfield, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3083) for the relief of J. H. Sparks, of Clearfield, Pa.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3084) granting a pension to Paul Broadhead, of Dubois, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSTON: A bill (H. R. 3085) granting a pension to William Sheppard, late of Company A, Sixteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JETT: A bill (H. R. 3087) for the relief of William H. Hugo—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 3088) to pay Carlos W. Shane for services rendered in the winter of 1847–48, in the first Cayuse war—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 3089) to grant a pension to Kate M. Pond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3090) to correct the military record of Henry Finnegass—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 3091) to increase the pension of John Beaird—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3092) granting an honorable discharge to Henry P. Cassel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3093) granting a pension to Maggie Donovan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3094) to pension John Flynn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3095) for the relief of Arthur L. Flint—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3096) to increase the pension of Annie Gray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3097) granting pension to George John Heitzman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3098) granting a pension to James Hayden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3099) granting a pension to Robert P. Holliday—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3100) granting an increase of pension to Andrew B. Keith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3101) granting an increase of pension to Friendly Lewis—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3102) granting an increase of pension to J. B. Lightcap—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3103) granting an honorable discharge to Wilson S. Lafferty—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3104) granting an increase of pension to James McCoy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3105) to pension David C. McMillen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3106) granting a pension to P. H. Mahan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3107) to remove the charge of desertion against Peter Parsch—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3108) to remove the charge of desertion against Peter Mott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3109) granting a pension to John Ryan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3110) to increase the pension of James A. Ralston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3111) to remove the charge of desertion from John Ryan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3112) granting a pension to Lydia Sampsell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3113) granting a pension to Alexander Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3114) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Snyder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3115) to reimburse J. M. Starr for money paid the Government as postmaster at Penfield, Ohio—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3116) granting a pension to Effie Super—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3117) to correct the military record of George Schell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3118) to remove the charge of desertion against Cyrus A. Tuttle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3119) granting an increase of pension to George C. Underhill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3120) granting a pension to Alfred Vansickles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3121) granting a pension to Fred. C. Wickham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3122) granting an increase of pension to Rowland J. Welsh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3123) to increase the pension of James L. Wing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3124) for the relief of Jacob Walker, son and assignee of Thornton Ralls—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LESTER: A bill (H. R. 3125) for the relief of the Importing and Exporting Company of the State of Georgia—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3126) granting a pension to Olivia T. Way—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3127) for the relief of Rosa M. Wyatt, of Bryan County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3128) for the relief of the owners of the steamer *Leesburg*—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3129) for the relief of the estate of William I. Way—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3130) for the relief of Jacob Cohen—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LANE: A bill (H. R. 3131) to restore to the pension roll the name of Matilda O'Connor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 3132) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John H. Lash—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3133) for the relief of Edward Hounsom, of Glenwood, Mo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 3134) for the relief of James Q. Shirley and the estate of Francis De Long, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3135) to correct the military record of Lieut. Edward B. Howard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 3136) granting a pension to Adam Kelman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3137) granting a pension to Elijah E. Harvey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3138) granting a pension to Elisha J. Essex—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 3139) for the relief of Mrs. Mary L. Bryan, of Grant County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3140) appropriating $10,000 for the support of a school for the blind at Fort Gibson, Ind. T.—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3142) for the relief of the Pine Bluff Baptist Church, of Jefferson County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3143) for the relief of Chester Bethel—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3144) to relieve Abel S. Reynolds from the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3145) for the relief of certain persons residing in the original Hot Springs Reservation of Arkansas—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3146) granting a pension to Sarah A. Bowen—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3147) for the relief of Thomas Boles—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3148) for the relief of the estate of William B. Pool, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3149) for the relief of the legal representatives of Calvin B. Cunningham—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3150) for the relief of Elvey Brewer, of Saline County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3151) to authorize certain persons who have intermarried Cherokees to sue for their interest in certain moneys of the tribe in which they were excluded—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3153) for the relief of the estate of John Kirk—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3154) for the relief of the estate of J. H. Moseby, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3155) for the relief of the estate of William P. Burrough—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3156) for the relief of the firm of Bertrand & Scull, late of Arkansas—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3157) for the relief of the estate of Holliday S. Ravell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3158) granting a pension to Cyrus D. Johnson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3159) for the relief of John McDermott—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3160) to grant an honorable discharge to and remove the charge of desertion against Thomas Hardin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3161) for the relief of James A. Mitchell, of Sebastian County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3162) for the relief of the estate of Samuel J. Jones, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3163) for the relief of Mrs. Salome Sengel, widow—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3164) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth L. Traweek, of Sebastian County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3165) for the relief of the estate of James Scull, late of Arkansas—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3166) for the relief of Mrs. Mary L. Bryan, of Grant County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LYBRAND: A bill (H. R. 3167) to grant increase of pension to Thomas H. Cook, Company I, Seventeenth Illinois Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3168) to grant a pension to Silas Brown, Company B, One hundred and eighty-seventh Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3169) to correct military record of Sampson B. Ellsworth, Company G, First Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3170) to correct the military record of John A. Maddox, Company H, Eighty-eighth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3171) to correct the military record of Shannon S. Bailey, Company D, Second Battalion Eighteenth United States Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3172) to correct military record of Lawson Zane, Tenth Independent Battery Ohio Light Artillery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3173) to correct the military record of Jacob Schunk, of Company E, Eleventh Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3174) to grant pension to William L. Fawcett, Company D, One hundred and eighteenth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3175) for the relief of Mrs. S. B. Duvall, widow of Rev. W. P. Duvall—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3176) granting increase of pension to Joseph V. Stevenson, Company H, Ninety-sixth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3177) granting increase of pension to Thomas

Reed, Company H, Thirty-sixth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3178) to correct military record of Fredrick H. Steger, Company H, First New York Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3179) granting increase of pension to Isaiah W. Buckney, Company E, Fifty-fifth Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3180) for relief of and payment of bounty which may be due William Brake, Company F, Thirty-first Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McLAIN: A bill (H. R. 3181) for the relief of the Protestant Orphan Asylum of Natchez, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 3182) for the relief of John C. Phillips—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MEYER of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 3183) for the relief of John Kouns, of Louisiana, surviving partner, and so forth—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3184) for the relief of certain employees of the United States mint at New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3185) granting a pension to Bowman H. Peterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3186) for the relief of the estate of Raymond Pochelu, deceased, late of New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3187) for the relief of the estate of Dominigue Pochelu, deceased, late of New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3188) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Shannon, widow of Joseph R. Shannon, deceased, and administratrix of his estate—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3189) referring to the Court of Claims the claims for moneys paid as customs duties and of internal-revenue taxes on cigars imported from the island of Cuba by Francis A. Gonzales, and by Francis A. Gonzales and Antonio Gonzales—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3190) for the relief of John F. Kranz—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3191) for the relief of the heirs of Pierre Sanvé—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3192) for the relief of Emilie L. Major or her legal representatives—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3193) for the relief of certain heirs of the officers and crew of the United States light-house schooner *Mignonette*, lost near Brazos Santiago, Tex., in the storm of September 21, 1887—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3194) for the relief of A. Cusimano & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3195) for the relief of John Rhodes and wife—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3196) for the relief of F. Pezzica—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3197) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Mander—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3198) for relief of legal representatives of Frederick Fuhr, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3199) for the relief of the Third Presbyterian Church, of New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3200) for the relief of the owners of the British ship *Foscolia* and cargo—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3201) for the relief of Peter F. Kendall, of Louisiana—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 3202) granting a pension to Catherine E. O'Brien—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 3203) for the relief of Richard King—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORRIS: A bill (H. R. 3204) to refer certain claims for Indian depredations to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MULLER: A bill (H. R. 3205) granting an honorable discharge to Newall Graham, of the United States bark *Houghton* and the United States ship *Cactus*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3206) to correct the naval record of Thomas Dunn—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3207) for the relief of Tobias E. Lamb—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3208) for the relief of Hannah Dean Tillman—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 3209) to correct the military record of John Bennett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3210) granting a pension to Margaret Porter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3211) granting a pension to William C. Slater—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3212) to increase the pension of Johnson White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3213) to increase the pension of James C. Carlton—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3214) to increase the pension of J. S. Dukate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3215) to correct the military record of Preston H. Mitchell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3216) to correct the military record of John W. Parsons—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3217) granting a pension to Malinda McBride—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3218) granting an increase of pension to John W. Burton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3219) to grant a pension to William H. Lane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 3220) granting a pension to Mrs. Elmina Creighton—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3221) for the relief of the widow and heirs of Samuel Kramer—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NEWLANDS: A bill (H. R. 3222) for the relief of George W. Chedic—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3223) granting a pension to William H. Lane, late of Company D, Second United States Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3224) granting a pension to Jeremiah B. Moore—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OTEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 3225) granting a pension to Elizabeth Bent Cooper, of Yorktown, Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 3226) for the relief of Mrs. Sarah C. Jones and Mrs. Lucy F. Tyler—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 3227) for the relief of William Edward Bailey—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3228) for the relief of J. P. O'Brien—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 3229) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Emmet Stafford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3230) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Oscar A. Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3231) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Sylvester Morgan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3232) granting an increase of pension to David Flinn—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3233) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas B. Ireland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. RYAN of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3234) for the relief of Sadie Thome, widow of S. W. Thome, late United States consul at Asuncion, Paraguay, South America—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3235) granting an increase of pension to Robert M. McCormick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3236) removing charge of desertion from military record of John J. Muldowney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3237) removing charge of desertion from military record of Edward Delaney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3238) removing charge of desertion from military record of John Lucid—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3239) removing charge of desertion from military record of Morgan R. Hughes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBB: A bill (H. R. 3240) for the relief of the heirs of Erdman Bodenschatz, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 3241) for the relief of James H. Latham—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3242) for the relief of the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3243) granting a pension to Harriett S. Cady—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3244) granting a pension to Phebe A. Bean—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REEVES: A bill (H. R. 3245) for the relief of Cappie King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3246) for the relief of Isaac D. Page—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3247) for the relief of George Mowry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3248) granting a pension to Visa C. Morrill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3249) for the relief of A. J. Baker, of Streator, Lasalle County, Ill.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 3250) for the relief of Henry M. Bicknell, late postmaster, Garrett, Ind.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3251) to remove charge of desertion now standing against James Hennessy on rolls of the War Department—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 3252) for the relief of Sarah Somerville Lion, widow of Maj. Thomas W. Lion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3253) for the relief of Pohick Church, in Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 3254) for the relief of Ann M. Coleman, widow of Robert G. Coleman, deceased, of Virginia—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 3255) for the relief of John A. Fairfax, of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3256) for the relief of Robert D. Embrey—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 3257) granting an increase of pension to John W. Sutliff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3258) granting a pension to William C. Hickox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3259) granting a pension to Henry D. Wrighter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3260) granting a pension to Mrs. S. M. Button—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3261) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Hull—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3262) for the relief of Benjamin W. Loring—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 3263) granting a pension to Belinda Holt—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3264) granting a pension to Lydia G. Cate—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3265) granting a pension to Thomas O. Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3266) granting an increase of pension to Charles D. Hanscom—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3267) granting an increase of pension to Jacob W. Mooar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3268) granting an increase of pension to James W. Kessler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIBLEY: A bill (H. R. 3269) granting a pension to Eliza McIntyre Matheson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3270) for the relief of Joseph Grove, alias William Fitch, late of Company A, Thirteenth Ohio Infantry, and Company E, Eighth Kansas Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3271) granting a pension to Melissa A. McKissick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3272) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of Andrew P. Jones—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 3273) to repay to the city of Denver the sum of $3,200 for amounts of judgments it has been compelled to pay for damages incurred by reason of negligent construction by the United States of sidewalks adjacent to post-office building in that city—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 3274) for the relief of Julius E. Mugge, of San Antonio, Tex.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 3275) for the relief of Susan S. Rayner—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 3276) for the relief of the heirs of William Ward, deceased, late of Cartaret County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 3277) for the relief of the Cape Fear and People's Steamboat Company—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3278) for the relief of Thomas S. Lutterloh—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TONGUE: A bill (H. R. 3279) to increase the pension of Louis Alexander Dunlop, alias Alexander Dunlop—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3280) removing the charge of desertion against Thomas J. Matthews, who served as captain in Company I, Second Tennessee Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3281) to remove the charge of desertion against Edward Hughes and place his name on the pension roll at the rate of $25 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3282) to provide pension to Ralph E. Summers, for services in the Oregon Indian wars—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3283) for relief of B. F. Tupper—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3284) for the relief of the heirs at law of George McGhehey—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3285) authorizing the issuance to Charles F. Beebe of patents for certain mineral lands, and mill sites appurtenant thereto, in the State of Washington—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3286) providing for the payment of claims arising out of the Cayuse Indian war, in Oregon, in 1847–48—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3287) to provide for the payment of the claim of the Indians of the Klamath Reservation, in Oregon, and so forth—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3288) providing for the payment to the Indians of the Klamath Reservation, in Oregon, for lands excluded from the treaty reservation of said Indians by erroneous survey—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3289) to remove charge of desertion against Peter Kenney or Peter Kinney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3290) to remove the charge of desertion against James H. Rhodes, of Talent, Oreg.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3291) removing the charge of desertion from the name of James K. Parker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3292) removing the charge of desertion from the name of Edward Hughes, who served as a private in Company C, Fifth United States Volunteers, and also as a private in Company D, Thirty-eighth United States Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3293) granting a pension to John Kearns, of Stayton, Oreg.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3294) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim against the United States by John Perdue, his heirs and assigns, by reason of the loss of certain lands in the State of Oregon—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3296) for the relief of Henry Judge, of Ashland, Oreg.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3297) to pension Alonzo Sabin, of Company H, Fifty-second Regiment New York State National Guard Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3298) for the relief of the legal representatives of Chauncey M. Lockwood—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3299) to remove the charge of desertion against John Cabler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3300) granting to the Silver Lake Irrigation Company a right of way for reservoir and canal through the Klamath Indian Reservation, in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3301) confirming the sale of certain lands owned by Jefferson Harney and wife and allowing the same to be alienated—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3302) for the relief of William H. Campbell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3303) granting a pension to Robert Sturgens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3304) to correct the military record of John Fox, of Albany, Oreg.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3305) granting a pension to Littleton Lindsay, of Hillsboro, Oreg.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 3306) to remove the charge of desertion from record of William Heine—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3307) for the relief of Matilda Hennessy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3308) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Thomas Haller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3309) to remove charge of desertion from record of Albert Olde—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3310) to remove the charge of desertion from record of Enoch Vandecar—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 3311) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of William Ridge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 3312) for the relief of Ellen V. Myer, widow of George V. Myer, late Company K, Fiftieth Pennsylvania Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3313) for the relief of Robert McMahon, late of Company D, Seventh Pennsylvania Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3314) for the relief of Francis Johnson, late of Company A, Fifty-seventh Pennsylvania Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3315) for the relief of Charles W. Chapman, late of Company B, Seventh Pennsylvania Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3316) for the relief of George B. Capwell, alias George B. Casswell, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-first Pennsylvania Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3317) for the relief of Judson G. Howell, late of Company F, One hundred and seventh Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3318) for the relief of Richard H. L. Craw, late of Company H, Fifth Pennsylvania Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3319) to correct the military record of Theodore W. Dunham—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3320) to correct the military record of James Hagerty, late private, Company K, Seventy-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3321) to correct the military record of Mansel H. James, deceased, late of Cannelton, Ind.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3322) to correct the military record of John L. Keys—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3323) to authorize the President to revoke the order dismissing William T. Godwin, late first lieutenant, Tenth Infantry, United States Army, and to place the said William T. Godwin on the retired list with the rank of first lieutenant—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3324) to correct the military record of Max Muller, late private, Company K, Third Regiment United States Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3325) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of John Scanlin, late private, Company F, Eighty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 3326) for the relief of the trustees of St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church at Norfolk, Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3327) for the relief of the trustees of the Norfolk Academy—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: Petition of the Bainbridge Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Philadelphia, Pa., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Petitions of citizens of the Thirty-third Congressional district of New York, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: Petitions of citizens of Portland, Brunswick, and other towns in the First Congressional district of Maine, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. ATWATER: Petition of J. Baringer and others, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BABCOCK: Petitions of citizens of the Third Congressional district of Wisconsin, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BAILEY of Kansas: Petitions of 108 citizens of the State of Kansas, against the admission of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BAKER: Petitions of citizens of the Second Congressional district of Maryland, against the admission of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BARBER: Petitions of numerous citizens of the Eighth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, urging the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, petition of Christian Endeavorers of Schoeneck, Pa., favoring international arbitration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BELL: Resolution of the Presbyterian Church Synod of Colorado and petitions of citizens of Colorado, against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BELLAMY: Petition of citizens of the Sixth Congressional district of North Carolina, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Petitions of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BOREING: Petitions of citizens of the Eleventh Congressional district of Kentucky, in opposition to the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: Petitions of citizens of the Fourth Congressional district of Maine, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BROSIUS: Protest of 70 citizens of Lancaster County, Pa., against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BROWN: Petitions of numerous citizens of the Sixth Congressional district of Ohio, against the seating of B. H. Roberts in the House of Representatives—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: Petitions of citizens of the Sixth Congressional district of Arkansas, protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BULL: Petitions of citizens of the State of Rhode Island, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Petitions of citizens of the Second Congressional district of South Dakota, protesting against the admission of Brigham H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BURKETT: Resolutions of the Ministerial Association of Lincoln, Nebr., and citizens of the First Congressional district of Nebraska, and of the Epworth League of Normal, Nebr., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petitions of citizens of the Third Congressional district of Maine, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petitions of citizens of the Sixth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, urging the rejection of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: Petitions of numerous citizens of the Fifth Congressional district of Kansas, protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. CAPRON: Petitions of citizens of the Second Congressional district of Rhode Island, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: Petitions of citizens of the Ninth Congressional district of Missouri, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. COCHRANE of New York: Petitions of citizens of the Nineteenth Congressional district of New York, for the reclassification of the Railway Mail Service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. COUSINS: Petitions of citizens of Tipton, Monticello, Animosa, and other towns in the State of Iowa, urging the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. COX: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Frank M. Dooley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROMER: Sundry petitions of citizens of the Eighth Congressional district of Indiana, protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. CROWLEY: Papers to accompany House bill to increase the pension of Mary A. Ryan—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to Levi Goens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers in support of House bill for the relief of Martha A. Cheyne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Theodore Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill granting an honorable discharge to John A. Cheyne—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: Protests of citizens of the Tenth Congressional district of Indiana, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. DALZELL: Numerous protests of citizens of the Twenty-second Congressional district of Pennsylvania, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. S. A. DAVENPORT: Sundry petitions of citizens of the State of Pennsylvania, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: Petitions of citizens of the Sixth Congressional district of Wisconsin, against the seating of Representative-elect B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. DAVIS: Petitions of citizens of Ocala and Palatka, Fla., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. DENNY: Petition of citizens of the Fourth Congressional district of Maryland, protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. DOVENER: Petitions of citizens of Bethany and Middlebourne, W. Va., against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. EDDY: Sundry petitions of citizens of the Seventh Congressional district of Minnesota, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of Rev. E. Marsh and citizens of Willsboro, Bushkirk, Cassayuna, Shushan, Glens Falls, Burke, Coila, and Cambridge, N. Y., against the admission of B. H. Roberts to the Fifty-sixth Congress—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. ESCH: Petitions of numerous citizens of the Seventh Congressional district of Wisconsin, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. FARIS: Petitions of citizens of Rockville, Md., against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Petitions of numerous citizens of the State of Minnesota, protesting against the admission of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. FLYNN: Paper to accompany House bill No. 2638, for the relief of Hezekiah Faubrian—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 2639, for the relief of Joshua D. Ditto—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREER: Protests of various religious denominations and citizens of West Virginia, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. GAMBLE: Sundry petitions of citizens of the State of South Dakota, against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. GASTON: Two petitions of surfmen and citizens, relating to surfmen of the United States life-saving station—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petitions of railway postal clerks for the reclassification of the Railway Mail Service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GORDON: Petitions of citizens of the Fourth Congressional district of Ohio, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petitions of the Presbytery of Allegheny and numerous citizens of Allegheny, Pa.; citizens of Emsworth, Glenshaw, and others of the Twenty-third Congressional district of Pennsylvania, against the admission of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Petitions of citizens of Freetower, Falmouth, and Cataumet, Mass., against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Petitions of citizens of Greensburg and Rising Sun and counties of Jefferson and Decatur, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Petitions of citizens of the Fourth Congressional district of Michigan, against the admission of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. HAY: Petitions of citizens of the Seventh Congressional district of Virginia, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. HEDGE: Numerous petitions of citizens of the First Congressional district of Iowa, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petitions of numerous citizens of the State of Connecticut, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. HILL: Petitions of citizens of the Fourth Congressional district of Connecticut, against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. HITT: Petitions of citizens of Mount Morris, Ashton, Kings, and other towns in the Ninth Congressional district of Illinois, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. HOFFECKER: Sundry petitions of citizens of the State of Delaware, protesting against the admission of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petitions of numerous citizens in the State of New Jersey, protesting against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. JONES of Washington (by request): Statement of Judge Randolph, to accompany petition of J. Edward Buckley—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Christian Church of Walla Walla and citizens of the State of Washington, protesting against the admission of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. KERR: Petitions of citizens of the Fourteenth Congressional district of Ohio, favoring the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of citizens of the Eighteenth Congressional district of the State of New York, protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. KLUTTZ (by request): Petition of the heirs of Thomas S. Martin, of Yadkin County, N. C., asking reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KNOX: Petition of James Spence and others, of Andover, Mass., opposing the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. LANE: Petitions of citizens of the Second Congressional district of Iowa, protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. LITTLE: Petitions of citizens of the Second Congressional district of Arkansas, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Petitions of citizens of the Second Congressional district of Maine, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. LLOYD: Petitions of citizens of the First Congressional district of Missouri, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. LONG: Petitions of citizens of the Seventh Congressional district of Kansas, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. LYBRAND: Petitions of voters and citizens of Huntsville, Ohio, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. McCALL: Petitions of citizens of the Eighth Congressional district of Massachusetts, protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. McDOWELL: Petitions of citizens of the Seventeenth Congressional district of Ohio, asking for the rejection of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. MADDOX: Petition of the heirs of John F. Cannon, of Gordon County, Ga., praying for reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the heirs of Andrew Milligan, of Chattooga County, Ga., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of citizens of the Seventh Congressional district of Georgia, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. MANN: Petitions of surfmen and citizens of Chicago, Ill., relating to surfmen of the United States life-saving station—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MERCER: Petitions of citizens of the Second Congressional district of Nebraska, urging the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Petition of voters of Bloomington, Ind., against the admission of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Malinda McBride—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Johnson White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of John Burton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill in behalf of John Bennett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of John W. Parsons—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of James C. Carlton—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MINOR: Petitions of citizens of Sturgeon Bay, Clintonville, New London, Appleton, Marshfield, and other towns in the State of Wisconsin, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. MOON: Various petitions of citizens of the Third Congressional district of Tennessee, against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. MULLER: Petitions of citizens of the Seventh Congressional district of New York, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, petition of citizens of the Seventh Congressional district of New York, for the reclassification of the Railway Mail Service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., asking that some of the new ships be constructed at the New York Navy-Yard—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petition of citizens of Tulare, Cal., against the admission of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. NEVILLE: Resolutions and petitions of numerous citizens of the Sixth Congressional district of Nebraska, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. NORTON of Ohio: Petitions of numerous citizens of the Thirteenth Congressional district of Ohio, against the admission of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. OTJEN: Petition of H. R. Upton and others of the Fourth Congressional district, urging the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. OTEY: Petitions of citizens of the Sixth Congressional district of Virginia, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. PACKER of Pennsylvania: Petitions of numerous citizens of the Sixteenth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, against the seating of B. H. Roberts in the House of Representatives—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: Petitions of citizens of the Twentieth Congressional district of Ohio, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. POWERS: Petition of citizens of the First Congressional district of Vermont, against the admission of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. PRINCE: Petitions of numerous citizens of the Tenth Congressional district of Illinois, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. RAY of New York: Paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to William C. Hickey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Henry D. Wrighter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for an increase of pension to Jacob Hull—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of citizens of the Twenty-sixth Congressional district of New York, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. RIDGELY: Petitions of citizens of Independence and Varck, against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. RIXEY: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Sarah Somerville Lion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBB: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of the heirs of Edward Bodenchatz, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Petitions of numerous citizens of the Seventh Congressional district of the State of Massachusetts, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Petitions of citizens of Watertown, Conn., against the seating of Representative-elect B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petitions of citizens of the Twenty-fifth Congressional district of New York, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SIBLEY: Petitions of citizens of the Twenty-seventh Congressional district of Pennsylvania, protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SIMS: Petitions of citizens of the Eighth Congressional district of Tennessee, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petitions of citizens of the Twenty-second Congressional district of Illinois, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: Petitions of numerous citizens of the Second Congressional district of Michigan, against the seating of B. H. Roberts in the House of Representatives—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: Petitions of citizens of the Ninth Congressional district of Ohio, urging the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SPALDING: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Larimore and citizens of North Dakota, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petitions of citizens of Southbury, Deep River, and Middletown, Conn., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, resolutions of Admiral Foote Post, No. 17, Department of Connecticut, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPRAGUE: Petitions of citizens of Milford, Mansfield, Roxbury, and other towns in the State of Massachusetts, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. STARK: Protests of citizens of Saunders, Polk, and Saline counties, Nebr., and D. B. Perry and others, of Crete, Nebr., against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Resolution of the Synod of Minnesota and citizens, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, resolution of the St. Paul Chamber of Commerce, in favor of placing hides on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: Petition of citizens of the Ninth Congressional district of the State of Wisconsin, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petitions of citizens of the First Congressional district of New Hampshire, against the seating of B. H. Roberts in the House of Representatives—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Petitions of citizens of the Fifth Congressional district of Nebraska, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. TERRY: Petition of the Little Rock Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. THAYER: Petitions of citizens of the Third Congressional district of Massachusetts, protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. VREELAND: Petitions of citizens of the Thirty-fourth Congressional district of New York, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. WACHTER: Petitions of citizens of Baltimore, Md., and others, for the construction of a light-house on Point No Point, on the west side of Chesapeake Bay—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WANGER: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions, missionary associations, churches, and citizens of the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. WARNER: Petitions of citizens of the Thirteenth Congressional district of Illinois, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. WATERS: Sundry petitions of citizens of the Sixth Congressional district of California, protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. WEAVER: Petition of citizens of Springfield, Ohio, urging the rejection of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, petitions of citizens of the Seventh Congressional district of Ohio, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: Petitions of citizens of the Fourth Congressional district of Massachusetts, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. WHITE: Paper to accompany joint resolution No. 67,

relating to money due the estates of deceased colored soldiers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Tarboro and Kinston, N. C., for the rejection of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: Paper to accompany House bill to correct the military record of John Scanlin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill to correct the military record of Theodore W. Dunham—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill to correct the military record of Max Miller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill revoking the order dismissing William T. Godwin, late of the United States Army, and placing him on the retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. ZIEGLER: Protests of citizens of the Nineteenth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *December 11, 1899.*

Prayer by Rev. LUCIEN CLARK, D. D., of the city of Washington.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut called the Senate to order, and the Secretary read the following:

UNITED STATES SENATE.
Washington, D. C., December 11, 1899.

I, WILLIAM P. FRYE, President pro tempore of the Senate, being absent from the city of Washington, hereby designate Senator O. H. PLATT to perform the duties of the Chair on this day.

WM. P. FRYE.

Thereupon Mr. PLATT of Connecticut took the chair as Presiding Officer for to-day.

THE JOURNAL.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last, when, on motion of Mr. BURROWS, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

PURCHASE OF SUPPLIES FOR TROOPS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Quartermaster-General of the Army, calling attention to the necessity for continuing the suspension of provisions in the act of June 7, 1898, entitled "An act to suspend the operations of law relating to the War Department, and for other purposes;" which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF BOARD OF ORDNANCE AND FORTIFICATION.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting the annual report of the Board of Ordnance and Fortification for the year ended October 31, 1899; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

EXAMINATION OF ACCOUNTS BY WAR DEPARTMENT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting copies of letters from the Quartermaster-General and Surgeon-General of the Army, together with copies of indorsements thereon by the Acting Commissary-General of Subsistence, the Inspector-General, the Chief Signal Officer, the Chief of Engineers, the Chief of Ordnance, and the Paymaster-General of the Army, calling attention to the urgent necessity for continuing the suspension of the provision of the law for examination of monthly accounts by bureaus and offices of the War Department; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF VISITORS TO ANNAPOLIS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a copy of the report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy for the year 1899; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

STATUTES RELATING TO PATENTS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following communication from the commissioners to revise and amend the statutes relating to patents, trade-marks, etc.; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Patents, and ordered to be printed:

DECEMBER 11, 1899.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE, *Washington, D. C.*

SIR: We, the commissioners to revise and amend the statutes relating to patents, trade and other marks, and trade and commercial names, appointed under the act approved June 4, 1898, have the honor to present herewith to you, and through you to the Senate, a preliminary report.

Very respectfully,

FRANCIS FORBES.
A. P. GREELEY.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF OKLAHOMA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the journals of the council and house proceedings of the Fifth legislative assembly of the Territory of Oklahoma, together with a copy of the session laws of 1899; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Territories.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEW MEXICO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the journals of the council and house proceedings of the Thirty-third legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, together with a copy of the session laws of 1899, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Territories.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ARIZONA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the journals of the Twentieth legislative assembly of the Territory of Arizona, together with a copy of the session laws of that Territory; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Territories.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER presented a petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GALLINGER presented the petition of S. F. Shepardson and 8 other citizens of Parkhill, N. H., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BAKER presented the petition of John F. Brown, principal chief of the Seminole Nation of Indians, of Wewoka, Ind. T., praying that an appropriation be made for the payment of the claims of the loyal Seminole Indians; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. HOAR. I present resolutions of the legislature of Massachusetts, in favor of the adoption of a constitutional amendment giving Congress authority to establish uniform hours of labor in manufactories throughout the United States. The resolutions should be read, I suppose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts desire to have them read or printed in the RECORD without reading?

Mr. HOAR. They should be read, according to the uniform courtesy of the Senate, I believe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolutions will be read.

The resolutions were read, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, *in the year 1899.*

Resolutions relative to a proposed constitutional amendment giving Congress authority to establish uniform hours of labor in manufactories.

Resolved, That the general court hereby approves the endeavor of the Hon. WILLIAM C. LOVERING, Representative from this Commonwealth in the Congress of the United States, to procure the submission to the several States by Congress of a constitutional amendment giving Congress authority to establish uniform hours of labor in manufactories throughout the United States.

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to each of the Senators and to the several Representatives in Congress from this Commonwealth.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *March 29, 1899.*

Adopted. Sent up for concurrence.

JAMES W. KIMBALL, *Clerk.*

SENATE, *March 31, 1899.*

Adopted in concurrence.

HENRY D. COOLIDGE, *Clerk.*

A true copy.
Attest:
JAMES W. KIMBALL,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of 210 citizens of Massachusetts, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the memorials of Edwin D. Mead and 153 other citizens and of C. H. Johnson and 5 other citizens of Massachusetts; V. D. Kenney and 53 other citizens of Nebraska; O. E. Bross and 37 other citizens of Iowa; C. C. Parker and 19 other citizens of Arkansas; W. Mumford, of Jersey City, N. J.; Rev. John Anketell, of New York; Capt. George W. Loyd and 169 other citizens of New York; J. Loudenslager and 157 other citizens of Ohio; G. C. Mercer and 119 other citizens of Pennsylvania; D. F. Festner, of Covington, Ky.; Carl Schon and 2 other citizens of Maryland; Mrs. M. A. Marshall, of Orange Valley, N. J.; E. H. Pease and 9 other citizens of Connecticut; Louis Buck and 9 other citizens of Indiana; J. S. Wilson and 2 other citizens of South Dakota; August Hansem and 9 other citizens of California; R. E. Blount and 29 other citizens of Illinois; W. P. Butler and 160 other citizens of Minnesota; Fred N. Crundem and 56 other citizens of Missouri; Samuel R. Craig and 3 other citizens of Maine; I. W. Mitchell and 9 other citizens of Kansas, and H. B. Nichols and 9 other citizens of Oregon, remonstrating against any extension of the sovereignty of the United States over the Philippine Islands in any event, and over any other foreign territory without the free consent of the people thereof; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of 103 citizens of Providence, R. I., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SEWELL presented the petitions of Rev. Earnest F. Partridge and 61 other citizens of Manahawkin, of Albert Allen and 17 other citizens of Point Pleasant, John Nixon and 11 other citizens of Broadway, F. T. Walker Jones and 64 other citizens, Charles B. Reed and 8 other citizens of Colts Neck, H. O. Breemer and 18 other citizens of Branchville, William Nelson and 37 other citizens of Paterson, J. W. Davis and 48 other citizens of Burlington, George W. Whitney and 82 other citizens of Jersey City, A. B. McKoff and 36 other citizens of Hightstown, W. P. Stevenson and 78 other citizens of Roselle, Walter Satherwart and 19 other citizens of Allentown, W. Hotchkiss and 116 other citizens of Upper Montclair, J. H. Alberton and 34 other citizens of Ironia, W. H. Gulick and 52 other citizens of Kingston, Rev. T. H. Athey and 50 other citizens of Hammonton, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Woodstown, P. V. Bergen and 39 other citizens of Bound Brook, Edward D. Hutchinson and 23 other citizens of Plainfield, Thomas Plater and 46 other citizens, J. C. Mayberry and 21 other citizens of Marksboro, of the Hudson County Christian Endeavor Union, of Jersey City, H. D. Brass and 33 other citizens of Basking Ridge, S. H. Crawford and 40 other citizens of Montclair, C. De Yound and 14 other citizens of Paterson, George W. Peak and 14 other citizens, W. H. Oppangh and 49 other citizens of Springfield, Rev. L. B. Hafer and 38 other citizens of Friesburg, Henry P. Condit and 54 other citizens of Westfield, James C. H. Webb and 194 other citizens of Madison, W. J. Nevies and 56 other citizens of South Orange, T. D. Warrick and 46 other citizens of Clayton, J. F. Hulbert and 53 other citizens, and of Edward Barrow and 126 other citizens of Clinton, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McMILLAN presented the petition of H. A. Mosser, of Mount Clemens, and sundry other citizens of Michigan, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURROWS presented the petitions of the Ministerial Alliance of Kalamazoo, of Rev. J. J. Cooper and sundry other citizens of Bellevue, Gil R. Lovejoy and 68 other citizens of Macomb County, C. B. Case and sundry other citizens of Lenawee County, J. T. Otis and 99 other citizens of Grand Junction and Breedsville, of A. J. Osborn and 46 other citizens of Hillsdale County, and of James Easton and 18 other citizens of Clare, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TURLEY presented the petitions of R. F. Carr and 22 other citizens of Cumberland Gap, W. T. Hart and 46 other citizens of Hustburg, A. L. Wheatley and 17 other citizens of Wayne County, E. S. Namon and 122 other citizens of Knoxville, T. O. Maynard and 18 other citizens of Dekalb County, B. F. Lamb and 18 other citizens of Luther, Edward Walker and 28 other citizens of Otes, W. R. Dawson and 103 other citizens of Knox County, R. L. Cox and 11 other citizens of Louisville, G. C. Duncan and 23 other citizens of Winfield, R. H. Anthony and 26 other citizens of Greenfield, N. O. Castle and 25 other citizens of Harriman, and A. E. Clements and 107 other citizens of Tracy City, all in the State of Tennessee, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McLAURIN presented petitions of the general missionary committee of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of E. W. Key and sundry other citizens of Greenville, and of G. W. Grant and sundry other citizens of Richardsonville, all in the State of South Carolina, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Baptist Convention of South Carolina, remonstrating against the admission of Representative-elect Roberts to a seat in the House of Representatives; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PETTUS presented the petitions of Dr. T. C. Eiland and sundry other citizens of Bullock, of R. C. Abernethy and sundry other citizens of Tinela, of G. H. Harris and sundry other citizens, and of O. C. Doster and 15 other citizens of Newton, all in the State of Alabama, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HEITFELD presented petitions of the Commercial Club of Lewiston, of the board of county commissioners of Latah County, of the city council of Lewiston, and of the village council of Nampa, all in the State of Idaho, praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of a portage railroad at The Dalles and Celilo, in Oregon and Washington, to facilitate the navigation of the Columbia River; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. KEAN presented the petitions of T. W. Cogle and 14 other citizens of Jersey City, of Rudolph Proctor and 16 other citizens of Yardville, of Alex. Harvey and 10 other citizens of New Jersey, of Fred M. Geer and 99 other citizens of East Orange, Moses H. Canfield and 26 other citizens, Albert Von Duson and 14 other citizens of Pinebrook, J. R. Atkinson and 14 other citizens of Elizabeth, of 14 members of the Fortnightly Jaunts Club of Madison, of sundry members of the Christian Endeavor Union of Hudson County, of Rev. John B. Kugler and 20 other citizens of Reaville, and of John H. Palmer and 45 other citizens of East Orange, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COCKRELL presented the petition of F. W. Hunn and sundry other citizens of Kirkwood, Mo., and the petition of W. C. Davis and sundry other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of sundry citizens of California, praying for the establishment and equipment of a gun-assembling plant for the Pacific coast, and suggesting Benecia, Cal., as the best location for that plant; which was referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented the petitions of James A. Batty and 61 other citizens of Elwood, of William F. Barclay and 36 other citizens of Harmony, Alonzo B. Clark and 12 other citizens of Indianapolis, Rev. J. L. Riley and 32 other citizens of Cynthiana, J. A. Barnes and 62 other citizens of Hebron, and of Rev. H. J. McKinnell and 19 other citizens of Marshfield, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HANNA presented a petition of J. C. McCoy Post, No. 1, Grand Army of the Republic, of Columbus, Ohio, praying for the passage of a per diem pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the State Medical Society, of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation regulating the inspection of immigrants; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the survivors of the One hundred and sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the passage of the service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the laying a cable between the United States and Cuba; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the League of Fourth-Class Postmasters of Caldwell, Ohio, and a petition of the League of Fourth-Class Postmasters of Arabia, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation increasing the salaries of fourth-class postmasters; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of D. M. Ronzer Post, No. 393, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Ohio, praying that an appropriation be made to enable ex-Union soldiers who have lost limbs by reason of accident or disease since their discharge to purchase artificial ones; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of Dr. C. M. Galloway, of Xenia, Ohio, and 22 other petitions of sundry citizens of Ohio; of H. S. Lawrence, of Van Wert, Ohio, and 25 other petitions of sundry

citizens of Ohio; of G. A. Watt, of Bellevue, Ohio, and 58 other petitions of sundry citizens of Ohio; of Rev. J. M. Anderson, of Columbus, Ohio, and 26 other petitions of sundry citizens of Ohio; of Martin Seelig, of Summit Hill, Ohio, and 20 other petitions of sundry citizens of Ohio; of H. N. Henderson, of Lynchburg, Ohio, and 8 other petitions of sundry citizens of Ohio; of J. M. Keck, of Kingsville, Ohio, and 32 other petitions of sundry citizens of Ohio; and of R. H. Till, of East Liverpool, Ohio, and 2 other petitions of sundry citizens of Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of W. R. Smith, of Lexington, Ky., praying for the enactment of legislation increasing the pensions of Mexican war veterans; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PRITCHARD presented a petition of the Southern Cotton Spinners' Association, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the preservation of the integrity of the Chinese Empire, for the vigorous prosecution of the war in the Philippines, for the construction of an isthmian ship canal, and for the construction of a cable from the Pacific coast to Hawaii, Japan, China, the Philippines, and other oriental points; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOUTHERN COTTON SPINNERS' ASSOCIATION,
SECRETARY AND TREASURER'S OFFICE,
Charlotte, N. C., November 11, 1899.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the cotton-yarn department of our association, which was convened in this city November 2, 1899, and at which meeting there were representatives of over sixty cotton mills, representing millions of dollars invested capital, resolutions, of which the following is a copy, were offered and unanimously adopted.

Yours, very truly,

DR. JOHN H. MCADEN, *President.*
GEORGE B. HISS, *Secretary and Treasurer.*

RESOLUTIONS.

"Mr. D. A. Tompkins, of Charlotte, N. C., offered the following preamble and resolutions, seconded by Mr. R. B. Miller, of Shelby, N. C.:

"Whereas the increasing manufacturing interests of the United States from nine billion dollars value in 1890 to twenty billion (estimated) in 1900 makes it plain that our domestic markets can no longer take all our manufactured products; and

"Whereas the Southern cotton manufacturing interests alone have increased from the product in 1890 of one and a half million spindles to five million (estimated) in 1900, and the development of trade for our surplus American-made cotton goods has been largely in China and other oriental countries: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we urge upon the President of the United States and our Senators and Representatives in Congress the following measures:

"First. The preservation of the integrity of the Chinese Empire, of all our treaty rights with that Empire, and the maintenance of an open-door policy in China with the commerce of all nations.

"Second. Vigorous prosecution of the Philippine war to a conclusion and the restoration of order in that territory by our Government.

"Third. Construction, without delay, of an isthmian ship canal.

"Fourth. Construction of a cable from the Pacific coast to Hawaii, Japan, China, the Philippines, and other oriental points.

"*Resolved*, That we consider that a large degree of the importance of the last three items lies in the value of those measures in accomplishing the first item and in protecting our trade in China and othern Eastern countries.

"*Resolved*, That we recommend, if it be necessary, cooperation of our Government with the Governments of England and Japan to preserve and protect a common trade interest and treaty rights for unrestricted commerce in China and other Eastern countries.

"*Resolved*, That we recommend to Congress such revision of our navigation laws as will foster the development of our merchant-marine service to an extent to handle our expanding foreign commerce.

"*Resolved*, That we recommend to Congress such increase in our Navy as will make it fully adequate to protect our commerce in all seas and in all parts of the world.

"*Resolved*, That printed copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress, and to the press."

Mr. PRITCHARD presented petitions of the North Carolina and Virginia Conference, William A. Darr and 230 other citizens, of R. A. Spaugh and other citizens, J. O. Adkinson and 19 other citizens, D. P. Wynn and 68 others, Henry T. Gregory and 31 other citizens, J. J. Barker and 18 other citizens, Rev. N. H. Guyton and 15 other citizens, J. M. Williams and 45 other citizens, Harry M. Boyd and 18 other citizens, John M. Morgan and 35 other citizens, George T. Simmons and 22 other citizens, and of the general missionary committee of the Methodist Episcopal Church, all in the State of North Carolina, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Morrison County, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation opening railroad indemnity lands to settlement under the homestead law; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation removing the tariff on hides; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the legislature of Minnesota, praying that the internal-revenue tax be removed from contracts of sale on wheat, corn, oats, flax, and other grain; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petitions of Rev. F. W. Fraser and 26 other citizens of Crookston, of Rev. F. E. Seazer and 8 other citizens of Lake Benton, Rev. J. G. Reinhardt and 10 other citizens of Clara City, Rev. C. E. Shepherd and 14 other citizens of Clear Lake, H. W. Barker and 18 other citizens of Elbow Lake, Rev. George R. S. Fisher and 19 other citizens of Rochester, C. E. Oakley and 25 other citizens of Buffalo, L. C. Little and 22 other citizens of Minneapolis, H. E. Barrett and 47 other citizens of Minneapolis, L. C. Little and 315 other citizens of Minneapolis, E. S. Nooldredge and 41 other citizens of Stewartville, W. G. Hammett and 14 other citizens of Hawley, O. S. Taylor and 17 other citizens of Castle Rock, John Black and 14 other citizens of Alexandria, J. H. Nelson and 18 other citizens of Sacred Heart, George H. Houghton and 44 other citizens of Minneapolis, W. S. Frear and 48 other citizens, J. T. McCleary and 18 other citizens of Marshall, Rev. G. R. Wannemacher and 17 other citizens of Marshall, Mrs. Mattie King and 48 other citizens, Rev. William Ezra Bates and 300 other citizens of Winnebago City, Frank Benson and 14 other citizens of Harmony, and of J. Simonsen and 12 other citizens of Northfield, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PENROSE presented petitions of 176 citizens of Philadelphia, of 46 citizens of Corry, 15 citizens of Hollidaysburg, 84 citizens of Mount Carmel, 21 citizens of Barnsboro and Cherrytree, 102 citizens of Erie, 19 citizens of Linwood, 9 citizens of Everett, 8 citizens or Beaverfalls, 20 citizens of Custer City, 17 citizens of Gardeau, 16 citizens of Johnstown, 92 citizens of Ebensburg, 41 citizens of Horatio, 9 citizens of Lebanon, 19 citizens of Millersburg, 58 citizens of Rockdale Mills, 258 citizens of Summerville, 122 citizens of York, 91 members of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of York, 109 citizens of Negley, 22 citizens of Evans City, 41 citizens of Espeyville, 26 citizens of Johnstown, 24 citizens of Brockwayville, 12 members of the Ladies' Friday Night Club of Meadville, 22 citizens of Upsonville, 43 citizens of Williamsburg, 54 citizens of Uniondale, 65 citizens of Girardville, 44 citizens of Kerrmoor, 17 citizens of Forest City, 12 citizens of Reading, 12 members of the New Century Guild of Philadelphia, 28 citizens of Mainesburg, 46 citizens of Marion Center, 130 citizens of Belle Vernon, 56 citizens of Oakdale, 110 citizens of Greene County, 41 citizens of Venango County, 600 members of the First Presbyterian Church of Bradford, 19 citizens of Somerset, 42 citizens of Hazelton, 14 citizens of Covington, 24 citizens of Numidia, 64 citizens of Mifflinburg, 10 citizens of Holmesburg, 45 citizens of Ridley, 61 citizens of Fairfield, 5 citizens of Robertsdale, 18 citizens of Allentown, 19 citizens of Westchester, 27 citizens of Swarthmore, 18 citizens of Norristown, 19 citizens of Springchurch, 47 citizens of Callensburg, 106 citizens of Pittsburg, 34 citizens of Lemont, 18 citizens of Dubois, 55 citizens of Wurtemberg, 52 citizens of Galilee, 45 citizens of Woodland, 24 citizens of Mount Pleasant, 20 citizens of Belleville, 19 citizens of East Canton, 89 citizens of Washington, 32 citizens of Beallsville, 34 citizens of Derry, 22 citizens of Allegheny, 78 citizens of Lancaster, 17 citizens of Thompson, 47 citizens of Hatton, 17 citizens of Monongahela, 50 citizens of Conshohocken, 7 citizens of Oakmont, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Carmichael, the Woman's Missionary societies and sundry members of the Presbyterian churches of Cumberland, of the officers of the Ministerial Association of Shenandoah, and of the congregations of six churches of Bellwood, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SIMON presented a petition of sundry members of the Christian Endeavor Union of Oregon, praying for the establishment of an international tribunal of arbitration; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ALLISON presented the petitions of J. W. Cowan and 34 other citizens of Eldora, of A. L. Rhodes and 36 other citizens, David E. Evans and 102 other citizens of Lewis, A. E. McElroy and 17 other citizens of Milo, John MacAllister and 43 other citizens of Storm, M. E. Lellinger and 33 other citizens of Afton, F. H. Miller and 46 other citizens of Mount Auburn, J. W. Carlstrom and 40 other citizens of Conroy, C. H. Clark and 75 other citizens of Central City, Fletcher Brown and 74 other citizens of Nevada, A. A. Basye and 59 other citizens of Rock Rapids, P. D. Ankeny and 31 other citizens of Berwick, H. J. Crawford and 98 other citizens of West Liberty, Charles Wilson and 71 other citizens of Orient, W. R. Gray and 59 other citizens of Coin, J. K. Fowler and 200 other citizens of Clinton, E. M. Vittum and 246 other citizens of Grinnell, D. O. Bean and 42 other citizens of Strawburg, J. L. Whitney and 105 other citizens of Alta, C. F. Barrett and 23 other citizens of Hampton, G. H. Jakway and 39 other citizens of Lamont, W. R. Stryker and 88 other citizens of Marengo, M. E. Belinger and 34 other citizens of Afton, S. J. Mendel and 47 other citizens of Dows, J. A. Bronson and 97 other citizens of Wyoming, A. L. Dillon and 26 other citizens of Essex, D. Farnsworth and 29 other citizens of Plainfield, J. C. Kendrick and 40 other citizens of Pella, of the members of the Madame de Soudery Club

of Des Moines, O. O. Sinclair and 14 other citizens of Scotch Grove, P. L. McCreery and 51 other citizens of Elma, Robert McElroy and 28 other citizens of Warren County, B. C. Barnes and 99 other citizens of New Albin, R. E. O'Burne and 11 other citizens of Montgomery County, W. L. Leland and 18 other citizens of Hawarden, Hans Hanson and 23 other citizens of Dows, B. B. Fountain and 48 other citizens of Linn Grove, H. B. Griffin and 19 other citizens of Midland, H. Myer and 18 other citizens of Pomeroy, William Orr and 17 other citizens of Clarinda, A. W. Hogue and 28 other citizens of Moville, J. G. Bull and 17 other citizens of Toledo, George Winterbourne and 45 other citizens of Seymour, N. A. Whitehill and 15 other citizens of Dunkerton, D. D. Davies and 13 other citizens of Columbus City, Charles N. Morse and 21 other citizens of Lemars, Rev. C. Nord and 5 other citizens of Sioux City, William Kerr and 10 other citizens of Sioux City, L. F. Andrews and 27 other citizens of Des Moines, Henry H. Brighton and 18 other citizens of Fairfield, J. S. Tussey and 56 other citizens of Columbus City, C. A. Smith and 22 other citizens of Wayne, K. Seehuus and 12 other citizens of Locust, E. A. Larson and 34 other citizens of Stanton, John Meyer and 37 other citizens of Alton, and of Robert Larson and 18 other citizens of Chariton, all in the State of Iowa, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CHILTON presented the petitions of Dodge Mason and 75 other citizens of Kemp, Henry Daner and 78 other citizens of Ballinger, R. W. Ridley and 31 other citizens of Campbell, W. H. Mayer and 37 other citizens of Brownwood, C. L. Hogue and 17 other citizens of Denton, G. H. Stovall and 6 other citizens of Sabine Pass, D. R. Lemaster and 18 other citizens of McDade, James Mitchell and 17 other citizens of Gatesville, of 17 members of the Young Men's Christian Association of Denison, of the congregation of St. Luke's Episcopal Church of Denison, and of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Denison, all in the State of Texas, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut presented a petition of the legislature of Connecticut, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was read, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT, GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
January Session, A. D. 1899.

Resolution concerning the exclusion of polygamists from membership in Congress.

Resolved by this assembly, That it is the sense of the representatives of the people of Connecticut, in general assembly convened, that the practice of polygamy or plural marriage should forever exclude and disqualify any person from membership in the National Congress.

Also that a copy of this resolution be sent to the members of Congress from this State.

House of representatives, passed May 2, 1899.
Senate, passed June 20, 1899.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of record in this office, in testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said State, at Hartford, this 23d day of June, A. D. 1899.

[SEAL.] HUBER CLARK, *Secretary.*

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut presented a petition of the legislature of Connecticut, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the act of May 4, 1898, which provides that only first-class battle ships and cruisers shall be named for the States; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, as follows:

House joint resolution No. 405. Concerning the naming of battle ships after States.

Resolved by this assembly, That the Senators and Representatives representing this State in Congress are hereby requested to secure an amendment to the act of May 4, 1898, which shall provide that only first-class battle ships and cruisers shall be named for the States.

Certified as correct by —— ——.
Approved May 11, 1899.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

I, Huber Clark, secretary of the State of Connecticut and keeper of the seal thereof and of the original record of the acts and resolutions of the general assembly of said State, do hereby certify that I have compared the annexed copy of the resolution concerning the naming of battle ships after States with the original record of the same now remaining in this office and have found the said copy to be a correct and complete transcript thereof.

And I further certify that the said original record is a public record of the said State of Connecticut now remaining in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the said State at Hartford this 8th day of December, 1899.

HUBER CLARK, *Secretary.*

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut presented the petition of Thomas A. Emerson and sundry other citizens of Clinton, Conn., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MASON presented the petitions of Charles E. Dixon, C. M. Burkholder, James M. Love, J. N. Black, W. H. Macy, J. U. Turner, and sundry other petitions of citizens of Illinois, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CHANDLER presented the petitions of Charles T. Page and 43 other citizens of Concord, S. McLoughlin and 34 other citizens of Manchester, Rev. John S. Curtis and 17 other citizens of Hopkinton, M. F. Little and 24 other citizens, Lyman D. Bragg and 86 other citizens of Lisbon, Edwin A. Black and 23 other citizens of East Sullivan, C. S. Murkland and 29 other citizens of Durham, Eugene Marston and 23 other citizens of Sullivan, and O. S. Bartlett and 103 other citizens, all in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HAWLEY presented a petition of the Thirty-third National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, praying that liberal appropriations be made to enable the Gettysburg National Military Park Commission to acquire the necessary lands and to complete at an early date the work provided for by the act creating the park; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Society of the Grand Army of the Potomac, praying that appropriations be made to enable the Gettysburg National Military Park Commission to continue and complete the work on the military park at Gettysburg; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Peoria, Ill., and a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Quincy, Ill., praying for the establishment of a commercial cable between the United States and Cuba; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the interstate-commerce laws; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. THURSTON presented petitions of 68 citizens of Auburn, of 19 citizens of Coleridge, 41 citizens of Dodge, 22 citizens of Oxford, 59 citizens of Crete, 19 citizens of Gibbon, 47 citizens of Western, 30 citizens of Ainsworth, 19 citizens of Pender, 18 citizens of Blair, and of 12 citizens of Prairie Center, all in the State of Nebraska, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GEAR presented a petition of 145 citizens of Iowa and a petition of 655 citizens of Iowa, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GALLINGER presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 35) granting a pension to Louise Donath; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 29) for the relief of Corinne Strickland; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 36) granting a pension to Emma G. Sargent; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 28) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James H. Waters; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE.

Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 330) to restore to their original status as to promotion officers of the Navy and Marine Corps losing numbers by reason of the advancement of other officers for exceptional and meritorious service during the war with Spain, reported it without amendment.

SPACE FOR COMMITTEE ROOMS.

Mr. SPOONER. I am directed by the Committee on Rules, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 28) relating to the use of the rooms lately occupied by the Congressional Library in the Capitol, to report it favorably without amendment, and I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that it be acted upon at this time.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SPOONER. I will say about the joint resolution that under the law as it now stands both Houses have jurisdiction of the space. It is necessary, therefore, to pass a joint resolution giving each House a portion of the space. A similar measure has heretofore passed the Senate. If this joint resolution shall pass the other House, it will give us twelve new committee rooms. The plans are already made, and it is of the utmost importance for the convenience of Senators and the transaction of public business in the Senate that we should have those committee rooms at the earliest possible time.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COURTS AT PARKERSBURG, W. VA.

Mr. WARREN. I am directed by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 26) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the use of the United States post-office and court-house building at Parkersburg, W. Va., by the circuit court and criminal court of Wood County, W. Va., sitting at Parkersburg, to report it without amendment, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PETTIGREW (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1019) to provide for the coinage of the American product of silver, maintain the parity, and to increase and extend our export trade with all silver-using countries; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1020) for the consolidation of third and fourth class mail matter and for the establishment of a parcels post with free collection and delivery, country and city, and with indemnity in case of loss or damage; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 1021) authorizing the President to appoint a commission to investigate the commercial and industrial condition of the Empire of China, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1022) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint a commission to investigate the commercial and industrial condition of the Empire of Japan, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 1023) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to loan naval equipment to certain military schools; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1024) for the relief of Thomas F. Ryan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1025) for the relief of Alice Utz, heir and legatee of Joshua Wiley, and to give the Court of Claims jurisdiction, and to remove the bar of statute of limitations; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ELKINS introduced a bill (S. 1026) to amend the act approved March 15, 1878, entitled "An act for the relief of William A. Hammond, late Surgeon-General of the Army;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1027) for the transformation of the inner basin of the Potomac flats into a public bathing pool; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HANNA introduced a bill (S. 1028) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George W. Harbaugh; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1029) granting a pension to Henry B. Lambe (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1030) granting a pension to Catharine Harris; and

A bill (S. 1031) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Kearney.

Mr. PRITCHARD introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 1032) for the relief of Adolphus Ervin Wells;

A bill (S. 1033) for the relief of Benjamin F. Buckner and Taylor Buckner;

A bill (S. 1034) to correct the military record of Thomas O. Pritchard;

A bill (S. 1035) to correct the military record of Solomon Chandler;

A bill (S. 1036) to correct the military record of John Metcalf;

A bill (S. 1037) to correct the military record of John Shelton;

A bill (S. 1038) to authorize the Secretary of War to remove the charge of desertion and issue to Isaac N. Babb, Twenty-third Indiana Battery, an honorable discharge;

A bill (S. 1039) to correct the military record of George C. Haynie;

A bill (S. 1040) for the establishment of a soldiers' home at Southern Pines, N. C.;

A bill (S. 1041) to complete the military record of James A. Sams, and for an honorable discharge; and

A bill (S. 1042) for the relief of Levi Jones.

Mr. PRITCHARD introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1043) granting a pension to Hiram R. Rhea;

A bill (S. 1044) granting an increase of pension to Rachel M. Worley;

A bill (S. 1045) granting a pension to S. F. Radford;

A bill (S. 1046) granting a pension to Mary A. Hampton;

A bill (S. 1047) granting an increase of pension to John McGrath;

A bill (S. 1048) granting a pension to George A. B. Physioc;

A bill (S. 1049) granting a pension to Sarah A. Metcalf;

A bill (S. 1050) granting a pension to Jane Chandler;

A bill (S. 1051) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Reynolds;

A bill (S. 1052) granting an increase of pension to Rachel Frisbie;

A bill (S. 1053) granting an increase of pension to Delania Ferguson;

A bill (S. 1054) for the relief of Thomas H. Atkinson;

A bill (S. 1055) granting a pension to William H. Hendricks;

A bill (S. 1056) granting a pension to A. L. Jones and Sermanthia Howell, minor heirs of Abraham Jones;

A bill (S. 1057) granting a pension to Gaston Higgins;

A bill (S. 1058) granting a pension to John Bailey;

A bill (S. 1059) granting a pension to Silas B. Hensley;

A bill (S. 1060) for the relief of Matilda Haynie;

A bill (S. 1061) granting a pension to certain East Tennesseeans engaged in the secret service of the United States during the war of the rebellion;

A bill (S. 1062) for the relief of Elias M. Gibbs;

A bill (S. 1063) granting a pension to Malcom McCourry;

A bill (S. 1064) granting a pension to James H. Landreth;

A bill (S. 1065) granting an increase of pension to Bettie Lee Ward;

A bill (S. 1066) granting a pension to Margaret E. Shipp;

A bill (S. 1067) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Consolacion Victoria Kirkland, widow of Rear-Admiral William A. Kirkland, United States Navy;

A bill (S. 1068) granting a pension to Jennie A Kerr; and

A bill (S. 1069) granting a pension to Flora Hollifield.

Mr. PRITCHARD introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1070) for the relief of G. M. Woodruff;

A bill (S. 1071) for the relief of J. M. Johnson, administrator of Henry Johnson, deceased;

A bill (S. 1072) for the relief of J. E. Merriam;

A bill (S. 1073) for the relief of Mrs. M. A. Bulla, executrix of G. M. Bulla;

A bill (S. 1074) for the relief of Isaac Brown; and

A bill (S. 1075) for the relief of Jennie A. Kerr.

Mr. PLATT of New York introduced a bill (S. 1076) to pay certain Treasury settlements; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1077) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John W. Terwilliger; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1078) to reappoint Warren C. Beach a captain in the Army, and to place him on the retired list, in addition to the number now authorized; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1079) for the relief of Alexander Stoddart, of New York;

A bill (S. 1080) for the relief of the legal representatives of George M. Clapp, of the Washington Iron Works;

A bill (S. 1081) for the relief of the executrix or legal representatives of Roger A. Francis; and

A bill (S. 1082) for the relief of Hyland C. Kirk and others, assignees of Addison C. Fletcher (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. PLATT of New York introduced a bill (S. 1083) to adjust the pensions of those who have lost limbs; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1084) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to reissue the pension certificate of Charles A. Hausmann and increase the rate of his pension; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 1085) to place officers of the

Army upon the same footing as regards retirement with officers of the Navy, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1086) to amend section 12 of an act entitled "An act for increasing the efficiency of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1899; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BERRY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1087) for the relief of the estate of William K. Sebastian, deceased, late of Phillips County, Ark.;

A bill (S. 1088) for the relief of the estate of Jamerson W. Rice; and

A bill (S. 1089) for the relief of Henry McGill, of Monroe County, Ark.

Mr. McENERY introduced a bill (S. 1090) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to refund certain moneys collected by the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MONEY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1091) for the relief of J. C. Fitzgerald, of Chickasaw County, Miss.;

A bill (S. 1092) for the relief of the estate of Alice Hardaway, deceased, late of Benton County, Miss.;

A bill (S. 1093) for the relief of Mary E. Martin, of Tate County, Miss.;

A bill (S. 1094) for the relief of Greenwood Rushing, of Shelby County, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 1095) for the relief of the estate of S. N. Clark, deceased, late of Hinds County, Miss.; and

A bill (S. 1096) for the relief of Abbie P. Anderson, executrix of William A. Watson, deceased, late of Marshall County, Miss., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883.

Mr. VEST introduced a bill (S. 1097) for the relief of Joseph E. Montgomery; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1098) for the relief of M. A. Shelton, of Bates County, Mo.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SULLIVAN introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1099) for the relief of the estate of Ann Sum, deceased, late of Warren County, Miss.;

A bill (S. 1100) for the relief of A. J. and Martha S. Ward, of Hinds County, Miss.;

A bill (S. 1101) for the relief of the estate of F. C. Henderson, deceased, late of Warren County, Miss.;

A bill (S. 1102) for the relief of the estate of Joel Hullum, deceased, late of Warren County, Miss.;

A bill (S. 1103) for the relief of Francis E. Whitfield and Lucy G. Whitfield, of Alcorn County, Miss.;

A bill (S. 1104) for the relief of John A. Brent, of Pike County, Miss.;

A bill (S. 1105) for the relief of Margaret Champion, of Scott County, Miss.;

A bill (S. 1106) for the relief of Mary Ann Nagle, of Vicksburg, Miss.;

A bill (S. 1107) for the relief of Archilles M. Haraway, of De Soto County, Miss.;

A bill (S. 1108) for the relief of Martha T. Davis, of Marshall County, Miss.;

A bill (S. 1109) for the relief of Jordon Broadway, of Marshall County, Miss.;

A bill (S. 1110) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Edna Jackson, deceased, late of Panola County, Miss.;

A bill (S. 1111) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Jane H. Minor, deceased, late of Marshall County, Miss.;

A bill (S. 1112) for the relief of the estate of Susan L. Hardaway, deceased, late of Benton County, Miss.;

A bill (S. 1113) for the relief of the estate of Joseph Albert Stouse, deceased, late of Yazoo City, Miss.;

A bill (S. 1114) for the relief of the estate of Samuel Stowers, deceased, late of Warren County, Miss.;

A bill (S. 1115) for the relief of A. W. McCauley;

A bill (S. 1116) for the relief of the estate of C. D. Hamilton, deceased;

A bill (S. 1117) for the relief of the estate of Richard Harding, deceased;

A bill (S. 1118) for the relief of the estate of Thomas Duty, deceased, late of De Soto County, Miss.;

A bill (S. 1119) for the relief of D. M. Snowden;

A bill (S. 1120) for the relief of the estate of James Roach, deceased, late of Hinds County, Miss.;

A bill (S. 1121) for the relief of Maria A. White;

A bill (S. 1122) for the relief of Sallie Bailey, administratrix of the estate of Richard Griffith, deceased;

A bill (S. 1123) for the relief of the legal representatives of Benjamin Roach, deceased, late of Washington County, Miss.;

A bill (S. 1124) for the relief of Mary E. Gray; and

A bill (S. 1125) for the relief of the estate of Charity Clements, deceased.

Mr. SULLIVAN introduced a bill (S. 1126) for the relief of Mrs. Narcissa G. Short; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1127) to increase the pension of Hannah G. Strong; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1128) to correct the military record of H. L. B. Hovis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1129) to relieve from revenue tax deeds, mortgages, and leases; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1130) to require postmasters to keep revenue stamps for the use and convenience of the public; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. McLAURIN introduced a bill (S. 1131) for the relief of Rudolph Lobsiger; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. TURLEY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1132) for the relief of John Conner, sr.;

A bill (S. 1133) for the relief of William J. Smith and D. M. Wisdom;

A bill (S. 1134) for the relief of George T. Vance and Guy P. Vance, executors of the estate of William L. Vance, deceased, late of Memphis, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 1135) for the relief of Alfred B. Carter, of Shelby County, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 1136) for the relief of the estate of Eliza Lawrence, deceased, late of Shelby County, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 1137) for the relief of Joseph Tagg, of Memphis, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 1138) for the relief of Gertrude A. Leftwich, widow of John W. Leftwich;

A bill (S. 1139) for the relief of the estate of David Jameson, deceased, late of Shelby County, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 1140) for the relief of Thomas V. Brady, of Shelby County, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 1141) for the relief of Sarah W. Walker, of Shelby County, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 1142) for the relief of the estate of Fletcher Lane, deceased, late of Shelby County, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 1143) for the relief of Clara E. Bryan, of Memphis, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 1144) for the relief of the board of trustees of La Grange Synodical College, of La Grange, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 1145) for the relief of estate of Hiram D. Connell, deceased, late of Shelby County, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 1146) for the relief of Elisha Nelson;

A bill (S. 1147) for the relief of the estate of Thomas E. Robinson, deceased, late of Henderson County, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 1148) for the relief of the estate of William White, deceased, late of Hawkins County, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 1149) for the relief of the estate of Elizabeth Burke, late of Memphis, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 1150) for the relief of Jacob Glenn, of Memphis, Shelby County, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 1151) for the relief of Greenwood Rushing, of Shelby County, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 1152) for the relief of estate of Mathew Brown, deceased, late of Shelby County, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 1153) for the relief of Mary C. Jackson, of Shelby County, Tenn. (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1154) for the relief of the estate of John Heathcock, deceased, late of Gibson County, Tenn. (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1155) for the relief of William Stidham, of Fayette County, Tenn. (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1156) for the relief of estate of B. B. Neville, deceased, of Shelby County, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 1157) for the relief of the estate of William Parham Butterworth, deceased, late of Fayette County, Tenn; and

A bill (S. 1158) for the relief of S. L. Carpenter, of Fayette County, Tenn.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 1159) to provide for the

construction of the Patent Office of the United States, including a hall of inventions, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1160) to provide for the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River from Washington to Fort Myer and the national cemetery at Arlington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1161) for the relief of the Seaboard and Roanoke Railroad Company;

A bill (by request) (S. 1162) providing for the purchase of Temple farm, at Yorktown, Va., and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1163) for the relief of William Bushby;

A bill (by request) (S. 1164) for the relief of estate of John Catlett, deceased, late of Warren County, Va.;

A bill (by request) (S. 1165) for the relief of Phillip W. Engs, of New York City, N. Y., and Enoch M. Marshall, of Fauquier County, Va.;

A bill (by request) (S. 1166) for the relief of George W. Rosenberger, of Newmarket, Va.;

A bill (S. 1167) for the relief of the legal personal representatives of Henry H. Sibley, deceased;

A bill (S. 1168) for the relief of the Winchester and Potomac Railroad Company; and

A bill (S. 1169) for the relief of Adel Virginia Spangler, of Frederick County, Va.

Mr. DANIEL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1170) for the relief of John M. Blankenship; which was read twice by its title, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1171) for the relief of Louis Weber; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1172) to reimburse the depositors of the Freedman's Savings and Trust Company for losses incurred by the failure of said company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1173) to authorize the Falls Church and Potomac Railway Company of Virginia to extend its line into and within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PETTUS introduced a bill (S. 1174) for the erection of a public building at Selma, Ala.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1175) to grant lands to the State of Alabama for the use of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Alabama, for negroes, and the State Normal College, at Florence, Ala.; which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To what committee does the Senator from Alabama desire to have the bill referred?

Mr. PETTUS. I suppose it should go to the Committee on Public Lands or to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. HOAR. Is it a bill for a grant of land to an agricultural school?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is so informed.

Mr. HOAR. Have not such bills always gone to the Committee on Education and Labor or to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

Mr. PETTUS. I have no objection to the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the impression that the bill should go to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. HOAR. I think the original grant, which was advocated by the late Senator from Vermont, and all of the supplemental grants afterwards came from the Committee on Education and Labor; but if the bill proposes a mere grant of public land and does not appropriate so much money from the proceeds of it, it should go to the Committee on Public Lands. I have no objection to that reference.

Mr. PETTUS. I will state that this bill passed the Senate in the last Congress, but never got a hearing in the House. It was then referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the bill will be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. PETTUS (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1176) to provide pensions for freedmen, and so forth; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PRITCHARD introduced a bill (S. 1177) for the relief of Calvin J. Cowles; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MORGAN introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1178) for the relief of Mrs. Susan Murphy Nelson;

A bill (S. 1179) for the relief of the estate of A. J. Peacock, deceased, late of Jackson County, Ala.;

A bill (S. 1180) for the relief of Mrs. C. S. Robinson, of Madison County, Ala.;

A bill (S. 1181) for the relief of the estate of John Meals, deceased, late of Madison County, Ala.;

A bill (S. 1182) for the relief of Mary Ann Jackson, of Selma, Ala.;

A bill (S. 1183) for the relief of William A. Watkins, of Lauderdale County, Ala.;

A bill (S. 1184) for the relief of J. R. B. Eldridge, of Madison County, Ala.;

A bill (S. 1185) for the relief of the estate of A. N. Perkins, deceased, late of Tuscaloosa, Ala.;

A bill (S. 1186) for the relief of the estate of Vincent Armstead, deceased, late of Lauderdale County, Ala.;

A bill (S. 1187) for the relief of Francis Wilkes, of Lauderdale County, Ala.;

A bill (S. 1188) for the relief of B. J. Curry;

A bill (S. 1189) for the relief of the estate of F. L. Hammond, deceased, late of Madison County, Ala.; and

A bill (S. 1190) for the relief of Bettie Linder, administratrix of B. Franks, deceased, of Lauderdale County, Ala.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 1191) granting an increase of pension to Orpha W. Reynolds; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GEAR introduced a bill (S. 1192) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1193) granting a pension to Lydia A. Wilson (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1194) granting a pension to John B. Ritzman (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1195) granting a pension to Mary J. Kramer;

A bill (S. 1196) granting a pension to Joseph Grade (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1197) granting a pension to Calvin W. Stone (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1198) granting a pension to Gustavus H. Waldin (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1199) granting a pension to John D. Pickard;

A bill (S. 1200) granting a pension to Nancy A. Judson;

A bill (S. 1201) granting a pension to Stephen W. Wickham;

A bill (S. 1202) granting a pension to Sarah E. Stubbs (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1203) granting a pension to Lewis S. Horsey;

A bill (S. 1204) granting a pension to William Gaddis;

A bill (S. 1205) granting a pension to William L. Ray;

A bill (S. 1206) granting a pension to R. A. Schellhous (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1207) granting a pension to Levi Chandler;

A bill (S. 1208) granting a pension to Gilman Williams;

A bill (S. 1209) granting a pension to Angus Campbell;

A bill (S. 1210) granting a pension to William W. Wright;

A bill (S. 1211) granting a pension to Ross Wheatley;

A bill (S. 1212) granting a pension to John W. Canaday;

A bill (S. 1213) granting a pension to Sarah Williams (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1214) granting a pension to Charles Blitz (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1215) granting a pension to Harrison Smith (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1216) granting a pension to Oscar W. Lowery (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1217) granting a pension to Louis P. Vance (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1218) granting a pension to J. A. Seaton (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (by request) (S. 1219) to close up pension cases immediately following the death of the pensioner or applicant.

Mr. GEAR introduced a bill (S. 1220) for the relief of John A. Spielman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1221) to remove charge of desertion against Hershel Hand; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1222) for the relief of Edward T. Latta;

A bill (by request) (S. 1223) for the relief of O. J. Markle (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (by request) (S. 1224) for the relief of Emily M. Hoge.

Mr. GEAR introduced a bill (S. 1225) regulating the mailing and publication of semiweekly newspapers; which was read twice

by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. HOAR introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1226) granting a pension to George G. Kemp (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1227) granting a pension to Ernest B. Hutchins (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1228) granting a pension to Thomas Jordan (with accompanying papers).

Mr. McCOMAS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1229) for the relief of the Merchants and Miners' Transportation Company, of Baltimore, Md. (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1230) for the relief of the estate of Richard Lawson (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1231) for the relief of Virginia I. Mullan, of Annapolis, Md.;

A bill (S. 1232) for the relief of Catherine Burns, of Annapolis, Md.;

A bill (S. 1233) for the relief of Bernard James (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 1234) for the relief of William James (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. McCOMAS introduced a bill (S. 1235) to permit the Washington Telephone and Telegraph Company to install, maintain, and operate a telephone and telegraph plant and exchanges in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1236) for settlement of the claim of Mrs. Lydia Chapman; which was read twice by its title and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1237) authorizing the Secretary of War to issue an honorable discharge to William S. Clinton; which was read twice by its title and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1238) increasing the pension to James M. Blades (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1239) granting a pension to Harriet Scott, widow of John Scott (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1240) granting a pension to Samuel Nichols (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 1241) to place the name of Charles S. Devine on the pension roll.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 1242) to increase the pension of Adele W. Elmer; which was read twice by its title, and, with an accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1243) for the relief of the owner or owners of the schooner *Bergen;* which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. THURSTON introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1244) granting an increase of pension to Walter P. Davis (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1245) granting a pension to Oliver Domon (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1246) granting a pension to Charles A. Perkins;

A bill (S. 1247) granting a pension to Katherine Mulcahy;

A bill (S. 1248) granting an increase of pension to Edward Yarton;

A bill (S. 1249) granting an increase of pension to John C. Knapp;

A bill (S. 1250) granting a pension to Mrs. Hattie E. Redfield;

A bill (S. 1251) increasing the pension of Celia A. Jeffers to the sum of $30 per month;

A bill (S. 1252) granting a pension to George W. Field;

A bill (S. 1253) granting an increase of pension to Aurelius Roberts;

A bill (S. 1254) granting a pension to Catherine E. O'Brien;

A bill (S. 1255) granting an increase of pension to James M. Simeral;

A bill (S. 1256) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Cook;

A bill (S. 1257) granting a pension to Robert W. Oliver; and

A bill (S. 1258) granting a pension to Loughlin F. Maginn.

Mr. SCOTT introduced a bill (S. 1259) for the relief of the legal representatives of Paul McNeel, deceased, of Pocahontas County, W. Va.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BAKER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 1260) to enable the President to restore Second Lieut. Henry Ossian Flipper, United States Army, to duty, rank, and status in the United States Army;

A bill (S. 1261) for the relief of Charles H. Wilson (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1262) for the relief of Daniel W. Light.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 1263) to provide for the payment of the loyal Seminole Indians in accordance with treaty stipulations; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1264) granting a pension to James A. Southard;

A bill (S. 1265) granting a pension to Elender Herring, of Elsmore, Kans.;

A bill (S. 1266) granting a pension to Jacob Saladin;

A bill (S. 1267) granting an increase of pension to Jackson Osborn;

A bill (S. 1268) granting a pension to Sarah R. Burrell, of Wichita, Kans.;

A bill (S. 1269) granting a pension to Nancy J. Dunaway, of Garnett, Kans.;

A bill (S. 1270) granting a pension to Mrs. J. J. Woods, of Oswego, Kans.;

A bill (S. 1271) granting a pension to Charles Williamson;

A bill (S. 1272) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Ridenger, of Newton, Kans.;

A bill (S. 1273) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Canfield, of Minneapolis, Kans.;

A bill (S. 1274) granting an increase of pension to Augustus C. Pyle (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1275) granting a pension to John W. Richardson, of Bonner Springs, Kans.;

A bill (S. 1276) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Jackson, of Newton, Kans.;

A bill (S. 1277) granting an increase of pension to Joseph P. Howe;

A bill (S. 1278) granting an increase of pension to F. W. Baker;

A bill (S. 1279) granting an increase of pension to William Eastin, of Louisburg, Kans.;

A bill (S. 1280) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Hering, of Leavenworth, Kans.;

A bill (S. 1281) granting an increase of pension to Franklin W. Emery; and

A bill (S. 1282) granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. Huff.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 1283) for the relief of the estates of Daniel Woodson and of Ely Moore; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1284) for the relief of W. H. L. Pepperell, of Concordia, Kans.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. BUTLER introduced a bill (S. 1285) for the relief of Susan S. Rayner; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1286) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Durham, in the State of North Carolina; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 1287) to amend sections 20, 34, 38, and subdivision b of section 64 of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1288) granting to the State of California 5 per centum of the net proceeds of the cash sales of public lands in said State; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1289) to provide for the construction of an additional light-ship for use on the coast of California, Oregon, Washington, or Alaska, as exigencies may determine; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1290) to provide for the erection of a public building at San Francisco, in the State of California; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. ALLISON introduced a bill (S. 1291) authorizing the settlement and adjustment with the Sioux City and Pacific Railway Company of its indebtedness to the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 1292) to remove the charge

of desertion against the record of Lorenzo A. Paddock; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1293) granting pay and allowances to Francisco V. De Coster, late captain, First Battalion of Cavalry, Mississippi Marine Brigade; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1294) granting a pension to Samuel D. Butler;
A bill (S. 1295) granting a pension to Louisa Hale;
A bill (S. 1296) granting a pension to Mary R. Bacon;
A bill (S. 1297) to increase the pension of William L. Dow;
A bill (S. 1298) granting a pension to Capt. Oscar Taylor;
A bill (S. 1299) granting a pension to Jacob Niebels;
A bill (S. 1300) to increase the pension of Rebekah C. Lyman;
A bill (S. 1301) to increase the pension of Gilbert E. Bushnell;
A bill (S. 1302) to increase the pension of Charles Riley, of Battery L and Battery F, First United States Artillery;
A bill (S. 1303) to increase the pension of John C. Fenscke;
A bill (S. 1304) granting a pension to William Brown;
A bill (S. 1305) for the relief of Samuel A. Lundborg;
A bill (S. 1306) to increase the pension of Ellen Spalding;
A bill (S. 1307) granting a pension to Frank Ferris;
A bill (S. 1308) granting a pension to Frederick S. Chamberlain;
A bill (S. 1309) granting an increase of pension to Herman Piel; and
A bill (S. 1310) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Myers.

Mr. WOLCOTT introduced a bill (S. 1311) relating to fees to be allowed registers and receivers of United States land offices; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1312) granting a pension to E. W. Hershe;
A bill (S. 1313) granting a pension to Upton T. Smith;
A bill (S. 1314) granting an increase of pension to Wilson E. Davis;
A bill (S. 1315) granting an increase of pension to John C. Fitnam; and
A bill (S. 1316) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan J. Totten.

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1317) granting an increase of pension to Hudson B. Calvert;
A bill (S. 1318) granting an increase of pension to Harriet E. Meylert, widow of Asa P. Meylert (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1319) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Joseph (with accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 1320) granting an increase of pension to Elam Kirk;
A bill (S. 1321) granting a pension to Melvina Greenawalt; and
A bill (S. 1322) for the relief of Henry Brandt.

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 1323) to correct the military record of John McKinley;
A bill (S. 1324) providing for the promotion and retirement of officers of the Army; and
A bill (S. 1325) to correct the military record of Samuel Kerr, alias Charles Walton (with accompanying papers).

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 1326) for the relief of Morris F. Cawley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1327) for the relief of George Rushberger; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1328) for the relief of William B. Sutter; which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1329) granting a pension to Mary Jackman (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1330) granting a pension to Ellen M. Goodale; and
A bill (S. 1331) granting an increase of pension to Ellen C. Abbott.

Mr. COCKRELL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1332) for the relief of Richard A. Winscott; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. I introduce the bill by request, and I desire to have it so stated. I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 1333) for the relief of Francis O'Bannon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1334) for the relief of J. H. Sanders; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 1335) for the relief of Thomas E. Streeter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1336) for the relief of William Leech; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1337) granting a pension to Catherine E. Whitcomb; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1338) for the relief of John Reed, alias Michael Flannagan; which was read twice by its title, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1339) to place James W. Long, late a captain in the United States Army, upon the retired list of the Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1340) in reference to the civil service and appointments thereunder; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee to Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 1341) referring to the Court of Claims a certain claim for the use of hook attachments for firearms; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BACON introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1342) for the relief of Phillip E. McDaniel;
A bill (S. 1343) for the relief of Thornton Talley;
A bill (S. 1344) for the relief of the estate of William D. Wheeler, deceased, late of Bartow County, Ga.;
A bill (S. 1345) for the relief of George McDonald, administrator of the estate of Edward McDonald; and
A bill (S. 1346) for the relief of Joel Cross.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut introduced a bill (S. 1347) granting an increase of pension to Marie Sharpe; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1348) granting an increase of pension to Eliza M. Stillman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1349) for the erection of a public building at Meriden, Conn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 1350) for the relief of the Little Rock and Memphis Railroad Company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CHILTON introduced a bill (S. 1351) to regulate the transportation of goods manufactured or sold under a contract or conspiracy in restraint of trade; which was read the first time by its title.

Mr. CHILTON. This bill is substantially the same as one which I introduced at a previous session as an amendment to another bill, and I succeeded in getting a vote on it. I ask that it be read in full—it is short—and that it lie on the table.

The bill was read the second time at length, and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That every person who, knowing that any article or articles are manufactured or their sale controlled or their price affected by any contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce, sends or transports, or causes to be sent or transported, any such article or articles from a place in one State or Territory to a place in another State or Territory or the District of Columbia, or from a place in the District of Columbia to a place in a State or Territory, shall be punished by imprisonment not more than three years.

SEC. 2. Every person who, knowing that the trade or commerce in or manufacture of any article or articles is monopolized or engrossed by any person, corporation, or association, or two or more persons, corporations, or associations, sends or transports, or causes to be sent or transported, any such article or articles from a place in one State or Territory to a place in another State or Territory or the District of Columbia, or from a place in the District of Columbia to a place in a State or Territory, shall be punished by imprisonment not more than three years.

SEC. 3. That the offenses against the United States described in the two preceding sections shall be deemed to have been committed in either the judicial district from which said articles were sent or transported or the judicial district into which said articles were sent or transported, and said offenses may be dealt with, inquired of, tried, determined, and punished in either district in the same manner as if they had been actually and wholly committed therein.

Mr. CHILTON introduced a bill (S. 1352) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Comanche, Kiowa, and Apache tribes of Indians in Oklahoma Territory, and to open their reservation for settlement; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 1353) granting an increase of pension to Louisa M. Wright; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1354) to determine the lineal rank of medical officers of the Army upon entrance into the service; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Commitee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 1355) for the relief of the heirs at law of Maj. Tarleton Woodson, deceased, in accordance with the findings of Court of Claims; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MCMILLAN introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 33) recognizing the gallantry of Frank H. Newcomb, commanding the revenue cutter *Hudson;* of his officers and men; also retiring Capt. Daniel B. Hodgsdon, of the Revenue-Cutter Service, for efficient and meritorious services in command of the cutter *Hugh McCulloch* at Manila; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PROCTOR introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 34) authorizing the printing of 35,000 copies of Bulletin No. 24, Department of Agriculture, entitled "A Primer of Forestry," for the use of Congress and the Department of Agriculture; which was read twice by its title, and, with accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. HOAR introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 35) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; which was read the first time by its title, the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, as part of the Constitution, namely:

"The term of office of the President and Vice-President and of the Fifty-sixth Congress shall continue until the last Wednesday of April, in the year 1901, at noon; and the last Wednesday of April, at noon, shall thereafter be substituted for the 4th of March as the commencement and termination of the official term of the President, Vice-President, Senators, and Representatives in Congress."

Mr. BUTLER introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 36) to carry into effect two resolutions of the Continental Congress, directing monuments to be erected to the memory of Gens. Francis Nash and William Lee Davidson, of North Carolina; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 37) to prohibit combinations between corporations to control interstate commerce and transportation; which was read the first time by its title.

Mr. MORGAN. I ask that the joint resolution be read at length.

The joint resolution was read the second time at length, as follows:

Be it resolved, etc., That any contract, agreement, or combination between two or more corporations which has for its purpose the control of the price of anything which is the subject of or enters into interstate commerce or the cost of the transportation thereof, so as to increase the same at any place or locality in the United States or to discriminate in favor of or against any class of dealers, traders, or consumers of such articles within the United States, is contrary to the public policy of the United States, and every such contract, agreement, or combination is illegal and is prohibited.

SEC. 2. Any person being a member of any corporation or acting as its agent, officer, or employee who enters into any such contract, agreement, or combination or knowingly assists in the execution or performance thereof is guilty of a misdemeanor and is liable to prosecution for such offense on information or by indictment in the district court of the United States in and for the district in which such offense is committed. And on conviction thereof such person shall be fined in a sum not less than $100 and not to exceed $5,000 and also be imprisoned for a term, in the discretion of the court in which such conviction is had, not less than one month and not greater than two years.

Mr. MORGAN. I ask that the joint resolution lie on the table. I desire to call it up at some future day and make some remarks on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will lie on the table.

EX-SLAVE BOUNTY AND PENSION ASSOCIATION.

Mr. PETTUS. I introduce a bill by request. It is a bill of which I do not approve.

The bill (S. 1176) to provide pensions for freedmen, etc., was read the first time by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], the chairman of the Committee on Pensions, to the bill which has just been introduced. The bill has been presented in former Congresses, I think in either two or three Congresses, and in order that the Senator from New Hampshire may see the importance of taking action upon the bill at an early day I will ask that it may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read at the request of the Senator from Missouri.

The bill was read at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all persons released from involuntary servitude, commonly called slaves, in pursuance of the proclamations of ex-President Abraham Lincoln, dated, respectively, September 22, 1862, and January 1, 1863, and in pursuance of amendments to the constitutions of the several States wherein slavery or involuntary servitude formerly existed, recognized by the Federal Constitution and laws of the United States, or by any law, proclamation, decree, or device whereby persons once held as slaves or involuntary subjects in consequence of race or color or Federal or State recognition of involuntary servitude, except for the commission of crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall be, and hereby are, made pensioners upon the bounty of the United States, and also such persons as may be charged by laws of consanguinity with the maintenance and support of freedmen who are unable by reason of age or disease to maintain themselves.

SEC. 2. That any person who may have been held as a slave or involuntary servant under and by reason of any law of the United States, or of either of the States of the United States, or in consequence of any device or custom prevailing within such States or the United States, except for the commission of crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, and who shall have been released from such servitude in manner before stated, and who shall at the date of the passage of this act have reached the age of 70 years, shall be entitled to and receive the sum of $500 from the Treasury of the United States, hereby authorized to be paid out of any moneys not otherwise appropriated, and to the sum of $15 per month during the residue of their natural lives. This provision shall apply to male and female freedmen alike; and all persons so released from servitude who shall be less than 70 years of age and of the age of 60 years or over shall be entitled to and receive the sum of $300 and also $12 per month until they shall reach the age of 70 years, when they shall be entitled to and receive the greater sum hereinbefore stated as a monthly payment; and all persons released from servitude as before stated who shall be less than 60 years old and of the age of 50 years or over shall be entitled to and receive the sum of $100 and also $8 per month until 60 years old, when they shall receive $12; and all persons released from servitude as before stated who shall be less than 50 years of age shall be entitled to receive $4 per month until 50 years old, when they shall receive $8. All moneys herein authorized to be paid shall be dispensed from the general funds of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

SEC. 3. That relations or others who may be charged with the support of aged or infirm persons released from involuntary servitude in manner aforesaid shall be entitled to and receive the monthly pension awarded to such aged or infirm persons in whole or in part upon showing, to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior, that such support is afforded in a humane and becoming manner, the amount of such payment being under the control and direction of the Secretary aforesaid.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Interior shall have power to prepare all needful rules and regulations for the carrying into effect of the provisions of this act according to the true intent and meaning thereof, and to designate proper officers or agents through whom freedmen and other persons may make application for payment and receive moneys authorized to be paid by the provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. That all needful rules and regulations for the carrying into effect of the provisions of this act shall be approved by Congress before the taking effect thereof.

SEC. 6. That the compensation of agents charged with the enforcement of this law shall be recommended by the Secretary of the Interior and approved by Congress.

SEC. 7. That this act shall take effect and be in force from and after the 1st day of January, A. D. 1891.

Mr. GALLINGER rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill was introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. PETTUS] by request. He stated that he does not approve of the bill. It will be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, in connection with the bill, my attention having been called to it by the Senator from Missouri, I desire to say that, in my judgment, no such bill ought to have been presented to Congress. I hold in my hand what purports to be and is a certificate of membership in the Ex-Slave Bounty and Pension Association, bearing the number 1367, the headquarters being in Nashville, Tenn. It certifies—

That Kitty Baw, of Nashville, of the county of Davidson, State of Tennessee, is a member of the Ex-Slave Bounty and Pension Association, having paid the membership fee of 25 cents to aid in the passage of the ex-slave bounty and pension bill as presented to the Fifty-fourth Congress in the Senate of the United States by the Hon. JOHN THURSTON, of Nebraska. The holder of this certificate agrees to pay 10 cents per month to the local association to aid the State association and raise funds to promote the passage of the aforesaid bill.

I hereby testify that I was born a slave and am entitled to all the benefits included in said bill. My age is 85 years.

KITTY BAW.

Issued at Nashville, Tenn., this 5th day of July, 1897.

P. F. HILL, *President and General Manager.*
J. F. MANSON, *State Secretary.*

In my judgment this is one of the bills that ought not to receive, and I think I can safely say it will not receive, favorable consideration by the Committee on Pensions of this body. Some persons in the South are making a good deal of money out of this movement. They are deluding these poor people, men and women, into the belief that a bill of this character can pass Congress and that they can receive the amount of money named in the bill, and in view of that fact ex-slaves are paying an admission fee and 10 cents a month, which must be a burden to those poor people, to keep this association alive, in the hope that at some time a bill of this character will be enacted into a law.

Mr. MASON. I desire to say a word if it is proper. I suppose it is proper to discuss the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MASON. If the Senator yields, I wish to make a brief statement.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator asks permission, I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. MASON. I just want to say to the Senator from New Hampshire and to the Senate that I was urged to introduce by request a similar bill in the Fifty-fifth Congress, and I did introduce it.

I wish to state that I believe it was used for a bad purpose. An immense correspondence came to me from all over the South, indicating that ignorant people there were solicited to pay 25 and 50 cents to join the association, to whom certificates were issued showing that they were contributing something to have some legislation passed. I do not know that the bill is not meritorious; but inasmuch as I was induced to introduce it without understanding it, in order that I may let my correspondents know about it in the future in this public way, I simply make this statement.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have here a memorandum from a special examiner of the Pension Bureau, dated Nashville, January 31, 1899, in which he says that "hundreds of these fraudulent certificates can be found in the hands of the old and ignorant negroes in this vicinity."

Mr. President, the Committee on Pensions, judging from the flood of bills that has been presented since this Congress commenced, will have its hands full if it considers the meritorious measures that will come before it. In this connection I wish again to make the request I made in writing to Senators during the third session of the Fifty-fifth Congress, that the individual Senators ought to share this responsibility with the committee and endeavor to ascertain before sending bills to the Pension Committee that they have some merit in them, whether they are general or special pension bills. We had nearly 3,000 bills before our committee during the last Congress, and Heaven only knows how many we shall have during the present Congress if the flood continues as it has commenced.

Mr. THURSTON. Will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me for a moment?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. President, in this same connection I desire to make a statement.

I heartily concur in the suggestion made by the Senator from New Hampshire. At the first session of Congress when I took my seat as a Senator I was requested to introduce the bill which has since been reintroduced at subsequent sessions by other Senators. I stated when I introduced the bill that I did it by request; that it was drafted and submitted by an ex-Confederate soldier, Col. W. R. Vaughan, formerly of Virginia; that it had been introduced previously in the House of Representatives at a former session, and that I did not assume any responsibility for the bill.

Unfortunately, the bill was afterwards used all through the country, as I agree with the Senator from New Hampshire, for improper purposes. Its introduction caused me no end of annoyance. I think I have written and sent out answers to more than 2,000 inquiries, and I have always sent the same kind of a letter, assuring the writer that the bill had not the slightest chance of becoming a law, and that anyone attempting to use it for the purpose of creating an organization and collecting money was necessarily engaged in a fraudulent enterprise.

In order that the matter may have the widest publicity, I hope that, if the bill makes its appearance at the present session of Congress, its introduction, by unanimous action, will be denied.

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not know whether that would be exactly in order or not. If we had the old rules, where previous notice had to be given of the introduction of a bill at a subsequent time, the statement the Senator from Nebraska has made would be applicable to it.

I simply wanted to urge upon the Senator from New Hampshire the propriety of having his committee immediately report this bill back adversely to the Senate, and that will answer the same purpose. It will not do to allow the bill to slumber in the committee room and let it be used for the purposes for which it has been used for the last six or eight years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Missouri that the bill might be treated as having had but one reading to-day and the action to refer be reconsidered, and then the question would arise whether it should have a second reading.

Mr. COCKRELL. I object, then, to the second reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The action of referring to the Committee on Pensions will, without objection, be reconsidered, and the bill will lie on the table.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I object. I hope the bill will be referred to the committee in the ordinary way, and that it will be promptly reported back and dealt with. I agree with the Senators who have spoken that it ought not to pass, but it is not a bill which is being considered on its merits, and it ought not to be denied the respect of ordinary treatment. The English people are discussing with great gravity this year the question of old-age pensions for all persons who are unable to support themselves.

Mr. COCKRELL. I withdraw the objection and will let the bill go to the committee.

Mr. HOAR. I will finish my sentence.

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. I know a good many very thoughtful, wise, and influential persons who are dealing with the subject in this country. A friend of mine in Massachusetts the other day, whose name would command the highest respect in the Senate, told me he was giving his time to a consideration of the subject. If that policy deserves respectful consideration in regard to any class of persons, it certainly deserves respectful consideration in regard to a class of persons a large part of whose life was spent in slavery, whose earnings and labors were given to the benefit of others and not their own.

I say this as not in the least supposing that the Congress of the United States will adopt such a policy, not in the least as indicating any favor to it myself, but I think it is something which deserves the ordinary treatment and that the bill should go to the committee. The Senator from New Hampshire can report it back to-morrow or as soon as the committee has met, and the Senate can express its opinion and that will stop the agitation.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, just one word more in regard to this matter. I am very glad that the bill is to go to the committee. I think that is the proper procedure, and I will promise that so far as I am concerned it shall have early consideration.

Mr. President, before dismissing the subject, I wish to put in the RECORD a letter from the Commissioner of Pensions on the subject, bearing date February 4, 1899, showing that he has taken cognizance of this matter, and that he, in writing to the chairman of the committee, expresses the hope that the bill will not receive serious consideration. I will submit the letter without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF PENSIONS, OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER,
Washington, February 4, 1899.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In the Fifty-fourth Congress a bill was introduced in the Senate that provided for pensioning the ex-slaves. Though I do not suppose it was ever thought of seriously, or intended in any way to give them pensions, it was published all over the South, and it has afforded occupation for many bad men to take advantage of the poor and ignorant negroes, and they form associations charging them 25 cents admission and 10 cents a month dues. I inclose you one of the certificates sent to me by one of the special examiners now on duty at Nashville, in my own State.

You can see what a fine field it opens up for bad men to operate in.

Very respectfully,

H. CLAY EVANS, *Commissioner.*

Hon. J. H. GALLINGER, *United States Senate.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being made to the reversal of the former action of the Senate, the bill will be considered as referred to the Committee on Pensions.

JAMES AND WILLIAM CROOKS.

Mr. BURROWS. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Claims be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 297) for the relief of James and William Crooks, of Canada, erroneously referred to that committee, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, that order will be granted.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. GALLINGER, it was

Ordered, That the papers in the pension claim of Wilson W. Brown (S. 4349) Fifty-fifth Congress, second session, be withdrawn from the files of the Senate and transmitted to Daniel A. Dorsey, Kearney, Nebr., no adverse report having been made in the case.

REPORT ON FORESTRY IN SWEDEN.

Mr. NELSON submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That 20,000 copies of the report on forestry in Sweden, made to the Department of State by Gen. C. C. Andrews, late Minister at Stockholm, be printed for the use of the Senate; the said report to be revised by the author.

EXPENSES OF VICE-PRESIDENT'S FUNERAL.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay from the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by direction of the President pro tempore in arranging for and attending the funeral of the late Vice-President of the United States and President of the Senate, Garret A. Hobart, at Paterson, N. J., on the 25th of November, 1899, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

CŒUR D'ALENE MINING TROUBLES.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas it has become a matter of record in the State of Idaho that Brig. Gen. H. C. Merriam, United States Army, together with the governor of Idaho, under date the 8th of May, 1899, officially announced to the mine owners of a portion of the Cœur d'Alene district, in Idaho, that their mines would be closed in case they employed men who belonged to a labor organization known as the Miners' Union; and

Whereas Brig. Gen. H. C. Merriam, United States Army, at that time in

command of a detachment of United States soldiers at the Cœur d'Alene mines, compelled each miner given employment in said mines to sign a pledge renouncing forever all allegiance to the Miners' Union, and in addition each miner so employed was required to assert that he would never again seek membership in the Miners' Union; and

Whereas Brig. Gen. H. C. Merriam, United States Army, through some of his subordinate officers, under the opportunity afforded by a condition of martial law, is charged with brutal treatment of civilian prisoners: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate by what authority Brig. Gen. H. C. Merriam, United States Army, performed the acts recited in the foregoing preamble, and also to transmit to the Senate copies of all orders issued by his superiors to the said General Merriam or by the said General Merriam or any of his subordinates, and also copies of all official reports made in connection with the Cœur d'Alene mining troubles during the year 1899.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CHANDLER. I object to the present consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire objects.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Then let the resolution lie over until to-morrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being made, the resolution will go over.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed as a document for the information of the Senate a statement in regard to these matters made by Edward Boyce, president of the Western Federation of Miners.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota asks that an order be made for the printing of a document which he submits.

Mr. CHANDLER. I shall not object to that request, but I also ask that General Merriam's report, made to the Secretary of War on this same subject, may be printed in the same document. I suppose there is no objection to that.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I object to its being printed in the same document, but I do not object to its being printed as a separate document.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then I ask that the report of General Merriam on this same subject may be printed as a document. I send it to the Secretary's desk.

Mr. PETTIGREW. To that I do not object, but I do not wish to have it printed as part of the document I present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota requests that an order be made for the printing of a certain document which he submits, but which has not been read. Is there objection?

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the order will be made.

Mr. CHANDLER. Now I ask that General Merriam's report, which I have sent to the desk, may be printed as a document for the use of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, that order will be made.

SOUTH AFRICAN REPUBLIC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further concurrent or other resolutions, the Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. I desire to call up that resolution, Mr. President, and I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois calls from the table the resolution heretofore submitted by him; which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. MASON December 6, 1899, as follows:

Whereas from the hour of achieving their own independence the people of the United States have regarded with sympathy the struggles of other people to free themselves from European domination: Therefore,

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That we watch with deep and abiding interest the heroic battle of the South African Republic against cruelty and oppression, and our best hopes go out for the full success of their determined contest for liberty.

Mr. MASON. Mr. President, the war between monarchy and republicanism began in earnest July 4, 1776, and no treaty of peace has ever been concluded, nor ever will be, until the question is settled right. The monarchical trust company, though often quarreling among themselves, have always agreed on one thing, that a republic is a mistake because it threatens to make strained relations between God and the king; not that the king cares for himself, but has always been deeply fearful and extremely solicitous lest God should be worsted in the division of influence, territory, and trade. Notwithstanding this solemn pretense, it is noticeable in history that the king has never quite lost sight of his own interests, and has joined other kings and potentates, worshiping a different deity, to hold in check the foolish ambition of men to govern themselves. Thus early in the century did the Emperor of Russia assist the Turk in subduing the ambitious Greek, dividing the glory at their respective religious shrines and the plunder between themselves. It may not be inappropriate to read here the declaration of the Emperor and the answer made by Daniel Webster when he offered and supported a resolution similar to the one now before the Senate. I read the declaration of the Emperor of Russia at the opening of the monarchical trust. He said:

There can no longer be such a thing as an English, French, Russian, Prussian, or Austrian policy. There is henceforth but one policy which, for the safety of all, should be adopted both by people and kings. It was for me first to show myself convinced of the principles upon which I founded the alliance. An occasion offered itself, the rising in Greece. Nothing certainly could occur more for my interests, for the interests of my people, nothing more acceptable to my country, than a religious war in Turkey. But I have thought I have perceived in the troubles of the Morea the sign of revolution, and I have held back. Providence has not put under my command 800,000 soldiers to satisfy my ambition, but to protect religion, morality, and justice and to secure the prevalence of those principles of order on which human society rests. It may well be permitted that kings may have public alliances to defend themselves against secret enemies.

Let me read right here Mr. Webster's reply to that in supporting his resolution in favor of giving sympathy to the Greeks; and this, my colleagues will understand, while it is familiar to most of them, is simply to state the law of precedent, to show that the resolution I have offered is strictly in line with the established precedents of the United States of America. Answering the monarchical trust, Mr. Webster said:

The end and scope of this amalgamated policy is neither more nor less than this: To interfere, by force, for any government, against any people who may resist it. Be the state of the people what it may, they shall not rise; be the government what it will, it shall not be opposed. The practical commentary has corresponded with the plain language of the text. Look at Spain, and at Greece. If men may not resist the Spanish Inquisition and the Turkish scimiter, what is there to which humanity must not submit? Stronger cases can never arise. Is it not proper for us at all times, is it not our duty at this time, to come forth and deny and condemn these monstrous principles? Where but here, and in one other place, are they likely to be resisted? They are advanced with equal coolness and boldness, and they are supported by immense power.

The timid will shrink and give way, and many of the brave may be compelled to yield to force. Human liberty may yet perhaps be obliged to repose its principal hopes on the intelligence and vigor of the Saxon race. As far as depends on us at least, I trust those hopes will not be disappointed, and that, to the extent which may consist with our own settled pacific policy, our opinions and sentiments may be brought to act on the right side and to the right end on an occasion which is in truth nothing less than a momentous question between an intelligent age full of knowledge, thirsting for improvement and quickened by a thousand impulses, on one side and the most arbitrary pretensions sustained by unprecedented power on the other.

But, we are asked, what interest have we? If I did not believe that we had an interest I should not have presented this resolution. In the struggle between democracy and royalty, the continuous war between the divine right of kings and the divine right of man, it would be cowardly for the great Republic to be silent. It never has been silent before. Let me read what President Monroe said in regard to the rising in Greece in his message December 3, 1822, a year before the speech of Mr. Webster in the House of Representatives. I read from the message of President Monroe. This was not making an entangling alliance or calling for the Army or the Navy. Monroe said in December, 1822:

The mention of Greece fills the mind with most exalted sentiments and arouses in our bosoms the best feelings of which our nature is susceptible. Superior skill and refinements in the arts, heroic gallantry in action, disinterested patriotism, enthusiastic zeal and devotion in favor of public and personal liberty are associated with our recollections of ancient Greece. That such a country should have been overwhelmed and so long hidden, as it were, from the world under a gloomy despotism has been a cause of unceasing and deep regret to generous minds for ages past. It was natural, therefore, that the reappearance of those people in their original character, contending in favor of their liberties, should produce that great excitement and sympathy in their favor which have been so signally displayed throughout the United States. A strong hope is entertained that these people will recover their independence and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth.

But, Mr. President, why should I attempt to show our interest? I must read again from this speech of Mr. Webster, so familiar to most of you, to gather what he felt was our interest. Mr. Webster spoke—and I read from his speeches, volume 1, page 251—as follows:

It may now be required of me to show what interest we have in resisting this new system.

Not that a monarchy was new, but that a combination of monarchies that were to repress republics was new. But, says Mr. Webster:

What is it to us, it may be asked, upon what principles or what pretenses the European governments assert a right of interfering in the affairs of their neighbors? The thunder, it may be said, rolls at a distance. The wide Atlantic is between us and danger, and however others may suffer we shall remain safe.

I think it a sufficient answer to this to say that we are one of the nations; that we have an interest, therefore, in the preservation of that system of national law and national intercourse which has hitherto subsisted so beneficially for all. Our system of government, it should be remembered, is throughout founded on principles utterly hostile to the new code, and if we remain undisturbed by its operation we shall owe our security either to our situation or our spirit. The enterprising character of the age, our own active commercial spirit, the great increase which has taken place in the intercourse between civilized and commercial states, have necessarily connected us with the nations of the earth and given us a high concern in the preservation of those salutary principles upon which that intercourse is founded. We have as clear an interest in international law as individuals have in the laws of society.

But apart from the soundness of the policy on the ground of direct interest, we have, sir, a duty connected with this subject which I trust we are willing to perform. What do we not owe to the cause of civil and religious liberty, to the principle of lawful resistance, to the principle that society has a right to partake in its own government? As the leading republic of the world, living and breathing in these principles and advanced by their operation with unequaled rapidity in our career, shall we give our consent to bring them into disrepute and disgrace? It is neither ostentation nor boasting to say that there lie before this country in immediate prospect a great extent and height of power. We are borne along toward this without effort, and not always with even a full knowledge of the rapidity of our own motion. Circumstances which never combined before have cooperated in our favor, and a mighty current is setting us forward, which we could not resist, even if we would, and which, while we would stop to make an observation and take the sun, has set us at the end of the operation far in advance of the place where we commenced it. Does it not become us, then, is it not a duty imposed on us, to give our weight to the side of liberty and justice, to let mankind know that we are not tired of our own institutions, and to protest against the asserted power of altering at pleasure the law of the civilized world?

But we are told that England was our friend in the war with Spain. How? Her people were our friends because her people are a Christian people; her Government has never been our friend except for purposes of its own. I have no desire to twist the lion's tail, but truth compels the statement, so far as our interests are concerned, for the last half century the Government of England and the people of England have been divided. You remember 1861? The Government did all it could to divide the Union, but the brave, starving weavers refused to resolve against us, saying they would starve before they would say a word for slavery. Buteven suppose she were to-day our best friend, are we to be silent and uphold a wrong in consideration of that friendship? If she had helped us do an honorable thing, are we bound to help her do a dishonorable thing, like pulling down the flag of a republic and putting the flag of monarchy in its place? Are we to trade our moral influence among the nations of the world for a friendly growl? Are we to become the lion's whelp; or has the eagle glutted itself with carrion and agreed to screech no more until the lion roars? We Republicans are charged with a secret alliance with England. It can not be true, and the vote which this or a similar resolution receives will answer the charge.

Understand me, this is no declaration of war, no involving of our Army or Navy. The American doctrine is, and has always been since the days of Monroe, to interfere, by force, if necessary, when monarchies made encroachment in America, and in all other controversies in Europe to keep aloof, but never to hesitate to speak our mind in favor of the people as against the king. The proof is in the Monroe doctrine, well known to you as applied to America, and the Monroe message, just read, expressing hope for Grecian independence. The reason for this difference is clearly stated by Mr. Webster, as follows:

> The same reason that would authorise us to protest against unwarrantable combinations to interfere between Spain and her former colonies would authorise us equally to protest if the same combination were directed against the smallest state in Europe, although our duty to ourselves, our policy, and wisdom might indicate very different courses as fit to be pursued by us in the two cases.

Four years before, Henry Clay, in the House of Representatives, speaking for the recognition of Buenos Ayres, said:

> He would not seek to force upon other nations our principles and our liberty if they did not want them. He would not disturb the repose even of a detestable despotism. But if an abused and oppressed people willed their freedom; if they sought to establish it; if, in truth, they had established it, we had a right, as a sovereign power, to notice the fact and to act as circumstances and our interest required.

Almost the exact language of Mr. Webster.

> He would say, in the language of the venerated Father of his Country—

This is a quotation from President Washington. I find it in the speech of Mr. Clay, but I do not know from what State paper it was taken, and there is nothing in Mr. Clay's speech to show. But the quotation from Washington is as follows:

> He would say, in the language of the venerated Father of his Country, "Born in a land of liberty, my anxious recollections, my sympathetic feelings, and my best wishes are irresistibly excited whensoever, in any country, I see an oppressed nation unfurl the banners of freedom."

Both Webster and Clay were members of the House of Representatives at the time of making the speeches quoted from, one appealing for recognition and encouragement for Greece and one for Buenos Ayres. It would seem that Washington, Monroe, Webster, and Clay were enough to appeal to to establish the American doctrine; and I purpose to show briefly that we have followed it ever since. We have never received a favor from any nation of the world, great or small, that kept the moral conscience of this people still when a great wrong was being committed, from the time of the Greek revolution to the war with Spain in regard to Cuba.

Then we are told—I am told—if it does not involve our ships and Army, and we intend to use no force, we can do no possible good. Once again hear Webster on the good we can do in establishing public opinion. We can at least speak from our consciences here and help to establish public opinion, but it does not involve the Army or the Navy. I read from the same volume at page 253:

> It may, in the next place, be asked, perhaps, Supposing all this to be true, what can we do? Are we to go to war? Are we to interfere in the Greek cause or any other European cause? Are we to endanger our pacific relations? No; certainly not. What, then, the question recurs, remains for us? If we will not endanger our own peace, if we will neither furnish armies nor navies to the cause which we think the just one, what is there within our power?
>
> Sir, this reasoning mistakes the age. The time has been, indeed, when fleets, and armies, and subsidies were the principal reliances even in the best cause. But, happily for mankind, there has arrived a great change in this respect. Moral causes come into consideration in proportion as the progress of knowledge is advanced, and the public opinion of the civilized world is rapidly gaining an ascendency over mere brutal force. It is already able to oppose the most formidable obstruction to the progress of injustice and oppression, and as it grows more intelligent and more intense it will be more and more formidable. It may be silenced by military power, but it can not be conquered. It is elastic, irrepressible, and invulnerable to the weapons of ordinary warfare. It is that impassable, unextinguishable enemy of mere violence and arbitrary rule, which, like Milton's angels—
>
> Vital in every part, * * *
> Can not but by annihilating die.
>
> Until this be propitiated or satisfied, it is vain for power to talk of triumphs or of repose, no matter what fields are desolated, what fortresses surrendered, what armies subdued, or what provinces overrun. In the history of the year that has passed by us, and in the instance of unhappy Spain, we have seen the vanity of all triumphs in the cause which violates the general sense of justice of the civilized world. It is nothing that the troops of France have passed from the Pyrenees to Cadiz; it is nothing that an unhappy and prostrate nation has fallen before them; it is nothing that arrests, and confiscation, and execution sweep away the little remnant of national resistance.
>
> There is an enemy that still exists to check the glory of these triumphs. It follows the conqueror back to the very scene of his ovations. It calls upon him to take notice that Europe, though silent, is yet indignant. It shows him that the scepter of his victory is yet a barren scepter; that it shall confer neither joy nor honor, but shall molder to dry ashes in his grasp. In the midst of his exaltation, it pierces his ear with the cry of injured justice; it denounces against him the indignation of an enlightened and civilized age. It turns to bitterness the cup of his rejoicing, and wounds him with the sting which belongs to the consciousness of having outraged the opinion of mankind.

If it was important then, under our condition at that time, how much more important now? Have we not "progressed," as suggested by Webster? Then it took months to communicate with the nations of the world; now in minutes we estimate the time. We are nearer the world and read its daily doings before breakfast. Then electricity was almost a myth and hid within the ground or wildly flew among the clouds. Now we are grown more tolerant of political and religious differences. Now we burn no witches. Now we sell no slaves. Now we know that both great parties have followed the "American policy," as Webster called it, and declared for forcible intervention for humanity's sake. Now have we cleared our decks for action, putting out our men and money, asking no territory, no money, nothing, only that liberty may come to the children of men.

Oh, Mr. President, if we would speak, and speak quickly, it would sting the politicians who brought on the war of greed for gold and cheer the poor brave Dutch defender of his home.

Mr. President, if Senators need any more proof of what the American policy is, I beg them to read the speeches of Webster and Clay; to read the correspondence between our Government and Austria, when we did all we could to encourage Hungary in 1850; to read our own action as to the Armenians and the Turk, or, later, our own intervention between Cuba and Spain.

Mr. President, I desire to insert here, without reading, the resolution of sympathy for Brazil, offered by that distinguished Senator from Ohio, Mr. Sherman, and the letter of Secretary Blaine, which speaks for itself.

Joint resolution congratulating the people of the United States of Brazil on their adoption of a republican form of government.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United States of America congratulate the people of Brazil on their just and peaceful assumption of the powers, duties, and responsibilities of self-government, based upon the free consent of the governed, and in their recent adoption of a republican form of government.

A kind word, in line of precedent, as Senator Sherman said, and it was passed in this Chamber, on a roll call, without a dissenting vote (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Fifty-first Congress, first session, page 1229); passed House of Representatives unanimously, on motion of my colleague, Mr. HITT (same RECORD, page 1282).

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *Washington, February 23, 1891.*

SIR: I have the honor to inclose herewith for your information a copy of a dispatch No. 100, dated the 23d ultimo, from our consul-general at Rio de Janeiro, inclosing the translation of a joint resolution of the Congress of Brazil expressing the thanks of the people of that country for the joint resolution of the Congress of the United States, approved February 19, 1890, congratulating the people of Brazil on their adoption of a republican form of government.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

JAMES G. BLAINE.

Hon. JOHN SHERMAN,
Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations,
United States Senate.

No. 100.] CONSULATE-GENERAL UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Rio de Janeiro, January 22, 1891.

SIR: I have the honor to send you the following important inclosures:

(1) The expression of cordial regard to the United States of America for their expression of opinion looking to the maintenance of the republican institutions established in Brazil and the happiness and prosperity of the Brazilian people thereunder; said joint resolutions were passed with tremendous applause during my sitting in the diplomatic gallery.

The death of Gen. Benjamin Constant, minister of public instruction, is generally deplored. He was a man of great ability, unyielding devotion to republicanism, and of proverbial integrity of character.

(3) The cabinet of ministers have resigned, giving as a reason the passing of the constitution to its second reading, which will, when promulgated, oblige them all to resign as incompatible; but the real reason is that they refuse to approve a decree granting a guaranty of interest on some millions required by the generalissimo to build a new port, that of Torres, in the State of Rio Grande do Sul, and moreover the fact that all the ministers were determined to place bounds to what they call the ambition of Generalissimo Deodoro.

I am proud to recognise and transmit to my Government the fact of a growing sentiment of regard and fraternal feeling on the part of the youngest of all American republics toward the oldest of all. Such indications in future I shall watch with untiring interest.

I have the honor, sir, to be your obedient servant.

O. H. DOCKERY, *Consul-General.*

Hon. WILLIAM F. WHARTON,
Assistant Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

[Translation.]

MESSAGE.

The Constitutional Congress of the United States of Brazil, at its first session, opened and effected at the city of Rio de Janeiro on the 15th of November, in the year 1890, first year of the Republic of Brazil:

JOINT RESOLUTION.

The Senate and the Chamber of Deputies of the United States of Brazil, met together as a constituent assembly, have resolved:

To express by means of this message, in the name of the people of Brazil to the people of the United States of America, the feelings of gratitude inspired in their breasts by the friendly terms of the highly honorable message of congratulation voted and adopted by the Congress of the United States;

To affirm once again and by the present means the sentiments of union and fraternity which bind the people of Brazil to the American nation, in the earnest desire to maintain and honor the institution of a republican form of government in Brazil, endeavoring to secure by the happiness and prosperity of the Brazilian family the peace and prosperity of all nations.

Here is a resolution offered by the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] (see RECORD, pages 36 and 959–965):

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the people of the United States of America, through their representatives in Congress assembled, convey to the President and people of the Republic of Transvaal their earnest congratulations upon their success in establishing free representative government, republican in form, and in their opposition to any foreign power that denies to them the full enjoyment of these rightful liberties.

The people of America having realized, through the favor of the God of Nations, the blessings of government based upon the consent of the governed, entertain with confidence the pleasing hope and belief that the principles of self-government will be securely established through the influence of the Republic of France, in her colonies, and of the Republics of Liberia and the Transvaal, founded by the people in Africa; and that those Republics will foster and give firm support to the peaceful progress of Christian civilization in the new and vast field now being opened to the commerce and institutions of all the nations of the earth throughout that great continent.

Resolved, That the President of the United States is requested to communicate this action of Congress to the President of the Republic of Transvaal.

The following report by my distinguished colleague [Mr. CULLOM] was adopted (see RECORD, pages 36 and 959–965):

Concurrent resolution.

Whereas the supplementary treaty of Berlin of July 13, 1878, between the Ottoman Empire and Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Italy, and Russia, contains the following provisions:

"LXI.

"The Sublime Porte undertakes to carry out without further delay the ameliorations and reforms demanded by local requirements in the provinces inhabited by the Armenians, and to guarantee their security against the Circassians and Kurds.

"It will periodically make known the steps taken to this effect to the powers, and will superintend their application.

"LXII.

"The Sublime Porte having expressed the wish to maintain the principle of religious liberty, to give it the widest scope, the contracting parties take note of this spontaneous declaration.

"In no part of the Ottoman Empire shall difference of religion be alleged against an individual as a ground for exclusion or incapacity as regards the discharge of civil and political rights, admission to the public service, functions, and honors, and the exercise of the different professions and industries.

"All persons shall be admitted, without distinction of religion, to give evidence before the tribunals.

"Liberty and the outward exercise of all forms of worship are assured to all, and no hindrance shall be offered either to the hierarchical organization of the various communions or to their relations with their spiritual chiefs.

"The right of official protection by the diplomatic and consular agents of the powers in Turkey is recognized both as regards the above-mentioned persons and their religious, charitable, and other establishments in the holy places;" and

Whereas the intent and object of the above-cited provisions of said treaty are to place the Christian subjects of the Porte under the protection of the other signatories thereto, and to secure to such Christian subjects full liberty of religious worship and belief, the equal benefit of the laws, and all the privileges and immunities belonging to any subjects of the Turkish Empire; and

Whereas by said treaty the Christian powers, parties thereto, having established, under the consent of Turkey, their right to accomplish and secure the above-recited objects; and

Whereas the American people, in common with all Christian people everywhere, have beheld with horror the recent appalling outrages and massacres of which the Christian population of Turkey have been made the victims: Therefore,

Resolved by the Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is an imperative duty, in the interest of humanity, to express the earnest hope that the European concert brought about by the treaty referred to may speedily be given its just effect in such decisive measures as shall stay the hand of fanaticism and lawless violence, and as shall secure to the unoffending Christians of the Turkish Empire all the rights belonging to them both as men and Christians and as beneficiaries of the explicit provisions of the treaty above recited.

Resolved, That the President be requested to communicate these resolutions to the Governments of Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Italy, and Russia.

Resolved further, That the Senate of the United States, the House of Representatives concurring, will support the President in the most vigorous action he may take for the protection and security of American citizens in Turkey, and to obtain redress for injuries committed upon the persons or property of such citizens.

On the Armenian resolutions the question was not raised whether we were interfering in European politics. We did not seem to be afraid to offend any of the powers. Gentlemen spoke freely. There was no let or hindrance to the opinion of Senators. No one feared to express an opinion upon the subject.

Speaking to these resolutions, the distinguished Senator from Maine, the President of the Senate [Mr. FRYE], said:

Sir, the British rulers are no friends of ours.

I call attention to the fact that he took the same position that most Senators do—that there is a vast difference between the English people, who are our friends, and the English rulers or English Government, who never have been our friends. I ask gentlemen who shall reply to me to remember the difference. The Senator from Maine further said:

Now she is sitting quietly by seeing these Armenians, for a solid year, murdered because they were Christians, when she was one of the very agencies agreeing to protect their lives or to compel Turkey to do it. And she had the power in her hands any day to do it. So I say, regardless of what Great Britain might have thought, if I had had my way, Congress would have memorialized Russia at once to take possession of Armenia and the United States would back her in the doing of it. (Page 962.)

That might have meant war. The resolution I offer means nothing of the kind.

Mr. MORGAN submitted the following resolution (see Report No. 393):

Whereas the President of the United States, in his message to Congress, says that—

"The rich and populous valley of the Congo is being opened to commerce by a society called the International African Association, of which the King of the Belgians is the president and a citizen of the United States the chief executive officer. Large tracts of territory have been ceded to the association by native chiefs, roads have been opened, steamboats placed on the river, and the nuclei of states established at twenty-two stations under one flag, which offers freedom to commerce and prohibits the slave trade. The objects of the society are philanthropic. It does not aim at permanent political control, but seeks the neutrality of the valley. The United States can not be indifferent to this work nor to the interests of their citizens involved in it. It may become advisable for us to cooperate with other commercial powers in promoting the rights of trade and residence in the Congo Valley free from the interference or political control of any one nation;"

Be it resolved by the Senate of the United States, That prompt action is recommended to the President toward securing unrestricted freedom of access and traffic to our citizens in their legitimate enterprises in the Congo Basin, from its mouth to its sources:

1. By taking such measures as may be necessary to assure protection to our citizens and their trade in the territories called the Free States of the Congo, acquired from native chiefs by the Committee of the Upper Congo, and under the flag of the African International Association, freedom from customs dues, the right to trade, to reside, and acquire property, whether as traders or missionaries, freedom of religious belief, and freedom from the slave trade.

2. By reasserting and applying the policy of previous Administrations denying rights of sovereignty and of intervention by any power, great or small, to the mouth of the Congo, the gateway of central Africa, and by taking such steps, in concert with other commercial powers, as shall assure freedom of passage, by land and water, through that region, unrestrained by any impositions, to all peoples in their legitimate pursuits, and which shall prevent the further deportation therefrom of Africans for forced labor in any form.

I wish, very briefly, to call your attention, Mr. President, and the attention of Senators to an article upon the Congo Free State, by Theodore S. Woolsey, found in Johnson's Universal Cyclopædia. I am endeavoring merely to open the case at this time. The extract is as follows:

The United States led the way. The Committee on Foreign Relations reported to the Forty-eighth Congress that the acts of cession of the native chiefs were within their rights and that the association could lawfully accept them. This Government, accordingly, April 22, 1884, recognized the International Association of the Congo as a sovereign and independent power under the title of the Congo Free State. Within a year Austria, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Russia, Spain, and Sweden followed the example of the United States.

That shows again the precedent; it shows the habit, if you please to call it such, in similar cases.

I will not cumber the RECORD with more precedents at present, but urge you to remember the course we took in the case of Spain in Cuba.

Gentlemen may say: "Cuba was in America, on our continent, near our home; and under the Monroe doctrine we had an absolute right to interfere, because it involved our own peace of mind; it was near our door." I again call the attention of gentlemen who desire to answer me and to speak upon the other side of the question to the opinion of Monroe and Clay and Webster, that the same outrage would call for the same protest whether in Europe or America, although our course of conduct might be different, based on policy and interest of our own country.

Mr. President, I do not at this time intend to go at length into the controversy that brought on the war. Late official information is hard to get, for the reason that public documents for this year, usually issued by Great Britain, which will show the official diplomatic correspondence, have for some reason not been sent to

our National Library, although expected for some time in due course of mail. It may be that they have been stopped at Ladysmith.

I have here both of the conventions which will be under discussion; I have here the treaties as they were written and signed; and I charge that under the then existing relations between Great Britain and the Republic Great Britain had no legal right to raise any question of the local conduct of the Boers as to laws of suffrage; that Great Britain knew it, and only did it to aggravate and goad on the Republic to war that they might despoil their land, own their homes, rule their people, and absorb the rich mines of South Africa.

In other words, it is a fight to control South Africa, and the only way England could do it was to threaten, bulldoze, browbeat, and interfere with the Dutchman until, out of sheer humiliation and desperation, he was driven to fight, and then turn on the army of the great nation, and meantime cry to the nations of the world: "See us poor English. We did not shoot first. Please give us your sympathy. We are for liberty. Our flag is there." Let the distinguished lilliputian statesman, rattling around in Gladstone's shoes, trying to undo his work and break his promises, be assured that he is deceiving no one, except possibly himself. Let me read, briefly, the statement of Justin McCarthy.

I read from his Life of Gladstone. It is a construction of the convention of 1884 and also that of 1881. This, rather, is his construction of the convention of 1881:

Peace was established on fair and honorable conditions. The Transvaal Republic was restored with a British protectorate against foreign nations and foreign invasion and with a British high commission, but with the entire local and national self-government for which the Boers, to do them justice, had fought so well. Mr. Gladstone, of course, was denounced by all the jingoes of England. They raged against him because he had allowed the curtain of this drama to fall upon what they called the triumph of the Boers. Mr. Gladstone went on his course unheeding. He had asked of his own heart and mind and conscience what was the right thing to do, and he had done it. It was a brave act. But it was an act only in keeping with the whole of Mr. Gladstone's career.

Mr. President, I have before me the debate in Parliament between Sir Michael Hicks-Beach and Mr. Gladstone, on July 25, 1881, when a motion of censure against the Gladstone government was pending and about to be voted upon. Let me read a few extracts from Mr. Gladstone's speech. I assume that if any gentleman opposes the offering of sympathy to the Boers, I assume that if any gentleman objects to offering sympathy to the Republic, he will give some reason; that he will endeavor to show that the Republic at least is in the wrong in some particular and that the monarchy is in the right, unless he shall take the broad ground that the American policy as established by the fathers and construed by Monroe, Webster, and Clay is a mistake, or that we have changed the American policy for some good reason. I now read from Mr. Gladstone:

In 1852 we solemnly engaged to respect the independence of the Transvaal.

Mind you, this goes back of the convention of 1884.

In 1852 we solemnly engaged to respect the independence of the Transvaal. That was by a treaty formed between us and the representatives of the Boer population. What right had we to infringe that treaty? What right had we to make ourselves the judges of that treaty, and then set up the miserable plea, in the dispatch of the right honorable gentleman opposite, that there was an implied reservation in that treaty—an implied reservation which made us parties competent to deal with it as we did deal with it?

I propose to show you that every man who has written for an American magazine within the past six months insists upon an implied reservation in the convention of 1881 or the convention of 1884. Gladstone further says:

Why, sir, what a doctrine to apply to the whole formation of treaties that are to bind nations together, and the very essence of which is that no party can, under any circumstances, have any title to import into a treaty, of his own motion, that which the treaty does not contain.

An elementary principle of treaties as it is an elementary principle of contracts. Who can read unmoved the brave, unselfish words of Gladstone, who was brave enough to confess the errors of his own country and tried to teach us that true statesmanship consists in endeavoring to have his country do right?

We had no right—

I again read from Gladstone—

We had no right to break the Sand River convention except on the ground of offense on the part of the Boers against ourselves; but, unfortunately, we broke it upon pleas relating to matters of remote apprehension and policy which invested us with no title at all to deal in a way with such a solemn instrument so contracted. If we are to talk of loyalty, if we are to talk of honor, if we are to talk of humiliation, if we are to talk of blushing, it is those who deal with these solemn instruments in a manner so unscrupulous who ought to be very careful how they throw these stringent and formidable terms at their opponents.

I ought to say that the resolution of censure did not pass. It was defeated by a large majority, and I think for the reasons given in Mr. Gladstone's closing remarks as his reason for not continuing the war. I ought also to say at this point, as a matter of fairness to him, and as a part of our recollection of him, that it was charged that he was a coward; that he had settled the war at a time when the British arms had been defeated, whereas the record is that before the great battles he had sent the proposition of compromise; and only those in politics in England today, judging from their speeches, who would throw a charge of cowardice upon the life and character of Gladstone, are carrying on this war to-day, because they say it ought to have been carried on then, notwithstanding this solemn contract of the Government and the solemn treaty made in 1881 following the war.

But if it shall appear that there was an element not of cowardice in Gladstone, but of discretion, the morning's dispatches would indicate that it was a very sound discretion.

England by solemn act in her own Parliament sustained the action of the Gladstone party in settling and making the convention of 1881. I read another short extract from the speech of Mr. Gladstone:

We should have made this war first on the Transvaal, but too probably in the end upon a very large portion, nay, on the whole of the Dutch population of South Africa, which numbers two to one of the English.

Does this sound prophetic in view of the fact that President Steyn has joined the Boers? Does it sound anything like a prophetic discretion?

We should have made the war at an enormous cost, with immense difficulty, and with the strong disapproval of the civilized world. But what should we have made it for, and when we had ended the war what should we have done? We should have done the very thing we have now done. We should not have wished to keep under the sovereignty of the British Crown these unwilling and reluctant subjects. We should have been glad to give them the very liberty we have conferred on them. We have attained that end without bloodshed, for the bloodshedding that occurred, as is well known, was due to local counsels. This is what we have done: We have chosen to attain the end we had in view and to confer liberties which we knew we ought to confer without carrying a most painful and dishonorable warfare, a warfare which would have done nothing to increase the general fame or credit of England.

Let the gentleman who answers me to-day tell me the political or the military or the historical difference between that war and the war now progressing. Broken treaties then; the same to-day, as it was even when they broke the Sand River convention of 1852.

Reading again from Mr. Gladstone:

Sir, these are the grounds on which we have proceeded in the Transvaal. Our case is summed up in this: We have endeavored to cast aside all considerations of false shame, and we have felt that we were strong enough to put aside these considerations of false shame without fear of entailing upon our country any sacrifice; we have endeavored to do right and to eschew wrong, and we have done that in matters involving alike the lives of thousands and the honor and character of our country, and whatever may be the opinion of gentlemen opposite, we believe we are supported, not only by the general convictions of Parliament, but by those of the country. From the remotest corner of Anglo-Saxon America have come back to us echoes of the resolution we have taken—favoring and approving echoes, recognizing in the policy of the Government a higher ambition than that which looks for military triumph or territorial aggrandizement, an ambition which seeks to signalize itself by walking in the plain and simple ways of right and justice, and which desires never to build up empire except in the happiness of the governed.

I have read this last part to show what Webster meant years ago by public opinion and its power above armies and fleets. "From far America, favoring and approving echoes," said Mr. Gladstone. To approve the course of Gladstone is to disapprove the present course of the English Government.

"Approving echoes," said Gladstone. What echoes will her present ministry hear?

I think at the opening of this debate I ought, in fairness, to note some of the defenses sought to be made by the writers for England in our American magazines. One writer in this month's Atlantic Monthly assures us that it was very difficult to become a voter in the Republic, and sets out the manner in full of becoming a burgher. It is practically the same routine required in Illinois for first and second papers, and the only complaint made in Illinois is that citizenship is most too cheap. They are charged with holding them twenty-one years. Some people we hold for two hundred and fifty years and never admit them to citizenship. We allow no one to question our family affairs, either. But that statement is not true, and I propose to show by the contract and by the law itself that every statement that could possibly be worked into the newspapers and magazines of this country has been introduced which could, by falsehood, prejudice the people of this country against the Boers struggling for self-government, and uphold the English Government, which is not being upheld by the English people. You will not forget, I suppose, that they have not recruited a regiment in Scotland and that the Irish congratulated the mules who deserted and joined the Boers.

President Kruger says:

The difficulty with the Englishmen here is that they want to be burghers and at the same time retain their English citizenship.

Suppose they or any other country should propose that to us; suppose any man should ask to vote here and help run this Government and not renounce his allegiance to his former sovereign. There is not a school boy in Illinois twelve years of age who would not say to him, "If you vote under this flag you must fight where you vote." I say to you now that no nation but a professional bully would seek to have any other nation in the world permit her citizens to become citizens but not subjects. If they would make the request here, we would give them the same answer that Kruger gave them at Modder River and at Ladysmith. Truly,

the Lion hath a taste for blood in weak veins, and an overwhelming penchant for gold mines.

This writer in the Atlantic Monthly—and I think he makes the strongest plea that is made for England in any of the current magazines I have been able to procure within the last two months—states more strongly than anyone else whose writings I have been able to read the English position or pretense. Before I read his construction of the convention of 1881 and 1884 I ought to inform Senators that it is not in the advertising columns of the magazine. He says:

> This status depends upon the fact and extent of British suzerainty under the two conventions of 1881 and 1884. The convention of 1881 consisted of a preamble and a number of articles. The preamble grants self-government to the inhabitants of the Transvaal in these words:
>
> "Complete self-government, subject to the suzerainty of Her Majesty, to the inhabitants of the Transvaal territory, upon certain terms and conditions and subject to certain reservations and limitations."
>
> Now, I take this to mean that on certain terms and conditions—that is, the laying down of arms, and so on—self-government was to be granted to the people of the Transvaal under the suzerainty of the Queen, but that this self-government was to be subject to certain reservations and limitations. In other words, the reservations and limitations did not refer to the suzerainty, but to the self-government. It was not to be unconditional self-government, but self-government with certain specified limitations, in addition to the general limitations of the Queen's suzerainty.
>
> As there can be no question as to the assertion of the suzerainty in the convention of 1881, there remains only one point to be dealt with—whether the suzerainty persists in the convention of 1884.

And the way he disposes of that proposition is something marvelous:

> Any doubt as to the existence of the suzerainty would at once be removed by an examination of the circumstances under which the convention of 1884 was signed. The Transvaal delegates requested the British Government to do away with suzerainty by making the proposed convention a treaty between two powers. This the Government refused to do, on the ground that the Transvaal was not in fact an independent power, nor was it intended that it should be represented as such. So the issue was definitely raised before the convention was signed, and the Transvaal delegates signed the convention knowing the feelings of Her Majesty's Government on the matter.

And so he closes his whole legal argument of the right of England under the convention of 1884 with the broad statement that suzerainty was contained in the convention of 1881 and it persisted or continued in the convention of 1884, although not a word was spoken of it in the convention of 1884.

Was ever so strained and absurd construction given to a convention? He says, first, that the words "certain terms and conditions" in the preamble puts a limitation on the words "complete self-government." It is in the preamble. No article is cited to show any limitation, and the whole convention is passed over by this strained and unnatural construction. This also notwithstanding the construction of Gladstone, who made the treaty, and the definition of Florence MacCarthy, just read. But follow him. Having fixed, by mere dictum, the limitations, conditions, etc., in the convention of 1881, he assures us blandly that the only point left is, "Did the suzerainty persist in the convention of 1884?"

Then he tells us that before it was signed there was correspondence between the two powers whereby England refused to say that the Transvaal State was a government and entitled to be treated as such, and that, therefore, the Boers knew the intention of the Queen's Government and are bound by that hidden power which they soon demolished when they sought to assert by mere force of words and force of guns a change in the very terms of the Sand River convention.

Assuming the writer in the magazine quoted to be correct, that the convention of 1881, which I have here, gave "complete self-government" subject to certain conditions or limitations, will any Senator contend that after granting this "complete self-government" there could be any limitations except those contained in the convention itself?

I ask you, gentlemen, if anyone is to do me the honor or kindness to reply to this suggestion, Will you contend upon the floor of the Senate that there were any limitations in the convention that were not shown by the convention itself? It is safe to say that no lawyer will so contend. Even the writer mentioned would not so contend had he read the agreement (convention) as signed by Kruger, as follows: "We agree to all the above conditions," thus leaving it absolutely impossible for England to insert bodily limitations which she had theretofore done in the other convention and of which Gladstone so bitterly complained in the lines I have quoted. Mind you, I am speaking of the convention of 1881.

The convention of 1881 above mentioned contained all the powers granted to England as suzerain. These powers will be found in article 2 of the convention of 1881, page 903, State Papers of Great Britain, No. 72, as follows: "(a) Right to appoint British resident, duties thereafter defined, etc.; (b) right to move troops through the State in times of war, and (c) control of the external relations of the State, including the conclusion of treaties." There are in all thirty-three articles in the convention, and I respectfully defy anyone to show any authority to mix in or control the internal affairs of the young Republic, as I shall shortly show they have done. But it is said the convention of 1884 amended and limited the convention of 1881. Let us examine that. It will be found at page 5, State Papers, volume 75. The preamble recites that this convention "*shall, when ratified by the Volksraad of the South African Republic, be substituted for the articles in the convention 1881.*" It was signed in February, 1884, and ratified by the Congress of the Republic August 8, 1884. It then became the substituted and not the amended convention. There is no direct or indirect assumption by England in preamble or article asserting power as suzerain. The suzerainty in its broad sense does not "persist" in the convention of 1884, and even the clause in the convention of 1881 keeping control of all foreign relations is eliminated, so that the Republic could make treaties with the Orange Free State and with any tribes, north or south, without the approval of Her Majesty.

I also want to call attention to the fact that the so-called convention of 1884 partakes more of the nature of a treaty between the two powers. The signatures of Kruger and his associates follow that of Sir Hercules Robinson, the Queen's commoner, instead of a poor little acceptance signed separately by Kruger and his associates. The "suzerainty" is omitted, and the name of one of the parties is changed from the Transvaal State to the "South African Republic." The provision for change is made in this solemn convention, which amounts to a treaty, and I insist that in no part of the convention or treaty, call it what you will, is found the authority of England to interfere in the internal or local matters of the Republic as they did.

After reading the two conventions you will see how almost childish it appears to say that the suzerainty continued or persisted in the convention of 1884, because in the correspondence preceding its execution the Republic had notice of the claim of Great Britain; this in violation of the elementary principle of law that all claims, tenders, and views are merged in the written instrument and are supposed to have been waived if not in the written instrument, which alone shows the points on which the minds met. Even a court of equity will not permit the changing of a written contract unless it is shown that the part complained of was there by mistake of both parties or was inserted by fraud.

I only refer to this magazine writer just one moment more, so that he may answer his own argument—to let him answer his whole defense of British crime in South Africa. He says, and I quote almost his closing words:

> The question really at issue between the Transvaal and Great Britain is that of supremacy in South Africa.

That is it, Mr. President. We have got the truth at last from a writer in an American magazine on the English side. The question is one of supremacy.

I ask, in the name of common justice, Mr. President, what right has England to be supreme in South Africa after signing the two solemn conventions which I have quoted? She has not the same right that she had to be supreme in our colonies in 1776. She has the same right, Mr. President, that I have to be supreme in your home, or that you have to be supreme in mine.

Then, to briefly state the point, the friends of England claim in American papers and magazines that at the opening of the present trouble, with which my resolution deals, England was suzerain of the South African Republic because she was suzerain of the Transvaal State under the convention of 1881, although the convention of 1884, which fixed the status of the two parties, does not mention suzerainty in any place, and was a substitute and not an amended convention. I respectfully claim that the convention of 1881 was by the very terms of the convention of 1884 abrogated, and all its terms and conditions ceased to exist, as if it never had been, on the 8th of August, and that even if the term suzerain as contained in the convention of 1881 gave in its broad sense a power to England to interfere in the local government of the Transvaal State, no such unlimited or concealed power rests in England by the convention of 1884; that therefore at the time of the breaking out of the present trouble the powers of Great Britain were limited to the article in the convention of 1884.

It is to be understood that whatever powers she had she had by the convention of 1884, and that to go back to the convention of 1881 and seek to insert in the convention of 1884 powers that existed in the convention of 1881 because they were in the convention of 1881 is neither fair nor honest, because by the very terms of the convention of 1884 it became a substituted convention between the two powers, and not the amended convention.

Mr. President, I think I have made that point clear to gentlemen who have done me the kindness to listen. I did not expect to have the attention of many upon this subject in the Chamber. I only ask a fair hearing for the resolution which I have presented. I purpose to get it; I expect to get it. I say now that any justification of the course of England at the present time can only be had upon the basis that the convention of 1884 is not the contract between the parties and it does not state the true status of the parties, and that for the benefit of England you must insert, in violation of the elementary law of treaties, the powers that were not contained in the convention.

What better proof can I show you than to show that Great Britain herself did not dream of any such power. She simply said, So many Englishmen are complaining I can't bother with all. I'll just change the map and the laws of the Republic and assuage the English grievance at wholesale, and at the same time gratify the longings of my liberty-loving soul for gold mines.

At the Bloemfontein conference, held May in this year of our Lord, between the British high commissioner and President Kruger—I wish I had time and opportunity to read it all; it is reported in shorthand and opens on page 14 of Blue Book, entitled "South African Republic Correspondence," marked (C 9404), and I shall also have occasion to read from similar Blue Book, marked same (C 9415).

The two opening pages are interesting—it is the efforts of two diplomats sparring for an opening—interesting to note the directness of Kruger and the indirectness of the high commissioner.

Hear the President:

So as not to confuse matters, I understand from his excellency—

That is, the high commissioner from the English Government—

that it is not his wish to give orders in internal matters.

I am addressing the Senate to the proposition that England herself claimed no right to interfere in the internal affairs of the Transvaal Republic or the South African Republic. The President said this to him at the opening, after having called attention to the fact that the English soldiers were gathering on the border; and if Senators shall stand on this floor in opposition to this resolution and say that certain rights left in the power of England to interfere in internal affairs I ask them to read the statement of their own representative at the time of this meeting and conference with Kruger in July of this year:

So as not to confuse matters, I understand from his excellency that it is not his wish to give orders in internal matters, but to give me friendly hints, to which I am prepared to listen, as in the case of Bunn last year. I would like his excellency to give any point he would like discussed. I do this because his excellency does not give orders or commands, but has entered into the conference in a friendly spirit.

HIS EXCELLENCY. I have no idea of giving orders or commands to the President.

Here follows ten full lines of indirectness.

The PRESIDENT. I am willing in a friendly way to discuss matters that touch internal affairs.

Where is the claim of suzerainty that permits interference by England in the internal affairs of South African republics? At the very threshold of the last conference Kruger makes it plain and compels the English diplomat to admit that he has no right to demand, order, or command one thing as it relates to the internal affairs of South African republics.

Where is the claim of the friends of England that she had any legal right to interfere upon the question of suffrage or any other question relating to the internal affairs of Africa, for that was the question; that was what she was trying to do. She was trying to have English citizens run the Republic, to vote the Republic, and fight for the Queen. President Kruger said:

I am willing, in a friendly way, to discuss matters that touch internal affairs.

Let me read again and show you the high commissioner is forced to uncover the main point he is seeking—that of suffrage. Before I read, let me read what was in his heart, what his intentions were, and how he intended to control the electors in the Republic and have them to vote there and fight, if necessary, under the British flag. I read first from page 3, from his communication to Chamberlain explaining his intentions. When gentlemen upon this floor or any other floor talk about these liberty-loving Englishmen going over there to bring the blessings of liberty to those people, let them read from their own commissioner what his intentions were. It is not necessary to go to a magazine article, written by gentlemen who are paid to write the English side. This is what he himself says:

Bearing both these points in mind, I proposed that the full franchise should be given to every foreigner who (a) had been resident for five years in the Republic; (b) declared his intention to reside permanently; (c) took an oath to obey the laws, undertake all obligations of citizenship, and defend the independence of the country.

Where is the proposition—to renounce allegiance to the Queen, as you find it here in the record—except, after getting his first paper, and he is put in possession of part of his citizenship, the commissioner demands that he shall not renounce his allegiance to the Queen, but says that after that, if he decides to take his full papers, and if during the next three or five years the Outlanders find that they are not in full accord with the Boers, and that they can handle that country better with the bullet than they can with the ballot, then they are willing to renounce their allegiance, because it then becomes the Englishman's country and not the Dutchman's home, who laid the foundations of that home away back in the early day when our fathers started on this continent. There never has been a day nor an hour that their liberties have not been imperiled by the same country that sought to imperil our liberties. This Republic has been successful because we are a brave people, who have been isolated and thereby protected.

Mind you, Mr. President, I am reading from the proposition addressed to Mr. Chamberlain himself, explaining the intention of the high commissioner, Mr. Milner. You will not be surprised, then, when you know what was in his heart to read the conversation between him and President Kruger. Let me read further from this communication:

What was vital in my scheme was the simplification of the oath and the immediate admission to full burghership on taking it. The last words are italicized by the high commissioner: "It is a direct proposition to make citizens, but not subjects; to allow the Englishman to enjoy without paying the honest dues of citizenship."

Kruger, still patient, still maintaining that the high commissioner has no legal right to speak, again gets the high commissioner to admit it, and says, as a fair reason for restricting suffrage:

The PRESIDENT. I would like you to bear one point in view, viz, that all kinds of nations and languages of nearly all powers have rushed in at the point where the gold is to be found. In other countries they make it four or five years to obtain the right to vote. With us the difference is this:

I am not surprised that in other places the men would have to wait for more than a year to get it, because there are millions of old burghers, and the few that come in can not outvote the old burghers; but with us those who rushed into the gold fields are in large numbers and of all kinds, and the number of old burghers is still insignificant; therefore we are compelled to make the franchise so that they can not all rush into it at once, and as soon as we can assure ourselves by a gradual increase of our burghers that we can safely do it, our plan was to reduce the time for anyone there to take up the franchise, and that is also my plan.

His excellency understands that if those who rushed in speedily get a vote equal to our burghers, and they can vote in the Volksraad, then in a very short time those who are brought in can turn the laws topsy turvy and do as they like, and with that my independence would fall, in that they could make laws as they liked, and the burghers would be crushed out in that way, and that is why they are so strict on that point. As his excellency doubtless knows, I have proposed to the Volksraad that the time should be reduced by five years, and gradually as more trusted burghers join our numbers we can perhaps go further.

Mr. President, I shall go but one step further at this time, to show the insufferable impertinence of the representatives of Great Britain. I may feel compelled to do so at a later day if gentlemen who may oppose this resolution shall claim that the demands of England within were made in good faith.

There was an association formed in South Africa of delectable and delightful citizens known as the South African League. I want to show you the insufferable impertinence of the representatives of that league at that particular time. It was organized to encourage Great Britain to interfere in internal affairs in South Africa.

Its members were not willing to assume the duties of citizens, to announce their intentions, and surrender allegiance to Great Britain, and by becoming citizens of the Republic help to make its laws; but they intended to change the laws by use of political "influence," or what is spoken of latterly as "pull." They corresponded with the Government of Great Britain and were given a warm hearing, and if any Senator will take time to read the correspondence to learn what they intended to demand, you will see at once why President Kruger was suspicious of "friendly hints."

I call your attention to the communication of this modest body of unnaturalized citizens dated June 16, this year, pages 32, 34, and 38, and addressed to the British high commissioner at Cape Town. They demand, first, that the judiciary shall not be governed by the statutes of the Republic; second, a decided change in the manner of amending the constitution; third, that the Dutch language shall be abandoned in the Congress and the courts and the English language substituted therefor. The next in importance, they demand that an alien should have the same opportunity to hold civil-service appointment as the citizen; a change in municipal government to allow aliens to have same power as citizens; also a change in the police force and in the jury system.

There is a fort overlooking Johannesburg, and it must come down. I quote the exact language: "No permanent cordiality between the two antagonistic elements of the community can be looked for until the entire demolition of the fort." Then I suppose it is fair to say there would be "permanent cordiality" if the fort was demolished. You may remember the "permanent cordiality" between the wolf and the sheep after the dog had been demolished. If there remains any doubt as to the plan of the high commissioner, I read (page 46) from his dispatch to Mr. Chamberlain, July 14, this year:

The question is, Does it insure immediate and substantial share of political powers for uitlanders? which is what I am aiming at.

Ah, Mr. President, there is, there can be, no doubt about what he was aiming at—"immediate and substantial share of political powers" by aliens and unnaturalized residents. Suppose such a proposition should be made to us by any country under any circumstances. They would get the same answer that Kruger now gives them at Modder River and Ladysmith.

Mr. President, I had thought to read you the opinions of our own people, as expressed in public meetings and the papers, but I

have detained you now too long. I can not close, however, without reading extracts from the speech of Michael Davitt six weeks since in the English House of Commons.

Speaking of charges against the Boers, he said:

As this bill sanctioning this war provides means for its prosecution and commits this House to this policy, which provoked hostilities, I will vote against its second reading. The honorable member for Sheffield (Sir Ellis Ashmead Bartlett), who spoke a few moments ago, spoke on Friday last and made general charges of corruption against the Transvaal Government and grounded a defense for this war upon these charges. I challenged him for proofs five days ago. Where are they to-day?

Not a single tittle of evidence has he brought forward to substantiate these calumnies, and this is the general character of the slanderous campaign of the jingo authors of this war. The honorable member is, I believe, a nobleman in the country of Swaziland and would be entitled to sit in the house of lords of that part of Africa, if such an institution existed, but I am not aware that he has ever been in the country in his life or can speak with authority on South African affairs.

The honorable member contends, of course, that this war was necessary and that it ought to have taken place long ago. He, at least, is consistent. One of the objects of this war, according to the colonial secretary and to the leader of the House, is to save the natives from Boer oppression and to give them the better and more humane government of Great Britain. Not a single word of proof of this oppression has been offered in this debate.

It is one of a series of countless assertions reflecting upon the character of your foes, not a single one of which was proved to be true.

It is only a part, but a cruel part, of the method by which this miserable war has been promoted.

These editors and stockbrokers ought, in penance, to be compelled to walk past the inquiry room at the war office every day to witness the scenes which this policy is responsible for. This is what they would witness, as described by a correspondent in one of the London papers: "As one stands by the door of the room, with its cold official surroundings, and looks toward the corner where upon an easel are displayed names of those who have given their lives for their country, there is an unconquerable feeling that one is actually in the presence of the dead. The suggestion is heightened by the coming and going of the mourners. They pass in silently. Ladies in their furs, and their humbler sisters in sorrow from the striving quarters of the city. Each is turning a strained white face to the lists, and praying silently that nothing will be revealed. Side by side a daintily gloved hand and a grimy finger move slowly down the roll. The gloved hand stops midway in a list of killed, and the agonized eyes tell the remainder of the story of death." This is one side of the picture. On another page of the same paper this was justified and described in the following manner:

"PATRIOTISM THAT PAID—HOW THE INVESTORS BACKED THE LITTLE BRITISH ARMY.

"The 1895 boom in South African shares has come back after a holiday of four years, but its return is not welcomed by those who expressed the greatest regret at its departure. The reason of this is that it gave no indication of its approach and sprung its arrival upon an unprepared city. The Kaffir houses and the stock-exchange professionals even throw doubt upon its genuineness and pretend to think that it is only a little wolf masquerading in the lion's skin. They know all the while that it is the real thing; but if they could get a few sellers to weaken the market for them it would suit their books much better."

And then follows the announcement that "yesterday's chartereds became a hot favorite and were bid up to 3⅛, with signs of old-fashioned buying in five and ten thousand share lines.

"With regard to them, it is plausibly argued that they will benefit most from the results of the war, and will be soonest able to take advantage of the change in the situation. It is still possible that the Boers may do a great deal of harm to mines on the Rand, but they can not possibly hurt Rhodesia. After the fighting is over a few more weeks will see railway communication with Buluwayo restored and a new influx of immigrants into Rhodesia started." And this is the war for the "franchise," the war against "Boer corruption," the war for "justice, liberty, and humanity." It is not such a war. It is a war for the meanest and most mercenary of ends and aims which ever prompted conquest or aggression, and it will rank in history as the greatest crime of the nineteenth century.

Mr. President, but a few words more and I shall be done. I have shown the resolution to be in line of precedent of the policy of the United States of America; that it makes no difference whether the political crime against a republic is in Europe, Asia, Africa, or America, the duty of protest is the same, though a different course may be marked out for us by reason of location, duty, and policy; that though we are on friendly terms with Great Britain, yet we are not in such an alliance as should swerve us from the full discharge of our duty; that, in view of our settled practice, it should not be regarded by England as aimed at her, for we will do the same when any monarch attempts to destroy a republic. I think I have shown the difference between the people of England and the administration or Government of England. There is no one familiar with the question but what admits that if Gladstone were living and his party in power this bloody war would never have occurred.

And if it be charged that this resolution is calculated to injure one political party in England and help another and is a mixing in with their politics, then we answer that if the plain discharge of our duty as republicans and democrats in the broad sense interferes with politics in England, the effect is too insignificant to be considered now. I have not sought to excite prejudice by our past differences with England. They are forgotten and forgiven. But when the colors of a republic are struck and we sit silent, it it would seem that we are ashamed or tired of our institutions and by our silence give consent to the destruction of self-government in Africa.

Mr. President, at Mount Vernon an ex-Confederate soldier told me that he was once stationed near the grave of Washington and visited the tomb in his uniform; that he left his arms on the outside and met there many men in blue. A spirit of thankfulness comes over me whenever that picture appears before my eyes. I am thankful that amidst our bloody strife there was one uncontested spot left where brothers could meet. I have always had it in my mind that the whole United States, like that spot at Mount Vernon, was one spot on the earth where lovers of liberty and self-government could meet. The Greeks found comfort here. The Hungarians sent Kossuth, and he was received with open arms and was given assistance in adjusting with Austria.

Simon Bolivar drew deep inspiration from here and established self-government in South America. The statue of Liberty Enlightening the World in New York Harbor is neither a myth, fiction, nor a lie. We may say without boasting that if self-government is right, we have helped the world. The gates at Castle Garden have always swung in, but not alone because of the better wage. One other reason is that they have watched us from afar. They have seen our common schools. They have seen poor boys open the gates of wealth. They have seen the boys go from the shops and farms of honest toil to the Congress and march from the towpath and the rail splitter's cabin to the White House. They have heard us tell our children: "There is the highway of life; be brave and honest, and there is no door that will not open to you if you are worthy."

Then, Mr. President, if I am right, this resolution will help. It will say to the world, "Washington, Monroe, Clay, and Webster are dead, but the American policy still lives." It may sting the oppressor, as Webster said, but it will be a message of affection and hope to the struggling Republic.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MASON] has said. I wish that many of the eloquent passages of his speech might have been delivered in the House of Commons, where I am sure they would have been appropriate, and I am also sure they would have done a great deal of good. But I have no intention of either discussing or debating this question, Mr. President. Whatever private opinions or private sympathies may be, there is a wide gulf fixed between private sympathy and opinion and public action. The action of the Senate as part of the treaty-making power would constitute public action. The executive department has assumed an attitude of strict neutrality between the two parties in the very deplorable war which is now in progress in South Africa. If we should pass such a resolution as this, we should immediately change the attitude of the country.

During our own war with Spain we were extremely desirous of and we expected neutrality from the other nations of the earth. That neutrality we received, and in the case of at least one of the parties in the present war it was very friendly neutrality. Our Government has assumed the attitude of strict neutrality in this case. If we are to depart from it by the passage of a Senate resolution, it certainly is a subject which requires the most careful consideration, and I trust, Mr. President—and I so move—that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] moves that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MASON. I understood the resolution would be referred without any motion. There is no objection to the reference. When I introduced the resolution I asked that it lie on the table until I could be heard in this opening statement. Then I understood that under the rules it would go without any motion to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CAPT. B. TELLEFSEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, as a case not acted upon by the Fifty-fifth Congress, a report from the Secretary of State and accompanying papers relating to the claim of Capt. B. Tellefsen, of the Norwegian steamer *Albert*, against the Government of the United States for $938.96, being the expenses incurred by him in consequence of a violation of Article XIII of the treaty of commerce and navigation of 1827 between the United States and Sweden and Norway.

WILLIAM McKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, December 11, 1899.

COMMERCIAL ATTACHÉS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the consideration of the Congress, a communication from the secretary of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, inclosing resolutions unanimously adopted by that chamber on June 1, 1899, requesting legislation authorizing the appointment of commercial attachés to the principal embassies and legations of the United States.

WILLIAM McKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, December 11, 1899.

NORWEGIAN STEAMSHIP "NICARAGUA."

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, as a case not acted upon by the Fifty-fifth Congress a report from the Secretary of State and accompanying papers relating to the appeal for indemnity addressed to the equitable consideration of the Government of the United States by the owners and late master of the Norwegian steamship *Nicaragua*.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *December 11, 1899.*

BUREAU OF AMERICAN REPUBLICS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Printing.

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit a communication from the Secretary of State, inclosing the annual report of the Director of the Bureau of the American Republics, with accompanying documents.

The attention of Congress is called to the request of the Secretary of State that 2,500 copies of the report be printed for the use of the Bureau.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *December 11, 1899.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution providing for the printing of the report of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers in addition to the usual number, 500 copies of the report of the assistant inspector-general on the State homes, and 150 copies of the record of members for the use of the Home; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Samuel T. Baird, late a Representative from the State of Louisiana, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. William L. Greene, late a Representative from the State of Nebraska, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. HOAR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After thirty-three minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

HOME FOR DISABLED VOLUNTEER SOLDIERS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed of the report of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, in addition to the usual number, 500 copies of the report proper, 500 copies of the report of the assistant inspector-general on the State homes, and 150 copies of the record of members, for the use of the Home.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE SAMUEL T. BAIRD.

Mr. MCENERY. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the resolutions from the House of Representatives relative to the death of my late colleague in that body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following resolutions from the House of Representatives; which were read:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *December 8, 1899.*

Resolved, That the House has heard with deep regret and profound sorrow of the death of Hon. SAMUEL T. BAIRD, a member of the Fifty-fifth Congress and a member-elect to this Congress from the State of Louisiana.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House notify the Senate of the passage of these resolutions, and as a further mark of respect to the memory of our deceased colleague the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MCENERY. Mr. President, at some future time I shall ask that a day be fixed to pay fitting tribute to the memory of the Hon. S. T. BAIRD, late a member of the House from the State of Louisiana. I now offer the resolutions which I send to the desk, and ask for their adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana submits resolutions, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of SAMUEL T. BAIRD, late a Representative from the State of Louisiana.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 12, 1899, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 11, 1899.

CIRCUIT JUDGE.

George Gray, of Delaware, to be United States circuit judge for the Third judicial circuit, said position having been provided for by act of Congress approved February 23, 1899. George Gray was temporarily appointed to the above-named position March 20, 1899, during a recess of the Senate.

CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE COURT OF PRIVATE LAND CLAIMS.

Joseph R. Reed, of Iowa, to be chief justice of the Court of Private Land Claims for the term ending June 30, 1900, as provided for by act of Congress approved February 24, 1899. Joseph R. Reed was temporarily appointed to the above named position on March 4, 1899, during a recess of the Senate.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICES OF THE COURT OF PRIVATE LAND CLAIMS.

Wilbur F. Stone, of Colorado, to be associate justice of the Court of Private Land Claims for the term ending June 30, 1900, as provided for by act of Congress approved February 24, 1899. Wilbur F. Stone was temporarily appointed to the above-named position on March 4, 1899, during a recess of the Senate.

Henry C. Sluss, of Kansas, to be associate justice of the Court of Private Land Claims for the term ending June 30, 1900, as provided for by act of Congress approved February 24, 1899. Henry C. Sluss was temporarily appointed to the above-named position on March 4, 1899, during a recess of the Senate.

William W. Murray, of Tennessee, to be associate justice of the Court of Private Land Claims for the term ending June 30, 1900, as provided for by act of Congress approved February 24, 1899. William W. Murray was temporarily appointed to the above-named position on March 4, 1899, during a recess of the Senate.

Thomas C. Fuller, of North Carolina, to be associate justice of the Court of Private Land Claims for the term ending June 30, 1900, as provided for by act of Congress approved February 24, 1899. Thomas C. Fuller was temporarily appointed to the above-named position on March 4, 1899, during a recess of the Senate.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Job Barnard, of the District of Columbia, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the District of Columbia, vice Walter S. Cox, resigned. Job Barnard was temporarily appointed to the above-named position October 1, 1899, during a recess of the Senate.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Thomas H. Anderson, of the District of Columbia, to be attorney of the United States for the District of Columbia, vice Henry E. Davis, resigned. Thomas H. Anderson was temporarily appointed to the above-named position October 1, 1899, during a recess of the Senate.

William M. Byrne, of Delaware, to be attorney of the United States for the district of Delaware, vice Lewis C. Vandegrift, whose term expired April 18, 1898. William M. Byrne was temporarily appointed to the above-named position June 15, 1899, during a recess of the Senate.

Charles H. Brown, of New York, to be attorney of the United States for the northern district of New York, vice Emory P. Close, removed. Charles H. Brown was temporarily appointed to the above-named position October 25, 1899, during a recess of the Senate.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

Lemuel Gustine, of Louisiana, to be marshal of the United States for the western district of Louisiana, vice James M. Martin, whose term will expire December 12, 1899.

George M. Buchanan, of Mississippi, to be marshal of the United States for the northern district of Mississippi, vice Alexander J. Cooke, deceased. George M. Buchanan was temporarily appointed to the above-named position September 26, 1899, during a recess of the Senate.

Trevanyon L. Mathews, of Nebraska, to be marshal of the United States for the district of Nebraska, vice George H. Taumel, resigned. Trevanyon L. Mathews was temporarily appointed to the above-named position October 25, 1899, during a recess of the Senate.

Eugene P. Nute, of New Hampshire, to be marshal of the United States for the district of New Hampshire, vice Clark Campbell, whose term expired August 13, 1898. Eugene P. Nute was temporarily appointed to the above-named position March 13, 1899, during a recess of the Senate.

William H. Grimshaw, of Minnesota, to be marshal of the United States for the district of Minnesota, vice Richard T. O'Connor, whose term expired February 22, 1899. William H. Grimshaw was temporarily appointed to the above-named position March 11, 1899, during a recess of the Senate.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

J. Barton Miller, of the District of Columbia, to be justice of the peace in the District of Columbia, assigned to the city of Tennallytown, a vacancy having existed there since 1886, by the transfer of Joseph W. Davis to the city of Georgetown. J. Barton Miller was temporarily appointed to the above-named position April 5, 1899, during a recess of the Senate.

Terrence A. Duffy, of the District of Columbia, to be justice of the peace in the District of Columbia, assigned to the city of Brightwood, vice Robert W. Best, deceased. Terrence A. Duffy was temporarily appointed to the above-named position April 5, 1899, during a recess of the Senate.

Albert L. Richardson, of the District of Columbia, to be justice of the peace in the District of Columbia, assigned to the city of Anacostia, vice Conrad H. Weiss, resigned. Albert L. Richardson was temporarily appointed to the above-named position April 5, 1899, during a recess of the Senate.

SUPERVISORS OF CENSUS.

Harvey A. Kasson, of Akron, Summit County, Ohio, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixteenth supervisor's district, vice Joseph W. Little, deceased.

David J. Lewis, of Whiteville, Columbus County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of North Carolina. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

GENERAL OFFICERS.

To be brigadier-generals.

James H. Wilson, late major-general, United States Volunteers, April 12, 1899.

Fitzhugh Lee, late major-general, United States Volunteers, April 12, 1899.

Joseph Wheeler, late major-general, United States Volunteers, April 12, 1899.

Lieut. Col. William Ludlow, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, late major-general, United States Volunteers, April 13, 1899.

Lieut. Col. Adna R. Chaffee, Third United States Cavalry (now colonel Eighth United States Cavalry), late major-general, United States Volunteers, April 13, 1899.

Capt. Leonard Wood, assistant surgeon, United States Army, late major-general, United States Volunteers, April 13, 1899.

Col. John C. Bates, Second United States Infantry, late major-general, United States Volunteers, April 13, 1899.

Col. Samuel B. M. Young, Third United States Cavalry, late major-general, United States Volunteers, April 13, 1899.

Lieut. Col. George W. Davis, Fourteenth United States Infantry, late brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, April 14, 1899.

Col. Theodore Schwan, assistant adjutant-general, United States Army, late brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, April 14, 1899.

Col. Robert H. Hall, Fourth United States Infantry, late brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, April 15, 1899.

Col. Loyd Wheaton, Twentieth United States Infantry, late brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, April 15, 1899.

Charles King, late brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, April 15, 1899.

Frederick D. Grant, late brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, April 15, 1899.

Col. Robert P. Hughes, inspector-general, United States Army, late brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, April 16, 1899.

Col. Samuel Ovenshine, Twenty-third United States Infantry, late brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, April 17, 1899.

Irving Hale, late brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, April 17, 1899.

Col. James F. Smith, First California Volunteers, April 24, 1899.

Col. Frederick Funston, Twentieth Kansas Volunteers, May 1, 1899.

TO BE ASSISTANT ADJUTANTS-GENERAL.

With the rank of lieutenant-colonel.

Capt. Hugh L. Scott, Seventh United States Cavalry, August 17, 1899.

With the rank of major.

First Lieut. J. Franklin Bell, Seventh United States Cavalry (now captain, Seventh United States Cavalry), April 17, 1899.

First Lieut. John J. Pershing, Tenth United States Cavalry, June 6, 1899.

First Lieut. Robert E. L. Michie, Second United States Cavalry, July 26, 1899.

Capt. James B. Hickey, Eighth United States Cavalry, September 5, 1899.

Capt. Edwin St. J. Greble, Second United States Artillery, September 5, 1899.

Capt. Robert H. Noble, Third United States Infantry, September 5, 1899.

Capt. Benjamin Alvord, Twentieth United States Infantry, October 18, 1899.

TO BE INSPECTORS-GENERAL.

With the rank of lieutenant-colonel.

Maj. Charles Heyl, inspector-general, United States Army, September 30, 1899.

With the rank of major.

Capt. Parker W. West, Eighth United States Cavalry, April 17, 1899.

Capt. Alfred C. Sharpe, Twenty-second United States Infantry, April 17, 1899.

Capt. William D. Beach, Third United States Cavalry, September 6, 1899.

First Lieut. Robert A. Brown, Fourth United States Cavalry, September 30, 1899.

TO BE JUDGE-ADVOCATES.

With the rank of major.

Capt. Edgar S. Dudley, assistant quartermaster, United States Army, April 17, 1899.

Capt. Charles McClure, Eighteenth United States Infantry, April 17, 1899.

First Lieut. Harvey C. Carbaugh, Fifth United States Artillery (now captain, Fourth United States Artillery), April 17, 1899.

John A. Hull, late judge-advocate with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, United States Volunteers, April 17, 1899.

George M. Dunn, of Colorado, April 17, 1899.

TO BE QUARTERMASTERS.

With the rank of major.

Capt. Guy Howard, assistant quartermaster, United States Army (since deceased), April 1, 1899.

Capt. James B. Aleshire, assistant quartermaster, United States Army, April 1, 1899.

Noble H. Creager, late chief quartermaster, with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, United States Volunteers, April 1, 1899.

Capt. John T. Knight, assistant quartermaster, United States Army, July 6, 1899.

Capt. John T. French, jr., assistant quartermaster, United States Army, July 6, 1899.

Capt. George S. Cartwright, Twenty-fourth United States Infantry, July 11, 1899.

Capt. Abraham S. Bickham, assistant quartermaster, United States Volunteers, November 10, 1899.

TO BE ASSISTANT QUARTERMASTERS.

With the rank of captain.

First Lieut. Willard A. Holbrook, Seventh United States Cavalry, April 1, 1899.

Jacob C. R. Peabody, of Massachusetts, April 1, 1899.

William E. Horton, of the District of Columbia, April 1, 1899.

Louis F. Garrard, jr., of Georgia, April 1, 1899.

William C. Cannon, of Illinois, April 1, 1899.

Nathan P. Batchelder, of California, April 1, 1899.

Ira L. Fredendall, of Wyoming, April 10, 1899.

First Lieut. John C. Gilmore, jr., Fourth United States Artillery, June 14, 1899.

Harry L. Pettus, of Alabama, June 14, 1899.

Henry J. May, of Ohio, June 14, 1899.

Patrick H. McCaull, of Virginia, June 21, 1899.

Sylvanus G. Orr, of Georgia, July 7, 1899.

First Lieut. George Le R. Irwin, Fifth United States Artillery, July 13, 1899.

Daniel W. Arnold, of Illinois, July 17, 1899.

First Lieut. Sydney A. Cloman, Fifteenth United States Infantry (now captain, Twenty-third United States Infantry), July 18, 1899.

Laurance C. Baker, of New York, July 25, 1899.

George W. Povey, of Oregon, August 28, 1899.

Benjamin Johnson, of California, August 28, 1899.

John Landstreet, jr., of Tennessee, September 9, 1899.

First Lieut. Henry L. Kinnison, Twenty-fifth United States Infantry, September 18, 1899.

First Lieut. William A. Burnside, Fourteenth United States Infantry, September 18, 1899.

Francis Lithgow Payson, of New York, September 18, 1899.

First Lieut. Perry L. Miles, Fourteenth United States Infantry, October 10, 1899.

TO BE COMMISSARIES OF SUBSISTENCE.

With the rank of major.

Capt. Oliver E. Wood, Fifth United States Artillery, April 17, 1899.

Capt. David L. Brainard, commissary of subsistence, United States Army, April 17, 1899.

Capt. George B. Davis, commissary of subsistence, United States Army, April 17, 1899.

Capt. George W. Ruthers, Twenty-fourth United States Infantry, July 8, 1899.

TO BE ASSISTANT COMMISSARIES OF SUBSISTENCE.

With the rank of captain.

First Lieut. Harry E. Wilkins, Second United States Infantry, April 17, 1899.

Philip Mothersill, of New Mexico, April 17, 1899.

Daniel Hogan, of Illinois, April 17, 1899.

William H. Anderson, of Ohio, June 19, 1899.

Capt. John Landstreet, jr., assistant quartermaster, United States Volunteers, with the rank of captain, September 18, 1899.

TO BE SURGEONS.

With the rank of major.

Franklin A. Meacham, of Utah, April 5, 1899.

Capt. Jefferson R. Kean, assistant surgeon, United States Army, April 17, 1899.

Charles M. Drake, of Georgia, July 5, 1899.

Capt. Frank R. Keefer, assistant surgeon, United States Army, October 1, 1899.

Capt. Henry C. Fisher, assistant surgeon, United States Army, October 1, 1899.

Capt. Charles B. Ewing, assistant surgeon, United States Army, November 1, 1899.

Capt. William B. Banister, assistant surgeon, United States Army, November 11, 1899.

TO BE ADDITIONAL PAYMASTERS.

With the rank of major.

Hugh R. Belknap, of Illinois, March 11, 1899.

Charles Newbold, of the District of Columbia, March 11, 1899.

Bradner D. Slaughter, of Nebraska, March 11, 1899.

TO BE SIGNAL OFFICERS.

With the rank of major.

Capt. Richard E. Thompson, Signal Corps, United States Army, April 17, 1899.

Capt. William A. Glassford, Signal Corps, United States Army, April 17, 1899.

Capt. Joseph E. Maxfield, Signal Corps, United States Army, April 17, 1899.

Capt. George P. Scriven, Signal Corps, United States Army, April 17, 1899.

With the rank of captain.

First Lieut. George O. Squier, Signal Corps, United States Army, April 17, 1899.

First Lieut. Samuel Reber, Signal Corps, United States Army, April 17, 1899.

First Lieut. Gustave W. S. Stevens, Sixth United States Artillery, April 17, 1899.

Benjamin F. Montgomery, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, April 17, 1899.

Edward B. Ives, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, April 17, 1899.

Eugene O. Fechét, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of major, April 17, 1899.

Charles B. Hepburn, of the District of Columbia, April 26, 1899.

Daniel J. Carr, of Connecticut, June 2, 1899.

With the rank of first lieutenant.

Carl F. Hartmann, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of captain, April 17, 1899.

Frank E. Lyman, jr., late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of captain, April 17, 1899.

Ambrose Higgins, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of captain, April 17, 1899.

John J. Ryan, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of captain, April 17, 1899.

Leonard D. Wildman, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of captain, April 17, 1899.

Daniel J. Carr, of Connecticut, April 17, 1899.

Second Lieut. George C. Burnell, United States Volunteer Signal Corps, April 26, 1899.

William M. Talbott, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of second lieutenant, April 26, 1899.

Second Lieut. Walter L. Clarke, United States Volunteer Signal Corps, May 15, 1899.

Basil O. Lenoir, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of second lieutenant, June 2, 1899.

Second Lieut. William O. Bailey, United States Volunteer Signal Corps, August 16, 1899.

With the rank of second lieutenant.

Charles B. Hepburn, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of captain, April 17, 1899.

William Mitchell, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of first lieutenant, April 17, 1899.

Victor Shepherd, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of first lieutenant, April 17, 1899.

Walter L. Clarke, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of first lieutenant, April 17, 1899.

George C. Burnell, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of first lieutenant, April 17, 1899.

Charles B. Rogan, jr., late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of first lieutenant, April 17, 1899.

William O. Bailey, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of first lieutenant, April 26, 1899.

Richard O. Rickard, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of captain, April 26, 1899.

William E. Davies, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of first lieutenant, May 15, 1899.

Charles M. Duffy, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of first lieutenant, May 15, 1899.

William W. Colt, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of first lieutenant, May 15, 1899.

Sergt. Alfred T. Clifton, Volunteer Signal Corps, March 15, 1899.

Sergt. Mack K. Cunningham, Volunteer Signal Corps, March 15, 1899.

First-class Sergt. Niels P. Yurgensen, Signal Corps, United States Army, August 16, 1899.

PORTO RICO BATTALION.

To be majors.

Capt. Lorenzo P. Davison, Fifth United States Infantry, June 5, 1899 (since resigned).

Capt. Eben Swift, Fifth United States Cavalry, December 1, 1899, vice Davison, resigned.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Thomas F. Maginnis, Eleventh United States Infantry, May 13, 1899.

Osman Latrobe, late major Fourth United States Volunteer Infantry, May 13, 1899.

Frederick M. Page, late assistant adjutant-general, United States Volunteers, with the rank of captain, May 13, 1899.

To be first lieutenants.

James T. Ord, late first lieutenant, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry, May 13, 1899.

Charles H. Hamilton, late first lieutenant, Third United States Volunteer Engineers, June 20, 1899.

Christian Briard, late first lieutenant, Fifth United States Volunteer Infantry, June 26, 1899.

Allen D. Raymond, late captain, First United States Volunteer Engineers, July 12, 1899.

To be second lieutenants.

Harry L. Cooper, of Pennsylvania, August 2, 1899.

Blas Nadal, of Porto Rico, August 14, 1899.

First-class Sergt. William W. Bessell, Signal Corps, United States Army, November 13, 1899.

Hosp. Steward Jacob E. Wyke, United States Army, November 28, 1899.

TO BE SIGNAL OFFICER, WITH THE RANK OF MAJOR.

Capt. Frank Greene, Signal Corps, United States Army, December 6, 1899, vice Thompson, vacated by promotion to major, Signal Corps, United States Army.

TWENTY-SIXTH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenants.

Sergt. Maj. George R. D. McGregor, Twenty-sixth Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 13, 1899, vice Comstock, promoted.

Com. Sergt. George Garity, Twenty-sixth Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 25, 1899, vice Byrne, resigned.

TWENTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenants.

Sergt. Thomas MacA. Knox, Company D, Twenty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, August 12, 1899, vice Gregg, resigned.

First Sergt. Matthew T. E. Ward, Company C, Twenty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 5, 1899, vice Griffin, promoted.

First Sergt. Arthur L. McCoy, Company B, Twenty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 13, 1899, vice Plummer, promoted.

Hosp. Steward Joseph W. Lacour, Twenty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 14, 1899, vice Knox, promoted.

First Sergt. Frederick B. Hennessy, Company D, Twenty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 14, 1899, vice Shaw, promoted.

First Sergt. William H. Raymond, Company C, Twenty-seventh

Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 27, 1899, vice Munford, promoted.

Sergt. Alvin S. Perkins, Company E, Twenty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 27, 1899, vice Faulkner, promoted.

TWENTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenant.

Sergt. Maj. Frederick G. Turner, Twenty-eighth Infantry, United States Volunteers, October 13, 1899, vice Warner, discharged.

TWENTY-NINTH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenants.

Sergt. Maj. Charles M. Pendleton, Twenty-ninth Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 9, 1899, vice Avery, resigned.

Sergt. Maj. Judge L. Farwell, Twenty-ninth Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 18, 1899, vice Wells, promoted.

Battalion Sergt. Maj. Calvin F. Holmes, Twenty-ninth Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 18, 1899, vice Dillon, discharged.

First Sergt. William B. Renziehausen, Company A, Twenty-ninth Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 18, 1899, vice Conrad, resigned.

THIRTIETH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenant.

First Sergt. Robert E. Brooks, Company E, Thirtieth Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 16, 1899, vice Wright, promoted.

THIRTY-FIRST INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenants.

Sergt. Maj. Jennings B. Wilson, Thirty-first Infantry, United States Volunteers, August 30, 1899, vice Monroe, promoted.

Q. M. Sergt. Richard M. Corwine, Thirty-first Infantry, United States Volunteers, October 25, 1899, vice Simpson, discharged.

Sergt. Maj. Charles H. Danforth, Thirty-first Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 28, 1899, vice Lindsey, promoted.

THIRTY-SECOND INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenants.

Sergt. Maj. Henry E. Schack, Thirty-second Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 22, 1899, vice James, discharged.

Battalion Sergt. Maj. Frank Werner, Thirty-second Infantry, United States Volunteers, December 4, 1899, vice Goodrich, promoted.

THIRTY-THIRD INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenants.

William M. True, of Missouri, August 24, 1899, vice Febiger, promoted.

Sergt. Maj. Wallace W. Goddard, Thirty-third Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 12, 1899, vice Case, promoted.

First Sergt. John A. Jackson, Company I, Thirty-third Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 13, 1899, vice Edmundson, promoted.

Q. M. Sergt. John M. Flemister, Thirty-third Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 14, 1899, vice Sherburne, promoted.

Battalion Sergt. Maj. Etienne de P. Bujac, Thirty-third Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 25, 1899, vice Lipop, promoted.

Sergt. Frederick E. Coe, Company I, Thirty-third Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 25, 1899, vice Healey, promoted.

THIRTY-FOURTH INFANTRY.

To be first lieutenant.

First Lieut. John W. Haussermann, Twentieth Kansas Volunteers, August 3, 1899, vice Geishbush, resigned.

To be second lieutenant.

First Sergt. Harry G. Peterson, Company D, Thirty-fourth Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 9, 1899, vice Dorrington, promoted.

THIRTY-FIFTH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenant.

Com. Sergt. Roger Duval, Thirty-fifth Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 23, 1899, vice Collins, promoted.

THIRTY-SIXTH INFANTRY.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. John J. Haisch, Twentieth Kansas Volunteers, July 26, 1899, vice Point, promoted.

First Sergt. William C. Read, Battery C, Third United States Artillery, August 3, 1899, vice Erickson, vacated.

THIRTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenant.

Sergt. Maj. John Storch, Thirty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, December 5, 1899, vice Cocke, resigned.

THIRTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenant.

Com. Sergt. Albert J. Woude, Thirty-eighth Infantry, United States Volunteers, December 6, 1899, vice Johnson, promoted.

THIRTY-NINTH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenant.

Q. M. Sergt. Marcus Covell, Thirty-ninth Infantry, United States Volunteers, October 13, 1899, vice Orton, promoted.

FORTY-FIRST INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenants.

Sergt. Ralph C. Caldwell, Company H, Forty-first Intantry, United States Volunteers, October 21, 1899, vice Butler, promoted.

First Sergt. Odus J. Reeder, Company D, Forty-first Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 13, 1899, vice Glover, promoted.

Sergt. Harvey J. Simmons, Company E, Forty-first Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 13, 1899, vice Miller, promoted.

Battalion Sergt. Maj. Henry Wessel, Forty-first Infanty, United States Volunteers, November 18, 1899, vice Nowlen, promoted.

FORTY-SECOND INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenant.

Sergt. Maj. Walker W. Hamner, Forty-second Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 20, 1899, vice Webster, promoted.

FORTY-THIRD INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenants.

Q. M. Sergt. James L. Elmer, Forty-third Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 13, 1899, vice Sweeney, promoted.

Private Charles C. Estes, Company G, Forty-third Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 13, 1899, vice Thayer, promoted.

First Sergt. John N. Truden, Company A, Forty-third Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 30, 1899, vice Swann, promoted.

FORTY-FOURTH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenants.

Sergt. Maj. George Bennett, Forty-fourth Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 10, 1899, vice Levack, promoted.

Q. M. Sergt. Walter E. Van Houten, Forty-fourth Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 30, 1899, vice Hall, promoted.

FORTY-SIXTH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenant.

Private Sidney H. Hopson, Light Battery A, Second United States Artillery, September 16, 1899, vice Whitehead, resigned.

FORTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY.

To be major.

Capt. James A. Shipton, Forty-first Infantry, United States Volunteers, October 26, 1899, vice Hubbell, resigned.

To be second lieutenants.

Sergt. Maj. Joseph H. Dent, Forty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, October 30, 1899, vice Murphy, promoted.

First Sergt. George A. Purington, Company C, Forty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 1, 1899, vice Morrow, promoted.

First Sergt. Brice P. Disque, Company E, Forty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 13, 1899, vice Garrison, promoted.

FORTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY.

To be first lieutenant.

Arthur L. Cabanne, of Missouri, October 26, 1899, vice Bright, vacated.

FORTY-NINTH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenant.

Sergt. Maj. James M. Dickerson, Forty-ninth Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 10, 1899, vice Blaney, promoted.

SECOND LIEUTENANTS, MARINE CORPS.

Herbert Mather, New Jersey.
Henry L. Roosevelt, New York.
Fred M. Eslick, Tennessee.
Jay M. Salladay, Illinois.
Rush R. Wallace, Tennessee.
Macker Babb, West Virginia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *December 11, 1899.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read, corrected, and approved.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the special order which has been assigned as the business of the House for to-day.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That on Monday, December 11, immediately after the reading of the Journal, the House shall resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. No. 1, entitled "A bill to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes;" general debate thereon shall continue to not later than 5 o'clock p. m. of Friday, the 15th day of December, and thereafter debate under the five-minute rule until 5 o'clock p. m. of Saturday, the 16th day of December, at which time the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House, with any amendments adopted by the committee, and a vote shall be taken on the bill and amendments, if any, without intervening motion, to final passage, immediately after the reading of the Journal on Monday, the 18th day of December.

And during said debate the House shall on each day adjourn not later than 5 o'clock p. m.

The SPEAKER. Under the order of the House which has just been read by the Clerk, the House will now resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the financial bill, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] will please take the chair.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. HEPBURN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes.

The bill was read at length.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, this country presents the anomalous situation of being the absolute and unchallenged leader in almost every field of advanced thought, whether in science or literature; certainly the most advanced in material development and the control of trade; by far the superior in manufactures and growth of markets; and yet it is the field of greatest controversy upon the subject of the standard of value and the proper media of exchange.

No nation has devoted more time to public discussion and legislative consideration of the question of finance than the United States. The past twenty-five years has witnessed the greatest interest in the subject of any similar period in the history of the nation, and during the past four years every possible phase of the subject has been presented. Continued discussion very naturally develops various proposals for remedy of actual and fancied evils, and the time seems ripe for an honest and careful effort at a fair solution of the problem.

Notwithstanding the fact that the so-called money question continues in great interest among our people, and notwithstanding there have been occasions when serious doubt clouded the situation and produced grave fears lest the entire fabric of our monetary system might be seriously shaken, yet it is to the great credit of the Government that every dollar of our money in circulation is absolutely sound and unquestioned. Throughout the entire time of troublous discussion and debate, in periods when public confidence had well-nigh disappeared and panics produced serious dangers, as well as in the periods of our greatest prosperity, every dollar of American money has been at a parity with the best dollar in circulation. This condition has led many people into the erroneous belief that there was no need for legislation, and that the best that the Government could do would be to let the subject alone.

Such people are not familiar with the frequent pledges of the Government to maintain the parity of our money, declaring by Congressional acts the honest purpose of the Government to faithfully and surely guarantee the full parity of all money in circulation. The present parity depends entirely upon such declarations and guaranties, but its maintenance and enforcement rest with the judgment or caprice of the Secretary of the Treasury, who, by a single order directing the use of silver in the discharge of our obligations, may completely destroy the parity and shift the standard to the metal so used. It seems far better to attempt a proper regulation of the question by a clear and permanent statute rather than depend upon occasional declarations by the Government of its intention. It is far better to end the matter by a public law, which shall be plain and unequivocal, rather than rely upon proposals of what may or shall be done at some future date, or leave so dangerous an option within the control of one man, whether he be the President or his financial adviser.

OUR MONEY AND ITS HISTORY—FORMS OF MONEY.

All of our money in the United States is under Federal control, and the laws authorize ten different kinds, namely, gold coins, gold certificates, standard silver dollars, silver certificates, Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890, subsidiary silver, United States notes (greenbacks), national-bank notes, nickels, and coppers. Each kind is in circulation to-day, all at parity, every dollar equal in purchasing and debt-paying power. Gold coins, standard silver dollars, and Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890, are full legal tender. United States notes (greenbacks) are full legal tender, except for duties on imports and interest on the public debt. Subsidiary silver is legal tender for amounts not exceeding $10, and nickels and coppers are legal tender to the extent of 25 cents. Gold certificates, silver certificates, and national-bank notes are not legal tender.

The legal-tender quality adds no value to the money, but merely makes provision whereby debts may be discharged by the tender of specific kinds of money which, being good, the creditor is bound to accept. It is for convenience and to avoid embarrassment which a captious creditor might cause by insisting upon any special character of payment, or which a captious debtor might create by making payment in a character of money at the time greatly inconvenient to the creditor. I do not deny but that there are those who claim that legal tender adds value, nor that governments have repeatedly undertaken to supply a deficiency in money by giving it the legal-tender quality and attempting to force it into circulation.

The universal and absolute failure of all such efforts is sufficient evidence that this quality is not a quality of value. There is not a single instance in the history of finance where the legal-tender quality added to a money has enabled it to circulate at a greater value than its intrinsic value, where it does not possess equally the pledge and faith of the government for its full redemption. The history of government efforts to force legal-tender money into circulation irrespective of its intrinsic value and without the government pledge is a record of failures, without a single exception. All of the various kinds of money in the United States are based upon a common standard of value, in which each can be measured. The present standard of value in this country is gold, and has been so recognized in practice for more than half a century.

THE STANDARD.

Money is a medium of exchange, and where there are different varieties there must be a common measurement of value. Whether this standard is sought to be controlled by the statute or left exclusively to the laws governing trade and commerce, nevertheless there is, and always has been, in every community dealing in trade, a common method of measurement whereby articles of value are exchanged. This proposition is almost self-evident and is universally admitted. It is only when effort is made to control by statute such measurement of value, different from the method pursued in common trade, that confusion arises.

There can be no proper and valid exchange unless the tool of measurement regulating the exchange shall be equally acceptable to both parties. The basic principle of exchange is value. The question of convenience, of immediate use, of human need or desire may be involved, but nevertheless the basic principle is value; and where there is not an absolute exchange of property for property, the standard of measurement or unit of value which acts as the common tool of exchange must in itself contain the element of value. The element of value is just as essential to a standard of value as the element of weight to a standard of weight or of length to a standard of measurement. Firmness, stability, and constancy are characteristics which any standard must possess if it shall meet the demand upon it by universal use for honest and true measurement, whether of value, weight, or length—firmness in adherence to the principle and purpose to which it is dedicated, stability in its individual strength, and constancy in its character to preserve its integrity. Adaptability to the uses of trade, simplicity of terms to meet the requirements of small transactions equally with large concerns, and uniformity of reputation are qualities necessary to the successful operation of any standard.

There can be but one standard of measurement at a given time. An attempt to couple two standards differing in any degree in essential characteristics will shift the standard to the weaker link. If the basis of a standard of value should be two metals, each possessing characteristics essential to true measurement, there would still be, in effect, but one standard. Value is determined by such a multitude of circumstances, bearing such complex relations to each other, influenced by supply and demand, utility, adaptability, human desire, and other causes without number, that exchanges of property can easily be effected only by the common use of a variety of media of exchange each representing accurately the units of value as measured by the standard into which it can be converted on demand. Voluntary and universal exchange in coppers, nickels, silver, and gold, bank notes, greenbacks, and certificates mark the true test of a standard into which each can be converted with ease.

Law does not create this condition. It merely recognizes it and operates as a check against its disturbance. All efforts to effect by law a standard through any different principle than this have been futile, and the laws of trade and commerce, indifferent to statute law, have universally and consistently recognized as the standard that metal the intrinsic value of which has been most stable and most free from fluctuations. The immutable laws of trade, which control such condition, suffer no more by a statute than an effort to change the tides by royal edict.

HISTORY OF OUR MONEY STANDARD.

The first effort in this country toward establishing a monetary standard was in 1786, when the Congress of the Confederation chose as the unit of value the "Spanish milled dollar," containing 375.64 grains of pure silver. There was then no mint in the United States, and the "milled dollar" was never coined in America.

The first coinage law under the Republic was enacted April 2, 1792, and sought to establish a double standard of gold and silver at a ratio of 1 to 15. Whatever the result of the operation of the law, and the failure of the two metals to maintain the relative values fixed by statute, nevertheless it is quite clear that it was the intent and purpose of the lawmaking power to provide and legalize a double standard of value.

The subsequent act of June 28, 1834, changing the ratio from 1 to 15 to 1 to 16, by reducing the weight of the eagle from 270 grains to 258 grains, was in the hope of maintaining the double standard by regulating the ratio to conform to the commercial values of the metals.

Less than three years thereafter, by the act of January 18, 1837, which changed the ratio from 1 to 16 to 1 to 15.988 by again modifying the quantity of metal in the coins, the effort to maintain the double standard was apparent. The remarkable discovery of gold in California in 1847 and 1848 and in Australia in 1851 had a material influence upon the relative value of gold and silver, and the bullion in the silver coins of the United States increased in value beyond the value noted by their face. This condition bore fruit in the act of February 21, 1853, which provided for the reduction of the amount of metal in the silver half-dollar, quarter, and dime, and prohibited the further coinage of subsidiary silver coins, except upon Government account. The bullion value of a silver dollar prior to 1853, and, indeed, prior to 1873, was, the great proportion of the time, in excess of the face value, and comparatively few were coined.

The difference between the bullion and face value of silver coin accounted for their withdrawal from the channels of trade as a medium of exchange, and their conversion into commodities, regulated in value by the laws governing trade and commerce, irrespective of the statute making provision for their circulation as money at fixed valuations. The necessity for small change created the demand for the half-dollars, quarters, and dimes, which remained in circulation because the bullion was reduced and circulated at par because of the guaranty of the Government. By the provision of the law these subdivisions of the dollar were "paid out at the mint in exchange for gold coins at par," and there has never been a doubt but that their redemption would be equally at par. The struggle of the Government to maintain the double standard by law continued for nearly sixty years. The shifting of the ratio between the two metals was met by the change of statute.

The universal experience in business transactions marked the withdrawal from circulation of the undervalued coin. The debates in Congress just prior to the passage of the act of February 21, 1853, clearly mark the change of sentiment against the further effort to maintain a double standard. It was plainly claimed upon the floor of the House that in practice the gold standard was in force, and that it was the clear purpose of the Government to accept the single gold standard. While no statute was made to this end, the operations of the laws of trade gave recognition to this basis of values. No effort was made to change this sentiment, and for twenty years the question of coinage commanded but little attention by the American people. The struggle of the Government through the civil war crippled the credit of the Republic, and for a time specie payments were suspended and the Government degenerated to a paper basis.

The act of March 18, 1869, "to strengthen the public credit," pledged the Government to the payment of its demand notes and obligations in coin. This was the dawn of a new day in American finance and marked the resurrection of Government credit from the abyss into which it had fallen. The only coin in circulation at the time of the passage of the act of March 18, 1869, was gold. The subsequent provision for the redemption of the demand notes, and the universal policy of the Government to make redemption in the best coin known at the time of redemption, demonstrates beyond doubt that this pledge of the Government has been faithfully kept. It was but a short step, in principle as well as in time, to the provisions in the act of July 14, 1870, "to authorize the refunding of the national debt," which made the bonds of that issue "redeemable in coin at the present standard of value."

The steps approaching the adoption of the gold standard became short and rapid. For five years prior to 1873 the question of legalizing the gold standard was under discussion in financial circles. As early as the winter of 1869 a bill was prepared in the Treasury Department containing provision for the discontinuance of the coinage of the silver dollar and the adoption of the gold dollar piece, at the standard weight of 25.8 grains, as the unit of value. This proposed measure was widely circulated among experts in finance, whose suggestions and criticisms were invited. On April 25, 1870, this bill, as S. 819, was introduced, and on December 19 following was favorably reported.

From the date of its preparation, in all of its forms, and throughout its discussions, covering several sessions, the provisions before mentioned remained intact. Not only that, but these two provisions were the only provisions relative to the standard of value and the silver dollar ever contained in the bill, either as it was originally drawn or throughout its entire consideration. The old standard silver dollar was never mentioned in the bill. The bill became a law February 12, 1873. For more than a quarter of a century preceding that date the commercial world had treated gold as the standard of measurement of values. The "act of 1873" was merely the policy and practice of our people crystallized into statute law. The change from the unwritten to the written law was simple and unattended by the slightest disturbance in trade.

If there had been no further legislation concerning the coinage of silver, there would exist to-day no single doubt of the money standard of the United States. The law of February 12, 1873, clearly adopts the gold one-dollar piece, at the standard weight of 25.8 grains of gold, as the unit of value. That statute has never been repealed nor directly amended, and by legal construction is in force to-day. Yet subsequent acts have so affected it that there is some doubt as to whether gold is fully recognized as our monetary standard. The act of February 28, 1878, authorizing the coinage of the standard silver dollar, and the act of July 14, 1890, directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of Treasury notes thereon, brought into circulation such a tremendous quantity of silver guaranteed by the Government to circulate at par that the burden of the Government was so increased as to make doubtful the strength and stability of the standard.

The fall in the price of silver gave courage to the advocates of cheap money, who sought, by restoring the silver dollar to circulation at less than its intrinsic value, to accomplish what they had failed to accomplish in their battle for cheap money at an earlier period. Public sentiment so suddenly changed upon this question that a free-coinage bill passed the House of Representatives on the 13th of December, 1876, by a vote of 167 to 53. Fortunately it was not acted upon by the Senate. A similar measure passed the House on November 3, 1877, by a vote of 163 to 34. Early in the year 1878 this bill was considered by the Senate and a compromise effected, resulting in the passage of the so-called "Bland-Allison act" on the 15th of February, 1878.

With all the ills which this measure brought upon the country, it was far to be preferred to an absolute free-coinage bill which threatened the country at that date.

President Hayes vetoed the bill, but on the 28th of February, 1878, it was passed over his veto by both Houses, the vote in the House being 196 to 73, and in the Senate 46 to 19. The rapidity with which the silver dollars were coined and issued into circulation greatly stimulated the advocates of cheap money, who became restless at the delay occasioned by the mints, which were not able to turn out the money as rapidly as the people desired, and the law of July 14, 1890, providing for the immediate issue of Treasury notes based upon the bullion purchased, to be redeemed by the dollars as coined, enabled the issue of the money more rapidly than was provided by the capacity of the mints.

By the act of September 26, 1890, Congress discontinued the coinage of the one-dollar gold piece, which the law of February 12, 1873, had declared to be the "unit of value." This act further confused the legal status of the standard. While the actual existence of the gold one-dollar piece is not essential, yet, it having been declared by law to be the "unit of value," its discontinuance cast doubt upon the character of the standard. The purchasing clause of the law of July 14, 1890, was repealed November 1, 1893. So grevious had grown the burden upon the Government because of the vast issue of a depreciated coin that confidence in the Government's ability to maintain it was shaken. The same law which repealed the purchasing clause of the act of July 14, 1890, contained the provision declaring it to be the fixed purpose of the Government to maintain its gold and silver "of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value."

But for this declaration the silver coins would have circulated only at their intrinsic value, which was less than par. With the declaration the pledge of the Government for the maintenance of

their parity with gold created an obligation as sacred as a national bond. By this pledge the Government made additional recognition of the standard of gold, in which, by implication, it proposed to measure the value of the silver dollar.

DOUBTS.

The tremendous increase of silver coin under the operation of the laws of 1878 and 1890 created a doubt as to the ability of the Government to maintain the parity of all of its money. Prior to 1873, when the gold standard was adopted, there had been issued by the Government only 8,031,238 silver dollars. From February 12, 1878, when the recoinage of the silver dollar was authorized, to November 1, 1893, when such coinage was discontinued, there were coined by the Government 482,357,376 silver dollars. Upon this last date there was not a silver dollar in circulation whose face value equaled its intrinsic value. The difference between the intrinsic and face value was a Government obligation, so established by Congressional act. No other method of maintenance of the parity of silver with gold other than the pledge of the Government was known to the law. The ability of the Government to bear this burden was never questioned. The mere money obligation imposed by the law created no serious embarrassment. It was the principle involved, coupled with the repeated efforts by a very considerable number of the people of the country to establish absolute free coinage of silver, which shook public confidence and produced the fear that a change of the monetary standard would result. Numerous propositions looking to such change were introduced in Congress, some of which were given such consideration as to keep the anxiety of the public at high pitch.

The passage of the so-called "Teller" resolution, February 28, 1898, by the United States Senate was hardly calculated to quiet these fears. In a period of less than twenty years two forcible efforts to establish absolute free coinage of silver were made and two laws enacted authorizing the coinage of the silver dollar, resulting in the issue of the vast sum of $482,357,376, the same being the number of silver dollars coined from 1873 to 1893. With such dangers existing and with the energy of a great political party, with a vast number, though a minority, of our people clamoring for a change of standard, the necessity for a positive and unequivocal declaration by law seems absolute and paramount.

WISDOM OF IMMEDIATE ACTION.

If the legal standard to-day is the gold standard, under the act of 1873, a positive statute to that effect can do no harm. If, on the other hand, there is any reasonable doubt, it should be dispelled by a statute plain and clear in its terms and absolute in its effect. The American Government is too great for it to hesitate to make absolutely certain any of its policies, its responsibility to its people in the proper and peaceful discharge of their trade too sure and certain for it to suffer the slightest doubt of the standard of measurement of values in the vast business transactions of our people. The present conditions are most favorable and the time most opportune for the clear and unequivocal adoption of the gold standard.

Prior to the year 1896 the gold standard had been legally adopted by thirteen of the leading nations of the world, and since 1896 by four such nations, as evidenced by the following table:

Austria-Hungary	1892	Great Britain	1816
Brazil	1854	Japan	1897
Costa Rica	1896	Norway	1873
British Honduras	1894	Peru	1899
Chile	1895	Portugal	1854
Denmark	1873	Russia	1897
Egypt	1885	Sweden	1873
Finland	1877	Turkey	1882
Germany	1871		

Ten nations have suspended the coinage of silver on private account, thus effectually, although not absolutely, fixing their status as gold-standard countries. The names of such nations and the dates of their action are shown by the following table:

United States	1853, 1873, and 1878	Spain	1878
Belgium	1873	India	1893
France	1873	Switzerland	1874
Holland	1873	Greece	1875
Italy	1875	Venezuela	1892

Our adoption of the gold standard is in perfect accord with the movement in all of the leading nations of the world and in perfect harmony with the policy of our Government throughout its history. To dispel all lingering doubt from the mind of the public and to give clear expression to the nation's purpose relative to its monetary standard is the object of the legislation proposed by the bill under consideration. When the standard shall be permanently established and all doubt of its stability removed the parity of all our money will be fully recognized, and the kind of money in which payment shall be made will rarely, if ever, be the subject of dispute. When certainty shall take the place of doubt and the integrity of our credit be as fixed as the honor of the nation, the national debt can be readily refunded at lower interest rates and future loans negotiated with ease upon better terms than ever before.

The rapid development of American trade and its vast expansion, bringing our people into close relations with the leading nations of the world, makes it imperative that the standard of value in which settlements are made shall be the best known to the highest civilization and shall safely appeal to intelligent and successful experience. Recent events, shaped by causes beyond our control, bearing obligations which national honor requires shall be courageously discharged, open new fields for American statesmanship. Channels of trade yet unknown to American enterprise and avenues of commerce yet to welcome American products will surely result. Such conditions emphasize the necessity for a standard of value which shall remain firm throughout the vicissitudes of competitive trade. Its permanence and stability should be above suspicion. Its security should be absolute.

Such are the general conditions of trade, as well as the condition of the National Treasury, that no disturbance whatever can possibly be caused by the legislation proposed. The volume and variety of our interstate and foreign trade has never before been equaled. The supply of labor fails to meet the demand for employment. Bountiful harvests and the output of manufactories strain the means of transportation. Vast enterprises for the extension of shipping facilities by land and sea are in progress. No clouds yet appear to cast a shadow upon our prosperity. The national revenues have been abundant and satisfactory, notwithstanding the expense incident to the war with Spain, which has been concluded with success and honor, nor the expense incurred by the insurrection in the Philippines. The taxes imposed by the Government to meet the increased expenditures are being patriotically borne by our people without a murmur.

The Government has been able to meet its obligations with ease and has declared its willingness to anticipate its interest payments so as to quickly return the money to the channels of trade, while at the same time it has reduced the national debt by the purchase of bonds before their maturity. The revenues exceed the expenditures, notwithstanding the extraordinary obligations. The Government is suffering no embarrassment whatever with her finances. The net gold in the Treasury on the 2d day of October, 1899, was $254,328,820. There is more gold in the United States now than ever before. The world's product of gold in 1898 was the greatest in history and exceeded the product of 1897 by $48,616,600 and of 1896 by $85,177,600. The product of gold and silver since 1860 is shown by the accompanying table:

Product of gold and silver in the world since 1860.

[The annual production of 1860 to 1872 is obtained from 5-year period estimates, compiled by Dr. Adolph Soetbeer. Since 1872 the estimates are those of the Bureau of the Mint.]

Calendar year.	Gold.		Silver.		
	Fine ounces.	Value.	Fine ounces.	Commercial value.	Coining value.
1860	6,486,262	$134,083,000	29,095,428	$39,337,000	$37,618,000
1861	5,949,582	122,989,000	35,401,972	46,191,000	45,772,000
1862	5,949,582	122,989,000	35,401,972	47,651,000	45,772,000
1863	5,949,582	122,989,000	35,401,972	47,616,000	45,772,000
1864	5,949,582	122,989,000	35,401,972	47,616,000	45,772,000
1865	5,949,582	122,989,000	35,401,972	47,308,000	45,772,000
1866	6,270,086	129,614,000	43,051,583	57,646,000	55,663,000
1867	6,270,086	129,614,000	43,051,583	57,173,000	55,663,000
1868	6,270,086	129,614,000	43,051,583	57,086,000	55,663,000
1869	6,270,086	129,614,000	43,051,583	57,043,000	55,663,000
1870	6,270,086	129,614,000	43,051,583	57,173,000	55,663,000
1871	5,591,014	115,577,000	63,317,014	83,958,000	81,864,000
1872	5,591,014	115,577,000	63,317,014	83,705,000	81,864,000
Total	78,706,630	1,628,252,000	547,997,231	729,563,000	708,521,000
1873	4,653,675	96,200,000	63,267,187	82,120,800	81,800,000
1874	4,390,031	90,750,000	55,300,781	70,674,400	71,505,000
1875	4,716,563	97,500,000	62,231,719	77,578,100	80,500,000
1876	5,016,488	103,700,000	67,753,125	78,322,000	87,000,000
1877	5,512,193	113,947,200	62,679,916	75,278,600	81,040,700
1878	5,761,114	119,092,800	73,385,451	84,540,000	94,882,200
1879	5,202,174	108,778,800	74,383,495	83,532,700	96,172,600
1880	5,148,880	106,436,800	74,795,273	85,640,000	96,705,000
1881	4,983,742	103,023,100	79,020,872	89,925,700	102,168,400
1882	4,934,086	101,996,000	86,472,091	98,232,300	111,802,300
1883	4,614,588	95,392,000	89,175,023	98,984,300	115,297,000
1884	4,921,169	101,729,600	81,567,801	90,785,000	105,461,400
1885	5,245,572	108,435,800	91,600,959	97,518,800	118,445,200
1886	5,135,679	106,163,900	93,297,290	92,703,500	120,629,800
1887	5,116,861	105,774,900	93,123,586	94,651,000	124,281,000
1888	5,330,775	110,196,900	108,827,000	102,185,900	140,706,400
1889	5,973,790	123,489,200	120,213,611	112,414,100	155,427,700
1890	5,749,306	118,848,700	126,695,062	131,937,030	163,632,000
1891	6,320,194	130,650,000	137,170,919	135,500,200	177,352,300
1892	7,094,286	146,651,500	153,151,762	133,404,400	198,014,400
1893	7,618,811	157,494,800	165,472,621	129,119,900	213,944,400
1894	8,764,362	181,175,600	164,610,294	101,493,030	212,829,000
1895	9,615,190	198,763,600	167,500,960	109,545,660	216,561,900
1896	9,783,914	202,251,600	157,061,370	105,859,300	203,069,200
1897	11,552,532	238,812,000	164,073,172	98,443,800	212,134,800
1898	13,904,363	287,428,000	165,305,572	97,524,500	213,715,400
Total	167,120,321	3,454,083,800	2,780,506,618	2,590,386,100	3,595,075,700
Grand total	245,826,951	5,082,335,800	3,328,503,849	3,289,949,100	4,303,596,700

The product of gold from mines in the United States in 1898 was the greatest in the history of the world, exceeding the product of 1897 by $7,100,000 and of 1896 by $11,375,000. The product of gold and silver from mines in the United States since 1860 is shown by the following table:

Product of gold and silver from mines in the United States since 1860.

[The estimate for 1860–1872 is by R. W. Raymond, commissioner, and since 1872 by the Bureau of the Mint.]

Calendar year.	Gold.		Silver.		
	Fine ounces.	Value.	Fine ounces.	Commercial value.	Coining value.
1860	2,225,250	$46,000,000	116,015	$157,000	$150,000
1861	2,080,125	43,000,000	1,546,875	2,062,000	2,000,000
1862	1,896,300	39,200,000	3,480,469	4,685,000	4,500,000
1863	1,935,000	40,000,000	6,574,219	8,842,000	8,500,000
1864	2,230,088	46,100,000	8,507,812	11,443,000	11,000,000
1865	2,576,759	53,225,000	8,701,171	11,642,000	11,250,000
1866	2,588,063	53,500,000	7,734,375	10,356,000	10,000,000
1867	2,502,197	51,725,000	10,441,406	13,886,000	13,500,000
1868	2,322,000	48,000,000	9,281,250	12,307,000	12,000,000
1869	2,304,563	49,500,000	9,281,250	12,298,000	12,000,000
1870	2,418,750	50,000,000	12,375,000	16,734,000	16,000,000
1871	2,104,313	43,500,000	17,789,062	23,578,000	23,000,000
1872	1,741,500	36,000,000	22,236,328	29,906,000	28,750,000
Total	29,012,908	599,750,000	118,065,232	157,306,000	152,650,000
1873	1,741,500	36,000,000	27,650,000	35,890,000	35,750,000
1874	1,620,563	33,500,000	28,849,000	36,869,000	37,300,000
1875	1,615,725	33,400,000	24,518,000	30,549,000	31,700,000
1876	1,930,162	39,900,000	30,009,000	34,690,000	38,800,000
1877	2,268,788	46,900,000	30,783,000	36,970,000	39,800,000
1878	2,476,800	51,200,000	34,960,000	40,270,000	45,200,000
1879	1,881,787	38,900,000	31,550,000	35,430,000	40,800,000
1880	1,741,500	36,000,000	30,320,000	34,720,000	39,200,000
1881	1,678,612	34,700,000	33,260,000	37,850,000	43,000,000
1882	1,572,187	32,500,000	36,200,000	41,120,000	46,800,000
1883	1,451,250	30,000,000	35,730,000	39,600,000	46,200,000
1884	1,489,950	30,800,000	37,800,000	42,070,000	48,800,000
1885	1,538,325	31,800,000	39,910,000	43,500,000	51,600,000
1886	1,693,125	35,000,000	39,440,000	39,230,000	51,000,000
1887	1,596,375	33,000,000	41,260,000	40,410,000	53,350,000
1888	1,604,841	33,175,000	45,780,000	43,020,000	59,195,000
1889	1,587,000	32,800,000	50,000,000	46,750,000	64,646,000
1890	1,588,880	32,845,000	54,500,000	57,225,000	70,465,000
1891	1,604,840	33,175,000	58,330,000	57,630,000	75,417,000
1892	1,596,375	33,000,000	63,500,000	55,563,000	82,101,000
1893	1,739,323	35,955,000	60,000,000	46,800,000	77,576,000
1894	1,910,813	39,500,000	49,500,000	31,422,000	64,000,000
1895	2,254,760	46,610,000	55,727,000	36,445,000	72,051,000
1896	2,568,132	53,088,000	58,835,000	39,655,000	76,069,000
1897	2,774,935	57,393,000	53,860,000	33,316,000	69,637,000
1898	3,118,398	64,463,000	54,438,000	32,118,000	70,384,000
Total	48,644,946	1,005,574,000	1,106,709,000	1,047,172,000	1,430,841,000
Grand total	77,657,854	1,605,324,000	1,222,774,232	1,204,538,000	1,583,491,000

The output of silver, as shown by the above tables, has varied in different years, while the product of gold has steadily increased annually since 1890. Notwithstanding the fluctuations in the product of silver, its value per ounce has had a uniform tendency downward, declining to 59 cents per ounce in 1898, its lowest register, as shown by the following table:

Highest, lowest, and average price of bar silver in London, per ounce British standard (0.925), since 1833, and the equivalent in United States gold coin of an ounce 1,000 fine, taken at the average price.

Calendar year.	Lowest quotation.	Highest quotation.	Average quotation.	Value of a fine ounce at average quotation.
	Pence.	Pence.	Pence.	
1833	58⅞	59⅛	59 3/16	$1.297
1834	59⅛	60⅛	59 15/16	1.313
1835	59⅛	60	59 7/16	1.308
1836	59⅛	60⅛	60	1.315
1837	59	60⅛	59 5/16	1.305
1838	59⅛	60⅛	59⅛	1.304
1839	60	60⅛	60⅛	1.323
1840	60⅛	60⅛	60⅛	1.323
1841	59⅛	60⅛	60 1/16	1.316
1842	59⅛	60	59 7/16	1.303
1843	59	59⅛	59 3/16	1.297
1844	59⅛	59⅛	59⅛	1.304
1845	58⅞	59⅛	59⅛	1.298
1846	59	60⅛	59 5/16	1.300
1847	58⅞	60⅛	59 7/16	1.608
1848	58⅛	60	59⅛	1.304
1849	59⅛	60	59⅛	1.309
1850	59⅛	61⅛	61 1/16	1.316
1851	60	61⅛	61	1.337
1852	59⅛	61⅛	60⅛	1.326
1853	60⅛	61⅛	61⅛	1.348
1854	60⅛	61⅛	61⅛	1.348
1855	60	61⅛	61 3/16	1.344
1856	60⅛	62⅛	61 3/16	1.344
1857	61	62⅛	61⅛	1.353
1858	60⅛	61⅛	61 3/16	1.344
1859	61⅛	62⅛	62 1/16	1.360
1860	61⅛	63⅛	61 15/16	1.352

Highest, lowest, and average price of bar silver in London, etc.—Cont'd.

Calendar year.	Lowest quotation.	Highest quotation.	Average quotation.	Value of a fine ounce at average quotation.
	Pence.	Pence.	Pence.	
1861	60⅛	61⅛	60 13/16	$1.333
1862	61	62⅛	61 1/16	1.346
1863	61	61⅛	61⅛	1.345
1864	60⅛	62⅛	61⅛	1.345
1865	60⅛	61⅛	61 1/16	1.338
1866	60⅛	62⅛	61⅛	1.339
1867	60⅛	61⅛	60 15/16	1.328
1868	60⅛	61⅛	60⅛	1.326
1869	60	61	60 7/16	1.325
1870	60⅛	60⅛	60 5/16	1.323
1871	60 3/16	61	60⅛	1.328
1872	59⅛	61⅛	60 5/16	1.322
1873	57⅛	59 1/16	59⅛	1.29709
1874	57⅛	59⅛	58 15/16	1.27883
1875	55⅛	57⅛	56⅛	1.24233
1876	46⅛	58⅛	52⅛	1.16414
1877	53⅛	58⅛	54 1/16	1.20189
1878	49⅛	55⅛	52 7/16	1.15358
1879	48⅞	53⅛	51⅛	1.12362
1880	51⅛	52⅛	52⅛	1.14507
1881	50⅞	52⅛	51 15/16	1.13229
1882	50	52⅛	51 3/16	1.13562
1883	50	51 7/16	50⅛	1.10874
1884	49⅛	51⅛	50⅛	1.11068
1885	46⅛	50	48 7/16	1.06510
1886	42	47	45⅛	.99467
1887	43⅛	47⅛	44⅛	.97046
1888	41⅛	44 7/16	42⅛	.93074
1889	42	44⅛	41 11/16	.93511
1890	43⅛	54⅛	47⅛	1.04634
1891	43⅛	48⅛	45 7/16	.98800
1892	37⅛	43⅛	39⅛	.87145
1893	30⅛	38⅛	35 7/16	.78930
1894	27	31⅛	28⅛	.63479
1895	27 3/16	31⅛	29⅛	.65406
1896	29⅛	31 11/16	30⅛	.67565
1897	23⅛	29 3/16	27 5/16	.60483
1898	23	28⅛	26 5/16	.59010

If, under all these conditions, the United States shall clearly by law adopt the gold standard, it will experience even less friction than resulted from the resumption of specie payment. The Government is most fortunate in being able to act in such an important matter under such favorable circumstances.

MAINTENANCE OF THE STANDARD.

But the gold standard is not to be adopted by a mere definition of the unit of value. Its full, complete, and harmonious operation must be provided for. The definition of the unit of value should be followed by a provision for the full payment of Government obligations in the standard. The recognition of the standard is reflected in the method pursued by the Government in the payment of its obligations. Mere statutory declaration would be idle unless the conduct of the nation toward its own debts were consistent with the statute. Law and conduct both must be free from ambiguity. National honor and national credit are closely allied. In the discharge of its debts the Government has always followed the practice of making payment in money equivalent to the best money known at the time. Gold has been the money received by the Government when our credit has been pledged, and the discharge of such debts in money of less value would be repudiation.

This provision will create no change in the practice which the Government has universally observed. Where the custom has so long prevailed to pay out gold for the greenback and Treasury note, as well as for the interest-bearing obligations, the plain provision by statute, in perfect harmony with such custom, will strengthen the credit of the Government, without effecting the slightest change in the national policy. The creation of a division of the Treasury where this practice may be operative, separate from the fiscal transactions of the Government, is in perfect accord with good business principles. It provides a place where, figuratively and practically, the "counter" of the Government may be found, with an officer ready and fully authorized to discharge all of the duties devolving upon the Government for the issue and redemption of its obligations. Such division of the Treasury will hold, in addition to the funds specifically dedicated to the payment of outstanding certificates, an amount of gold equal to 25 per cent of the amount both of United States notes and Treasury notes outstanding as a reserve fund to meet any demand for the redemption of greenbacks and Treasury notes when presented.

There is now no specific law authorizing any particular sum to be held as a reserve to meet the redemption of the greenbacks, unless it is contained in the provision of the law relating to the issue of gold certificates, directing that no more gold certificates shall be issued whenever the gold in the Treasury falls below $100,000,000. Such practice should be legalized and based upon a specific statute. A reserve fund of one-fourth of such notes outstanding is deemed sufficient to guard against any sudden demand

of holders for the redemption of these obligations. Especially is it thought that such sum is sufficient in view of the provision wherein it is stipulated that all notes and certificates, when redeemed or exchanged, shall be held and not be withdrawn nor disbursed, except in exchange for an equivalent amount of the coin in which said notes or certificates were redeemed or exchanged, save only when transferred by the Secretary of the Treasury from one fund to another.

The different funds which would, by this section, be referred to such division of the Treasury, together with the respective amounts, on the 30th day of September, 1899, are as follows:

1. Gold coin and bullion, represented by outstanding gold certificates	$135,501,119
2. United States notes, represented by outstanding currency certificates	16,100,000
3. Silver dollars, represented by outstanding silver certificates	405,197,504
4. Silver bullion, represented by outstanding Treasury notes	91,167,280
5. Gold coin and bullion, equal to one-fourth of the United States notes ($346,681,016) and Treasury notes ($91,167,280) outstanding	109,462,074

The first four items enumerate the special deposits dedicated to specific payments. As these obligations are met, the deposits are correspondingly reduced.

In the absence of a law providing protection to the gold reserve, it is always subject to an encroachment in expenditures to meet the general expenses of the Government. Whenever such encroachment seems probable, a fear has arisen that the Government may not be able to meet its demand obligations, and a run upon the reserve for the redemption of the demand notes has followed. This situation is responsible for the so-called "endless chain." By separating the reserve fund from the general fund and prohibiting its use, except for redemption of United States notes and Treasury notes, the dangers to which it has been so greatly subjected will be removed. These demand notes are being redeemed in gold now and always have been, and no additional burden is imposed upon the Government. It is sought to simplify and legalize the practice, and create a division in the Treasury where the whole business of issuing and redeeming notes may be transacted, and to establish complete confidence in the redemption of our demand obligations.

INTERCHANGEABILITY.

If the absolute and unquestioned parity of all our money shall be truly and honestly maintained, proper provision for their interchangeability should be made. The provision for the interchangeability of the money of the Government has greatly frightened some people. The thought that any of our money might be taken to the counter of the Government and, upon presentation, be exchanged for gold coin has developed in many honest minds a serious doubt of the ability of the Government to discharge such function. But how else is this full parity to be maintained? In what other manner is it possible to measure the value of money, except by its comparison with, or measurement by, the standard of value? No difficulty arises when a silver certificate is presented to the Government in exchange for silver dollars, or of a gold certificate for gold dollars, or of a currency certificate for greenbacks.

But these are mere certificates of deposit, or warehouse receipts, if you please, for actual property or commodity which is specifically on deposit at the National Treasury, especially and solely dedicated to the payment of the certificates outstanding, for the payment of which they are pledged. No trouble has existed in ordinary times for the exchange of a greenback for gold, and it was only because of the reissue of the greenback, creating a so-called "endless chain," that the Government was at all embarrassed in the redemption of its demand obligations. The provision of the bill under consideration whereby such notes when once redeemed shall remain undisturbed in the Treasury, except by transfer from one fund to another under the direction of the Secretary, and reissued only in exchange for the same coin for which such exchange or redemption was made, will forever put an end to such difficulty. It is only in the case of the silver dollar that any doubt arises when the subject of interchangeability is advanced.

This only emphasizes the claim before made, that the issue of the vast number of silver dollars has been the cause of the embarrassment to the Government relative to its monetary standard. But the fact exists most plainly that these dollars are in actual circulation, and are based on the obligation of the Government, no matter whether that obligation be in the form of a statutory pledge or resting for final redemption upon the gold standard of value; nevertheless, it still remains that their absolute parity with gold has been assured, and the obligation must be met. In my judgment, it is best to meet it squarely, fairly, plainly. The intrinsic value of the silver dollar is less than its face. There is a certain proportion of the silver dollar which is based entirely upon the Government pledge. There is a certain proportion which is equaled by its intrinsic value. The two can not be separated.

A part of the dollar can not be redeemed by the Government and a part unredeemed because it rests upon its intrinsic value. The only sensible and scientific way to make absolute provision for the parity is by providing that it shall be interchangeable with gold. I take it that few would object to this method but for the fear that a greater amount of silver dollars might be presented at one time than there was gold sufficient to meet the demand for exchange. But there are two things which will operate to overcome that fear. The first is that the legalizing of the gold standard and provision for the equality of all forms of money at a parity with the standard will so remove all doubt of the soundness and integrity of our money that there will be little occasion for the exchange of one kind of money for another.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Yes.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. In reference to the silver dollars, when they are taken to the Treasury and are redeemed in gold, what is to become of them after they have been received by the Treasury? Are they to be paid out again or not?

Mr. OVERSTREET. There are two alternatives. The first is, they may be returned to trade upon the presentation of gold for their exchange, or they may be transferred by the Secretary of the Treasury from the redemption fund to the fiscal fund and used in the discharge of the Government expenses.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Then if they are paid out in due course of trade and transferred to this fund that the gentleman speaks of, do they not then become an endless chain in themselves, the same as you say the greenbacks and Treasury notes do?

Mr. OVERSTREET. No, sir; for the following reason——

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Will the gentleman answer that? If they are paid out in the due course of trade, can they not be taken back and gold demanded, and then go the round again for another endless chain, like the one the gentleman has talked of in reference to greenbacks and Treasury notes? I would like the gentleman to make that clear.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I am perfectly willing to answer the gentleman's question. I may say that I think I have answered it very conclusively in the argument that I have prepared, but in order to deal with entire fairness with the gentleman I will answer his question now. Under the present law an endless chain is created because the greenback is reissued immediately and may again seek its way to the Treasury for a second redemption. That is stopped by the proposition which I have just elaborated in my argument. Under the proposed law the silver dollar, if exchanged for gold, would be returned to trade upon presentation of gold for another exchange of the silver; or it may be returned from one fund, the redemption fund, to another, the fiscal fund, by the Secretary of the Treasury. Just at that point is to be found the reason why an endless chain of silver dollars can not occur. It is the Secretary of the Treasury who has that option and right to transfer the silver dollar and pay it out, and it only goes out in the payment of the expenses of the Government.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Then will the gentleman yield for one other question? I do not mean to interrupt the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Then, if I understand, under this act the option is left absolutely with the Secretary whether he will keep them to be redeemed in gold or whether he transfers them to a fund that can go into the channels of trade and be paid out by the Government. Is that what you mean?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I understand the gentleman.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Is that what you mean? Is that the option?

Mr. OVERSTREET. If the gentleman will pardon me, I think that the part of my argument to which I am just about to direct my attention answers his question; and if it does not, when I am through I am perfectly willing to yield to him.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. I do not mean captiously to interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I understand, and I would willingly yield further if I did not think the gentleman's question was answered in the portion of my speech which is next to come.

Mr. SHAFROTH. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Yes.

Mr. SHAFROTH. If the Secretary of the Treasury exercises the option given him under this bill to keep the silver dollars and not to turn them into the general fund of the Government, will it not produce a contraction of the currency to the extent of $482,000,000?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Absolutely not, for the reason that the silver dollars can not be taken to the Treasury for exchange unless an equal amount of gold goes at once into circulation to take their place in trade. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SHAFROTH. You mean to say that if there is no quantity of gold in the Treasury that they can not be redeemed. Is that your answer?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Well, that is an impossible query, for the reason that gold must be kept in the Treasury.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Is it not a fact that when gold is drawn from the Treasury it is drawn for export, and that consequently when the silver dollar is presented to the Treasury and the gold is withdrawn that that money instead of remaining in circulation in this country goes to foreign countries? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. OVERSTREET. That happens under Democratic administrations. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] When the revenues of the Government do not equal expenses and trade becomes paralyzed and business at a standstill, then gold is exported; but under the beneficent influences of this measure and of the policy advocated by the Republican party, which presents it, that condition may and will never arise. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. OVERSTREET. I think I want to answer the first queries that were propounded, which I feel will be answered by the portion of my argument which I have now reached.

The demand for such exchange will be reduced in proportion as the certainty of the exchange is made manifest. [Applause on the Republican side.] There will be nothing to gain by the exchange.

If the silver dollar shall be made by law interchangeable with the gold dollar, if it can be used wherever the gold can be used, no benefit will accrue from such exchange. If the silver dollar is as good as gold, is not the holder entitled to the gold if offered in exchange? If the gold is no better than the silver dollar, can the fact be more completely demonstrated than by full exchange?

Furthermore, under the provisions of the proposed measure the large silver certificates will be broken up and reissued into certificates of denominations of one, two, and five dollars, thus bringing the silver circulation to the use of the small daily transactions of the people, which is commonly known as the pocket trade. Such provision will result in the scattering of the silver circulation, either in the dollar or the certificates, through so broad a territory and in the field of such constant demand that it will be exceedingly impracticable to gather together at one time any considerable amount for purposes solely of exchange at the Government counter. A few bills of large denomination, aggregating a very considerable sum, may be readily obtained, and their presentation for redemption or interchangeability would be embarrassing, but it is exceedingly difficult and expensive to gather and transport as many as a million silver dollar pieces, and equally troublesome to withdraw from the channels of daily trade any considerable sum of certificates of denominations of one, two, and five dollars. By this provision not only will the parity of the silver dollar be absolutely assured, but a place honorable and creditable for the use of the silver circulation will be effected.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I will ask the gentleman if under this bill all forms of currency, including greenbacks, Treasury notes, silver certificates, and silver dollars, are not a charge upon the gold fund which may be exchanged by the Secretary of the Treasury for gold?

Mr. OVERSTREET. They are, and always have been. They are on the gold fund now.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. No, sir.

Mr. OVERSTREET. The policy has not been changed on the part of the Government, and the proposition of this bill only crystallizes into law that practice which the Government has followed throughout the history of the country for half a century.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I will ask you if every single dollar of the circulation excepting gold is not, under this bill, made a part of this endless chain which may be used to extract gold from the Treasury?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Not at all.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. If it is not a charge upon the gold, how do you remove this from being a part of the endless chain? Have you not charged all the time during the last four years that you had no other object except this endless chain that you wanted to break up? Did you ever hear of any other argument in favor of the establishment of the gold standard except that it was to break up this endless chain that you speak of?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I am perfectly frank to state that the policy that the Republican party has advocated since 1896 only demonstrated the adaptability of that standard to the breaking of the endless chain.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. And you propose to break it by making it apply to silver dollars as well as to greenbacks?

Mr. OVERSTREET. The proposition of this measure is to break the endless chain in the greenback redemption and prohibits the reissue except in exchange for the same coin in which it is redeemed, and the only exception is that to which I have referred.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Then you propose to aid the breaking of the endless chain by adding to the denominations of currency that are to be made a charge upon gold?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I expect the gentleman will be heard in the argument on his side, and which I fancy his brain is now working on. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. When was it that the Government first redeemed silver certificates in gold, or have they done so at any time?

Mr. OVERSTREET. The Government never has redeemed silver dollars in gold, and this bill does not provide for the redemption of silver dollars in gold. Every silver dollar ever issued by this Government has been based upon a declaration by Congressional act to maintain its parity and interchangeability with gold. I refer the gentleman to the law of November 1, 1893, which contained a provision that the silver dollar should be maintained at a parity and interchangeable value with gold. We make no provision for final redemption at all, but for the purposes of establishing beyond controversy and without evasion the parity which we have by numerous acts pledged ourselves to maintain we say that that parity is best maintained by the absolute interchangeability of the moneys.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. I do not captiously desire to interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I know. We propose to have the bills of larger denominations withdrawn and smaller ones issued in their place, so that they may be more readily obtained. [Applause.]

There have been coined into silver dollars the total sum of $490,388,614. Experience has shown that a greater number of silver dollars have been coined than the people care to accept. They fail to be absorbed by general trade, and are largely used as a pledge for the issue of silver certificates, which are preferred.

Of the total silver coinage there were, on September 30, 1899, in silver certificates $405,197,504 and in silver dollars $85,191,110 in circulation.

Of this number there were on that date held by the Treasury $5,023,285 silver dollars, leaving upon that date in actual circulation only $80,167,825 of silver dollars.

Mr. GAINES. How many certificates?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Four hundred and five millions.

By the withdrawal from circulation of all one, two, and five dollars of greenbacks and Treasury notes, reissuing the same into larger denominations, and the reissue of the silver certificates of large denominations into one, two, and five dollar certificates, it would not only make a creditable and honorable place for the use of silver, but would at the same time make provision for a larger number of small notes, which the growing business of the country has greatly demanded.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana be permitted to conclude his remarks.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to complete his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman from Indiana may be permitted to conclude his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. And that the time be charged to that side—that is, the difference in the time be charged to that side.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I have no kind of objection to the gentleman's time being extended. He is to be followed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MADDOX], and I would like to have it understood that the same courtesy be extended to him.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Whatever time I consume on this side is chargeable to our division of the time.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Precisely; and if the gentleman from Georgia occupied an hour and any gentleman in the House should object, although his time is chargeable to this side, his speech would terminate. Therefore I desire to couple with the request that the gentleman from Indiana be allowed to complete his remarks that the gentleman from Georgia shall also be permitted to conclude his remarks.

Mr. OVERSTREET. With the understanding that whatever time he consumes shall be charged to that side.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. That is perfectly understood.

There was no objection.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I speak of the use of silver certificates rather than the use of the silver dollars for the reason that experience has shown that the people do not care to accept the silver dollar in large numbers in circulation.

Mr. GAINES. Is it not a fact that the people also prefer gold certificates to the gold, just as they prefer the silver certificates to the silver coin?

Mr. OVERSTREET. It has not been so demonstrated, because the issue of gold certificates has been limited, and under the law can not be issued except when the gold reserve is above a fixed amount. And I will say, further, that all forms of paper money have a popular sentiment among the people, and when things are in normal condition and when these certificates are reduced below $10 they will have a hold on the trade of the people, and it will be so held in circulation in everyday transactions that it will be nearly impossible for any considerable amount of silver certificates to be presented at one time for exchange.

The Government has repeatedly made effort at vast expense to force the silver dollar into circulation by paying express charges for transportation of the same from the mints into the channels of trade, but without apparently making much impression upon the public mind, which greatly prefers the certificates representing the silver dollars. The efforts of the Government for the past fourteen years in this respect are set forth in the following table:

Shipments of silver coin from the Treasury offices and mints during each fiscal year from 1886, and charges thereon for transportation.

Fiscal year.	Standard dollars.	Fractional coin.	Total.	Charges.	Rate per thousand.
1886			$33,561,037.57	$67,820.99	$2.02
1887			35,196,902.84	62,353.38	1.77
1888	$28,953,654.18	$8,033,053.75	36,986,707.93	70,057.68	1.89
1889	26,427,496.71	8,331,777.97	34,759,274.68	69,309.34	1.99
1890	27,283,457.90	9,405,227.50	36,688,685.40	73,045.73	1.99
1891	29,299,237.20	11,598,692.10	40,897,929.30	77,257.62	1.89
1892	24,614,586.95	14,270,479.51	38,885,066.46	76,178.69	1.96
1893	27,098,582.65	11,957,903.90	39,056,486.55	71,980.77	1.84
1894	24,516,980.50	9,281,407.08	33,798,387.58	67,086.44	1.98
1895	27,155,466.80	11,885,117.47	39,040,584.27	78,333.84	2.01
1896	28,412,300.35	12,458,107.03	40,870,407.38	78,755.54	1.93
1897	29,600,035.10	12,029,955.29	41,629,990.39	81,526.24	1.96
1898	33,270,610.00	15,330,205.24	48,600,815.24	110,065.53	2.26
1899	33,305,262.00	17,018,536.65	50,323,798.65	111,741.61	2.22

Of the total amount of silver coined by the Government to September 30, 1899, viz, $490,388,614, there were in silver dollar pieces $85,191,110 and in silver certificates in one, two, and five dollars, $175,064,553, leaving the sum of $230,132,951 to be given and used in the pocket trade of the people if the larger denominations of silver certificates should be reissued in denominations of one, two, and five dollars, as shown by the following table:

Silver dollar pieces (September 30, 1899)		$85,191,110
One-dollar notes other than silver certificates		13,320,824
Two-dollar notes other than silver certificates		11,109,752
Five-dollar notes other than silver certificates		186,144,552
Silver certificates of $1, $2, and $5		175,064,553
Total under $5		470,830,791
National-bank notes of $1, $2, and $5		75,990,505
		394,840,286
Total silver dollars coined (September 30, 1899)		490,388,614
Silver dollar pieces	$85,191,110	
Silver certificates in $1, $2, and $5	175,064,553	
		260,255,663
Remaining to be given a use		230,132,951
Held by the Treasury (September 30, 1899):		
Silver dollar pieces	5,023,285	
Silver certificates	4,610,821	
		9,634,106
Net to be kept in circulation		220,498,845

There can be little question but the two provisions before mentioned, of making the silver actually interchangeable with gold and scattering it through the medium of certificates into the daily transactions of the business of the people, will very largely, if not completely, avoid any possible danger of their presentation in any considerable amounts at the Government counter for exchange.

SUBSIDIARY COINS.

The law enacted July 22, 1876, limits the issue of subsidiary coins to $50,000,000. The growth of our business has developed such a demand for small change that, notwithstanding the limitation fixed by statute, subsidiary coins have so increased that on September 30, 1899, there was outstanding $76,523,333.

This excess issue, certainly necessary, should be legalized, and further coinage of subsidiary coins left to the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury. Owing to the great supply of silver bullion purchased under the law of July 14, 1890, it appears that such supply can be safely drawn upon for such coinage of subsidiary coins as shall be necessary for our trade, and a corresponding amount of Treasury notes canceled. The recoinage of worn and uncurrent coins is provided for only by the annual appropriation bills, and is sufficiently important to justify a permanent statute.

SILVER CERTIFICATES.

The proposed bill gives authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to issue or reissue United States notes or Treasury notes, in denominations not less than $1, as he may prescribe, and provides that all silver certificates hereafter issued or paid out shall be in denominations only of $1, $2, and $5.

Two objects are sought by this: First, to empower the Secretary of the Treasury with discretion for the supply of small notes to meet the demands of the business world as the same shall arise. This necessity has been prominent of late on account of the vastly increased business of the country, requiring change in small transactions. Under the present law the Secretary of the Treasury does not possess this discretion, but is required to reissue such notes in the same denominations as redeemed, and the rigid enforcement of the law greatly embarrasses general business where such demand for small notes exists. While provision is made for the issue of United States notes and Treasury notes of such denominations, not less than $1, as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, yet it is presumed that such discretion will be exercised by the Secretary of the Treasury only for the purpose of meeting an urgent demand for small notes and that, in the absence of such emergency, silver certificates will largely comprise the note issue of the Government under $10. Rather than operate as a restriction of the note issues under $10, such provision will afford a relief by an increase of circulation of small notes.

The second object of this provision is to break up the large silver certificates. The breaking up of the large silver certificates will place upon silver, either in the dollar or in the certificates representing the silver dollars, a great proportion of the burden of daily business transactions, and thus so scatter the certificates that, even if an effort were made to embarrass the Treasury by their presentation for exchange, the difficulty of procuring them would very largely, if not completely, defeat such effort.

The total amount in silver certificates on September 30, 1899, was $405,197,504, of which $175,064,553 was in denominations under $10. The total number of silver dollars coined up to September 30, 1899, was $490,388,614, so that on that day there were outstanding 85,191,110 silver dollars. Of this last sum there was held by the Treasury, unrepresented by certificates, $5,023,285, leaving but $80,167,825 actually in circulation. If the field of daily business transactions, or the "pocket trade," shall be given over to silver, it would be quickly absorbed and, once distributed, would become the permanent medium of exchange in small transactions among our people. It could fill no greater nor more honorable use.

The total amount of our money on September 30, 1899, in denominations under $10 (except the fractional currency, subsidiary coin, and gold dollars) was $470,830,791, divided as follows:

Silver dollars, unrepresented by silver certificates	$85,191,110
Silver certificates	175,064,553
Greenbacks	82,289,173
Treasury notes of 1890	52,295,450
National-bank notes	75,990,505

The breaking up of the silver certificates over $5 would increase the money in denominations under $10 by $230,132,951. But the discretionary power given the Secretary of the Treasury concerning the issue of greenbacks and Treasury notes in denominations under $10 renders possible the withdrawal from circulation of such denominations of the greenback and Treasury note aggregating $134,584,623 and their reissue in larger denominations. Hence the minimum of increase of small notes would be the difference between the total amount of silver certificates over $5, or $230,132,951, and the aggregate of the greenbacks and Treasury notes under $10, or $134,584,623 which is $95,548,328. If the national-bank notes under $10 should be converted into larger denominations, the minimum increase of small notes would be but $19,557,823, an insufficient increase of small notes, and hence the denominations of the bank notes remain undisturbed by the bill.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman from Indiana allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I prefer, Mr. Chairman, not to yield at the present time, because I am trespassing on the indulgence of the committee now.

Mr. COX. Very well.

Mr. OVERSTREET. The demand for money of small denominations has been most urgent, and it is believed that the cash transactions of the people will give employment to the increase here provided without increasing the strain upon the Treasury.

BANKS.

The proposed measure makes no change in the general banking laws. Indeed, a studied effort has been made to effect a complete guaranty of the quality and parity of our money without any disturbance in the quantity or kind. But, without changing in any form the circulation or kinds of money, three propositions are made concerning banks, which seek rather to correct recognized defects than to in any way make original propositions.

BANK-NOTE CIRCULATION.

The proposition to allow national banks to issue circulation to the par value of the bonds deposited for their security is neither new nor partisan. It has been recommended by four Presidents

and five Secretaries of the Treasury, and bills containing such provision have been introduced in Congress and supported by members of both political parties. It is entirely consistent with the present banking system. The same reasons which justify the issue of 90 per cent of the bonds will justify an issue to the par value of the bonds. The only objection advanced, aside from that of demagogic attack generally upon banks, is that it permits too large an increase of the volume of circulation and threatens an inflation.

But it is unfair to compare the amount possible under the proposed bill with the amount of bank notes now in circulation. The lack of profit upon bank-note circulation because of the tax has reduced such circulation far below the amount ever expected, and such reduction can be creditably charged to a contraction which was equally unexpected. The proper comparison is between the amount possible under the present law and the amount possible under the proposed amendment, which would be but a 10 per cent increase, an amount which can be easily absorbed by the business of the country and utilized in as many different money centers as there are national banks. The proposition is sound in logic, safe in practice, and more consistent with the system in vogue than the present law.

TAX UPON BANK FRANCHISES.

The repeal of the tax upon national-bank notes and the substitution of a tax upon bank franchises as measured by their capital, surplus, and undivided profits, are proposed in a spirit of fairness and for a just distribution of the burden of the tax. Under the present law every national bank must deposit at least $12,500 in bonds, being 25 per cent of the minimum of the capital stock ($50,000) with which a national bank may be organized. Experience shows that the metropolitan banks issue the least circulation, many of them issuing none, depending upon the large deposits for their loanable capital. Very often these deposits are largely increased by country banks establishing reserve agencies. On the contrary, the small banks, forced to draw heavily upon their capital to make safe provision for their different reserve funds, are compelled to issue note circulation to insure a reasonable loanable fund, and suffer in the transaction by paying the circulation tax in greater degree, in proportion to their capital, than the larger and better-equipped city banks.

The per cent fixed for the tax, one-tenth of 1 per cent semiannually, will produce substantially the same revenue realized under the present law. The revenue received from the present tax during five years last past was $9,469,948.39, while the proposed tax upon the same banks for the same period would have been $9,778,858.12, the difference being, through a period of five years, only $308,909.73. The beneficial results of this proposition will be that the larger banks will pay the tax in the same degree as the smaller banks, while the amount of revenue will be practically unchanged.

SMALL BANKS.

The proposed amendment authorizing the organization of banks with capital as low as $25,000 in places containing no greater population than 2,000 is designed to meet the demand coming from the sparsely settled districts of the country and the small but growing towns for banking accommodations.

By authorizing the establishment of banks of small capital in small communities money will be held in the country districts where it can be used at the seasons of the year when it is most in demand. Not only will the supply be bettered, but interest rates will be made lower by reason of the change. Under the present law national banks can not be organized with less capital than $50,000, and the consequence is that the amount required for the purchase of bonds and the reserve funds have operated against the establishment of national banks in small communities. The bill proposes to change this in the way named in the hope of creating money centers of small degree in various localities, where the convenience of the system will greatly aid in the movement of crops at seasons of the year when, under present methods, money for short-time loans is procured only with difficulty, attended with increased interest rates.

The advocates of currency reform firmly declare that the financial operations of the Government are upon the gold standard, but that the honest fears engendered by doubtful legislation relative to silver coinage and the persistent attack upon the standard of value fully justify the legislation asked. To firmly fix gold as the standard of value in unequivocal terms, made fully operative by all proper safeguards, is the central idea of the law proposed. It is confidently believed that the country demands it and that our action will be ratified by the people.

The supporters of the proposition are not confined to the Republican party, nor to the so-called "money centers." Democrats of courage and conviction have nobly dared to break from party lines and suffer, unflinchingly, the sting of the party whip in honest and patriotic effort to uphold the integrity of the national credit and make secure the foundation of the vast and expanding business of our people. The American people in the great agricultural fields of the country are fully awake to the importance of the subject and appreciate the wisdom of the legislation. Nearly all of those who wavered in 1896 corrected their error in 1898.

While the question is economic and should be separated from partisan debate, yet the Republican party will not attempt escape from responsibility for the legislation, believing that it is wise for the country, safe for the people, and in perfect harmony with the institutions of the nation. Whatever attitude has been assumed by the Republican party toward silver coinage has been controlled by conditions which existed at the time and which seemed best for the interests of the country. Every possible effort was made to render full test toward fixing the relation of silver and grant the fullest opportunity to demonstrate the ability of the Government to provide the largest possible coinage of the metal without endangering the stability of the standard. This effort extended in good faith to conferences looking to international agreements, but without success. But when it became evident that the gold standard was endangered there was neither hesitation nor halting upon the part of the Republican party, which promptly and courageously declared for the maintenance of the existing gold standard. The year 1896 marked the limit of patient experiment. Since then the party has been pronounced in its position and is to-day united in its effort to firmly fix this standard without equivocation or evasion. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SIMS. I would like to ask the gentleman one question.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, certain tables, together with a statement in analysis of the bill.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Chairman, I make no objection, providing leave is granted for a certain number of days, say ten days, for other members to print their remarks.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I think there will be no trouble about that.

Mr. MADDOX. I think that will have to be done in the House, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CANNON). The gentleman is correct about it.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I hope that I shall be permitted to ask the gentleman from Indiana for his construction of section 2.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I have not the floor now, so that I can not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MADDOX) is recognized.

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say to the members of this House that it was either my fortune or misfortune, I am not certain which, to be on the Banking and Currency Committee in the last House of Representatives. I heard a great deal of talk about the currency and about the single gold standard and various other things connected with banking. There were many bills presented to that committee for its consideration, and each individual presenting those bills thought, as a matter of course, that his was the proper one. But it is a matter of history that that committee failed to evolve any bill that met with the entire sanction of the Republican party on this floor at that time.

It is a part of the history of the country that the Fifty-fifth Congress, before its adjournment, appointed—that is, the Republican party in a Republican caucus appointed—a committee for the purpose of drafting a bill to present to this Congress, and the newspapers tell us that they met down on the seashore and various and divers other places and prepared this bill that is now presented to this House. So it will be seen that these gentlemen have had ever since the adjournment of the last Congress to consider this bill and to prepare themselves to defend it. And when this Congress convened they come in with a gag rule and call on us within two days from the time the bill is presented to answer their well-matured plan, which took them from nine to ten months to consummate, and then we are told that we are dealt fairly with on this side.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] undertook to justify the rule that is imposed on this side of the House by citing certain precedents in the Fifty-third Congress. But what were those precedents? The very questions that were determined there—in other words, the bills submitted to the House and supposed to be passed upon in the limit of time he mentions—had been discussed day after day in the Fifty-third Congress before that bill went to the Senate, and for two or three long months were discussed in the Senate; and yet they cite that as a precedent why the Democrats should be bound and gagged with this rule, and that, too, on a question of so vast importance as this bill presented to us to-day. I want to say to the members of this House that if I have analyzed this bill correctly, if I understand it, there is no measure that has been presented to the American Congress in the last half century that is fraught with so much that is dangerous to people of this country in remote sections, even to the great centers of this Republic. And then to think that

under these conditions we are absolutely gagged, as I might say, under the present rules that have been adopted by the majority of the House.

But I desire to call your attention to another fact before I proceed to discuss this bill. I read in the newspapers the other day that there was a banquet held over in New York at which our late leader on that side of the House—and a leader he was—Mr. Reed, of Maine, was present. He was invited to respond to the toast, I believe, "Finances of our country." Among other things he said, he undertook to analyze the late vote that was had in Ohio for governor, and he told those people present that there was nothing in that vote to encourage the Republican party that they had a cinch on the Government by any means, and that if they wanted the gold standard enacted into a law they had better be about it right away [laughter on the Democratic side]; that the Republicans had a majority of both Houses and the President. So I take it that the faithful sent the word abroad that it was necessary to do this thing at once if it was done at all.

So I presume that this is the excuse, Mr. Chairman, for this "rush" order for the legislation now before us. Now, it is a very singular fact that a country which is so prosperous as we have been led to believe that this country is at the present time by the message of the President of the United States should need such legislation as this. This condition of prosperity has been claimed by the President himself and by statesmen on the other side of the House. They claim that the gold standard is already existing. They claim that this is really the source of our present degree of prosperity. Why rush, then, into the House of Representatives a gag rule, so as to shut off the minority and force through a bill of this character which is now pending, when, according to your own statement and the statement of your own political friends, there is no necessity for it? Is there any special or peculiar reason why this legislation should be so hurried, as you now propose it shall be, other than that you are afraid of the people and propose to take Mr. Reed's advice?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I propose with these few preliminary remarks to get down to the facts, to consider the bill itself in all of its details, and I want to say now, in the beginning of my remarks, that I shall not discuss the advantages or the disadvantages of the gold standard, to which the gentleman from Indiana who has just taken his seat has devoted so much time. I shall leave that question for the consideration and analysis of some other gentlemen on this side of the Chamber. I propose to address myself briefly to the workings of the pending bill, if enacted into law, as I understand its operations; and I crave the attention of Representatives on this side of the House, and on that side as well, for, with all due respect to your ability and intelligence, I do not believe you gentlemen who have in caucus determined to support the bill understand all of the features embodied therein.

The first section of the bill provides for the single gold standard. The question has been discussed somewhat before, I believe, but has never been approved by or submitted for the approval of the people of the United States.

May I not stop here, Mr. Chairman, to say that in the last national convention—of 1896—that we had in this country the Republican party at St. Louis adopted a bimetallic platform, or a platform favoring the free coinage of silver under an international agreement?

May I not say that at Chicago the Democratic party adopted a similar provision, but without demanding the aid or interposition of any other nation? Over 12,000,000 people voted on these two propositions, and 300,000, I believe, or about that number, voted on the proposition of a single gold standard, and carried one little militia district in the United States!

Who is it that demands the single gold standard to-day? The gentleman from Indiana who has just taken his seat [Mr. OVERSTREET] says that long before silver was demonetized by the act of 1873 the monetary and commercial interests of the country discussed the subject. Now, the financial interests of the country have discussed this bill that is presented to us for our consideration to-day. The great body of the people of this country—those people who pay the taxes, who must meet the burdens, the expenditures of the country, these people who have fought for the flag of the country, and are expected to protect it—have not been consulted in regard thereto. [Applause on Democratic side.] And we are told, sir, by the gentleman who has just taken his seat that the gold standard exists to-day, and has been so recognized by this Administration. Now, if the gold standard exists to-day it exists by reason of the usurpation of a party, and without any authorization of any existing law of the land. [Applause on Democratic side.] But, as the gentleman from Indiana candidly admits, this first section has for its purpose to make that lawful which these officers of the Government have done without authority of law. But I propose to refer to this proposition a little later on—that is, to show what is the demand for the legislation now proposed.

The second section of the bill proposes to strike the word "coin" from every promise to pay and every obligation which has been made by the people of the United States. Every sort of liability which has been contracted by the Government of the United States in pursuance of law is to be ultimately redeemed in gold. The purpose of the present legislation is to apply to the bonded indebtedness of the people, which is payable in coin, the word "gold," to strike out the word "coin" and to amend all of these obligations by inserting in lieu thereof the word "gold." That is one of the propositions of the pending bill. That is the purpose of it. The word "coin" is to be stricken from every obligation that is given by the United States and "gold" inserted in lieu thereof. For what purpose? Why, Mr. Chairman, the purpose is obvious. The purpose is to change the contract which was made with the people of the United States, with the holders of these obligations, thereby making those bonds more valuable and enriching the already rich at the expense of the people. The purpose is to make the gold standard the basis on which all of the contracts and obligations of the Government shall be based. I apprehend that no gentleman will stand on this floor and sincerely suggest a doubt as to the purpose of the pending legislation.

Now, what are we to do? In the first place, we must remember that the proposition here is to strike from every contract of indebtedness, that the toiling masses of this country will have to pay ultimately, the word "coin" and insert in lieu thereof the word "gold." Who has consulted the great mass of the American people in order to find out whether such a proposition as that does or does not meet their approbation?

Where did you get the authority? Did you get it from the great toiling millions who pay the taxes of the country? I think you have been consulting the financial circles again on that subject, and that you are doing their bidding only.

The third section of the bill authorizes the establishment of a division of the Treasury to carry out this scheme. Now, you understand, gentlemen, there is a new division to be established in the Treasury for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this bill. In other words, one great banking institution is to be established by the United States to serve the purpose of the national banks of this country, to furnish them security for their banking ventures, and where they may at will speculate on the money of final redemption placed there by the toil of the people. That is what it means, no more and no less. This section further provides that—

> There shall be transferred from the general fund in the Treasury of the United States, and taken up on the books of said division as a redemption fund, the amount of gold coin and bullion held against outstanding gold certificates, the amount of United States notes held against outstanding currency certificates, the amount of silver dollars held against outstanding silver certificates, the amount in silver dollars and silver bullion held against outstanding Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890.

All these are to be transferred to this new division in the Treasury. It will be observed that the silver bullion and silver dollars held for redemption of the Treasury notes issued under the act of 1890 are to be impounded completely and retired from circulation, for they are now to be redeemed in gold, and that—

> an amount of gold coin and bullion to constitute a reserve fund equal to 25 per cent of the amount, both of United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890, outstanding.

Now, you understand by this proposition, gentlemen, that in this new division, while all this bullion and specie and these United States notes that are held for the purpose of redeeming outstanding certificates that have been issued upon this bullion and gold and silver and United States notes are to be transferred to this division, here is a provision that 25 per cent of gold shall be transferred to this new division for a reserve fund; that is, 25 per cent of all outstanding Treasury certificates issued under the act of 1890 and the currency known as United States notes and more commonly known as greenbacks.

Now, I have a report here which will show exactly how much outstanding money of this character we have, and all you have to do is to find 25 per cent of these Treasury notes and of the greenbacks outstanding, and you will find how much gold we must keep up in this new division of the Treasury along with this vast sum of money that is to be transferred to that division.

Mr. COX. Will my colleague allow me just there for one moment?

Mr. MADDOX. Certainly.

Mr. COX. Let us get this point out clearly, so that we will understand it. Now, there is 25 per cent to be transferred into this new bureau there, as a kind of redemption fund.

Mr. MADDOX. Yes.

Mr. COX. Now, has your mind been called to the point, Where do they get that 25 per cent from?

Mr. MADDOX. Where do they get it from?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. MADDOX. I am going to explain that to you. They have a scheme to get it mighty easy.

Mr. COX. I understand that they are going to get it by issuing bonds.

Mr. MADDOX. Oh, I understand. There is no trouble about getting it.

Now, in addition to that, this bill provides that in transferring from one division to what they call the general fund we must keep—and that is something that we must at all times keep in view—we must keep not less than $50,000,000 in the other end of the Treasury. Now, add that sum to the 25 per cent of these outstanding notes, with this other vast sum of money, and you will find what it is that they propose to impound in the Treasury of the United States and to hold there.

The bill requires that all gold and gold bullion held against outstanding certificates of the United States, notes held against outstanding currency certificates, all the silver dollars held against outstanding certificates, the amount held in silver dollars and silver bullion against outstanding Treasury notes issued under the act of 1890, 25 per cent in gold of all outstanding United States notes and Treasury notes of 1890, and not less than $50,000,000 of the general fund are to be held in the Treasury at all times. That is in the third section.

Now I want to call your attention to section 4 of this bill. That section proceeds to turn over to the Secretary of the Treasury the earth and the fullness thereof. He is directed to maintain the gold reserve at all hazards. He may issue and sell bonds whenever in his judgment it is necessary to maintain the reserve fund, payable in gold, and without limit, so that the interest does not exceed 3 per cent, and that they are made payable in gold. Now, gentlemen, in this connection I want to call your attention to the act under which these gentlemen have been selling United States bonds and bringing gold into the Treasury, and then let you compare this act with the one that they propose to enact now. Now, listen:

On and after the 1st day of January, 1879, the Secretary of the Treasury shall redeem in coin the United States legal-tender notes then outstanding on their presentation for redemption at the office of the assistant treasurer of the United States in the city of New York, in sums of not less than $50; and to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare and provide for the redemption in this act authorized or required, he is authorized to use any surplus revenue from time to time in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and to issue, sell, and dispose of at not less than par in coin either of the description of bonds of the United States described in the act of Congress approved July 14, 1870.

Now, gentlemen, that is the law under which the bonds of the people have been sold in order to keep up what they call a gold reserve in the Treasury of the United States.

Notwithstanding we had millions of dollars of coin, as defined by the statutes of this country, in the Treasury at this time for the redemption of outstanding obligations, they assumed to say that under and by virtue of this provision of law the Secretary of the Treasury shall have authority to issue the people's bonds, or the people's promises to pay, and to buy gold, when every debt that was then outstanding was redeemable in coin, and according to the law of the land silver was coin, and there was an abundance of coin and bullion to have met every obligation.

When I hear gentlemen on that side of the House discussing the existing gold standard, as they call it, I am reminded that under a statute in Georgia if a man can hold a piece of property in peaceable and adverse possession for twenty years it gives him a perfect title; but there is never a minute during that time that that fellow is not uneasy for fear some other fellow is going to take the land away from him by virtue of a title; and that is exactly the proposition here. You want to get this bill enacted into law and, by your usurped authority in depreciating silver, establish what you call the existing gold standard before the people can have the opportunity to place a party in power that respects the law and will compel you to disgorge your unauthorized and illegal possessions, gained under what you call an existing gold standard that never existed except by arbitrary power exercised by the Treasury.

Now, gentlemen, is there any law or any interpretation that can be given to this section by which the President of the United States is authorized to go out and barter the bonds of the people for gold when he has got coin in the Treasury that will meet the demands under the laws of the country and pay the indebtedness according to the contract? Besides, it is only meant to redeem United States notes, commonly known as greenbacks.

Now, this law proposes to issue gold bonds at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury; and I say there is no limit upon his power, except that they shall be made payable in gold and that they shall not bear more than 3 per cent interest. Now, I think I will be able a little later on to show you why this power is unlimited. The facilities in this bill for raiding the Treasury of the United States have never been equaled on earth and never will be again, I think.

Section 5: This section provides that the United States notes, commonly known as greenbacks and Treasury notes, issued under the act of 1890, presented for redemption, shall be redeemed in gold now at the will of the holders, and that the silver certificates shall be redeemed in accordance with the existing law.

Now, gentlemen, in order to understand this scheme that they have now you must understand the law as it exists to-day. These Treasury notes and these greenback notes to-day, under the laws of the United States, are redeemable in coin, silver, and gold, as the Stanley Matthew's resolution provides, and when they are redeemed they are to be reissued and put in circulation again.

What is the effect of this bill? The meaning of this bill, if enacted into law, is that these certificates, greenbacks, and Treasury notes—these greenbacks, when they are paid in, have to remain impounded in the Treasury of the United States until you present gold to take them out. Under the laws to-day—that is to say, if the laws of this country were obeyed—they could be redeemed in silver and gold alike, and when once redeemed they could be reissued again and sent forth to the country to increase the circulation. So that you see in this measure they propose not only to make them payable in gold, but it is a scheme to decrease the circulation. It decreases the circulation exactly to the amount of gold that to the extent and amount of certificates that are in existence, because when you present the greenbacks for redemption you draw from the Treasury the gold and these greenbacks remain impounded. There is no way for them to be returned to circulation until you take gold back and buy them out again. Under the existing law they are required to be reissued, and they would go out to pay the expenses of the Government and enter into circulation again. This bill, if enacted into law, will forbid that.

Under this law every greenback, every Treasury note, and every silver dollar issued is to be exchangeable for gold, only, so far as silver is concerned, the silver dollar is to be exchanged with the holder of the certificate when the silver dollar is on a parity with gold. Now, that is what it means. If the silver dollar, when you carry silver certificates to the Treasury for redemption, is at a parity with gold, you are expected to accept a silver dollar for your silver certificate. Why had not they just as well say eggs or any other old thing, if on a parity with gold. Now, that is the purpose of this bill, so far as the silver certificate is concerned, and, gentlemen, if this bill is enacted into law, mark you, that I prophesy to-day that within less than five years every silver dollar except the subsidiary coin will be confiscated and practically sent to the junk shop. They have provided easy ways for it in this measure.

My honest opinion is that, upon reading this bill, if your party on that side of the House had been sincere they would have ordered the silver to the block and sold it for gold, thus realizing as much out of the wreck you propose as possible for the people. What is the use to have a silver dollar in the Treasury at all that you say costs 50 cents, when a little piece of paper that probably will not cost one-hundredth part of a cent answers the same purpose? Why do you want to trouble the people to take that piece of paper to the Treasury and get a silver dollar for it and then take that silver dollar and draw a gold dollar on it? But gentlemen say they do not propose to redeem the silver in gold. Gentlemen, it does not matter what they propose; it does not matter what construction you put upon this law; when you turn it over to the parties that are to be benefited by it you will find what construction will be placed upon it.

I say to-day if it is possible for the United States Treasury to construe the law as it has done in order to depreciate the silver dollar, as it has done, it is possible to construe a law to mean almost anything. Now, they say in this bill that silver is not to be disturbed, its legal-tender quality is still to be maintained, but just along a little bit further you will find a masked battery under the polite word of "exchange." And when these national banks get hold of that battery they will turn it upon the Treasurer of the United States, exchange every silver dollar in it for one of gold, if the Secretary of the Treasury has to mortgage this country to its full value to raise the gold to accomplish this purpose, and they will disparage this money to such an extent that it will be practically worthless in a few years.

It will be seen that our whole financial structure is based on the gold in the Treasury, and the gold in the Treasury had, and to be had, depends on the ability of the Treasurer to exchange the promises of the people to pay in gold with interest produced by the labor of the toiling millions of this country. In other words, if these notes are redeemed in gold—and who would expect anything else when gold is the standard—you must carry that same kind of coin back to get your greenbacks or your Treasury notes from the Treasury.

Now, it would seem from a casual reading of the bill that, if silver certificates are presented for redemption, they are to be redeemed in silver, but as a matter of fact they are to be redeemed in gold, or "exchanged," to use their polite term.

Section 8 provides that section 5159 of the Revised Statutes of the United States shall be repealed, and that section 8 of this bill shall be substituted therefor. Now, the section, gentlemen, to be repealed—and I call your especial attention to this—reads this way:

SEC. 5159. Every association, after having complied with the provisions of this title, preliminary to the commencement of the banking business, and

before it shall be authorized to commence banking business under this title, shall transfer and deliver to the Treasurer of the United States any United States registered bonds, bearing interest, to an amount not less than $30,000 and not less than one-third of the capital stock paid in. Such bonds shall be received by the Treasurer upon deposit, and shall be by him safely kept in his office, until they shall be otherwise disposed of, in pursuance of the provisions of this title.

That means, gentlemen, that before any man or any association can commence banking business in this country they must at least purchase $30,000 of the registered bonds of the United States before they can begin business. It further says not less than one-third of the capital stock paid in. Now, let me draw this illustration for you—this is a law that exists to-day—and then I will talk about the amendment. Suppose a man has a bank with a capital stock paid in of a million dollars. He is required to purchase three hundred and thirty-three and one-third thousand dollars of bonds.

Mr. BROSIUS. No; only two hundred and fifty thousand.

Mr. MADDOX. I am talking about the law as it now stands. They have got to purchase three hundred and thirty-three and one-third thousand dollars registered bonds of the United States before they can proceed to business. Now, this law, if I understand it, only requires the national bank, the million-dollar bank, to purchase $50,000 of registered bonds before beginning business; those that are of $150,000 or less shall purchase one-quarter of the capital stock paid in of registered bonds of the United States. Now, gentlemen, if I am correct, the bill further provides the method by which these gentlemen can withdraw their bonds from the United States Treasury that they have deposited before. For instance, a bank has purchased $333,000 of bonds and issued certificates on that amount, which money is in circulation to-day. This new bill provides that these gentlemen can call in their circulating medium down to the extent of $50,000 and go to the Treasury and turn it over to the Treasurer and withdraw the bonds they have deposited heretofore, by that means contracting the currency of the country at will. That is what it means.

I want to call your attention to the fact that while every method is offered here in this bill for contracting the currency, there is no way by which the currency can be increased except upon the authority granted the national banks, who will have the right to issue the certificates to the limit of the bonds they take out. It is left entirely to the discretion of the banks. They throw that sop to us and tell us in towns of less than 2,000 inhabitants they will allow the organization of banks with $25,000 capital, and we are supposed to be content with that.

But you will remember, gentlemen, that they do not propose in this bill anywhere to compel these bankers to issue the certificates to the full amount of the bonds they take out, or to the full amount of bonds they are authorized to take out. That is left entirely discretionary with them, but they may withdraw their circulation altogether if they want to; they need not issue a dollar if they do not want to. They make provisions by which the currency issued by the Government may be impounded and withdrawn from circulation, and the only means of increasing the circulation in the bill is left to the option of the national bankers. If they withdrew their circulation and produced a panic in 1893, when there was no law by which the national currency could be impounded, what will they do when our whole finances are turned over to them? It is to their interest to make money scarce and as high as possible. Our experience with them in 1893–94, that as soon as the panic which they had inaugurated for political purposes got beyond their control they closed their doors and proved their incapacity to meet the situation. Are we to learn nothing by experience?

Now, what is the difficulty in the pending bill? As I say, you have a method in its construction. You have in every way provided against the increase in circulation. You have every door barred to an increase in the circulation in the country. The whole business tends not to increase the circulation of the money of the people of the country, but the operation of the whole proposition is to put the people absolutely in the hands of the national banks.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Will the gentleman allow an interruption just there?

Mr. MADDOX. I would prefer to proceed in my own time without interruption.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I would like to ask the gentleman a single question. Whether it is not a fact that that identical statement that he has just made, and which he also made a few moments ago, that the bill tended to contract the currency of the country, was not made in the last Presidential campaign by almost every silver speaker on the platforms in every part of the United States?

Mr. MADDOX. I will state to the gentleman frankly that I never heard it or suggested it myself.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Did you not contend that if we went to a gold standard it would contract the currency because of the diminishing product of gold? Did you not make that statement through your party organs and platform speakers?

Mr. MADDOX. I do not know that such statement was made to my personal knowledge.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. It was so stated.

Mr. MADDOX. If the gentleman will permit me to proceed——

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH (continuing). It was stated in the last campaign, and it was made an argument by some stump speakers, but, as a matter of fact, in place of being an accurate statement, the circulating medium has increased largely throughout the country.

Mr. MADDOX. So you say.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I do say it, and can prove it.

Mr. TERRY. Does the gentleman from Michigan forget the fact that the output of gold is nearly doubled?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Does the gentleman from Georgia deny that the circulation has increased?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. What kind of circulation?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Gold, silver, and paper money.

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Chairman, I object to a speech being inserted in the body of my remarks. The gentleman will have ample time in his own right to make any suggestions he pleases to make upon this subject.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I only asked the gentleman to state "yes or no." But he denies that the circulation has increased.

Mr. MADDOX. I am perfectly willing to take the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury. I will not deny his statement. He so states in his report.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. You want to familiarize yourself with the subject before you undertake to make a speech on the money question.

Mr. MADDOX. Perhaps I am informed, if the gentleman will wait.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. You do not seem to be.

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Chairman, I prefer to proceed in my own way without interruption.

Section 8 provides for a change in section 5159 of the Revised Statutes by amending it so as to read: "That every association, after having complied with the provisions of this title, preliminary to the commencement of the banking business, and before it shall be authorized to commence the banking business, under this title shall transfer and deliver to the Treasurer of the United States as security for its circulating notes any United States registered bonds, bearing interest, to an amount, where the capital is $150,000 or less, not less than one-fourth of the capital, and $50,000 where the capital is in excess of $150,000."

This section also provides that such bond shall be received by the Treasurer upon deposit, and goes on further to provide that banks having on deposit bonds in excess of that amount are authorized to reduce their circulation by the deposit of lawful money as provided by law. The section also provides that the amount of such notes issued by any national banking association shall not exceed in any case the par value of the bonds deposited as herein provided. That is to say, that any association which enters into the business of banking may exercise its own volition in the matter and does not need to issue a dollar of circulation unless they desire to do so, or they can, on the other hand, issue circulation to the full extent of the par value of the bonds purchased by them. The law says they shall not exceed that amount in circulation, but shall be confined to the amount of the bonds purchased, leaving it entirely within their discretion to enlarge or to contract the currency, as they may see fit.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has just asked me a question about the circulation or about the contraction of the currency has suggested that we contended for that in the last Democratic canvass. Now I propose to call the attention of the House to something that your side contended for in that same canvass. You did not contend for the single gold standard then.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. If the gentleman from Georgia challenges the issue in my Congressional district, I will state to him that he is entirely mistaken, for that was actually the issue made there.

Mr. MADDOX. I am challenging the position of your party upon this section.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. If the gentleman challenges the statement I have made, I will state now plainly that we made the issue in that campaign in my district broadly upon that question.

Mr. MADDOX. Well, it was against your platform, and I am going to prove it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] is in the House. I call the attention of all the members on this side who heard it to the fact that a few days ago the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], in discussing the rule under which we are now acting, said that the Republican party would have to turn aside from nothing it advocated in 1896 in advocating this bill. I propose to challenge that statement and to bring witnesses to show that they will have to do so. Now, as I have already stated, in the great conventions that were held by the two parties in 1896 and in the contests that were fought out in this country the questions upon which those contests hinged were bimetallism by international agreement with the Republican party and bimetallism without the intervention of any other country with the Democratic party.

How well do I remember that in the last days of the Fifty-fourth Congress, just after the great campaign in 1896, a bill was sent into this House from the other body for the purpose of appointing a high commission to go to Europe to bring about international bimetallism, as the Republicans had pledged in their platform in 1896, in St. Louis. When that bill was reported to this House favorably from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Charles W. Stone], the proposition was attacked in this House by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Quigg], who said that your party was committed to the gold standard. He took issue with it. He attempted to defeat it, and in that he was joined by Mr. Johnson of Indiana, by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KNOX], by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HENRY], and, I think, by my friend from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] also.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of that side and of this side of the House to what these great Republican leaders said their pledges to the people were in 1896. I want to show you by what authority they come here to-day and propose to enact the gold standard and to fix it upon this country, and I want to show you what the proposition was that put them in office. I propose to show by the statement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] in this House that over 100 members owed their election to the Fifty-fifth Congress to the advocacy of the bimetallic standard by your party in 1896. I propose to show by that late lamented, great, and distinguished man, Mr. Dingley, of Maine, that it was a party pledge that you made and one that ought to be honestly carried out. I shall show by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] that the man who advocates anything to the contrary is an apostate from his party. Yet you come here to-day and tell the country that you are justified and authorized in establishing the gold standard for this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

When I have shown that, I propose to show to you and to the country upon the highest evidence why it is that our commission in Europe failed to accomplish international bimetallism because of the intermeddling of the Cabinet officers of the present Administration. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BENTON. And the President as well.

Mr. MADDOX. And that you have not in good faith endeavored to carry out the pledges and the plans that you promised the people you would in 1896.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I propose to introduce the witnesses. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Clerk to read these extracts, unless some other gentleman will read them for me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read them if the gentleman desires.

Mr. MADDOX. Now, gentlemen, I call your attention to these utterances of the distinguished leaders on that side of the House. This is from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Fifty-fourth Congress, just after the campaign of 1896, when these questions were fresh in the minds of these statesmen who addressed this House at that time. I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am not willing to allow the gentleman from New York [Mr. Quigg] to interpret the Republican platform for me. [Applause.] I do not understand that document as he has attempted to interpret it here, and I do not believe that the Republicans of the United States understood it as he attempts to give it interpretation. I find in that platform, Mr. Speaker, a pledge that the Republican party would use all honorable exertions to labor to secure the very international agreement that is looked to in this bill. It must be remembered that the Republican party does not change its views every year, and that the Republican platform of 1896 is but a continuation of the platform of 1892. There is no material difference between them. Every declaration that you find in one you find clearly stated in the other, or find to be a fair and just implication from that which is stated.

In 1892 we expressly commended the efforts that were then being made by a Republican Administration in the direction of an international conference. When we made the declaration that we did make in the platform, that we would use all honest efforts to secure international agreement, every man understood that that was in continuation of the policy of the last Republican Administration, and through this very means of an international conference. That, I say, was the understanding of everyone. I want to disclaim again, Mr. Speaker, the right of the gentleman from New York to interpret the platform to mean that we pledged ourselves irrevocably to a gold standard and against the free coinage of silver. Our declaration ought not to be so construed by anyone. Here it is:

"The Republican party is unreservedly for sound money. It caused the enactment of the law providing for the resumption of specie payment."

"Specie payment," observe—not gold. It plumes itself upon that fact.

"Since then every dollar has been as good as gold. We are unalterably opposed to every measure calculated to debase our currency or impair the credit of our country. We are therefore opposed to the free coinage of silver except by international agreement—"

"Except by international agreement." "Except" is the emphatic word. There is a pledge that we are in favor of the free coinage of silver through an international agreement. No man can escape that language. The platform goes on—

"except by international agreement with the leading commercial nations of the world, which we pledge ourselves to promote, and until such agreement can be obtained the existing gold standard must be preserved."

Do you find in that language an irrevocable pledge for all time to the gold standard? The pledge is that "until" we can secure this international agreement "which we pledge ourselves to promote," we will maintain the existing gold standard.

Mr. Speaker, with the views that I have of this platform, I could not utter the sentiments the gentleman from New York has uttered without regarding myself as an apostate from Republicanism and as recreant to the pledge. [Applause.]

* * * * * * * *

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield six minutes to the gentleman from Maine, Mr. Dingley. [Applause.]

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the six minutes which have been allotted to me I can only briefly suggest two reasons why I shall support the pending bill. First, it is in response to the clear, distinct, unequivocal pledge of the Republican party in the last campaign. [Applause.] Mr. Speaker, sometimes resolutions are adopted in national conventions hastily and inconsiderately that have no binding force, but everyone who is acquainted with the circumstances under which the St. Louis convention was held understands that this feature of the platform was a clear, distinct, and well-considered declaration of the Republican party. [Applause.] * * *

[Extract from Mr. GROSVENOR.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, important declarations in political platforms are never the result of accident, but are always the result of design. They are always born of conditions existing in the constituents of the party that gives the utterance. The Republican convention at St. Louis was a representative body of a great party in the country, and the men who went there and represented their several constituencies understood the conditions at home. They did not go to St. Louis to declare a platitude nor to make a mere declaration that was not demanded by existing conditions and that was not in consonance with the opinions of their constituents. The Republican party at the threshold of the campaign was met by the question of what should constitute its financial plank, and looking to what the party had done and what it had already pledged itself to do, it found that it had put into the statute book of the United States the declaration that the country pledged itself to the maintenance of the parity between gold and silver on November 1, 1896, when a Republican Congress, by the almost solid vote of its party in both Houses, repealed the Sherman purchasing clause and enacted the following:

"That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value."

That was the law of the United States of America when the St. Louis convention assembled and the platform was adopted, and yet the gentleman from New York [Mr. Quigg] comes here and tells us that the Republican party is under no obligations in regard to the parity of this coinage, but is a single gold standard party. The compromises of the St. Louis convention produced the result that we have before us, and I want to read a single paragraph from the proceedings of that convention, which will show what the understanding of the representatives there present was when this plank was brought in.

Mr. HARDY. And the gentleman from New York was a delegate to that convention.

Mr. QUIGG. Yes, I was, and voted for the platform and shall construe it in the Fifty-fifth Congress.

Mr. GROSVENOR. It does not need any construction. We did not need any construction of it during the campaign.

I was saying that more than 100 men who will ornament the next House of Representatives on the Republican side owe their election to that platform and an honest espousal of it before the masses of the people. [Applause.]

Now, what have we here? The Republican party on this floor is called upon to act to-day. This bill is here for action, not repudiation. This bill came from the gathered wisdom of its friends at the other end of the Capitol; it came in obedience to the voice of the Republican party. True, a great many men got on board of the Republican ship during last summer. Are we to turn from our own proposition because Democrats voted with us? Quite the reverse. When we saw them drowning in the water we gathered them up and took them ashore, and we have planted them on the rock of honest money and good government, and the Republican party owes nothing more to the men who have joined it for principle. [Loud applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I ask unanimous consent to put certain of the paragraphs that I imperfectly read into my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDOX. Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that the evidence there from the lips of these gentlemen shows conclusively that when Mr. Quigg and these other gentlemen would commit your party irrevocably to the gold standard, they refused to let them do so in the most emphatic terms, and declared that a hundred men upon that side of the House owed their seats to the advocacy of bimetallism in your platform. And I take it—I think I may legitimately do so—that had they advocated a different policy the President of the United States would not occupy the chair that he occupies to-day. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I desire to call your attention to statements attributed by the newspapers to the President:

President McKinley, in a speech at Toledo, Ohio, on February 12, 1891 clearly expressed the operation of the theory of the demonetization of silver in the following language:

"During all of Grover Cleveland's years at the head of the Government he was dishonoring one of our precious metals, one of our own products, discrediting silver and enhancing the price of gold. He endeavored even before his inauguration to office to stop the coinage of silver dollars, and afterwards and to the end of his Administration persistently used his power to that end. He was determined to contract the circulating medium and to demonetize one of the coins of commerce, limit the volume of money among the people, make money scarce, and therefore dear. He would have increased the value of money and diminished the value of everything else—money the master, everything else the servant. He was not thinking of 'the poor' then. He had left 'their side.' He was not standing forth in their defense. Cheap coats, cheap labor, and dear money! The sponsor and promoter of these professing to stand guard over the welfare of the poor and lowly! Was there ever more inconsistency or reckless assumption!"

This question naturally arises, Who authorizes these gentlemen to bring this bill before Congress to fasten the gold standard upon the country? You will find that they will rise upon that side of the House and attempt to explain to you that they have tried to bring about international bimetallism. They made the attempt to do so, but the question is, Have they honestly made that attempt? I propose to let one of their own party men, a Senator in the United States Senate, and one of the high commissioners

sent to Europe to bring about that result, answer that question for himself. Now I call your attention to a portion of Mr. WOLCOTT's speech:

Here, Mr. President, I should naturally end this account of our negotiations, negotiations which are still pending and undetermined. The extraordinary statements, however, lately made by the Secretary of the Treasury, and which, unexplained, must seriously affect the future of any further attempts toward securing international action, require some reference at this time.

When Congress convened on the 6th of last month, the President, in his references to the subject of international bimetallism, spoke earnestly and anxiously of his desire to see an international bimetallic agreement consummated. His assurances gave renewed hope to bimetallists all over the country, and seemed final and conclusive answer to those who had claimed that the President was not in earnest in his efforts toward international bimetallism. For myself, I needed no such proof. I had again and again been made to know how genuine was the President's devotion to this settlement of the vexed question. Within a fortnight after this, with no event meanwhile which would change existing conditions, the Secretary of the Treasury, in support of a bill which he has prepared respecting the currency, said as follows to a committee of Congress:

"The objects I have in mind in the series of provisions offered by me are four in number:

"1. To commit the country more thoroughly to the gold standard, remove, so far as possible, all doubts and fears on that point, and thus strengthen the credit of the United States both at home and abroad."

The two statements are utterly at variance and contradictory to each other. They can not be reconciled. This is not the proper occasion to analyze the bill of the Secretary. It will reach limbo long before it reaches the Senate. He proposes to capitalize the premium on our bonds sold recently and to make them, with others to be issued, asecurity definitely payable in gold.

The Secretary forgets that only a few months ago, when the country was in dire distress, we were compelled to pay $9,000,000 for the privilege of keeping the word "gold" out of some of these very bonds. He ought not to forget, for the bank of which he was president, it was said, got some of the bonds and received some of the proceeds of that deplorable transaction. But I do not intend to discuss the bill which the President's message specifically does not indorse, and it is premature to criticise the Secretary's Republicanism, for his advent into the party and the Cabinet were practically contemporaneous. We must accept the situation.

In my opinion, the great majority of the members of the Republican party are bimetallists, and the fact that they are misrepresented by a Cabinet officer is not pleasing, but it is endurable. The selection of the members of his official household is the President's own affair, and so long as he stands upon the question of bimetallism where he has ever stood, there is no serious ground for apprehension. But even in the inconceivable event that the Chief Magistrate of this people should, in the exercise of his judgment, determine to countenance the final fastening upon this country of the burdens of the gold standard, I trust we may still warrant for faith and hope in the pledges of the party and the wisdom of its counsels.

We will cross our bridges when we come to them. The time when this country will submit to the final imposition of gold monometallism is far away. Whatever differences of opinion may exist as to the ability of this country to maintain alone the parity between silver and gold, there is no question that the concurrence of other nations would help and not hinder the cause of bimetallism in the United States, and efforts to secure it ought to receive the cordial support of every citizen who is opposed to gold monometallism.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman from Georgia allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. MADDOX. Certainly.

Mr. GAINES. Is it not a fact that during the extra session of the Fifty-fifth Congress the President sent in a message here on the currency question, calling for the creation of a home monetary commission to more firmly fix the gold standard on this country, and at the same time Senator WOLCOTT was at work with the International Monetary Commission in Europe working for international bimetallism?

Mr. MADDOX. In Indianapolis?

Mr. GAINES. He wanted a commission to work in the United States to continue the gold standard, while at the same time the Wolcott commission was in Europe working for bimetallism or the double standard.

Mr. MADDOX. The fact is, and it can be proven, that when this commission was in Europe attempting to bring about bimetallism in accordance with the pledge of the Republican party to the people by which that Administration holds its possession to-day, that commission was being undermined by the Cabinet officers of this country and by other parties belonging to that party, and it is true, as the gentlemen from Tennessee suggest, that he did send such a message to Congress. And here, when you rise in this House, if you should, I undertake to say that gentlemen will claim that they attempted to bring about bimetallism, but I confront you with these facts. This gentleman who was on the commission says that bimetallism is not dead. I commend the reading of his speech to every one of you. He gives you the reason he failed, in no uncertain tones, and the present Administration is directly responsible for its failure.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to call the attention of the committee to a couple of extracts of what is purported to have emanated from Mr. Lincoln. I have read them often:

If a government contracted a debt with a certain amount of money in circulation, and then contracted the money volume before the debt was paid, it is the most heinous crime that a government could commit against the people.

Now, gentlemen, if I am right in my theories in regard to this matter, when this five hundred millions, or nearly so, of silver is practically confiscated and sent into the junk shop, when the national-bank currency is withdrawn, the greenbacks and Treasury notes impounded, according to what Mr. Lincoln says, there can be nothing that is more heinous for a government to do than to break the contract in this way and under these circumstances.

Mr. BURTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDOX. Certainly.

Mr. BURTON. I will ask the gentleman if he refers to any message or authenticated paper of Mr. Lincoln?

Mr. MADDOX. It is a newspaper extract. I have seen it often before.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It does not make any difference; it is true.

Mr. MADDOX. As my colleague states, it does not make any difference who said it; it is true, all the same.

Now, Mr. Lincoln said something else. That is, he is reputed to have said:

I see in the near future a crisis arising which unnerves me and causes me to tremble for the safety of my country. As a result of the war, corporations have been enthroned, and an era of corruption in high places will follow, and the money power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudice of the people until all wealth is aggregated in a few hands and the Republic is destroyed. I feel at this time more anxiety for the safety of my country than ever before, even in times of war. God grant that my suspicion may prove groundless.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Will the gentleman from Georgia permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. MADDOX. Certainly.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That quotation has been floating for a good many years, and was submitted to the biographers of Mr. Lincoln, who have control of his papers, and they have more than once publicly stated that it does not appear in Mr. Lincoln's papers and that it is not in his style; so that their idea is that Mr. Lincoln is free from the charge that he gave expression to such a sentiment.

Mr. MADDOX. He may not have said it, but it was a statement that would have done him or any other man credit, and the prophecy has been fulfilled. Nor could there be presented anything more conclusive as to the results of the power of these corporations than this bill demonstrates here to-day.

Mr. TERRY. You might say that it was never denied to be the utterance of Lincoln until lately.

Mr. MADDOX. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I have analyzed this bill correctly, I think it is this in the concrete.

This bill is a scheme to legalize the authority that has been asserted by the Treasurer of the United States in attempting to put this country on a gold basis without the authority of law.

This bill is a scheme to take from the people one-half of its money of final redemption and confiscate the same.

This is a bill to change and alter the contracts of the people without their consent, for making their obligations which have heretofore, since the organization of the Government, been payable in coin, both gold and silver, payable in gold only.

This bill is a scheme to contract the currency at the will of the bankers.

This bill is a scheme to adopt the gold standard for the benefit of the banks, without making themselves liable in any way to furnish the gold to sustain it. This bill is a scheme for the advantage of about 300,000 people holding stock in national banks to the disadvantage of the rest of the people in the United States.

This bill, in my judgment, is a scheme by which and through which will be operated the most gigantic trust that ever cursed any nation or country.

I want to say now that this bill, as proposed, has been considered in financial circles, but has not been asked for by the great body of the people of this country. They have not been consulted about it. Thousands and thousands of people throughout the land who are to be the most affected by it know nothing of it; they have not been consulted in regard to it. In every State and county throughout the Republic there reside the great toiling millions who have to bear the burdens of this Government. They have no newspapers, no lobbies, no organizations to associations to defend their interest. They are looking to-day to the patriotism, to the honor and integrity of the Representatives of this House to take care of their interest. I trust that they will not look in vain to the Representatives of the great party to which I belong. Let every Democrat vote no, thereby putting the seal of his condemnation on the most dangerous and baneful measure that has found its way into Congress in a half century. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, for the first time since I have been a member of this House I have not only been invited to speak, but urged to do so by those who are responsible for the steady flow of conversation on this side of the Chamber [laughter], and while that is a new sensation, I will admit that it is not an altogether disagreeable one, though, to tell the truth about it, I have not that appetite for discussing the silver question that I once had. I fear that we all share in that strange decline of interest which is observable throughout the country whenever men come together for the purpose of talk and controversy. I remember a time when if a man was seen upon a street corner in an attitude of debate, he would be surrounded within a few minutes by the whole voting population of the neighborhood and could be sure of an audience whether he hired a hall or not. But to-day if a man should be seen in that attitude upon the same corner, it would tend to greatly reduce the population of the town. [Laughter.]

This is not because these questions are less important than they were, but because the substance of them has taken final shape in the opinion of all the people. Complaint is made to-day that enough time has not been allowed to enable our Democratic friends to prepare for this debate. I have always had a suspicion that my friends on the Democratic side were never adequately prepared to discuss the gold and silver question, but never expected to hear from such distinguished sources as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] on last Friday and my distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. MADDOX] to-day the candid admission that after years of speechmaking even the select men of the Democratic party feel that they require an additional period of incubation before they are ready to tackle the question in the Congress of the United States. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Now, I do not pretend to be as well able to speak on the question as I used to be. There was a time when I carried in my head, or in my satchel, about all the figures that had any real application to the question; and one of the embarrassments of my unexpected participation in the debate to-day arises from the fact that I have left my figures at home and my documentary evidence at my boarding house. But after all, that does not trouble me as much as it might, because I guess the debate has reached a stage where a person has to choose between letting go of the statistics or losing his audience. [Laughter.] To-day nearly everybody feels a sufficient authority on this subject within himself to dispense with extracts either from old speeches or standard textbooks. One of the results of the national education through which we have passed was that everybody began to feel that he could make a speech on this subject himself, a frame of mind absolutely fatal to the authority of other people's speeches. But there is a more complete reason why the Democratic party does not feel as well able to discuss the silver question now as it was in that memorable year when the Federal Union was resolved into a general debating society.

Mr. Chairman, things have changed in the United States since the date of that great discussion. I hold in my hand a volume called The First Battle [laughter and applause], a volume which was printed about three years ago and sold by subscription for $3.50. It sold well, I am informed, considering that neither the covers nor the contents were worth anything, netting to the author in the neighborhood of $40,000. The volume seems to have been retired from circulation without any particular clamor for a reissue, for I had the greatest possible difficulty in securing a copy, finally being able to track one to a second-hand bookstore, where, without much negotiation, I corralled it for 25 cents. [Laughter.] That decline in the price of The First Battle is only an approximate measure of the decline in public interest and public confidence in the hearsays and flights of the imagination there collected together. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, I notice, Mr. Chairman, in reading this book, that a good many speeches that were actually made were left out, and only those preserved which deal with the more solid and enduring features of the doctrine the author was engaged in propagating. Most of the speeches had even then grown inconsequential and unavailable for the holiday trade that followed the election of 1896, and I shall only pick out a few which deal with the author's philosophy at its most important points. For example, I find here a speech, made in the little city of Newton, in Iowa, near the beginning of his first journey into the enemy's country. Supposing the town had been named after Sir Isaac, he thought a few remarks on the subject of gravitation would be in order. Thereupon he said:

> Some of the laws of finance—I may say all the great laws of finance—are as certain in their operation and as irresistible in their force as the law of gravitation. If you throw a stone into the air you know that it will come down. Why? Because it is drawn toward the center of the earth. The law upon which we base our fight is as sure as the law of gravitation. If we have a gold standard, prices are as certain to fall as the stone which we throw into the air. [Laughter.]

I expect that this solemn declaration of immutable principles would be received more seriously here if there were not so many persons present who recollect the author's first address on this subject on this floor in 1893. At that time he was devoting his energies to a Democratic scheme for reducing the price of everything by free trade with those countries which produce things cheaper than we do. And when he was confronted by the fact that the protective tariff had operated to secure the same beneficent results by the universal employment of our own people, he declared that things were not yet cheap enough, but that everybody was being robbed by the extortions of the protective tariff; and in so far as he admitted that the products of labor had declined in price he said:

> You must attribute it to the inventive genius that has multiplied, a thousand times in many instances, the strength of a single arm and enables us to do with one man what fifty could not do fifty years ago. That is what has brought down prices in this country and everywhere.—*Congressional Record*, March 16, 1892.

In less than four years this versatile young man, the national success of his party having in the meantime still further reduced prices by putting American industries into the soup house, turned about and proposed to help the case by doubling the price of every article of man's use and necessity in the United States. It would have been a strange satire on human credulity if the Democratic party had been able to win the election of 1892 by offering their services to bring prices down and then to win the election of 1896 by throwing Mr. Cleveland overboard and starting out on a new scheme with the object of putting prices up. When we come to look back at it, it was evidently too much to expect that the same community could be swindled twice by the same fellows within the space of four years. I therefore ask everybody to keep in mind for a few minutes this heartfelt tribute to Sir Isaac Newton to which I have referred.

I find here also a speech delivered in Minneapolis to a congregation of good women, and I am glad that Mr. Bryan had the courtesy to recognize the influence and interest of the women of the United States in politics. My own conviction is that the Republican party owes them a good deal more than the Populistic movement does, because a woman's mind is less likely to be dazzled by brilliant conclusions than a man's is. I have often said that the Republican party won in the great debate because at the American fireside, where the discussion was carried on in dead earnest, there was a debater who searched the mysteries of the question without being disturbed very much by the explosions of red fire and campaign spectacles. She demanded to know what the effect was to be on the household treasury of creating a new coin called a dollar out of material valued nowhere in the world at more than 50 cents.

Gentlemen on the other side say that the Republican party bought and intimidated the working people of the United States; that they were corrupted and coerced into voting the Republican ticket. They are mistaken. They were won over by a little woman at home, who counseled them to keep clear of a proposition which proposed to double the price of everything, at least until they had made written agreements to double their own wages and salaries; so that I think that Mr. Bryan was not only chivalrous but wise when he addressed to the women of Minneapolis by far the best speech he made during the campaign. Among other things he told these women:

> The gold standard means dearer money; dearer money means cheaper property; cheaper property means harder times; harder times means more people out of work; more people out of work means more people destitute; more people destitute means more people desperate; more people desperate means more crime.

You see that in this hasty sketch he carried the women of Minneapolis by easy stages from the crime of '73 to the universal reign of crime incident to a continuance of the gold standard in the United States. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] The election returns of that town indicate that Mr. Bryan did not make a very deep impression upon the women of Minneapolis by this speech; they did not think very much of it, although I have no doubt they enjoyed the peach-ripening smiles that went with it. And it would be an interesting thing for Mr. Bryan to go back to Minneapolis and get that splendid congregation of women together once more, if only for the satisfaction of knowing what they think of him by this time.

Now, I can readily perceive how a man who has his system encumbered with a philosophy like that would naturally call for time if suddenly required now to express his views with reference to the gold standard as opposed to the free coinage of silver in the United States. I would be glad if you folks could have more time. My sympathies go out to my friends on the other side on account of the short shift allowed them for readjusting back-number ideas to the present-day condition of affairs. Yet, on the other hand, we have got to save a little sympathy for ourselves, and on the whole we will agree that while the matter is somewhat sudden in this House there is no particular suddenness so far as the country is concerned.

In every Congressional district the people have been discussing this matter with more or less diligence for a space of some years. There is not a line in this bill that has not been at least twice recommended by the President of the United States, and not a single thing in it that has not been at various times reported by committees of this House. What we do, therefore, we do in the light of day, each man acting for the people whose commission he bears.

Yet I find in the New York Herald of yesterday an interview with one ex-Governor Altgeld, of Chicago, and I name him because he is a type of the unscrupulous clamor that follows every debate on the money question in the United States. He says:

> The policies of the Republican party have been determined by syndicates, and the men at Washington have simply carried out instructions. It is hard to conceive a more pitiable or contemptible sight than that of the Republican Representatives simply obeying orders.

I will say to ex-Governor Altgeld and to the disintegrating group of charlatans for which he speaks that the Republican party is here obeying orders. I am here obeying the orders of a vast majority of the people of the Tenth Congressional district of Iowa.

I come here as an humble Representative in this Chamber to enter the judgment of my constituents and to do what I can to put the laws of this country into harmony with their opinion. [Applause.]

This bill has had to bear the weight of no little criticism. There was a good deal of noise made about the ears of the last Congress because they did not then take action in the matter of currency legislation. Mass meetings were held all over the West, urging and even threatening representatives in Congress in connection with this matter. No account was taken of the fact that the Senate had not yet been delivered from the control of Populism, and this House was urged to spend its time in splashing in the water, without the reasonable expectation of seeing currency legislation carried beyond a vote in this Chamber. This precipitancy arose from the fact that a considerable number of men in the House and out of it, after great meditation, had perfected a certain system of finance in their own minds, and little toleration was extended by these to the difficulties which naturally grew up in respect to the passage of such legislation. There is an infirmity in the human mind which tends to consider knowledge as a monopoly, existing in the minds of experts, under a sort of copyright, and there seems to be something about the pursuit of the science of money especially which enables everybody to appreciate his own ideas without treating very hospitably the ideas of anybody else. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

To a man, therefore, bearing the burden of exclusive information like that even the rational delay arising from the fact that nothing could be finally done appeared like a reckless waste of time. There were criticisms also, though, I am bound to say, not in any spirit of hostility to this measure, because it does not present a more academic scheme of finance. I confess that I share in neither of these complaints. There was no sense in sending a bill like this to perish at the hands of an unfriendly Senate, and so far as the size of this measure is concerned it seems to me to be big enough for practical purposes. It covers all the ground upon which the verdict of the people has been taken; and while it is not an elaborate code of monetary reform, like some that were manufactured for us by accommodating gentlemen on the outside, and like others matured by studious and able men among our own number, it is none the less respectable on that account. While it is a little bill, it deals with great things, and in such a way that nobody is bewildered and nobody lost in the woods, except our brethren on the other side, who are now vainly trying to recall distant echoes of campaign cries that have grown ludicrous in the light of experience.

Venturing to speak only for myself, I think this bill comes to us at about the right time and about the right size, and I only wish that we might be able to present it as a Christmas gift to the business world of America. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The central and dominant purpose of the measure is to define the standard of value, to make known by law, without quibble, uncertainty, or evasion, exactly what the dollar of the United States is, what the word means, what is to be understood when the name of the standard coin is spoken. We propose to give to the American dollar a significance so free from doubt and ambiguity that the meaning of it shall be fixed and unquestionable throughout the commercial world. But it will be observed that in defining without equivocation the standard of value this bill does not ignore the historical fact that we have long been and now are on the gold standard.

A MEMBER. If we are now on the gold standard, what is the necessity of this bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Well, the necessity for this bill arises from the fact that, notwithstanding we are on the gold standard and have been for more than two generations, there are some of the boys on your side that have not heard of it yet. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

As a matter of fact, we are on the gold standard and have been for practical purposes since 1834. The law of that year, by treating 16 ounces of silver as equivalent to 1 ounce of gold, effectually excluded the coinage of silver dollars, because the material was worth more in the market than the nominal value of the coin. Therefore nobody presented the silver for coinage, and even fractional currency gradually disappeared from circulation and use. The country could not even keep a 10-cent piece in circulation until the act of 1853 had debased fractional coins and authorized their manufacture in limited quantities out of material bought on Government account.

There can be no question that the act of 1853 was intended to do away with the inconvenience of attempting to maintain two standards of value. Mr. Dunham, of Indiana, who was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, in a speech which will be found in the Appendix to the Congressional Globe, volume 6, page 190, said distinctly on this floor:

> We intend to do what the best writers on political economy have approved, what experience, where the experiment has been tried, has demonstrated to be the best, and what the committee believe to be necessary and proper—to make but one standard of currency and to make all others subservient to it. We mean to make the gold the standard coin and to make these new silver coins applicable and convenient, not for large but for small transactions.

These matters have been discussed in various forms in books and in pamphlets in recent years, but the clearest and most satisfactory discussion of them which has come under my notice will be found in a recent work published by the Putnams on The History of American Coinage, by our old colleague, affectionately remembered in this House, D. K. Watson, of Ohio, now a member of the commission to revise and codify the laws of the United States. For painstaking research and impartial historical accuracy this book is a most admirable treatise on this subject, worthy of a place in the library of every student. Nor can there be any sound dissent from Mr. Watson's conclusion that the effect of the passage of the act of 1853—

> Was just what the leading members of Congress said it would be when it was being discussed in the House of Representatives. It effectually put the country on the gold basis, thus supplementing the effect of the act of 1834.—*History of the American Coinage*, page 151, second edition; Putnam's Sons, 1890.

I repeat, therefore, that for practical purposes we have been on the gold basis for more than two generations. If we were not put there by the act of 1834, the act of 1853 completed it; and if there was any doubt about it after 1853, it was finally resolved in 1873, although it took the Democratic party some time to find out what was done at that time, and nearly twenty-five years to get really excited on the subject. [Laughter on the Republican side.] You need not be distressed; I am not going to defend myself or anybody else against the crime of 1873. I have made myself reasonably familiar with the literature of that subject, even going to the extent of reading the speeches which repose in the peaceful tomb of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am going to be absolutely frank here, and I do not want anybody on the other side to draw a "quotation" on me [laughter], whether it is what I may have said or what somebody else has said. [Renewed laughter.]

Of course, if anybody intends to do that, there is probably no way for me to prevent it, but I want you to understand in advance that I am not to be embarrassed by anybody's speeches or votes in the years that have intervened since the "crime." [Laughter.] I would like to agree with others, and I have a pardonable ambition to agree with myself, but for the purpose of disposing of this business I do not intend to be constrained by what this man or that man said or did twenty years ago, and I do not propose to be bound by what I said and did myself.

Mr. COX. You admit that you were wrong all the time?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I will let others explain their own mistakes. I have not been here long enough to make all the mistakes possible to be made about silver. [Laughter.]

Mr. COX. You have made a good many.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I confess only one. I confess that I shared in the general stupidity in respect to the law of 1890, which required the daily purchase of 6 tons of pig silver to be paid for with promissory notes. [Laughter.]

Mr. COX. And the trouble is that you have not got through with it yet.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Hardly a session of Congress has passed since 1890 that some enterprising member has not risen on this floor and read out loud a paragraph from the speech I made here, or rather printed in the RECORD without making it, in 1890, on the silver legislation of that year. It has been used to show that I was at that time in favor of the "free and unlimited." In point of fact, in 1890 I had my first opportunity to put in a vote against 16 to 1, and I have always had some satisfaction in the fact that there never has been a session of Congress from that time until now that I did not have at least one such opportunity. [Laughter.] So that there is one thing I ought not to be accused of, and that is that I have ever supported a proposition to manufacture our dollars of material worth less than a dollar, for the benefit of the gentlemen who owned the material, and that is some satisfaction. [Applause.]

But in 1890 I voted for the act which I now regard as of unquestionably bad policy, the act for the purchase of the silver bullion to be piled up in the Treasury of the United States. I did it because Senator TELLER of Colorado and Senator Sherman of Ohio both agreed in thinking that the purchase of the entire American product would restore the parity between gold and silver. I thought that when 16 to 1 became thus the actual ratio between gold and silver free coinage would be easy and unobjectionable, and my troubles have arisen from the fact that before I got through I ventured the prediction that during Harrison's Administration that state of affairs would come to pass and the free coinage of silver be entered upon without inconvenience, difficulty, or danger. [Laughter.]

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. COX. You say that you voted for that law, and that when you voted for it you made a speech?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I voted for it and slipped a speech on the subject into the RECORD before I went home.

Mr. COX. And you were wrong about that?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Well, I am trying to apologize for it, Colonel. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. COX. I am trying to get you out of the hole which you put your party in. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOLLIVER. We have been trying ever since to get out, though I hardly think we have profited very much by your assistance. When we came in 1893 to repeal that law I confess that I was in the greatest perplexity of mind. The country was in the midst of an unexampled panic, and while I have always believed that Mr. Cleveland grossly overstated the responsibility of that law for the untoward events which followed his election, at the same time there can be no doubt that the policy of piling up silver in the Treasury, purchased by the issue of promissory notes payable on demand, contributed materially to the distrust and confusion of the business community. In such an emergency, as so often happens under our system of government, party lines were forgotten and the Republican party upon the call of a Democratic President had the courage to undo the blunder of 1890. When I came down here to the extra session I had an idea that maybe I was the only person entirely at sea on the questions that brought the Congress together.

I remember that one day as I was passing the house of Senator Sherman, then as now everywhere regarded as one of the wisest and safest authorities upon financial matters, and saw him sitting out in front of his home, like Abraham before his tent. I went in and talked with him about my anxieties and fears, and I shall never forget the simplicity and kindness with which he spoke to me—that simplicity which characterizes all great minds. He said that "if I were in your place I would not worry about these questions. Twenty years ago I thought I knew a good deal about the silver question, but every prediction I have ever made on the subject in our efforts to restore the value of silver bullion has turned out exactly opposite to what I expected."

Mr. COX. That is the way it is going to do again. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOLLIVER. So that when I listened to my friend from Georgia [Mr. MADDOX], making predictions on this subject, I made up my mind that if he had been troubled in the past by the predictions of other years, as many on this side of the House have been, he would have been more economical with his prophecies about the future. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Senator Sherman was of the opinion that if we bought all the silver produced in the United States as fast as it was produced we would restore the ratio. But Congress forgot at least one element which enters into the law of commercial demand, and that was that the purchase of silver bullion to be piled up in the Treasury is not such a consumption of it as would materially affect the price. We know more on this subject than we did even ten years ago. To-day there are few competent students in any country who believe that the act of one nation putting a stamp on an ingot of silver is providing such a consumption of it in an economic sense as would materially affect the ratio of its value compared to gold.

I have concluded, being guided by what has happened to us, that the law of 1873, in omitting the silver dollar of a former generation from our list of authorized coins, was an act of farsighted wisdom, worthy of the Administration of General Grant. [Applause on the Republican side.] We have seen hard-pressed politicians drag General Grant from his grave for the purpose of holding him up for public contempt as one who did not know what his own Administration was doing and what laws his own right hand was signing. Others, more bold and more infamous still, have not hesitated to say that he deliberately sold out in secret the interests of his country for the sake of the moneyed class in the United States. If there was ever any force in these accusations they are decayed and lifeless now, for the American people, cherishing that stainless name in their hearts, will go no further to justify the act of 1873 than to recollect the immortal signature, "Approved. Feb. 12, 1873. U. S. Grant." [Applause on the Republican side.]

If the act of 1873 had remained undisturbed by subsequent silver legislation, all or nearly all of our monetary problems would have been simplified, if not avoided altogether. I say that notwithstanding the party in which I have served all my life is responsible for all that has ever been done for silver. I do not accuse our friends of the Democratic party of ever having helped silver at all. During the whole of Mr. Cleveland's first Administration you never even offered a bill on this subject in this House, though you had a majority here and though the slender Republican majority in the Senate was made up from the silver States.

And the last time you elected Mr. Cleveland President of the United States I charge that you elected him well knowing that he was the most hostile factor in the politics of the country against the free coinage of silver. He was not nominated by the money power of New York. Either the money power of New York had no influence or else they used it to send delegates malignant in their antipathy to Mr. Cleveland, because in his nomination what you have described as the money power of the East was overruled by the South and the West, and thus Mr. Cleveland was a second time made leader of the Democratic party. You think you did a bad thing for yourselves, but I tell you that you unintentionally did a first-rate thing for the American people. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

It may be said, therefore, that the silver question was never seriously taken up in the United States until 1896. You on that side never allowed your dim and nebulous convictions on the subject to interfere with your electing its chief enemy President, and we on our side never hesitated to write our platform for the entertainment of our Rocky Mountain friends. But in 1896 the American people brushed politics aside and sat down in solemn earnest to settle an issue that had been the plaything of the politics of the American people for a quarter of a century. The argument for free coinage was not new. For fifteen years it had reposed peacefully on a mass of statistics and a scrapbook of garbled extracts and worthless political speeches. In the first months of the campaign all these were brought to the front—what Mr. Carlisle said; what Mr. Blaine said; how Mr. CANNON voted; how Mr. McKinley voted—but the American people insisted on going to the root of the question.

The campaign opened with a blare of trumpets and in the Mississippi Valley it looked as if everything was going Democratic, so much so that politicians who had failed in the business in the Republican fold got quickly into the silver camp, declaring with genuine exhilaration that 16 to 1 was sweeping the country like a prairie fire. These are the people that are entitled to our sympathy to-day as they gather together in disconsolate committee meetings to talk with one another about old times and to enjoy the meager remnants of a political importance that has long since disappeared. [Laughter.]

In July, 1896, the people of the United States began to argue the silver question on the stump, at their firesides, in great political assemblies, and when they were through, my humble opinion is that the debate for practical purposes was over. If the State of Iowa, where we are nearly all farmers, had voted one way, and the State of Massachusetts, where they are nearly all engaged in mercantile and industrial pursuits, had voted the other, there might be some doubt about it, although I would stand by the judgment of the 80,000 majority of farmers in Iowa. But when a proposition gets a black eye at the same election in the State of Iowa and in the State of Massachusetts by about the same majority, I tell you that there is no future for that proposition in an intellectual life of the American people. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I desire to call your attention to two reasons which sent the silver agitation to the wall before that campaign was half over. In the first place the questions that arose were questions of fact, and the campaign had not gone on four weeks before the American people found out that the facts you folks were relying upon were in the nature of fakes and humbugs. For instance, Mr. Bryan, in the address, to which I have alluded, to the women of Minneapolis, illustrated the effect of the demonetization of silver in 1873 by comparing it to the destruction of one of two piles of wheat of equal size, and declared that the destruction of one-half of the metal money of the country had naturally doubled the value of the other half, thereby cutting into the value of all other property; had sent the value of property down by sending money up.

That was the argument, and the only objection to the conclusions that came from it was that it was not true, and the more people examined into it the less they believed it to be true. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. What argument did you make for silver?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I have not had, Mr. Chairman, to ask forgiveness for making any. [Laughter and applause.] In the first place, the silver dollar from the foundation of our mint had never entered into the volume of the currency of the country, the total aggregate coinage hardly exceeding $8,000,000, so that it was literally true that the law of 1873 had never taken from the American people any use of silver which they had at the time enjoyed. There was of course some force in the proposition that the legislation of commercial Europe might have injuriously affected the value of silver, but nobody in his senses could make out how you could correct by the legislation of a country which had not used silver the hostile policy by those countries which actually had used it.

Mr. SIMS. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. SIMS. With your present lights and information before you, are you now in favor of opening the doors of the mints to the free coinage of silver by international agreement?

Mr. DOLLIVER. No, sir; I am not. I have joined in the last experiment with silver, on an international basis or otherwise. [Applause on the Republican side.] I have been humbugged as long as I calculate to be, if I know it. There is certainly no pressure for international agreement now such as might have reasonably existed five years ago, because if the Director of the Mint is correct the world's supply of gold has grown with such an amazing annual increment that before the end of the next year it will more than equal the total aggregate of gold and silver put

together when the St. Louis platform was adopted; so that I think that those who believed in international bimetallism will find small necessity for the further agitation of that subject, while those who only acquiesced in the efforts of our Government to promote the international agreement no longer feel the slightest pressure of duty in that regard.

Another thing the American people wanted to know was what was to be the result to them if they should indulge in this scheme of free coinage, and there was in public life no man who even pretended to be able to predict the result of the policy. Nobody could tell what the value of the free-coinage dollar would be. Mr. Bryan himself first said one thing and then another. In New York when he accepted the nomination he said, as the frost of that occasion was settling upon him, that the result would be to produce a coin exactly equal to the gold dollar; but long before he got back to the West he was denouncing the gold dollar as a two-hundred-cent affair and declaring that the rights of the poor man could only be protected by cutting its inflated value in two; so that the historian will never know exactly what Mr. Bryan's views of the question were. He was candid enough, however, to admit that he did not pretend to be dealing with an exact science; that he did not know what the effect would be of beginning the free coinage of silver; that it was an experiment and he was willing to try it. He was traveling without baggage at the time [laughter] and was ready to try it.

Governor Boies, of Iowa, did not hesitate to write, in response to a question propounded by the New York World, that it was impossible to predict what the effect would be of giving free coinage of silver; and Senator VEST, a wiser man than both, on the floor of the Senate solemnly stated that the human mind had not the faculties which enabled it to foretell what the effect of this policy would be.

The American people were in a situation better calculated to invite experiments than they are likely again soon to be. Their business was at a standstill; their property was shrunken in value; their debts were pressing upon them; the hands of labor were everywhere idle, and the products of labor lay in a dead market place, diminished in value almost beyond human belief.

With such surroundings the special car made its pilgrimage throughout the United States, and it is not surprising that so many troubled hearts made a favorable response to the eager rhapsodies which had done business beyond the Missouri for so many years. It will be written in our history, in vindication of our institutions and as an everlasting witness for popular government, that the American people, standing in the midst of their prostrate fortunes, weary and heavy laden under burdens too heavy to be borne, deliberately chose, trampling under foot the temptations of the hour, to bear the ills they had, rather than fly to others which they knew not of. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I have heard boast made of the number who followed the free-silver banner. I have always wondered that there were not more. I recollect an earnest conversation I had once in this Chamber with Judge Boatner, of Louisiana, a sincere and patriotic man. We agreed that the proposed policy might produce unexpected misfortunes, and I did not in the least lose my respect for him when he said that he was going with his party because nothing could happen to his people worse than had already come upon them. It is not surprising that communities which in literal despair of their business surroundings looked hither and thither in hope of relief should give a friendly ear to those who were offering them a distinct remedy for their evils.

The success of the patent-medicine industry of the United States is an interesting testimony that such infirmities of human nature are prevalent in the world. You on your side had a distinct advantage over us. You knew exactly what you were going to do; and curiously enough in this world a man has a great advantage over everyone else when he has an exact remedy at hand. We on our part had to indulge in arguments, in expressions of hope, in appeals to experience.

Mr. Bryan, for instance, found the farmers of the West selling corn for 10 cents a bushel, and he came to them and said, "Now, that is too low a price for corn," and every farmer in the United States said, "That is right;" and I say that that was so; and the place I parted company with Mr. Bryan was as to the remedy for that state of things. He said the way to increase the price of corn was to cut in two the value of the dollar. He said the reason that corn was 10 cents a bushel was because the dollar was a 200-cent dollar, and he went to our debt-burdened people and proposed deliberately to double the price of the products of the farm by cutting in two the value of the standard coin of the realm.

The American people studied that proposition carefully, and the more they studied it the less they liked it; and while they were engaged in the study of it they heard a voice from a little vine-covered portico of a cottage yonder in Canton, Ohio, saying:

Open the mills of the United States; give the American people something to do for a living; give their old employments back and their old wages, and you will create a market that will very speedily restore the price of farm products and of all other products of labor in the United States.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, I will appeal to the experience of every man whether that philosophy of our affairs has not turned out to be the true philosophy. Mr. Bryan said that we did not have money enough in circulation, and he may have been right about that; for the fact was, we did not have very much money in circulation at the time he was performing his most famous acts in the field of oratory and eloquence. Everybody that had any money held onto it; everybody that had any money in the banks went and got it; everybody that sold goods for cash took the money home; so that the channels of trade were without circulation and the money of the American people was hidden away in the private hoards of a panic-stricken community.

I appeal to every business man's experience whether the decisive vote of the American people adverse to Mr. Bryan's candidacy did not immediately unlock the hoarded money of the United States. In every bank the very next morning after that election you could tell that something had happened. There was a queer smell in the bank—a smell somewhat like the odor of the old north room in a New England homestead, peculiar but not disagreeable [laughter]—a smell of hoarded gold brought from its hiding place and laid down again on the bank counter to reopen an account.

That vote of the American people did more. It put the loanable funds of the whole world at the disposal of the business of this country, so that money flowed from all quarters for investment in the United States. As a result, we have not only seen the money which we had put back into circulation, but in the last three years the aggregate volume of money in the United States has increased by leaps and bounds. You will admit that by the free coinage of silver about all you could have done for us would have been to manufacture silver dollars as fast as you could. Even supposing that the unlimited issue of a coin inferior in value to the corresponding coin of gold would not have instantly taken away from us what money we had in gold, depreciating our whole money supply to the silver standard, all you proposed to do for us was to open the mints and begin the manufacture of silver dollars.

You thought that would increase the money supply. We believed that its immediate and fatal effect would have been to drive away our whole volume of gold coinage; but even if we were wrong as to that and your policy did not affect the circulation of gold, still your policy would have been a poor recourse, under the circumstances, compared with ours. The Director of the Mint tells me that if all the mints in the United States worked all the time, night and day, and did nothing else, they could manufacture only 50,000,000 silver dollars in a year. The Secretary of the Treasury tells me that since William McKinley was inaugurated there has been added to the volume of money in the United States the stupendous aggregate sum of $400,000,000, most of it in gold and all of it as good as gold. Now let me make that a little clearer. If you had worked all the mints all the time you could have manufactured out of silver only $150,000,000 since William McKinley was inaugurated; but our policy has given to the business of the American people $400,000,000 in less than three years, an amount which would have taken all the mints of the United States, working all the time, eight years to manufacture out of silver.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. And every dollar is worth a hundred cents.

Mr. DOLLIVER. My friend says that every dollar is worth a hundred cents. That is the best thing about it. Every man who gets a dollar by the labor of his hands or the sale of his products knows that that dollar is as good as gold everywhere in the world. In other words, brethren, we have done for you at least four times as much as you expected to be able to do for yourselves; and now why would it not be a good idea for you to get out of the main traveled road and let the procession move on? [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

In 1896 Mr. Bryan said in a score of speeches, preserved in this curious volume, that if the gold standard was fastened upon this country, the price of everything would go down and keep going down under a law as inexorable as the law of gravitation.

Do you think we have reached the end of the gold standard?—

He cried, addressing the people of Baltimore September 19—

There is no end. Do you think that we have drained the cup of sorrow to its dregs? No, my friends, you can not set a limit to financial depression and hard times.

Is there a man on this floor to-day, regardless of his politics, who will stand up here and say publicly that in making these statements Mr. Bryan knew what he was talking about? [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] If there is, I would like to have him stand up. [After a pause.] I now call the attention of the country to the fact that the Democratic party in this House has become so bewildered by the industrial and commercial activity which surrounds us that not one of his followers

will stand up here and say that on a question which goes to the heart of this controversy Mr. Bryan had sufficient wisdom to guide the footsteps of those less enlightened than himself. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] He said wages would come down and the working people of the United States be left without employment. Was he right about that? When he spoke there were a good many in this country in that condition, and my heart always went out in sympathy to these industrious millions and their helpless families.

I expect we had as much sympathy as you folks had, even though we did not coincide with your scheme for restoring wages and happiness. Let us all rejoice that after less than three years of Republican Administration there is not an industrious man out of employment—not one in the United States. Not only are the great centers of industry and commerce busy, but a revival has taken place even in the remote villages and rural districts.

It may interest you to know that since the last session of this House I have become a farmer. [Laughter.] Last summer when I wanted to build a barn I walked all over a town of 12,000 people trying to get somebody to put a foundation under it, and I declare to you that I had finally to put it in myself. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARHAM. Is the barn still standing?

Mr. DOLLIVER. It is, and in every respect a good job. If you have kept your eye on the newspapers, you have noticed that the wages of labor are everywhere steadily going up, adding millions of dollars to the comfort of the humble homes of the land; so that when Mr. Bryan predicted a still further loss of employment and a still further decline in wages the whole world now knows that he was wrong and not right. I do not think any the less of him personally because his speeches have not come out true. When a man tells me that it is going to rain and it turns out to be a sunshiny day, I do not have any less respect for his moral character. [Laughter.] But where a man predicts dry weather and plenteous showers fall instead, I insist that unless he expects to hear a personal application of the proverb by which the mental outfit of such a one is described, he should at least get in out of the rain. [Laughter.]

Mr. Bryan in 1896 claimed that the restoration of prosperity in the United States was entirely impossible except under his general management, and I here publicly convict him, by the open book of universal experience, of wholesale and retail dealing in misfortunes that never come. He told the multitudes, which had a right to look to him for wisdom and guidance, that the design of the friends of the gold standard was to put it in the power of a few bankers to corner the money of the world.

Talk about monopolies, talk about trusts—

He said, speaking in this city on the centennial of Washington's Farewell Address—

my friends, they propose to establish the most gigantic trust of all—a money trust—and let a few men who hold it all deal it out at such price as they will to all the others of the 70,00,000 American people.

You will see that his idea was even cruder than that just uttered by my friend from Georgia [Mr. MADDOX], that those interested in banking and other business enterprises of the country are conspiring together for the purpose of disturbing the national prosperity—of wiping out the very thing which makes any kind of business either profitable or possible.

There are men in this House who, from the habit of bringing cheap prejudices into things which ought to be entirely free from prejudice, seem perfectly capable of believing that the banks of the United States are likely some day to get together and form a conspiracy to throw themselves into the hands of a receiver. [Laughter.]

With the same dull and baffled insight into practical questions, Mr. Bryan insisted that the money power was about to take the American people by the throat and shake out of them what little remained of their industrial and commercial life. I take this occasion to say that if the money power did conspire to multiply the sorrows of poverty and debt in the United States, the conspiracy has turned out to be the worst failure imaginable.

During General Harrison's Administration, when it was comparatively easy to get into debt, I took advantage of the fair sailing which seemed to be before us and bought as much land as I could borrow money to make a payment on. Everybody seemed to be willing to loan money; they even stopped me on the street and asked me if I could not use a little money, and the most embarrassing thing I had to contend with during the campaign of 1896 was that these fellows all wanted to see me. I sent down word that I was not in. [Laughter.] They said that they would wait. [Renewed laughter.] So it took a good deal more ingenuity to keep my creditors in an agreeable state of mind during the campaign than it did to refute the bogus bimetallism of 16 to 1. [Laughter.] It is a relief to know that the burden of debt has been lifted not only from my own shoulders but from the scattered millions of my countrymen. The mortgages of the United States which have come due since Mr. Bryan's defeat have all been either paid or refunded at a rate of interest lower than ever before seen and tending lower still.

In view of that state of things, what becomes of the motto which Mr. Bryan saw carried in a procession at Lexington, Ky., in the fall of 1896? "I challenge you," said he, "to find in any one of the speeches that will be made this year by the opponents of free silver a single sentence which contains as much of political economy and common sense as is contained in that phrase, 'High money—low times.'"

That might have been political economy and common sense in 1896, but who will deny that it is balderdash and mere declamation now? I know what I am talking about. Not long ago I bought a piece of land which had a mortgage of $6,000, drawn at the rate of interest which prevailed in 1895 and having a reservation of the right to pay it in whole or in part on any interest day.

When the April interest came due this year I said to myself, "Would not it be a good idea for you to show your faith in Republican predictions? You told your constituents that if the standard of value was made secure public and private credit would be strengthened and that the interest on money, instead of going up, would go down. Would it not be a good thing to see whether it will operate in your own case or not?" I did not have the money and did not know where I would be able to get it, but I thought I would see whether the Republican platform was worth anything to me, and so when I wrote to the Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company of Milwaukee, inclosing a draft for the interest due April 1, I added this postscript:

P. S.—Unless it is agreeable to your company to reduce the rate of interest on these notes to 5 per cent, I will feel obliged to pay them.

[Laughter.]

Three days afterwards I got a letter from the manager of the company, saying that my letter had been referred to the committee on finance, and in accordance with its report—

it is entirely agreeable to our company to reduce the rate on your notes to 5 per cent, provided you will waive the right to pay them before they are due.

[Laughter.]

I want to say to you, boys, that I have had a good many hard knocks in my time and a good many hand-to-hand conflicts with trouble; I have heard you speak about the conspiracies of Wall street and Lombard street until I have sometimes felt like sharing your fears for the future, and I tell you now that I never in my life, before I got that letter, felt that I had the money power of Europe and America on the dead run. [Loud laughter.]

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Does the gentleman give his experience in that business transaction as the rule which governs the Republican party?

Mr. DOLLIVER. It is the experience of every farmer, of every business man, of every man in the least interested in the borrowing and lending of money.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. You do not seem to catch my question. I mean when you deceived that insurance company.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I did not deceive them at all; I simply bluffed them. [Great laughter on the Republican side.] Is there a Democrat in this House who has any scruples against that? [Renewed laughter.]

In other words, my countrymen, three years under the Administration of William McKinley has taken all of the terror out of the gold standard, not only for the Republican party, but for the industrious millions of America. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMS. I thought you said that we had the gold standard since 1834.

Mr. DOLLIVER. But we have had several Democratic Administrations in the meantime, and I am talking now about the effect of the last election and about our desire and purpose to give expression in the law to the verdict of the people taken three years ago. I say frankly that it could not have been done two years ago or one year ago, but it can be done to-day by the unanimous vote of the Republican members of this House, because our pathway has been lit up by the experience of the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.] It is gratifying also to say that there is not a man on this side that is constrained by the action of the caucus, for the vote in the caucus was a unanimous vote if I may be pardoned for letting out a secret which I have already seen in the newspapers. [Laughter.]

Here, as the American people stand at the beginning of a new era, full of hope and courage, we propose to equip the business community with the best tool of exchange known to modern commerce. We propose to send our ships into all harbors, as we have raised our flag in the uttermost parts of the earth; we want it understood in Europe and America, in Africa, and in Asia, and in the islands of the sea that there is no longer any question as to what the standard dollar of the United States is. [Applause.] We want a draft on New York, expressed in dollars, drawn in Manila, to be as intelligible in the Orient as if drawn in pounds sterling on the Bank of England.

Wherever our fleets go, wherever our flag floats, we will place our dealings with the world above suspicion and beyond reproach. [Applause.] And so we are going to listen respectfully to your

speeches; and while we may smile to ourselves as you attack the hydra-headed monsters of Lombard street and of Wall street, we intend to quietly write in the laws of this country what has always been the practice of the Government, that every obligation of the United States shall be paid in gold.

When a man comes to the counter of our Treasury we are going to lay down two coins before him, the gold dollar and the silver dollar. We will say to him, "There are our coins; they are exactly of equal value; one is the standard and the other is at par with the standard; the credit of the United States, all that we are, all that we have, is pledged to make one just as good as the other; take your choice. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill is presented as the caucus measure of the Republican party. That party is in possession of both the executive and legislative branches of the Government. It is therefore safe to assume that the bill contains all the combined wisdom of the greatest minds in the dominant party upon the subject of finance; in other words, that it is the very best upon that subject of which you gentlemen on the other side of the House are capable. Were you capable of anything better, I fancy that you would have lost no time in telling us so. I represent a constituency in the city of New York that will probably be as vitally affected by the passage of this bill as will any in the the United States. If I am to vote for it, I must be convinced not only that it does no harm, but that it does good, and that it improves existing conditions. There is a class of men who sincerely believe that all ills can be remedied by legislation; that no evil can be so great that an act of Congress will not set it right. I believe that one of the curses of our couuntry is too much legislation, and that unless positive, actual good can be accomplished it is better to let well enough alone.

I take it that the purpose that has actuated the majority in introducing this bill, that has set them tinkering with our national finances, that has caused them to proceed in this extraordinarily hasty and indecent manner, is the ambition to live up to a certain pledge said to be contained in the last Republican national platform. I confess that it is a helpful and a hopeful sign that the Republican party is willing to live up to any promise whatsoever. [Laughter.] Hastily conceived and crudely drawn, its consequences unweighed and its results unknown, the Republican majority is to be dragooned into voting for this bill in proof of the alleged conversion of its leaders from the Republican bimetallism of 1892 to the new doctrine of Republican monometallism of 1896.

I do not wish it understood that I advocate the present system of bank-note currency. The first direct consequence of the enactment of this bill will be a very great rise in the market price of Government bonds. Let me illustrate by one class of bonds. In 1895, when the then President of the United States was negotiating with the so-called "bond syndicate" for the issue of a fifty-million-dollar loan, the gentlemen who composed that syndicate agreed to take a 3 per cent gold bond at par instead of a 4 per cent coin bond authorized by the act of January 14, 1875, at 104½. In other words, in their opinion, and it is conceded that they are the shrewdest, ablest financiers living, a 4 per cent coin bond at 104½ is equal in value to a 3 per cent gold bond at par. Now, the enactment of the bill before the House will at once make all our coin bonds gold bonds, and according to the theory of the bond syndicate, which I am unwilling to dispute, a 4 per cent coin bond at 104½ will be equal in value to a 4 per cent gold bond at 133½; but the coin bonds that were issued at 104½ are now worth in the market 134. So that by this reasoning the substitution of the word "gold" for the word "coin" must increase their market price to 171, an increase of 27½ per cent. If this be true in reference to this one issue, it will necessarily be true in reference to all our outstanding coin bonds.

It may be said in answer to this that my figures are exaggerated and that our coin bonds are to-day virtually gold bonds and selling on a gold basis, and that the substitution of the word "gold" for the word "coin" will not increase their market value. If this is true, then our credit is not nearly as good as is that of Great Britain, a proposition that I fancy no member of this House will care to indorse. The average price of British consols during the year 1897 was a trifle under 113. Were the interest increased to 4 per cent the consol would be worth 164½; yet the consol is not by any manner of means as desirable a bond, even at the same rate of interest, as our 1925 4 per cents will be when made gold bonds. If our 1925 4 per cents are to-day gold bonds, when reduced to the terms of consols they would be worth only 92, or $210 less, bond for bond, than consols.

I pass over the fact that the substitution of the word "gold" for the word "coin" will result in presenting an unearned bonus of $60,056,735 to the holders of the loan of 1925 alone. If this bill is of such vital importance to the country, as its supporters half-heartedly insist, the mere presentation to the national bondholders of an unearned premium of 27½ per cent should not be allowed to weigh against it. But let us consider what will be the effect of the rise in the market price of our bonds.

Another section of this bill permits our national banks to issue bank notes up to the par value of their holdings in United States bonds, instead of up to 90 per cent, as they are at present authorized, and substitutes a franchise tax for the present tax of 1 per cent on bank-note issues. Why? Because it is conceded, and rightly so, that the market price of Government bonds is to-day so high that it is more profitable for our national banks to sell their bond holdings and to reinvest the proceeds in other securities than it is to hold them as collateral for the issue of bank notes up to 90 per cent of the par value of their holdings. This bill proposes to increase the authorized issue of bank notes one-ninth, while at the same time it increases the market value of our bonds one-fourth. If it is unprofitable to-day to issue bank notes, how much more unprofitable will it be after the enactment of this bill?

Under present conditions for every 4 per cent bond of the issue of 1925 held by a national bank $900 in bank notes may be issued, which, if loaned at 4 per cent with the tax of 1 per cent deducted, means a profit of $27 a year; add to this $40 interest on the bond makes a total profit of $67. Were the bond sold at the market price and the proceeds, $1,340, invested at 4 per cent, the profit for the year would be $53.60, or only $13.40 in favor of the bank-note issue, scarcely enough to pay for the annoyance of submitting to the law in reference to bank-note issues.

By the proposed plan, for every 4 per cent bond of the issue of 1925 held by a national bank, $1,000 in bank notes may be issued, which, if loaned at 4 per cent with no tax deducted, would mean a profit of $40 a year; add to this $40 interest on the bond would make a profit of $80. Were the bond sold at what would be its market price, the word "gold" having been substituted for the word "coin," and the proceeds, $1,710, invested at 4 per cent, the profit for the year would be $68.40, or only $11.60 in favor of the bank-note issue and $1.80 less than under existing conditions. Instead of increasing the number of banks of issue, this bill, if enacted, will reduce them to the vanishing point, and cause the disappearance of the $343,842,068 in bank notes outstanding December 1, 1899, and the consequent contraction of the currency to that extent.

A glance at the following table will make my meaning clear:

UNDER PRESENT SYSTEM.

Interest on one bond at 4 per cent	$40.00
Bank lends $900 in notes at 4 per cent	36.00
Total	76.00
Less 1 per cent tax	9.00
Net profit for one year	67.00
Bank sells bond and invests proceeds, $1,340, at 4 per cent.	53.60
Difference in favor of bank-note issue	13.40

UNDER PROPOSED SYSTEM.

Interest on one bond at 4 per cent	$40.00
Bank lends $1,000 in notes at 4 per cent (no tax)	40.00
Net profit for one year	80.00
Bank sells bond and invests proceeds, $1,710, at 4 per cent.	68.40
Difference in favor of bank-note issue	11.60

Or $1.80 less than and in favor of existing system.

During the debate I have heard this remarkable utterance:

There can be no contraction of the currency under this system, for the reason that either the note is in circulation, or, if redeemed, its equivalent is in circulation.

This statement is worthy of the ignorance that has inspired the bill. There are in circulation $405,253,656 Treasury notes and United States notes which, under the terms of this bill, must be redeemed in gold, and once redeemed not reissued except for gold. For the sake of argument, let us assume that the enactment of this bill will find as much gold in the Treasury as there was December 7, 1899; that is, $239,462,213.43.

This is an assumption which I think is entirely unwarranted, but I am willing to make it for the purpose of presenting the case for this bill in the most favorable light possible. When all this gold has been used for redemption purposes, there will still remain $165,761,443 of notes outstanding to be redeemed, and, moreover, the gold reserve must be brought up to the $100,000,000 mark. In other words, gold to that amount must be procured by the sale of bonds, and must necessarily be taken from the gold in circulation; so that by the most charitable view of this bill the circulation will be contracted $265,761,443, and the bonded debt of the country will have been increased by that amount at an annual cost of $7,972,843. This will mean a total contraction of $509,603,511.

In estimating the volume of the currency in a country it is necessary to take into consideration the check money, which in all civilized nations plays so important a part. It is necessary to consider the rapidity with which credit can be transferred by means

of an extended and sound banking system. Thus India, one of the most populous and also one of the poorest countries on earth, has a per capita circulation of $2.39; China a per capita circulation of $1.96—both almost ignorant of the use of check money and of banking facilities in our acceptance of the term; while France and Germany, much less populous, but far more prosperous and well provided with banks, have, respectively, per capita circulations of $35.19 and $19.38, without taking into account the very large amount of check money that circulates side by side with the legal-tender money.

The volume of currency necessary for the transaction of business in any country depends, not upon the size of the population, but upon the amount of that county's wealth. As it is impossible to estimate with any accuracy the amount of wealth in a country, it has become the custom, for the purposes of comparison, to express the amount of circulating medium in proportion to its population. While this is not always a safe measure of the amount of needed circulation, it is safe to say that in ordinarily prosperous times the per capita of circulation will represent the amount required in the ordinary transactions of business. On the 1st of December, 1899, the total circulation per capita in the United States was $25.85, which probably represents the smallest amount of circulation with which business can be carried on without resorting to temporary and clumsy makeshifts, such as clearing house certificates. As a result of the contraction which will be caused by this bill, the circulation per capita will be reduced to $19.21, or less than that of almost any other solvent country on earth, with the exception of the United Kingdom, whose banking facilities are far superior to our own and which possesses an elastic currency the like of which we have never known.

You have claimed that you were the friend of the business man in this country. You have insisted that, as a party, your one ambition was to make this country prosperous. Through no effort of yours the country is prosperous, and now you assume that you were the cause of its prosperity, but you are unwilling to let well enough alone, and propose to improve conditions which you had no part in bringing about. Any business man will tell you that one of the chief dangers to the prosperity of this country is the inelasticity of our present monetary system; that under present conditions our currency is not capable of expansion or of contraction to meet the needs of trade. Every man employed in trade realizes that he has constantly hanging over his head, threatening him with bankruptcy, the danger of "tight money."

If this is true in the great commercial cities, it is doubly a menace in sections of the country far removed from the money centers. You have the Government in all its branches; you have the power; you profess a philanthropic friendship for the business interests of this country; and yet, instead of trying to remedy the condition of affairs that exists to-day, you propose by this bill to make matters infinitely worse by withdrawing the only semi-elastic currency we have, by contracting the circulation 25 per cent, and by reducing the per capita to $19.21. The enactment of this bill, revolutionizing the financial system of the country from top to bottom, contracting the currency and reducing the per capita, will be followed by a money famine which must lead to the destruction of confidence and credit and to a commercial panic the like of which this country has never seen.

You are willing to risk all this; you are willing to sacrifice that prosperity which you claim has come because of you, and which we claim has come despite you; you are willing to ruin thousands and to plunge hundreds of thousands into undeserved poverty, light heartedly, unthinkingly, for the purpose of redeeming a platform promise, for the purpose of a little cheap political advantage. The results of the enactment of this bill will be, first, the making of our already inelastic currency still more rigid; second, the increase of our bonded debt over $265,000,000, and of our annual interest charges nearly $8,000,000; third, the contraction of the currency by over $509,000,000 and the reduction of the per capita circulation to $19.21; and, fourth, the substitution for the endless chain of greenbacks, as at present, of an endless chain of silver dollars, to be redeemed, reissued, and redeemed in gold as often as presented.

With a proper regard for my duty as a Representative from New York, with a conscientious desire to serve the best interests of my country, I can not bring myself to vote for this bill.

I have heard it said, Mr. Chairman, that some gentlemen on this side of the House, some sound-money Democrats, intend to vote for this bill, because they are convinced that by so doing they will aid the cause of sound money. I sincerely trust that I have been misinformed. I had firmly believed until recently that the Democratic party upon the floor of this House would present a united front in opposition to this bill. I had hoped that those who believe in the free coinage of silver at the fixed ratio of 16 to 1, without the aid or consent of any other nation, would have been joined by those who, while believing in bimetallism, doubt the possibility of maintaining the parity of the metals under free coinage. Sound-money Democrats, this bill does not aid the cause of sound money. I beg you, I implore you, before you resolve to cast your votes for it, bring to its consideration all the patriotism that is in you; ask yourselves if the passage of this bill will not be the end of all financial legislation, at least during our time; ask yourselves if the passage of this bill will not forever prevent a just and a proper reform of the currency; ask yourselves if this bill is not the severest blow that has ever been aimed at a sound financial system. And if, as I believe you will, you decide that this is a bad bill, and that its passage will not be for the best interests of the country, then stand up side by side with the party you all love and to which you all belong, and help to cast an undivided and a united Democratic vote against one of the worst pieces of legislation ever submitted to the United States Congress. [Loud and long-continued applause on the Democratic side.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HOPKINS having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, sundry messages from the President in writing were communicated to the House by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

The committee resumed its session, Mr. HEPBURN in the chair.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, I had not expected to detain the committee with any remarks this afternoon. I thought if I should speak at all it would be at a later stage in the course of this discussion. But it seems that no one upon our side is prepared to speak just now, and much of my time may be taken up in committee duties after to-day, and so, with the indulgence of my fellow-members, I will address myself, hurriedly and necessarily imperfectly, to the pending question.

One might wonder, at first impression, as to what is the reason for the legislation now proposed; from whence comes the call for its enactment. But if at all acquainted with the history of the country in recent times you would have no difficulty in answering the query. The call does not come from the great mass of the American people; it does not come from the level of American citizenship; not from the producing elements of the country; but it comes from those who hold the mortgage executed by the Republican party, for value received, in 1896—from those who have been clamorous for fulfillment of the promises then so lavishly made to them.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], who was eloquent and interesting, as he always is upon every subject on which he speaks—Mr. DOLLIVER says that with gold so plentiful the money question has grown stale and unprofitable in his estimation. He says he thinks that in July, 1896, the general belief prevailed throughout the country that the forces which gave to the world the promise of a battle royal upon the lines drawn by the people at Chicago were sure to win. He tells us that as he then saw us rally around the standard of that magnificent specimen of manhood and democracy, William J. Bryan, of Nebraska [applause on the Democratic side], he thought we were about to sweep the country, and that victory was destined to perch upon the banner of that champion of the people. He says that but a short time afterwards, in the progress of the discussion of the money question which took place among the people of the country, enlightened by the politicians of his own party, the whole aspect of the question was changed, especially when a voice came to the people from Canton, Ohio, promulgating a doctrine just the reverse of that which Bryan and his friends preached.

My recollection is not the same as that of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa. I think he is in error. My recollection is that owing to events, not necessary to discuss now, and which could not be treated properly in the very short time at my command, a very different condition of affairs then existed. The Republicans felt secure in their strength; thought themselves invincible; thought the victory theirs—the battle so one-sided as to be won even before it was fought.

It was not a change of opinion, brought about by reason and argument, as claimed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], that gave the victory of November, 1896, to his party; the battle was fought and won on an entirely different principle, and by other agencies.

Not ready to meet their opponents on the hustings, not prepared to discuss the momentous questions of the hour, man to man, with argument against argument, all the influences and agencies of concentrated wealth, the despotic power of employers in tyrannous control over the employed, were brought into play. The mechanic was threatened with the closing of the factory where he found work and wages. The man whose daily toil and its reward furnished daily subsistence for himself and his family was told he must face discharge and beggary if he did not support the cause which the gentleman from Iowa says was so abundantly sustained in argument. Out of the strong boxes, seldom opened at the call of distress, seldom opened when philanthropy and nobility of spirit are

abroad, from out of those strong boxes came great quantities of hoarded wealth, gathered by unjust laws and by the perversion and abuse of laws in themselves not wrong. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Frightened, scared, panic-stricken, your party mortgaged its soul and body, its present, past, and future, together with the substance of the people, in order to raise the means with which to overcome, not by the force of argument, not by right reason, not by an appeal to the nobler instincts of humanity, but by an appeal to all that is sordid, all that is selfish, all that is corrupt and tyrannical, the American manhood that followed the flag unfurled at Chicago. You gathered together the united influence of wealth and despotic control over the destinies of the many, and mortgaged yourselves and these United States to increase the hold of these classes upon the American public, if out of their abundant substance, if out of the storehouse of their vast power, aid would come and save you from the judgment and the ballots of the millions of unpurchased and untrammeled American citizens.

The appeal was not in vain. The mortgage can not be repudiated because the condition failed, because the consideration was lacking. You carried the election of 1896, not because you overbore us in the conflict of reason, not because you appealed to loftier sentiments of American manhood, or assured an expectant American public, looking only for what was right and just, that your policies were sounder and would bring more in fruition than ours, but because you had the corrupt and tremendous power of money, which you used unsparingly, and because you had the vast power of numerous corporations holding in control the destinies of thousands, aye, of millions, of toilers, and used that power without mercy. These powers, massed and gathered, won your victory of 1896, won it against a man who received in that election over a million votes more than were ever cast for anyone who battled in all the years past under the same standard that he bore. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Say what you can in glorification of that victory. If you are proud of it, we are doubly proud of the noble fight that we gave you, clean from start to finish. We were overborne, but we were not overborne in the field of logic. We were not overborne in the forum of morals. We were not carried down because you were right and because we were wrong, but because you summoned to your aid agencies mightier for the time being than the will of the unpurchased and the unpurchasable American citizens in opposition to you. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And now you come to fulfill the conditions upon which you won. In the years past you have hesitated and delayed; you have equivocated and quibbled. In 1896 you appealed to the people by your platform and, in all the Western and Southern regions of the country, by tongue and pen, as bimetallists, better and truer than we were. You asserted that you were going to bring bimetallism, the free coinage of silver, not in what you denominated the reckless way in which we advocated it, but in a safe, sound, secure way. You would send your commissioners abroad, to all the nations of the earth; would gather into one great bond all bimetallists, theoretical and practical. Then the mints would be opened. Then free coinage would be established and be maintained upon a safe, sound, and secure basis. Were you honest then or did you seek to deceive the people? If you were dishonest then, what evidence have you that you are honest now? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If you were honest then, what evidence do you bring that you are right now? But three short years have elapsed since your platform was made, in which you declared for free silver coinage by international agreement, which you solemnly pledged yourselves to promote, and yet you are now advocating precisely what, in all the South and West, you then repelled with scorn. There could not then be found in those regions a corporal's guard of you who claimed to be anything else than bimetallists. You were "safe" bimetallists, "sound" bimetallists, "bimetallists by the right route," "bimetallists upon the solid ground," "bimetallists who were going to carry the country to the double standard, not with jolts and jars and backsliding and danger, but steadily and securely, there to remain while the ages should roll on."

Now you are going to put the country upon the gold standard. You say it has been upon the gold standard since 1834. In the convincing language of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], if not upon the gold standard in 1834, surely then from 1853; and if not upon the gold standard in 1853, then unquestionably upon it in 1873; and I suppose, if perchance not entirely and indisputably upon it in 1873, then most certainly upon it yb your legislation of 1890. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If we are upon the gold standard and have been there, lo, these many years, do you suppose the people who hold the mortgage that you executed to secure the victory in 1896 have been clamoring merely for a shadow? Do they not know what they are asking, and have they no means of estimating what they will get? Do you impute to those people absolute idiocy? If they are to get nothing by this legislation, why do they ask it and why do you give it, in discharge of your great obligation to them, for giving you the victory in 1896 by corruption and by terror and by threats?

But are you really doing nothing in this bill? Is this bill a mere gentle bit of play, a mere exhibition of ability to plaster upon the statute book something new? Is there nothing in it? The gentleman from New York [Mr. MCCLELLAN], who has just delivered a most thoughtful address, has pointed out how you will be giving as a bonus—not perhaps as a bonus; for you promised it and were paid for giving it, but how you will be giving, all the same—to the holders of the obligations of the Government millions and millions of dollars, according to your own philosophy and declarations, and according to theirs, by the passage of this bill. Where is your right to do it? Where have you the warrant to place upon the American people an additional dime of burden without giving to them something in compensation for what you exact from them?

What right have you to put into the bonds of the United States now outstanding anything which will enable those who hold them, wherever dispersed the world over, to exact from the American taxpayer an additional farthing, or a farthing of one metal when he has the legal right to use another metal in payment? Where is your warrant or authority for it? Do you proclaim that you are going to create "confidence" in the Government while you boast of its credit? You have not the pitiful excuse that sufficed for the passage of the credit strengthening act of years ago, which for years and years worked hardship and wrong upon the people of this Union. You have no such pretense for this act. You say it does not matter whether the word "gold" is or is not in the bonds, whether issued or to be issued under this bill enacted into the law. But let me remind you, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCCLELLAN] has done, that when you issued these bonds the people who were to buy them—the bond mongers—told you that if you would write the word "gold" in the bonds they would give you more for them and that they would bring more on the market. The Congress of the United States refused to authorize the issue of gold bonds. Every obligation of the United States may be lawfully paid with silver dollars.

The most reckless of you will not dare deny that every obligation of the Government is payably in coin, whether of gold or silver. We have the right under the Constitution and under the law, the right in morals, the right in the courts, the right in fairness to the people, to discharge all these obligations by paying in gold coin or silver coin, or both, as may be best for us, we deciding.

Now, then, you are proposing to give many millions of dollars to these bondholders, to give them not of your own substance, but of the substance of the people of the United States. You are proposing now, when expenditures are mountain high, swelling far above the loftiest level of extravagance and waste ever reached at any time in the past—you are proposing now, not to check these expenditures in the interest of economy, not to stay this waste, but to give millions, tens of millions, hundreds of millions of dollars to those who hold the obligations of these United States of America which are to be met and discharged, principal and interest, from the toil and sacrifice and savings of our people—aye, often from what is necessary to feed and to clothe American men, women, and children.

By this innocent little bill this is to come to pass: All the obligations of the United States shall be discharged with gold, and then will be presented that beautiful spectacle—over the anticipation of which the gentleman from Iowa revels in blissful eloquence—when the creditor of the Government, approaching the Treasury of the United States, will have laid out for his inspection, to delight his hungry eyes and to increase the palpitation of his fluttering heart, the gold and the silver, and there he will be told, "Take your choice; one is just as good as the other, but the obligations are payable in gold, gold! gold!! The contract has been changed and changed in your favor. The option of the Government has been given away by the law of a profligate Congress. The option of the Government has been surrendered in payment of a party pledge and promise made years ago in order to carry an election which could not be carried by fair means. Take your choice, but the obligation is payable in gold!" How the gentleman from Iowa revels in the prospect, revels in the vision which spreads out before him, haunts him, perhaps, in his dreams of these money changers demanding gold for bonds payable in coin! The bonds are outstanding in every country and clime and are all provided for by existing law. It seems that the edict to change the contracts and the law has gone forth.

The Congress of the United States, by direction of the powers that control the dominant party, in pursuance of a pledge in the interest of the masters of the same party, is about to write "gold" into every contract existing, every contract to be made, public and private, thus adding greatly to the burdens of the masses of the people and donating to a privileged class, wherever its members may be, whether in this land or any land under the shining sun, the rich booty. Meanwhile the money question is no

longer of interest, you say, for eloquent and distinguished gentlemen like Mr. DOLLIVER find that it has palled upon the taste, has lost power over the imagination, and no longer holds the fancy of the fanciful.

By your bill the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to issue bonds at will. What more monstrous than to empower a single officer, not elected by the people even, but appointed by the President, to mortgage as often and as heavily as he shall please to do, and for no better or more urgent purpose than you disclose, all the men, women, and children and all the property in our great Republic, not only the persons and things in being, but millions of American citizens and billions of dollars worth of property yet to be!

By this same bill you make all debts, public and private, present and future, payable under existing law in "coin"—silver coin or gold coin—payable in gold coin alone. Why thus rob the public? Why thus rob the citizen in his private business affairs? Do you fancy you can do all this and escape the righteous vengeance which your misdeeds merit? May not the stern slogan of the voters, the inspired refrain of the ballots, be "Thou shalt not steal?"

The coin debts and obligations of to-day, both public and private, all the debts and moneyed obligations of all the to-morrows—you are determined to make "gold," the god of the Briton and your god by adoption, the exacting measurer of them all. Do not count too confidently upon popular toleration of such conduct.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] says you will listen to our remarks, but will vote solidly for the gold standard, bond-issuing, national-bank trust bill. He says that in the Republican caucus not a vote was thrown against this policy or this bill. I wish to nail that where it is, because the day is not far distant when in many of the Congressional districts of the United States, if I do not miss my guess, Republican members of this House will be found giving as their excuse and apology and justification for voting against the interests of their constituents and for this bill the caucus edict of their party and their duty to party. They will plead that their caucus overruled them, and that after a struggle valiant but vain they accepted the verdict, as in Republican duty bound. Out of the mouth of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] let there be confutation and confusion to each one of these hypocrites and pretenders. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side].

Every one of you from the prairies of the West, from the mountain States, from the States of the far North, from the South—every one of you voted in your caucus for the policy which you are ready now to vote for in the House. Do not go back to your constituents and plead the "baby act," do not talk about the lofty Republican party to which you belong and whine that you, as a dutiful member of that party, and humble at that particular time, bowed in obedience to the edict of your caucus, submitted to the decree of wise men in council. Go bravely back if you can, go honestly at least, and say, "I voted for this policy in caucus and I stand by it." Do it if you dare, and then when the Fifty-seventh Congress is organized there will not preside in that chair a gentleman of your party faith. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

There is great trouble, it seems, with some matters that appear in the book written by Mr. Bryan following the election of 1896, and called "The First Battle." The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] invested in that book at a bargain, and if the gentleman from Iowa reads that book he will know more than the gentleman from Iowa has furnished us evidence that he now knows. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

There has been a large quantity of gold produced in the last two years, we are told; the silver chimera has vanished into thin air and no longer has any interest for some gentlemen.

Coming down to the mathematical precision of the statistician from Iowa—and in using the word "statistician" I do not reflect on the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] [laughter]—the statistician from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] says that if the mints of the nation had been open to free coinage only about 150,000,000 silver dollars, the depreciated dollars, the 40-cent dollars, as the gentleman denominates them, would have been coined in three years and rolled out and put in circulation among the people, while wonders have been wrought, he says, during the beneficent reign of the amiable person to whose "little vine-clad porch at Canton, Ohio," were carried, at no expense to themselves, carloads and train loads of men, in order to affect the result of the election, by creating an appearance of unanimity concerning vine-clad porch sentiments. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Who does not know that mints are made with ease and that our mint capacity could be increased at will?

It was contended in 1896 that prices, in a general way, depend upon the quality of money available to measure the commodities sold and for sale. In 1899 the gentlemen on the other side indorsed that theory, by proclaiming that there is now no need of silver coinage; that now the gold standard may be firmly established, because there is a larger quantity of money in the country than there was before. Who was right in 1896 upon this point? The gentleman from Iowa says that in 1896 there was great scarcity of money; that it was locked up and could not be had; that prices were low and times were hard. Money is abroad now, he says, and everything is prosperous, prosperity abounding, prosperity universal, the idle man, if industrious, something that can not be found, a vanished goblin of the past, a shadow that flitted before our vision, but is gone, leaving the beneficent radiance of McKinleyism absolutely unobscured. In 1896, I say, it was contended by those who rallied around the banner of William J. Bryan that when you increase the quantity of primary money in the country you increase the level of prices. In 1899 the gentlemen who then opposed that theory say the volume of money is increased, and prices are advanced, to the extent that it is not necessary to resort to silver coinage for more money; and now they are bold enough and expectant enough, in remembrance of favors past, to support the pending gold-standard bill.

You take credit for the discoveries in the Klondike. You put upon your own credit side of the ledger all that has been gathered from the golden sands of southern Africa. All that came from the wondrously rich mines of Cripple Creek you simply appropriate as either produced or brought to light by the direct agency of that little vine-clad porch in Canton, Ohio. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

How long is this outpouring of gold to continue? Can some of your wise men tell us what the rate of increase will be; what the rate of decrease? In the history of the world many times the world has thought that there was about to be a plethora of the precious metals. Not alone has it been thought in some quarters that silver would be too abundant. Only a short time back certain nations of the world, as you know, alarmed at the great discoveries of that metal in California and Australia, demonetized gold upon the ground that gold was going to become too plentiful to be useful for a money metal.

How long is the gold output to continue? Do you know? The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] says that we were very much at fault in 1896 because no one could say precisely and absolutely what would be the effect of restored free silver coinage. We showed you by the light of history the ground of our hope and belief. We gave to you facts from the lips and the works of historians, living and dead, as to what had been done. We gave you the history of the centuries. We asked you to behold the landmarks of the ages. We said that what had been done through a long series of years, what transpired in the flight of the centuries, we believed could be made to happen again.

You are now in a place where you are to do some prophesying. How much gold is to be produced next year, and how much the year after, and how much the year after that? How much gold is necessary in this country? Has the level been reached? If not, when will it be reached? It would be like idle children playing upon the seashore, making marks in the sand to be obliterated, one after another, by each incoming wave, for you to enter upon that field of conjecture. All of history is against your proposition that gold is going to be produced in enormous quantities for any considerable period of time. But if it should be; if, contrary to all the experience of men, contrary to the reasonings which the facts of past ages give us, gold should be produced in vast quantities for a considerable period of time, those of you who survive the deluge that you are inviting, those of you who escape from the waters which you are about to let loose, and who return here when that condition of things exists, will be found loud and clamorous for stopping the coinage of gold.

I believe this country never has suffered, never will suffer, from a superabundance of good, sound legal-tender money. I am one of those who believe, and my reading of history sustains me in that belief, that the world never has known the day or the hour, nor man a country or section of a country or a spot in a country, where there has been real genuine suffering or hardship because of the existence of too much primary money, too much money of final redemption, too much money, the measure of all things that pass in the commercial world by purchase and sale. Do you know of such a country? If you do, enlighten those of us who do not, please, by giving us some of the facts in relation to it. I know and you know of times even in our own short experience—not to go beyond that, not to trust to the words of others, as found in history—you and I ourselves know of times of direst distress prevailing from shore to shore, aye, the universe over, on account of the scarcity of money; when prices went down and business was stagnant, when men suffered for bread and were clamoring for work, all because of the scarcity of primary money.

How do you know and how can you know that the world is about to produce, or that the world has produced, a surplus of the materials out of which to make solid and substantial full legal-tender gold and silver money? That period never existed in the history of the world. How do you know it has come now? How do you know it is to come? How do you know it is in the near future or in the future at all? You do not know; you are merely making good your pledge to the money mongers.

How can your legislation be in the interest of the great public?

Is it not in the interest of the masses of the people to have money cheap, as compared with commodities, in order that commodities as compared with money may be comparatively high?

"But," says the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], "prices have advanced; prices are high." And, pray, tell us how have they advanced? Some of you are associated with trusts. Some of you know that prices have advanced, and that the trusts have advanced them in many lines. Wire nails and barbed wire and thousands of other things have advanced in price. They have advanced mightily, as every man must know who is interested in the profits of their production; as every man must know who is interested in the trusts that control them; as every one of the plain thousands and millions of the men who are compelled to buy these articles of prime necessity is compelled to know. Prices of some things have advanced; prices of some things are higher. What made them so? In many instances the trusts did it; not because of increased cost of production; not because of increased wages to those who produced the articles; not because of increased prices to those who furnished the raw material, but by bold robbery on the part of those who have formed the trusts, under the shadow and protection of the very people who are ready now by this bill to form a more gigantic trust, the trust of trusts, the central trust, the trust around which all others are expected to revolve, and to which all others are expected to gravitate. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

They tell us that prosperity prevails everywhere. Is that true? Are there not special reasons for its existence where it is found? Is it universal? On the contrary, is it not a fact that right in this city property can be bought to-day, in the sunlight of this bogus McKinley prosperity, for less money than it would command two or three or five years ago? There is not a State in the western or southern part of our Union where a great deal of property, in town and country, can not be bought to-day for less money than would buy it but a few years ago. There has been so much talk about prosperity being all-pervading and abiding that I am reminded of the people who are said, by telling frequently a thing which is not true, telling it with unction, finally to believe it themselves. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] Prosperity has been proclaimed here and there and everywhere. You proclaimed that it would come, and now you insist that it has come; that it is universal. Let your answer come, as come it will, from the hearthstones and from the ballots of the plain people of the land.

How many things have happened to produce this sporadic prosperity, prosperity here and there in spots? If three-fourths of all the buildings in this magnificent city were suddenly to be destroyed, vast prosperity would ensue in the building business and in the supply of all the materials necessary to build. Everybody able to buy would be forced to buy to replace what the ravages of the destroying element had robbed him of. Those unable to buy would be compelled to give place to those who could buy. The demand for labor would be intense. The pressure for building supplies, for all things most useful in the reconstruction of a desolated city, would be unprecedented. Every man who desired employment could secure it, and the would-be employer would not higgle with him as to the wages which he should receive. Would that be prosperity—making good again what had been lost, repairing the damage of the fire or flood or cyclone?

Gentlemen may forget that for some months this country has been at war. They may forget that a large share of the young men of the land went to Cuba and Porto Rico; that now many are in the distant Philippine Islands. They may forget that for months many thousands of these young men were detained in camps in this country, ready for departure to the seat of war, withdrawn from the active pursuits of life, consumers and no longer producers. You may recollect that there was an extraordinarily increased demand, an imperative demand, which had to be met at once, for all the various things necessary to equip and supply and sustain an army.

Munitions of war, clothing, food, means of transportation, were all in great demand. What could be the effect of all that but to increase activity in very many lines and, for the time being, to increase prosperity in all the avenues of trade, business, and manufacture into which that strongly imperative call went? Where is the evidence of prosperity outside of that? Where is the general building up, the general advancement, except that which comes from special reasons, easily traceable to causes which are temporary, which must pass with the events that called them into being? Be not too sure that while you prattle about prosperity, with wild speculators and reckless speculation all about you, the deep fires of a volcano which you fancy is extinct may not break forth suddenly, to spread financial panic and ruin far and wide.

One of the things that you propose to do in this bill is to take in and retire the greenbacks. How many of you who come from the States of the West, how many of you who have prated about the greenback being the creature of the Republican party and about the Republican party being its best friend, how many of you who have won your seats here by proclaiming love for that sainted money of the civil war, how many of you are going back to your constituents to admit that you, in caucus and in the councils of your own party, voted for and advocated the measure which takes in and destroys the greenback?

It will not do to say to me that you will pay out the greenbacks again. The object of your legislation is to take them in and give power to the Secretary of the Treasury to divert them from the channels of trade, to keep them from the people of these United States.

The silver dollars which you are going to redeem in gold are dollars in which every obligation of the Government may be paid. We know, and pardon us if we believe you must know, that you will grievously wrong American manhood when you make standard silver dollars—half a billion of them nearly—redeemable in gold. You are unmindful of your duty to the masses, the people of the United States, whose support you got in part by means that were corrupt and by coercion that was odious and un-American. Worse still, you are betraying the people, who regarded you as sincere in your declaration that you really did look to the welfare of the masses of American citizens and would be mindful of them when you could do your will here, and therefore supported you.

It is a huge bank trust which you are to create. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MCCLELLAN] thinks it will fail, because, he thinks, you are not offering sufficient inducement to the bondholders to tempt them to embark in the banking business. They think your legislation will enhance the value of the bonds by making them payable in gold, and you are depriving your countrymen of the right to use the silver half of the money of the country in paying them. Your scheme, however successful in the pockets and the minds of those who presented it, will be a bitter disappointment in its realization to the plain Republicans, who, forgotten by you, may forget you in turn or hold you in remembrance for deserved punishment.

You expect that a bank syndicate in the seat of financial empire in this country will be the sun of your new system and that around it will revolve as satellites the lesser banks. With a bank trust, mighty, far-reaching, almost omnipotent in financial affairs; with your other trusts, which you have created and foster in the interest of the Republican party, you may think you will be absolutely secure. It may be so. The special class to whom you appealed in 1896 see that their confidence was not misplaced, but are you secure, after all, in disregarding the interests and the rights of American citizenship? Will there not rise up against you in judgment your own words, speeches, platforms, and promises to the masses? The gentleman from Iowa says he does not care anything about that. He says he is not going to be held to what he did; not going to be held to what he said. [Applause.] Forgetful of what you said to your plain Republican constituents, indifferent as to them, you are keeping faith with the plutocratic mortgagees as if they alone gave you victory.

You say you are going to put this bill through by a unanimous Republican vote. You have taken your orders. The gentleman from Iowa says it has been whispered that they have taken their orders upon that side. The gentleman from Iowa says he has taken his orders—taken them from the farmers of the district in Iowa which he represents. Did those farmers call upon you to retire from their use, and the use of the American people, the greenbacks which you have lauded so many times and of which, though you were not the father, you have certainly made yourself, by speech, the step-father? [Laughter.] Did they call upon you for legislation to destroy the silver dollar with which they transact their business and pay their taxes and debts? You are acting under orders, but you pretend to misunderstand the source of those orders. They come from elsewhere than the farmers. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This bill is your remedy for evils, when you say there are none. This is an assurance for the future, which you say is already assured us. You are following in the way blazed by Old England. You are in line with the English system, but not in one thing alone. Why, lately you have put yourselves in closer touch with England and sympathize with her in her schemes of spoliation. Only in individual cases do you sympathize with the Boers of South Africa in their struggle for liberty against that country which smothered liberty in Ireland and has struck it down in every quarter of the globe. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

You are abandoning the aspirations of the people of these United States to be free themselves and to help others to freedom, aspirations as lofty and as noble as any that ever inspired man since the morning stars sang together. We were once a liberty-loving, liberty-respecting nation. We were an inspiration and an encouragement to other people. Now your sympathies are with those who are trying to crush out liberty and your proudest boast is that you are engaged in the business yourselves. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

You may think that everything is bright for you. You may think that 1900 can have no fears for you; that the battle is already

won. But recollect that the approval of those who can be bought by partial legislation may not compensate you for the loss of others who have followed your standard from a devotion to principle which they thought you shared with them and who will not follow you when convinced that those principles no longer animate you, if they ever did. [Renewed applause on the Democratic side.]

Do not count too securely upon the result in 1900. Recollect there will be gathered against you then men not drawn together under "orders," but coming as volunteers; men battling for homes and principles and liberty; men waging the fight that was waged in this country more than once in the century past; men standing upon principles proclaimed, defended, and illustrated by the bravest and best Americans that ever trod American soil. They will be there as volunteers; they will come from the farms and the shops, from the hills and from the valleys; and it will be a mighty host. Against them you may throw successfully your cohorts purchased by payment actually made and promises of things to be done, and then again you may not.

I have great reliance in American manhood when once aroused. Do not think that this defiance of their rights, this throwing to the winds of your own promises and your own professions, this legislation for classes against the masses, this iniquitous measure, will go unchallenged. Money again will be talked about at the fireside. Men will be gathered upon the street corners again. Again they will be making the gestures that the gentleman from Iowa made so artistically. Again the plain people will be found in conversation, in discussion; and these little groups, let me warn you, will assemble East and West and North and South, and great meetings will grow from them; and they will not assemble to praise or thank you. You may find that all the British friendship you have gathered in your endeavor to ingratiate yourself with the old "mother" who tried to strangle us in our infancy [laughter on the Democratic side], to assassinate us in the days of our youth, and who now, through you, is using us may fall short of your needs.

All the help you can get from corporations, with all the power of the money which you give them out of the people's purse, expecting that a goodly portion of it will be used for your benefit—all this superadded may not be enough. We will appeal to American manhood, to American patriotism. We will have again abroad in this land a spirit of inquiry and earnest discussion. Do not flatter yourselves that when the great conflict of 1900 is on we shall not be heard from; and let me warn you that when the battle is fought and the victory won it may not be necessary to go to the White House or to the "vine-clad cottage" at Canton, Ohio, with congratulations, but across the mighty Mississippi and over the prairies of the great West to a modest little home in Lincoln, Nebr. [Great applause on the Democratic side.]

The hour of 5 o'clock having arrived, the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HEPBURN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House bill No. 1 "to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes," and had come to no resolution thereon.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the following resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations be authorized to have printed and bound all documents for use of said committee that it may deem necessary in connection with subjects in relation to appropriations being considered, or to be considered, by the said committee during the Fifty-sixth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolution was agreed to.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present for reference to the appropriate committee, when organized, a certain concurrent resolution of the State of Texas, requesting the calling of a constitutional convention to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States when a sufficient number of States shall concur therein. Inasmuch as this is a matter of some importance, I wish to ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. And not for reference to a committee?

Mr. LANHAM. And to be referred to the appropriate committee when appointed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas requests that the resolution be printed in the RECORD for the information of the House. Is there any objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The resolution is as follows:

Concurrent resolution, S. C. R. No. 4.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

Whereas the Constitution of the United States of America provided that Congress, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments to said Constitution:

Therefore, we, the senate of the State of Texas, the house of representatives of the State of Texas concurring, do hereby petition and request the Congress of the United States of America to call a convention for proposing amendments to said Constitution as soon as the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States of the United States of America shall concur in this resolution by applying to Congress to call said convention.

Be it further resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and is hereby, directed to send a copy of this resolution to the Congressmen from Texas, and to the governor of each State at once, and to the legislatures of the several States as they convene, with a request of them to concur with us in this resolution.

D. H. HARDY, *Secretary of State.*

Approved June 5, 1899.

COMMERCIAL ATTACHÉS TO EMBASSIES AND LEGATIONS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the consideration of Congress, a communication from the secretary of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, inclosing resolutions unanimously adopted by that chamber on June 1, 1899, requesting legislation authorizing the appointment of commercial attachés to the principal embassies and legations of the United States.

WILLIAM McKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, December 11, 1899.

NORWEGIAN STEAMSHIP NICARAGUA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, as a case not acted upon by the Fifty-fifth Congress, a report from the Secretary of State, and accompanying papers, relating to the appeal for indemnity addressed to the equitable consideration of the Government of the United States by the owners and late master of the Norwegian steamship *Nicaragua*.

WILLIAM McKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, December 11, 1899.

BUREAU OF AMERICAN REPUBLICS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Printing:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit a communication from the Secretary of State, inclosing the annual report of the Director of the Bureau of the American Republics, with accompanying documents.

The attention of Congress is called to the request of the Secretary of State that 2,500 copies of the report be printed for the use of the Bureau.

WILLIAM McKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, December 11, 1899.

NORWEGIAN STEAMSHIP ALBERT.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, as a case not acted upon by the Fifty-fifth Congress, a report from the Secretary of State, and accompanying papers, relating to the claim of Capt. B. Telefsen, of the Norwegian steamer *Albert*, against the Government of the United States for $998.90, being the expenses incurred by him in consequence of a violation of article 13 of the treaty of commerce and navigation of 1827 between the United States and Sweden and Norway.

WILLIAM McKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, December 11, 1899.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Leave of absence was granted to Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine, indefinitely, on account of important business.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE ERMENTROUT.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have been delegated by the Congressional delegation from my State to announce the death of Hon. DANIEL ERMENTROUT, a Representative from the Ninth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, which took place on the 17th of September. He was a member of the Forty-seventh, Forty-eighth, Forty-ninth, Fiftieth, and Fifty-fifth Congresses.

I move the adoption of the resolutions I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The resolutions will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Hon. DANIEL ERMENTROUT, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to his memory the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to unanimously; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the commissioners to revise and amend the statutes relating to patents, trade and other marks, and trade and commercial names, transmitting a preliminary report—to the Committee on Patents, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Tonawanda Harbor and Creek, New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Bass River Harbor, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of the banks of the Ohio River at or near New Liberty, in Pope County, Ill.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Cottage City, Mass.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of a channel from Lake Michigan to Stony Lake, Oceana County, Mich.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Two Islands or Saxton, Minn.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of the Ohio River bank from Mound City to Cairo, Ill.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Sandwich Harbor, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Winthrop Harbor, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of a canal in the Colorado River, in Matagorda County, Tex.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Patchogue River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the annual report of the Board of Ordnance and Fortification—to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Attorney-General submitting certain estimates of deficiency appropriations—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of State, referring to Congress the subject of the alleged deficiency in the *Virginius* indemnity fund—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a special estimate of appropriation for observation of eclipse of the sun of May 28, 1900—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the findings of the Comptroller of the Treasury in the case of P. S. Corbett—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department requesting an additional allowance for the services of skilled draftsmen, civil engineers, computers, accountants, etc.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a copy of the report of a board of visitors to the United States Naval Observatory for the year 1899, with a favorable recommendation of its contents—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Quartermaster-General of the Army, calling attention to the necessity of continuing the suspension of provisions of the act of June 7, 1898—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Treasurer of the United States, submitting petitions from the compositors and from pressmen in his office for an advance in their pay—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the custodian of dies, rolls, and plates, Bureau of Engraving and Printing, in relation to an increase of the salaries of the custodian and his force and a change in the designation of the employees—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the commissioner of the Freedman's Savings and Trust Company, transmitting the annual report for the year ended December 2, 1899—to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, relating to the purchase of the Gerdom patent gas check—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting letters from the Quartermaster-General and Surgeon-General of the Army calling attention to the urgent necessity for continuing the suspension of the provision of the law for the examination of monthly accounts by bureaus and officers of the War Department—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the petition of Joshua Bishop, commander, United States Navy, retired—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Jacob B. Carwell against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Augustus S. Shaver, administrator of James Mathews, deceased, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Josephine Andersen, administratrix of Thomas Andersen, deceased, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Sarah R. Maclin, for herself and as administratrix of Benjamin P. Maclin, deceased, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Nancy H. Beans and Rebecca H. Beans, executrixes of Isaiah B. Beans, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of I. A. McSpadden, administrator of Cyrus A. Humphries, deceased, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Charles Posey against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of David L. Harris, administrator of Leah Bray, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of William B. Fleeman against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Charles M. Wells, administrator of Martha L. Wells, deceased, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of W. T. Lynch, administrator of Henderson Lynch, deceased, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of White B. Campbell, administrator of James Campbell, deceased, and others, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of John

Young against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of J. D. Sanders, administrator of Isaiah Sweat, deceased, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of John Beets, administrator of George W. Beets, deceased, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Isaac W. Lewis against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Hugh N. Kirby, administrator of James Bundren, deceased, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of G. M. Barber against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of preliminary examination of Arcadia, Mich.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Isaac Young against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 3330) providing for construction of a Pacific cable—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHOWALTER: A bill (H. R. 3331) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Newcastle, in the State of Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 3332) for the construction of a public building at Owosso, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 3333) to regulate the use of the contingent fund of the House in the payment of the funeral expenses of deceased members—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 3334) to amend section 3005 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 3335) for the erection of a new public building at Burlington, Vt.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 3336) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Cordele, in the State of Georgia, and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3337) for the erection of a public building at the city of Hawkinsville, Ga., and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3338) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Fort Valley, in the State of Georgia, and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3339) for the improvement of the Ocmulgee River, Georgia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 3340) for the erection of a public building at Baraboo, Wis.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 3341) relating to widows' pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 3342) to open a street through block 205, from Fourteenth street to Fifteenth street NW., concurrent with the streets in the adjacent blocks called "Wallach place" and "Caroline street," and so forth—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3343) to regulate the service and fix the hours of service for persons employed as policemen, firemen, and officers in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 3344) to divide the State of Washington into two judicial districts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 3345) to provide for the erection of a public building at Lawrence, Kans.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 3346) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Mason City, Iowa, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HENRY of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 3347) making appropriation for continuing improvement of Pearl River, Mississippi—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BELLAMY: A bill (H. R. 3348) to repeal the duty on wood pulp and all other material used in the manufacture of printing papers and writing papers, and to reduce the duty on manufactured printing papers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 3349) concerning the naming of naval vessels after States—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ZENOR: A bill (H. R. 3350) for the establishment of a military post at the Falls of the Ohio—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEYER of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 3351) to provide an American register for the steamer *Esther*, of New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 3352) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to increase the pension of pensioners on attaining the age of 64 years—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LORIMER: A bill (H. R. 3353) to establish a postal savings depository system and to provide for the conduct and regulation of the same—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 3354) for a public building for a marine hospital at Buffalo, N. Y.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FLYNN (by request): A bill (H. R. 3355) to enable Indians to obtain patents for their lands—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas (by request): A bill (H. R. 3356) to enforce certain contracts entered into between citizens of the United States and the Indians of the Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Texas: A bill (H. R. 3357) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building in the city of Corsicana, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3358) to provide for the erection of an addition to the United States post-office in the city of Dallas, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3359) to limit the jurisdiction of the district and circuit courts of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3360) to establish a branch of the United States circuit and district courts for the northern district of Texas at the city of Corsicana—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3361) to prohibit the payment of anything for expenses in election-contest cases, and to repeal all laws allowing expenses for the same—to the Committee on Elections No. 3.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 3362) to create a permanent reservation on Annette Island, southeastern Alaska, for the use of the Metlakahtla Indians and other natives of Alaska—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 3363) to establish a national military park at the battlefield of Stones River—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 3364) to establish the compensation for the collector of customs for the district of Richmond, Va.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 3365) to extend and make flexible national-bank currency, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 3366) to remove the limitation in the payment of arrears of pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3367) to restore the rights of certain militiamen, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3368) to remove the limitation in the payment of arrears of pensions on account of gunshot wounds received in the service in the line of duty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3369) to put in force in the Indian Territory certain provisions of the laws of Arkansas relating to corporations,

and to make said provisions applicable to said Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3370) in regard to the employment of ex-Union soldiers, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 3371) pensioning the widow of one who served as an officer or enlisted man in the military or naval service of the United States, and who was permanently disabled by the loss of a limb in battle, granting to the widow the same rate of pension as was granted to her husband in his lifetime—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 3372) providing for authority to copy the muster rolls of Confederate armies—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3373) providing for the extension of the national cemetery, on the Williamsburg turnpike, near the city of Richmond, Va.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: A bill (H. R. 3374) for the establishment of a light-house at the mouth of Oyster Bayou, near the Louisiana coast, in the Gulf of Mexico—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 3375) to increase the pension of certain soldiers, sailors, and marines—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 3458) for the relief of certain State militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 3506) to provide for the erection of a monument for Joseph Anthony Mower—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 3533) to reimburse the depositors of the Freedman's Savings and Trust Company for losses incurred by the failure of said company—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PEARRE (by request): A bill (H. R. 3597) to incorporate the Frederick Douglass Memorial and Historical Association—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 3701) to restore to certain citizens the proceeds arising from the sale of their lands under the several acts levying direct taxes, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 3715) to place officers of the Army upon the same footing as regards retirement with officers of the Navy, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3716) for the erection of a public building at Marblehead, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHOWALTER: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 69) proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting polygamy and polygamous cohabitation within the bounds of a State or Territory of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 73) authorizing the printing of the report of the Nicaraguan Canal Commission—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. PAYNE: A resolution (H. Res. 32) requesting the Superintendent of Documents to furnish the House with certain copies of the Revised Statutes and supplement—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BULL: A resolution (H. Res. 33) authorizing the Committee on Accounts to designate committees to which session clerks should be assigned—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. DE GRAFFENREID: A resolution (H. Res. 34) requesting the Secretary of War to furnish statement of all contracts for river and harbor improvements entered into since May 12, 1898—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LENTZ: A resolution (H. Res. 35) proposing to extend the authority of the special committee authorized to investigate the right of B. H. Roberts to a seat in the House to also investigate certain postmasters in the State of Utah as to their eligibility to hold office—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POWERS: A resolution (H. Res. 36) for the appointment of a special messenger in and about the House—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. NORTON of Ohio: A resolution (H. Res. 37) to cause survey and estimate of cost of deepening and widening channel leading to and along harbor front, Sandusky, Ohio—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. JETT: A resolution (H. Res. 39) relative to the heroic struggles of the people of the South African Republic against cruelty and oppression—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Connecticut, concerning the naming of a battle ship *Connecticut*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SPRAGUE: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relating to a proposed amendment to the Constitution giving Congress authority to establish uniform hours of labor in manufactories—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 3376) for the relief of Franklin Lee and Charles F. Dunbar—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3377) for the relief of William F. Wheeler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3378) authorizing the Secretary of War to certify Frank D. White, late corporal, Company I, Two hundred and second Regiment New York Volunteers, for a position in the civil service—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. ADAMS: A bill (H. R. 3379) for the relief of Mrs. A. C. Wagner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: A bill (H. R. 3380) for the relief of the estate of Owen Conlen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3381) for the relief of the estate of Naphtalia Solomon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3382) for the relief of Eugene Augustin Bourcy, of St. Martin Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3383) for the relief of Auguste Alvarado, of Lafayette, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3384) for the relief of Edgar Breaux, of Lafayette Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3385) for the relief of Zachine Dugat, of Lafayette Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3386) for the relief of Balisaire Cormier, of Lafayette Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3387) for the relief of Mary M. Hopkins, of Lafayette Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3388) for the relief of Susan L. Bailey, of Lafayette Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3389) for the relief of estate of Louisa Breaux, deceased, late of Lafayette, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3390) for the relief of Mrs. Raymond Riu, of Lafayette Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3391) for the relief of Corrinne Perrett Fusilier—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3392) for the relief of John Ellis, of Vermilion Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3393) for the relief of the estate of Jean Crouchet, deceased, late of New Iberia Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3394) for the relief of estate of Jean Constantin, deceased, late of Lafayette, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3395) for the relief of estate of Mrs. Celestine Vavasseur, deceased, late of Lafayette Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3396) for the relief of the estate of John A. Rigues, deceased, late of Lafayette Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3397) for the relief of George Henderson, of Lafayette Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3398) for the relief of Valivien Martin, of St. Martin Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3399) for the relief of J. M. Charpentier, of St. Mary Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3400) for the relief of Natalie Bondrean, Lafayette Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3401) for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Hilbert, of Lafayette Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3402) for the relief of the estate of Charles A. Slack, deceased, late of Iberville Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3403) for the relief of Bennett Lilly, of Lafayette Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3404) for the relief of P. Emile Arceneaux, of Lafayette Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3405) for the relief of William Guchereau, of Lafayette Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3406) for the relief of the estate of Charles Armelin, deceased, late of St. Mary Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3407) for the relief of Louis Broussard, of Lafayette, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3408) for the relief of Louis Hymelle, of St. Martin Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3409) for the relief of Augustin Broussard, of Vermilion Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3410) for the relief of Arvillien Broussard, of Vermilion Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 3411) for the relief of R. P. Mitchell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3412) for the relief of John E. Barrett—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3413) to grant a pension to Nancy Dillard—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3414) to grant a pension to J. S. Grubb—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3415) for the relief of Samuel Greenlee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3416) for the relief of Wiley Cazart—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3417) to correct the military record of Isaac McQuinn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3418) for the relief of Solomon B. Tucker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3419) to grant a pension to Mrs. Lucinda Roberts—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3420) for the relief of Silas J. Grenade—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3421) for the relief of William M. Cox—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3422) for the relief of C. C. Speers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3423) for the relief of Henry P. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3424) for the relief of Newton Gray—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 3425) for the relief of E. W. and A. Cross, of Wakefield, R. I.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 3426) granting an honorable discharge to Jesse Dotts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3427) granting a pension to Florence E. Wilbur, of Lawrence, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3428) granting a pension to Emmet Gillooly, of Humboldt, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3429) granting a pension to Mary McLaughlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3430) granting a pension to William H. Deesler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3431) granting a pension to A. M. Templer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3432) granting a pension to Joseph Fipps—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3433) for the relief of the University of Kansas—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 3434) for the relief of the New England Distilling Company, of Covington, Ky.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3435) for the relief of L. H. Lyne & Co., late of Lynchburg, Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BAILEY of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 3436) for the relief of John Abel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 3437) granting a pension to Elam Kirk—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 3438) to correct the naval record of Joseph Pitt, alias Joseph Marr, of the United States steamers *Princeton* and *Sassacus*, and to erase the name of Joseph Marr and substitute the name of Joseph Pitt on the records of the United States Army—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3439) for the relief of the legal devisees of James W. Schaumberg—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 3440) for the relief of George W. Hale—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3441) to correct the record of Stephen W. Coakley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 3442) granting a pension to Mary E. Peters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 3443) for the relief of Peter, alias Louis, Heck—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3444) granting a pension to William G. Brooks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3445) for the relief of J. Ware Butterfield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3446) granting an increase of pension to Charles P. Judd, of Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3447) for the relief of L. H. Boyle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3448) for the relief of Hiram B. Hatten—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3449) for the relief of Uriah Barnes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3450) for the relief of William W. Burritt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3451) granting a pension to William Crossland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3452) for the relief of Regina Mayer—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3453) granting an increase of pension to Ralph Mulvane, of Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3454) granting a pension to Joseph E. Baldwin, of Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3455) granting a pension to Henry K. Winans, of North Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3456) granting a pension to John W. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3457) granting a pension to George Reynolds, of Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3459) for the relief of Miss Lou Jahn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3460) for the relief of Oliver J. Lyon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3461) granting a pension to George M. Horning—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3462) for the relief of J. W. Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3463) to pension Mrs. Catharine Shipley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3464) for the relief of John H. Tullis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3465) for the relief of Jerome Kunkel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3466) for the relief of Hiram Stimple—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROWLEY: A bill (H. R. 3467) granting a pension to Isaac Willingham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3468) granting a pension to Turner J. Bowling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3469) granting a pension to George W. De Wald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAPRON: A bill (H. R. 3470) granting an increase of pension to Capt. George W. Weeden, of Olneyville, R. I.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 3471) for the relief of John Edenburn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHICKERING: A bill (H. R. 3472) for the relief of Timothy Sullivan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 3473) for the relief of Samuel Sentenne—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 3474) for the relief of John W. Vandine, of Halls Mills, Wetzel County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3475) to grant a pension to William W. Freeman, of Zinnia, Doddridge County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3476) to grant a pension to Jacob Hare, of New Cumberland, Hancock County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3477) to grant a pension to Willis Mollohan, of Caress, Braxton County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3478) granting a pension to J. A. J. Lightburn, Lewis County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3479) for the relief of John J. Robinson, of Endicott, Wetzel County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS: A bill (H. R. 3480) for the relief of John McGovern—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3481) granting a pension to Josephine A. Haley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 3482) for the relief of the vestry and church wardens of the Episcopal Church of the parish of St. Helena, in the State of South Carolina—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3483) for the relief of Mrs. Jane A. Sanders, widow of Edward W. Sanders, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 3484) for the relief of Thomas Bumstead, late of Company A, Fifty-first Wisconsin Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLYNN (by request): A bill (H. R. 3485) to correct and amend the military record of Stephen Helton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3486) to relieve John Friedlin from the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FREER: A bill (H. R. 3487) to pension Solomon Beck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3488) for the relief of the First Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Point Pleasant, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3489) to pension William H. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 3490) granting a pension to Freeman H. Farr—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3491) granting a pension to Melvina Greenawalt, widow of Abraham Greenawalt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3492) to correct the record of Isaac Kase, late Company G, Forty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, by removing the charge of desertion from the same—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 3493) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Morse, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: A bill (H. R. 3494) granting a pension to Nancy C. Tenant, widow of Samuel F. Tenant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3495) granting a pension to Levi G. Wilgus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, A bill (H. R. 3496) to pension John R. Dougherty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 3497) for the relief of the estate of S. N. Clark, deceased, late of Hinds County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3498) for the relief of the Roman Catholic Church of St. Peter's, at Jackson, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3499) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Nancy Mitchell, of Lincoln County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3500) for the relief of William M. Dotson, alias William M. Ilsley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (for Mr. WHEELER of Alabama), a bill (H. R. 3501) to pension Mrs. A. J. Bassett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3502) for the relief of the estate of W. W. Dunton, deceased, late of Hinds County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3503) for the relief of Mattie J. and W. P. Horn, heirs of Preston A. Horn—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3504) for the relief of Mrs. Rachael Vining—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 3505) for the relief of Louise Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 3507) granting a pension to Emily J. Stowell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3508) granting a pension to Mary Bell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 3509) for the increase of pension of Farnham J. Eastman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOY: A bill (H. R. 3510) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph Kulage, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 3511) to inspect and correct the accounts of certain employees of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 3512) to pension Rebecca G. Irwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: A bill (H. R. 3513) awarding a pension of $50 per month to Edwin Hurlburt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 3514) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. M. A. C. Kaigler—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3515) for the relief of George H. Sieg, a citizen of Americus, Sumter County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3516) for the relief of J. W. Holmes, a citizen of Americus, Sumter County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3517) granting an increase of pension to Marx Kunz, sr.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3518) granting an increase of pension to John H. Freeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3519) granting a pension to Leander F. McCoy—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3520) granting a pension to Adaline Simons—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 3521) for the relief of heirs of J. H. Dibble—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3522) for the relief of Lucy S. Bane—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3523) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas W. Brewer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3524) granting a pension to Fannie W. Williams—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3525) for relief of Mary Diamond—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3526) granting a pension to James M. Ellett—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3527) for the relief of the estate of Charles M. Roberts, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3528) for the relief of Louisa B. Blair—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3529) granting a pension to M. E. P. Bennett—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3530) granting a pension to M. A. Lucy—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3531) to authorize the Light-House Board to pay to Chamblin, Delaney & Scott the sum of $2,125—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3532) for the relief of the heirs of Samuel Ayers, of Virginia—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 3534) granting a pension to Alfred Le Valley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3535) granting an increase of pension to William Hopkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3536) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Ridenger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3537) for the relief of Morton A. Pratt—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3538) granting an increase of pension to Charles Ross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LORIMER: A bill (H. R. 3539) granting an increase of pension to John H. Osborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3540) authorizing the placing of the name of Joseph Hooker Wood upon the retired list of the United States Army with the rank of lieutenant-colonel of cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANE: A bill (H. R. 3541) for the relief of George Humphrey—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3542) granting an honorable discharge to James B. Mulford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3543) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Janes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 3544) to remove charge of desertion from the record of Charles Sandfordt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3545) granting a pension to Mrs. Ellen Hardin Walworth—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3546) granting a pension to Caroline M. H. Searing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3547) for the relief of John A. Whitman, a blind soldier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 3548) for the relief of W. R. Austin & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 3549) granting a pension to Ransom L. Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3550) for increase of pension of Henry W. Holden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3551) for increase of pension of William A. Hayes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3552) for the relief of Daniel J. Ockerson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3553) granting a pension to Watson Empson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3554) granting an increase of pension to Barnabas A. Bonham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3555) granting the Court of Claims jurisdiction to hear and determine Thomas Page's claim for Indian depredation—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3556) for increase of pension of Barton S. Dawson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3557) for the relief of Mrs. M. E. Halderman, widow of Francis Halderman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3558) to correct the military record of James Owens—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3559) granting George W. Wicks and his two children land in lieu of allotments and of annuities—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MEYER of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 3560) for the relief of the heirs of Myra Clark Gaines, deceased, of the parish of Orleans, La.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3561) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to refund certain moneys collected by the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 3562) granting a pension to Mary Jane McLaughlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3563) to grant a pension to T. Gilbert Floyd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3564) granting a pension to Nancy Ellen Bessom—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3565) granting a pension to Johanna E. O'Brien—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRIS: A bill (H. R. 3566) granting a pension to Louisa Hale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3567) for the relief of Charles E. French—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 3568) granting a pension to Sarah Maley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLMSTED: A bill (H. R. 3569) granting a pension to Mary Idle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3570) for the relief of Cyrus E. Salada—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3571) granting a pension to George W. Lehman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R.3572) for the relief of Samuel Feevy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3573) for the relief of Elizabeth Weaver, dependent mother of William H. Weaver, late captain of Company D, Twelfth Pennsylvania Reserves—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3574) for the relief of Jane E. Wox, widow of Anthony Wox, late private, Company K, Two hundred and tenth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3575) granting an increase of pension to William C. Mills—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3576) granting a pension to Emma Handshaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3577) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to correct the military record of Levi Sheetz—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3578) granting an increase of pension to John Sweesy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3579) granting a pension to Martin P. Schaffner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3580) granting a pension to Kate E. Keiser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3581) for the relief of David B. Zorger and H. C. Fitzgerald—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3582) for the relief of the heirs of Margaretta D. Fenn, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3583) granting a pension to Abram Heckendorn, of Harrisburg, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3584) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Michael Neidinger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3585) to remove the charge of desertion against John P. Leitzel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3586) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Francis Tomlinson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3587) for the removal of the charge of desertion standing against the name of John Keys—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3588) to correct the military record of Lieut. John W. Geiger, deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3589) for the removal of the charge of desertion standing against the name of John Brininger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3590) to correct the military record of John F. Kelly—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3591) to correct the military record of Joseph Betz—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3592) to correct the military record of John F. Geist—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 3593) authorizing the President to place the names of Julius R. Frederick, Henry Biederbick, Francis Long, and Maurice Campbell on the retired list with the rank, pay, and allowance of first-class sergeants of the Signal Corps of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OTEY: A bill (H. R. 3594) for the relief of E. H. Murrell—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 3595) for the relief of Elizabeth Thomas, of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 3596) for the relief of Elizabeth Thomas, of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 3598) to enable the President to restore Second Lieut. Henry Ossian Flipper to duty, rank, and status in United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 3599) for the relief of Lewis M. Millard—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PUGH: A bill (H. R. 3600) for the relief of the heirs of Ann H. Shaler, of Campbell County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 3601) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of Nathaniel Tillotson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3602) correcting the military record of Zebulon A. Cornell, alias James Cromwell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 3603) for the relief of Isaiah Berdine, Loudoun County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3604) for the relief of the trustees of the Waterford Baptist Church, Waterford, Loudoun County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3605) for the relief of the trustees of Broad Run Baptist Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3606) for the relief of Martha F. Rixey, of Culpeper County, Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 3607) for the relief of George A. Nowland, administrator of James B. Beaver, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3608) for the relief of the heirs of Benjamin Crump, of Culpeper County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 3609) to grant pension to Agnes B. Hoffman, as widow of William G. Hoffman, late first lieutenant Third United States Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 3610) for the relief of Thomas M. Emerson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3611) for the relief of Joseph H. Thompson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3612) for the relief of C. C. Lowe, of Rutherford County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3613) for the relief of Dobson Johnson, of Dekalb County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3614) for the relief of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Fayetteville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3615) for the relief of J. M. Carney, of Franklin County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3616) for the relief of Barclay M. Tillman, of Bedford County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3617) for the relief of William F. Cowan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3618) authorizing the heirs of Benjamin Lillard, of Tennessee, to present their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3619) to pay the heirs of Benjamin Lillard, of Tennessee, for property lost, destroyed, taken, and used by the United States forces during the late war—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3620) authorizing Musadora, Victoria, Ella, and Frank Wasson, of Tennessee, to present their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3621) granting a pension to James M. O'Neal, soldier of Indian war—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3622) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Jordon H. Moore—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3623) for the relief of L. D. Sugg, of Lincoln County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3624) for the relief of J. H. Blackburn, Dowelltown, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3625) granting a pension to Tempier Goodson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3626) for the relief of James C. Hoover, of Rutherford County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 3627) granting an increase of pension to Freeman C. Stanton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3628) granting an increase of pension to Katherine Taylor Dodge—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3629) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Redding—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. H. 3630) granting a pension to Annie W. Coit—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3631) to correct the military record of Edwin T. Leach—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3632) to correct the military record of Charles H. Hawley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 3633) for the relief of H. Clay Hall—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3634) to amend the military record of Sylvester W. Barnes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 3635) granting an increase of pension to Timothy B. Eastman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3636) granting an increase of pension to George A. Libby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3637) to increase the pension of Ellen C. Abbott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHOWALTER: A bill (H. R. 3638) granting an increase of pension to John G. W. Book—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3639) to increase the pension of James Graham, a veteran of two wars—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3640) granting a pension to Mary Pollock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3641) granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. McCabe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3642) granting an increase of pension to Adolphus Lavine, late of Company I, One hundred and sixty-ninth New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3643) to correct the military record of John B. Dininger, late of Company D, Eighty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3644) appropriating $300 to Peter Fennell, late of Company H, One hundred and ninety-ninth Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3645) appropriating $100 to John M. Turner, of Butler, Pa., late of Company E, Seventy-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 3646) for the relief of William Chilton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3647) for the relief of Calvin R. Rutherford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 3648) to increase the pension of Charles W. Little—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3649) to increase the pension of William Percival—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3650) to pension Eliza Wilson, mother of Clark L. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A bill (H. R. 3651) placing James W. Long, late a captain, United States Army, on the retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3652) to renew certain letters patent—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. SNODGRASS: A bill (H. R. 3653) for the relief of Willis Cromwell, of Tennessee—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3654) for the relief of Calvin Myers, of Overton County, Tenn., a soldier in the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 3655) granting a pension to Mrs. Margaret Burns, as widow of Peter Burns, late of Company F, Twenty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 3656) granting a pension to Mary A. Beuchat—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3657) granting a pension to Elizabeth Mayes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3658) granting a pension to Catherine Broughton, dependent mother—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3659) granting a pension to L. Emma Boone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3660) granting a pension to Franklin I. Gilbert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3661) restoring to the pension rolls the name of Mary A. Rusher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3662) granting a pension to John D. Lindsay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3663) to authorize the payment of commutation to David Jones—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3664) granting an honorable discharge to Jacob Metzger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3665) granting an honorable discharge to Elias May—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3666) granting an honorable discharge to Jacob Longacre—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3667) granting an honorable discharge to David Clancy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3668) for the relief of William W. Crissinger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3669) granting an honorable discharge to David Harrington—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3670) granting an honorable discharge to William Hartzell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3671) granting an honorable discharge to Benjamin F. Hildenbittle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3672) granting an honorable discharge to James Ammerman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3673) granting an honorable discharge to George G. Patterson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3674) granting an honorable discharge to Joseph Price—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3675) granting an honorable discharge to Frank H. Sefton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3676) granting an honorable discharge to William Sinclair—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3677) granting an honorable discharge to George W. Thorn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3678) granting an honorable discharge to John B. Hosteau—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3679) granting an honorable discharge to Phillip Kurtz—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3680) granting an honorable discharge to Archie Downey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3681) granting an honorable discharge to Jacob S. Wedley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3682) granting an honorable discharge to David J. Albaugh—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3683) granting an honorable discharge to Henry Wernet—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3684) granting an honorable discharge to William Kynett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3685) granting an honorable discharge to Mathew Healy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3686) granting an honorable discharge to James Boyle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3687) granting a pension to Julia Yates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3688) granting a pension to William Embley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3689) granting pension to Daniel L. Saeger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3690) extending the term of patent No. 227024—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3691) granting a pension to Thomas Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 3692) to fix the status of certain officers of the Army and Navy at time of their discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3693) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Sanford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3694) granting an increase of pension to James Bottoms—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WACHTER (by request): A bill (H. R. 3695) for a pension for James E. Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: A bill (H. R. 3696) for the relief of Mary R. Frost—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 3697) for relief of estate of John Dear, deceased, of Attala County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3698) for the relief of the legal representatives of Benjamin Roach, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3699) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of John Willis, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 3700) to increase the pension of Frank Podom—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 3702) granting a pension to Elizabeth F. Wolfley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3703) granting an increase of pension to Ellis P. Phipps, late lieutenant of Company A, Twelfth New Jersey Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZENOR: A bill (H. R. 3704) granting a pension to Bridget A. Kelly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 3705) granting a pension to Almeda Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 3706) for the relief of Jerry S. Fish, of Cameron, Marshall County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3707) for the relief of William D. Anderson, of Walkersville, Lewis County, W. Va., late private of Company A, Tenth West Virginia Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3708) to pension Asa Moneypenny, of Cox Mill, Gilmer County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3709) to pension Hiram Rollins, of West Union, Doddridge County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3710) granting a pension to William H. Sehon, of Harrison County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3711) for the relief of Henry P. McMasters, late private of Company F, One hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3712) for the relief of Jacob W. Hudson, of Weston, Lewis County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3713) for the relief of Michael Shepherd, of Halls Mills, Wetzel County, W. Va., late private of Company D, Forty-second Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3714) for the relief of Elizabeth Muhleman, widow, and the heirs at law of Samuel A. Muhleman, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOY: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 70) for the relief of Felix H. Hunicke—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 71) recognizing the gallantry of Frank H. Newcomb, commanding the revenue cutter *Hudson;* of his officers and men; also retiring Capt. Daniel B. Hodgsdon, of the Revenue-Cutter Service, for efficient and meritorious services in command of the cutter *Hugh McCulloch* at Manila—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CORLISS: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 72) recognizing the gallantry of Frank H. Newcomb, commanding the revenue cutter *Hudson;* of his officers and men; also retiring Capt. Daniel B. Hodgsdon, of the Revenue-Cutter Service, for efficient and meritorious services in command of the cutter *Hugh McCulloch* at Manila—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petitions of numerous citizens, churches, and societies in the counties of Fayette, Washington, and Greene, State of Pennsylvania, in opposition to the seating of Brigham H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. ADAMSON: Petitions of citizens of Heard County, Ga., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Petitions of citizens of the Thirty-third Congressional district of New York, and Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Buffalo, opposing the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BABCOCK: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, C. W. Wachter, A. L. Proutty, and other citizens of the Third Congressional district of Wisconsin, protesting against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BAILEY of Kansas: Petition of H. L. Tripp and 22 other citizens of Oneida, Kans., against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, petition of Lois A. Steele and others, of Brown County, Kans., against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BARNEY: Petition of citizens of the Fifth Congressional district of Wisconsin, against the admission of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, resolution of the Turnvereins of the Chicago district, in relation to the Philippine war—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BELL: Petitions of citizens of Pueblo, Colo., against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Petition of members of the State committee of the Evangelical Alliance of Pennsylvania, against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BOREING: Petition of citizens of Leslie, Ky., favoring constitutional amendment defining marriage—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of citizens of Wayne and Monroe counties, Ky., protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: Petition of George E. Lake and other citizens of Island Falls, Me., against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BRENNER: Protests of Rev. Henry Crumpton and other citizens of the Third Congressional district of Ohio, protesting against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BROWN: Petitions of citizens of the Sixth Congressional district of Ohio, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Petitions of citizens of South Dakota, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BURKE of Texas: Petitions of citizens of the Sixth Congressional district of Texas, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BURKETT: Petitions of certain churches, synods, and citizens of the First Congressional district of Nebraska, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petitions of Mrs. Nellie S. Bunker and other citizens of the Third Congressional district of Maine, protesting against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petitions of the Christian Endeavor Society of Chester County, Pa., and citizens of the Sixth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Marshallton, Pa., favoring a constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of John Edenburn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHICKERING: Numerous petitions of citizens of the Twenty-fourth Congressional district of the State of New York, protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. CLARKE of New Hampshire: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Milford and Swiftwater, mass meeting of Rochester, and others of the State of New Hampshire, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: Numerous petitions of citizens of the Second Congressional district of Texas, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. CROWLEY: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Turner J. Bowling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of John Chaney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Isaac Willingham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of W. De Wald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church of North America, for a constitutional amendment defining marriage—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, protest of the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church of North America, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. S. A. DAVENPORT: Petitions of E. F. Ritter and others, of Venango County, and F. S. Pease and others, of Northeast, Pa., urging the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: Petition of citizens and surfmen of Two Rivers, Wis., relating to surfmen of the United States life-saving station—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of people of Waupun, Wis., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. DAYTON: Petitions of citizens of the Second Congressional district of West Virginia, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. DENNY: Petitions of numerous citizens of the State of Maryland, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. DOVENER: Petition of citizens of Wheeling and others of the First Congressional district of West Virginia, against the admission of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Jerry S. Fish, of Marshall County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSS: Paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to Thomas Bumstead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREER: Petition of B. F. Kollin, jr., and numerous other citizens of the Fourth Congressional district of West Virginia, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. GAMBLE: Petitions of the General Missionary Committee of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Methodist Episcopal and Congregational churches of Wellington Springs, and Woman's Christian Temperance Union and citizens of Hot Springs, S. Dak., against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. GASTON: Petitions of numerous citizens of the Twenty-sixth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, against the admission of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, petition of citizens of Cochranton, Pa., and vicinity, for the cessation of hostilities in the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GLYNN: Petitions of Right Rev. William Craswell Doane and 237 other citizens of Albany, N. Y., against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, petition of the Presbytery of Troy, N. Y., favoring an amendment to the Constitution defining marriage—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAFF: Petition of women and women's societies of Peoria, Ill., citizens of Princeville, and many others of the Fourteenth Congressional district of Illinois, protesting against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Four petitions of Rev. W. R. Campbell and other citizens of the State of Utah; also petitions of citizens of the Second and Tenth wards of Allegheny, Pa., protesting against the admission of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania: Petitions of citizens of the Ninth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, against the seating of B. H. Roberts in the House of Representatives—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Petitions of citizens of North Falmouth, Mass., urging the rejection of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, resolution of the Southern Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, favoring the passage of laws to further restrict the practice of polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROUT: Petitions of F. E. Hayward and voters and citizens of the Second Congressional district of Ohio, protesting against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, petition of Frank Martin and citizens of Williamstown, Vt., praying for the election of United States Senators by popular vote—to the Committee on Elections.

Also, petition of Frank Martin and 22 citizens, favoring such legislation as will secure to the people adequate antitrust laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Williamstown, Vt., for protection in the use of adulterated food products—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to Calista F. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for an increase of pension to James Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill to correct the military record of Alexander Wilkie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of F. E. Hayward, of Westminster, N. Y., opposing the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Petitions of citizens of the Fourth Congressional district of Michigan, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. HENDERSON: Petitions of Rev. J. W. Cowan and other citizens of Eldora, Iowa, and Mrs. Laura Doan Steele, of Mexico, Mo., and numerous other petitions of citizens of the State of Iowa, protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, petition of the National Council of the Women of New Zealand, in favor of woman's suffrage in Hawaii—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petitions of citizens of Clinton and West Hartford, Conn., against seating B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. HEPBURN: Petitions of Rev. John Williamson, J. C. Calhoun, and numerous citizens of the Eighth Congressional district of Iowa, against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the Roberts Case.

Also, petition of Grand Army post and 28 other citizens of Chariton, Iowa, asking that Mrs. Mary A. Douglass be placed on the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOFFECKER: Petition of the New Century Club of Milford, Del., against the admission of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of citizens of Allentown and East Millstone, N. J., urging the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. HULL: Resolutions of the Farmers' National Congress, held at Boston, Mass., October 3-10, 1899, in favor of rural free mail delivery—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. JETT: Protests of J. M. Truitt, G. B. Smith, Charles Harrison, W. A. Chambers, and numerous other citizens of the Eighteenth Congressional district of Illinois, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: Petition of citizens of Walla Walla and others, of the State of Washington, protesting against the admission of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. JOHNSTON: Petitions of citizens of the Third Congressional district of West Virginia, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. JOY: Paper to accompany House bill to reinstate Lieut. F. H. Hunicke into the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KERR: Petition of E. B. Fairfield and others, of Mansfield, Ohio, against the right of B. H. Roberts to a seat in the House of Representatives—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of Rev. L. A. Robbins and others, of Millbrook, N. Y., against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. KNOX: Petition of citizens of Andover, Mass., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. LANHAM: Petitions of citizens of the Eighth Congressional district of Texas, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. LENTZ: Petitions of citizens of the Eleventh Congressional district of Ohio, against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. LONG: Petitions of the Seventh district Federation of Woman's Clubs of Kansas, Aaron Breck, B. H. Moore, and others, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of citizens of Santa Clara County, Cal., against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. LYBRAND: Petitions of numerous citizens of the Eighth Congressional district of Ohio, against the seating of Representative-elect B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: Petition of citizens of Paragould, Ark., protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. McDOWELL: Petitions of citizens of the Seventeenth Congressional district of Ohio, urging the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. McPHERSON: Petitions of numerous citizens of the Ninth Congressional district of Iowa, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. MAHON: Petition of citizens of Faunettsburg, Pa., favoring the passage of laws to further restrict the practice of polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Mifflin County, Pa., against the admission of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of Andrew W. Rogers and others, of Chicago, Ill., asking for the rejection of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. MARSH: Petitions of citizens of Hancock and McComb counties, Ill., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. MERCER: Petitions of Christian Endeavorers of Nebraska and H. C. Reckmeyer, of Arlington, Nebr., protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. MESICK: Petitions of citizens of the Eleventh Congressional district of Michigan, urging the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Preston H. Mitchell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of J. Radcliffe and others, of Mountain Spring, Ind.; E. C. Vankirk and others, and citizens of Bloomington, Ind., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. MOODY: Petitions of citizens of the Sixth Congressional district of Massachusetts, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. MORGAN: Petitions of C. G. Jordan, L. H. Hudson, J. L. Goodrich, R. L. Palmer, and many other citizens, churches, and societies of the Tenth Congressional district of Ohio, in opposition to the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. MULLER: Petitions of numerous citizens and societies of Staten Island, N. Y., urging the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petition of citizens of National City, Cal., against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. OLMSTED: Numerous petitions of citizens of the Fourteenth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, against the seating

of B. H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. PACKER of Pennsylvania: Petitions of numerous citizens, churches, and societies of the Sixteenth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. PAYNE: Papers to accompany House bill No. 3233, for the relief of Nicholas B. Ireland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 3230, to correct the record of Oscar A. Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 3229, in behalf of the widow of Emmet Stafford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 3231, for the relief of Sylvester Morgan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 3232, for the relief of David Flinn—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Congregational Church of East Bloomfield, N. Y., to forbid the sale of liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of citizens of the Twenty-eighth Congressional district of New York, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. PEARRE: Petition of various churches, missionary societies, and numerous citizens of the Sixth Congressional district of Maryland, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also (by request), paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Elizabeth Thomas, of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. POWERS: Petition of W. B. Hurlbut and other citizens of the State of Vermont, for the reclassification of the Railway Mail Service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PRINCE: Petitions of citizens of Sterling, Ill., against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Paper to accompany House bill for the removal of the charge of desertion against Columbus B. Davis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIXEY: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Agnes B. Hoffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill relating to the claim of Martha F. Rixey—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, paper to accompany House bill in behalf of the Broad Run Baptist Church, of Fauquier County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Waterford Baptist Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Isaiah Berdine—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBB: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of William F. Woods—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Petitions of 226 voters of Melrose, Mass., against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Nebraska: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions, certain churches, and associations in the Third Congressional district of Iowa, against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petitions of J. W. Burns, C. W. Newton, and several other citizens of Fort Wayne, W. H. Hardiman and others, of Lima, Ind., and of the Indiana Conference of the Evangelical Association, protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Petitions of the New England Southern Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, certain societies and citizens of the Third Congressional district of Connecticut, citizens of Plainville, Lebanon, and other towns in the Third Congressional district of Connecticut, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, petition of employees of the New York Navy-Yard, against the transfer of money appropriated for work at the New York Navy-Yard for other purposes at other places—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN of New York: Petitions of citizens of the Thirty-second Congressional district of New York, against the admission of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Paper to accompany House bill correcting the military record of Sylvester W. Barnes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMALL: Petition of A. L. Harrington and other citizens of the First Congressional district of North Carolina, favoring the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petitions of 46 old soldiers of Jackson County, Ill., for a per diem service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: Petitions of Rev. W. J. Hageman and others, of Wood County, Ohio, against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SPALDING: Petition of the Methodist and Congregational churches of Cando, N. Dak., against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petitions of citizens of Woodbridge, North Haven, and New Haven, Conn., against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SPRAGUE: Petition of women of Attleboro, Mass., protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, resolutions of the Boston Congregational, Methodist, and Universalist Ministers' Association, with regard to postage on books of public and incorporated libraries—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of citizens of El Paso, Tex., against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. STEWART of New York: Petitions of numerous citizens, churches, presbyteries, and societies in the Twenty-first Congressional district of New York, against the seating of B. H. Roberts in the House of Representatives—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of Rev. James Thompson, of Ashland, N. H., and Woman's Christian Temperance Union of New Hampton, N. H., against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Petitions of R. A. Evans and other citizens of Meriden, Oxford, and McCook, Nebr., against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Petitions of citizens of the First Congressional district of Minnesota, protesting against the seating of B. H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. THAYER: Petitions of numerous citizens of the Third Congressional district of Massachusetts, against the admission of B. H. Roberts to the Fifty-sixth Congress—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: Petitions of 1,288 citizens, religious organizations, and societies of the Eleventh Congressional district of the State of Iowa, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, petition of Rev. C. J. Almquit, of Arthur, Iowa, and other citizens, in favor of amendments to the Constitution prohibiting polygamy within the United States and disqualifying polygamists, etc.—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: Petitions of J. H. Rogers, W. W. Dixon, L. M. Kumler, and other citizens of the Fifteenth Congressional district of Ohio, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. WEAVER: Petitions of citizens of Piqua, Troy, and other towns in the Seventh Congressional district of Ohio, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: Petitions of S. E. Bell, J. H. Hurlbut, and citizens of Sterling, Howard, Gardner, Lancaster, and other towns in the Fourth Congressional district of Massachusetts, against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina: Petitions of James L. Barnwell, of Beaufort; Annie S. Means, of Charleston; Benjamin Chaplin and others, of Hampton County, S. C., praying for the sale of certain bonds now in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury, and payment of the proceeds of the sale to them and others from the sale of whose lands said funds arose—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Petitions of the Bradford Sunday School Association and citizens of the Fifteenth district of Pennsylvania, against the right of B. H. Roberts to a seat in the House of Representatives—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: Petition of the League of Social Service, and Rev. George B. Bell and others, of the Fourth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, urging the rejection of Brigham H. Roberts—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, petitions of the Young Men's Christian Association of the Pennsylvania Railroad Department, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring

the passage of laws to further restrict the practice of polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, paper to accompany House bill to correct the military record of James Hagerty—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ZENOR: Petition of the Presbyterian, Methodist Episcopal, Episcopal, and other churches of Jeffersonville, Ind., and churches and citizens of the Third Congressional district of Indiana, urging the rejection of B. H. Roberts as a Representative—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *December 12, 1899.*

Prayer by Rev. LUCIEN CLARK, D. D., of the city of Washington.

Mr. DONELSON CAFFERY, a Senator from the State of Louisiana, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. GALLINGER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

FINDINGS BY COURT OF CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings filed by that court in the cause of James C. Williams, administrator of the estate of Haller Nutt, deceased, *vs.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings filed by that court in the cause of Parmelia B. Finney, administratrix of T. C. Finney, deceased, *vs.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings filed by the court in the cause of Emma R. Bailey, executrix of John J. Bailey, deceased, *vs.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF NAVIGATION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting the report of Elmer L. Corthell, a delegate from the United States to the Seventh International Congress of Navigation, held at Brussels, Belgium, July 18, 1898; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

MEDICAL SERVICE OF GERMAN ARMY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 6th instant, a copy of the report of Dr. McG. Woodbury on the medical service of the German army; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

COMMANDER JOSHUA BISHOP.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication from the Secretary of the Navy; which was read:

NAVY DEPARTMENT, *Washington, December 9, 1899.*

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith the petition of Joshua Bishop, commander, United States Navy, retired.

Very respectfully,

JOHN D. LONG, *Secretary.*

The PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The letter and accompanying papers will be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. HOAR subsequently said: I wish to call attention to rather a remarkable breach of our rules. It is a matter very unimportant in itself. It is that the head of one of the Departments transmits to the Senate the petition of a citizen who, I believe, is an officer under that Department.

The rule of the Senate requires that the petition shall be presented by a member; that it shall be presented under certain conditions; that it shall be indorsed in a certain fashion and presented at a certain time. I do not understand that it is the privilege of any Executive Department to undertake to determine the character or quality of a petition that should be presented, and that we should receive it as of course when so transmitted.

I merely call attention to this irregularity, not as having any importance whatever at present, but that it may not form a precedent.

Mr. CHANDLER. Do I understand the Senator from Massachusetts to think that if an officer in the Navy desires some action by Congress there is any impropriety in having that request transmitted to this body by the Secretary of the Navy? Where is the harm?

Mr. HOAR. It is contrary to the Senate rule. It should be transmitted to some member of the body and by him presented.

Mr. CHANDLER. If it is to be treated strictly as a petition, I agree.

Mr. HOAR. It is. That is all there is to it.

Mr. CHANDLER. If it is not in proper form, that is another matter; but I conceive that a request by any naval officer for legislation for his benefit or for the benefit of the service may very wisely be submitted to the Secretary of the Navy and may very properly be transmitted by the Secretary of the Navy to Congress.

Mr. HOAR. There is no indorsement on this petition. It is a mere transmission of the petition of a citizen, who is a naval officer. What the Senator from New Hampshire says might wisely be done and is undoubtedly done in many cases; but this petition comes here contrary to our rule, which is that every petition or memorial shall contain so and so; that it shall be signed by the petitioner; that it shall have indorsed thereon a brief statement of its contents, which this petition has not; and that it shall be presented and referred without debate. It is a very clear case.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have not had an opportunity to examine the petition, which I see is receiving the scrutiny of the President pro tempore of the Senate; but if it is in the form of a petition to Congress, then I quite agree with the Senator from Massachusetts that it ought to be presented through a member of the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. That is all of it.

Mr. CHANDLER. I then only repeat that a proper request for legislation by a naval officer or by an army officer may very properly be transmitted to the Senate by the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of War with or without his indorsement.

Mr. HOAR. But not as a petition.

Mr. CHANDLER. Not as a petition.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did not examine the paper particularly. There are quite a number of accompanying papers.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented the petitions of W. H. Clark and 36 other citizens of Charleston, of Rev. William Wood and 40 other citizens of Boothbay Harbor, D. E. French and 88 other citizens of Hampden, Trueman S. Perry and 18 other citizens of Waterford, Henry H. Noyes and 36 other citizens of New Gloucester, Rev. W. H. Rice and 23 other citizens, Rev. W. W. Hayden and 17 other citizens of Madison, F. E. Eashnan and 13 other citizens of Portland, C. M. Herring and 19 other citizens of Brunswick, Rev. L. A. Jones and 18 other citizens of South Limington, Jasper Hardy and 15 other citizens, Henry L. Chapman and 18 other citizens of Brunswick, Norman La Marsh and 33 other citizens of Castine, and of Rev. W. C. Westcott and 39 other citizens of Winter Harbor, all in the State of Maine, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WELLINGTON presented the petitions of John M. McElmoyle and sundry other citizens of Elkton, of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Elkton, and of Fannie E. Pridham and sundry other citizens of Baltimore, all in the State of Maryland, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CHANDLER presented the petitions of A. J. Hutchinson and 46 other citizens of Milford, R. L. Duston and 10 other citizens of Portsmouth, A. E. Lambert and 17 other citizens of Wetford, W. W. Cole and 18 other citizens, C. V. French and 5 other citizens of Cornish Flat, A. D. Lee and 34 other citizens of Meredith, C. W. Watley and 31 other citizens of Campton, B. A. Willmott and 15 other citizens of Lee, H. H. Porter and 18 other citizens of Littleton, J. W. Reed and 8 other citizens of Stoddard, and of A. F. Grow and 39 other citizens, all in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BATE presented the petitions of Rev. J. B. Eshman and 53 other citizens of Howell, J. H. Graham and 11 other citizens of Pomona, W. T. Hart and 46 other citizens of Swanbluff, William Ward and 18 other citizens of Whitehorn, C. B. Waller and 18 other citizens of Fallbranch, Rev. S. V. Lowe and 19 other citizens of Rutledge, W. N. Brown and 80 other citizens of Brakebill, A. T.

Goodloe and 35 other citizens of Springfield, J. A. George and 36 other citizens of Athens, Rev. W. C. Carter and 113 other citizens of Erin, T. J. Stricklin and 17 other citizens of Dowelltown, Rev. W. S. Crawford and 14 other citizens of Crawfordton, M. G. Walker and 76 other citizens of Newport, and of S. M. Gupton and 32 other citizens of Springfield, all in the State of Tennessee, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KENNEY presented the petition of Fred A. Peabody and sundry other citizens of Middletown, Del., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McLAURIN presented the petition of George W. Croft and Theodore G. Croft, of Aiken, S. C.; of F. Lydia Stone, Lalla E. Croft, Floride L. Croft, Harriett P. Croft, Charlotte M. Croft, and Edward Croft, of Greenville, S. C., praying that an appropriation of $1,000 be made to reimburse them for damages done to their property in the city of Greenville by soldiers of the Volunteer Army of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PETTIGREW presented the petition of F. Mitchell and sundry other citizens of Faulkton, S. Dak., and the petition of W. B. Wait and sundry other citizens of South Dakota, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WARREN presented petitions of 400 citizens of Cheyenne, of 29 citizens of Laramie County, of 52 citizens, and of members of the Sunday School Association of Laramie County, all in the State of Wyoming, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the General Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and a memorial of the Presbytery of Boulder, Colo., remonstrating against the admission of Representative-elect Roberts, of Utah, to a seat in the House of Representatives; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WETMORE presented the petition of William H. Cargill and 32 other citizens of Rhode Island, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HOAR presented the memorials of Benjamin F. Smith and 19 other citizens of Massachusetts, Rev. C. F. Cutter and 167 other citizens of New York, E. A. Dean and 10 other citizens of Ohio, F. R. Durgin and 67 other citizens of Vermont, H. W. Benedict and 9 other citizens of New York, W. J. Reichert and 29 other citizens of Illinois, John May and 49 other citizens of Idaho, J. P. Taylor and 9 other citizens of Oregon, J. D. Johnson and 9 other citizens of Pennsylvania, Charles Sotheran and 1 other citizen of New York City, C. W. Garrett, of Washington, D. C., and of 14 other citizens of the States of Tennessee, Georgia, Maryland, and West Virginia, remonstrating against any extension of the sovereignty of the United States over the Philippine Islands, in any event, and over any other foreign territory without the free consent of the people thereof; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DAVIS presented the memorial of Dr. Reginald Barkley Leach, of St. Paul, Minn., relative to the arsenization prophylaxis of yellow fever, Asiatic cholera, and "the plague;" which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PENROSE presented the petitions of J. C. McDonell and 76 other citizens of Newton Hamilton, of John B. Meredith and 12 other citizens of Chester, Rev. J. R. Burrows and 58 other citizens, Robert M. Foster and 112 other citizens of State College, all in the State of Pennsylvania, and a petition of the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church of North America, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 1006) granting a pension to Margaret M. Badger, widow of the late Commodore Oscar C. Badger, United States Navy; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented the petition of Joshua Bishop, commander, retired list, United States Navy, praying that his claim for alleged items of pay due and unpaid for services as a lieutenant-commander of the United States Navy between the dates of September 13, 1867, and March 9, 1871, etc., be referred to the Court of Claims for adjudication; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

MONTANA SENATORIAL INVESTIGATION.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution reported by Mr. CHANDLER from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized and directed to investigate the right and title of WILLIAM A. CLARK to a seat as Senator from the State of Montana, and said committee is authorized to sit during the sessions of the Senate, to employ a stenographer, to send for persons and papers, and to administer oaths, and that the expenses of the inquiry shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the committee.

WEST VIRGINIA SENATORIAL INVESTIGATION.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution reported by Mr. CHANDLER from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized and directed to investigate the right and title of NATHAN B. SCOTT to a seat as Senator from the State of West Virginia; and said committee is authorized to sit during the sessions of the Senate, to employ a stenographer, to send for persons and papers, and to administer oaths; and that the expenses of the inquiry shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the committee.

CHRISTOPHER ELLIS.

Mr. HAWLEY. The bill S. 620 is for the relief of Christopher Ellis. It was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, but Ellis is a machinist in the Navy. The Committee on Military Affairs asks to be excused from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The report was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 1356) for the relief of Edwin L. Field; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1357) for the relief of the owners of the brig *Abby Ellen;* which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HALE. I introduce three bills of some importance relating to the Navy Department, which I ask may be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and with each printed the explanatory letter of the Secretary of the Navy that accompanies the bill.

The bill (S. 1358) to authorize the use of depositions before naval courts in certain cases was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying letter of the Secretary of the Navy, ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The bill (S. 1359) to amend sections 1529 and 1530 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to the classification of naval vessels, was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying letter of the Secretary of the Navy, ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The bill (S. 1360) to amend section 13 of an act entitled "An act to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States," approved March 3, 1899, relating to the pay of officers of the Navy, was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying letter of the Secretary of the Navy, ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1361) granting a pension to Thomas H. Boswell;

A bill (S. 1362) increasing the pension of Christopher Denny;

A bill (S. 1363) increasing the pension of John W. Rollins;

A bill (S. 1364) increasing the pension of Henry H. Blockson; and

A bill (S. 1365) increasing the pension of Lorinda N. Smith.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 1366) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of William Cruse;

A bill (S. 1367) to correct the military record of John Bass, late a private in Company G, Forty-eighth Illinois Volunteers, and to grant him an honorable discharge;

A bill (S. 1368) removing the charge of desertion from the name of Samuel Brown, of Dunlapsville, Union County, Ind., who served as a private in Company A, Thirty-fifth Indiana Infantry Volunteers;

A bill (S. 1369) removing the charge of desertion from the name of John Brinkworth;

A bill (S. 1370) to correct the military record of William T. Rominger; and

A bill (S. 1371) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of F. W. Zickendrath.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced the following bills; which were

severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1372) for the relief of John Schierling, administrator de bonis non of the estate of Gallus Kerchner, deceased;

A bill (S. 1373) for the relief of George F. Roberts, administrator of the estate of William B. Thayer, deceased, surviving partner of Thayer Brothers, and others; and

A bill (S. 1374) appropriating money to pay the claim of the Western Paving and Supply Company.

Mr. WELLINGTON introduced a bill (S. 1375) to increase the limit of cost of public building at Cumberland, Md.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1376) granting a pension to Martha E. Kenly; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1377) for the relief of the trustees of the Reformed Church of Sharpsburg, Washington County, State of Maryland;

A bill (S. 1378) for the relief of Miss L. V. Belt, administratrix of Alfred C. Belt, deceased;

A bill (S. 1379) for the relief of Elizabeth Smith;

A bill (S. 1380) for the relief of Mary W. Kramer; and

A bill (S. 1381) for the relief of Louise Stewart.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 1382) for the relief of Francis S. Davidson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1383) for the protection of song birds; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a bill (S. 1384) in reference to the civil service and appointments thereunder; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Mr. DAVIS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 1385) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Sylvester D. Foss;

A bill (S. 1386) for the relief of Sarah K. McLean;

A bill (S. 1387) to place Francis W. Seeley on the retired list of the Army; and

A bill (S. 1388) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Haeply.

Mr. MCMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1389) to reimburse the Lake Carriers' Association for moneys expended for maintaining lights on the Great Lakes and their connecting waters; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1390) for the construction of a public building at Owosso, Mich.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. WETMORE introduced a bill (S. 1391) relating to the names of streets in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. FOSTER introduced a bill (S. 1392) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Walla Walla, in the State of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1393) for the relief of Thomas Paul; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 1394) for the relief of Bvt. Col. Thomas P. O'Reilly; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MCBRIDE introduced a bill (S. 1395) to increase and limit the appropriation for a public building at Portland, Oreg., and to designate its uses; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1396) to increase the pay of letter carriers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1397) granting an increase of pension to David S. Aiken (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1398) granting an increase of pension to George Gans;

A bill (S. 1399) granting a pension to Thomas H. Scudder; and

A bill (S. 1400) granting a pension to William Lyman Chittenden (with accompanying papers).

Mr. SULLIVAN introduced a bill (S. 1401) providing for the publication of the pension roll; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1402) for the erection of a public building at Natchez, Miss.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1403) for the relief of estate of W. E. Tomlinson, deceased;

A bill (S. 1404) for the relief of estate of Louisa A. Ragsdale deceased;

A bill (S. 1405) for the relief of the Baptist Church at Red Banks, in Marshall County, Miss.;

A bill (S. 1406) for the relief of J. B. Fuller;

A bill (S. 1407) for the relief of Melchisedec Robinson;

A bill (S. 1408) for the relief of Samuel Scott;

A bill (S. 1409) for the relief of M. A. Reinhart;

A bill (S. 1410) for the relief of the estate of William M. Kimmons, deceased; and

A bill (S. 1411) for the relief of D. G. Rice.

Mr. MCLAURIN introduced a bill (S. 1412) for the relief of G. W. Croft and others; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 1413) granting a pension to Erie E. Farmer; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present, to accompany the bill, the petition of Mrs. Erie E. Farmer, widow of Henry Farmer, deceased, a soldier in Capt. John Chiles's company of the Second Regiment Tennessee Infantry, Indian war, with affidavits of William Nickell and A. B. Davidson. I move that the bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MONEY introduced a bill (S. 1414) for the relief of the Protestant Orphan Asylum at Natchez, in the State of Mississippi; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CLAY introduced a bill (S. 1415) for the relief of the legal representatives of G. B. Lamar, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. TURLEY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 1416) to amend the military record of Charles Hentz, late private of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Connecticut Infantry Volunteers;

A bill (S. 1417) to amend the military record of Samson Mead, late private of Company G, Third Regiment Michigan Cavalry Volunteers; and

A bill (S. 1418) for the relief of Alfred T. Moreland.

Mr. TURLEY introduced a bill (S. 1419) to increase the pension of Annie B. Goodrich; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 1420) for the proper recognition of the services of commissioned officers of the United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1421) to correct the military record of James Cahoon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1422) granting a pension to Mary A. Thornton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. KEAN introduced a bill (S. 1423) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Elizabeth, N. J.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 1424) for the relief of William J. Freeman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1425) to adjust the pensions of those who have lost limbs or are totally disabled in them;

A bill (S. 1426) granting a pension to Lide D. Pennypacker (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1427) granting a pension to J. Newman Keech (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1428) providing for the appointment of members of the medical profession on the board of appeals in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, to whom shall be referred all medical and surgical questions;

A bill (S. 1429) granting a pension to William Johnston (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1430) granting a pension to Mary T. Brown (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1431) granting an increase of pension to Jennie C. Taylor;

A bill (S. 1432) to adjust the pensions of those who have lost

limbs or are totally disabled in them, or have additional disabilities; and

A bill (S. 1433) to equalize the rate of pension of those who have lost limbs or are totally disabled in them.

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 1434) for the correction of muster of Benjamin F. Hasson (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1435) to correct the military record of Gideon Howell, alias Judson Howell;

A bill (S. 1436) to correct the military record of George I. Spangler (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1437) to correct the military record of William Gilfoyle; and

A bill (S. 1438) to correct the military record of Edward T. Lewis (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1439) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. SPOONER introduced a bill (S. 1440) relating to quarantine and the public health; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

Mr. TELLER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1441) granting a pension to James G. Hartzell;

A bill (S. 1442) granting a pension to Andrew J. McWade;

A bill (S. 1443) increasing the pension of Jackson J. Lane;

A bill (S. 1444) granting a pension to Thomas B. Hanoum;

A bill (S. 1445) granting an increase of pension to William Wells;

A bill (S. 1446) granting a pension to John C. Fitnam;

A bill (S. 1447) granting a pension to Jacob D. Walter;

A bill (S. 1448) granting an increase of pension to Baley Bison;

A bill (S. 1449) granting a pension to Lewis W. Goddard;

A bill (S. 1450) granting a pension to Henry Stutsman;

A bill (S. 1451) increasing the pension of Mrs. Hulda Shaw;

A bill (S. 1452) granting a pension to Aaron Wood;

A bill (S. 1453) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary L. Daniels;

A bill (S. 1454) restoring the pension of Theron Johnson;

A bill (S. 1455) restoring the pension of Alexander W. Browning;

A bill (S. 1456) granting an increase of pension to Fordyce M. Keith;

A bill (S. 1457) for the relief of Henry A. F. Worth;

A bill (S. 1458) granting a pension to Rafael Chacon;

A bill (S. 1459) granting a pension to John Burns;

A bill (S. 1460) granting a pension to Charles A. Hutchings;

A bill (S. 1461) granting an increase of pension to John M. Odenheimer;

A bill (S. 1462) granting a pension to Thomas B. Roark;

A bill (S. 1463) granting an increase of pension to Jasper Pitts;

A bill (S. 1464) granting a pension to James H. Hower;

A bill (S. 1465) granting an increase of pension to John C. Fitnam; and

A bill (S. 1466) granting an increase of pension to Belle F. Ralston.

Mr. PLATT of New York introduced a bill (S. 1467) to provide for the erection of a post-office in the city of New York, and making appropriation therefor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1468) authorizing the consolidation of independent post-offices in the boroughs of Manhattan, Bronx, Richmond, and Queens, New York, with the post-office at New York, N. Y., and making appropriation therefor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 1469) granting an increase of pension to Philip P. Getchell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BUTLER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads:

A bill (S. 1470) to establish postal savings banks for depositing savings at interest, with the security of the Government for repayment thereof, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1471) authorizing the Postmaster-General to advertise for sealed proposals to furnish to the Government first-class mail cars of the best and most substantial structure, sufficient in numbers to perform the railway mail service of the United States; and

A bill (S. 1472) to establish a postal telegraph and telephone system, and to enlarge the postal facilities of the people of the United States.

Mr. BUTLER introduced a bill (S. 1473) to regulate the service and fix the hours of service for persons employed as policemen, firemen, and officers in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. WARREN introduced a bill (S. 1474) to authorize the readjustment of the accounts of Army officers in certain cases, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1475) to complete the establishment and erection of a military post near the city of Sheridan, in the State of Wyoming, and making appropriation therefor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. STEWART introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 38) to authorize the President to appoint to the Naval Academy acting naval cadets who served during the war with Spain; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. HALE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 39) to provide for payment of salary to certain retired officers of the Marine Corps; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

TERRITORY OF HAWAII.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. On a previous day of the session I asked that the bill (S. 222) to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii, which was introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM], might lie on the table, and that action was taken. I supposed at that time that the bill would more properly be referred to a committee which might be appointed by the Senate; but I have no objection to its reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as it came from that committee last year.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope that will be done, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill, having been read twice, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AFFAIRS IN THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate whether the flag of the Philippine republic was carried by vessels in the bay of Manila, and whether the flag of the Philippine republic was ever saluted by Admiral Dewey or any of the vessels of his fleet at any time since May 1, 1898. Were Spanish prisoners delivered over to the Philippine forces at the time of the surrender at Subig Bay? Did a vessel commanded by the forces under Aguinaldo, flying the Philippine flag, accompany the vessels *Concord* and *Raleigh* back to Subig Bay in June, 1898, in order to compel the surrender of the Spanish forces?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CHANDLER. I object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire objects. The resolution will go over under the rule.

RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE IN NORTH CAROLINA.

Mr. PRITCHARD. I submit a resolution, which I ask may be read and lie on the table.

The resolution was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Whereas the legislature of the State of North Carolina, at its session of 1899, submitted to the people of that State, for ratification or rejection, a proposed amendment to the constitution of said State, as follows:

"SEC. 4. Every person presenting himself for registration shall be able to read and write any section of the Constitution in the English language; and before he shall be entitled to vote shall have paid, on or before the 1st day of March of the year in which he proposes to vote, his poll tax as prescribed by law for the previous year. Poll taxes shall be a lien only on assessed property, and no process shall issue to enforce the collection of the same except against assessed property.

"SEC. 5. No male person who was on January 1, 1867, entitled to vote under the laws of any State in the United States wherein he then resided, and no lineal descendant of any such person, shall be denied the right to register and vote at any election in the State by reason of his failure to possess the educational qualifications prescribed in section 4 of this article: *Provided*, He shall have registered in accordance with the terms of this section prior to December 1, 1908. The general assembly shall provide for a permanent record of all persons who register under this section on or before November 1, 1908, and all such persons shall be entitled to register and vote at all elections by the people in this State, unless disqualified under section 2 of this article: *Provided*, Such persons shall have paid their poll taxes as required by law."

And whereas section 5 of the proposed amendment undertakes to confer the right of suffrage on one class of citizens of that State and to exclude another class of citizens from the enjoyment of said privilege;

Resolved, That section 5 of the proposed amendment is in contravention of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States, and that any State that adopts said provision as a part of its organic law does not possess a republican form of government as contemplated by the Constitution of the United States.

ADDITIONAL PRINT OF BILLS.

On motion of Mr. FRYE, it was

Ordered, That there be printed for the use of the Senate, in addition to the usual number, 1,000 copies of each of the following bills: Senate bill 727, to promote the commerce and increase the foreign trade of the United States and

to provide auxiliary cruisers, transports, and seamen for Government use when necessary; Senate bill 738, to establish a department of commerce and industries.

JUDGE-ADVOCATE-GENERAL, NAVY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. McBRIDE (by request) submitted the following resolution; which was read:

Resolved, That as the Navy is entitled to nothing less than the best legal ministry, and as the Judge-Advocate-General decides all questions of Constitution, law, and justice for every ship, station, and department in the whole naval service, as well as the many comprehensive matters stated in Congressional Directory as pertaining to said office, inquiry be made if so important a judicial elevation should not be limited to jurists, who, while being versed in naval law and regulations, shall have had at least five years' legal practice, instead of being as now limited (act of June, 1880) to officers of the Navy and Marine Corps.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The request is that the resolution be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HALE. It ought to go to the Committee on Naval Affairs. It is in relation to an officer of the Navy Department.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Committee on Naval Affairs finds that the opinion of the Judiciary Committee on the merits of the resolution is important, of course the Naval Committee will ask for it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will be printed and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

CŒUR D'ALENE MINING TROUBLES.

Mr. HALE. If there is no further morning business——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is a resolution lying on the table which came over from yesterday and which the Chair lays before the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. That resolution, with reference to General Merriam, has been read once. If the Senator from South Dakota will strike out the preamble and accept the following amendment, I have no objection to having it passed——

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will not accept the amendment. I do not know what it is, but I know it is something pernicious, from the source. I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CHANDLER. It requires a pernicious Senator to deal with a pernicious proposition.

Mr. PETTIGREW. That is the reason why you enlist.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that my amendment be stated, the motion being to strike out in the resolution from the words "by what authority" down to and after the words "the foregoing preamble" and insert what I send to the desk. If that amendment is adopted by the Senate and the preamble stricken out, there will be no objection to the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire is speaking with reference to the resolution just laid before the Senate. The resolution has heretofore been read. It went over under objection under the rule, and the Senator from New Hampshire offers an amendment, which will be stated.

Mr. GALLINGER. I should like to hear the resolution read again.

Mr. SPOONER. Let it be read again.

Mr. VEST. I should like to hear the preamble of the resolution.

Mr. SPOONER. Let the resolution as introduced be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the entire resolution, with the preamble.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. PETTIGREW, as follows:

Whereas it has become a matter of record in the State of Idaho that Brig. Gen. H. C. Merriam, United States Army, together with the governor of Idaho, under date the 8th of May, 1899, officially announced to the mine owners of a portion of the Cœur d'Alene district, in Idaho, that their mines would be closed in case they employed men who belonged to a labor organization known as the Miners' Union; and

Whereas Brig. Gen. H. C. Merriam, United States Army, at that time in command of a detachment of United States soldiers at the Cœur d'Alene mines, compelled each miner given employment in said mines to sign a pledge renouncing forever all allegiance to the Miners' Union, and in addition each miner so employed was required to assert that he would never again seek membership in the Miners' Union; and

Whereas Brig. Gen. H. C. Merriam, United States Army, through some of his subordinate officers, under the opportunity afforded by a condition of martial law, is charged with brutal treatment of civilian prisoners: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate by what authority Brig. Gen. H. C. Merriam, United States Army, performed the acts recited in the foregoing preamble, and also to transmit to the Senate copies of all orders issued by his superiors to the said General Merriam or by the said General Merriam or any of his subordinates, and also copies of all official reports made in connection with the Cœur d'Alene mining troubles during the year 1899.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the resolution by striking out the preamble, and to amend the resolution itself by striking out, in line 1, page 2, after the word "Senate," the words "by what authority Brig. Gen. H. C. Merriam, United States Army, performed the acts recited in the foregoing preamble" and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

Whether or not Brig. Gen. H. C. Merriam, United States Army, has undertaken to close mines in Idaho in case men were there employed who belonged to labor organizations or to compel miners to sign pledges to renounce allegiance to any such organizations, or injuriously treated civilian prisoners.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment which is offered to strike out the preamble will, under the rules, go over until action has been had upon the amendment offered to the resolution itself. So the question before the Senate now is on the amendment offered to the resolution.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I move that the resolution and amendment be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Including the amendment to the preamble?

Mr. PETTIGREW. Including the amendment to the preamble.

Mr. HAWLEY. I can not imagine a resolution more appropriate to be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I hope, certainly, that the resolution will not pass in its original form. It says, Whereas General Merriam did this, that, and the other. It remains to be seen whether he did it or not. It gives judgment upon the officer and then wants the Secretary of War to tell why he did it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Personally I have no objection to any reference of the resolution which the Senator from South Dakota wishes to have made; but if he really wants from the Secretary of War the information which the resolution seems to call for, the amendment which I have offered facilitates its purpose. Instead of asking the Secretary of War by what authority General Merriam has done those things, it asks the Secretary of War whether or not he has done the things, and we shall get the information wanted and also the copies of the orders sought by the closing paragraph in the Senator's resolution.

That is a fair and appropriate and orderly method of ascertaining the facts which the Senator says he wants; but to ask the Senate to recite as a fact that General Merriam has done all these things, including brutal treatment of civilian prisoners, instead of asking whether or not he has done them, is something which I imagine the Senate will not do.

Mr. President, the answer which General Merriam himself will make to all these inquiries is contained in his report on the miners' riots in the State of Idaho, which was yesterday ordered to be printed by the Senate, but still it is perfectly proper that this information which the Senator says he wants should be obtained; only, instead of accepting my amendment, to inquire whether or not these things have been done, the Senator now asks to have his resolution and the proposed amendments referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. I have no objection to that course, but it seems to me the simplest method for the Senator would be to endeavor to get the information he has been seeking.

Mr. HAWLEY. I object to the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I am entirely indifferent as to which committee the resolution goes to. I aim to ascertain who is responsible for a proceeding in Idaho which is a disgrace to civilization. I do not blame the active Senator from New Hampshire for undertaking to avoid the force of these facts. I rather object to his representing the Republican party in doing it, because I do not know whether he is a Republican or not, and I should like to place the responsibility, if it exists, squarely on the Republican party. I am entirely indifferent——

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from South Dakota allow me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. CHANDLER. Let me say a word right here.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will yield in a moment, but not now.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator will not yield now?

Mr. PETTIGREW. Not now. I am entirely indifferent as to which committee the resolution goes to. I am entirely willing that the committee shall pursue its own course. It can report the resolution back in any form it chooses, or it can smother it in committee. Either course will be satisfactory to me if it is satisfactory to the committee. There will be no controversy about it.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Republican party has its faults, but I have been much more willing to remain a member of it since the Senator from South Dakota left it than I was before.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Will the Senator from New Hampshire allow me?

Mr. CHANDLER. No; not now.

Mr. President, General Merriam has answered all this, but inasmuch as the Senator from South Dakota undertook to recite the fact that General Merriam was charged with brutal treatment of civilian prisoners, and to induce the Senate to pass a resolution asking by what authority he did it, I will read a few words from

General Merriam's report bearing upon that point, in justice to the officer and in justice to the War Department. He says that after the arrests were made the men—

were placed in a large building, two stories high, which had been constructed and used as a warehouse for storage of hay and grain and other articles by a merchant. It was a good building for the purpose in every way, except that it had no provision for fires and was, of course, without furniture, so that camp fires outside were resorted to and the prisoners were compelled to sleep on the floors, but had an abundant supply of hay to lie upon. The prisoners were also fed at the expense of the State by an experienced caterer, who had managed a large miners' boarding house and had both the necessary means and experience for that purpose.

By daily inspections I satisfied myself that the prisoners were being furnished abundant food and well prepared, although it sometimes unavoidably happened that meals were served later and somewhat irregularly, owing to the large numbers, irregular hours of arrival, and limited facilities for serving. Many of the prisoners were also brought in without blankets, and could not be supplied until bedding was sent or brought to them by their families and friends. It is probable that in this way some of the prisoners were exposed to cold at night and that some of the sickness was due to this exposure, yet the local physician employed by the State for their care informed me that the percentage of sick was far below the average among the same people as a rule.

Without reading further, I may say that General Merriam proceeds to say that with the aid of the governor of the State he went on and wholly relieved all cause of complaint. So the charge that those prisoners were brutally treated is absolutely without any foundation in fact. Now, we can ascertain all the facts if we will ask the Secretary of War in a resolution properly framed; but if the Senator does not want his resolution to pass in that language, I shall move that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on referring the resolution, with the amendment offered to it, to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut move to amend by inserting the "Committee on Military Affairs" in place of the "Committee on Education and Labor?"

Mr. HAWLEY. I understood the Senator from New Hampshire to make that motion.

Mr. CHANDLER. If it is in order to substitute a different committee, I will make the motion. I did not know that it was.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I said I was indifferent as to the reference of the resolution.

Mr. CHANDLER. If it is in order, I move to amend the motion to refer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to substitute the "Committee on Military Affairs" in place of the "Committee on Education and Labor."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion to refer the resolution, with the amendment offered to it, to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What shall be done with the preamble?

Mr. HAWLEY. Let it be referred with the resolution.

Mr. CHANDLER. The preamble should go with the resolution to the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That course will be pursued.

Mr. HAWLEY. Permit me to assure the Senator who makes this movement that the Committee on Military Affairs will see that every measure is taken to get full information on the subject.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. DANIEL ERMENTROUT, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and transmitted resolutions of the House thereon.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. HALE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business. There ought to be such a session.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After forty-five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE DANIEL ERMENTROUT.

Mr. PENROSE. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the resolutions from the House of Representatives in respect to the death of my late colleague in that body.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following resolutions from the House of Representatives; which were read:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Hon. DANIEL ERMENTROUT, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to his memory the House do now adjourn.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I offer the resolutions which I send to the desk and ask for their adoption. On a later occasion I shall request that a day be fixed to pay tribute to the memory of my late colleague in the other House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania submits resolutions, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. DANIEL ERMENTROUT, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That as an additional mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 13, 1899, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 12, 1899.

DISTRICT JUDGE.

Joseph A. Gill, of Kansas, to be judge of the United States court of the northern district of the Indian Territory, vice William M. Springer, whose term expired December 11, 1899.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

John J. Sullivan, of Ohio, to be attorney of the United States for the northern district of Ohio, vice Samuel D. Dodge, whose term expired December 11, 1899.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

SECOND UNITED STATES VOLUNTEER ENGINEERS.

To be captains.

First Lieut. William M. Venable, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

First Lieut. Christopher C. Fitzgerald, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

First Lieut. Eugene Klapp, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

First Lieut. Frederick J. Mills, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Lewis B. Hamilton, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

Second Lieut. George A. Purington, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

Second Lieut. Clarence F. Jackson, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

Second Lieut. David G. Anderson, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

Second Lieut. Thomas Cooney, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

Second Lieut. Charles J. Carlsen, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

Second Lieut. Anton Schneider, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

Second Lieut. Robert M. Fulweiler, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

Second Lieut. Orville Benson, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, March 5, 1899.

To be second lieutenants.

Sergt. Maj. William F. Sims, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

Battalion Sergt. Maj. William T. Carpenter, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

Sergt. Rolland Adelsperger, Company E, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

Sergt. William C. Bakhaus, Company G, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

Sergt. Fred B. McCrosky, Company C, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

Corpl. Charles W. Beaver, Company C, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

Sergt. Charles N. Bellamy, Company A, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, March 5, 1899.

Sergt. Frank M. Levings, Company F, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, May 6, 1899.

THIRD UNITED STATES VOLUNTEER ENGINEERS.

To be captain.

First Lieut. Samuel F. Crecelius, Third United States Volunteer Engineers, April 15, 1899.

To be assistant surgeon with the rank of first lieutenant.

Acting Asst. Surg. Harry R. Lemen, United States Army, April 25, 1899.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Francis Wharton Griffin, Third United States Volunteer Engineers, April 15, 1899.

Second Lieut. Luther E. Smith, Third United States Volunteer Engineers, April 25, 1899.

To be second lieutenants.

First Sergt. William J. Fairback, Company D, Third United States Volunteer Engineers, April 15, 1899.

Sergt. Foster H. Hilliard, Company L, Third United States Volunteer Engineers, April 25, 1899.

William R. Maxwell, of Georgia, April 25, 1899.

SECOND UNITED STATES VOLUNTEER INFANTRY.

To be surgeon with the rank of major.

First Lieut. Edward J. Barrett, assistant surgeon, Second United States Volunteer Infantry, May 8, 1899.

To be captain.

First Lieut. John H. Gregory, jr., Second United States Volunteer Infantry, May 13, 1899.

To be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Lloyd Parkinson, Second United States Volunteer Infantry, May 13, 1899.

To be second lieutenants.

First Sergt. Lemar H. Hendricks, Company E, Second United States Volunteer Infantry, January 7, 1899.

First Sergt. Herbert H. Hoag, Company K, Second United States Volunteer Infantry, April 28, 1899.

First Sergt. Theodore Soelter, Company M, Second United States Volunteer Infantry, May 5, 1899.

First Sergt. George M. Apple, Company I, Second United States Volunteer Infantry, May 8, 1899.

Battalion Sergt. Maj. George A. Seyde, Second United States Volunteer Infantry, May 8, 1899.

Sergt. Charles C. Loomis, Company K, Second United States Volunteer Infantry, May 13, 1899.

THIRD UNITED STATES VOLUNTEER INFANTRY.

To be major.

Capt. Walter K. Wheatley, Third United States Volunteer Infantry, March 17, 1899.

To be captain.

Algernon Sartoris, of the District of Columbia, March 17, 1899.

FOURTH UNITED STATES VOLUNTEER INFANTRY.

To be major.

Capt. Henry A. Wise, Fourth United States Volunteer Infantry, May 22, 1899.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Wade L. Jolly, Fourth United States Volunteer Infantry, March 6, 1899.

First Lieut. George D. Barbour, Fourth United States Volunteer Infantry, May 22, 1899.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. John A. Thayer, Fourth United States Volunteer Infantry, March 6, 1899.

Second Lieut. Richard T. Ellis, Fourth United States Volunteer Infantry, May 1, 1899.

Second Lieut. John M. Baldwin, Fourth United States Volunteer Infantry, May 27, 1899.

To be second lieutenants.

First Sergt. Albert S. Johnson, Company K, Fourth United States Volunteer Infantry, March 6, 1899.

Sergt. Maj. Richard M. Corwine, Fourth United States Volunteer Infantry, May 1, 1899.

First Sergt. Robert T. Patterson, Company F, Fourth United States Volunteer Infantry, May 27, 1899.

FIFTH UNITED STATES VOLUNTEER INFANTRY.

To be assistant surgeon with the rank of first lieutenant.

John C. Greenewalt, of Pennsylvania, April 22, 1899.

To be second lieutenants.

First Sergt. James A. Campbell, Company B, Fifth United States Volunteer Infantry, April 11, 1899.

First Sergt. Corlis S. Ragland, Company K, Fifth United States Volunteer Infantry, April 11, 1899.

NINTH UNITED STATES VOLUNTEER INFANTRY.

To be assistant surgeon with the rank of first lieutenant.

William E. Apple, of Pennsylvania, March 5, 1899.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. William H. Robinson, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry, April 12, 1899.

Second Lieut. Joshua L. Jones, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry, May 17, 1899.

Second Lieut. Adolph J. Wakefield, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry, May 22, 1899.

To be second lieutenants.

Q. M. Sergt. Joshua L. Jones, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry, April 12, 1899.

Sergt. Maj. Poole S. Hall, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry, May 22, 1899.

Chief Musician James W. McNeal, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry, May 22, 1899.

First Sergt. James R. Longs, Company L, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry, May 23, 1899.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 12, 1899.

LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS.

Herbert Putnam, of Massachusetts, to be Librarian of Congress.

APPOINTMENT IN VOLUNTEER ARMY.

To be major-general.

Brig. Gen. Leonard Wood, United States Volunteers, December 5, 1899.

SUPERVISORS OF TWELFTH CENSUS.

Alexander M. Drew, of Fresno, Fresno County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of California.

John D. Mackenzie, of San Jose, Santa Clara County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of California.

Stephen H. Olmsted, of San Rafael, Marin County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of California.

Thomas W. O'Neil, of Sacramento, Sacramento County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of California.

Frank F. Davis, of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of California.

John E. Rickards, of Butte, Silver Bow County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of Montana.

Harrison Dingman, of Washington, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of District of Columbia.

Carl C. Plehn, of Berkeley, Alameda County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of California.

Joseph B. McMillan, of Fairhaven, Whatcom County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Washington.

Curtis B. Winn, of Albany, Linn County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Oregon.

George F. Telfer, of Portland, Multnomah County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Oregon.

William H. Savidge, of Boise, Ada County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of Idaho.

Frederick A. Tritle, of Prescott, Yavapai County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of Arizona.

Austin Mires, of Ellensburg, Kittitas County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Washington.

Arthur Pratt, of Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of Utah.

Pedro Sanchez, of Santa Fe, Santa Fe County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of New Mexico.

Earl W. Tremont, of Eureka, Eureka County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of Nevada.

Frank S. Tesch, of Denver, Arapahoe County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Colorado.

William H. Brisbane, of Leadville, Lake County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Colorado.

Charles W. Riner, of Cheyenne, Laramie County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of Wyoming.

Clinton D. Eaton, of Wilton Junction, Muscatine County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Iowa.

Jacob W. Doxsee, of Monticello, Jones County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Iowa.

John T. Drug, of Stratford, Hamilton County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Tenth supervisor's district of Iowa.

William E. Hamilton, of Odebolt, Sac County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eleventh supervisor's district of Iowa.

Albert H. Fortune, of Bloomfield, Davis County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Iowa.

Frank F. Everest, of Council Bluffs, Pottawattamie County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of Iowa.

George H. Markley, of Lansing, Allamakee County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Iowa.

Francis M. Kyte, of Osceola, Clark County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of Iowa.

John W. Krapfel, of Waterloo, Blackhawk County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Iowa.

Isaiah D. Evans, of Kenesaw, Adams County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Nebraska.

Samuel C. Smith, of Winterset, Madison County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Iowa.

John W. Rowley, of Keosauqua, Van Buren County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Iowa.

John T. Mallalieu, of Kearney, Buffalo County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Nebraska.

Frederick W. Miller, of Falls City, Richardson County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Nebraska.

Thomas E. Hibbert, of Adams, Gage County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Nebraska.

John L. Burke, of Hot Springs, Fall River County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of South Dakota.

Andrew H. Laughlin, of Lisbon, Ransom County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of North Dakota.

William E. Peebles, of Pender, Thurston County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Nebraska.

James M. Humphrey, of Fort Scott, Bourbon County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Kansas.

Charles S. Briggs, of Carbondale, Osage County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Kansas.

David Williams, of Webster, Day County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of South Dakota.

William H. Smith, of Marysville, Marshall County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Kansas.

James C. O. Morse, of Hutchinson, Reno County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Kansas.

Charles W. Landis, of Osborne, Osborne County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Kansas.

Erastus Bainbridge, of Owenton, Owen County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Kentucky.

Robert H. Elliston, of Williamstown, Grant County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Kentucky.

Charles K. Caron, of Louisville, Jefferson County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Kentucky.

Elisha M. Flack, of Hopkinsville, Christian County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Kentucky.

Jeremiah G. Forester, of Harlan, Harlan County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eleventh supervisor's district of Kentucky.

John Bright, of Stanford, Lincoln County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of Kentucky.

Clarence G. McAlister, of Owingsville, Bath County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of Kentucky.

Henry S. Howes, of Paintsville, Johnson County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Tenth supervisor's district of Kentucky.

William N. Foster, of Greensburg, Green County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Kentucky.

Jo Broaddus, of Chillicothe, Livingston County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Missouri.

George J. Baer, of Kansas City, Jackson County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Missouri.

Alfred C. Moore, of Marion, Crittenden County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Kentucky.

Jerome S. Higgins, of St. Louis, St. Louis County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eleventh supervisor's district of Missouri.

Samuel J. Harrison, of Hannibal, Marion County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Missouri.

Charles A. Davault, of Farber, Audrain County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of Missouri.

Harry H. Parsons, of Marshall, Saline County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Missouri.

Barton J. Morrow, of Neosho, Newton County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Thirteenth supervisor's district of Missouri.

Elmer E. E. McJimsey, of Maryville, Nodaway County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Missouri.

James F. Reed, of Liberty, Clay County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Missouri.

Frank W. Rauchenstein, of Clayton, St. Louis County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Tenth supervisor's district of Missouri.

Joseph M. Pidcock, of Greenfield, Dade County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Missouri.

Judson S. Hill, of Morristown, Hamblen County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Tennessee.

John W. Vosholl, of Lynn, Osage County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of Missouri.

Benjamin T. Walker, of Dexter, Stoddard County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Twelfth supervisor's district of Missouri.

Daniel A. McDougal, of Savannah, Hardin County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of Tennessee.

Joel J. Jones, of Fayetteville, Lincoln County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Tennessee.

Archelaus M. Hughes, of Columbia, Maury County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Tennessee.

James R. Penland, of Sevierville, Sevier County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Tennessee.

George H. Morgan, of Cookeville, Putnam County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Tennessee.

Elwood W. Mattson, of Chattanooga, Hamilton County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Tennessee.

Thomas F. Tobin, of Memphis, Shelby County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Tenth supervisor's district of Tennessee.

James D. Senter, of Humboldt, Gibson County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of Tennessee.

Peter P. Pickard, of Waverly, Humphreys County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Tennessee.

Horatio C. Burchard, of Freeport, Stephenson County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Illinois.

Edward D. Blinn, of Lincoln, Logan County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eleventh supervisor's district of Illinois.

William E. Birkenbeuel, of La Salle, La Salle County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Illinois.

John B. Fithian, of Joliet, Will County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Illinois.

Gerald M. Finlay, of Augusta, Hancock County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of Illinois.

Fenton W. Booth, of Marshall, Clark County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Thirteenth supervisor's district of Illinois.

William Jackson, of Shabbona, Dekalb County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Illinois.

George F. Gilbert, of Chicago, Cook County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Illinois.

William C. Galloway, of Aledo, Mercer County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Illinois.

Henry J. Schmidt, of Nashville, Washington County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifteenth supervisor's district of Illinois.

Theodore G. Risley, of Mount Carmel, Wabash County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourteenth supervisor's district of Illinois.

Garrett DeF. Kinney, of Peoria, Peoria County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of Illinois.

Thomas Worthington, of Jacksonville, Morgan County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Tenth supervisor's district of Illinois.

James M. Truitt, of Hillsboro, Montgomery County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Twelfth supervisor's district of Illinois.

Edwin S. Swigart, of Champaign, Champaign County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Illinois.

John C. Billheimer, of Washington, Daviess County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Indiana.

Arthur E. Bradshaw, of Delphi, Carroll County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of Indiana.

Jonathan C. Willis, of Metropolis, Massac County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixteenth supervisor's district of Illinois.

Charles W. Lee, of Sugar Branch, Switzerland County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Indiana.

Charles G. Covert, of Evansville, Vanderburg County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Indiana.

Vincent G. Clifford, of Indianapolis, Marion County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Indiana.

David B. J. Schafer, of South Bend, St. Joseph County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Thirteenth supervisor's district of Indiana.

Joseph D. Poutch, of New Albany, Floyd County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Indiana.

Eli N. Norris, of Valparaiso, Porter County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Tenth supervisor's district of Indiana.

John F. Thompson, of Newcastle, Henry County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Indiana.

Orlando A. Somers, of Kokomo, Howard County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eleventh supervisor's district of Indiana.

Arthur L. Sharpe, of Bluffton, Wells County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of Indiana.

Ethel M. Allen, of Portland, Ionia County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Michigan.

Sol. A. Wood, of Angola, Steuben County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Twelfth supervisor's district of Indiana.

Isaac L. Wimmer, of Rockville, Parke County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Indiana.

George H. Brown, of Port Huron, St. Clair County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Michigan.

Flavius L. Brooke, of Detroit, Wayne County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Michigan.

Robert J. Bates, of Ironwood, Gogebic County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Twelfth supervisor's district of Michigan.

Charles H. Gurney, of Hillsdale, Hillsdale County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Michigan.

James K. Flood, of Hart, Oceana County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of Michigan.

Elbert V. Chilson, of Lansing, Ingham County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Michigan.

Charles L. Rarden, of Greenville, Montcalm County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eleventh supervisor's district of Michigan.

Festus R. Metcalf, of Adrian, Lenawee County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Michigan.

Charles R. Jackson, of East Tawas, Iosco County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Tenth supervisor's district of Michigan.

William Binkley, of Sidney, Shelby County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Ohio.

Benjamin S. Wing, of Hastings, Barry County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Michigan.

Otto L. Sprague, of Owosso, Shiawassee County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of Michigan.

Edward Q. Crane, of Batavia, Clermont County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Ohio.

Charles F. Brotherton, of Ashtabula, Ashtabula County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighteenth supervisor's district of Ohio.

Edwin Batt, of Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Nineteenth supervisor's district of Ohio.

Louis B. Fauver, of Elyria, Lorain County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Thirteenth supervisor's district of Ohio.

Frank M. Martin, of Caldwell, Noble County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourteenth supervisor's district of Ohio.

Sylvester W. Durflinger, of London, Madison County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Ohio.

William M. Hostetter, of Lisbon, Columbiana County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventeenth supervisor's district of Ohio.

William T. Hoopes, of Marysville, Union County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Ohio.

Isaac H. Gaston, of St. Clairsville, Belmont County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifteenth supervisor's district of Ohio.

Winfield S. Lambert, of South Webster, Scioto County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of Ohio.

Alexander Kiskadden, of Tiffin, Seneca County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Twelfth supervisor's district of Ohio.

Urban H. Hester, of Van Wert, Van Wert County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Ohio.

Otto E. Vollenweider, of McArthur, Vinton County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Tenth supervisor's district of Ohio.

George Stoddard, of Wyoming, Hamilton County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Ohio.

Frank P. Richter, of Hamilton, Butler County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Ohio.

Frank S. Baldwin, of Waupaca, Waupaca County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Wisconsin.

Robert J. West, of Toledo, Lucas County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of Ohio.

Henry A. Williams, of Columbus, Franklin County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eleventh supervisor's district of Ohio.

Eugene McIntyre, of Waldo, Sheboygan County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Wisconsin.

Alonzo A. Loper, of Ripon, Fond du Lac County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Wisconsin.

Jens B. Jensen, of Ellsworth, Pierce County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of Wisconsin.

Andrew J. Turner, of Portage, Columbia County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Wisconsin.

Richard Meyer, jr., of Lancaster, Grant County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Wisconsin.

John W. Miller, of Wausau, Marathon County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of Wisconsin.

William F. Avera, of Camden, Ouachita County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Arkansas.

Alfred G. Wright, of Milwaukee, Milwaukee County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Wisconsin.

Charles S. Van Auken, of La Crosse, La Crosse County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Wisconsin.

William B. Moss, of Jasper, Newton County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Arkansas.

James T. O'Hair, of Little Rock, Pulaski County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Arkansas.

James B. Baker, of Melbourne, Izard County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Arkansas.

William B. Peyton, of Keatchie, De Soto Parish, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Louisiana.

William H. Darrough, of Wyandotte, Crawford County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of Indian Territory.

Cage Rembert, of Helena, Phillips County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Arkansas.

John Yoist, of New Roads, Pointe Coupee Parish, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Louisiana.

Peter H. Segura, of New Iberia, Iberia Parish, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Louisiana.

Charles W. Phillips, of Lonewa, Ouachita Parish, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Louisiana.

Charles Banks, of Clarksdale, Coahoma County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Mississippi.

Albert E. Livandais, of New Orleans, Orleans Parish, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Louisiana.

William Clegg, of Lafayette, Lafayette Parish, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Louisiana.

Gines E. Galcerau, of Sturgis, Oktibbeha County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Mississippi.

Harvey E. Fitts, of Aberdeen, Monroe County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Mississippi.

Robert M. Bourdeaux, of Meridian, Lauderdale County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Mississippi.

Willis E. Mollison, of Vicksburg, Warren County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Mississippi.

William H. Mounger, of Enterprise, Clarke County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Mississippi.

William A. McDonald, of Ashland, Benton County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Mississippi.

Jeff D. Burns, of Tyler, Smith County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Texas.

William D. Bell, of Quanah, Hardeman County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Texas.

Ivan G. Conkling, of Enid, Garfield County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of Oklahoma.

Kennan S. Fisher, of Ennis, Ellis County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Texas.

Dunn R. Emerson, of Marlin, Falls County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of Texas.

Thomas H. Dwyer, of Brenham, Washington County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Twelfth supervisor's district of Texas.

James O. Luby, of San Diego, Duval County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Thirteenth supervisor's district of Texas.

Edward R. McLean, of Austin, Travis County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Tenth supervisor's district of Texas.

Robert M. Kelso, of Denton, Denton County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Texas.

Emmett W. Smith, of Nacogdoches, Nacogdoches County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of Texas.

Hart Settle, of Galveston, Galveston County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eleventh supervisor's district of Texas.

Willis G. Robinson, of San Antonio, Bexar County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Texas.

Joel W. Goldsby, of Mobile, Mobile County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Alabama.

Samuel M. Vernon, of Brownwood, Brown County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Texas.

John B. Stephens, of Mount Pleasant, Titus County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Texas.

Jefferson J. Sims, of Silver Run, Talladega County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Alabama.

John B. Long, of Jasper, Walker County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Alabama.

Daniel S. Jones, of Moody, St. Clair County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Alabama.

Walter U. Simmons, of Courtland, Lawrence County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of Alabama.

Asa E. Stratton, of Troy, Pike County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Alabama.

Rufus B. Smyer, of Birmingham, Jefferson County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Alabama.

James W. Anderson, of Covington, Newton County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Georgia.

George D. Anderson, of Marietta, Cobb County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Georgia.

Alexander Akerman, of Dublin, Laurens County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eleventh supervisor's district of Georgia.

Melville L. Covington, of Carrollton, Carroll County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Georgia.

Elbert L. Campbell, of Eudora, Jasper County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of Georgia.

Henry Blun, jr., of Savannah, Chatham County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Georgia.

Edward D. Smythe, of Augusta, Richmond County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Tenth supervisor's district of Georgia.

Judson M. Strickland, of Thomaston, Upson County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Georgia.

Henry W. Hopkins, of Thomasville, Thomas County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Georgia.

Gustavus A. Bingham, of Salisbury, Rowan County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of North Carolina.

John H. Witzel, of Blue Ridge, Fannin County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of Georgia.

Henry Wetteroth, of Americus, Sumter County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Georgia.

John A. Hendricks, of Marshall, Madison County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of North Carolina.

Joseph J. Jenkins, of Pittsboro, Chatham County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of North Carolina,

John T. B. Hoover, of Hillsboro, Orange County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of North Carolina.

Osmund F. Pool, of Taylorsville, Alexander County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of North Carolina.

Augustus M. Moore, of Greenville, Pitt County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of North Carolina.

Wheeler Martin, of Williamston, Martin County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of North Carolina.

Lindsey J. Breeden, of Bennettsville, Marlboro County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of South Carolina.

David J. Lewis, of Whiteville, Columbus County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of North Carolina.

Walter B. Steele, of Highpoint, Guilford County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of North Carolina.

David H. Russell, of Anderson, Anderson County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of South Carolina.

Samuel A. Pearce, of Columbia, Richland County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of South Carolina.

Thomas J. Cunningham, of Clowney, Chester County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of South Carolina.

George W. Blankenship, of Jonesville, Lee County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of Virginia.

Jonathan W. Wheeler, of Charleston, Charleston County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of South Carolina.

George W. Shell, of Laurens, Laurens County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth Supervisor's district of South Carolina.

Charles M. Hirt, of Rocky Mount, Franklin County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Virginia.

Charles C. Carrington, of Houston, Halifax County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Virginia.

Robert R. Campbell, of Warrenton, Fauquier County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of Virginia.

George T. Scarburgh, of Accomack, Accomack County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Virginia.

Francis R. Lassiter, of Petersburg, Dinwiddie County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Virginia.

Robert T. Hubard, of Bolling, Buckingham County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Tenth supervisor's district of Virginia.

John M. Steck, of Winchester, Frederick County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Virginia.

Chapman P. Snead, of Etna Mills, King William County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Virginia.

Henning E. Smith, of Suffolk, Nansemond County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Virginia.

POSTMASTERS.

George E. Scofield, to be postmaster at Greenwich, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut.

Charles A. Potter, to be postmaster at Danielson, in the county of Windham and State of Connecticut.

William H. Brown, to be postmaster at Jewett City, in the county of New London and State of Connecticut.

William C. Barhite, to be postmaster at Ridgefield, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut.

Frank J. Brettle, to be postmaster at Ellis, in the county of Ellis and State of Kansas.

Jacob B. Boyer, to be postmaster at Baxter Springs, in the county of Cherokee and State of Kansas.

Harry C. Achenbach, to be postmaster at Clay Center, in the county of Clay and State of Kansas.

Charles S. Hutchison, to be postmaster at Wilson, in the county of Ellsworth and State of Kansas.

James H. Downing, to be postmaster at Hays, in the county of Ellis and State of Kansas.

Jesse S. Carpenter, to be postmaster at Council Grove, in the county of Morris and State of Kansas.

Joseph S. Stone, to be postmaster at Burrton, in the county of Harvey and State of Kansas.

Joseph E. Stone, to be postmaster at Caney, in the county of Montgomery and State of Kansas.

Madge E. Long, to be postmaster at Belleville, in the county of Republic and State of Kansas.

Sidney G. Haley, to be postmaster at Phillips, in the county of Franklin and State of Maine.

James H. De Coster, to be postmaster at Mechanic Falls, in the county of Androscoggin and State of Maine.

Albert M. Wasser, to be postmaster at Girard, in the county of Crawford and State of Kansas.

Justin Berkin, to be postmaster at Morris, in the county of Stevens and State of Minnesota.

Charles B. Woodman, to be postmaster at Westbrook, in the county of Cumberland and State of Maine.

Guy W. McAlister, to be postmaster at Bucksport, in the county of Hancock and State of Maine.

Eilert Koefod, to be postmaster at Glenwood, in the county of Pope and State of Minnesota.

Barker C. Grover, to be postmaster at Zumbrota, in the county of Goodhue and State of Minnesota.

John Frisch, to be postmaster at St. Charles, in the county of Winona and State of Minnesota.

George F. Breder, to be postmaster at Egg Harbor City, in the county of Atlantic and State of New Jersey.

Fred E. Wheeler, to be postmaster at Appleton, in the county of Swift and State of Minnesota.

Theodore H. Sorlien, to be postmaster at Granite Falls, in the county of Yellow Medicine and State of Minnesota.

James L. Hays, to be postmaster at Newark, in the county of Essex and State of New Jersey.

Adam Dealaman, to be postmaster at Dunellen, in the county of Middlesex and State of New Jersey.

George W. Cooper, to be postmaster at Somerville, in the county of Somerset and State of New Jersey.

Henry R. Tatem, to be postmaster at Collingswood, in the county of Camden and State of New Jersey.

George W. Smith, to be postmaster at Hackettstown, in the county of Warren and State of New Jersey.

Lawrence W. Sickler, to be postmaster at Glassboro, in the county of Gloucester and State of New Jersey.

John R. Crain, to be postmaster at Jamestown, in the county of Greene and State of Ohio.

Chandler W. Carroll, to be postmaster at St. Clairsville, in the county of Belmont and State of Ohio.

Joseph D. Whitaker, to be postmaster at Penn Grove, in the county of Salem and State of New Jersey.

Jennie L. Gardner, to be postmaster at Ripley, in the county of Brown and State of Ohio.

Martin B. Edwards, jr., to be postmaster at Toronto, in the county of Jefferson and State of Ohio.

Charles C. Dewstoe, to be postmaster at Cleveland, in the county of Cuyahoga and State of Ohio.

Vernie E. Humphrey, to be postmaster of Fayette, in the county of Fulton and State of Ohio.

Samuel Hilles, to be postmaster at Barnesville, in the county of Belmont and State of Ohio.

Andrew J. Heinlein, to be postmaster at Bridgeport, in the county of Belmont and State of Ohio.

David M. McConnell, to be postmaster at Osborne, in the county of Greene and State of Ohio.

Alfred H. McCline, to be postmaster at Calla, in the county of Mahoning and State of Ohio.

Charles W. Jones, to be postmaster at Waverly, in the county of Pike and State of Ohio.

Charles B. Saxby, to be postmaster at Weston, in the county of Wood and State of Ohio.

Charles S. Putnam, to be postmaster at Conneaut, in the county of Ashtabula and State of Ohio.

William N. Peirce, to be postmaster at Glenville, in the county of Cuyahoga and State of Ohio.

John B. McNally, to be postmaster at Wellsburg, in the county of Brooke and State of West Virginia.

Victor C. Wass, to be postmaster at Centerville, in the county of Turner and State of South Dakota.

William T. Ellis, to be postmaster at Salem, in the county of McCook and State of South Dakota.

Lawrence Hauck, to be postmaster at Phillipsburg, in the county of Granite and State of Montana.

Arthur J. Kinney, to be postmaster at Harrington, in the county of Kent and State of Delaware.

Gustavus C. Schrink, to be postmaster at Pottsville, in the county of Schuykill and State of Pennsylvania.

William A. Chapman, to be postmaster at Cedartown, in the county of Polk and State of Georgia.

Oscar T. Adams, to be postmaster at Fort McPherson, in the county of Fulton and State of Georgia.

George H. Keep, to be postmaster at Missoula, in the county of Missoula and State of Montana.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *December 12, 1899.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolutions of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

Joint resolution (S. R. 28) relating to the use of the rooms lately occupied by the Congressional Library in the Capitol; and

Joint resolution (S. R. 26) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the use of the United States post-office and court-house building at Parkersburg, W. Va., by the circuit court and criminal court of Wood County, W. Va., sitting at Parkersburg.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. In pursuance of the special order, the House will now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, before that action is taken, permit me to make a statement. It seems quite obvious that it will be impossible for gentlemen on this side of the Chamber, from the number who have applied to me for an opportunity to speak on the pending bill, and I am informed that there are a number of gentlemen on the other side in the same position—that it will not be possible for all of them to be heard during the daytime within the time set apart for the consideration of the bill. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that, beginning with to-night and ending on Friday night, there may be night sessions for debate only, beginning at 8 o'clock and terminating at half past 10 o'clock, under the same order as has been made for the day sessions.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I would ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he does not think that a less number of nights would be sufficient. It would seem that one or two night sessions would be all that could be required to accommodate them.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will modify my request, Mr. Speaker, so that the night sessions will begin to-morrow night. That will give us the nights of Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday. I hope the gentleman will not object to that.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will submit the request of the gentleman from Tennessee, that on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday there shall be night sessions, beginning at 8 o'clock and ending at 10.30, for the purpose of debate only on the pending bill. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would suggest also, Mr. Speaker, also in this same connection, that for five legislative days after the bill is disposed of leave to print be allowed to gentlemen who may desire to submit remarks on the pending bill.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I hope the gentleman from Tennessee will yield to me for a moment.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Certainly.

Mr. OVERSTREET. After having granted three nights for the discussion of the bill, I think the request for leave to print on the part of all members is just a little unreasonable. Now, if the gentleman will modify his request so that it will apply to the extension of remarks on the part of members who have spoken upon the bill, I certainly would not object to that.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Then, Mr. Speaker, I will modify the request and ask consent that for five legislative days, after the disposition of the bill, gentlemen who have spoken upon it may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PAYNE. I hope, if the suggestion of the gentleman from Tennessee is adopted by the House, that it will be understood to apply to legitimate speeches, and not permit members to print some book or essay on political economy which they may think applicable to the pending question.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think the gentleman from New York is entirely right. I do not want the RECORD to be abused or to be filled up by printing books or financial essays, but only legitimate matter which would probably be used in debate on the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman makes the request that those participating in the debate may have five days after the conclusion of the debate in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I desire to suggest, Mr. Speaker, legislative days, because possibly no RECORD will be printed within the five days after the expiration of the time fixed for the consideration of this bill.

The SPEAKER (continuing). And such printing to be confined to the subject of the special order.

Mr. PAYNE. I think, Mr. Speaker, that these speeches ought to be printed, or ought to be in the hands of the Public Printer, before the holiday recess.

Mr. RICHARDSON. But, Mr. Speaker, if we adjourn the day after the vote is taken on the pending bill there will probably be no RECORD published in which these speeches could be printed.

Mr. PAYNE. I think the gentleman's first suggestion is not objectionable—that five days be allowed in which to file these speeches. They can be printed when the first RECORD is published after that date.

Mr. RICHARDSON. But suppose there is no RECORD.

Mr. PAYNE. They will appear in the first RECORD published after the disposition of the bill. Five days, I think, instead of five legislative days, would be unobjectionable.

Mr. RICHARDSON. With the understanding that these speeches shall be published in the first RECORD which appears after the five days have expired, I have no objection to that; and my request is that gentlemen who participate in the debate, under the special order, may have until the publication of the RECORD on the first day after the holidays to print such remarks as they desire to make.

Mr. PAYNE. But that is subject to the same objection I have just made. My suggestion is that five days be allowed to file remarks with the Public Printer—five days after the expiration of the special order. The proposition of the gentleman from Tennessee goes right back to the objection which I first suggested, and gives really seventeen days instead of five. We object to that. If you will limit it to five days after the bill is disposed of there will be no objection. I think that is ample time.

Mr. OVERSTREET. That is to say, that the speeches must be in the hands of the printer by Saturday of next week. That would be five days from the close of the present special order.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Well, if that is agreeable, I have no objection; but I can see no objection to handing the speeches to the Public Printer up to the date of the publication of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will endeavor to state to the House what he understands to be the request, which is that those participating in this debate on the floor of the House may have five days from the conclusion of the special order within which to file their remarks with the Public Printer, their remarks to be confined to the discussion of the special order. Is there objection to this request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

And then, in pursuance of the special order, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes, with Mr. HEPBURN in the chair.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I listened with more than ordinary interest yesterday to the opening of this debate. I had curiosity to know what our friends on the other side would say at this late day upon the question which they seem to think is involved in this proposed legislation. I was prepared, with some elaborate knowledge of the arguments that had been made upon the subject of the free and unlimited coinage of silver, but I had witnessed during the past six months such a disintegration of the forces which in 1896 stood by the banner of the great leader of the party who advocated that dogma that I believed—I hoped, at least—that it might be possible that our Democratic friends on the other side of this House would discuss the merits of this legislation and waive, for the present time at least, any distinct advocacy of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at 16 to 1.

I thought that with the breaking up of their party organization in Kansas, the repudiation of their platform by the Democracy of Pennsylvania and Maryland, the significant defeat of their party in the Dakotas, and the evidences coming from all directions in the Northwest and the Southwest that this dogma was no longer a possible issue that would bring victory, that it might be that our Democratic friends would come to us with some other suggestion.

But they are here, and they are here with the same old, stale battle cry, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND], with a pertinacity which closely approximates audacity, talks about the victory of 1896 as having been brought about by fraud, by bribery, and by intimidation. The political party that found it necessary to call upon a candidate for President to uphold a Goebel law in Kentucky ought not at this late day to talk about bad legislation and intimidation.

Now, once for all, I want to say to the gentleman that it will not be a valuable declaration in the United States to charge that the Republican party of this country carried the country in 1896 either by corrupting the ballot with money, by intimidation, or by any other means not strictly in keeping with the best and most upright obedience to law.

It is very easy, Mr. Chairman, to stand up and charge a political

party with having bribed the voters of the country. It is very easy for a leading and distinguished Democrat to charge that the men of his party are for sale. It is very easy for a distinguished Democrat to say that the voting population of his party have not the courage to vote their sentiments and will sell their votes at an election. But it is not so easy to prove the charge or to convince the people of the facts thus alleged.

I have never had that estimate of the Democratic party myself and I deny that general allegations of that character are worthy of the distinguished position occupied by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND]. More than two-thirds of the campaign fund of the Republican party, certainly largely more than half of the national campaign fund of the Republican party of 1896, placed in the hands of its national committee, was expended in the printing and circulation of printed matter among the voters of the country. We entered upon a campaign which bade fair in the outset to be an assault by the Democrats upon the policy of the Republican party in the matter of revenue legislation of Congress, and suddenly we found ourselves precipitated into the fight that ultimately resulted in the election of McKinley. The question of silver suddenly came to the front and assumed a most important place. And so it was that a campaign of education upon a scale unparalleled in the history of political parties in this country was inaugurated by the Republican party and carried through to triumphal victory in the end.

So much for that. Hereafter I trust that our friends on the other side will make deliberate statements of facts, coupled with times, place, and amounts of money, and, as far as possible, the names of Democrats who were hired to vote the Republican ticket, and especially that locations where bribery or intimidation took place be pointed out.

Mr. SULZER. Will the gentleman from Ohio permit a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes; certainly.

Mr. SULZER. Does the gentleman from Ohio know how much money the Republican party expended in 1896?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Does the gentleman from New York know?

Mr. SULZER. I do not know; but I have read the fact stated in the papers that the party expended a very large amount of money.

Mr. GROSVENOR. You never read anything in the papers but what was true, did you?

Mr. SULZER. Oh, yes.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Do you believe what was in the papers?

Mr. SULZER. I would like to know whether you can answer the question which I asked?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will you answer my question? Do you believe the statements that you read in the newspapers? [Laughter.]

Mr. SULZER. I would like you to answer my question.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman believes what he saw in the papers, he has got the information he seeks; if he does not believe, I am not going to correct a misapprehension of facts.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman can not state it, I am entirely content.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, the gentleman from New York knows that I have occasionally had information that I did not state on this floor. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. SULZER. I thought, Mr. Chairman, that as the gentleman said that his party had expended two-thirds of this campaign fund in circulating literature he would know how much money they had.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, "the gentleman from Ohio" does know to a dollar, and "the gentleman from Ohio" remits the gentleman from New York to such sources of information as he may value.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to proceed. There has been a great deal said here, and some of it is exceedingly interesting, about the change that the Republican party in this country has made upon the question involved, and I have understood, if I do not misapprehend, that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] claimed that this question of the gold standard in the United States had never yet been submitted to the voters of the country.

I so understood him—that this was a new thing; nobody had asked for it; nobody had called upon the Republicans in Congress to pass any measure of this character. If I am right about that, I want to say that the gentleman is wholly and absolutely mistaken in his statement. I hold in my hands a pamphlet containing a complete illustration of what took place at St. Louis nearly four years ago, when the Republican party met and established the platform upon which the campaign of 1896 was fought out; and I undertake to say, from the various propositions that were there submitted, this statement is a true statement. There were no differences of opinion that were material between the various leading Republicans when assembled at St. Louis upon the question of what the platform should be upon the subject of the currency.

I hold in my hands a poll of the members of the committee on resolutions, made before they had assembled, and which gives the individual opinions of every member of that great committee. If any gentleman will take the trouble to read it—and I shall place it in my remarks—he will discover that an overwhelming majority of that committee were in favor, even prior to their assemblage at St. Louis, of putting into the platform a declaration in favor of the gold standard, and that the only controversy that arose at St. Louis, or has ever arisen since that time among Republicans, has been the question of who favored certain wording, certain expressions, certain mere verbiage in the platform: but so it was that finally, under the guidance of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, Senator FORAKER, who had in his possession all the propositions that had been made, two or three of which are accredited to myself and one or more to the distinguished Speaker of this House, out of all these propositions was molded the platform about which there was no dispute and which advocated a declaration by the Republican party in favor of the gold standard—"the existing gold standard"—and under that battle cry we won the great victory, and from that day to this there has been no word of contention among the Republicans of this country.

The known opinions of the gentlemen who constituted the committee on resolutions of the convention before their first meeting are shown in the following poll:

Alabama.—H. V. Cashin, existing standard.
Arkansas.—John McClure, gold.
California.—Allen B. Lemmon, 16 to 1 free coinage
Colorado.—Senator TELLER, 16 to 1 free coinage.
Connecticut.—Sam. Fessenden, existing gold standard.
Delaware.—J. E. Addicks, gold.
Florida.—J. W. Archibald, gold.
Georgia.—Not settled. Existing standard.
Idaho.—Fred. T. Du Bois, 16 to 1 free coinage.
Illinois.—R. W. Patterson, existing gold standard.
Indiana.—Gen. Lew Wallace, gold.
Iowa.—JOHN H. GEAR, ——.
Kansas.—C. A. Swinson, ——.
Kentucky.—Leslie Coombs, gold.
Louisiana.—H. C. Warmouth, sound money.
Maine.—AMOS L. ALLEN, gold.
Maryland.—James A. Gary, gold.
Massachusetts.—HENRY CABOT LODGE, existing gold standard.
Michigan.—Mark S. Brewer, sound money.
Minnesota.—Ex-Governor William R. Merriam, gold.
Mississippi.—Wesley Crayton, ——.
Missouri.—Hon. F. G. Niedringhaus, sound money.
* *Montana.*—Charles Hartman, free coinage.
Nebraska.—Peter Jensen, existing standard.
Nevada.—A. C. Cleveland, 16 to 1 free coinage.
New Hampshire.—Frank S. Streeter, gold.
New Jersey.—Frank Bergen, gold.
New York.—Edward Lauterbach, gold.
North Carolina.—M. L. Mott, sound money.
North Dakota.—Alex. Hughes, existing standard.
Ohio.—J. B. FORAKER, existing standard.
Oregon.—Charles S. Moore, gold.
Pennsylvania.—Smedley Darlington, gold.
Rhode Island.—Walter A. Read, gold.
South Carolina.—C. M. Wilder, present standard.
South Dakota.—Gold.
Tennessee.—Not settled. Sound money.
Texas.—Not settled. Gold.
**Utah.*—F. J. Cannon, free silver.
Vermont.—Dr. H. D. Haton, gold.
Virginia.—J. D. Brady, sound money.
Washington.—A. F. Burleigh, gold.
West Virginia.—F. M. Reynolds, gold.
Wisconsin.—R. M. Lafollette, gold.
Wyoming.—B. F. Fowler, silver.

TERRITORIES.

Arizona.— —— ——.
New Mexico.—John S. Clark, ——.
Oklahoma.— —— ——.
Indian Territory.—J. P. Grady, gold.
District of Columbia.—Not settled. Gold.
Alaska.—Not settled. Gold.

[Those against whose names appear a star left the convention and now belong to the Bryan Democracy.]

Now, who cares about going back into ancient history to find how parties of this country have stood upon this question? I said when this rule was under consideration that our friends on the other side would have enough to do to hold themselves together in opposition to this bill without discussing anything or to analyze their position, and if they saw fit to discuss our antecedent history it was all right. I am going to put into the RECORD Democratic declarations upon a certain series of questions, and point out to you what sort of a record you have, and after you have disposed of that you can come back at us about consistency in politics. Why, when the war for the suppression of the rebellion was going on every leading, distinguished Democrat of the United States denounced these greenbacks that my friend from Missouri almost shed tears over yesterday. It was really painful to me, with my sympathetic nature, to hear him talk about the bare possibility of impounding a few of the greenbacks—that very mode of money, that very proposition that the Democratic party in Congress and throughout the country, in the years 1862 to 1865, denounced as worthless rags and sent word to the soldiers in the army not to take that money, for it was utterly worthless. The same Democratic party three years later, in 1868, in New York, nominated Horatio Seymour on a platform in favor

of irredeemable greenbacks without any prospect or provision that they should ever be redeemed—a socialistic, Populistic, hoboistic proposition from beginning to end. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. TERRY. Will the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. GROSVENOR. For what purpose?

Mr. TERRY. Does not the gentleman think it would be a little nearer recent history if, instead of going back to the attitude of the Democratic party in 1861, he would refer to the attitude of the Republican party in regard to greenbacks in the years 1892, 1893, 1894, and 1895?

Mr. GROSVENOR. My friend from Arkansas has a mind that always outstrips mine in the race. He always gets ahead of me.

Mr. TERRY. That is a pretty hard thing to do. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Does the gentleman from Arkansas think I would talk about 1868 and omit the gems of political literature involving the Democratic platforms of more recent date?

Mr. TERRY. I said the Republican platform.

Mr. GROSVENOR. And the Republican platform also. I will give the gentleman the platforms of 1892 of both parties now, and he will find little to console him upon this question. The Democratic platform of that year, on which Cleveland run for office, has the following:

> We denounce the Republican legislation, known as the Sherman Act, of 1890 as a cowardly makeshift, fraught with possibilities of danger in the future, which should make all of its supporters, as well as its author, anxious for its speedy repeal. We hold to the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country, and to the coinage of both gold and silver without discriminating against either metal or charge for mintage, but the dollar unit of coinage of both metals must be of equal intrinsic and unchangeable value.

Then the Democratic party stood where the Republican party stood exactly in that year 1892. They elected a President who came into this House and asked the members of this House to justify and authorize the borrowing of money at 3 per cent interest upon gold bonds, and I shall speak about that later on. I shall print in my remarks some of these various declarations of the different parties; and while I am ready to confess that conditions have changed since these declarations, I maintain that the Republican party has always held to the single cardinal doctrine that every dollar of our money shall be of equal intrinsic value, and that every dollar shall have the equal debt-paying power in the country. It has always stood by the bondholder and the laborer alike. It has always declared that the man who drew his pension and the man who drew his pay for a day's labor and the man who cuts his cupons off the bonds shall be paid in a dollar of equal value. The whole legislation of the Republican party from 1892 down to now has been right along that line.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MCCLELLAN], whom I always like to hear talk, for I have found him to be clear and explicit in his views, made a most singular statement yesterday, and I desire to refer to it. He stated that if we now proceed to legislate and enact a law that shall make all the bonds of the Government payable in gold in the terms of the law itself then we shall advance the premium upon all the outstanding bonds of the country way up to an enormous and most fabulous price.

He talked about a 4 per cent bond being $1.75, or something like that, on the dollar—a thing never heard of except in the dreams of Democratic statesmen when they have been trying to palm off a 50-cent dollar on the laboring people of the United States. Let me call my young friend's attention to the difficulty under which he labors. He does not undertake to give this as his opinion, based upon his own knowledge of financial matters, but he goes back to 1893 or 1895 and takes up the fact that Cleveland proposed a bond issue for sixty-two millions—it was not fifty millions, as my friend thinks—a gold bond at 3 per cent interest, or a coin bond at 4½ per cent, and then he figures out the difference there would have been at that time under that state of the bonds and the time the issue was paid, and undertakes to convince the people of this country that our bill now pending would have the same effect on the whole issue of the Government bonds now outstanding that operated and effected the offers made for the purchase of those bonds.

The gentleman has misinterpreted the difference between these two bonds at that period of time. The 3 per cent gold bond was an anomaly in our legislation, and had we passed that bill, which the Democratic Congress voted almost solidly for, the effect of it would have been this—as I understood at the time, and as I understand now: we should have segregated that $62,500,000 of that loan out from the great mass of the bonded indebtedness of the country and we should have imported into the terms of the bond the word "gold," whereas all the other bonded indebtedness of the country was payable, by the terms of the bonds, in "coin."

Now, the effect, Mr. Chairman, would have been at once to call attention of the financial world to the fact that Congress was using language in the enactment of the law that imported a discrimination between the various classes of bonds. You could not hold the legislation of Congress as of no force and effect. You could consider the word "coin," as used in one part of the declaration, and "gold," as used in another, as meaning precisely the same thing, when the word "gold" is used in the one sense and the word "coin" in a very different sense. So the first impression was that the coin bonds would be payable in the silver dollar of the country; that is unmistakable; and the effect would have been to place the bonds that had "gold" inserted in them upon a higher plane and fix them at a higher value than the other bonds.

I remember very well the circumstances connected with the legislation to which gentlemen have referred. Gentlemen have talked of Senator Sherman and his connection with the issue of these bonds. They have suggested what he said as to the purpose of the law. They have stated what his understanding was as to the purpose of the insertion of the word "gold" into the bonds then issued. I remember very well the vote upon that occasion. I remember the action taken by my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS], then leading the majority of the Republican side on that question, and in opposition to the insertion of the word "gold" in the bonds, and I acted with him. It was argued here that it made a difference between the coin and the gold bonds of some $16,000,000 to the Government in the long run of the series.

I had an interview with Senator Sherman on the subject. I said to him, "This charge has been made, and by my vote, it is said, I have undertaken to increase the cost to the Government, according to the statement which has been urged, of some $16,000,000." He took a pencil and made a rapid calculation. He said, "That is entirely correct. It will cost the Government to redeem the bonds you authorize $16,000,000 more than if you had authorized gold bonds." I thought I was going to get a lecture from him for my vote on that question, but he said, "There is another view which should be taken of this matter. If you put the word 'gold' into the bonds you issued, you would have made a suggestion to the people of the United States that all the other bonds already issued were payable in silver, and thereupon you would have depreciated the outstanding bonds four times $16,000,000." That was the argument that was made at that time by the financiers of the day, and that is the argument that is just as true now.

Now let us recur again to the argument of the gentleman from New York. We do not insert the word "gold" into the new issue of bonds, but we do put into the law affecting them a provision which must meet the approval and sanction of both branches of the Government. We provide that all of the bonds of the Government and all of the obligations of the Government shall be payable in gold, and when we do that we do not advance the value of the outstanding bonds or increase the indebtedness of the Government to the extent of a single copper.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] said that we are making a new departure for the Government, and so said the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. The gentleman from Missouri says we are making the Government a largely increased debtor; that we are making a gift to the people of the difference between the gold and the coin bond. That statement, however, has no force whatever, unless the gentleman proposes that it is the purpose of himself and his party to pay the outstanding bonds of the Government in a money that is worth less than gold. Does he propose that? Does the gentleman propose to carry out the argument and the scheme to cut down the value of the bonds of the Government below par in gold? If so, there is some sense in his argument. If not, it is simply "sound and fury, signifying nothing."

But now let us get back to the changes of opinion which have come upon us in the last few years. I was once assailed on the floor of the House for an alleged change of opinion, and following the example of my able and distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], I will give a personal illustration. My attention was called to a vote that I gave in the legislature of the State of Ohio, and I am glad to be able to state my exact position in regard to it. I was a member of the legislature of that State in 1875, and from that time to 1879, during four years, and from 1876 to 1877 I was a member of the house of representatives and was the speaker of that body. There was introduced in the senate a proposition advocating the passage of the Bland-Allison Act. At that time the difference between the gold and silver in the dollar was something like from 3 to 5 cents—not more than 5 and not less than 3. We were approaching then the resumption period and the law was to take effect on the 1st day of January, 1879.

All this country was in doubt, except a very few financiers. There was terror everywhere lest we should go to protest, and a leading Democrat of Ohio, a most distinguished Democrat, in his speeches in the fall of that year, said that when the subtreasury in New York should be opened on the 1st day of January it would require the standing Army to protect the Treasury from the rush that would be made to cash in the greenback dollars and the demands upon the Treasury. And so, believing as I did then, that the passage of the Bland-Allison Act, or its equivalent, whatever the form was, would be a relief to the Treasury and aid it in resumption, and the difference between the intrinsic value of the metals being so small, I voted in favor of that resolution, as did everybody else almost in both branches of the Ohio legislature. And, Mr. Chairman, gentlemen need not turn to me and point me

out as an example of changing front. If conditions to-day were where they were then, I would now vote for the same measure that I voted for in 1877.

Other gentlemen have grown wiser as well as I have, and step by step we have seen the ruin that any other course than the one now proposed will always bring upon the country; and so we are admonished by the people of the country to stand for the measure now under consideration.

Why, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] talks about the Republican party being under the domination of the wealthy classes, and undertakes to point out that we do nothing here that is favorable to what he is pleased to call "the masses." Why, if there is any one party on the face of this continent that more nearly represents the aspirations, the hopes and the interests of the masses of the people of this country, surely it is the Republican party. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Let us see what has happened. I am not going back now, my friend from Arkansas will take notice, into ancient history. I will come down to some modern history. Three years ago last summer we had a great contest in the United States. People talk about the days of Henry Clay, of Daniel Webster, and the great men of those periods. I have read the history of the politics of my country, and I say without hesitation that the greatest battle of intellect, of brains, of education, the greatest battle ever fought in the arena of American politics, was the battle of 1896. More study was given to politics that year than ever before. More earnest attention was given to the real questions involved that year than in any other year, and the greatness, the power, the eloquence, the learning were not all on one side. I frankly admit it. I was there and I heard the contest. I heard the clash of arms. I witnessed the charging columns upon the battlefield, and I testify without hesitation that it was a battle of giants and it was a battle for principle and not for spoils.

How came it and what was there of it? The summer of 1896 came upon the people of the United States finding them in the worst condition they were ever in in all the history of the country. There was more poverty, more starvation, more uncertainty, more bankruptcy, than on any previous occasion in the history of our country. I know that Professor Fiske, ignoring the present, tells us that the most terrible days of our country were in the years that followed the close of the Revolutionary war. Those troubles were ephemeral and small in comparison with the horrors which presented themselves to the people of the United States in the year 1896. And they were all the worse because we had just emerged from a period of magnificent prosperity.

The year 1893 dawned upon us with the greatest prosperity the country had ever had up to that date, but from the very introduction of the year 1893 down to the close of 1896 horrors accumulated upon every hand and trod upon each other's heels, so swift they came. There were more idle men in this country than ever before. There were more soup houses than ever before. The one great industry that has always flourished under the Democratic party, the American soup house, was in a more flourishing condition than ever known before on earth. Our foreign trade had been diminished. Our mills and factories stood idle. Everybody agreed to it. Go back to your own speeches on the floor of this House in the summer of 1896, gentlemen, prior to the two conventions, and you agreed with us and we agreed with you that the times were troublous, that the oppression of the people was horrible, and that something had to be done; and you went to Chicago and we went to St. Louis to tell the people of this country what we proposed to do, you admitting all that we claimed and we admitting all that you claimed.

You said the panacea was this, the free and unlimited coinage of silver and the maintenance of the free-trade tariff bill called the Wilson Act. That is what you said. You said, "Give us those two things." One was a negative proposition—"We will not repeal this law." The other was an affirmative proposition—"We will pass the free-silver law." And you said—and there is the mistake you made; there is where you put all your eggs in one basket—you said, "If you do not have free silver you will never have any better times." You said throughout this country that a vote for McKinley meant 10-cent corn, 25-cent wheat, 3-cent cotton, and all the various horrors that were coming rapidly upon us; and your great candidate for the Presidency said to the starving laborers, "Your wages will never be increased in this country until you have the free coinage of silver." He said to the farmers, who were selling their wheat at 45 cents a bushel, "You will never get any more for your wheat until we have the free coinage of silver." He said, "The volume of the currency is so small that business can not be transacted upon it, and it will never be any better until you have the free coinage of silver."

That was the issue, as they said. What did we say? We said the question of the coinage of silver had nothing to do with it. We said the trouble came of sending our money to pay for the articles that we consumed among the American people to foreign lands, and expending our money to pay for labor in the old countries. And we said, "Give us back the McKinley law, or its equivalent, and we will stand upon 'the existing gold standard,' and good times will come." [Applause on the Republican side.] That was the issue, gentlemen. You know it; you know it as well as I do. I have exaggerated nothing; I have not dotted an "i" nor crossed a "t" that was not all previously in your argument to the people of this country.

The campaign went on; the battle was fought; it was a battle of education; it was a battle that brought into action every prominent man in the United States, and the issue was as clearly made as it was possible. Looking back to that period, I have only to regret that during the latter days of that great campaign there was practically a substantial silence by the great leader of the Democracy upon the real question of the free coinage of silver; and as the desperation of the closing hours began to come he came into the laboring districts of the great middle North and West and appealed to the laboring men and the poor men, the suffering men of that community, in a way that nothing but the heat of a Presidential campaign and the desperation of his own position would have justified.

He came into my own district. The miners of that district were suffering for bread. They were mining coal about two and a half days a week at 45 cents a ton, and he appealed to them against the men of money. And, Mr. Chairman, there never was an hour in the history of this country when we were in greater peril—when it was doubtful whether he would be elected or not. I rode during the latter days of the campaign among the miners of my district and heard the muttering of voices that I hope I will never hear again in my life.

Men who were hungry, men who were looking forward to the coming of a cold and desolate winter without the prospect of any improvement of the conditions, men who had heard the unfortunate voice of this great leader rallying them against the men of money, men who had something, men who are the leaders of the business interests of the country; but they did not falter. And I shall never forget the impression that was made upon me as I rode upon a special train for miles on three days before the election, with decorated cars, to let the people know that it was a campaign movement; and I saw in front of the little cabins of the coal miners here and there, very often on the great majority of them, a little flag, a little American flag, that typified the faith of that miner in that great party that had always upheld that flag and the interests of labor [loud applause on the Republican side]; and it was both pitiful and beautiful, as we swung past them, to see the little children coming out, almost naked, almost starving, and pointing to the flag upon their little cabins.

The election came, and the faith of the people swung over to the Republican party, answering every call to duty, and elected McKinley and a Republican Congress. [Loud applause.] He who to-day undertakes to say that that was not the voice of the American people is deaf to a sound that has convinced the intelligence of this country. What happened? Prosperity came. It did not come very fast. We assembled here on the 15th day of March. We passed a tariff bill, under the pledge of the Republican party made by Mr. McKinley to the people of this country when standing upon the porch of his little house, as was described so eloquently by the gentleman from Iowa. He declared that there was but one thing to do, and that was to pass a tariff law.

We came here in obedience to his pledge, and in answer to that call, on the 31st day of March, we passed the Dingley bill. It was delayed and impeded in the Senate, and became law on the 24th of July. Great reactions in business come slowly, and our Democratic friends caught the hope that the horrors that they created were still to last and hang over us. I do not want to say anything unpleasant, and am not going to; but it is a very curious thing to me that I never saw a happy Democrat when he could not complain of something. [Laughter.] I never saw a happy Democrat when he could not pick out somebody that was unhappy.

Why, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] has not really waked up to the fact that we have prosperity in this country, and his great leader, the champion of the Democratic party, went about the country lecturing for a year and a half, inquiring as he came into the towns and villages, "Where is the advance agent of prosperity?" and my friend from Iowa did not sleep regularly for six months under the demands of the Democratic party to make good his proposition that Mr. McKinley was "the advance agent of prosperity." But it came. The farmers of Kansas in a single year paid off and canceled $65,000,000 of mortgages that used to be wailed about on the floor of the House.

The following extract from a recent news publication shows how labor has been benefited:

MEANS MILLIONS TO EMPLOYEES—INCREASE IN MAINE AND NEW HAMPSHIRE MILLS.

MANCHESTER, N. H., *December 7, 1899.*

Following the announcement from Boston yesterday that wages at the Amoskeag, Stark, and Amory cotton mills here are to be advanced 10 per

cent December 18, Agent Charles D. McDuffie, of the Manchester company, has declared that his mills also will grant an increase of 10 per cent on December 18. In all, nearly 15,000 hands are affected by the new schedule here.

The pay rolls of the mills in Massachusetts aggregate $112,000 a week. The new rates mean an increase of nearly $600,000 a year in wages.

LEWISTON, ME., *December 7, 1899.*

The mills of this State will grant the general increase in wages now being arranged in cotton-manufacturing towns of New England.

Notices of a 10 per cent advance are being posted gradually through the cotton districts of Maine. To-day the Androscoggin, Continental, Bates, and Hill mills, of Lewiston, announce an increase of 10 per cent to begin December 18. About 5,000 hands are employed by the four corporations.

The Baker mills, of Auburn; Farwell mills, of Lisbon, and other concerns will take some action on the question shortly. The York corporation, of Saco, will raise wages Monday. The Lockwood Mills, of Waterville, have announced a 10 per cent increase for December 18. The Laconia and Pepper manufacturing companies will increase the pay of their 3,000 employees 10 per cent December 10.

And the following:

WHERE THE MILL HANDS PROFIT—WAGE INCREASE IN THE NEW ENGLAND STATES, AND THE CITIES THAT ARE BENEFITED.

NEW YORK, *December 12, 1899.*

The following table shows where the wages of mill hands in New England have been increased, the number of hands affected, and the amount of advance:

MASSACHUSETTS.

Place and mill.	Number of hands.	Monthly increase.
Adams, Berkshire	1,600	$8,000
Amesbury, Hamilton woolen	700	2,000
Attleboro, Knights'	900	2,300
Chicopee, Chicopee and Dwight	800	2,000
Clinton, Lancaster gingham	2,500	6,400
Dodgeville, Knights'	800	2,100
Fall River, 23 corporations	30,000	100,000
Hebronville, Knights'	1,000	3,000
Hyde Park, Readville	1,600	5,000
Lawrence, 5 corporations	10,000	25,000
Lowell, 12 corporations	18,000	60,000
Manchang, Knights'	400	1,000
Methuen, Methuen	1,500	4,000
New Bedford, 18 corporations	13,000	45,000
North Adams, 3 corporations	1,400	3,000
Taunton, Corr	400	1,200
Whitinsville, 3 corporations	1,000	3,100
Williamstown, Williamstown	500	1,200

NEW HAMPSHIRE AND VERMONT.

Dover, N. H., Cocheco	1,500	$4,200
Hookset, N. H., Hookset	300	800
Manchester, N. H., 4 corporations	15,000	50,000
Nashua, N. H., Nashua and Jackson	3,500	9,000
Pownal, Vt., Arnold	500	1,000
Suncook, N. H., 3 corporations	1,500	4,100

RHODE ISLAND.

Albion, Chace	1,500	$5,000
Arkwright, Interlaken	2,000	7,500
Centerville, Warwick	1,800	6,800
Manville, Lippitt	1,500	6,500
Pawtucket, 3 corporations	5,000	15,000
Woonsocket, 4 corporations	6,000	18,000
Scattered, Knights' Goddard mills	18,000	50,000

CONNECTICUT.

Danielson, Wauregan	1,500	$4,800
Grosvenordale, Grosvenor Ballou	1,600	5,000
Jewett City, Ashland	1,200	4,000
Killingly, Attawangan	1,800	6,000
Quinnebaug, Stevens	600	2,000
Willimantic, Windham	1,200	4,000

MAINE.

Augusta, Edwards	1,100	$2,400
Biddeford, Pepperell	3,500	9,500
Lewiston, 4 corporations	5,000	12,500
Saco, York	1,500	4,100
Waterville, Lockwood	1,500	4,000
Total for New England	164,000	510,500

In addition to the foregoing mills, other operators have signified their intention to soon raise the scale.

The payment of the mortgages upon farm lands in Kansas is in keeping with the record everywhere. But in Kansas they knocked out the whole argument, so far as that was concerned, and the people of Kansas not only knocked out the mortgages, but they knocked out the Populist representatives in Congress with the sole exception of one. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Now, my friends, I am going to make a few concise interrogatories. Can you name one thing you said after your introductory remarks of "Ladies and gentlemen" or "Fellow citizens" in any one of your campaign speeches of 1896 that ever became true? [Laughter on the Republican side.] Can you? If you can, I appeal to you, under this order to print, to put it into the RECORD and let us embalm it.

Was there one thing you said—and you may start at Bryan and go clear down to the smallest Democrat or go up to the largest Democrat, and you may take all the newspapers and all your arguments, and if you will find one single suggestion, either affirmative or negative, that came out as you said, I will agree that I never heard of it up to this time. Can you name it? You can not. Do you want the people now to take your word that you understand this question that is now pending here? Do you?

Suppose one of you were a witness on the witness stand and a competent cross-examiner questioned your fitness as an expert. On cross-examination he would say, "My friend, you have been in politics for a long time?" "Yes." "You were in the campaign of 1896, were you not?" "Yes." "You made speeches and wrote letters and talked to the people?" "Yes." "Please find one thing, and bring it to me, which you then said that was not false when you said it or was a mistake of fact." I think you would be ordered to stand aside by the court, who would be the judge of your competency as a witness. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

You said we would have no foreign trade. We have had the biggest foreign trade this country ever had in all its history. You said we would not have money enough to do business. We have $400,000,000 more to-day than when you made that prophetic utterance, and every dollar is of equal par value. But we are here to say that no contingency shall ever arise, if we can help it, when you shall undo the work the people demand shall be done. [Applause on the Republican side.] You are in favor of the free coinage of silver, are you? The most disastrous agitation that ever came into this country. Under it in 1896 the cash value of property in this country had decreased more than the whole cost of the civil war, the war with Spain, and the war with Aguinaldo and the Philippine Islands.

And what do you expect to gain by it? Thank the Lord, who has so long stood with us, you can not undo the demands of the American people for eight years unless death intervenes to bring about the results. The Senate of the United States is arranged by some decree of Providence or the wisdom of man, or both acting jointly, in such a condition that you have no hope for the free coinage of silver for at least eight years to come. Now, are you willing to agitate the people of this country again? Are you willing to unsettle values, are you willing to again threaten the people of this country with the devastation you brought upon the business of the country before?

Now, one or two more questions. If I am wrong, tell me. What caused the good times of 1892? I refer you to the commercial reports of December of that year and I refer you to the President's message of December, 1892. What brought it about? Answer that. It came right in at the very feet of this great crime of 1873. We made greater progress than we had made in the same number of years before. What brought it about? Was it your wisdom or ours? There was not a statute on the statute books of the country which you had put there. There was not one there that effected the results that we did not put there.

Answer me the next question. What caused the country to go from that condition in business down into the terrible condition that we found ourselves in 1896? Explain it, my friends. Tell it so we can understand it; but let me give you a warning as to one thing—you may work out a theory of your own to explain how hard times came, you may talk about the Sherman law and other things of that character—but let me warn you that if you do that my next question you can not answer in consonance with my third question. My next question is this: If that be true, what caused the reaction of 1897? What was it that brought to this country a condition of prosperity the like of which no people on earth ever had before? Tell me that; and tell me why it is that every time the Democratic party gets into power we go down in the scale of prosperity, and every time the Republican party comes back into power we get up again. Go back to 1837, and come on down, and the record is all alike and uniform.

Let us be practical about these things. Let us consider them in a common-sense light. Let us get down to the business itself, and not take the theories of the advocates of the free and unlimited coinage of silver as a basis on which to act. Such theories are obsolete; they are not in consonance with the ideas of the times; but we can deal with the question in a common-sense way. Let us not deal with it in the light that sends a cold chill down the backs of millions of Democrats in the country when you say that you are going to nominate Bryan, on the Chicago platform, and make him and that platform the standard of your party. [Applause and laughter on Republican side.] Is it not wise, is it not common sense? Then come to the front and let us discuss these things in a reasonable way.

Let us consider the question as to what is the matter with the country, what was the matter with it in times past, and who rescued it from the dangers which threatened it. Who gave labor to

the laborers of the country; who abolished and closed the soup houses; who scattered the charitable institutions and made their operation no longer necessary, and who gave credit to the Government obligation throughout the entire world? Tell me all of these things candidly and honestly, and then it will be time to talk of "trusts and combines" until you are tired.

Before closing this particular part of my remarks I want to say that I shall have a word to say myself on the subject of trusts. I incorporate into my remarks at this point three sections of the Sherman law of 1890. These were passed by a Republican House, passed by a Republican Senate, and approved by a Republican President.

They are as follows:

SECTION 1. Every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations is hereby declared to be illegal. Every person who shall make any such contract or engage in any such combination or conspiracy shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding $5,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 2. Every person who shall monopolize, or attempt to monopolize, or combine or conspire with any other person or persons to monopolize any part of the trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding $5,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 3. Every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce in any Territory of the United States or of the District of Columbia, or in restraint of trade or commerce between any such Territory and another, or between any such Territory or Territories and any State or States or the District of Columbia, or with foreign nations, or between the District of Columbia and any State or States or foreign nations, is hereby declared illegal. Every person who shall make any such contract or engage in any such combination or conspiracy shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding $5,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both said punishment, in the discretion of the court.

There is one thing that you will not overlook in the consideration of the matter, that every time a Democratic Administration was in force opportunity was given for the creation of these organizations, but on the incoming of a Republican Administration the tendency was to break up and curtail the strength of the trusts in this country.

I wish some gentleman on the other side of the House, between now and Friday night, when this debate is to close, would be kind enough, after reading the three sections of the law to which I have just referred and alluding to the criminal character of the trusts and combines of the country, to discuss them in the light of the decision of the Supreme Court, and to state what, in his judgment, could be added to the legislation adopted by the Republican party in this connection. Just put it in plain words. Do not stand up and attack trusts or attack members on this side of the House for the law which has been enacted. You never had anything to do with the passage of the law or the enforcement of it. It is a Republican law, passed by a Republican Congress, and enforced by them. Tell me now what you would add to it. If there are objections to the law, let us know what they are. Come right out—and that is a sensible way to deal with the matter—and say what you would, in the line of words, add to make it more far-reaching, more sweeping or effective than it is to-day. If you can add to the effectiveness of that law or strengthen it in any way, I should be very glad to have a suggestion to that extent.

Mr. Chairman, I should not undertake to carry out the suggestions of Mr. Bryan and his supporters, that Congress shall be authorized to legalize or destroy absolutely the corporations of this country in the different States of the Union. I believe in leaving to the States themselves the power to create and limit the operations of corporations, and I believe the suggestion that carries with it the limitation by Congress of the power of the States in this regard unwise and unstatesmanlike. A proposition that would curtail the power of the States themselves in the management of their local affairs, it seems to me, should shock every man and every intelligent American politician. I have said heretofore that I was a better Democrat than many of those who occupy seats upon the other side and who talk of Democratic principles in that regard. I do not believe in a recognition of power which would authorize the General Government to go into the States and undertake to interfere with domestic affairs or with domestic traffic and to say that such and such commodities shall not cross the line of the States, or which should undertake to limit or destroy the powers of State corporations.

But I do not propose at this time to discuss that question. There is another point to which I wish to attract the attention of the committee.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I will ask the gentleman if the decision of the courts in the last thirty years have not entirely changed the legal aspect of the interstate-commerce law? In other words, has not the doctrine, in a certain way, deprived the States of the very power the gentleman is now discussing?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, now, that opens quite a wide field. Would that be a justification why Congress should now undertake to assail the corporations of a State by legislation? I admit that there has been all over this country, in the State courts and in the Supreme Court of the United States, a growth of judicial interpretation. I admit that. The gentleman is a lawyer and he knows I am right, and he knows that there is no great State of the Union that can say that this system of legal interpretation has not invaded the supreme authority of his own State. I admit that, but that is no reason why we should to-day undertake by Congressional action, to destroy the power of the States to control and regulate their own domestic affairs in their own way. The States must finish the work so auspiciously begun by Congress and the Supreme Court.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican party of the United States does not need oral argument in the halls of Congress nor dissertations in the press of the country upon these vital questions. There are voices which proclaim the triumph of Republicanism that do not depend upon human organs for their effectiveness. From the pine-clad hills of Maine to the utmost southern extent of New England the whirl of the spindle, the ring of the hammer, and the shout of happy, well-paid operatives are a constant and most vociferous proclamation of Republican triumph. From New York to San Francisco, all along the mighty avenues of travel and traffic, the voices of commendation and exultation because of Republican legislation and Republican intelligence and Republican statesmanship go up in the breezes of the morning and are sung as vespers at the hour of evening twilight.

The mighty volumes of flame and smoke pouring from the chimneys of enormous industrial establishments wave a beacon light to heaven announcing the triumph of protective tariff and sound money. Mingled with the click of the pick in the coal measures of Ohio, Pennsylvania, Indiana, and West Virginia is the voice of our workingmen, well paid where starvation wages were in force, well fed where starvation stalked with gaunt horror, well clothed, well educated, satisfied, contented, happy. Their voices sing praise for Republican intelligence and Republican patriotism, mingled with the fall of the coal measures and the ring of the implements of industry.

On every railroad line from the Pacific shore to the Atlantic coast tens of thousands of laden cars mingle the voice of machinery with the indorsement of Republican action. The happy husbandman, upon millions of acres of fertile soil, as he returns from his labor bringing his sheaves with him, realizes in an advancing market wider demands for his product, the entering of a jubilee, and his voice is heard in perpetual argument in favor of sound money and protection.

The scratch of the pen upon the record in the Northwest and the Southwest as it cancels the millions of mortgages placed there in the hour of Democratic distress and starvation now canceled by the payment of money that has come to the owners of these splendid farms through the intelligence and patriotism of Republican administration joins in the grand cry of indorsement all along the line. As in the olden time the morning stars sang together for joy, and all the sons of God rejoiced, so from Maine to California, from the North to the South, from the East to the West, the sons of toil, the sons of business, the sons of America join in the glad shout that drowns the feeble voice of partisan speculation and partisan denunciation in the grand, glorious, ringing chorus of a redeemed and happy nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] is recognized for forty minutes.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. Chairman, I have been much entertained by the felicitations in which the gentleman who has just closed [Mr. GROSVENOR] has indulged regarding the increased prosperity of the times; felicitations in which I join; felicitations in which every member on this side of the House joins. We all admit that times are better; that the prices of many products and classes of property have risen; that the mills are open; that our railway trains are carrying increased quantities of freight and increased numbers of passengers; that there is a favorable trade balance which during the past two years has increased to almost phenomenal proportions. All these evidences of increased prosperity we hail with the utmost satisfaction, but we claim that they constitute a vindication of the theory of bimetallists that prices largely depend upon the quantity of money in circulation, and that, all other things being equal, the contraction of the money volume means falling prices, and an enlargement of the money volume means rising prices, and that as population and business increase a proportionate increase in the quantity of money is required in order to maintain stable prices and prevent falling prices.

We claim it is the duty of the Government to authorize the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver as they come from the gold and silver mines, the ancient and accustomed sources of money, and that if these, aided by the employment of the various credit agencies devised by man, are not sufficient to meet the requirements of exchanges and the maintenance of prices, the

Government should issue legal tender paper money in quantity sufficient for such purposes, and we claim that the existing prosperity, so welcome after a long period of depression, though coincident with the present Administration, has not been caused by it, but by the responsiveness of nature to the eager and pressing demands of man, who, denied by unwise legislation the accustomed utilization of the silver product of the mines has pressed inquiry and investigation in the remote parts of the world for the gold which alone is given monetary efficiency.

We claim that the enlarged production of gold recently experienced has, in a measure, met the demands of the quantitative theory of money, and has saved us from the ruin with which the monometallic policy threatened us. The Republican party has not saved us from destruction; nature itself has reached out an availing hand and placed within the reach of man an unexpected supply of gold, such as has never before been realized. No bimetallist ever claimed or contended that there was any virtue in the quality of money. We all insisted that the quantity of money, that the volume of money, must be maintained; that it must be enlarged proportionately to the increase of population and business, and the vindication of our theory rests in existing conditions; for the annual product of gold to-day is nearly three times as great as it was in 1873, when the process of demonetizing silver was commenced, and it was that increase in the product of gold, which means an increase in the quantity of money throughout the world, which has saved us from the policy of contraction which the Republicans inaugurated in 1873 and completed in 1893 by the repeal of the Sherman Act, and propose to make more efficient now by the measure pending before this body.

THE PANIC OF 1873.

Recollect that, in 1873, and for years prior thereto, the product of gold had been constantly diminishing. Nature, as if intending to fill the vacuum caused by the diminution of gold, let out an increased supply of silver, and the contention of the gentlemen on the other side was that, whilst gold was diminishing and silver was increasing in quantity, we should limit the coinage of new money entirely to the metal which was diminishing in quantity and deny monetary use to the metal which was increasing in quantity; and so in this country, at the close of a destructive war, when twelve millions of people had been practically added to our population by the capitulation of Lee, people whose only currency was Confederate paper, whose efficiency as a medium of exchange was entirely destroyed by the result of the war, we started upon a policy of contraction and commenced the retirement of the greenbacks and denied coinage to the silver product from our mines.

And so from 1873 until 1878, when the use of silver was partially restored under the Bland Act, and the volume moderately increased, the most disastrous contraction took place, sweeping away the fortunes of thousands and hundreds of thousands, transferring the wealth from the debtors to the creditors, changing mortgages into deeds, and accomplishing the greatest centralization of wealth known up to that time in the history of the country, and only to be surpassed by the enormous concentration of wealth caused by the recent depression.

Our gold friends insist that the resumption of specie payments was the cause of the improved conditions following 1878. We claim that these improved conditions were caused by the increase of money through the Bland Act, an increase which stayed the fall of prices, but which later on, as business, population, and exchanges increased, was insufficient to maintain stable prices. And then came the Sherman Act of 1890, which, though imperfect in its construction as judged by the rules of monetary science, steadied somewhat the fall of prices until its repeal, checking the output of new money, brought on the disastrous depression of 1893 and subsequent years.

THE PANIC OF 1893.

Let us trace the history of the country through the period of depression commencing in 1893. The panic of that year was not caused by the coinage of silver under the Sherman Act.

There were two causes for this panic. One was the constantly diminishing price which this country was receiving from the export of its farm products, the price of these products being largely determined by the prices in silver countries, whose exports were stimulated by the low price of silver. Another cause was the failure of the McKinley Act to meet the expectations of its framers as a revenue producer. The free admission of sugar took away a large annual revenue for which no sufficient substitute was offered by the McKinley bill, and the bill which was intended to cure the evils of a surplus revenue presented all the disadvantages of a deficit revenue.

The surplus in the Treasury was gradually exhausted, and toward the close of Harrison's Administration an issue of bonds was seriously considered. The country therefore was drained in two ways: The national Treasury was drained of its accumulation by a deficit-producing revenue bill, and the country was drained by an adverse balance of trade owing to the fact that its agricultural products had been lessened in their debt-paying capacity. Accompanying this came a demand for gold in Austria, and the greenbacks and Treasury notes were used by foreign financiers as a means of drawing out the gold required for the Austrian treasury.

Mr. Cleveland, aided by the banks and the metropolitan press, took advantage of the situation to raise the false cry that the Sherman Act was the cause of existing conditions, and the banks themselves, in their keen desire to stop the coinage of silver, created a clamor which, in turn, caused a run upon the banks. The withdrawal of deposits and the constant diminution of bank credits was a natural result. The Cleveland Administration having come into power, its first act was to repeal the Sherman Act, and the second was to pass the Wilson tariff bill. No more unfavorable time could have been taken for the lowering of the tariff wall. The very purpose of this act was to let more foreign goods in; every foreign product which was admitted displaced so much American labor, and thus a readjustment of the labor question throughout the country was forced.

The country during Cleveland's Administration was subjected to two great disturbances—one financial, by cutting off the increase of money throughout the United States by the repeal of the Sherman Act, when more money was needed; the other was industrial, involving the lowering of the tariff wall and a proportional substitution in our own markets of foreign products for products produced by the labor of our own people. During all this time confident predictions were made of an immediate advance in prosperity, to be caused by increased confidence. None of these predictions were realized, and the Republican party came into power upon the promise of a protective tariff measure and of an increased volume of money to be secured by free coinage of silver through international agreement.

As soon as a Republican victory was announced it was declared that confidence was restored and that the wheels of industry would immediately move. The whistles of the factories throughout the country heralded the coming of renewed prosperity and activity, but Congress met in the following March without the realization of this confident prediction. It was then insisted that as soon as the protective tariff bill was passed the wheels would move, and so the Dingley bill was framed and allowed to take its course unobstructed by the opposition, and even aided by the friends of silver. The bill passed, and again the factory whistles were sounded, but the wheels did not move, and Congress adjourned later on without any material improvement in the condition of the country. I can recall the gloomy countenances of my Republican friends at that time. Their predictions had not been realized; the wheels had not commenced to move—discouragement and prostration everywhere.

SHORT CROPS ABROAD.

It was not until after Congress adjourned that the change took place. The cause of it was the great demand for our agricultural products, caused by short crops elsewhere, the result being a favorable balance, which brought within a few months many million dollars of gold to us. This was followed by large exports of manufactured goods, mainly produced by the very trusts now complained of, and which constitute so serious a menace to individual enterprise as well as to the compensation of labor. The gold trust produced the industrial trusts.

The cause for their organization was falling prices and the necessity of cheaper production, and so the various industries were combined; improved machinery was secured; middlemen were dispensed with; clerks, salesmen, and officials were consolidated, and the result was a cheapened production which sought the markets of foreign countries. Thus the great demand for our agricultural as well as our manufactured products brought to this country within three years very nearly $300,000,000 in gold, and the increase in prosperity can be directly traced, not to the repeal of the Sherman Act, not to the passage of the Dingley Act, though the latter was a factor by doing away with a deficit of revenue, but to the increased volume of money caused by the increased production of gold and by a favorable trade balance which restored the per capita circulation in this country which prevailed prior to 1893, viz, $25 per head—the per capita during intermediate years having fallen as low as $23 per head.

BANK CREDITS INCREASED.

The effect of this increase of money was to increase the gold in the treasury and to increase the cash reserves in the banks. Each dollar of additional cash reserve gave an opportunity of the extension of $5 of credit by the banks, and thus a hundred millions additional cash in the banks meant a possible extension of credit to the extent of five hundred millions, which thus increased the check transactions of the country. The panic had been caused by a withdrawal of cash from the banks, which, in turn, compelled the banks to call in their loans.

The loans made by national banks in 1893 had been diminished from over two billion dollars, prior to 1893, to one billion eight hundred and seventy-one million in 1894, and in 1898 these loans

were increased to two billion two hundred and fourteen millions, and in 1899 to two billion four hundred and ninety-six million dollars. In other words, between 1893 and 1899 the bank loans had been increased over six hundred millions, five hundred millions of which was accomplished between 1897 and 1899.

This statement is itself proof of the contention of bimetallists, that, admitting the assumption of the monometallists that most of the transactions of the country are accomplished by checks as distinguished from cash, it is also true that the aggregate amount of checks depends upon the amount of credits issued by banks, and that the amount of credits issued by banks depends upon the cash within their vaults, and the increase of five hundred millions in two years of bank credits, and the consequent multiplication of exchanges through bank checks, is directly traceable to about one hundred millions of additional cash deposited in the national banks.

Though no accurate data can be obtained as to State and private banks, it is safe to say that their credits had increased to nearly the same extent as that of the national banks, and it is fair to assume that within two years the bank credits have been increased at least eight hundred millions by the deposit with the banks of less than two hundred millions of additional money, secured through the increased production of gold and by a favorable balance of trade; for it must be recollected that of the three hundred millions of increased money secured during the past three years at least one hundred millions has gone into the Federal Treasury, and is therefore not a basis for bank credits.

The increase of prosperity during the past two years demonstrates the correctness of the theory entertained by bimetallists, viz, that all other things being equal, prices will depend upon the quantity of money in circulation; that an increase of the money volume means higher prices and a diminution of the money volume means lower prices.

The demonetization of silver was started in 1873, at a time when the production of gold was lower than it had been for twenty years. There was no expectation at that time of an increase in the production of gold; on the contrary, the general opinion was that the output of gold was steadily diminishing, and yet, when more metallic money was constantly required to meet the increasing wants of business, it was proposed to demonetize the money which was increasing in volume and to give monetary efficiency only to the metal which was diminishing in product.

The gradual fall of prices from 1873 to 1897 accompanied the gradual and progressive reduction in the use of silver, until the whole world, suffering from the appreciation of gold and the depreciation of property and products, started out in search for gold. The result has been a tremendous increase in the product of gold, the annual product to-day being nearly treble the annual product when the process of silver demonetization commenced.

THE CLAIM OF THE BIMETALLISTS.

The increased production of metallic money has relieved the situation and proved the contention of bimetallists as to the quantitative theory. All that intelligent bimetallists claim is that the world needs more money; that all the gold and all the silver thus far produced has not been sufficient to meet the world's demand for money; that the world is more likely to get a sufficient supply from two sources than from one; that the vital question is a sufficient supply; that the rise in prices and the increase of prosperity consequent upon the larger production of gold during the last two years and the increased prosperity in this country consequent upon the addition to its money volume of nearly three hundred millions, have proved the contention of the bimetallists and vindicated their theory.

BASIC MONEY CONTRACTED.

The vice of the proposed action is that the Republican party now proposes to take advantage of the increasing production of gold for the elimination of the existing stock of silver in this country from use. The metallic stock of the country consists of about nine hundred millions of gold and six hundred millions of silver, fifteen hundred millions in all. This is the only basic money, the only money of final redemption.

It is true there are greenbacks and national-bank notes in existence, but these are merely promissory notes payable in metallic money, issued either by the Government or the banks. While they aid in the exchanges they form no part of the money of the country; on the contrary, they themselves are redeemable in money. The metallic money needs no redemption; gold needs no redemption, silver needs no redemption; but the purpose of the dominant party is to make the six hundred millions of silver redeemable in gold by the Treasury.

It is true that they use the term "exchange"—that is to say, the Treasury is to exchange gold for silver—but if gold is to be given for silver, clearly silver will turn into a debt redeemable in gold, and thus become a liability of the Treasury. By this process the basic money of the country is to be contracted from fifteen hundred millions to nine hundred millions, and unless relief is given in some other way the contraction will be disastrous.

FUNCTION OF CHECKS.

To justify this great wrong, the dominant party claims that the great bulk of the business of the country is conducted upon a credit basis, and that credit involves absolute security as to the standard. It is claimed that checks and bills of exchange have largely taken the place of money. No greater fallacy exists than this. Checks and bills of exchange have not taken the place of money. Their use is merely supplementary to that of money. Their general use involves the necessity for more money instead of less money.

PRACTICE OF BANKS.

Of the money of the country, not counting the money in the Treasury, about two-thirds is now in the pockets of the people, used in the small exchanges; the rest is in the banks, and furnishes the basis of credit. The former has been aptly termed by the gentleman from Indiana "pocket money;" the latter has been aptly termed by the gentleman from New York "check money." It is the custom of banks to loan to their customers, on the average, about five times as much money as they have, the loans being turned into deposits, against which the depositors are accustomed to check.

The amount of the depositors' accounts, therefore, depends upon the amount of loans made by the banks, and the amount of loans depends upon the money that the banks have. Country banks are required to keep a reserve of 15 per cent of their deposits in cash; banks in reserve cities are compelled to keep 25 per cent, an average of about 20 per cent. Assuming, therefore, that the banks of the country have to-day loaned out as much money as they can upon their present reserves of cash, it is impossible to understand how they can loan out more money as business and population increase without an increase in cash.

An increase of cash in the banks will enable them to loan more money; a diminution of cash in the banks will cause them to loan less money. A contraction of bank loans means a contraction in bank deposits, and a contraction of bank deposits means a contraction of bank checks, so there is an intimate mathemetical relation between the cash on the one hand and the bank loans, bank deposits, and aggregate of bank checks on the other.

Because the nature of the use of money has changed, it does not follow that there is need of less money. It is true that the proportion of cash transactions to check transactions is not so great as it was formerly in this country, and is not so great as in other countries where the cash system prevails, but the credit system means a multiplicity of exchanges, and increased bank credits necessitate increased cash reserves.

We on this side of the House admit the efficiency of credit in the exchanges of the world, but we insist upon it that credit is based upon money and can not exist without money. The basis of all credits in this country is the bank loans. The bank loans of the country of the national banks to-day aggregate $2,500,000,000. The cash in these banks to-day aggregates less than $500,000,000.

The loans are five times as great as the cash. So a dollar of pocket money has in exchanges only the efficiency of a dollar. A dollar of cash in a bank has the efficiency in exchange of five dollars, and any large withdrawal of cash from the banks immediately results in calling in the bank loans, the suspension of general credit, and the prostration of the industries of the country.

So that these gentlemen who insist on the qualitative theory in money as opposed to the quantitative theory, who insist that as civilization advances business is more largely done by instruments of exchange, by private checks, by bills of exchange and drafts, lose sight of the fact that the number of checks issued in a given period of time depends upon the bank deposits, the bank deposits depend upon the bank loans, and the bank loans depend upon the cash in the banks. Thus a direct relation in quantity exits between the credits of the country and the actual cash in the banks.

TRUSTING TO CHANCE.

What folly it is, then, when more basic money is being constantly required, to inaugurate a system which may gradually retire six hundred millions of silver dollars now a part of the money of the country. The answer is made that the increased production of gold will rapidly furnish the money necessary to take the place of the silver eliminated.

Thus chance is substituted for certainty. What certainty is there that the world will produce $300,000,000 in gold annually? What certainty is there that this country can secure any large proportion of that product? The war in the Transvaal may at any time cut off one-third of the production. The great spurt in the production of gold may be followed, as heretofore, by a decline. In addition to this, the movement of the countries of the world toward the gold standard is not half completed, and yet this country has suffered during the past six years by the immense accumulations of gold in Austria and Russia, accumulations not yet completed.

India is about to hoard gold for the purpose of establishing the gold standard, and if this movement is followed by China and by the South American States the new demands for gold will be very

much greater than the current supply. It is reasonable to expect other nations to follow the example of the United States, and the action of the United States is likely to precipitate a scramble for gold such as took place when Germany took steps toward the adoption of the gold standard in 1873.

Nearly one-half of the metallic money of the world to-day is silver. How far can even the present production of gold, absorbed as it largely is in nonmonetary uses, such as the industrial arts and dentistry, avail to take the place of nearly four billions of silver dollars which are likely to be gradually eliminated from the world's currency under the initiative of the United States?

The gentlemen on the other side point with pride to the fact that under Republican auspices the money of the country has increased $300,000,000 in three years. But suppose the world's production of gold had remained as it was in 1873—that is to say, about $125,000,000 per annum; suppose it had remained as it was in 1893, about 150,000,000 per annum. Would this great increase in the volume of our money have taken place, and would the existing conditions of prosperity have been inaugurated?

And yet, gentlemen, just when you are congratulating yourselves upon an era of changed conditions, when you are felicitating yourselves upon a rise in prices of commodities throughout the country, with reference to which so many arguments were made the other way in the campaign of 1896, you are taking measures to attack this rise in prices and the advance of prosperity by repeating the experiment of 1873 and the experiment of 1893, for you propose practically to contract the volume of money now in circulation. Is that your purpose?

But you say you do not contract the volume of the currency; that you simply retire the greenbacks with gold, which takes the place of the greenbacks in the general circulation. But in order to pay for the greenbacks you must get gold in some form, either from this country or from foreign countries.

If you rely upon your revenues to give you the gold with which to redeem greenbacks, you must get it from this country. If you do not rely upon the revenue, you must get the gold by bond issues; and in either case, with the disposition of the people of this country to invest in our Government bonds, the gold will come from our own country, not from abroad. So that you actually draw $346,000,000 of the country's gold into the Treasury by the process of revenue or by the issue of bonds, and then pay it out in the redemption of greenbacks which are only issued again for gold. Do you mean to say that that is not a contraction of the currency of the country? The country has only the same amount of gold as before and is minus the greenbacks.

And then as to silver. You say that you do not pretend to redeem silver, but you propose to exchange gold for silver. That is a very cunning phrase, but I think it will deceive no one, for when gold in the Treasury is exchanged for silver out of the Treasury, the inevitable effect will be the retirement of the silver, and thus you practically change the silver of the country into a promise to pay gold. You stamp upon silver just as you do upon paper a promise to pay gold dollars.

At present we have fifteen hundred millions of basic money in this country, according to the report of the Director of the Mint, nine hundred millions of gold and six hundred millions of silver, all of it basic money, all of it money of final redemption, all of it money that needs no redeemer. Now, the bookkeeping of our financial system is divided into two columns, money in one column and debts in the other, debts payable in money, money the thing with which debts are paid.

You have here in this country 1,500,000,000 units of gold and silver available for the redemption of the vast mass of debts upon the other side of the column—national debts, State debts, municipal debts, railroad debts, corporate debts, private debts. You have $1,500,000,000 of redemption money, and opposed to it you have—what? Nearly $5,000,000,000 due to depositors through the agencies of banks alone, and billions upon billions superimposed upon the bank credits in the shape of municipal, State, national, corporate, and private indebtedness.

Yet you propose to take from the money column six hundred millions of silver, stamp upon it a promise to pay gold, and turn it over to the debt column. You diminish the money; you increase the debts. Do you believe that the business of the country will not be disturbed; that there is no process of contraction about that; that the pocket money that is in the hands of the people will not be disturbed; that the cash in the banks will not be disturbed; that our vast system of credit will not be disturbed, and that the use of check money in the transactions of life will not be disturbed? Nothing but an enormous production of gold in the future can prevent this, and as to this are you reckless enough to take the chance in the face of the fact that an increased demand for gold may be caused by your initiative?

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE.

Let me add a few words regarding the recent monetary negotiations with England and France. You will remember that in March, 1897, an act was passed providing for an international conference to secure a fixity of value between gold and silver at a common ratio by international agreement and that the President was empowered to call a conference, to appoint commissioners, and also to appoint special envoys to foreign countries.

In April following the President appointed Messrs. WOLCOTT, Payne, and Stevenson as special envoys. Proceeding abroad, they secured the cooperation of France, and then addressed themselves, in connection with the French Government, to the British ministry. Their views were received with hospitality by a ministry the majority of whom were in principle friendly to bimetallism. The time was ripe for the consideration of the question, as during the previous year resolutions favorable to an international adjustment of this matter had been passed by the German, French, and British parliaments.

The proposals involved in the main the opening of the India mints to the coinage of silver at the French ratio of 15½ to 1, to be accompanied by the limited increase of the use of silver in England and by free coinage in France and the United States.

The British ministry referred the matter to the India Government, which, after considering the matter for several months, presented an extended argument to the British ministry in favor of declining the proposals. The principal reason urged was that an arbitrary valuation of 16d. for the Indian silver rupee had been established, which meant a ratio of 22 to 1, whereas the market ratio at the time was about 35 to 1. The India government insisted, among other things, that the increase of the gold value of the Indian rupee involved in the proposed change would absolutely check exports from India; in other words, that India would suffer the injuries arising from appreciating money. The principal objection was to the suggested ratio of 15½ to 1, it being clearly the desire of the India government to maintain there the existing ratio of 22 to 1.

The British ministry, upon the receipt of this reply, communicated with the American ambassadors, stating that it would be compelled to yield to the views of the India government upon the question, and that the first proposal was one which they were unable to accept, but they clearly invited other proposals, Lord Salisbury using the following language in his letter:

> It is possible that the time which has elapsed since the proposals were put forward in July last may have enabled the representatives of the two Governments concerned to form a more accurate estimate than was then practicable of the amount of assistance which they may expect from other powers and of the success which their scheme is likely to obtain. Her Majesty's Government might then be placed in a position to consider the subject with a fuller knowledge than they now possess of many circumstances materially affecting the proposals before them.

Nothing could have been more friendly than the final letter of Lord Salisbury, and no words could more clearly indicate a disposition to do something toward maintaining a fixed ratio between silver and gold by international agreement, and no words could be used which would more clearly express the desire that further communication should be had with the British Government on the subject.

Strange to say, the American Government dropped the matter there and proceeded no further. In fact, great uneasiness was manifested by the Administration during the period of these negotiations, which indicated a favorable result.

Whilst our envoys were abroad insisting upon it that the United States was friendly to bimetallism, and desired above all things to accomplish an international arrangement, the officials of the Treasury, in frequent interviews given out to the press and telegraphed abroad, expressed their firm and unalterable conviction that there was enough gold in the world for the maintenance of the gold standard, and that the pending negotiation was, and rightfully should be, fruitless. And during this very time the President was giving hospitable reception to the views of the Indianapolis monetary conference as to firmly establishing gold monometallism in this country. With what confidence could our envoys abroad press their views for bimetallism whilst our officials at home were giving in their adherence to gold monometallism?

It may rightfully be claimed therefore that the Administration abandoned these negotiations at the most critical period and at a time when the most powerful financial nation in the world was inviting a further consideration of the subject.

It will be observed that the prime minister inquired as to the amount of assistance which they might expect from other powers. A clear and businesslike conduct of these negotiations involved consultation with all the countries of the world, and particularly with those countries which were without silver stocks.

A diplomatic inquiry addressed to such countries, either by the envoys or by our ministers resident abroad in such countries, would evidently have secured some assurance as to the extent to which these other countries would go in the coinage of silver currently produced. It was an easy thing to put to them the statement that the money stock of the world was approximately one-third gold, one-third silver, and one-third paper, and that the very existence of the paper money indicated a scarcity of metallic

money, and that a movement was invited for the gradual substitution in all countries of silver and gold for the paper money then outstanding and aggregating nearly $3,000,000,000.

At that time the South American States, all of which under the pressure of creditors had declared for the gold standard without having a gold currency, had issued more than $500,000,000 in depreciated paper; since then increased, according to the Mint Director's Report, to over $1,000,000,000.

The friendly mediation of the United States with those countries would have been potential in securing an agreement that they would at least absorb fifty or one hundred million dollars annually until their paper money was superseded by silver, and accompanying this arrangements could have been made to increase their gold stock so that ultimately they would have a bimetallic currency.

So also Russia had at that time nearly five hundred millions of paper money. She had been hoarding gold for years with a view to making specie redemption, and doubtless an arrangement could have been made with her by which she would absorb annually a considerable amount of silver.

Countries fearful of going to free coinage might have been requested to state the exact amount of silver bullion which they would turn into coin annually for a period of five or ten years. Thus the material could have been collected which would give the British Government the information which it wished, viz, an estimate of the amount of assistance which the United States and France might gain from other powers.

But no such inquiries were made; the envoys returned to America; their solicitation of the nations of the world ended, and the monometallists breathed freely when they ascertained that the expedition, which had been sent out in perfunctory compliance with a platform, ended without accomplishing its purpose.

Judged by present indications, it is safe to say that there is not a single government in the world to-day more determined in its hostility to the use of silver than the Administration now in power in the United States.

OUR INDICTMENT.

The indictment, therefore, which we present against the Republican party is that while in its platform declarations it has at times indicated a friendliness to silver, it has never yet by any authoritative declaration, either in its platform utterances, the reports of its Congressional committees, or in legislative action, declared any principle of monetary science upon which the country could rely as a guide for future action; that it has either openly and avowedly declared the policy of contraction of the basic money of the country or that it has sought by evasion and equivocation to defeat the force and the strength of the movement toward a bimetallic monetary system.

It commenced its policy of contraction at the close of the civil war by retiring the greenbacks and by denying silver access to the mints, and that, too, at a time when the addition to our population of 12,000,000 of Southern people, whose currency had been destroyed as the result of the war, demanded that the tools of exchange should be increased rather than diminished. It yielded an unwilling and grudging submission to the Bland Act only after the President's veto and after the bill had been forced upon it by the intelligent sentiment of the country.

After yielding to an increased coinage through the Sherman Act, as a part of the compromise by which the McKinley bill was passed, it joined with Cleveland in forcing its repeal.

Having promised international bimetallism in the last campaign by a platform solemnly pledging continued and earnest efforts to that end, it made perfunctory compliance only with its provision, and withdrew negotiations in the face of a friendly letter from the British ministry inviting further negotiations.

Ignoring the fact that the countries interested in securing a larger volume of money were debtor countries, the countries that lacked money and indicated their want by borrowing from other nations, and that the debtor and producing nations of the world have a greater absorbing capacity for new money than the creditor nations; that the hunger of debtor nations for more money was evidenced by the large issues of paper money existing in the world, little of which was kept upon a parity with gold, the Republican Administration ignored the nations that hungered for new money and sought only conference with creditor nations whose interest was in favor of an appreciating standard of money rather than in favor of a standard which would maintain stable values.

Invited by the British ministry to present to it the assurances of the extent to which other countries would join in supporting silver, a Republican Administration, vested by Congress with the full power to conduct negotiations with each individual country or to call an international conference, failed and neglected so to do, and now proclaiming through its representatives on this floor that international adjustment is impossible and even undesirable, records itself in favor of confining the money of this country to the metal smallest in quantity and most limited in production, in favor of eliminating from its currency the more plentiful metal which hitherto has been linked with gold in the support of values and just relations between debtors and creditors. It thus takes the initiative in a new scramble for gold among the nations of the world.

If the Republican party would declare that it has faith in the quantitative theory of money, that it believes that the basic money should be increased in proportion to population and business, but that the large increase in the production of gold furnishes a sufficient assurance that the world will receive the needed additional supply, and that if it does not steps will be taken to add silver to it by a bimetallic union as a part of our monetary system, we would at least have a declaration, after these long years of suffering and distress, caused by an abandonment of the principles of monetary science, that would indicate that the party was right in theory, and that in the end, if the production of gold was not sufficient to take the place of silver now being eliminated from use, and to meet the reasonable expectations for an increased volume of money, its practice would conform to its theory either by the use of silver or some other basic money, requiring no redemption save receivability for public and private dues. But the action of the Republican party gives no such comfort. It declares for no principle, but simply asserts itself as devoted to a particular metal as the source from which money shall be made, regardless of its insufficiency in production to meet the increasing wants of the world.

Against such a declaration the intelligent sentiment of the country will yet protest in terms that will be unmistakable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nevada has expired. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] is recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], in the speech he delivered a few minutes ago, called upon this side of the House to answer three questions: First, why there was prosperity during the Harrison Administration; second, why there was depression during the Cleveland Administration; and, third, why there is prosperity during the McKinley Administration.

Mr. Chairman, there is one answer to all of these questions, namely, that the supply and demand of basic money during these Administrations varied in such way as to produce the good or bad times. If you examine the history of the three Administrations, you will find these alternate conditions were produced by the alternate state of the supply of basic money.

WHY THERE WAS PROSPERITY DURING THE HARRISON ADMINISTRATION.

During the Harrison Administration there were good times. What caused them? The creation by legislation of more basic money.

In June, 1890, there was passed by Congress what is known as the Sherman Act, which provided for the purchase by the Government of 4,500,000 ounces of silver each month. Gentlemen on the other side may smile at the thought that the silver bill produced it, but nevertheless it is true, and we can prove it by the man most vitally interested in that Administration, namely, Benjamin Harrison himself.

In the annual message to Congress of President Harrison in December, 1890, we find the following clear statement from him concerning the Sherman Act:

> The increased circulation secured by the act has exerted and will continue to exert a most beneficial influence upon business and upon general values. The enlargement of our currency by the silver bill undoubtedly gave an upward tendency to trade and had a marked effect on prices, but this natural and desired effect of the silver legislation was by many erroneously attributed to the new tariff act.

Surely the admission of the man most vitally interested in that Administration that the good times were caused by the silver legislation ought to determine conclusively that the condition was the result of the creation of more basic money during that Administration.

WHY THERE WAS DEPRESSION DURING THE CLEVELAND ADMINISTRATION.

Second. What caused the depression during the Cleveland Administration? The answer is plain. It was the destruction of basic money. That is what caused it. The first acts of the Cleveland Administration were the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act and the redemption in gold of the Treasury notes issued for the payment of the silver bullion under that law. It was during the early part of this Administration that silver was demonetized in India by closing the mints thereof to the free coinage of that metal. It was then that Austria attempted to resume specie payments in gold and thereby made great demands upon the gold of the world. Is it any wonder that there were depressed times under this Administration?

It was this destruction of basic money and this increased demand for gold which enhanced the purchasing power of gold and consequently decreased the price of all commodities and property, thereby producing stagnation in business and depressed times.

WHY THERE ARE BETTER TIMES IN THE M'KINLEY ADMINISTRATION.

Third. Why are we having better times during the McKinley Administration? The answer is clear. Because more basic money has been added to the currency of our own country and to that of the world. How? By the increased production of gold and the consequent increased coinage through the free-coinage laws for that metal. The production of gold for 1898 was $287,428,600—nearly double what it was in 1893. This increased production has to some extent relieved the strain upon and demand for gold and consequently produced rising prices. That is why times are better during the McKinley Administration.

The answers to the three questions propounded by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] are therefore the application of facts to the one general principle of supply and demand of basic money.

But I want to warn my friends on the other side that if you place increased burdens upon gold, as this bill proposes to do, you will find that the increased demand for and value of gold will surely follow, with its necessary result, falling prices, unless from some unexpected source additional supply of that metal is found to relieve that strain. It is hardly possible that such an enormous increase can occur.

The gold-standard men have it in their power, by simply letting things alone, to continue the rising prices and consequent better times; but if they attempt to replace the stocks of silver and paper moneys in the world by gold, as this bill initiates, then the increased demand for gold will be so great as to cause a most severe and long-continued depression.

EXTENT OF THE PRESENT PROSPERITY.

But, sir, I am not here to admit that these times are as prosperous as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] would have us believe. I wish they were more prosperous. I concede there is some prosperity, but if you eliminate the articles which are manufactured and controlled by monopolies and trusts, you will find that there has been only a very moderate increase in price of the principal staple commodities.

Let us see whether that statement can not be demonstrated. In 1846 there was a man by the name of August Sauerbeck, of London, who undertook to tabulate and average the market quotations of 45 of the principal commodities used by man. He selected those which would be freest from the cheapening effects of inventions. They are in the breadstuffs, such as wheat, corn, and rye; in the meats, such as beef, pork, and mutton; in the metals, such as iron, copper, and lead; and in the fibers, such as cotton and wool. These commodities represent 80 per cent of the world's commerce. These tables have been kept to the present time. They show a decline from 1873 to 1896, when they reached 61 per cent of the average prices of the ten years around 1873, or 54.9 per cent of what they were in 1873.

Since 1896 there has been a rise of from only 1 to 3 points per year, the average for the first nine months of 1899 being 66.9 per cent of the average prices of the ten years around 1873, or 60 per cent of what they were in 1873. There is an increase in three years from 61 per cent to 66.9 per cent—about 6 points.

Now, that is an increase, it is true, and we hail it with delight, but it is not such a wonderful and unprecedented rise as is claimed by the gentleman from Ohio. Eighty per cent of the commodities of the world have been increasing a little over 2 per cent per annum. That is the extent of the elevation of prices. These tables can not be denied. They are published in the London Economist, a gold-standard paper, and consequently ought to be accepted as conclusive. I wish to incorporate as a part of my remarks the Sauerbeck tables.

Mr. Sauerbeck's index numbers, to which is added the annual average price of silver in London and to which is added index numbers of the same forty-five commodities, taking as their base the average prices of 1873, and a table showing the increase of the purchasing power of a dollar, taking the average prices of 1873 as the base.

Year.	Sauerbeck's index numbers of 45 principal commodities, taking average price of 1867-1877 as their base = 100.	Index numbers of same 45 principal commodities, taking the average price of 1873 as their base = 100.	Table showing increase of purchasing power of a dollar, taking the average prices of 1873 as the base = 100.	Sauerbeck's index numbers of silver, taking the price 1867-1877 of 60.84d. = 100.	Annual average price of silver in London.
					Pence.
1873	111	100	$1.00		
1874	102	92	1.09	95.8	58 5/16
1875	96	86	1.16	93.3	56¼
1876	95	85	1.18	86.7	52¾
1877	94	84	1.19	90.2	54⅜
1878	87	78	1.28	86.4	52 5/16
1879	83	75	1.33	84.2	51¼
1880	89	79	1.27	85.9	52¼
1881	85	76	1.31	85	51 11/16
1882	84	75	1.33	84.9	51⅝
1883	83	74	1.35	83.1	50 7/16
1884	76	68	1.47	83.3	50 11/16

Mr. Sauerbeck's index numbers, etc.—Continued.

Year.	Sauerbeck's index numbers of 45 principal commodities, taking average price of 1867-1877 as their base = 100.	Index numbers of same 45 principal commodities, taking the average price of 1873 as their base = 100.	Table showing increase of purchasing power of a dollar, taking the average prices of 1873 as the base = 100.	Sauerbeck's index numbers of silver, taking the price 1867-1877 of 60.84d. = 100.	Annual average price of silver in London.
					Pence.
1885	72	65	$1.54	79.9	48⅝
1886	69	62	1.61	74.3	45⅛
1887	68	61	1.64	73	44⅜
1888	70	63	1.59	70.4	42⅞
1889	72	65	1.54	70.2	42 11/16
1890	72	65	1.54	78.4	47⅝
1891	72	65	1.54	74.1	45 1/16
1892	68	61	1.64	65.4	39¾
1893	68	61	1.64	58.6	35⅝
1894	63	57	1.75	47.6	28 15/16
1895	62	55.8	1.78	49	29¾
1896	61	54.9	1.82	50.5	30¾
1897	62	55.8	1.79	45.3	27 9/16
1898	64	57.6	1.74	44.3	26 15/16
1899 (9 months)	66.9	60	1.66	45.4	27 5/8

MONEYS TO BE REDEEMED IN GOLD UNDER THIS BILL.

Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to redeem in gold the following moneys of the United States:

The United States notes, commonly called greenbacks, consisting of	$346,681,016
The Treasury notes, consisting of	89,026,280
And the standard silver dollar, consisting of	482,622,376
Making a total of	918,329,672

The enormous strain on the gold reserve of the Treasury by having such a large quantity of money redeemable in that metal must, it seems to me, again put this nation in the scramble of the world for more gold.

THE STRUGGLE IN EUROPE FOR GOLD.

To-day Great Britain, Germany, Russia, and France are in a desperate struggle to maintain their gold reserves.

I say there is a struggle going on between European nations in which each is trying to grab from the other its already diminished gold reserve and which threatens most serious monetary stringency and consequent depression.

The Washington Post, a gold-standard paper, in its issue of December 1, 1899, publishes the following Associated Press dispatch:

GOLD RESERVE RUNS LOW—BANK OF ENGLAND RATE RAISED TO 6 PER CENT—STOCK MARKET AFFECTED.

LONDON, *November 30.*

The stock market was somewhat unsettled to day in consequence of the rise in the discount rate of the Bank of England from 5 to 6 per cent. But there are none disposed to cavil much at this advance, as it is recognized as being essential that the reserve should be augmented and that 5 per cent is ineffective in attracting gold.

Apart from the demands for money arising from the activity of trade, the Government will have, sooner or later, to raise additional war funds. The reserve at present is so low that it might at any time be suddenly reduced to a figure necessitating something worse than 6 per cent.

It must be remembered that the high rate of discount mentioned in the dispatch has never been equaled since the great failure of the Baring Brothers, of London.

In the Washington Post of December 4, 1899, is the following:

STRINGENCY IN GOLD MARKET—EFFECT OF ACCUMULATION OF YELLOW METAL BY BANK OF RUSSIA.

LONDON, *December 3.*

The Statist, commenting on the rise in the bank rate, says: "The accumulation of money by the Russian Government is largely responsible for the present shortness of the gold reserve here and in Germany. Under the circumstances, the political situation and the financial troubles in St. Petersburg, we can scarcely expect the Bank of Russia to part with any of its gold.

"While the advance in the value of money here will prevent New York from withdrawing its balances from London until easier conditions prevail, we can not look for gold imports from the United States. We must be prepared for a further reduction of the reserve, and may witness very stringent conditions."

Again, Mr. Chairman, in the Post of last Saturday, December 9, 1899, I find the following:

The hardening of money in Berlin and Paris and the heavy loss in gold by the Bank of England for shipment to South America were evidences of the constriction of the money supply abroad. This was sufficient to keep the sterling exchange rate firm in spite of our own stiffening money rate, but there was a significant decline in the rate of exchange in Paris in response to London's measures to shift pressure upon that center.

Henry Clews & Co., bankers of Wall street, in their letter to the public to-day make the following statement:

The money centers all over the world are disturbed at the present time. The Bank of England's rate of discount is now 6 per cent, which is the highest for over ten years, and the rate in Berlin is 7 per cent. The management of the Bank of France is the most despotic of the world's great financial institutions, and they hold on to their gold with an iron grasp. * * * The object, therefore, of the bank advancing its rate to 6 per cent, with the

possibility of its going still higher, is to draw gold from other sections of the world. France, Germany, Austria, Russia, and America all are resistant, as wherever gold is lost in this struggle contraction, followed by liquidation, is a natural sequence.

Notwithstanding this deplorable condition of the gold reserves of Europe, and notwithstanding the war in South Africa has closed the mines of Johannasburg and diminished the gold supply of the world fully one-third, here in this bill is a proposition to enormously increase the burden upon gold by making the $918,000,000 of currency redeemable in gold.

It is folly at such a time to talk of increasing the burdens upon gold.

THE ENORMOUS CONTRACTION OF THE CURRENCY AUTHORIZED BY THIS BILL.

Sir, great as is the evil of redeeming all the other moneys of the Government in gold, the worst feature of this bill is that it does not provide that these moneys when once redeemed shall be reissued to meet the obligations of the Government, as the law now requires. By reissuing currency a very large amount can be kept in circulation based upon a relatively small reserve in gold, but, sir, the provisions of this bill authorize the impounding in the Treasury of all the moneys of this Government except gold, bank notes, and fractional coins. It authorizes the retirement of nearly one-half of the entire circulating medium of the nation, and more than half of that which actually circulates.

At the opening of this debate I asked the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] whether the redemption and retention in the Treasury of the 482,000,000 silver dollars would not produce a contraction of the currency to that extent. He answered, "Absolutely not, for the reason that the silver dollars can not be taken to the Treasury for exchange unless an equal amount of gold goes at once into circulation to take their place in trade."

Can such an answer as that deceive anyone possessed of reasoning powers? Where must the Government get the $482,000,000 of gold with which to retire the silver dollars? Undoubtedly from the circulating medium of the country. What difference does it make whether it produces a contraction of gold or silver? The same amount of contraction of currency takes place in either event. And what is true as to retirement of the silver dollars is also true as to the greenbacks and Treasury notes. It is a homely aphorism, but nevertheless true, that "you can not have your pie and eat it, too."

It has been contended by some that it is not likely that anyone will present these forms of currency for redemption. Possibly not for a short interval of time, but sooner or later the price level of Europe and the bids of England for gold will cause exportation of gold, which will be supplied through the redemption of these currencies. Already the bids for gold by the nations of Europe, as shown by the extracts from papers I have just read, are becoming irresistible, and in all likelihood the export of that metal will soon begin.

Then we will find this alarming condition: Our paper and silver currencies locked up in the vaults of the Treasury, with power to reissue only for gold.

At such times the largest circulating medium is necessary in order to prevent panics. At such times the use of silver dollars and silver certificates as basic money become the great mass of the currency.

But, sir, not only are the currencies impounded, but what becomes of the gold with which they are redeemed? Is it placed in circulation in this country? Oh, no; it is withdrawn from the Treasury for foreign export. The inevitable result must be that we not only contract the currency by impounding the greenbacks and silver, but at the same time we further contract it by shipping the gold to Europe. Thus when these redemptions occur, it doubly contracts the currency and consequently makes the stringency doubly severe.

Again, even if demand for gold from Europe should not occur, these redemptions in time will be made.

All respectable authorities on political economy admit the quantitative theory of money. If you increase the quantity of money, you decrease the purchasing power of the same. If you decrease the quantity of money, you increase its purchasing power.

The great writer on political economy, John Stuart Mill, has well said:

> The value of money, other things being the same, varies inversely as its quantity, every increase of quantity lowering the value and every diminution raising it in ratio exactly equivalent.

Ricardo also crystallized that thought in this statement:

> That commodities rise or fall in proportion to the increase or diminution of money I assume as a fact that is incontrovertible.

Under this principle, the holders of securities and obligations payable in money become directly interested in decreasing the quantity of money, so that the purchasing power of their securities may become greater.

The provisions of this bill place it in the power of almost any large moneyed institution to demand a large part of these redemptions. There are banks in New York City through which hundreds of millions of dollars pass each year. If at the end of business each day it should take all its greenbacks and silver certificates and demand from the subtreasury of that city gold or gold certificates therefor, it would not take many months for it to contract the currency enormously.

To say that banks or moneyed institutions will not do such a thing is to deny that man is guided in business by self-interest.

THE PROPOSED ANNIHILATION OF SILVER.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, in authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to redeem silver dollars in gold, is a movement to totally annihilate silver as money. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is a new departure in the treatment of standard money in the history of the nations of the world. Sir, no nation on the face of the globe discredits any one form of basic money by redeeming it in another. There is not a nation to-day that redeems its silver in gold. There is only one nation and one colony that have the single gold standard in effect. They are Great Britain and Canada. Every other nation in the world has a full legal-tender silver coin resting upon its own base and acting as its own redeemer.

Even if the Secretary of the Treasury were required to pay out the silver redeemed to meet the expenses of the Government, it still would produce the annihilation of silver dollars as money. When you provide that the silver dollar may be redeemed in gold, you thereby destroy it as basic money and make it simply a promise to pay. When the policy of the Government to treat the standard silver dollars as mere promises to pay is once fixed, then there will arise the agitation, why should this Government have invested in silver dollars nearly $500,000,000 when they are mere promises to pay gold and such promises could be printed upon paper without practically any cost to the Government? The irresistible logic of such a course is to sell the silver dollars as bullion and totally annihilate silver as money.

Is the United States prepared to destroy nearly one-half of its basic money?

Is the world going to enter upon a policy of destruction of one-half of its primary money?

Sir, what result must follow if such a course is pursued? There is to-day and always has been nearly as much silver money as gold money in the world—a little over $4,000,000,000 of gold and a little less than $4,000,000,000 of silver.

If by legislation you strike down one of these metals as basic money, you must of necessity shift onto the other all the burdens of commerce and credit formerly borne by both metals. Nay, more, you must add the burden of redeeming the silver itself.

It would be like the killing of one of the horses of a double team and requiring the remaining horse not only to draw the same load but also to drag the weight of his dead companion.

As these metals are about equal in amount, you can readily see that the destruction of one of them must enormously increase the burden upon the other. Increasing the burden upon gold means increasing the demand for gold. You know the principle of supply and demand. You know that if you increase the demand you enhance the value of that which you demand. Hence the increase in the demand for gold must increase its value.

If gold were simply a commodity, such as iron or copper, its increase in value would be of very little consequence. It is true when one purchased a gold article they would have to pay a little more for it, just as they do now in purchasing an iron or copper article, but that is the only way in which it would affect the people.

The reason why every man, woman, and child in the world is interested in the increase in the value of gold is not because they have gold, but because they do have those things which are to be measured by gold, namely, property and commodities.

Increase in the value of your standard money means what? It means the increase of that which measures everything purchasable in the world. That means that your gold dollar buys more of commodities and property. That appears well for the man who has the gold dollar; but how about the man who sells? He is bound to yield up more of property and products to obtain that dollar, and that means that he must sell at a less price. If the seller has obligations to be paid in such enhanced value, it often means bankruptcy and ruin.

HAS THE INCREASED ANNUAL PRODUCTION OF GOLD OBVIATED THE NECESSITY OF SILVER DOLLARS?

But our gold-standard friends say that the annual production of gold has doubled in recent years, and therefore there is no necessity any longer for silver dollars. They confuse the annual production with the world's stock of gold. In fact, the annual production, though large compared with former annual productions, is yet exceedingly small when compared with the world's stock of gold. The annual production for 1898 was $287,428,000, fully one-half of which goes into the arts, which leaves only $144,000,000 for the monetary uses of the world. This is only 3 per cent of the world's stock of gold. Three per cent increase is no more than sufficient to keep pace with the legitimate increase of commerce and is totally inadequate to supply the place of the silver of the world. The proportion which the United States

would get according to its relative commercial importance would be about $35,000,000; hence it would take, even at this large rate of production, about fourteen years to supply the place of silver in this country alone. To predict that the annual production will for a long series of years largely increase is to indulge in the wildest fancy.

When the gold mines in California and Australia were discovered in 1849 the moneyed power of the world predicted that the production of gold would be so great as to make it necessary to adopt the single silver standard, and Germany, Holland, and Austria did adopt that standard in accordance with that sentiment. Some time after that the great Comstock lode in Nevada was discovered, and then it was predicted that Nevada alone would produce $500,000,0000 of silver a year.

It was then that the demonetization of silver was begun. All of these predictions proved false. To-day California is not producing one-fourth as much gold as in the '50s, and Nevada is not producing one-tenth as much silver as then. Yet there was as much foundation for making those predictions then as there is for making these now.

SHORTAGE IN THE PRECIOUS METALS.

Notwithstanding the increase in the annual production, there is to-day and always has been a shortage in the precious metals. This statement is demonstrated by the fact that nearly every nation is compelled, either through its banking institutions or through its treasury department, to issue a substitute for money in the form of credit or uncovered money. No nation would resort to the issuance of such a substitute unless there was an imperative necessity for a greater circulating medium, and the very fact that that necessity exists demonstrates the shortage in the precious metals.

Secretary Gage in his last report estimates that the total uncovered paper money of the world amounts to $2,836,300,000. This can not be supplied by gold in twenty years, even at the enlarged production of this year. If to this uncovered paper money is added the silver to be supplanted by gold, it will take the gold product for fifty years to accomplish it, without allowing any increase for the increasing demands of commerce.

The great cause of panics is the issuance of credit money. The government that does it either through its treasury or through its banking institutions is bound at some times to have most stringent conditions. Like the individual that goes in debt, sooner or later liquidation will be demanded, and usually at the most inopportune time, and distress will follow. With money that needs no redemption, such as silver and gold, there can be no such thing as a run on the Treasury. Sound economics would therefore sanction the proposition to substitute silver for all promises of the Government to pay if there were a sufficient quantity of that metal together with gold to supply the place of the other currencies. But while there is a shortage in the precious metals, contraction makes the balance of the money dearer and makes the conditions more critical.

When, in addition, the silver dollars are replaced with gold, it will produce an alarming condition with a certainty, other things remaining as they are, of a fearful depression, with falling prices for a number of years.

It is estimated that there is built upon each dollar of currency at least $15 of credit and $30 of property value. Hence the destruction of each dollar of currency entails a loss of $15 of credit and $30 of property value. The destruction by impounding the $918,000,000 of currency will therefore produce a loss, other things remaining the same, of $13,770,000,000 of credits and $27,540,000,000 of property value in the world.

POLITICAL EFFECT OF THE PASSAGE OF THIS BILL.

From a political standpoint the passage of this bill is bound to shift the issues a little to the disadvantage of the Republican party in the campaign of 1900. Although I am a firm believer in the ability of this Government to establish the parity of the metals at the ratio of 16 to 1 by giving to silver the same mintage rights now given to gold, yet I must confess that there were a large number of bimetallists in 1896 who doubted that ability, and who clung to the Republican party in the hope that it would carry out its pledge in favor of international bimetallism.

The passage of this bill by a unanimous vote of the Republicans will make the issue in 1900 that of gold monometallism. It drives from the Republican party not only those who believe in the free coinage of silver, but also all those sincere bimetallists who have hoped for international bimetallism and who have violently opposed the gold standard.

To fasten the single gold standard upon the country now is a most egregious error. We ought, under any consideration, to hold ourselves in a position so that when the commercial value of silver rises we can link the metals together by free coinage laws.

The cause of the free coinage of silver may appear gloomy at times, but nevertheless I have a firm conviction that, even if it should not come by legislation of this country, the world will again some day be on a bimetallic basis. It may be soon, but it surely will be in time.

Even if we should be defeated at every election, the conditions will some day force bimetallism.

Sooner or later there is bound to come a great conflict between two powerful nations. Although it is to be deplored, yet it will surely come. When that time arrives, bimetallism will be established. How?

It is a fact that no great war was ever fought on the gold standard. It is true that the great United States could fight little Spain on that standard, but Spain could not fight the United States on that standard. Within fifteen days after the declaration of war Spain went to a silver basis, which raised the price of silver all over the world nearly 10 per cent.

The reason no great war can be fought on the gold standard is because as soon as nations of equal strength become engaged a doubt arises in the minds of the inhabitants of each country as to whether it can win and consequently as to whether its paper money will go to a discount. The depositor in banks will think that perhaps the paper money may not remain good, and therefore the next time he draws money he will demand gold. At the very commencement of such a struggle each nation will find when it most needs a large circulating medium, when enormous contracts are being let for war supplies, that the gold has been withdrawn and is being hoarded by the people. When the nation is in most need of a large currency it finds it has hardly any.

The legislative bodies of each will immediately enact laws for an adequate currency. It is then that the capitalists will insist that the governments should not issue paper money, for fear that an overissue will make it worthless. It is then that they will insist that if gold can not be obtained, silver must be legalized and used.

The enormous demand in war times by two powerful nations upon the limited quantity of silver in the world available for coinage will, in my judgment, undoubtedly so increase the value of that metal as to establish its parity with gold.

I do not, however, believe that we will have to wait for such conditions. The passage of this bill will, in my judgment, produce such a revulsion in the public mind as to make the chances for the establishment of bimetallism, through the election of 1900, most excellent, indeed.

When bimetallism is again established, the world will be upon a financial basis that will lessen panics, diminish the financial embarrassments of governments, and produce such a fair measure of values as to be equitable and just to both debtors and creditors. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER] is recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, this is no question to be settled by financial learning or by shuffling of the cards that we call statistics. It is no party question, but one on which members of the opposite party have united with my own in saying that it is needful that the present standard of value throughout the country should be decreed by statute to be maintained. That is the only question to be argued here.

I was surprised that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] should have found opportunity, in answer to the kindly and temperate speech of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], to accuse this side of the House of being hypocrites, to attack our election as gained by fraud, and to say that it was a victory of corporations.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is a prince of courtesy in private relations. We can lay his expressions only to the bitterness of irretrievable defeat. His speech might have been epitomized as follows: "Discomfort guides my tongue and I can speak of nothing but despair," because this question has been settled. Let us delay but a moment to point out also that while a lawyer may sometimes be justified in abusing those upon the other side, and even if he may appeal from the court of appeals by swearing at it at the next corner, it may not be worth while to abuse that court of appeals too much in public, and that this judgment was the verdict of the people on the plain question submitted as a single issue at the election throughout the United States, the issue whether the transactions of this country should be in honest money.

It was not the issue of the rich against the poor. It was the issue of protection of the poor, for they are always the creditors—are creditors day by day in their wages, creditors in bank deposits, which are secured by mortgages given by the rich; creditors in insurance, which is likewise so secured. The campaign was fought by them and for them on that issue; it was won on that issue.

In bringing in this bill to carry that decision into effect this House brings no new thing before the country. They only carry out the verdict of the people. Now, let us add that it is an issue of importance. It is true that for the last twenty years a gold dollar of full value has been the standard, and that by the action of the Government the silver dollar, worth intrinsically but 50 cents, has been maintained at a parity with it in business transactions.

This has been done as a policy, carried out by men of both parties. Mr. Cleveland maintained that policy as fully as the present Administration. But the question now is whether that policy shall be made by statute a final and settled policy; and the danger is that, no matter what this House may think, and whatever its majority may be, no matter what the Senate may think and its majority may be, that policy may, under the present laws, be reversed by the will of a single man if elected by a sweep at some Presidential election.

This is not a party question. I have been appealed to for the last two years by my Democratic friends saying, "When will you make this matter certain? When will you relieve the country from this terror? When will you make it clear that we are to have a certain measure of value?" The questioners are not so much Republicans as Democrats. I could only say to them, "We will meet this question when our proposition may be turned into a legislative act. As long as the Senate is hostile any proposition that we may make may be misconstrued, and it may contain concessions made for the sake of compromise that would weaken our action. We will wait until we can act; then we will bring forward a measure at the first possible moment." We are fulfilling our pledge. As we do it we appeal to gentlemen on the other side to let it not be a party measure.

This is really all that is in this bill. It is recognized as such in this debate. There are subsidiary matters with reference to the circulation of national banks, introduced only to afford relief to the feelings of those that think there might be contraction and to insure relief to business in case such contraction should ensue. But these clauses are subsidiary. Will not the representatives of the old Democracy—the Jackson hard-money Democracy—stand with the people of the country for honest money? You have before you this fetich of a silver dollar, composed of but 50 cents of value plus a legislative fiat. It is worshiped as the equal of the true. "Choose you this day whom ye will serve." Among your party the prophets are many who say, "Follow with our idol." Follow not. "Choose you this day whom ye will serve," for the lightning of the voice of the people, which is often almost that of the Almighty, has fallen and devoured up the altars of those who have resisted under the sanctity of a false dogma.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman permit an interruption for a moment?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. If it comes in the line of the argument I am making.

Mr. GAINES. Did you promise your constituents that you would vote for a law to make the bonds and obligations of this Government payable in gold alone in making your speeches to them?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Yes, sir; I did. And I will say that the platform says that until an agreement for bimetallic use of gold and silver can be obtained the established gold standard shall be preserved.

Mr. GAINES. Well, now, have you and your party abandoned all idea of international bimetallism?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. We never promised that this could be done. We did expect to see it. Have you any idea that it can be obtained? If it can be, we always have stood up to our pledges. But you have no knowledge of the fact that it will by the conditions as they are now.

Mr. GAINES. I will answer your question.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I do not care for it now.

Mr. GAINES. You asked for it.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. It will come out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I will hear your answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is out of order.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I give the gentleman leave to answer yes or no.

Mr. GAINES. I am not out of order, with all due respect to the Chairman, as the gentleman yields to me.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Now, answer my question.

Mr. GAINES. Did your President, Mr. McKinley, when he thought international bimetallism was about to succeed, send an extra message asking for the creation of a commission to fasten the gold standard upon this country according to the Indianapolis platform?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. My question was susceptible of an answer, yes or no.

Mr. GAINES. My question was, Did your President abandon international bimetallism?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I shall not brook further interruption, because I do not think interruption of that kind is valuable. I asked the question whether it was probable. That was a question that could have been answered yes or no, and I leave it to the House. Now, I am rather glad that the question has been asked, for it allowed me to say that until this can be obtained the existing gold standard should be maintained.

This bill says it shall. Without this bill we can only say that it may be maintained if the Secretary of the Treasury chooses to do so. Like all great financial measures, this bill is simple. It declares only what is fact. It enacts only what would have been enacted had the conditions been as they are to-day. It declares that gold is the standard. My silver friends will every one acknowledge that it has been such under the policy of the Government during the last twenty years. It declares that the interest and principal of Government obligations shall be paid in gold, and they have been so paid in gold ever since they were issued and paid against the protest of my silver friends. We thus declare only what has been a fact.

But in so doing and in ordering the payment of the obligations and their interest in gold, we come, I admit, to the root of the question, because we thereby order that gold shall be exchanged for silver whenever that exchange is demanded. It is not necessary to go on and say, as we do, that the Secretary of the Treasury may in his discretion effect such exchange. The Government of the United States is now paying out for interest $40,000,000 in every year in gold. It must have this gold, but must take the silver dollar and the silver certificate for every dollar of taxes and every dollar of customs if so required.

If the people are not willing to pay gold into the Treasury, and the Government must pay it out, the Government must buy it as it did in the days of the late Administration. It bought it by issuing bonds. That is the reason that we now have in the Treasury $500,000,000 worth of silver against $400,000,000 of certificates; it is because we could not get the silver into the market, and we had to buy gold and leave silver in the Treasury to the amount of the extra $100,000,000. We have therefore bought gold.

We do not have to do so now, because, thanks to a protective tariff and thanks to the doctrine of honest money, business has revived. Prosperity is real. The gentleman from Nevada does not believe with my friend who preceded him that this is a bogus prosperity. Every man knows that business has revived, everyone knows that the balance of trade is in our favor. Everyone knows that we are able to pay our debts. Our taxes come into the Treasury in gold, and we pay our interest in gold, and it is in order that we may remain able so to do that we declare, in fulfillment of our pledge and in fulfillment of the vote of the people, that the obligations of the Government shall be so payable.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the committee please, I pass very briefly over other provisions of the bill. This measure provides that when greenbacks are redeemed in gold or silver coin they shall only be paid out again on return of like gold or silver coin. That is right, for otherwise both greenbacks and gold are put in circulation when one should only be the representative of the other.

Gentlemen ask whether our currency will not be contracted. No. Real currency, real money, always has to be bought. It is bought by labor at the mines; it is bought sometimes by the issue of Government bonds, but when these bonds are issued they do not buy simply from American citizens. They are available to buy gold from all over the world. It is likewise because our trade and our manufactures have been such that we could export, and because our farming has been such that we could export farm products, that we have been able to get gold into this country. Fear not the bogy of contracted currency while you have expanded industries. If a man makes more than he spends, he will save money. If the nation makes more than it spends, it will get money. A money plenty is not the cause, but the effect of prosperity.

Only a word more. I will not discuss the question of banking; that is for experts. The changes that are made are made in view of the fact that when the national banks were established they got 6 per cent United States bonds and 6 per cent on their discounts, and they could afford to pay a tax of 1 per cent a year. Now, when interest is at 3 per cent, it has been found that that tax is oppressive. The bill in the Senate and the bill in the House propose a reduction of that tax, so that the bank can give the country more currency when it is required. The banks are also allowed to issue currency up to the par value of their bonds, instead of to 90 per cent only. And yet my friend from New York takes up this provision and says there will be a contraction of the currency, and appeals to the gold Democrats to get into the car with themselves, who would pull down the honest money of this country! I appeal to you as patriots to look at the present and not at the past. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I desire to submit the following remarks under the leave granted by the House:

The measure will have the approval of the whole people. It represents the pledge of the party. It is simple. It is frank and outspoken. It is all the more a great financial measure because it is simple honesty and simple good sense. It faces the facts. It recognizes, declares, and enforces a policy that has been long settled, while in the minor particulars in which it changes the law as to national-bank circulation it makes that law only what it would have been originally had the conditions then been what they are now.

Since specie payments were resumed our dollar has been worth 100 cents. All business has been based upon a gold coin that would hold its value though it passed through the fire and although it went across the seas. We had hoped that the silver dollar might regain that character. But we have had to face the fact that its fluctuations in intrinsic value can not be controlled by fiat, that its depreciation is not temporary, but permanent, and that its honor and equal value can only be maintained by pledging thereto the credit of the Government. The brave man faces this exigency. It is a foe, but—

> With fearless eye he sees him,
> With fearless hand a welcome gi'es him.

Again, when the bill declares that the nation's debt, both principal and interest, shall be paid in gold, it meets the whole situation. Our Secretary of the Treasury says:

> It will be equally effective if by positive law it were made mandatory upon the Treasury Department so to pay and receive the two kinds of money—silver and gold—as to maintain their parity under all conditions. Such action would be in conformity to what has already been established as the policy of the Government.—*Report of Secretary of the Treasury*, pages LXXVII, LXXVIII.

Some day we shall find it well to put intrinsic value in all our coinage. It is sufficient now to decree the continuance of the great and honorable policy that the Government will pay gold or accept silver on request, and will see that every dollar shall be equal to every other dollar.

The so-called endless chain still exists as long as there is revenue to collect and interest to pay, and is independent of the existence of the greenback. But it is to that very endless chain alone that we owe the untarnished honor of our currency and the credit of our Government.

This measure, as we have seen, likewise provides that when greenbacks are redeemed in gold or silver coin they shall only be paid out again on the return of this gold or silver coin. The existence of four hundred millions of demand notes and four hundred millions of silver certificates, which must be maintained equal to gold, makes a combined sum which would be dangerous to any government in bad times. As patriots, while revenues are plentiful and the balance of trade is in our favor, so that we are receiving money from abroad instead of sending it there, we should make provision against an evil day by diminishing these obligations. A nation which does not lay up in summer may find itself poor in winter. There are some of us who can not help wishing that it were possible to retire all these notes and refund the whole Government debt at a lower rate of interest.

When the bill allows the formation of small national banks in small towns it does only what the original law would have done had the use of banks and bank checks been as universal then as it is to-day.

When the bill proposes to allow bank notes to be issued up to the par value of the Government bonds which secure them it does only what the original law would have done had the credit of the United States then been what it is to-day, had it been certain that these bonds would not have sold at a discount.

The House currency bill and that proposed by the committee of the Senate suggest different remedies as to national-bank taxation. The House bill would take off the tax on circulation and put it upon assets, and would fall more heavily on city banks of large comparative capital. The Senate bill leaves the tax on circulation but reduces it upon such currency as shall be issued upon a proposed new 2 per cent Government bond. It is for an expert on banking to say which of these remedies is better. Each is good, for either would remove an oppression.

It may be urged that the House bill is fairest in principle inasmuch as it taxes each institution according to its property and ability to pay. It may be said in reply that the funding of the whole national debt at 2 per cent would be a great step forward, and that a tax on circulation operates to restrain it when it is not needed, so that there is an opportunity for elasticity and expansion of currency when the market demands it and will pay for it.

At the end of the last fiscal year the banks owned over a hundred millions more of Government bonds than the notes which they had issued.

The Report of the Comptroller of the Currency, pages 1 and 2, states:

Resources.	June 30, 1899, 3,583 banks.
United States bonds to secure circulation	$228,870,310.00
United States bonds to secure United States deposits	73,497,040.00
United States bonds on hand	21,031,310.00
National-bank notes outstanding	199,358,382.50

The circulation would possibly not have been so restrained had there been no tax upon it, and under the present system there is thus considerable margin for expansion of our circulating medium in case of need.

But all this is matter of detail. A conference committee can settle it. It is for us only to rejoice that this bill is at last before the Legislature; that it will be passed substantially as it is, two Houses and the President concurring; that it gives the sanction of law to the policy which has been adopted by the great men of both parties; that it gives a seal to the obligations which have thus far been written in the hearts of every patriot; that it fulfills a pledge to which the majority of this House are in honor bound; that it speaks the language of simple truth and enforces the simple obligations of common honesty.

The country appeals to men of every party for a verdict. Say the truth in your vote on this bill. If a full-value gold dollar be the standard of value, say so. Do not vote "no" unless a 50-cent silver dollar be your standard. There is no compromise between the two. It is not a fight between gold and silver, for one dollar's worth of silver is worth just as much as a dollar in gold. The fight is between a dollar worth 100 cents and free coinage of a silver dollar worth only 50 cents. This bill declares that such a dollar is only in use and can only be in use because the credit of the Government is behind it, and that that credit shall stay behind it.

Say if this be not true. Some of my Democratic friends appeal to gold and silver Democrats to get up together in the same chariot. That chariot is not a band wagon this year. The honorable men of that party must determine what is honest and what is right, and on what platform they will stand before the people. And, outside of all party, we appeal to every true and patriotic man, choose to-day what you will do. Will you follow honesty and register the decree of the people? Will you stand up for honest money? Will you recognize the facts as they are, or will you shuffle and equivocate on this matter? It is time to act.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Mr. Chairman, it rarely falls to the lot of a man in public life to do an official act so wise, patriotic, and far-reaching in its effects as to stand out conspicuously from among the immature, unnecessary, and I might almost say unwise measures constantly engrossing the mind of a legislator and inviting the attention of the public.

To-day, however, marks a new period in the affairs of our country. After years of patient devotion and interesting discussion by the people a climax has been reached. The scattered rays of individual opinion have finally crystallized, and the period of helpful, courageous, and necessary financial legislation is at hand. It is wholly unnecessary, in my opinion, to retraverse the steps that have finally culminated in this unanimous report, but the experience, wisdom, and devotion reflected in this bill is a subject of universal commendation. We knew the committee differed among themselves; not in the ends sought, but the means by which to attain it; but their unanimity and earnest championship of this bill clearly discloses the fact that minor matters of difference have been waived in order that we might act unitedly in accomplishing the central purpose of fixing definitely and distinctly the gold standard into law.

The Republican party in their national convention took advanced grounds upon this question, and in the campaign that followed, aided and assisted as we were by many Democrats who regarded the subject of currency reform as paramount to party expediency, swept the country like a tidal wave, bearing into the vortex of political oblivion the Populistic champions of repudiation and disaster.

Out of the great victory of 1896 came the responsibility for wise currency legislation. We are now face to face with that sacred pledge to the people. The requisite majority for sound money now sit in both branches of Congress, while the great leader of all the forces for honest money sits in the Executive chair prepared to carry out the will of the people so unequivocally expressed.

The country waits to know whether our promise shall be redeemed. We should be united upon this side of the Chamber. Is there a hesitating doubter among us? From what State does he come? Hold him up, Mr. Chairman, to the public gaze! Let his constituents see what a pitiful spectacle the political cringer presents in the face of a great public duty! Mr. Chairman, there is no battle of the standards. The only possible controversy in the past has been between the gold standard and no standard, and the thoughtful, earnest man of affairs, the farmer and the laborer, bone and sinew of our body politic, whose enterprise and public spirit have made the country what it is to-day, sound-money Democrat as well as Republican, when the issue was made stood like a stone wall against the proposition to debase our currency. When the Free Silverite proposed to Mexicanize our country with a financial fallacy, as spurious as it was dangerous and as fallacious as it was tempting, the eyes of the civilized world were then upon us. It was just at the close of a century rich in moral, financial, and industrial achievements, but there was no hesitating or doubt. America stood the strain that was put upon it, and out of the turmoil of unfair discussion came the true principle of monetary reform.

The argument of the Silverite was that if the gold standard were sustained the currency of our country would be contracted and

money would appreciate. How shameful and false the statement! Instead of contracting the currency it has been expanded; instead of making money dearer we have actually cheapened it, until to-day money is loaned at a less rate of interest than ever before in the history of the country.

When Mr. Bryan was nominated as the Free Silver candidate for President in 1896 the total money in circulation in the United States was $1,509,725,200, and on December 1 of the present month, but three and one-half years later, the total money in circulation in the United States is $1,985,930,964, an increase of $476,205,764, or 31½ per cent.

Mr. SULZER. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Certainly.

Mr. SULZER. I should like to ask the gentleman how much of that increase is in silver dollars coined by this Government?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I will tell the gentleman before I finish, if he will be patient.

Mr. SULZER. Can you not answer that now?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Yes; but not without interrupting the continuity of my thought.

Mr. SULZER. And I would like to ask also if the present Administration did not coin those silver dollars at the ratio of 16 to 1?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Why, certainly; but not in unlimited quantities. I think my answer will be satisfactory to the gentleman from New York when that part of my argument is reached.

The steady and rapid growth in circulation of money in the United States gives the lie to the prediction of the free-coinage advocate, while in the month of November just passed our money in circulation increased $22,214,816, or over $700,000 every working day in the month, and every dollar of this money, whether gold, silver, or paper, is the equal of every other dollar in the hands of the richest or the poorest man in the Republic. What a splendid achievement in three and one-half years. Is it any wonder that scores of honest voters, tempted by the silver panacea, should now desert their cause and come to the support of President McKinley?

Even prominent men, high in the councils of the silver party, some of whom occupy seats on the other side of this Chamber, are now advising that it would be useless to make silver the issue in another Presidential contest, as the people now have their eyes open and will not be led blindly by reckless leaders. It was stated by our opponents that if the gold standard prevailed the coinage of silver would be suspended, that our mints would be closed down, that no more silver would be coined, and many well-intentioned voters were led to the belief that our party stood for gold monometallism. How interesting must be the report just published by the Director of the Mint. He says that—

> The coinage of gold this year was the greatest in our history, amounting to $108,177,180, as against $64,634,865 in the preceding year, and that it would have been considerably larger if the capacity of the mint had been greater.

He says that—

> The stock of gold bullion on hand increased from $96,688,332 on July 1, 1898, to $119,882,722 on July 1, 1899, while the coinage of silver dollars from bullion purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, was $18,254,709, as against $10,002,780 in the preceding year, and that the coinage of subsidiary silver during the year just closed was $9,466,877.65, against $6,482,804 in the preceding year.

Who now has the boldness to say that the present Administration proposes to discontinue the coinage of silver? I trust this answer will be satisfactory to the gentleman from New York.

The advocates of free silver stated again and again in the last Presidential campaign that gold was getting scarcer, and that it was dangerous to adopt a diminishing product as a standard of value. At the time the free-silver candidate for President delivered his speech of acceptance in New York we had in circulation gold coin and gold certificates amounting to $498,449,242, while there is now in circulation in the United States, upon the first of the present month, gold coin and certificates amounting to $778,388,303, an increase of $279,939,061, or 56 per cent, in a little over three years.

Where is the false financial prophet of that period? Is he the apologist upon the other side of this Chamber? Are you still defending this old story, riddled from end to end by the practical experience of the last three years? Or are you looking and longing for other political issues with which to deceive the American voter? If so, I warn you that mere expediency courts and deserves disaster.

The United States is a world power. The products of our labor find their way through trade channels into every port of the world. This condition of affairs is becoming more important every year. The immense foreign trade in which we are engaged has this year touched its highest point, aggregating nearly two billions of dollars, with a balance of trade in our favor of $529,874,813, while our domestic trade is prosperous in all departments of commercial activity. Surely this is the result of a wise governmental policy, which should be the proud pleasure of all good citizens to sustain.

Our total exports in the fiscal year of 1899 to the gold-standard countries of the world amounted to $1,071,072,166, and to those classified as having a silver standard $52,721,574, while our imports in the last fiscal year from countries having a gold standard were $499,896,284, and from those countries having a silver standard during the last fiscal year but $86,391,407, thus making our total commerce in the fiscal year with the countries having a gold standard $1,570,968,450, while with those having a silver standard our total commerce was $139,112,981.

How idle it would be for our country to go to a silver basis in the face of these astounding figures, which show our close and extended commercial relations with gold-standard countries and the much smaller trade enjoyed by us with silver-standard countries. The gold-standard countries of the world are the most progressive nations in the world, including as it does Austria-Hungary, Belgium, British North America, Costa Rica, Denmark, Egypt, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Japan, Netherlands, Sweden, Norway, Russia, Switzerland, Uruguay, Argentine Republic, Brazil, Chile, Italy, Portugal, Spain, and Venezuela, while the silver-standard countries only include second and fourth rate powers, such as China, Guatemala, Honduras, British East Indies, Mexico, Nicaragua, Bolivia, Ecuador, Colombia, and Peru.

There is not a well-informed man who will not readily concede that it is the part of wisdom for our country to have its underlying standard of value a unit recognized among the countries with which we have such important and extended commercial relations.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Chairman, that under our system labor is steadily employed, that agriculture flourishes, that manufactures test the full capacity of our factories, that debts are being paid, improvements being made, and the people generally contented and happy? Among the most powerful influences that have contributed to this enviable situation, in sharp contrast with the depression and idleness of three years ago, is the confident expectation that sound currency legislation will be enacted promptly by the party in power, thus placing our finances upon a solid and enduring basis, free from the influences of disturbing political conditions and beyond the reach of demagogues and agitators.

Mr. Chairman, this is our sacred duty, and it must be met ably and fearlessly. This is not a mere party question. We have been sustained in our controversy by men of all parties, and the right solution has to do with the welfare of the whole people and means the weal or woe of the country for generations to come. We have been under a gold standard for many years, but the maintenance of this policy was largely a discretionary one with the Secretary of the Treasury, and his power often questioned and sometimes denied. We must make it definite and obligatory. This bill fixes the standard and obliges the Government to maintain all our money—gold, silver, and paper—at a parity, thus insuring the monetary equilibrium of our financial affairs. In the redemption of this sacred pledge to the people I am proud to say that Michigan, represented in this national Capitol, is unitedly in favor of this bill, and I have been authorized by the entire delegation from our State to say that their votes will be recorded in favor of this measure, the passage of which will be viewed with satisfaction by the people of this country, who fully understand that its significance and purpose are identical with their own material welfare and the happiness and comfort of the homes of America. [Great applause on Republican side.]

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Chairman, March 4, 1897, the present Republican Administration was placed in control of the executive branch of our Government and was also placed in control of the House of Representatives. At that time we found our country, financially speaking, in a deplorable condition. Our revenues were not equal to our expenditures and had not been during the preceding four years. In the last Cleveland Administration it had become necessary, in the time of peace, in order to meet our current expenses and in order to maintain the parity of our money, that we borrow $260,000,000. It is currently reported that the syndicate of home and foreign money manipulators made out of these loans, which the people had to pay, from $30,000,000 to $40,000,000. This loan was made secretly, in so far as giving the people a chance to take a share in it, and was made at a time when we were at peace with ourselves and with the world and at a 4 per cent and 5 per cent rate.

Under the present Administration it became necessary to sell $200,000,000 of bonds to supply ways and means for carrying on the war with Spain. A different policy was pursued in disposing of the bonds. We had for President a man who had confidence in the people. He had heard it said that there was no money in this country in sufficient quantities to meet the requirements of trade and business. He had heard it said that the existing gold standard was destructive to the financial condition of the people. He had heard it said that the people had no confidence in the financial integrity of the Government. He knew that he was about to enter upon a war with a foreign country. He knew that war was to be conducted largely upon the high seas. He did not know what would be the end of the war except that he had faith to believe that the American arms would be successful. He did not know but what the war, when started, would be world wide before

ended and that all Continental Europe would enter into and take sides.

Surrounded as he was by these lowering and dense clouds, impenetrable alike to himself and to his people, he thought that the way to test his people was to see if they had faith in their Government, its honesty and its stability. He applied the test, and what was the result? He offered the bonds to his own people, and the response was satisfactory. For each $2 wanted $14 was offered. The bonds were sold to our own people at a 3 per cent rate. If a like amount of bonds had been sold under this Administration that was sold under the former Administration, the people would have saved in annual interest alone nearly $4,000,000, showing clearly and conclusively that the policy adopted by Mr. McKinley, as compared with the policy adopted by Mr. Cleveland in the sale of bonds, was in the interests of the people.

In the former National Administration our securities decreased in value. In the present Administration our securities have increased in value. Under the former Administration men were out of employment and were tramping our streets and highways, asking for work which they could not get and begging for bread to keep soul and body together. Soup houses were established at public expense in the large cities, and public buildings and halls were filled with hungry, shivering humanity, who used them for places in which to sleep. In short, we were a nation whose people were in want and whose credit as a nation was being questioned in the marts of the world. I am glad to state that this condition of affairs was changed through the votes of the people, Republicans and Democrats alike, joining in voting for Mr. McKinley for President of the United States.

Our present condition is happily stated by the President in his message to the Fifty-sixth Congress, in which he says:

> The country is in a condition of unusual prosperity, of universal good will among the people at home, and in relations of peace and friendship with every government of the world.

Mr. Chairman, you will recall the campaign of 1896 was fought out on two issues—tariff and money, the Republicans contending that the unfortunate conditions of our country were due to a revenue tariff and to the uncertainty of our money standard of value. Our friends upon the other side insisted that the revenue tariff had nothing to do with our then condition, that the tariff was not an issue, and that the existing gold standard of value was the sole cause of our trouble.

The issue as made up between the parties was one of tariff and of money. Many good men believed then and now believe that the real issue was the tariff, while also many good men believed then and now believe that the money question was the real issue. It was owing to these views so held that party lines in many instances were broken, and men who had been lifelong Republicans voted for Mr. Bryan and men who had been lifelong Democrats voted for Mr. McKinley. Perhaps at no time since the commencement of the civil war, when the fate of the nation hung in the balance, was there such a breaking up of party lines. To me it was and is a good sign, for it clearly shows that while the love of party is strong, love of country is stronger. Almost immediately after the induction of Mr. McKinley into office he convened Congress in a special session to provide for a revision of the tariff along Republican lines. He did not wait for Congress to convene under the Constitution, but felt that it was his duty, owing to the unfortunate condition of our people, to at once change, if possible, the condition of affairs. He saw and knew that as a people, industrially speaking, we were in a very unfortunate condition, and likewise he saw that something must be speedily done to relieve the nation from its financial embarrassment.

Seldom in the history of our country were so difficult political problems, in a time of peace, presented to an incoming administration. The Senate was not in political accord with the Executive and the House. The great Speaker, Mr. Reed, was likewise anxious to carry out the wishes of the people, and he refused to name the committees of the House other than a Committee of Ways and Means. While he was much criticised by the public press, he stood firm, and insisted that other legislation must wait, and only such legislation should be entered upon as was then necessary to relieve the people of their unfortunate condition. His conduct in that matter has met with the full approval of the people.

The Dingley bill was prepared and easily passed through the House, and later on became the law of the land. Almost immediately after its passage it began to show its good effect upon the industrial condition of our country. Factories which had long since been closed were opened and work began. Many industrial institutions which were running with light help and on short time were put to work with their full capacity. Many who were seeking work received it. Wages were increased and the great arteries of trade and commerce were set in motion. We no longer hear about the deficit, because we are now once more piling up a surplus. In the last five months our receipts have exceeded our expenditures about $14,000,000.

For the first time in eight years we are purchasing Government bonds and again paying off the public debt. It begins to look now like Republican times again. We nol onger hear any discussion of the endless chain because the endless chain never, in Republican times, empties the Treasury, but the endless chain does run and is freighted with the glittering gold, and adds to the surplus of the Treasury and to the financial standing and stability of our country.

We no longer hear any rumors of selling bonds to keep up the gold reserve. Under the operation of the Dingley law, the revenue law, and Republican management the balance of trade has been in our favor, and the payment to us has been made through what our friends like to call the dearest dollar, the glittering gold.

Under the former Administration it was almost a matter of daily occurrence for us to read about the shipment of gold from our country to Europe. The total import of gold for the years 1893, 1894, and 1895 was $128,770,234, and the total export of gold for said period was $251,790,088. Thus it appears that during these three years of Mr. Cleveland's Administration we exported $123,019,854 of gold from our country. Under this Administration it is a matter of almost daily occurrence for us to read of the shipment of gold from Europe to this country. The total import of gold for the years 1897, 1898, and 1899 was $280,866,195. The total export of gold for said period was $92,947,422. Thus it appears that during these three years of Mr. McKinley's Administration we imported $187,918,773 of gold from Europe to this country. We are feeling, through the arteries of trade and commerce, this incoming golden stream.

What better illustration of the industrial and financial uplift of our country can I call your attention to than for me to ask you as honorable, patriotic lovers of your country to look around you and compare its present condition with what it was in 1896?

The other question which was at issue in the campaign of 1896 was the money question. In 1896 about 6,500,000 honest, zealous, patriotic Americans by birth and by choice, under the leadership of Mr. Bryan, voted for the free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at a ratio of 16 to 1. In 1896 about 7,000,000 honest, zealous, patriotic Americans by birth and by choice, under the leadership of Mr. McKinley, voted to commit this Government, in its monetary affairs, to the single gold standard. On the one side it was contended that if the single gold standard was adopted there would not be a sufficient volume of money to meet the growth in population and meet the business demands of our people.

It was insisted that gold alone as a standard was not ample in quantity and was not obtainable by us to meet said growth. The distinguished leader of that party, Mr. Bryan, in one of his speeches favorably commented on a statement made by Senator Sherman that we should have at least an annual addition of $24,000,000 in the circulating medium of our country, and asked the question, "What provision has the Republican party made to supply the money we need?" to which he then gave his own answer, "None whatever." We of the other party then insisted that the balance of trade in our favor, under wise Republican legislation and management, and with the coinage of domestic gold, the supply would be ample to meet the requirements made necessary by the growth in population and by the business needs of our people. We have already stated how many millions of gold we have received by import in the last three years. We also are gratified to state that the gold coinage of domestic bullion of the past fiscal year amounts to more than $76,000,000.

When Mr. Bryan made his statement that we ought at least to annually add $24,000,000 to the volume of our currency, we have a right to believe that if we have added that amount to the volume of our currency we have at least met his objection to our inability under the existing gold standard to do so. We do not say that the addition of said amount annually is sufficient to fully meet with his approval. In 1896 the general stock of gold coin, including bullion, in the Treasury was $599,597,964, of date July 1, 1899, the general stock of gold coin, including bullion, in the Treasury was $963,498,384, being a gain in the three years of $363,900,420, or an average gain of $121,300,140, which was added to our stock of gold. If $24,000,000, in the view of Mr. Bryan, seemed to be a necessary sum to be added to the volume of our currency annually, ought he not to be satisfied if we have added annually to the volume of our currency $121,300,140 of gold?

In 1896 the general stock of money coined or issued July 1 was $2,347,306,006. July 1, 1899, the general stock of money coined or issued was $2,745,350,508. Thus it appears that in the three years, under the Republican administration, there has been added to the general stock of money $398,044,502, or an average of $132,681,500, of which annual average $121,300,140 was in gold, as heretofore stated. This further fact should be borne in mind, that every dollar so added is equal to every other dollar in debt-paying and purchasing power. We pledged ourselves in 1896 that we would maintain the then existing gold standard, which we have done. We pledged ourselves that we would see to it that a piece of paper on which was written the Government promise to pay, as well

as a piece of silver which the Government had coined and issued, which was worth about 50 cents on the dollar, should be kept equal to the best dollar possible to be coined either on public or private account, and which the commercial world regards as a gold dollar. This promise we have faithfully kept. How have we kept the promise? How is it possible for the Government to keep a piece of paper and a piece of silver and a piece of gold, the one equal to the other in debt-paying and purchasing power?

The gold is coined on private account. The silver is coined on Government account. The paper is issued part on Government account and part by national banks, who are required, under the law, to place in the hands of the Government ample security to meet the prompt redemption of their notes of issue. The gold in the gold coin is worth 100 cents, whether coined or uncoined. The stamp of the Government on the coin is notice to the public of its weight and fineness. The stamp of the Government neither adds to nor takes from its value. In the case of the silver coin, it is a statement that the Government coined and issued the same, and that, as it has received the full dollar's worth in exchange for it, the Government stands ready and willing to keep said silver equal in debt-paying and purchasing power to a like face coin in gold. Likewise the Government maintains its paper promise to pay. It says to anyone, you can bring to the mint your gold, and if you will bring a sufficient amount of metal, which in the market is worth 100 cents, we will coin and stamp it, and you can put it in circulation as money.

It does not say that anyone can come to the mints of the United States with a piece of silver metal worth 50 cents and have the Government coin and stamp it and allow the owner thereof to circulate it as money having equal debt-paying and purchasing power with a gold coin worth in the market twice as much as the silver piece of coin. The Government says, if necessary, it will go into the market and buy the silver, for instance, $100 worth, coin it into $200 worth of silver, and make the profit for the benefit of the people.

It further says that if it buy of the people stores or provisions, or pays any of its officers, soldiers, and employees, or pays to the widows and orphans of the soldiers who have defended its honor and its flag, at home or abroad, any money, that it shall see to it that he or she gets value received, and that every dollar which is thus paid out shall be equal to the best dollar in the world. In other words, the Government says it will control the issue of money and will keep in its own hands the power and ability to see to it that every dollar shall be equal to every other dollar. In order to keep its paper promises to pay equal and interchangeable with gold, like a prudent and successful business man, it has deposited in the Treasury of the United States and its branches $100,000,000 in gold, so that anyone who has any of its paper promises to pay, and has any doubt about the financial stability of its promises to pay being redeemed in gold, can go at any time and exchange said promises to pay for gold. Likewise, a prudent business man keeps to his credit in the bank money sufficient to honor the checks that he may issue.

The check is not payment, but an order for payment. The prudent man would not allow Tom, Dick, and Harry to draw checks against him without leave and limit. Neither will the Government allow the silver-mine owner without limit to issue silver money and hold the Government responsible for keeping that money equal, in debt-paying and purchasing power, with gold. By limiting the amount of paper money, and by limiting the amount of the issue of silver, the Government has it within its power to keep all of its money equal and interchangeable. It is the duty of the Government to see to it that its people has in circulation the best of money, and that it keeps that money of such kind and character that each of every kind in circulation, whether at home or abroad, is equal to the best. It can not afford to be dishonest to its own people, nor to the people of the world.

The strength of government paper is no stronger than the strength of the government which issues it. The currency issued by the Southern Confederacy is worthless. The currency issued by the United States has been kept equal to gold, but at a great expense to the Government that issued it. The boys of '61 were paid in Government promises to pay which were worth about 50 cents on the dollar. The boys of '98 carried in their hands the lamp of liberty, education, civilization, and our home people who bought the bonds paid to the boys a dollar worth 100 cents the world around. We pledged ourselves that without extra cost to the people we would maintain the gold reserve. This pledge we have kept. We pledged ourselves that we would make our country's credit equal to the credit of any country in the world. This pledge we have kept.

Mr. Chairman, as a result of the elections in 1898, the party to which we belong has been placed in full and complete control in the lawmaking departments of the Government. We have great opportunities and great responsibilities. At the very first chance we have of successfully legislating upon the question of the standard of value, we cheerfully proceed to carry out the wishes of the people as expressed at the ballot box. We now have for consideration a measure which will establish by law the single gold standard. From 1792 to 1873 we had a double standard, one of gold and one of silver, at prescribed ratios. During said period of time the ratio between the two standards was changed twice, thereby proving that we had an alternating but not a double standard. In 1873, by the coinage act, the gold one-dollar piece was made the unit of value. Since said time there has been silver legislation which has tended toward creating a silver standard of value.

The object and purpose of this bill is to set at rest all questions as to the existing legal unit of value in this country and to remove all doubt in relation thereto. There must be some standard of value. The civilized world has determined that the standard shall be gold. For more than a quarter of a century we have been acting upon the assumption that gold is the standard of value. This bill in unmistakable terms recognizes the gold standard. This bill also makes all interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the payment of money now existing or hereafter to be entered into and all United States notes issued under the law of July 14, 1890, payable in gold. It does not affect the present legal-tender quality of the silver dollars. On more than one occasion the Government has solemnly declared its intention and fixed purpose to preserve at all times the parity of gold and silver in the currency of the nation. It has kept them at a parity.

The passage of this measure will not cast any extra burden upon the Government. It will make clear the manner of the payment of the Government's interest-bearing obligations. It will settle beyond the possibility of a doubt the credit of the country at home and abroad. It will make it possible to easily refund at a lower rate of interest the interest-bearing obligations of the Government. It will induce the surplus capital of the world to come here in order to find a safe and profitable investment. As the rate of the interest-bearing obligations of the Government is lowered so will the rate of interest be lowered to the debtor throughout the country. Foreign capital will compete with foreign capital in seeking to invest in American securities at a low rate of interest when the doubt and uncertainty of the kind of money in which they are to be repaid is entirely removed, and when it is made certain by law that gold is the standard unit of value in our country.

This measure also creates in the Treasury Department a division of issue and redemption. In this division of issue and redemption is set apart gold and silver for the purpose of maintaining the parity of our currency. This is a wise provision, because it separates the fiscal operations of the Treasury from its issue and redemption operations. It also clothes the Secretary with ample power to maintain said issue and redemption fund, and authorizes him to sell gold-bearing bonds, if necessary, bearing interest at a rate not exceeding 3 per cent per annum, to maintain said reserve fund. This provision of the law so divides the operation of the Treasury Department that the people can readily see and understand whether bonds are sold to maintain the gold reserve or whether they are sold under the guise of maintaining the gold reserve and the money resulting from the sale is used to pay the running expenses of the Government on account of deficient revenues.

It is generally believed that the expenditures exceeded the receipts during Mr. Cleveland's last Administration and that money realized from his bond sales was diverted from the reserve fund into paying the current expenses of the Government. It appears that the revenues, exclusive of postal, for the years 1893, 1894, and 1895 were $996,931,723. It also appears that the expenditures, exclusive of postal, principal of debt, and premium for said three years were $1,107,198,533. It also appears that the expenditures for said three years exceeded the revenues by the sum of $110,266,810. It may be that a portion of the money realized by the bond sale in 1894-95 was used to meet this deficiency and the balance used to keep up the gold reserve.

The passage of this provision of the bill now under consideration so segregates the accounts in the Treasury that there can be no question about the purpose for which bonds may be issued and sold. There is also a provision in the bill to the effect that when the United States notes known as greenbacks and the Treasury notes are exchanged for gold the said notes so exchanged shall not be withdrawn except in exchange for an equivalent amount of gold.

This will stop what is familiarly known as the endless chain. This provision is in accordance with the recommendation of the President in his last and previous messages to Congress. It is objected by some that this provision impounds the greenbacks and Treasury notes and has a tendency to contract the currency. The objection is not tenable for the reason that the gold is exchanged for the greenbacks or the greenbacks are exchanged for the gold. While one is in circulation the other is not in circulation. Under the present law greenbacks are procured by gold

speculators and presented to the Treasury and gold paid out in exchange for them.

It appears that it has been the practice to pay out these greenbacks so taken in in the current affairs of the Government by its officers. Thereupon these same greenbacks so paid out are again obtained by the gold speculators and again presented to the Treasury and gold demanded in exchange. So the process continues until the gold reserve is reduced below $100,000,000 to the danger point, and thereupon a bond sale is ordered to maintain the gold reserve. This very process took place during Mr. Cleveland's Administration, and, to his credit be it said, he manfully and courageously maintained the gold reserve by the sale of bonds. The fault was in the law and the operations thereunder, and was not due to him.

We propose by this provision of the bill to put it beyond the possibility of the gold speculators to again put in operation the endless chain and to put it beyond the power of Government officials unwittingly to aid them in their attack upon the gold reserve. We do not intend to allow noninterest-bearing obligations, like the greenback and the Treasury note, to be so used as to compel the Government to provide gold for its redemption by creating an interest-bearing debt. There is ample money in the Treasury other than greenbacks and Treasury notes which can be paid out by the Government officials to meet the current expenses. The payments can be made in gold and silver.

I venture to predict that the present condition will obtain in a greater degree when this provision becomes law, and that is that gold is being presented to the Treasury and greenbacks and Treasury notes and silver dollars are asked for in exchange. It was asserted prior to 1879, when we resumed specie payment, that there would not be sufficient specie in the country to redeem the greenbacks when presented. This prediction did not come true. Likewise I do not believe that there will be any great demand by the holders of greenbacks and Treasury notes to exchange them for gold in case this provision of the bill becomes a law. If such be true, then there will be no impounding of greenbacks to any extent whatever, and another financial ghost which appears to frighten some of our friends upon the other side will vanish into thin air.

I am informed that there have been many requests made to the Secretary of the Treasury during the present year asking him to exchange greenbacks, Treasury notes, silver certificates, and silver dollars for gold, and that he has in many instances declined the proffered offer. It appears that in 1895–96 legal-tender notes were redeemed in gold to the amount of $276,010,154. It also appears that in the years 1898–99 legal-tender notes were redeemed in gold to the amount of $50,049,220. These two statements conclusively show the confidence the public had in the financial ability of the different Administrations.

There is also a wise provision in this bill allowing banks to issue circulation to the par value of the bonds deposited by them under the law. The purpose of this provision is to enlarge the circulation. It is estimated that this provision, if enacted into law, will add to the circulation about $100,000,000, provided, however, that the tax is taken off of the circulation, as is recommended by this proposed bill. It is not expected that this provision will meet with the approval of our friends who are unalterably opposed to the entire national banking act. It is believed that it will meet with the approval of the people of our country who approve of the national banking system and who prefer to have a paper currency as good as gold, rather than to have the wild-cat currency once in circulation in our country. It may be contended by some that when the tax is taken off of the circulation, the bonds will be to that extent enhanced in value. This is largely a matter of speculation, but it is believed by others that the bond will not be enhanced in value. It may be that when this measure goes to the Senate, a refunding bond provision may be inserted as an amendment; and if so, this objection to the enhancement of the bond will thereby be overcome.

The purpose of this provision is to give elasticity to our currency, and we have every reason to believe that it will so act. There is a provision in this bill which taxes the capital surplus and undivided profits of national banks. The purpose of this provision is twofold: First, to create a fund for the purpose of paying for the supervision of the Government over national banks and incidentally for revenue, and second, to relieve the smaller banks of the country from the burden of the circulation tax and to equalize among the national banks, great and small, the expense incident to Government supervision. By this transfer of tax the Government is the gainer and not the loser from a revenue standpoint. So that the charge, if made, that this provision of this bill is for the benefit of the banks and not for the benefit of the people is not true in fact. There is also another wise provision in this bill allowing banks with a capital of $25,000 to be organized in any place the population of which does not exceed 2,000 inhabitants. This provision allows the smaller villages and, in fact, the country districts to organize banks and to supply themselves with bank circulating notes. It is believed that this provision will work to the great advantage and betterment of the country. [Applause.]

This bill will be, when enacted into law, of incalculable benefit to our country. It is in line with our banking system; it is in line with our promises to maintain the existing gold standard. In fact, it gives vitality to that promise by putting it into the shape of law. If we are right in our contention as to the standard unit of value, we will enact it into law, and then it can be shown by experience what its working will be. Those of you who differ with us upon this very important question ought to welcome, gladly, our action in this matter; because if we are wrong in our contention, the country will be quick to realize it and they will turn to you with your views upon this question for relief. We feel confident that we are right. We are ready now to go on record upon this question and enact this measure into law. We hold ourselves responsible to the American people for our action. We believe that you are equally earnest and honest in your convictions upon this question and, with us, want to do what is best for our common country. We are in the majority in this Congress. We are responsible for legislation. We cheerfully assume the responsibility. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the party to which we belong will stand by the President in his Philippine policy and will uphold his military arm as long as the insurrection continues in those islands because, under the Constitution, it is his duty, as well as ours, to uphold the sovereignty of the United States in those distant islands as in all other places where our flag rightfully floats. As a party we stand by the policy of protection to home industry and of honest money with which to pay honest earnings. As a party we stand, now as ever, for the reduction of taxes, as fast as our national obligations will permit. We stand for more ships as the best conservators of peace. We stand for public improvements that will aid and cheapen transportation and promote the public service.

We favor legislation that will increase our merchant marine, so that American goods going abroad and foreign goods coming to our country may be carried in American vessels under the American flag. We favor fortifications and coast defenses. We favor a regular army large enough to maintain law and order wherever our flag rightfully floats. We believe in granting liberal pensions to the soldiers and sailors of '61 and '98 and to their widows and orphans. We stand for the enactment of the eight-hour law in Government works. We stand for the dollar which contains its intrinsic value and which is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. [Loud applause.]

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I approach the consideration of the pending bill conscious of the importance and gravity of the subject with which it deals and of my inability to do justice to a subject so important without more ample time for preparation than the Committee on Rules and the majority in this Chamber have seen fit to accord.

Up to this time the friends of the measure who have addressed the House have hardly referred to the bill at all. They have revamped campaign speeches, made up mostly of platitudes invented by Mr. Cleveland and Bourke Cockran, and bragged immoderately on themselves and their party, but not one of them has gone into details; not one of them has pointed out precisely how this bill is to cure the defects in our financial system. I believe that if enacted into a law it will inevitably aggravate these evils. I believe that instead of preventing panics it will breed them.

In my opinion, under normal conditions it will severely limit the volume of currency, compelling men of business to rely too largely upon bank credits as a means of exchange, and that under abnormal conditions, in periods of depression, caused, for instance, by crop failures, diminished exports, and an adverse balance of trade, resulting in gold exports, it expressly provides for the contraction of the currency, thereby insuring fourfold contraction of bank credits. Thus money is to be made most scarce and credit most difficult to obtain when money and credit are most urgently needed.

Several gentlemen have justified the arbitrary methods resorted to by the friends of the bill in order to rush it through the House, without allowing time for preparation for its discussion or opportunity to amend it, on the theory that it only establishes the gold standard, and that since the question at issue between gold monometallists and the advocates of bimetallism have been the subject of almost constant discussion for years, time for preparation for its discussion is unnecessary.

It is true the bill fastens the gold standard upon the country, and this, in my opinion, is sufficient to damn it; but this is not its only provision.

It largely increases the privileges and powers of national banks. It places them in supreme control of the money supply.

It empowers them to expand and contract the volume of currency at pleasure, thereby placing the business of the country at their mercy.

It allows them to keep token money as reserves and compels the

Government to assume the burden of the ultimate redemption of their notes.

It creates in this country a national bankers' oligarchy, invested with the sovereign power of furnishing the money of commerce and regulating the volume thereof, so that, in addition to the provisions declaring gold the only money of final payment, this bill contains provisions conferring such extraordinary powers upon private corporations and so dangerous to all classes of society that it deserves only the support of the representatives of the national banks.

Mr. Chairman, let us analyze this bill and ascertain precisely what changes it makes in existing laws. Its friends contend that it only establishes the gold standard. Let us compare its provisions with the coinage laws and other financial legislation now on the statute books and see whether this is true or not.

The bill under consideration reenacts the law of 1873, adding—what may have been viewed as a remarkable discovery by its author—that a dollar is one-tenth part of a ten-dollar gold piece. This grotesque and ludicrous feature will, I think, be generally regarded as a novelty, but it adds nothing to the law it reenacts.

The law of 1873 in so far as it made gold the only money of final payment was abrogated by the Bland-Allison law of 1878, which, in the language of its title, "restored the legal-tender character of the silver dollar." That is, the silver dollar was placed on an equality with the gold dollar as a legal tender for debts.

Before the enactment of the law of 1873 the standard dollar was made of silver, but the debtor might discharge his obligation with gold—that is, the silver dollar was the standard dollar, but gold was, equally with silver, a legal tender.

This was bimetallism.

The law of 1873 made gold a legal tender for any amount and silver a legal tender for not exceeding $10.

For five years it was unquestionably the law of the land, and during that period the single gold standard was a legal institution of this country; and while there is truth in the charge that the country has, since 1878, been subjected to all its evils, this has been done by the lawless acts and policies of the Treasury Department and not by virtue of any statute.

During the five years in which, under the law of 1873, the single gold standard was legal it was practically inoperative, for only paper currency was in use and the current debts of the period were paid in greenbacks.

By the enactment of the Bland-Allison law in 1878 the silver dollar was again made the equal of the gold dollar as money of ultimate redemption.

Thereafter all obligations, public and private, "except where expressly stipulated in the contract," might be paid in either gold or silver, at the option of the creditor.

So that indisputably the Bland-Allison law restored bimetallism.

Shortly after the passage of the Bland-Allison law the friends of the bondholders in the United States Senate strongly insisted that notwithstanding the restoration of bimetallism all Government obligations were payable in gold, and this called forth the adoption of the Stanley Matthews resolution, which declared by an overwhelming majority of both Houses of Congress that Government obligations, including all outstanding bonds, are payable in silver dollars or gold dollars, at the option of the Government.

This was notice to all the world that debts, public and private, may be fully and legally discharged by the payment of silver dollars.

In the international monetary conference of 1881 Mr. Howe, one of our delegates, reminded the high dignitaries there present, representing all the great powers of Christendom, that under the laws of the United States and the contract the Government of the United States had and would exercise this option, and nobody demurred.

Thenceforward until the campaign of 1896 the stock argument of Republicans against free coinage was that we had bimetallism—the option to pay debts in either gold or silver—and that the Government was providing the means of enjoying its benefits by constant additions to the volume of silver money.

I venture the assertion that there is not a gentleman on the Republican side of this Chamber who has not made this argument.

It was used constantly by Republican newspapers for nearly twenty years.

While not a weighty argument against the resumption of unlimited coinage, it was a correct statement of the law of the land. I contend now, as Republicans have heretofore contended, that the gold standard is not now and, except during the years intervening between the enactment of the coinage law of 1873 and the enactment of the Bland-Allison law, never has been a legal institution in the United States.

It is true that, in defiance of the statutes, the Treasury Department has, for twenty years, treated the silver dollar as a mere token and the gold dollar as the only full legal-tender coin of the country, but bimetallism—the use of gold and silver as money of ultimate payment—has had the sanction of legislation from the foundation of the Government down to this hour.

And yet in the course of this debate gentlemen have insisted that the single gold standard has existed in this country ever since 1834. In that year and again in 1837 the coinage law was amended so as to reduce the weight of gold coin sufficiently to change the coinage ratio of the metals from 15 to 1—the ratio provided by the statute of 1789—to 16 to 1.

This was the only change made in the statute. The gold pieces were made lighter. The silver dollar remained the standard dollar until 1873. Monometallism was not dreamed of. Could demagogism go farther or sink lower than to pretend that the statute of 1834 made any material change in the monetary system of this country?

And yet this argument has been used by men of national prominence.

In fruitless efforts to justify his apostasy and treason to his party and his country, Carlisle, if memory serves me well, invented it, as he did nearly all the other makeshifts that have since been used as arguments by Republican stump speakers.

Why, Mr. Chairman, no Republican has addressed the House without chewing over the platitudes coined by Cleveland and Carlisle during the brief period in which they earned the execration of their countrymen.

Carlisle knew, and gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber ought to know, that the coinage law of 1834 was intended to correct a mistake made by the framers of our first coinage law. It had no other object. The ratio had been fixed at 15 to 1. The world's ratio was 15½ to 1. This was an overvaluation of silver, an undervaluation of gold; hence only silver entered the channels of circulation. Gold went to other countries, where its valuation for money purposes was higher. To obviate this the amendment of the coinage law of 1834 should have made the ratio 15½ to 1, the world's ratio, but our lawmakers made another mistake. They fixed the ratio at 16 to 1, with the inevitable consequence that thereafter gold, on account of its undervaluation, took the place of silver in our circulation. Bullion dealers could make a profit of about 3 per cent by exporting American silver coined at the ratio of 16 to 1 to countries where it was admitted to the mints at a ratio of 15½ to 1.

Mr. Chairman, the accuracy of this statement of the purpose, intention, and effect of the laws of 1834 and 1837 can not be called in question, and yet advocates of the gold standard have the audacity to claim that the statute of 1834 established the single gold standard in the United States.

Carlisle, the debauched Iscariot whose name has become synonymous with treason and dishonor, invented it, and from the day of its first utterance it has occupied a conspicuous place in Republican campaign literature.

Even more remarkable is the assertion that in 1853 an amendment to the coinage laws by which the weight of subsidiary coin was materially reduced abolished bimetallism in the United States. A queer chapter of history furnishes an explanation of that amendment to our coinage laws. During the four or five preceding years the movement of silver to foreign countries had been going forward at an accelerated rate. The movement had reached alarming proportions. A dearth of small change seriously inconvenienced men of business. To stop this drain and for no other purpose the coinage law was amended so as to reduce the weight of subsidiary silver.

European countries suffered similarly. Like the United States, they were losing full weight silver coin.

Presently there came an explanation of what was regarded as a phenomenon. When, in 1848, England broke through the Chinese wall of exclusion by negotiating the first treaty of commerce entered into with the Celestials, it was found that in that land of mysteries gold and silver were interchangeable at the rate of 6 to 1. This opened up a profitable field to the bullion dealer. By sending silver to China and exchanging it for gold they netted a profit of about 60 per cent. At that period the silver mines were not very productive, and the cash drawers of Christendom were ransacked in quest of full-weight silver coin, which speedily found its way to the Orient. I may remark, in passing, that the amendment of our coinage laws in 1853 took place after the cause of silver exportation had disappeared. The Chinaman had ascertained the true value of his gold, and the traffic which had resulted in serious inconvenience to Europe and America had ceased. Nevertheless, after its cessation considerable demands from European countries, who sought to replenish their stocks of silver, occasioned the export of large quantities of our silver coinage until the amendment of 1853 put a stop to it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have fully stated the occasion and the purpose of an amendment of a legislative enactment which did not even squint at a change in our financial system. Is it not strange that gentlemen holding exalted places in the Government

in dealing with a matter so vital to the people, should have the audacity to assert that in 1853 the single gold standard was established in the United States?

The amendment of 1853 did not deprive either silver or gold of the right of free access to the mints nor curtail the legal-tender quality of either metal. The law of 1789 gave to the debtor the legal right to discharge his obligation in either gold or silver at his option, and that feature of the law remained unchanged until the passage of the demonetization act of 1873. Neither in 1834 nor in 1837 nor in 1853 did anyone dream of depriving debtors of this right, and yet again, imitating the Gamaliel at whose feet they have learned the catechism of gold monometallism—again imitating Mr. Carlisle and revamping his utterances—Republicans have declared on this floor that a law enacted to meet peculiar exigencies of commerce, enacted without discussion or the proposal of any such change, established the gold standard in this country.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The time allotted to me is slipping away, and I can not yield to interruptions.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Bennett, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, who reported that bill, said distinctly that the purpose of it was to establish the gold standard.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Your discovery is one that I would like to have verified.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I can verify it.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The gentleman from Iowa seems disposed to discuss substantial things to-day. Such a course would have been well received yesterday when he contented himself with splendid and unrivaled oratory. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DOLLIVER. I will produce the record.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I will not yield now.

Mr. LENTZ. There were only two men on the floor at that time who said that anything of the kind was ever considered.

Mr. McCLEARY. But there were two.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Will the gentleman permit me to refer to the record?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I object to further interruptions.

I again assert that neither silver nor gold was deprived of legal-tender power and the right of free and unlimited coinage by the amendment of 1853. The silver dollar remained the standard as it had been from the foundation of the Government. The law was amended at a time when Europe was busily engaged in discussing the adoption of silver monometallism, but when in no country under the sun was there a movement in favor of adopting gold monometallism. This country had its monometallists at that period, but they were silver monometallists. They had studied Chevalier and the writings of an English economist and were convinced that the latter was right in asserting that gold would soon be only fit for the dustpan.

Then, as now, New England corporations were the head and front of the scarce-money contingent. Water-power companies down East, in order to shield themselves against a deluge of cheap gold money, stipulated in leases that so many ounces of fine silver, instead of so many dollars, should be paid to them by their customers for water-power privileges.

Mr. Chairman, if in that period money-lending corporations had been as numerous and powerful as they are now, the movement in favor of the demonetization of gold which succeeded in Germany, Holland, and Austria would have extended to the United States; but the truth is that prior to 1873 no movement of the kind was ever heard of in American politics, and the contention that almost immaterial amendments of the coinage laws, dealing solely with details, and in no way affecting the financial system of the country, has any relation whatever to the question under discussion seems to me stupid and preposterous.

Mr. Chairman, I declare that now and here for the first time the Congress has under discussion a bill which effectually and entirely eliminates the silver dollar as money of ultimate payment, and thereby definitively establishes the single gold standard.

Here, for the first time, the leaders of the Republican party boldly doff the mask.

I do not care to thrash over the history of the passage of the coinage law of 1873 further than to state that at the time of its passage there was no discussion of the great question which has since so largely occupied the time of civilized nations. For twelve years prior to its passage no specie had circulated in the United States, and none did circulate here until five years later. Nobody was thinking about the coinage laws. The men of business who were then 30 years of age or less had never known anything but a paper currency, and as for the members of this House and of the Senate, it is a well-established fact that they regarded the bill as a measure dealing with administrative details, and in no way vitally affecting our monetary system.

Divers and sundry financial measures have heretofore been brought forward. Scores have been introduced in this and the other branch of Congress, but now for the first time a bill, favorably reported by a committee after full examination, unequivocally committing the United States to the gold standard, is the subject of debate in this House.

Under the provisions of this bill the silver dollar and the greenbacks are to remain a legal tender for all debts, public and private, except where otherwise expressly stipulated in the contract, just as greenbacks are, but all forms of currency, including silver dollars and silver certificates, are made redeemable in gold.

Henceforth the silver dollar, now legally the equal of the gold dollar as money of ultimate payment, is to be only a token, differing in no respect from the greenback. It is to lose its character as redemption money and become itself redeemable in gold.

It is the intention of the authors of this bill to forever close the door against bimetallism in the United States.

A system denounced, when not ignored, by the platforms of all political parties, from 1873, down to this hour, is about to be forced upon the country; and this crime, blacker even than the infamy of 1873, is to be committed by the representatives of a party that has never avowed such a purpose, but on the contrary stands solemnly pledged to a contrary policy.

Mr. Chairman, in my State, and in yours, in 1896, the Republicans contended that they, and not the Democrats were the true friends of bimetallism. They declared that Mr. McKinley, if elected, would maintain the gold standard as the surest and, in fact, the only way of securing bimetallism, and not with a view to its ultimate and irrevocable adoption. I hazard nothing in saying that in all the region lying west of the Alleghenies, this was the position of the Republicans in the only national campaign in which political parties have divided upon this question.

When Grover Cleveland began his crusade against silver, Republican orators in all parts of the country denounced him as an enemy of bimetallism. I have no doubt that scores of gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber delivered speeches denouncing his policy to cheering multitudes of Republicans.

Mr. Chairman, here is a sample of the Republican oratory of that period. It is an extract from a speech delivered by William McKinley, at Toledo, Ohio, February, 1891:

> During all of Grover Cleveland's years at the head of the Government he was dishonoring one of your precious metals—one of our own products—discrediting silver and enhancing the price of gold. He endeavored even before his inauguration into office to stop the coinage of silver dollars, and afterwards and to the end of his Administration persistently used his power to that end. He was determined to contract the circulating medium and to demonetize one of the coins of commerce, limit the volume of money among the people, make money scarce, and therefore dear. He would have increased the value of money and diminished the value of everything else—money the master, everything else the servant. He was not thinking of "the poor" then. He had left their side. He was not standing forth in their defense. Cheap coats, cheap labor, and dear money. The sponsor and promoter of those professing to stand guard over the welfare of the poor and lowly. Was there ever more inconsistency or reckless assumption?

This speech was extensively used in 1896 to convince Republicans that, if elected, the Republican nominee would not sanction the policy of Cleveland and follow in his footsteps, but would labor steadfastly for the restoration of bimetallism.

Mr. McKinley was right. The merciless bankers' oligarchy back of this measure then, and through whose influence it is now about to be made the law of the land, are "determined to demonetize one of the coins of commerce, limit the volume of money among the people, make money scarce, and therefore dear."

They would "increase the value of money and diminish the value of everything else."

They would make "money the master, everything else the servant."

Mr. Chairman, when these bitter words were poured out upon the head of Mr. Cleveland, when thousands of Republican orators were hurling similar verbal thunderbolts at the corpulent stuffed prophet who pointed out the path which is now leading them to dishonor, who would have dared to predict that seven years after the philippic I have read was delivered, McKinley as President and a Republican Congress would become the willing tools of the national bankers' trust and force upon the statute book a law fastening upon the country the policy they so fervently denounced?

It must not be supposed, however, Mr. Chairman, that this law imposes the hardships of the gold standard upon all alike. It exempts national banks from the necessity of keeping their reserves in gold and considerately loads the Government with that responsibility. Section 3 of the bill provides for a gold reserve of $150,000,000, and in order to keep it intact authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to sell bonds for its replenishment. Silver dollars, silver certificates, greenbacks, and Treasury notes are made sight drafts against this gold reserve, which thus becomes the foundation upon which is to stand the vast pyramid of credit represented by all forms of currency, including national-bank notes. The banks may keep their reserves in Treasury notes, silver certificates, or silver dollars. The Government, their gratuitous agent, redeems these notes on demand out of this redemption

fund. Thus, if the exigencies of business necessitate gold exports, or an opportunity to make profits by shipping gold out of the country arises, all bullion dealers have to do is to appear at the Treasury or at the subtreasury maintained for their benefit in New York and present for redemption in gold Treasury notes, greenbacks, silver certificates, or silver dollars—"any old thing" that happens to be in their vaults—and the gold will be forthcoming; and if necessary they can convert national-bank notes into sight drafts on the Treasury payable in gold.

Think of it, gentlemen! We are to have the gold standard, but our bank reserves are to be kept in token money.

The existing law requires national banks to keep on depost in the Treasury a 5 per cent redemption fund, and when it is impaired they must make good the deficiency.

And the note holder has no cause of complaint, for having received from one Treasury official in redemption of a national-bank note silver dollars—henceforth mere tokens, or greenbacks—he may step over to the adjacent wicket and exchange the tokens for gold.

We are to have the gold standard for the people; gold is to measure the value of their property and be the harsh standard for the measurement of all debts; but for the ultimate redemption of national-bank notes the Government is to maintain perpetually a gold reserve of $150,000,000.

And, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this is the most atrocious and indefensible feature of this miserable measure. Why, only a short time ago the wise men who concocted this monstrosity were fully convinced that if somehow the endless chain could be broken the financial problem would be solved. They said that the Government was in the banking business; that it was compelled to maintain a gold reserve with which to redeem the greenbacks; that then the greenbacks had to be paid out again, and so had to be redeemed over and over again, and that as long as this system was adhered to the country might expect to suffer occasionally and for protracted periods afflictions such as came upon us in 1893 and continued until 1898.

And what remedy did they propose? Why, contraction and enlargement of the privileges of the national banks, of course.

They demanded the retirement of the greenbacks and Treasury notes and the abolishment of the gold reserve. This, they said, would take the Government out of the banking business.

For three years this was the programme urged upon the country by the gold monometallists.

And what has it all simmered down to? A bill which adds to the greenbacks and Treasury notes, which formed the endless chain they have heretofore said ought to be abolished, the silver dollars, the silver certificates, and, as I have shown conclusively, the national-bank notes! It increases the gold reserve to $150,000,000, makes it a permanent institution, and in case of its impairment authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to sell bonds for its replenishment!

And this bill is the offering of the same tinkers who aforetime declared that the salvation of the country depended upon abolishing the gold reserve and taking the Government out of the banking business.

Mr. Chairman, having stated briefly some of the benefits that will accrue to the national banks under this bill, I will now give my views as to how it will affect the everyday business of the masses of the people. The gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber have not discussed this phase of the subject. They make a great ado about the business revival which, through dispensations of Providence and in spite of atrocious Governmental policies, came just in time to save the farmers, shopkeepers, mechanics, and laborers of this country from utter despair, and seem to think that this will be taken as proof conclusive that this bill is precisely what the country needs. It seems never to occur to them that a single turn of fortune's wheel may bring on adversity. Hard times may and unfortunately will come again. Experience has convinced the country that what it needs is such a change in the banking laws as will prevent severe contraction of the volume of money when credit is withdrawn and only money will save thousands from sinking from affluence to beggary.

Mr. Chairman, periods of depression, with creditors clamoring for payment, with debtors eager to sell property at any price, with gold flowing out of instead of into the country, call for enlargement instead of diminution in the volume of money. Will this bill furnish it?

Laying aside for the moment differences of opinion as to the coinage law and keeping in view only features of the measure which relate to the paper currency, we should be sure that this enactment will cure instead of breeding panics before giving it approval. I am thoroughly convinced that it will operate to contract the volume of money when money is most earnestly needed. Who ever heard of banks expanding note issues or any other form of credit during a panic?

I believe that the only cure for a stringency in the money market is more money, and if this position be correct, then this bill is about the worst that could have been devised.

Under its provisions currency, when redeemed in gold, must remain under lock and key, and the gold thus abstracted from the Treasury will be sent out of the country. National-bank notes presented for redemption by the Treasury raiders will be redeemed in gold, or, what amounts to the same thing, in greenbacks or silver, which can be forthwith "exchanged" for gold. So that by this bill Treasury raiding is simplified.

Under existing statutes, in order to raid the gold reserve bullion dealers have been compelled to obtain and present greenbacks or Treasury notes. Under the pending measure this is unnecessary. When gold is wanted for export, any and every thing goes, and if the gold reserve be trenched upon the Secretary of the Treasury must sell bonds and lay in a fresh supply.

Mr. Chairman, the taxpayers have not forgotten what it cost the Government to furnish to the bullion dealers of New York the large sums of gold sent abroad during 1893, 1894, and 1895 in payment of heavy adverse balances of trade due to foreign creditors.

When, by a conspiracy entered into by the President of the United States and his Secretary of the Treasury and the national bankers of New York, the great panic of 1893-94 was improvised as an "object lesson," for the purpose of influencing legislation, we had an illustration of what may be expected from the operation of this law. There occurred a sudden and enormous contraction of available currency at a time when nothing but money would stay the ravages of the storm. It was the work of the bankers' syndicate. Forced liquidation compelled the sacrifice of property. Everywhere thousands offered to sell, but for want of money few could buy.

The country banks did everything in their power to relieve the situation, but the banks of the great metropolitan cities, even when willing to extend accommodations, used their means to prop up the value of bonds and stocks, while the commerce and trade of a continent was withering and dying for want of money.

Exceedingly low prices were the inevitable consequence. This diminished the exchange value of our exports enormously and correspondingly increased the balance of trade against us. Gold was exported in increasing quantities.

Under similar conditions, do not gentlemen know this bill would fail utterly to meet the requirements of the country?

Foreign governments discourage in every manner possible exports of specie. The plan of the American gold monometallist is to make the Treasury of the United States an auxiliary of the business. They have done this in the past without authority or law. This bill makes it a compulsory duty.

In 1893-94 the New York bankers who make a specialty of exporting bullion reaped a golden harvest at the expense of the American people. They solicited the business, applied to the Treasury for the necessary gold to meet their requirements, and it was forthcoming, in exchange for greenbacks, which, under the law, could have been redeemed in silver, and the only consequence would have been a premium on London exchange.

Why, Mr. Chairman, right now the Bank of France is protecting its gold reserve by recourse to the means I have here pointed out. To have resorted to it in 1893 and 1894 would have entailed slight hardship upon the small number of persons and corporations owing balances abroad, but it would have mitigated the violence of a financial storm which brought ruin to thousands.

I know it is contended that the bullion dealers raided the gold reserve because they lacked confidence in the ability of the Government to redeem its obligations in gold, but the truth is they were money merchants, bullion dealers, carrying on the business because it is profitable. They made enormous profits and the taxpayers footed the bills. All they had to do was to call on the Federal Treasury, through the New York banks, for such sums as they desired and it was handed over. It was shipped out of the country, and next day the New York papers pointed to the transaction as evidence that confidence was lacking in the ability of the Government to pay its debts in gold.

Thus Ikelheimer made money, and Cleveland's "object lesson" was kept constantly before the country. When the gold reserve became depleted, to replenish it bonds were sold, and the raiders went to work again. My recollection is that two hundred and sixty-two millions was thus added to the interest-bearing debt, and not the least infamous phase of this scandalous proceeding was that out of these bond deals the conspirators who brought on the panic made princely fortunes. The bonds were sold at prices so low that even Goldbug papers, that justified their sale and defended the financial policy of the Administration, denounced the proceeding as infamous.

And, Mr. Chairman, in this connection I direct the attention of the gentlemen who are about to make these bonds, as well as all others, payable in gold to some pertinent facts with which the people are entirely familiar. With the exception of the $262,000,000 issued during Mr. Cleveland's Administration, the Government bonds outstanding are a legacy of the civil war. They represent greenbacks worth in specie less than 50 cents on the dollar. By the passage of the "credit-strengthening act," making them payable in coin, their value was doubled. By the passage of this act you

are about to make the bondholders another present of probably $200,000,000.

Do gentlemen on the other side of the House demand proof in support of this statement? It is found in the history of Mr. Carlisle's unsavory back-room bond deals. Mr. Cleveland strenuously urged the passage of a law conferring upon the Secretary of the Treasury authority to sell gold-bearing bonds to replenish the gold reserve, and as an argument in favor of the enactment of the measure cited the fact that the coterie of favorites who in those days thrived so splendidly on the profits of back-room deals with his Secretary of the Treasury would pay higher figures, by which, on an issue of $62,000,000, $16,000,000 would be saved to the Government if only the magic word "gold" could be written in the contract. Congress refused to comply with his request and the purchasers paid the lower price for bonds payable in coin.

And now, gentlemen, you propose to pass a bill which makes all Government bonds—those representing greenbacks, worth less than 50 cents on the dollar when the loan was made, and the bonds issued by Mr. Cleveland under the circumstances I have detailed—payable in gold.

Upon what theory do you justify this feature of the bill? Do you expect to satisfy your constituents by the use of lofty platitudes and resounding periods about "sound money" and "the best money" and "dollars of equal value" and the "necessity of maintaining the parity?"

Do you expect to win your constituents' approval of this act of reckless profligacy by lauding yourselves as guardians of the credit and honor of the country?

You are about to place in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury power to issue gold bonds, so that in case of its depletion he can replenish the gold reserve. Thus a single officer of the Government is to have power to lay upon this and coming generations ever-increasing burdens of taxation.

Mr. Carlisle carried on the back-room bond deals, which his countrymen have neither forgotten nor forgiven, under a statute long regarded as obsolete, a statute enacted for a particular purpose many years ago and which had not been thought of for twenty years. Now, instead of repealing that law you are about to enact one vesting permanently in the Secretary of the Treasury a power which in the past has been shamefully abused and which henceforth may be resorted to whenever the "friends of the Administration" see fit to raid the gold reserve and compel an issue of bonds to replenish it.

Mr. Chairman, without unduly extending my remarks I can not discuss at greater length the details of this bill. Viewed in its entirety the measure is a clumsy effort to establish the English system of finance in the United States. It establishes the gold standard, but does not require the banks to redeem their notes in gold. In England 170 banks of issue, called there provincial banks, may redeem their notes in Bank of England notes, and ultimate redemption is attained by presenting these Bank of England notes for payment. The $150,000,000 gold reserve and certain other Treasury assets set apart as a redemption fund by this measure, and by its provisions separated from other Treasury assets, finds its counterpart in the issue department of the Bank of England, which is in effect a department of the British Government as well as a department of a private corporation.

The difference between the English system and the one here proposed is that there the burden of the ultimate redemption of the corporations' promises to pay is thrown upon the bank, while this bill imposes that duty upon the Government.

At this time I will not undertake to trace the analogy further. It runs all through the scheme except in this, that unfortunately the very best feature of the English scheme of finance is not included. Ireland, Scotland, Wales, and English cities outside of London have local banks of issue, some of which have been in existence for more than a century. The notes of these banks circulate almost exclusively in the neighborhoods where they are issued, forming a strictly local medium of exchange and measurably relieving the interior of the destruction of values and business occasioned by panics which have their origin in the puts and calls of the gamblers of the London Stock Exchange.

The American people know by experience that national-bank issues have not in the past and will not in the future serve this purpose.

I believe that the Government should issue the paper currency of the country. The Constitution vests in this Congress the power to coin money and regulate the value thereof, and power to issue paper currency is no less an attribute of sovereignty than the power to coin money.

But the Republican majority in this House is determined to retire the Government's paper issues and are about to enact a law giving to private corporations this supreme prerogative. They seem to have attempted to adopt in its entirety a scheme of finance in vogue in a foreign country, and, lacking time to fully discuss this aspect of the question under consideration, I can only call attention to the fact that conditions here render it impossible for this country to avail itself of the best features of the English system.

And now, Mr. Chairman, a few words as to the levity with which the gentlemen on the other side, nearly every one of whom has confessed that he is a recent convert to Clevelandism, have insisted that the passage of this bill will forever dispose of the question which separated the political parties in 1896. Let me warn the gentlemen who indulge in this illusion that never were they more mistaken.

The question yet to be determined is whether the American people sanction a policy conceived by the small number who are benefited by the gold standard, and which has visited upon mankind more misery than "all the wars and pestilences of recorded times."

You are about to pass a bill intended to perpetuate a system devised for the avowed purpose of cheapening property and increasing the value of money, and think it will be acquiesced in. It never will be.

At its inception the movement in favor of monometallism was based upon the preposterous notion that governments were under obligations to protect the value of money and fixed incomes by barring out of the mints the products of the gold mines of California and Australia. This was to make "money the master—everything else the servant." The question at issue has not changed. The passage of this bill will not change it. Increased production of the gold mines will not eliminate it.

Gentlemen say that bimetallism is a dead issue; that henceforth gold alone is to be the money of final payment; that even though the wisdom of entirely demonetizing silver might have been doubtful at an earlier stage of the discussion, the recent large increase in the production of the gold mines has solved the problem, and therefore there will be general acquiescence in the action about to be taken by the McKinley Administration.

Mr. Chairman, before entering upon a discussion of this, the crucial question, I desire to state in precise terms the basis of the demand for the demonetization of one of the precious metals; when and where it originated, and the motive underlying it. I believe that with a full understanding of indisputable historical facts there would be no division of opinion among the masses in this country concerning the matter. A great many Republican orators and writers have contended that the people the world over grew tired of silver; that they longed to get rid of it, and that to gratify this desire it was demonetized by legislation. In other words, they ascribe the adoption of monometallism to evolution, the survival of the fittest metal, and insist that silver was discarded because the advanced civilization had reached conditions where it was no longer suitable for monetary purposes.

This argument, if argument it can be called, has been made plausible by the fact that in past ages iron, leather, shells, and other gross substances were used as money, and each in its turn abandoned on account of its unsuitableness to serve the purposes of more advanced civilization.

In order to demolish this subterfuge and makeshift it is only necessary to call attention to the fact that in the early fifties, when first the agitation in favor of monometallism began in Europe, its advocates made war on gold and not on silver. Long before that period Ricardo, the great English economist, had advanced the opinion that silver was more suitable for monetary purposes than gold, and supported his contention with arguments of great weight, probably the most forceful of which was that the susceptibility of silver to subdivision into coins of small value adapted it to the daily transactions of nine-tenths of the population and the fact that by its use loss by abrasion was one-twentieth of that entailed by the circulation of gold.

It would require a volume to even cursorily review the history of this controversy down to this the last act in the consummation of a scheme the sole purpose of which always has been and now is diminishment of the world's supply of metallic money. The demand for the demonetization of gold nearly fifty years ago was incited by the rise in prices resulting from a large increase in the production of the gold mines.

Germany, Austria, Holland, and, I think, Portugal actually demonetized gold, and in Europe the fear that it was about to become worthless as a money metal became so general that astute shopkeepers drew trade to their houses by hanging out banners offering to take gold for goods.

A decline in gold production ensued and the agitation ceased, but not until writers in France, Germany, and England, voicing the sentiment of the affluent classes of that period, had published numerous books and pamphlets urging the demonetization of gold as a measure made necessary by the tendency to rising prices everywhere prevalent.

The agitation in favor of monometallism was renewed in 1867. This time it was the discovery of rich silver mines that alarmed the money lenders, bondholders, and others living on fixed incomes. Extravagant stories had been sent out as to the wonderful productiveness of the Nevada mines. Numerous conferences

ensued, and finally at the Paris conference of 1867, at which all the great European powers and the United States were represented, an explicit demand for the adoption of monometallism was promulgated. Like that made by Chevalier, the French economist, and his colaborers in Germany and England fifteen years earlier, this demand rested upon a single proposition: It was said that inasmuch as bondholders, money lenders, and others enjoying fixed incomes would be put to greater expense by an increase in the price of living, therefore the upward tendency of prices must be arrested.

At this point I invite especial attention to a fact which it seems to me effectually disposes of the contention that its unsuitableness for monetary purposes occasioned the demonetization of silver. In the published proceedings of the Paris conference will be found the report of a committee setting forth the grounds upon which the demand for the adoption of monometallism was made. Language could not be plainer than was there employed:

> It is easy to see that the real value of the metals has diminished. It is difficult to estimate exactly what the diminution is; but, whatever it may be, it demands the attention of governments, because it affects unfavorably all that portion of the population whose income, remaining nominally the same, undergoes a yearly diminution of purchasing power. As governments control the weight and standard of money, they ought, so far as possible, to assure its value; and as it is admitted that the tendency of the metals is to depreciate, this tendency should be arrested by demonetizing one of them.

Mr. Chairman, it would be impossible to make a plainer statement of the question at issue. To prevent a rise in prices and not to serve the convenience of commerce was the motive which then actuated the advocates of the single standard, and the same object animates them now.

The Paris conference did not demand the demonetization of silver. Whether to continue the war on gold or to turn their guns on silver had not then been determined upon by the monometallists.

Finally the demonetization of silver was demanded.

In 1850, 1851, and 1852, when the gold mines were most productive, they objected to gold for monetary purposes.

Fifteen years later, when silver was likely to become more abundant than gold, they determined to bar it out of the mints.

Their object was to "make money scarce, therefore dear," and in each instance they used the means best calculated to accomplish the end then in view.

Further elucidation of the motives and objects of the gold trust is found in the public utterances of leading statesmen and politicians in foreign countries.

In a speech delivered at the international monetary conference of 1881, Mr. Broch, delegate from Norway, protested against the restoration of bimetallism, contending that inasmuch as it would cause higher prices, classes living on fixed incomes would be injured.

A few years before his death, in a speech in the British Parliament, Mr. Gladstone stated the question at issue and gave England's reason for adhering to the gold standard with a frankness that was fairly brutal. He reminded Englishmen that they had ten or more, probably fifteen, billion dollars invested in foreign countries; that payment was not expected; that, on the contrary, the aggregate foreign holdings of England grew larger year after year; that the interest on this vast sum was not paid in money, but commodities—food for the English people and raw materials for their factories; and concluded by saying that under the gold standard they were receiving, as interest on their investments, double the amount of commodities that they would receive under the bimetallic standard. He did not split hairs about ratios nor express alarm about the maintenance of the parity. He urged Englishmen not to disturb conditions which had doubled the value of fixed incomes, and warned them that if they did, prices of the products of American farms would return to the high level of twenty-five years ago, thereby giving Englishmen only one-half the income they then derived from foreign investments.

Mr. Chairman, I have regarded it as necessary to thus review the history of the controversy because, having arrived at the motives and purposes of the great interests back of the gold movement, we can more accurately weigh the value of arguments made on their behalf. Bimetallists rest their case upon a single proposition; that is, that there is not in the world and never will be a sufficient stock of gold to warrant the disuse of silver as money of final redemption. We contend that the mere fact that with both silver and gold in use as full legal-tender money, the supply would be insufficient, and cite in proof of this assertion that it has been in the past, is now, and will continue to be necessary to supplement the stock of specie with paper issues.

Until lately the Republican leaders have at least pretended to concur in this opinion. Prior to the election of Mr. McKinley to the Presidency all the great leaders of his party had given assent to the doctrine which has recently been scoffed at by the friends of this bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in answer to the sneers of the disciples of Grover Cleveland—and I include in this list even Democrats who favor this measure—I desire to say, first, that history mentions no instance in which a plethora of specie has injured a nation, but history does mention a score of great empires that have passed away for the want of it. Nowhere in the annals of the race is it said that at a particular period a deluge of the precious metals worked injury to its advancement, but great writers concur in saying that decreased productiveness of the mines brought on the dark ages. Sir, history abounds in reference to periods during which civilization languished because of a dearth of gold and silver.

Such was the condition of the world when this continent was discovered, and when Spanish treasure ships, laden with gold and silver from the mines of Peru and Mexico, poured into the channels of trade in Europe a fresh supply of specie, without which there would have been a return of the dark ages, an era of progress and advancement began. Such was the condition of the world fifty years ago when, on account of diminished production of gold and silver in Mexico and South America, the stock of metallic money became so far depleted that throughout the world commerce was carried on largely by barter. Again new life was imparted to civilization by rich discoveries in California and Australia, and again the world resumed its onward and upward march. On this continent most notably, but in a large degree in the remotest corners of the planet, the quickening impulse was felt.

In a single decade the registered tonnage of the world's shipping, intercontinental trade, and the production of the leading staples of commerce almost doubled. In 1820 the tonnage of the world's ships aggregated 5,834,000 tons. Twenty years later it had grown to 3,596,000 tons. In the twenty years following, stimulated by the large additions to the world's stock of specie, it almost doubled, reaching the enormous aggregate of 16,000,000 tons. In 1830 the world's commerce, including imports and exports, amounted to $1,960,000,000; in 1840, to $2,750,000,000; in 1850, to $3,800,000,000. Now mark the influence of an increased circulation. By 1860 it had increased to $7,200,000,000.

Using the progress of our own country as an illustration, in 1830 our commerce, including imports and exports, amounted to $105,000,000; in 1840, to $197,000,000; in 1850, to $297,000,000, and in 1860, to $653,000,000.

I lay down as a fundamental truth that an increase in the world's business necessitates a proportionate increase in the world's stock of metallic money.

Mr. Chairman, I regret my inability to present fully statistics as to this phase of the subject prepared for submission to the House, but will take the liberty of printing in my remarks a table showing the growth of the world's commerce and business during this century:

Tonnage register of the world's ships from 1800 to 1896.

	Tons.
1800	4,025,000
1820	5,834,000
1840	9,380,000
1860	16,000,000
1880	19,889,000
1896	24,000,000

Commerce of the world since 1830—aggregate imports and exports.

[Stated in millions of dollars.]

1830	1,900
1840	2,750
1850	3,800
1860	7,200
1870	10,550
1880	14,570
1890	16,860
1897	18,500

Foreign commerce of the United States—aggregate imports and exports.

[Stated in millions of dollars.]

1830	136
1840	282
1850	318
1860	687
1870	829
1880	1,504
1890	1,647
1899	1,901

The world's production of coal since 1820.

	Tons.
1820	17,200,000
1840	44,840,000
1850	81,400,000
1860	142,240,000
1870	213,400,000
1880	340,000,000
1890	520,000,000
1897	610,000,000

The world's production of iron since 1820.

	Tons.
1820	1,010,000
1830	1,585,000
1840	2,680,000
1850	4,442,000
1860	7,180,000
1870	11,910,000
1880	18,140,000
1890	27,157,000
1898	36,570,000

The world's production of steel since 1850.

	Tons.
1850	71,000
1870	540,000
1880	4,255,000
1885	6,150,000
1897	20,979,000
1898	24,000,000

The world's production of coffee since 1832.

	Tons.
1832	95,000
1844	255,000
1855	321,000
1865	422,000
1875	488,000
1885	718,000
1892	700,000
1897	840,000
1898	940,000

The world's consumption of fiber in 1840 and 1897.

	1840.	1897.
	Tons.	*Tons.*
Cotton	540,000	2,700,000
Wool	310,000	1,200,000
Flax	596,000	2,300,000

The world's steam power since 1840.

	Horsepower.
1840	1,656,000
1850	3,990,000
1869	9,380,000
1870	18,430,000
1880	34,650,000
1890	50,150,000
1896	66,100,000

The prodigious increase in the world's commerce during this century has far outrun the increase in the product of the mines.

It seems to have been reserved for this century to apply all that man had learned before to peaceful pursuits and to experience a realization of every hope indulged by the centuries of the past. In all European countries there has been an enormous increase in the volume of exchanges, domestic and foreign.

During this century there has been a large increase in the area of civilized states; cities have sprung up surrounded by densely populated communities, in regions which, fifty years ago, had not been explored.

It requires a larger sum of money to operate the world's railroads now than it did to pay all the expenses of all the Governments in the world one hundred years ago.

The daily expenses of the newspapers and printing houses in Christendom now exceed the pay roll of the factories of the world a hundred years ago.

The great State of New York contains a larger population than inhabited this continent a hundred years ago.

The foreign commerce, including imports and exports, of the United States this year has exceeded the foreign commerce of all the nations combined a hundred years ago.

The inspiration of modern industrial development has spread to the Orient, and the "sleeping millions" referred to by the great Napoleon as factors in the world's affairs that "were dormant, but not dead," have awakened from the slumber of ages. Industrial and commercial development is going on by leaps and bounds, not in the United States alone, but in every corner of the world, and before I conclude my remarks I think I will be able to demonstrate that, no matter what the output of the mines, it is not and never will be sufficient, even partially, to meet the demand for metallic money.

Why, Mr. Chairman, stronger arguments for the doctrines contended for by bimetallists have never been made than have fallen from the lips of gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber who have spoken in favor of this bill.

They have said over and over again that the revival in business which has recently taken place was attributable to an increased stock of the precious metals.

They have attributed rising prices to an increase in the per capita circulation.

They have pointed to the enormous quantity of gold brought to this country by the favorable balance of trade; to increased issues of paper currency and the coinage of several millions of silver as blessings of incomputible value.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] presented and has printed in the RECORD elaborate tables and voluminous statistics, all going to show a considerable increase in the volume of money, and he and other Republican orators who followed him agree that renewed business activity, rising prices, increased production, and vast additions to the wealth of the country have resulted.

Could recognition of the quantitative theory of money be more complete?

And yet in 1896 you said we had plenty of money and denied that more would restore prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that in trying to make a very strong case in favor of a bill that fastens gold monometallism upon the country the gentlemen have taken a position absolutely fatal to the theory on which the measure rests. They have laid much stress upon the large increase in our export trade, and with the native modesty of orthodox Republican statesmanship have taken unto themselves and their party full credit therefor. What, may I ask, have the politicians had to do with bringing about the more favorable business conditions now prevailing? Did Republican stump speeches cause for three consecutive years, beginning with 1896, crop failures in India, Russia, the Balkan States, and Austria-Hungary, our rivals in the production of wheat, thereby giving us a monopoly of European markets at prices made higher by abnormal scarcity? This, not Republican speeches, is what gave us a large favorable balance of trade and brought about accidental replenishment of our stock of metallic money, without which prosperity would have been impossible.

By pointing to large imports of gold and consequent better times the Republicans admit that what we needed in 1896 was not "confidence," but more money. It came to us, not as a result of anything done by the politicians or national bankers, but in payment for the products of the farms of the Mississippi Valley. Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska—three States that cast their electoral votes for Bryan and bimetallism—had more to do with restoring prosperity than all New England, with New York thrown in for good count.

Before entering upon an examination of the elaborate tables and voluminous statistics cited by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] I desire to call attention to some well-known economic facts. The first and most important is that according to the very best authorities fully three-fourths of the gold produced by the mines is absorbed by the arts or carried to oriental countries, from whence it never returns. Now, I know there is a disposition to brush this statement aside as incredible, but facts coming constantly under our own observation, as well as the history of the race, prove its correctness.

Gentlemen may say that this might have been true when the mines were producing a much smaller quantity than now, but that South Africa, the Klondike, and Cripple Creek are so deluging the world with gold that now no such a thing is possible.

I think it is only necessary to casually examine this assumption to prove its incorrectness. Other factors besides the extent of the production of the mines enter into the problem. It is in periods of depression that the largest additions are made to the volume of metallic money. In hard times economy is practiced by a large proportion of the population. Protracted periods of commercial paralysis compel a great many to forego the luxuries. The first pinch of hard times cuts down expenditures for things that can be dispensed with, and as long as hard times continue economy is practiced. During such a period the encroachment of the arts upon the stock of precious metals is at the minimum. Under such circumstances out of a relatively small output of the mines the money supply would be considerably increased.

The converse of this proposition is true. General prosperity enables a large proportion of the population to gratify the whims of fashion or cravings inspired by love of the beautiful and unattainable. It results that at the zenith of a prosperous era the consumption of gold is at the maximum, and with large production the increase in metallic money is small.

And I think, Mr. Chairman, that right here is found an explanation of what otherwise would be a mystery. We are told that gold and silver are durable metals, and that since their preciousness is a motive for their preservation from destruction the aggregate stock is being constantly increased.

Where, then, are the vast treasures that have been wrung from the mines by the toil and sacrifice of all the generations that have preceded us? To my mind the answer to this question seems very simple. As you walk down Pennsylvania avenue keep your eye on the shopkeepers' windows and then bear in mind that the display of jewelry and works of art wrought in gold and silver there seen are duplicated in every city in Christendom. In the palaces of the rich and in the hovels of the poor you may find an answer to this question, which, I think, effectually disposes of the arguments made in support of this measure.

The statistics presented by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] clearly prove that, notwithstanding the large increase in the production of the gold mines mentioned by him so boastfully, the addition to the world's stock of coined money has not relieved the strain felt by the financial world in recent years nor ameliorated the intensity of the struggle which constantly for years has menaced the prosperity of nations and the fortunes of individuals.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] presents a table showing the production of gold from 1862 to 1898, inclusive.

According to this table the world produced during this period gold of the value of $5,082,935,800.

Mulhall gives the aggregate stock of gold money in the world in 1898 at $4,594,900,000. Adding, $150,000,000 as a liberal estimate of the sum of subsequent additions to that amount, we have $4,744,900,000 as the aggregate stock of gold money now in the world.

Do these figures not plainly prove that there is now in use in the world as money a great deal less than the product of this century?

Do they not in fact prove that the world's stock of gold money is at this time barely equal to the product of the mines during the past thirty-five years? They certainly do prove that gentlemen who have persuaded themselves that gold production has grown so large as to effectually settle the money question have reached that conclusion without investigation or reflection, and that some of the orators of the other side who have sneered at bimetallism as a dead issue may be pardoned on account of their want of information on this subject.

But, Mr. Chairman, in other respects the statistics presented by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] are absolutely conclusive on this point.

According to the table showing the production of gold in recent years, the mines produced during the past ten years in round numbers $1,785,000,000 in gold. Statisticians say that this year's product will amount to over $300,000,000. Let us place it at that sum. This added to the product of the past ten years, as shown by the table brought here by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET], makes the aggregate product since 1888 $2,085,000,000.

This is a very large amount of gold, and if we accept the tables as accurate, and I know they are drawn from the most reliable sources within our reach, it is equal to two-thirds of all the gold money in the world in 1873.

But I assert, and shall undertake to demonstrate, that studied in the light of current history these figures, instead of proving that it is safe to rely upon the gold supply for a supply of metallic money, prove precisely the contrary. I have called attention to the product of the mines during the past ten years for the purpose of inquiring of gentlemen on the other side of the House what has become of it? It is true that recently our imports of gold have largely exceeded our exports; but it is also true that during the ten-year period referred to we sent abroad nearly a hundred million more gold than we imported.

Why is it, then, that when the United States reclaimed less than two hundred and eighty million of the three hundred and sixty-four million sent abroad during the past ten years all European capitals experienced the shock?

When the gold went abroad we were engulfed in ruin.

The gold recently imported into this country came to us in the ordinary course of trade, and when it came to us a wail was heard in every countingroom in London, Berlin, Paris, and St. Petersburg. To prevent gold exports the Imperial Bank of Germany advanced interest rates to 7 per cent. So did the Bank of England, and France took similar measures to prevent gold leaving that country. For three months or more the European papers have been discussing with alarm the prospects of further losses of gold.

What, then, becomes of the pretense that enormous production has settled the question?

If increased production has not relieved the situation, what may we expect when production declines?

When the South African war broke out, the London papers, reflecting the views of English bankers, indulged in gloomy forebodings as to the effect the loss of the product of the Transvaal mines would have upon the money market, and this notwithstanding the fact that over $2,000,000,000 has been produced by the mines since 1888. Again I inquire, Where has it gone? What has become of it?

While nominally all European countries have adopted the gold standard, Russia, Austria, Italy, and Spain use depreciated paper. Gold measures their debts, but the money of commerce used by their people is paper. Austria has been on a paper basis ever since the Napoleonic wars, with no prospect of returning to the use of specie as long as the gold standard holds sway. This observation applies also to Italy and Spain, where paper has been the money of commerce for a considerable period and is likely to remain so indefinitely. Russia has the largest gold reserve in the world, but ever since the Crimean war depreciated paper has been the sole circulating medium in that country. A year ago the great Empire began the redemption and retirement of paper, with a view to the resumption of specie payment, and thereby became subject to the evils which for a generation have afflicted every nation in which the gold standard prevails.

I thus refer to the status of monetary affairs in European countries for the purpose of directing attention to the fact that whatever advantages have grown out of the enormous production of gold, so frequently referred to in this discussion, have accrued to the five leading gold-standard countries—the United States, France, Germany, Great Britain, and Russia. Has the gold produced by the mines in recent years gone into the monetary circulation of these countries? Go read their newspapers for an answer. Read the foreign telegrams that appear day after day in the American newspapers, and learn that all Europe is threatened with a gold famine.

When recently the Secretary of the Treasury bought twenty millions of the Government bonds in order to relieve the New York money market the London papers expressed thankfulness for the timely intervention and congratulated the capitalists upon the fact that this would relieve the stringency in New York and prevent our drawing large balances which stand to our credit in London banking houses, and added that this would at least temporarily relieve the pressure in London, but that at Berlin pronounced stringency existed, and that no means for the relief of Germany were in sight.

Since then it has transpired that the action of our Treasury Department has enabled New York to go to London's relief. Large shipments of gold are going from New York to the English capital, and our bankers are adding to their large English balances. Notwithstanding the stringency at home and the fact that they could to-morrow draw on London for many millions, they are exporting gold by the million to prop up the gold standard there.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber look upon this great question from the standpoint from which Europe viewed it six or seven years ago. Then the balance of trade was against us, and in payment we were compelled to send large quantities of gold to Europe. The result was great stringency. Recently the balance of trade has been against Europe and part of our gold has come back to us and Europe is threatened with a financial collapse.

I direct attention to current events for the purpose of again inquiring what has become of the deluge of gold that has poured out of the mines during the last ten or twelve years. I declare that it has not placed even the strongest money powers in the world on a strong financial basis.

We contended in 1896 that there was not enough gold in the world to furnish the great commercial powers with a sufficient stock of specie. Everything that has transpired since then has proven the correctness of that position.

In conclusion, I desire to state broadly what I conceive to be the real problem involved. When first the bondholders and kindred classes demanded the demonetization of one or the other of the precious metals in order to make money scarce, the fixed debts of the world represented a comparatively small sum. I have seen in print the statement that at the end of the Napoleonic wars the world's fixed debts and dividend-bearing stocks in quasi-public corporations combined did not exceed twenty billions. It is probable that by 1850 the amount had doubled, and recent estimates place it at from one hundred and fifty to two hundred billions. Including State, municipal, corporate, and individual debts secured by mortgages, doubtless the aggregate is at least one hundred and fifty billions.

Placing the earning power of this enormous sum at 4 per cent per annum, it exacts in dividends and interest every year the enormous sum of $6,000,000,000. Under existing conditions a large portion of the six billions—at least two-thirds of it, and probably more—is added to the principal, and so the world sinks deeper and deeper into the bondage of debt. Every year the total sum of fixed charges becomes greater.

The enactment of this bill is another step in the direction of compelling the world to go on compounding the interest on fixed debts, thereby fastening perpetually upon the world the grasp of the money power.

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, usury is devouring the world. Everywhere the usurer is omnipotent. I firmly believe there is not in the world a single government that is not absolutely controlled by financial syndicates, corporations, and millionaire bankers. In this free Republic they have seized control of first one political party and then another in order to work out their evil purposes. They elect our Presidents, in many cases name the judges of our courts, and in every State in the Union employ the professional lobbyist to superintend politics, manipulate conventions, and control public policies. They seduce the weak, buy the vicious, and, by means of political enginery that only money will buy, strike down and destroy whoever is bold enough to dispute their sway.

Centralized wealth is a menace to human liberty in every part of the globe. In these latter days it has achieved many victories beneficial to the few and oppressive to the many. It has made kings, presidents, legislatures, and courts the instrumentalities by which it is rapidly absorbing the wealth of Christendom. Grievous have been the sins of truculent rulers and public officials who have yielded to its blandishments, but of all the infamies ever perpetrated for its benefit the step about to be taken by this Congress is the most infamous.

Sir, the impartial future historian will not fail to brand with dishonor the political party that is about to commit this crime. By the passage of this bill the scheme devised by the bondholders and capitalists of Europe fifty years ago receives the approval of the Republican party. It never has received the approval of the American people, and it never will.

To-day you gloat over this victory achieved by the flagrant violation of the confidence of the people, but a day of reckoning will come. "Be sure thy sin shall find thee out."

Throughout this discussion gentlemen have mentioned boastfully the general revival of business and industry throughout the country, the inference being that the country is indebted to Republican stump speakers for better times.

My friends, prosperity is not the creation of politicians. The men who toil, and not the men who talk, perform the labor and produce the wealth that blesses mankind. To the miner who plies his weary task unblessed by the sunlight, to the sailor who braves the dangers of the deep, to the pioneer who felis the forest, to the husbandman plowing in the field, to the artisan to whose skilled hands we are indebted for every comfort that blesses our homes, to God's creatures of the humbler sort the country is indebted for renewed prosperity.

If the eloquent gentlemen who have so immoderately praised themselves and their party as the authors of prosperity will look about them, without difficulty they may learn the cause of better times. The source of prosperity is told by the myriad voices of busy industry; the thunder of the locomotive, the whir of factory wheels, the song of the husbandman as he plows his field tell us whence it comes. To those who toil and are content, if so be it that poor privilege be given them, be awarded all the glory which Republican orators would take unto themselves. Blessed be they, the fruition of whose devotion is read in the sheen of golden harvests and seen in the product of field, forest, factory, mine, and shop. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I will ask leave to print without the five days' limit, on account of some statistics which I can not prepare within that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that he be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD without regard to the five days' limit. Is there objection?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I think that will have to be taken up in the House and not in the committee.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I do not see that it would have to be.

Mr. OVERSTREET. The committee has no power to grant that request. That will have to be made in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] is correct.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, since there has been so much of confession and not much of avoidance on the part of our friends on the other side, I suppose they will allow us some liberty of discussion. They promised us—or at least one of them did, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER]—to listen to our speeches and heed them not. Therefore, I suppose they will not think us unduly critical in any remarks we may make. Some of them are complaining of the fact that some on this side have charged them with being insincere. If I mistake not (and I do not think I do) the Republican party in national convention assembled, in their national platform, denounced the Democratic Administration a few years ago for its efforts to demonetize silver.

Mr. CARMACK. And, Mr. McKinley did the same thing.

Mr. SIMS. And, as suggested by my colleague, Mr. McKinley, who is now President, did the same.

Now, why did you denounce the Democratic Administration for its efforts to demonetize silver if it was a thing that ought to be done. My friends, do you regard this simply as a temporary matter? Is there no principle in it? Does it only have a momentary application? Was that platform made for that campaign only? Did you mean what you said? If you did, the demonetization of silver was worthy of your severest condemnation at that time. You put your fighting clothes and armor on and went forth to slay those who would demonetize silver. How long has that been? Where is the army that you sent forth to do battle for the cause of silver? One gentleman on the other side said, yesterday if I mistake not, that he did not care to be confronted with any statement that he had made heretofore; and I do not blame him. [Laughter.]

Why, he said prosperity had come upon them in such a wave out in Iowa that he was unable to get labor with which to build a barn since he had become a farmer. But in two minutes he let out the fact that he was in debt to everybody about there, and do you expect to get men to work for such a man as that? [Laughter on the Democratic side.] Why, my friend, you ought to have bluffed your other creditors as you said you did the insurance company before you tried to build a barn. [Renewed laughter.] My friend, Mr. DOLLIVER, of Iowa, said there came a small but potent voice from some place somewhere out in the State of Ohio—and I believe all places exist there for political purposes [laughter]—that we should "open the doors of the manufactories instead of the mints"—and that met with hearty approval upon the other side of the House—and as soon as you got in power you passed a bill, the Dingley tariff bill, and the doors of the manufactories forthwith all flew open.

But what else happened? As a logical result of the provision of that bill you built up and added another industry. Trusts opened their doors and the whole Republican party went in thereat. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Then what followed? When the trusts and combinations were formed sufficiently they began to close, and actually did close, the very doors that the Dingley bill was passed to open. [Applause.] Well, I suppose this is just simply Republican progress. Why, yes; we have got prosperity. They say on the other side, and I will not deny it, that labor is at present generally employed at living wages; but I believe it to be a fact, and so assert it, that from the panic level wages, on the average, have not increased over 10 per cent, and from the panic level manufactured goods have advanced many of them 100 per cent, and possibly more than that.

Therefore the operation of Republican legislation is not equal, is not fair, is not just, and through the doors of the trusts, and those who go in thereat, the manufacturers have reaped a 100 per cent profit, and in some cases 200 per cent. You said, Give us the Dingley bill, by which we will have the exclusive American market for our manufacturers, and there will be such an increase of competition at home that it will bring down the price of manufactured articles. You said that with the help of the exclusive American market you could compete with the world in manufactures. After you got the tariff and all you asked, and after you have the trusts and combinations without number, why, then, what else do you ask?

Why, now you have got to be great advocates of commerce and trade expansion; and in order to enable you to sell the goods made in this country with labor receiving American wages you actually ask Congress to walk up and pass the Payne ship-subsidy bill—to pay the freight in order that you may sell those goods in free-trade countries in competition with the pauper labor of those localities. Well, I suppose you will pass that bill. I suppose the great ship lines will get that. I suppose the manufacturers will get it, because they have never knocked at Republican doors in vain. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Now, my friends, I want to ask this question in all candor: If you are going to go to the gold standard, why not go to it in a logical way? If there is anything else in this measure except the assertion of the fact that we are on the gold standard and have been since 1834, why not do it in a logical way? Do you suppose the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] is exactly in accord with the provisions of this bill? Do you suppose that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FOWLER] is in accord with it? Of course we know they will support it, but if you want to get the gold standard go straight and logically about it. Redeem, cancel, and destroy every greenback by paying gold for them; withdraw every Treasury note and pay for it in gold; purchase every silver dollar and pay for them in gold. Where would you get the gold with which to do this, do you ask? Get it just as you do in this bill, by selling bonds and buying it. There is no other way to get it.

Then we would have one big bond issue and it would be over. My friends, you are afraid to trust the sincerity of your purpose, your real object, to your constituents, and you want to bring them to it by degrees. What is the result? You propose—and there are indications that you will gain your object—a bill that puts it within the power of those having sufficient means to regulate the markets and manipulate them to make thousands of dollars, yea millions of dollars, by the manipulation of the Treasury under this bill.

Now, my friends, why keep the greenbacks in existence in mere name? Why keep the silver dollars in existence in mere name? If, through the operations of this bill, you have got to maintain parity between silver and gold by means of the heavy hand of taxation, why keep the silver dollars at all? There are but two logical courses open, and one is the free coinage of silver into standard dollars with no string to it, and the other is a simple gold standard with the absolute obliteration of everything else in the way of money but the bank note. You know that this is logical—and this is what you intend to do—and what it will come to, providing you succeed.

Now, my friends—and I appeal to you as such because you all love me—why do you want to put it within the power of the greed of man to use the taxing power of this Government for his own individual benefit? I say that the present bill holds out the greatest inducements that have ever been offered to the greed of the monopolists to make money for themselves out of the provisions

of the bill. Under this bill capitalists, individuals, and corporations can go to the Treasury and present greenbacks in quantity sufficient to take every dollar out of the Treasury that is now there in gold.

By the operation of this law these greenbacks are locked up in the division of issue and redemption. These gentlemen, having that motive in view, can take the $240,000,000 in gold now in the Treasury out by presenting greenbacks for it under this bill and lock it up in the banks, while the paper money paid for it is locked up in the Treasury by this bill, and at once you have a contraction in the money in circulation to the extent of $480,000,000. You may say that they will not do it. But why leave the door open for such a raid on the Treasury? Why make it possible? Instead of the endless chain, you are going by this bill to create an endless source of bond issue. I will not be so cruel as to charge that it is the one thing you have in view, but, however, you ought to be charged with that which necessarily follows the provisions of your measure.

Now, what else? You have enabled those who so desire to contract the currency by this simple operation to the extent of $480,000,000. There are over $200,000,000 Treasury notes and greenbacks remaining in circulation after taking every dollar in gold in the Treasury out by their presentation that can the next day be presented and gold be demanded for them. The Treasury is without option; it must sell bonds for gold for the second installment. Banks, corporations, and individuals can thus operate; they can thus reduce the volume of outstanding circulation and bring corresponding depression in stocks and commodities which they can buy in at low prices, after which all they have to do is to return the gold from the vaults where they locked it up to the Treasury, get back the greenbacks and Treasury notes and put them into the banks, and they go into circulation. The gold, when paid back to the Treasury, goes back into circulation; therefore the currency is increased and prices advance, and that which they bought at low prices they will unload at great profits.

Now, it is within the opportunity of a political party to place within the temptations of the avarice and greed of men to do such a thing as this through the operations of this bill, and the markets can be put up or down just as often as desired, and bond issues can be forced without limit. Now, I appeal to you as honest men, why do you not come out in a heroic way, why do you not retire the greenbacks absolutely? Simply because you are afraid that your constituents have not progressed as far as you have, and you are waiting for your constituents to reach your present stage of progression.

Now, my friends, it has been alluded to here before on this floor that we have great prosperity; that it is due to the gold standard. There is prosperity all over the world at the present time. If it is due to the gold standard, they had it many years ago, and we have had it since 1834, as claimed by the other side. If to the mere fact of the existence of certain conditions we are to attribute all that follows, every panic in the United States since 1834 can be charged to the gold standard.

But, Mr. Chairman, as shown by the gentleman from Indiana on yesterday in the discussion of this question, the output of gold throughout the world has increased and reached the enormous sum of $287,000,000 last year. Now, would not this gold, if coined and turned into standard money, as it has been, have the logical and legitimate effect that we have always insisted that it would have and that we have in the course of the discussions on the floor of the House on these measures always claimed that it would have—that is, to increase prices? We have contended that with the increase in the standard money of the country the prices of commodities would increase, while with a decrease of the volume of money in circulation prices would decrease. Is anyone able now to say that this increased production of gold is likely to continue?

Is it not a fact that all gentlemen may recognize that the increased production of the gold mines of the world to-day is due more to accident than to effort, and is it not also true that when a mine is exhausted its output is forever gone? Have you any means of assuring the country that it will continue? You know that the enormous output of gold in the last few years has been due very largely to new processes for the extraction of gold from the low-grade ores which have heretofore been rejected. Well, a time will come when these low-grade ores will be exhausted. Improved methods have enabled us to use some of these ores; but there is a limit to them. If we could know, as a matter of fact, and determine in advance the output and increase of the gold mines of the world, so as to establish beyond question that the money supply from that source would be sufficient to meet the requirements of the world, then the question would be greatly simplified. But the exhaustion of the gold mines and the increased difficulty of procuring gold are matters that we are compelled to consider in connection with a proposition of this kind.

I know the argument has been made heretofore, and is being made to-day, that it is not honest for a great people like the people of the United States to pay their debts with money which is worth commercially 50 cents on the dollar. But if you were honest in your declaration of three years ago, and if you wanted bimetallism by international agreement or otherwise then or now, I ask you is this bill conducive to such an end? My good and frank friend from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] says he does not want it. I thank him for his candor. If there is a gentleman on that side of the House in favor of bimetallism by international agreement or otherwise I should be thankful if he would let me know it. I pause for an answer. I get none; and so I conclude that there are no gentlemen on the other side in favor of any such agreement as that. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Therefore, I charge that if England, France, Germany, and all the rest of the commercial world proposed to us the free coinage of silver, all gentlemen on the other side of the House would stand ready to vote against it, and it would be defeated by the unanimous voice of that party. If there is a single gentleman on the other side who is in favor of bimetallism of any kind or character, please let us know it. You are all silent as the grave.

Now, I know, Mr. Chairman, that you are not hypocritical. You have not been hypocritical in the past and are not now. You have declared your opinions openly and boldly. You have progressed, it is true; but let us look a little further into the result of the legislation you are now advocating. This law will provide for an indefinite issue of bonds, and by means of the same legislation we shall create a nontaxed class of people who live on the interest of the bonds of the Government and pay no taxes for any purpose whatever.

Why is it necessary, my friends, so far as existing contracts or indebtedness are concerned, to change the unit of payment from the denominations which were written in the contracts at the time they were made? Why give more than the "pound of flesh" when it is not demanded? Why not let the law apply to contracts hereafter to be entered into? Why undertake an indebtedness involving millions upon millions of dollars for the sole benefit of the creditor classes? Would it not be sufficient for all national purposes and for sustaining and maintaining the credit of the Government to go to the gold standard from now on? Why apply it to obligations which are entirely satisfactory to their holders as they now exist? Why apply it to old contracts?

It has been referred to during the course of this discussion, and I desire briefly to refer to it myself to show how this question was applied and dealt with during the Administration of President Cleveland. I wish to show how it was proposed to take 3 per cent interest on the part of the bondholder if the word "gold" was written in the bond instead of coin, and making a difference of $16,000,000 saving to the Government on about sixty-two and one-half million dollars of bonds then proposed to be issued. The conclusion is plain; you can not escape it; and if you pass this bill and send it to the Senate, and that body passes it, there can be only one result that will follow from its enactment. There will be an advance in prices of bonds and stocks, but in nothing else.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, would it interrupt the gentleman to tell us whether Tennessee is now prosperous under the gold standard?

Mr. SIMS. It will not interrupt me in the least. I am glad to tell the gentleman and everybody else just how Tennessee is getting along under Democratic rule. [Laughter.] Tennessee is prosperous in a measure, and prosperous in spots, as was suggested by another gentleman. All who have coal, and iron, and marble to sell, and timber, all of which have received their share of "the fatted calf" in the shape of the McKinley bill, have considerable money to circulate and feel that the times are better.

But where cotton has been grown and other agricultural products—corn, wheat, and things of that sort—the people are better off than they were in 1893 and a few years afterwards, but the change is so slight that you can not make the people themselves believe it. Further, the sale of live stock, mules, horses, and cattle have been enhanced, as you are bound to admit, by the war with Spain, the present war in the Philippines, and the war in the Transvaal. Men are in my State right now buying mules for the English army. Do you claim, my good friend from Iowa [Mr. LACEY], that the existing gold standard has brought about all these benefits? [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LACEY. Did any of those things exist in 1894 and 1895 and 1896?

Mr. SIMS. No; there was no war in those years, and prosperity among the farmers of Tennessee is like this bill—a new measure.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

Mr. GROSVENOR. May it not be that it is the adherence to the gold standard that has produced the war in South Africa, and hence become a part of the gold standard scheme?

Mr. SIMS. Why, my friend, as the war in Africa is of English production, of course it is the result of the gold standard and those who believe in it. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, at the expense of being charged with repetition I will analyze this bill. The objects of this bill are many.

First, to declare that the standard unit of value shall be the dollar and shall consist of 25.8 grains of gold nine-tenths fine, or 23.22 grains of pure gold, being the one-tenth part of the eagle. It must follow, if this bill becomes a law, that nothing is standard money but gold. A dollar can no longer be coined from silver, neither is any silver coin longer a dollar. It no longer depends, even in part, on the intrinsic or commercial value of the metal contained in it to give it value as currency or money. It in fact and effect becomes nothing more than a debt or liability of the Government. It is utterly demonetized and effectually destroyed as even a factor to be considered in prices of commodities or the burdens or benefits of contracts. It becomes in fact and in effect nothing more than mere token money and takes its place alongside nickels and pennies. And this is true not only as to silver dollars heretofore coined, but as to any that may hereafter be coined.

Only two years ago the Republicans claimed to be the only real friends of the double standard; they insisted with much seriousness that they were really and honestly in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, but on account of existing conditions in the great commercial nations of the world they were fearful of being able to maintain free coinage and that we would go to a single silver standard if we attempted it alone, and this they did not want any more than they wanted a single gold standard; that they believed with the efforts of this Government that they could get a sufficient number of the commercial nations of Europe to join in an agreement with this Government to effectually maintain the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1; that they would seek to promote and bring about such an agreement.

A majority of the people believed these promises were made in good faith and voted the Republican ticket. A commission was appointed, sent to England, France, and other countries. And while this commission was in Europe and working, apparently to secure the ends proposed, the Secretary of the Treasury was giving out statements at home here that indicated plainly to England that we did not want to succeed in our efforts, so called, to secure the promised international agreement; that we were really insincere. How could we hope to succeed in an effort to secure international bimetallism while virtually saying that we did not want it?

After the passage of this act making all debts now existing or hereafter created, both public and private, payable in gold, will it not be in the nature of impairing the obligation of these contracts to repeal this law or enact a law securing, by the consent of the commercial nations of Europe, the free and unlimited coinage of silver? In other words, if we, by passing this bill, write gold in the face of every existing contract, can not the holders of these obligations demand gold, even if free coinage should eventually come by international agreement or without it? Then if you on the other side are really desirous of securing international bimetallism, why pass this law, which can only prove a very serious if not an insurmountable obstacle in the way of such a result?

If you were favorable to bimetallism of any kind, international or otherwise, you would not want this bill to become a law. But this breaking of your pledges to the people you are pleased to style progress. God pity a people who are ruled by a party who believe in or are satisfied with any such progress. If keeping faith with the people is old fogyism, I hope and pray that the Democratic party will continue to be an old fogy.

You say that we are now on the gold standard, but you admit that every dollar of the public debt can be paid in the existing silver dollars; that every dollar of our private indebtedness not otherwise provided in the contract is payable in existing silver dollars.

With 3 per cent Government bonds at an enormous premium in gold, although payable in silver, what calls for this legislation whereby they are made payable in gold only? What do we owe these bondholders that we should by legislation further enhance the value of their bonds? What has the poor, oppressed debtor done that the burden of his existing indebtedness now payable in either gold or silver shall be made heavier by making his debts payable in gold only?

The old, worn-out, and threadbare argument is resorted to that the intrinsic or commercial value of the two metals has grown to be so far apart that it is no longer just and honest to pay debts calling for dollars in 412½ grains of standard silver, issued and coined on Government account, called a dollar. If you are, as you have heretofore professed to be, the friends of silver, why strike this additional blow at the commercial value of silver? Do you expect to increase the commercial value of silver by continuing to legislate against it? Do you expect to reduce the commercial or exchange value of gold by additional legislation in its favor?

I have often heard it said that you can not legislate value into silver or out of it nor can you legislate value into or out of gold; that the value of these two metals is due alone to their intrinsic qualities or properties. I admit that in so far as commercial or exchange value depends upon the intrinsic qualities or properties of either gold or silver you can neither add to or take away by legislation. But commercial value and intrinsic value are not synonymous. Commercial or exchange value does not depend alone upon the intrinsic qualities of gold and silver.

Commercial or exchange value includes all elements of value. Commercial or exchange value is the value possessed by money and can be and often is very greatly affected by legislation. Commercial or exchange value of any article is equal to the sum of all demands for it. Where a demand for an article is either increased or decreased by the effect of legislation its exchange or commercial value is affected accordingly and does not depend alone upon the intrinsic properties of the particular article of merchandise or property so affected.

Now, wheat as a grain has higher intrinsic value than corn; it also has higher commercial or exchange value. These two grains are used as food by the human race. Suppose that, for sanitary reasons, the use of Indian corn as an article of diet for human beings should be prohibited by legislation, what would be the result? The exchange value of corn would fall, while the exchange value of wheat would increase. Why? Because so much of the demand for corn as was caused by its use as human food has ceased; yet corn retains all the elements of intrinsic value it ever had, and its fall in price is due alone to unfriendly legislation; while, on the other hand, the price or commercial value of wheat has been increased, as more wheat or its products must be used in order to take the place of the products of corn, the use of which has been prohibited by legislation. Due to this cause, wheat advances in all the markets of the world, while the intrinsic qualities of wheat have neither been added to nor taken away by legislation. The same would also be true of many other products.

If by law the use of cotton in the manufacture of cloth was prohibited, the price of wool would at once advance, because there would be an additional commercial demand for wool, and this without any change in the intrinsic properties of wool.

Mr. Chairman, as gold and silver are commodities and nothing more, why are they not subject to the same effects due to legislation that any other product is? They certainly are, and no amount of sophistry can prove the contrary.

If we will only make it to the interest of the creditor class of this country to sustain and support the value of silver instead in depressing it, very different results will follow. The gentlemen on the other side propose to put the property evidenced by bonds, stocks, mortgages, and all forms of fixed indebtedness beyond the danger of unfavorable fluctuation, and by means of taxation keep it there. That is, you make all debts, private and public, payable in gold and provide that all other money shall be kept as good as gold by exchanging gold for it, and to get this gold with which to make the exchange you propose to sell bonds when necessary. You thus effectually remove every incentive to maintain the value of silver from that class of people who alone are able to maintain it.

If you wish to bring about certain results in any of the affairs of mankind, you need only to make it to the interest of those having the ability to accomplish the desired results, and they will certainly follow.

Mr. Chairman, suppose you have an obligation from your neighbor calling for the delivery of 10,000 bushels of wheat next October. Will you be found proclaiming to your friends that an enormous acreage of wheat has been planted; that the plant is in unusually good condition; that seasons are favorable for a large yield, and that the foreign demand will be light? I answer, No, sir; your interest is in sustaining the value of wheat and not in depressing it. You will not spend hours and days in trying to convince the world that there is an overproduction of wheat.

The same is true of silver. If we refuse to write "gold" in all the bonds, mortgages, and all other forms of indebtedness or contracts the terms of which are expressed in dollars, we will at least retain the partial support of the creditor class in our efforts to bring about international bimetallism. If it was probable that all such forms of indebtedness would be discharged in 412½-grain silver dollars, this creditor class will be interested in sustaining the value of the silver dollar.

Give us free, unlimited, independent coinage of silver at 16 to 1 and you will have heard the last of the 50-cent dollar. The creditor class would be the potential owners of every silver dollar coined or to be coined, and would also be interested in maintaining the value of the same, and with the ability they now have, coupled with the interest to do so, the maintaining of the parity of the two coins would no longer require legislation or Treasury operation.

Debtors really have no money. They may be temporarily in possession of money, but it is not theirs—no more than a borrowed horse is owned by the borrower—while on the other hand the creditor class may not in fact be in possession of all the money in the world, but they are nevertheless the real and true owners of the same and have lost possession only temporarily and by way of a loan for compensation called interest. So with free coinage

every ounce of silver would be potentially coined and in use as money just as gold is, and the same interests that uphold and protect gold would take care of silver in the same way, prompted and moved by the same causes. But with this bill a law and in operation, silver must further decline, as the creditor class are wholly relieved by it from any possible injury by such further decline, and are the only class who really have the power to prevent it.

So, Mr. Chairman, in both practical and moral effect this bill is in the interest of the creditor class only, and just so far as it is a benefit to them it is a corresponding injury to the unfortunate debtor class.

The Republicans are acting in the spirit of the parable, that from him that hath not shall be taken even that which he hath, and to him that hath shall be given, that he have more abundantly, and this is to be accounted to them for righteousness.

Taking this bill in order, the next thing proposed after establishing the single gold standard is to break the so-called "endless chain," by which gold is taken from the Treasury by presentation of greenbacks and Treasury notes. This is to be accomplished by establishing what is named in the bill as the division of "issue and redemption" in the Treasury Department, to which is to be transferred from the general fund in the Treasury all the gold coin and bullion held against outstanding gold certificates, all the silver dollars held against outstanding silver certificates, all the silver dollars and bullion held against outstanding Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890, all the United States notes held against outstanding currency certificates, and an amount of gold coin and bullion to constitute a reserve fund equal to 25 per cent of the amount both of United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890, outstanding.

And in order to maintain this gold reserve fund the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to sell gold bonds of the United States bearing interest in gold not to exceed 3 per cent per annum. And in order to maintain parity the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to give gold in exchange for any other money issued or coined by the United States, and when so redeemed or exchanged said money is to remain in said department of issue and redemption and shall not be withdrawn or disbursed except in exchange for an equal amount of the coin for which said money is redeemed or exchanged.

Bad as the present law is, this bill is infinitely worse. This bill places the Treasury of the United States completely in the hands of the banks and money dealers. By the operations of this law the money of the country can be locked up and its volume restricted at any time the banks see proper to do so. Under existing law, or other rules of the Treasury Department, when greenbacks are exchanged for gold they can be and are used by the Treasury Department for any and all purposes as same as the gold paid out for them could have been. But under this bill, when a greenback or Treasury note is paid into the Treasury for gold it must remain there until it is again paid out or exchanged for gold. It is thus completely locked up and withdrawn from circulation of every kind and character.

According to the official report of the Secretary of the Treasury, there are outstanding and in circulation United States notes amounting to $304,976,239; Treasury notes act July 14, 1890, $88,893,894, making the sum of $483,870,133, practically every dollar of which can be offered at any time under the provisions of this bill should it become a law and gold demanded and received for the same. On the 6th day of December, 1899, the net gold in the Treasury, including bullion, was $238,065,588.87. Suppose Treasury notes and United States notes to this amount are presented to the Treasury and gold exchanged for them; not one cent of gold would remain in the Treasury to exchange for other United States notes that might be presented, while there would remain outstanding and in circulation greenbacks and Treasury notes to the amount of $245,804,544.13.

Suppose, then, that there should be a demand to redeem $200,000,000 of these outstanding greenbacks and Treasury notes, how would it be accomplished? The answer is obvious to everyone. Bonds would have to be sold to the amount of $200,000,000 for the purpose of bringing back into the Treasury the gold paid out for the greenbacks and Treasury notes in the first instance. I ask, what is to prevent a repetition of the same thing as often as a bond issue was desirable by those seeking such an investment? We thus have a new endless chain of bond issues by using the provisions of this bill above pointed out.

Besides the use of United States notes and Treasury notes for this purpose the Secretary of the Treasury, if necessary to maintain the parity of gold and silver coins, in his discretion is authorized to exchange gold for silver dollars, so that those desiring to manipulate the markets of the country by an alternate tight and easy money market can, under the provisions of this bill, use the existing silver dollars to secure their objects the same as United States notes and Treasury notes.

Mr. Chairman, so far as enabling the speculators to use the United States Treasury to enable them to carry on their operations, they could not otherwise do. This bill is more to their liking and conserves their interests much better than to absolutely redeem and cancel all the United States notes and Treasury notes and to buy in every silver dollar and sell them as bullion in the markets, as before stated. By this course of procedure the United States paper money and silver money would go out of existence and could not be used, as under this bill, to bull and bear prices of commodities and securities just as they see fit.

By the privileges of this bill or in its necessary operations the national banks must issue all the paper money used by the people, and to better enable them to do so this bill makes such changes in the national banking laws as will make it more profitable for the national banks to issue their notes than under existing law. By this bill we give them a complete monopoly of furnishing all the paper money used by the people and increase the profit of note issuing in addition to the monopoly conferred. A more dangerous power or one fraught with greater possibilities of evil can not be imagined by the mind of man than this surrender by the people of the right to issue the paper money needed in their business and turn it over to the rapacity and greed of banking corporations.

Mr. Chairman, what would Old Hickory say of this bill, could he speak from the precincts of the tomb? What would Lincoln say of the prostration and surrender of his party to the uses and purposes of purely money-making capitalistic combinations?

The more standard money we have the better are the prices of products and the wages of labor. As the supply of metallic money can not, in the nature of things, be regulated by any human effort or foresight and must depend to a great extent upon the mere accident of discovery, we contend that greater stability can be had by the use of the two metals than one. Hence we are bimetallists and do not favor the single standard of either gold or silver, but believe that it is to the best interest of all mankind to make standard money metals out of both gold and silver.

If this bill is not class legislation I will be glad to know what it takes to constitute such legislation.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am fully aware and fully recognize what a waste of words it is to stand here and further discuss this measure. It has been made a caucus measure and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] has told us that there was a unanimous vote in the Republican caucus in its favor, not even one dissenting voice. This bill is the consummation of English effort for the past twenty years. It is the realization of the hopes of Lombard and Wall streets. It is the beginning of the end of our present form of government, the tottering to the downfall of our free institutions, and if not prevented by an aroused and awakened people there will be but little use for our further assembling in this Hall as the people's representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DRIGGS] is recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. DRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, two quotations are so replete with thoughts directly applicable to my personal convictions in regard to the great measure under consideration that I intend to quote and analyze them somewhat fully:

I. Two things, men of Athens, are characteristic of a well-disposed citizen—so may I speak of myself and give the least offense. In authority, his constant aim should be the dignity and preeminence of the commonwealth; in all times and circumstances his spirit should be loyal.—*Demosthenes's Oration on the Crown.*

II. It is good, also, not to try experiments in states, except the necessity be urgent or the utility evident; and well to beware that it be the reformation that draweth on the change, and not the desire of change that pretendeth the reformation.—*Bacon's Essay on Innovations.*

I desire, however, Mr. Chairman, above all else, at the commencement of my argument, to impress my colleagues on this side of the House with these facts, to wit: That I do not intend to criticise their sincerity of conviction toward any financial opinions different from those I entertain. I do not intend to stir up or create any division among ourselves, and, finally, above all else, I do not arrogate to myself that I am right and you wrong, but I do assert, and will endeavor to prove, later in my argument, that the money plank of the Chicago platform demanding the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 was not in harmony with the tenets of the Democratic party and departed from the traditional policy of its founders and greatest men. In pursuance of this plan I have divided my argument into three sections.

First. "In authority his constant aim should be the dignity and preeminence of the commonwealth."

Second. "It is good, also, not to try experiment in states, except the necessity be urgent or the utility evident," etc.

Third. "In all times and circumstances his spirit should be loyal."

We who represent in this House the American people have a rare opportunity to advance the dignity and preeminence of the Republic. We should aim to have our nation first in all things. We should strive to make laws so liberal, so just, so fair, so

sound that the people whom we represent should be able to pursue their course toward the strengthening of the Republic without fear of commercial disquietude or national disaster; then we having performed our duty, the wheels and spindles of our mills would busily hum, the rhythmic click of the reaping machines would be heard across our table-lands and plains, the merry songs of the cotton pickers would permeate the balmy air of the sunny South, while merchant, artisan, clerk, would rejoice in this national prosperity, and the busy mart of the entire commercial world would be forced to acknowledge their dependence upon American industry. A commercial elysium, such as this just pictured, however, could never last unless based upon an indestructible, sound, and safe currency. And such a currency must be based upon the standard of the nations with whom we have our greatest transactions, and this standard is gold. [Applause.]

Commerce has of recent years preferred gold. Legislative action has not forced silver to the wall; commercial action has. The merchant says, "Silver has now become an article of commerce, rising and falling in price, as do all other articles of commerce dependent upon laws of supply and demand. Its value, therefore, is fluctuating constantly; hence it is undesirable as a standard of value."

Mr. Chairman, I go even further and assert that in spite of the most favorable legislative acts and bolstering propositions silver has, through this action of the commercial world, declined in value.

Under the act of February 28, 1878, known as the Bland-Allison Act, the said act being "to authorize the coinage of the standard silver dollar and to restore its legal-tender quality," we find a direct attempt on the part of Congress to aid silver theorists, but what happened? Instead of increasing the value of silver per ounce it caused, through the increased production of the mines, its depreciation from $1.2048 per ounce in 1878 to $0.9668 in 1890. For complete data and statistics under this act see the following table from the Report of the Director of the Mint for 1894, page 17:

Amount, cost, average price, and bullion value of the silver dollar of silver purchased under act of February 28, 1878.

Fiscal year.	Fine ounces.	Cost.	Average price per fine ounce.	Bullion value of a silver dollar.
1878	10,809,350.56	$13,023,268.96	$1.2048	$0.9318
1879	19,248,086.09	21,593,642.99	1.1218	.8676
1880	22,057,862.04	25,235,081.53	1.1440	.8848
1881	19,709,227.11	22,327,874.75	1.1328	.8761
1882	21,190,209.87	24,054,480.47	1.1351	.8779
1883	22,889,241.24	25,077,327.58	1.1174	.8642
1884	21,922,951.52	24,378,383.91	1.1120	.8600
1885	21,791,171.61	23,747,460.25	1.0897	.8428
1886	22,690,652.94	23,418,980.01	1.0324	.7992
1887	26,490,008.04	25,988,620.46	.9810	.7587
1888	25,386,125.32	24,237,553.20	.9547	.7384
1889	26,408,861.03	24,717,853.81	.9538	.7222
1890	27,830,900.05	26,899,326.33	.9668	.7477
1891	2,797,379.52	3,049,426.46	1.0901	.8431
Total	291,272,018.56	308,279,260.71	1.0583	.8185

Consider carefully the enormous total, 291,272,018 ounces, and the tremendous cost thereof, $308,279,260. This act, however, was a failure, as it did not increase the price of silver, and again the free-silver theorists came to Congress and suggested another line of action for the benefit of the white metal. And so the Sherman Act of July 14, 1890, became the law. The silver men were now very happy, for at last they thought the Government had done the right thing by them. This act provided for "directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of Treasury notes thereon, and for other purposes." From the following table, taken from page 17 of the Report of the Director of the Mint for 1894, we find another remarkable condition of affairs. The Government, taking nearly the entire output of the mines of the United States, and thus creating a tremendous demand, was unable to keep up the price per ounce.

Amount, cost, average price, and bullion value of the silver dollar of silver purchased under act of July 14, 1890.

Fiscal year.	Fine ounces.	Cost.	Average price per fine ounce.	Bullion value of a silver dollar.
1891	48,393,113.05	$50,577,498.44	$1.0451	$0.8083
1892	54,355,748.10	51,106,607.96	.9402	.7271
1893	54,008,162.60	45,531,374.53	.8430	.6520
1894	11,917,658.78	8,715,521.32	.7313	.5656
	168,674,682.53	155,931,002.25	.9244	.7150
Grand total	459,946,701.09	464,210,262.96	1.0093	.7806

Output of the mines of the United States.

	Fine ounces.
1891	58,330,000
1892	63,500,000
1893	60,000,000

The above tables are so important that I submit, in addition, the price of silver per ounce during each month of the life of the act of 1890, to wit:

[The quotations are taken from the Mint report.]

Price per ounce.

1890:		1891—Continued.		1892—Continued.	
September	$1.16	October	$0.97	November	$0.85
October	1.08	November	.95	December	.84
November	1.03	December	.95	1893:	
December	1.05	1892:		January	.84
1891:		January	.93	February	.84
January	1.05	February	.90	March	.83
February	.99	March	.87	April	.83
March	.98	April	.86	May	.83
April	.97	May	.87	June	.84
May	.97	June	.88	July	.72
June	.98	July	.86	August	.74
July	1.00	August	.83	September	.74
August	.99	September	.83	October	.73
September	.98	October	.85		

During this time the Government has bought 168,674,682 ounces of silver, at a cost of $155,931,002 gold, and the price declined a little more than 1 cent per ounce per month average. In October, 1893, the buying was stopped by the repeal of the purchase act.

From the birth of the Sherman Act of June 17, 1890, to its death, October, 1893, what occurred to so tremendously upset business circles, create panics, cause commercial failures, and capital to become more timid? The silver advocates promised stability of prices and evenness of wages under the Sherman law, but, on the contrary, from such financial legislation disaster quickly spread throughout the land. Without desiring to burden you, my colleagues, with figures difficult to remember, I desire to submit the following table, taken from Bradstreet's report of 1896, in proof of what I have just said:

Year.	Employees.	Number of failures.	Actual assets.	Total liabilities.	Per cent assets to liabilities.
1889	978,000	11,719	$70,599,769	$140,759,490	50
1890	989,000	10,673	92,775,625	175,022,856	53
1891	1,010,000	12,394	102,893,000	193,177,000	53
1892	1,035,000	10,270	54,774,106	108,595,248	50
1893	1,050,000	15,560	262,417,532	402,427,818	65
1894	1,047,000	12,721	79,755,066	149,595,434	53

From this table we glean that from 1891 to 1893, inclusive, over 3,000,000 wage-earners were thrown out of employment; 38,000 business establishments forced into liquidation, with liabilities of $700,000,000 and assets of only $419,000,000, showing an actual loss of $281,000,000. Notice, then, the decrease, after the repeal of the act, of $250,000,000 in the amount of liabilities.

Mr. Chairman, I have searched the records and read the figures of reliable statisticians, and assert now, without fear of contradiction, that during the commercial history of Great Britain, France, Germany, and the United States for the years of the nineteenth century there were not any three successive years when commerce and commercial enterprises suffered so severely.

Upon whom, then, did these disasters most largely fall? The great merchant and manufacturer? No; but upon the merchant and manufacturer of modest means and small capital, for the failures under $5,000 in 1891 were 62 per cent of the total; in 1892, 64 per cent, and in 1893, 58 per cent, while over $5,000 and under $20,000, 27 per cent was the total in 1891, 28 per cent in 1892, and 27 per cent in 1893, and collectively, under $20,000, 87 per cent in 1891, 91 per cent in 1892, and 87 per cent in 1893. What do the figures mean, my colleagues? They mean that our Democratic constituents suffered infinitely more than did the Republicans, for our party consists largely of the men of small means and modest capital.

This is why I stand here advocating the passage of this Republican gold measure, for I know that every legislative attempt of recent years for the benefit of silver has injured the Democrat, the man of small means. If, in spite of legislative action, silver refused to remain at a ratio of 16 to 1, what is the cause for the decline? Nothing is easier to answer. It is, as stated before, the old law of supply and demand. [Applause.]

It is recognized by every student of economics that when the demand for anything exceeds the supply prices hold firm and high, and the greater the demand and the smaller the supply the greater the price. On the other hand, the smaller the demand and the greater the supply the lower the price. This statement requires no argument, no illustration.

The silver theorists say under free coinage at a ratio of 16 to 1 the United States would say to the world, We propose to pay $1.29 per ounce for all your silver, and in addition we will coin it free

of charge. Mr. Chairman, this is very pretty in theory, but what would inevitably follow? The United States would have some $500,000,000 to $1,000,000,000 of the world's silver, in addition to the annual mine output, thrown upon it for coinage, and many, many years would pass before the mint could possibly coin this inconceivable amount. Bonds would of necessity be issued to pay for the bullion; they would be silver bonds at high rates of interest, and would unquestionably sell below par, for the financial world would know beyond any shadow of doubt that the United States could not continue purchasing silver and meet its obligations with gold standard countries, its chief customers. Following the Gresham law, all the gold would leave us. Now, what would happen? Panic would follow panic, the demand for silver would decline through the demand of the whole people for an immediate change of a false financial system, and the price per ounce of the white metal would go tumbling down.

Look at it in another light. As stated a moment ago, our mints could not coin the silver in many years. The world would soon learn this and would then stop sending her silver to us, with this inevitable result, that the United States, unable to take silver, and the world unable to unload, the price would fall, for silver would again be forced into the highways of commerce and the commercial price would then take the place of the legislative price. In a nutshell the argument results in simply this: "We can not create anything by legislation; we can not keep two kinds of money at a parity by legislative action; we can not, most powerful though we are, perform impossibilities." We can, however, do what other commercial nations have done, and that is, establish gold as a standard and coin silver as it is needed and demanded, redeeming it in gold when necessary.

My silver colleagues may say, Why was it that for two thousand three hundred years the ratio between silver and gold varied only between 11.4 to 1 and 15 to 1; and then after 1876 the ratio varied from 17.88 to 1 in that year to 35 to 1 in 1898? In the short time alloted me it is impossible to take up the argument earlier than 1803. In that year $3 worth of silver was being produced for every dollar's worth of gold. From 1809 to 1830 the world's greatest producers of silver, the South American countries, were undergoing constant upheavals and wars with each other. Silver production fell off tremendously while the production of gold actually increased. In 1848 came the discovery of gold in California, and in 1851 in Australia.

A great demand for gold was the result and the demand has continued ever since, while the demand for silver as a monetary standard has become constantly less. I do not believe this was caused by the establishment of the gold standard in Germany, the failure of the Latin Union, or the United States act of 1873; for the true explanation of the 35 to 1 ratio of 1898 is that the commercial nations of the world have adopted gold for their standard of value on account of its greater convenience, greater intrinsic value, and greater stability in price, and have discarded silver on account of its becoming more and more each day an article of commerce, and consequently more liable to fluctuations similar to those of all other articles of trade.

As an additional evidence that the commercial nations of the world have determined to no longer continue silver as a monetary standard of value I would cite that England demonetized silver in 1816; the German Empire adopted the gold basis in 1873; in 1872 the Scandinavian Union, comprising Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, was formed on a gold basis; in 1874 silver was demonetized by the Latin Union, comprising the important countries of France, Italy, Belgium, Switzerland, and Greece; in 1875 the coinage of silver was suspended by Holland; in 1876 the same was done by Russia, and in 1898 this last country adopted the gold standard. This was followed a few months later by the establishment of the gold standard in Japan. Thus we can see that the nations controlling the commerce of the world, recognizing the changed condition of commercial transactions, have decided to adopt the gold standard. It is certainly the perfection of wisdom for the United States now to fall in line, for our merchants prefer gold to silver, and that which the people want they will have; that which they do not want they will not take.

The next step in this argument is the consideration of the act of 1873. It has been called a crime, and, too, it has been ofttimes said that very few, if any, of those voting upon this measure understood its import. There never was a measure passed by Congress more fully or lengthily debated, and I have too much respect for the mentality of the Senators and Congressmen of that epoch to accuse them of not understanding the tenets of that act. The original draft of this bill was submitted to experts the world over. Their answers can easily be found in House Executive Document No. 307. I have read a great number of them, and not one, but many, responders mention that it would probably demonetize silver.

On pages 2306, 2308, volume 102, of the Congressional Globe, Mr. Hooper made a long and learned speech upon the measure and said in relation to the reduction of weight of silver dollars from 412½ to 384 grains that—

> The silver dollar of 412½ grains, by reason of its bullion or intrinsic value being greater than its nominal value, long since ceased to be a coin of circulation, and it is melted by manufacturers of silverware. It does not circulate now in commercial transactions with any country. * * *

Is not the above speech perfectly clear as to the treatment the silver dollar was to receive? Without going any deeper into the consideration of this act I simply submit the following summary of procedure of the act of 1873:

Summary of procedure—The act of 1873.

	Senate.	House.
Submitted by Secretary of the Treasury	Apr. 25, 1870	
Referred to Senate Finance Committee	Apr. 28, 1870	
500 copies ordered printed	May 2, 1870	
Submitted to House, with supplementary report and correspondence		June 25, 1870
Reported, amended, and ordered printed	Dec. 19, 1870	
Debated	Jan. 9, 1871	
Passed the Senate by vote of 36 to 14	Jan. 10, 1871	
Senate bill ordered printed		Jan. 13, 1871
Bill reported with substitute, and recommitted		Feb. 25, 1871
Original bill reintroduced and printed		Mar. 9, 1871
Reported and debated		Jan. 9, 1872
Recommitted		Jan. 10, 1872
Reported from Coinage Committee, printed, and recommitted		Feb. 9, 1872
Reported back, amended, and printed		Feb. 13, 1872
Debated		Apr. 9, 1872
Amended and passed by vote of 110 to 13		May 27, 1872
Printed in Senate	May 29, 1872	
Reported, amended, and printed	Dec. 16, 1872	
Do	Jan. 7, 1873	
Passed Senate	Jan. 17, 1873	
Printed with amendments		Jan. 21, 1873
Conference committee appointed	Jan. 27, 1873	Jan. 25, 1873
Report of conference committee presented and concurred in	Feb. 6, 1873	Feb. 7, 1873
Became a law Feb. 12, 1873		

In addition I desire to say that this bill was printed eleven times by order of Congress and twice by the deputy Comptroller of the Currency. Committees during five sessions discussed it, and 66 columns of Senatorial eloquence and 78 columns of Representative oratory were published at the time in the Congressional Globe.

Does not this debate seem to have been most exhaustive and thoroughly frank, honest, and open?

Mr. Chairman, the United States has become a great power. Our export commerce grows larger year by year and the trade balances more favorable. Our bonds and securities are held and respected in every land. Our international dealings grow more harmonious each succeeding day. Foreign capital now approaches our shores to aid in our industrial development, and the magnificence of our national dignity and preeminence demands that we pay our obligations to the world in the coin with which it pays us, and this coin is gold.

IT IS GOOD ALSO NOT TO TRY EXPERIMENTS, ETC.

My colleagues, this is not an experiment in finance; its utility is evident, and it is the reformation in the method of transacting the business of the world that has brought about the change of the money standard of the world.

Has the dollar appreciated, prices consequently falling lower and lower, or have machinery and the vast increase of production over population, with the resultant lowering of consumption, caused the decline in prices? Has the wage earner benefited or suffered on account of the increased purchasing power of the dollar? If the gold standard, upon which we practically are to-day, has been for the good of the greatest number, it has been a success; if not, a failure.

I believe, sir, that, even conceding, which I do not, that the dollar has appreciated, the laborer or wage earner has benefited more than the capitalist, for with the falling prices brought about by over and increased production to consumption and by the immutable laws of supply and demand he is able to purchase in 1899 almost double the necessities and commodities purchasable in 1873 with the same dollar; while, on the other hand, the capitalist has been forced to accept lower rates of interest upon moneys invested in various enterprises and upon real estate. Depreciation of the dollar and consequently higher prices is certain to injure the wage earner and benefit the capitalist. Wages are slow to rise and excepting in times of greatest prosperity the increase of wages to the artisan, mechanic, and clerk would not be proportionate to the increased prices asked for everything necessary for their comfort and those dependent upon them for maintenance.

One step farther. I can not see, therefore, how any of our class of citizens, farmer, manufacturer, or otherwise, could be benefited by a depreciating dollar, for the increased prices received for their products would not be more than the increase of charge for everything

they might have to buy. An eminent Democrat, Warner, said, "All trade is barter, and money is only the medium of exchange. In other words, money is only the medium through which what we sell becomes converted into what we buy." This is so clear that it requires no proof. Therefore, the wage-earner having only his skill as a medium of exchange, converts it into money. The exhaustive tables prepared by the Senate committee a few years ago proved that the wage-earner has been a great beneficiary through the present standard. In the following table prices, wages, and purchasing power are carefully and fully considered:

	1845.	1850.	1855.	1860.	1865.	1870.	1875.	1880.	1885.	1890.
Meat	79.4	86.6	104.7	100	197	174.3	140.4	103.6	107.6	99.6
Other food	82.8	80.7	114.5	100	240.3	146.3	135	116.9	97.2	103.5
Cloths and clothing	97.1	91.3	94.7	100	209.2	139.4	120.1	104.5	84.8	82.4
Fuel and lighting	.....	102.6	121.1	100	237.8	196.5	156.5	100.2	89.6	92.5
Metals and implements	110.8	114.8	117.8	100	191.4	127.8	117.5	96.3	77.4	73.2
Lumber and building materials	106.7	102.2	103.4	100	182.1	148.3	143.7	130.9	126.6	123.7
Drugs and chemicals	121	123.6	129.2	100	271.6	149.6	144.2	113.1	86.9	87.9
House furnishing	102.3	125.6	121.1	100	181.1	121.6	95	85.2	70.1	69.5
Miscellaneous	114.8	107.7	115.2	100	202.8	148.7	122.9	109.8	97.5	89.7
Average of all prices	102.8	102.3	113.1	100	216.8	142.3	127.6	103.9	93	92.3
Average of all wages	86.8	92.7	98	100	143.1	162.2	158.4	141.5	150.7	158.9
Average wages by importance	85.7	90.9	97.5	100	148.6	167.1	158	143	155.9	68.2
Salaries of city teachers	74.8	83.8	91.4	100	134.7	186.3	188.1	182.8	186.3	86.3
Paper money	100	100	100	100	49.5	81.1	88.8	100	100	100
Gold price of silver bullion in London	95.5	97.3	100	100	99	98.2	92.2	84.7	78.7	77.4
Purchasing power of wages	84.4	90.6	86.6	100	66	114.1	124.1	132.3	162	172.1

Under average of prices in 1870 as compared with 1860 as a unit, meat stood at 174.3; cloths and clothing, 139.4; house furnishings, 121.6; miscellaneous (15 articles), 148.6; average of all wages, 162.2; purchasing power of wages, 114.1.

Comparing the above with 1890, we at that time being on a gold basis, we find meat stood at 99.6; cloths and clothing, 82.4; house furnishings, 69.5; miscellaneous (15 articles), 89.7; average of all wages, 158.9; purchasing power of wages, 172.1.

To the last two items in each table I desire to call special attention. Wages decreased less than 3 per cent, while the purchasing power of the wage-earners' medium of exchange increased a trifle over 50 per cent. The truth of this economic axiom is thus demonstrated: "Appreciation of the dollar in which wages are paid, and consequently lower prices, is, therefore, constantly and certainly to the advantage of the wage-earner. Depreciation of the dollar, and consequently higher prices, is always and certainly to his damage."

Now, on the other hand, we will consider how the capitalist has been affected. He is receiving lower rates of interest upon mortgages, bonds of the United States, or bonds of any State or municipality. The census of 1880 shows that of real-estate mortgages 46.6 per cent were at 5, 6, and 7 per cent interest; 24.6 per cent at 8 per cent; 27.2 per cent at 9, 10, and 12 per cent. In 1898 it was estimated that 77 per cent of the real-estate mortgages of the United States were under 6 per cent interest—some at 3 per cent—20 per cent under 8 per cent interest, and 3 per cent over 8 per cent, the class being largely speculative mortgages. The rates of interest on railroad, Government, and other bonds in 1873 were from 6 to 10 per cent per annum, even when payable in coin, while in 1898 the rates of interest on first-class gold bonds were only from 3 to 4 per cent per annum. This interest lesson is true of every country on the gold standard, while rates of interest in silver countries have either remained stationary as compared with 1873 or else become higher. Thus the wage-earner and not the capitalist is proved to be the greatest beneficiary under the gold standard.

Depreciation in prices has been caused by increased production and decreased consumption—the old law of supply and demand again.

The thought for this argument is taken from the speech delivered in the Fifty-second Congress, March 16, 1892, by the greatest Democratic orator of recent years. Mr. Bryan said:

> You must attribute it to the inventive genius that has multiplied a thousand times in many instances the strength of a single arm, and enables us to do with one man what fifty men could not do fifty years ago. That is what has brought down prices in this country and everywhere.

The discovery of steam power and the wonderful machinery development in connection therewith has increased the productiveness of manual labor many hundredfold. The last half of this century has witnessed greater developments than any preceding five half centuries; it has brought into our economic system a condition of affairs never dreamed of by our ancestors, and it is the result of these changed conditions that forced the world to adopt a new monetary standard. The steady growth of factories and cultivated fields, increased transportation facilities, the spreading out of enterprise to all portions of the world has made competition keener than ever known in earlier times. Mulhall's statistics on the commerce of the world are so marvelous that they are like unto a fanciful story from the Arabian Nights.

Commerce of the world since 1830.

[Aggregate of imports and exports in millions of dollars.]

Country.	1830.	1840.	1850.	1860.	1870.	1880.	1890.	1897.
United Kingdom	422	547	811	1,800	2,625	3,350	3,552	3,389
France	197	317	456	801	1,089	1,627	1,493	1,450
Germany	220	249	336	624	1,017	1,411	1,761	1,986
Russia	134	158	192	230	494	629	566	618
Austria-Hungary	72	105	139	225	368	513	441	669
Italy	96	144	182	249	317	437	451	438
Spain	33	48	53	120	197	240	283	301
Portugal	14	19	24	38	48	67	86	73
Holland and Belgium	144	216	293	413	653	1,137	1,488	1,915
United States	105	197	297	653	792	1,478	1,536	1,815
Spanish America	168	230	300	451	648	768	797	826
British colonies	43	101	211	494	614	974	1,430	1,550
India	48	93	144	249	408	518	629	440
Other countries	264	323	326	853	1,200	1,351	2,287	3,020
The world	1,960	2,750	3,800	7,200	10,500	14,500	16,800	18,500

In forty-seven years—1850 to 1897—commerce increased from $3,800,000,000 to $18,500,000,000, an increase of over fourteen and a half billions of dollars, or 480 per cent. During this time, in the nine leading commercial countries of the world, the population increased only 52 per cent and the commerce 222 per cent.

[Amounts represent millions.]

Country.	1850.	1860.	1870.	1880.	1890.
Great Britain	27.7	29.3	31.8	35.2	37.9
France	35.8	37.4	36.1	37.7	38.3
Germany	32.5	35.8	41	45.2	49.4
Austria-Hungary	32	32	35.7	37.9	41.3
Italy	22.2	25.9	26.8	28.4	30.9
Belgium	4.4	4.7	5	5.5	6
Russia	74.2	81.7	86.4	102.9	117.5
Holland	3.2	3.5	3.8	4.2	4.7
United States	23.2	31.4	38.5	50.1	62.6
Total	255.2	281.4	305.1	347	388.6

The following computations show the ratio of increase in commerce and in population, respectively, on a comparison of 1854 with each of the succeeding decennial periods:

	Commerce.	Population.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*
Increase of 1864 over 1854	68.12	10.26
Increase of 1874 over 1854	172	19.55
Increase of 1884 over 1854	207	35.95
Increase of 1893 over 1854	282	52.27

The world's increase of supply in four branches of commerce is given in the following table:

Products.	1840.	1850.	1890.	1898.
Coal.....tons..	.....	81,000,000	520,000,000	630,000,000
Iron.....do...	.....	4,422,000	27,157,000	36,570,000
Steel.....do...	.....	71,000	.....	24,000,000
Cotton.....million pounds..	1,310	.....	(1897) 5,900	.....

These Aladdin-like figures show most clearly why prices have fallen—population increasing about 55 per cent since 1850, commerce increasing 408 per cent. Prices remained higher prior to 1873 unquestionably because millions of dollars were being expended and thousands of men employed (in fact, the demand for labor was greater than supply) in the construction of the enterprises which made the later development and overproduction of commerce a certainty. The following table (Mulhall's) on the increase of steam power is a volume of argument in itself:

The world's steam power since 1840.

	Horsepower.
1840	1,650,000
1850	3,960,000
1860	9,380,000
1870	18,460,000
1880	34,150,000
1890	50,150,000
1896	66,100,000

From 1,650,000 horsepower in 1840 to 66,100,000 horsepower in 1896.

Thus the statement of Mr. Bryan that inventive genius has brought down prices everywhere is absolutely demonstrated.

I regret that I have not had time for the discussion of the Gresham law; the great increase in production of the gold supply of the world, which has created an exceedingly strong influence toward my support of this bill, or our commerce with gold-standard countries as compared with the commerce of silver-standard countries. In Appendixes A and B will be found the figures on production and commerce in extenso. In conclusion of this, the theoretical argument, I will only add that in the next century the United States, located midway between Europe and Asia, will become the financial center of the world if now we establish firmly the gold standard.

"IN ALL TIMES AND CIRCUMSTANCES HIS SPIRIT SHOULD BE LOYAL."

I am proud that I owe allegiance to the Democratic party; and, sir, in earnestness of loyalty to the principles of that party there is not a Democrat on the floor of this House more sincere than am I. I am proud, too, of the history of the Democracy. It is older than any other political party in this union of States. It has many great victories recorded to its credit, and while it has suffered severe defeats, it mattered not how crushing the blow or wild the tempest, it has weathered every political storm, and in the campaign soon to occur, if the wise leaders among the silver and gold wings of the party will but unite on the broad lines of Democratic compromise, conciliation, concession, we will march in serried ranks to the polls next November and give to the opposition party a battle royal.

The Democratic party, win or lose in 1900, will not be destroyed, for those fundamental principles enunciated by Jefferson, reaffirmed by Jackson, and reiterated by the Democratic national convention of 1876 are the political sheet anchors of our hope for the twentieth century. And these principles are, the recognition of equal rights and justice to all classes of our people; one law for the rich man and the laborer alike; no governmental paternalism to assist in the material wealth of the individual, but the granting of opportunity to all men to work out their own successes without governmental aid or restriction as long as the rights of every other individual are sacredly respected; freedom of speech, the press, religion, and debate, and the honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith. These, my colleagues, are the indestructible planks of the Democratic platform of principles, and Jefferson, the greatest of all Democrats, summed them up in this paragraph:

They should be the creed of our political faith, the text of civic instruction, the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust; and should we wander from them in moments of error or alarm, let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety.—*Richardson's Messages and Papers*, Volume 1, page 324.

I am equally proud of the great men who have made the Democracy famous in the history of our country—Jefferson, Randolph, Madison, Jackson, Benton, Monroe, Polk, Calhoun, Seymour, Tilden, and Russell of Massachusetts. Many of these men were, however, not in harmony with their party on every proposition. Randolph fought the foreign policy of Jefferson and the Democracy in and out of Congress; Calhoun was bitterly opposed to the Mexican war and the policy of his party and President Polk in connection therewith; Randall, though elected by his colleagues to the great office of Speaker of the House of Representatives, was an outspoken advocate of a protective tariff, in opposition to the views held by his party; and William E. Russell, the idol of the Massachusetts Democracy, was opposed to the financial plank of the Chicago platform. These great men all thought they were right, and they have never been considered less the adherents of Democracy for their action; so the right taken by them I take now, and that right is simply what I consider for the best interests of my Democratic constituents.

The Democratic party prior to 1896 was always known as the hard-money party, and I propose to show that were the illustrious men whom I have mentioned alive at the present time they would have been gold bugs, if I may use that term. I also propose to show from the planks of the platform of every Democratic convention from 1836 to 1892, wherever finance is mentioned it carries with it a demand for upholding the national credit. I also desire to quote the actual language of Jefferson, Jackson, Benton, Tilden, and Russell.

Jefferson said:

Just principles will lead us to disregard legal proportions altogether; to inquire into the market price of gold in the several countries with which we shall principally be connected in commerce and to take an average from them.

Note here the words "disregard legal proportion" and "market price." Jefferson apparently did not believe in legislative ability to keep up or make a ratio between gold and silver. He also said:

The laws are consequently so formed and administered as to bear with equal weight and favor on all, restraining no man in the pursuits of honest industry, and securing to everyone the property which that acquires.—*Richardson's Messages and Papers*, Volume I, page 407.

Free coinage, reducing the purchasing power of the dollar, would certainly not be securing to our millions of savings-banks depositors the property which they have acquired.

President Madison said (page 467, Volume I, Richardson's Messages and Papers), in his first inaugural message:

Indulging no passion which trespasses on the rights or the repose of other nations, it has been the true glory of the United States to cultivate peace by observing justice.

A few lines further on in the same document he said the United States should—

preserve in their full energy the other salutary provisions in behalf of private and personal rights, and should promote by authorized means improvements friendly to external as internal commerce.

The gold standard certainly harmonizes most thoroughly with these statements.

President Jackson said, in describing the money of the Constitution (page 586, Volume II, Richardson's Messages and Papers):

Congress have established a mint to coin money and passed laws to regulate the value thereof. The money so coined, with its value so regulated, and such foreign coins as Congress may adopt are the only currency known to the Constitution.

Gentlemen, is it not easy to see from this that the money coined at the mints—gold, silver, nickel, and copper alike—is the money of the Constitution? The bill under consideration does not depart from the Constitution, but makes the money of the Constitution more valuable to all the people, for it bases it upon the most stable and reliable standard, gold. [Applause.]

Jackson's eighth annual message, pages 246, 247, Richardson's Messages and Papers:

It is apparent from the whole context of the Constitution, as well as the history of the times which gave birth to it, that it was the purpose of the convention to establish a currency consisting of the precious metals. These, from their peculiar properties which render them the standards of value in all other countries, were adopted in this as well to establish its commercial standard in reference to foreign countries by a permanent rule as to exclude the use of a mutable medium of exchange. Such as of certain agricultural commodities recognized by the statutes of some States as a tender for debts or the still more pernicious expedient of a paper currency. * * *

Variableness must ever be the characteristic of a currency of which the precious metals are not the chief ingredient, or which can be expanded or contracted without regard to the principles which regulate the value of those metals as a standard in the general trade of the world. With us bank issues constitute such a currency, and must ever do so until they are made dependent on those just proportions of gold and silver as a circulating medium which experience has proved to be necessary not only in this but in all other commercial nations. * * *

When thus, by the depreciation in consequence of the quantity of paper in circulation, wages as well as prices become exorbitant, it is soon found that the whole effect of the adulteration is a tariff on our home industry for the benefit of the countries where gold and silver circulate and maintain uniformity and moderation in prices.

Note carefully that President Jackson said "just proportions of gold and silver." This is so absolutely clear and plain that it requires no further argument.

President Jackson's fight against the United States Bank was solely on account of the political machine it established, the careless handling of the public moneys, the recklessness of the officers, and the fluctuating value of the paper money. In no manner was it a fight against gold or silver at any ratio, but against an unreliable paper money. President Jackson said in his message December 2, 1834:

The progress of our gold coinage is creditable to the officers of the Mint and promises, too, in a short period to furnish the country with a sound and portable currency.

Not a word here about silver. I sincerely wish that all classes of Democrats could read all President Jackson's financial messages. No evening could be more profitably spent, for there is a vast amount of wisdom in each and every one of them.

We now come to what another great Democrat had to say on the subject, and I allude to Senator Benton, of Missouri, who said, in the Twenty-fourth Congress, second session, January, 1837 (Appendix to the Congressional Globe, page 146):

Gold is the enemy of paper; it keeps it down when the paper has a right to demand gold; and thus a paper currency founded upon gold, as it is in England, will always be kept more within bounds than a paper currency founded upon silver. Silver is too cumbersome to hold paper in check. A person would not wish to change even a twenty-dollar note into silver to carry in his pocket, but would gladly change it into gold.

If this quotation does not declare and make Senator Benton a Gold Democrat, my understanding of the English language is most faulty.

The longest message ever sent to Congress on a financial subject was that of President Van Buren to the special session of Congress, convened September 4, 1837. (Richardson's Messages and Papers, Volume III, pages 324-346.) It is too long for me even to attempt any quotations; and as each paragraph depends on the other for connected sense and argument, I would be forced to quote the entire message, so I therefore simply allude to it.

The money planks of the convention of 1876 were drawn by Samuel J. Tilden, and to them I will refer under national-convention planks.

William E. Russell, in the convention at Chicago, 1896, said:

I did not believe I should have lived to see the day when these great principles (the fundamental) would be forgotten in a Democratic convention.

Governor Russell thought, as do I, that the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 was a departure from Democratic principles.

These are a few of the utterances of great Democrats upon the financial question. Next I desire to give in full every plank of every Democratic national platform that can, in any manner, be construed as alluding to the financial question. Prior to 1848 no declaration in the platforms were made on the currency. In this year, however, at a Democratic convention held at Baltimore, the eighth plank of the platform, among other declarations, said:

That the fruits of the great political triumph of 1844 have fulfilled the hopes of the Democracy of the Union in protecting the currency and labor of the country from ruinous fluctuation.—*Stanwood's History of Presidential Elections*, page 109.

This is a simple declaration of pride on the part of the Democracy of 1848 in the fact that the currency was protected from ruinous fluctuations.

In the Charleston convention of 1860 the first plank of the platform was:

Democratic principles are unchangeable in their nature when applied to the same subject-matter.

Mr. Chairman, this plank of thirty-nine years ago exactly expresses my sentiments to-day, for I do not believe that any of the fundamental principles of a party can be changed by the dictum of a single national convention.

In the convention of 1868, held in Tammany Hall, New York City, on the 4th day of July, the fifth plank was:

One currency for the Government and the people, the laborer and the officeholder, the pensioner and the soldier, the producer and the bondholder.

The sixth plank contained this:

The credit of the Government and the currency made good.

This declaration meant most absolutely that the currency of the people was to be the best obtainable and of equal standing and equal value with every other currency the world over, and the credit of the Government was to be unimpeachable in the eyes of the nations of the world without equivocation and without technical declaration.

In the Greeley campaign the Liberal Republican convention at Cincinnati, in plank 7, said:

The public credit must be sacredly maintained, and we denounce repudiation in every form and guise.

I have simply quoted this plank from this platform because many Democrats of that day voted for Mr. Greeley. The straight Democratic convention at Louisville, however, in its fourth plank, resolved:

That the Democratic party is held together by the cohesion of time-honored principles which they will never surrender in exchange for all the offices which a President can confer.

Are not hard money, a stable currency, and a nonfluctuating standard time-honored principles of the Democratic party?

We now arrive at the great platform of the Democracy for the year 1876, and I believe that with the exception of Jefferson's original declaration of faith, the greatest platform ever adopted by the Democracy, the greatest declaration of principle was that of the convention of 1876. As said before, Mr. Tilden drafted the following planks, and I would ask you, my colleagues, to consider well their import:

Reform is necessary to establish a sound currency, restore the public credit, and maintain the national honor. We denounce the failure, for all these eleven years of peace, to make good the promise of the legal-tender note, which are a changing standard of value in the hands of the people. * * * We denounce that party which has made no advance toward resumption * * * and, while annually professing to intend a speedy return to specie payments, has annually enacted fresh hindrances thereto. We denounce the resumption clause of the act of 1875 and demand its repeal.

We demand a system of preparation by wise finance which shall enable the nation soon to assure the world of its perfect ability and its perfect readiness to meet any of its promises at the call of the creditor entitled to payment. We believe such a system, * * * creating at no time an artificial scarcity of currency, and at no time alarming the public mind into a withdrawal of that vaster machinery of credit, by which 95 per cent of all business transactions are performed—a system open, public, and inspiring general confidence—* * * would * * * renew in all its natural resources the prosperity of the people.

During the deliberations of this national Democratic convention on the 28th of June, 1876, Sunset Cox, of New York, said in a speech delivered before the delegates in convention assembled, and in speaking of the redemption law, that—

I voted in the committee to which I belong for the repeal of the redemption law. [Loud applause.] I voted for it because it did not provide for the resumption of a specie payment. It provided for silver, and we passed silver bills for change. They (meaning the Republicans) were afraid to take the responsibility, and we (Congress) demonetized silver, but it is a different thing as to gold and resumption.—*From the New York Herald*, June 28, 1876.

I also desire to refer to a speech of Senator Voorhees, of Indiana, in the same convention, in the second column, page 4, New York Herald, June 29, 1876, where he practically declares for the gold standard.

There can be no misconstruction, no misunderstanding of what this means; for as the bright stars of heaven shine out as beautiful beacons in the sky, so do these marvelous planks stand out as the brightest stars in the sky of the Democracy. The financial planks here drafted were culled from seventy years of Democratic wisdom upon the subject, and where Samuel J. Tilden stood in 1876 I stand now, and am not ashamed to acknowledge it either here or before my constituents.

We now come to the election of 1880. The Democratic convention of that year was held at Cincinnati on the 22d of June, and the third plank of the platform was:

We demand honest money, consisting of gold and silver and paper convertible into coin on demand; the strict maintenance of the public faith, State and national.

The legal ratio between gold and silver in that year was very much nearer the commercial ratio than it is to-day, and then silver was infinitely a more honest money than it is at the present time.

The next Democratic convention was held at Chicago, July 8, 1884, and in the third plank of that platform we find the following:

We believe in honest money, the gold and silver coinage of the Constitution, and a circulating medium convertible into such money without loss.

Note now that it was in this selection that the first direct "straddle" plank on the money question was made, and the plank just quoted clearly showed that the Democracy of that time had serious doubts of the possibility and practicability of gold and silver circulating as money without loss, one to the other.

In the convention of 1888 at St. Louis, the 5th of June, we note a strange fact, that no mention whatever is made in the platform on the currency question.

We now draw down to the convention of 1892, and plank 7 of that platform reads as follows:

We denounce the Republican legislation known as the Sherman Act of 1890 as a cowardly makeshift, fraught with possibility of danger in the future which should make all its supporters, as well as its author, anxious for its speedy repeal. We hold to the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country and to the coinage of both gold and silver without discrimination against either metal or charge for mintage.

Now note this remarkable declaration:

But the dollar unit of coinage of both metals must be of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, or be adjusted through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as shall insure the maintenance of the parity of the two metals, and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the market and in payment of debts; and we demand that all paper currency shall be kept at par with and redeemable in such coins.

Note "redeemable in such coin;" that is, a coin having a parity equal in every market of the world.

We insist upon this policy as specially necessary for the protection of the farmers and laboring classes, the first and most defenseless victims of unstable money and a fluctuating currency.

Upon this plank and one other, the tariff for revenue only, we went before the country and won the greatest victory in the history of the Democracy since the election of President Monroe.

Between 1890 and 1892 the storm clouds commenced to gather. A new movement has sprung up in the West, growing stronger, apparently, day by day. And this movement finally crystallized into the People's Party. In 1892 it held its first convention at Omaha, on July 2. And we now notice for the first time in American politics the most radical declaration ever made by any of all the parties which have existed since the commencement of our Government, and this departure was the following extreme declaration of the Populists on the money question:

Plank A.—We demand the free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the present legal ratio of 16 to 1.

We now approach the Chicago platform, and in that platform, in the third plank, we find that the great Democratic party has taken verbatim the plank of the Populist party of 1892 on the currency question, and that plank is:

We demand the free and unlimited coinage of both silver and gold at the present legal ratio of 16 to 1.

As shown before from the extensive quotations which I have made from the various national platforms of the Democratic party, no such departure ever occurred before. In conclusion, my colleagues, I simply desire to point out to you the fruits of the election of 1896. We lost New York State by over 260,000; New Jersey, which never but once before went for a Republican candidate for President, by over 80,000; Connecticut by over 50,000, and in addition Kentucky, Maryland, Delaware, West Virginia, and Indiana were placed in the Republican column.

The popular majority throughout the whole Union, 600,000 against us, was the greatest ever recorded against any party in this country. Above all else the Democracy has to-day not a governor, not a State legislature, not a United States Senator, in or from any State north of Virginia and Kentucky or east of the Mississippi River. No such condition of affairs existed before in our political history, for in the war election of 1864 New Jersey, Delaware, and Kentucky held true to the Democracy, and several Democratic governors and legislatures were elected. Even in the disastrous Greeley campaign of 1872 Delaware cast its vote for the regular Democratic candidate, Mr. Hendricks. The year 1896 was indeed a disastrous year for the Democracy.

My Democratic colleagues, I plead with you to meet the gold Democrats part way. We do not ask an ell; we will accept an inch, for the Democratic party has a great mission to perform. It must be more than a minority party; it must be a strong and pow-

erful opposition party, for the best interests of the country can only be served by having the only two great parties, the Democratic and the Republican, so closely matched in voting strength that when one does wrong the other will win.

Drop the free and unlimited coinage of silver at a ratio of 16 to 1 from the next national platform, and we can win. Drop it not, and we will as certainly lose. Instead of rainbow chasing in Republican States, why not bring back into line the Democratic States of New Jersey, Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, Kentucky, West Virginia, and New York? [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. POWERS] is recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, the only fault that I could possibly find with the bill under consideration lies in the fact that it is not quite drastic enough. The bill in one of its sections provides that the greenbacks, so called, may be taken to the Treasury and reissued in exchange for gold. If I had my way in respect to the greenback, I would provide that when it is returned to the Treasury and paid in gold it should be canceled, and I should insist at this time upon a provision of that kind if I could see any way by which the currency of the country could be preserved in its present volume and no contraction take place by reason of such cancellation.

The greenback was never anything but a mere promissory note. It was issued when the Government was in extremis. The Government was compelled to raise men for its Army, to equip them, to provide for a great variety of expenditures that could not be met by the ordinary currency in circulation, and it was therefore necessary to make a forced loan, to issue to the creditor of the Government a promissory note, payable to bearer, and having in it the quality of legal tender, so that the creditor of the Government might compel his creditor to accept it and thus make it current in the ordinary business transactions of the people. But it never lost its character as a note. It never was money except as it was compelled to be by the necessities of the case. Therefore, when it comes back to the Treasury, whence it was issued, I would pay it according to its terms and cancel it.

But, sir, I am aware, as this committee who framed this bill was doubtless aware, that there is a very tender sentiment toward the greenback; that it was issued in time of war, and it has been frequently said that it carried us through the greatest war in modern times. A veneration for it has sprung up, and probably no bill, as I would like this bill, that should provide for its retirement could be passed through either House of Congress. So I content myself by observing that we must accept this bill in all its essential details. Legislators can never seek for the highest possible good, but we are to seek for the highest good possible; and in this case, if we can take the greenback to the Treasury and receive gold for it and then take our gold to the Treasury and receive greenbacks, I suppose no possible harm will be done.

Now, sir, the two leading features in the bill are, first, to establish by positive legislative act the gold standard, and, secondly, a provision that the national-banking system shall be preserved by giving to it some more favorable consideration than the present law accords to it. The gold standard is to be established by a positive enactment of law. It has practically been in force half a century. We propose now to have no lingering doubts about it in the minds of our creditors, domestic or foreign, but it will be understood by all persons who see fit to invest in our securities that gold is the money of payment which this Government is pledged to, and there never shall be any question in respect thereto.

We have been dealing with this silver question for twenty years or more. We have done everything in the world to please our friends who are interested in silver mining. We have done everything to please our friends who believe in cheap money. We took a step in that direction when we passed the Bland Act in 1878, which it was fondly hoped would bring some relief. It was a stupendous blunder. The Sherman Act of 1890, which it was supposed would compose all the ills that the financial situation was then laboring under, was another stupendous blunder. The time has at last come when blunders must cease, and we must plant our currency on a bed rock from which it can never be removed; and that is proposed to be done in this bill by removing all possible question in the minds of all people as to the standard by which we propose to live hereafter in this Republic.

Now, then, it is said by our friends on the other side that it is a mistake to adopt the gold standard. Well, what do you propose? Criticism is never good for anything unless it suggests a remedy. The remedy which you propose is the free coinage of silver. There is no question about that. The newspaper press that represents your views, your probable candidate for the Presidency, every utterance that comes from your leaders, all point in one single direction—to the free coinage of silver. Now, then, I maintain that that remedy is altogether worse than the establishment of the gold standard which you complain of and worse than the existing conditions of uncertainty. What is free coinage of silver? What does it mean for this country? All the silver dollars that we now have in circulation were coined on Government account. They have the United States Government behind them. The Government issued them in the first instance, and if there never had been a word said upon the subject, the mere fact that they put those dollars out carries with it an implied obligation to make them good.

The Government has gone further than that, because it has repeatedly declared that the silver issue, and all other issues, shall be maintained at a parity. So that the silver dollar now in circulation, put out by the Government, is just exactly as good as gold. But that is not what you propose. You do not propose to have a silver dollar with the Government standing behind it. You propose to have free coinage. You propose to give to every individual mine owner who takes silver ore out of his mine the right to go to the mints of the Government and have his bullion manufactured into dollars free of expense to him, and then allow him to take those dollars away and put them in circulation. The Government is not behind those dollars.

Nobody is behind them except the silver mine owner, and he is not required to redeem them. If they pass into circulation in the country, they have got to go into circulation on their own intrinsic merits. They do not have the benefit of the Government fiat behind them. If an old lady had a silver teapot or spoon holder that she wanted to have coined, she could go to the mint and have it coined into dollars and take those dollars away. When she has that product made into money and she takes the dollars home and puts them in circulation nobody is behind those dollars except the old woman, and she is not required to make them good. That is the trouble with the free coinage of silver. There is no support given to the dollar. It must circulate on its intrinsic merits, and these are only 50 cents on the dollar, whereas the silver dollar as now put out and issued by the Government circulates at a hundred cents, because it has 50 cents of Government fiat behind it.

Mr. TERRY. I would like to ask the gentleman a short question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Vermont yield to the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. POWERS. I never knew my friend from Arkansas to ask a short question, yet I will give him the opportunity now. [Laughter.]

Mr. TERRY. Suppose we were to close the mints against the free coinage of gold, what do you suppose would be the intrinsic value of the thin bit of gold that you call a gold dollar?

Mr. POWERS. I suppose the gold in a gold dollar is worth 100 cents whether in the shape of a gold dollar or whether it has been through fire and is in a molten shape or wherever you put it.

Mr. TERRY. What makes it worth 100 cents except the fact that it is used in coinage?

Mr. POWERS. Because it is intrinsically worth 100 cents. It will make bosom pins, watches, and a thousand other things.

Mr. TERRY. How great is the use of watches, bosom pins, and such things compared with its use for coinage? If you cut off the demand for coinage purposes, would not it enormously decrease the demand for gold and consequently its value? Will the gentleman chew on that a while? [Laughter.]

Mr. POWERS. Now, Mr. Chairman, having chewed on that a while, I come to the proposition in this bill as it is presented to this committee to put this Government, in all its fiscal affairs, on a gold standard. In other words, you propose, and I do you no injustice when I say it, because I notice the gentleman from Missouri this afternoon took pains to quote that wonderful saying that made the Democratic candidate so prominent, about the crown of thorns—I say you propose to give to the people of this country a dollar that is intrinsically worth only 50 cents. The proposition in this bill is to give the people of this country a dollar intrinsically worth 100 cents, worth that in this country or any other country. Go to London, Berlin, Manila, you may take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, and the dollar that we propose to give you will buy you a 100-cent dinner wherever you may have occasion to eat.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman allow me to ask one little question?

Mr. POWERS. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. If the bill passes, will it not be harder for the slaves in Sulu to purchase their freedom?

Mr. POWERS. Well, my friend is getting onto a subject a little outside of this. I suppose my friend is an antiexpansionist, and as he has taken considerable interest in the people of the Sulus I will leave him to deal with the money question when we get them in. We propose to give an honest dollar. Is not that the best for this country? Is it not the best for every class of people in this country? Why, you gentlemen would rather have a double eagle in your pocket than twenty silver dollars. Your candidate for President, if the public press is to be believed, lately made a large investment in gold-bearing bonds, which shows how much faith he has in the gold dollar. I am told that the leading free-silver statesmen in the West that have large means when

they make their contracts to be paid in the future always put in a clause that they shall be payable in gold, and that shows what the faith of those people is in this matter.

Therefore I think we may safely say that we are trying to accomplish the greatest good for the greatest number when we are seeking to continue the best possible kind of money that can be circulated. The proposition for free coinage is to carry it on without the aid or consent of any other nation, as if the United States of America was going to do all its business within its own borders. We have to trade with every other civilized nation of the earth. We are trying to extend that trade by every conceivable process of statesmanship that we can invoke. Do you expect if we extend our trade that foreigners will take a currency worth only 50 cents on a dollar? If they do, we shall have to pay double price for their goods.

Now, then, the second feature of the bill which commends itself to my judgment is that section which gives the national bank the right to increase its circulation to a parity with its bonds. And the best part of that argument, in my mind, is the fact that it makes the establishment of State banks impossible. The national banking system is the best system ever devised for the people of this country. I am aware that eminent gentlemen on the other side of the House, and I suppose some on this side, are in favor of State banking institutions. Eminent financial men have applied themselves to the framing of a bill for the purpose of banking by States upon commercial assets. But, sir, I am old enough to remember some of the evils of the State banking system. I believe in the national banking system; I believe in the system that has the supervision and control of the National Government; and the highest benefits that such a system can give is to the bill holders and the great mass of the people.

We have 75,000,000 people in this country, and 74,000,000 of them have no interest whatever in any national bank or any other bank except that the bills issued and paid to them for services, for wages, or for commodities sold by them shall be good where they are circulated. A national-bank bill circulates as readily in Texas or California as in the State of its issue. A bank bill issued in Vermont is good in any other State in the Union. No man looks at the bill when he receives it to see where it comes from. It is a matter of indifference. He knows the bill is good wherever it goes. He simply sees that it is a national-bank bill, and it carries the evidence of its value upon its face, an evidence that can not be ignored.

Now, you can not use a bank bill issued by a private banking institution a hundred and fifty miles from the point of its issue. There will always be a question as to its value. The effect of the bill giving the banks an opportunity to enlarge their circulation and relieve them from the tax heretofore operating against the circulation will preserve the system itself and enhance the volume of the currency.

There is another excellent feature in this section of the bill to which I wish to allude briefly, and that is the method by which you tax the national banks. The present system of a tax on the circulation itself drives it out; it contracts the circulation, because the tax is a heavy one. There is not a bank in the country to-day, I will assert, which has in circulation all the money that it would be entitled to circulate, because it can not afford to pay the tax upon it. The tax of 1 per cent is a very large burden upon the circulation of the banks.

Now, you put the principle on a right footing when you say we will tax the franchises, the capital, the surplus, and the undivided earnings of the bank in place of the circulation itself. You reach the money in the banks by this system without impairing the circulation. Take, for instance, the Chemical Bank of New York, which has a capital of $300,000 and has some twenty millions of deposit. It issues no money; it has no notes in circulation; but under the operation of this bill it may do so without any difficulty whatever. Under the present law that bank pays no taxes to the Government. Under the proposed bill it will pay on its capital surplus and net earnings. Under the proposed bill all national banks will be tempted to take out circulation to the par of their bonds already on hand, and this alone will increase the volume of the currency over $20,000,000.

If the proposal to refund the outstanding bonds of the Government which mature in the next seven or eight years be adopted, banks will doubtless take the new issue as a basis for a still further and greatly increased circulation. That a bond paying 2 per cent interest, payable in express terms in gold coin and running fifty years, can be floated at par no one doubts.

The bill therefore promises great relief to those sections of the country which suffer from lack of currency and at the same time supplies a currency as good as gold. More than 350 national banks have become insolvent in the last thirty years, but no bill holder has ever lost a penny. When we contrast this record with that of any system of State banks ever yet devised, it demonstrates the wisdom of banking upon Government bonds rather than upon such commercial assets as the State would be likely to supply.

National-bank bills circulate freely wherever the American flag floats; State-bank bills continually suffer from an acute attack of homesickness. Besides, if each State is to determine the quality of the assets that shall be pledged for the redemption of its bank issues, our Populistic friends, if in control, will be likely to select assets that have no intrinsic value in their zeal to make something out of nothing.

It has been argued here to-day that this bill will place in the the hands of the national banks the entire control of the fiscal interests of the people. Just how such control is to be gained is not pointed out. Will some gentleman who says this be kind enough to point out how the national banks can get any control of his business or mine that could not as easily be secured by State banks? Either bank must of necessity be the servant of the people, and not their master. Either is seeking the patronage of the people, and will therefore be on its good behavior in order to gain it.

Banks of either kind can prosper only as the people are satisfied with their management. Will they lock their vaults and refuse to loan their funds and thus bring distress to the people? You might as well say that the merchant with a store full of goods will decline to sell them in order to distress his customers. Self interest will always avert such dangers.

The demand for State banks is only one phase of the cry for cheap money. It comes from the same source as the cry for the coinage of 50-cent dollars or the demand for irredeemable paper issues. Our people have repudiated all these Populistic demands. It only remains for us to plant ourselves upon the rock of honest money.

The bill under consideration is demanded by the conditions that surround us. Never in our history has such prosperity visited the homes of all our people. Let us, then, make this prosperity secure by giving to the wage-earners, the farmer, the manufacturer, and the tradesmen a dollar that will not disappoint him. Let us remove all those uncertainties respecting our currency that have rested for years like a nightmare upon our business interests. If gold is the recognized standard among the leading nations of the world we can not set it at defiance. We can easily secure our share of the world's supply. Our increasing exports will show the balance of trade on the right side.

Our vast volume of corporate and municipal bonds, with their higher interest rates and their unequaled security, all payable in gold coin, will outbid all other securities in the confidence of investors. The election of President McKinley was a powerful factor in the strengthening of our credit in the exchanges of the world. It was strong evidence that payments by our people were to be made in gold, the only payment that will make international transactions continuously possible.

If now we follow up the advantage gained by that election with the passage of the pending bill we will dispel all fears that our national obligations can be dishonored, and give to business ventures a new hope, to labor a better grounded and more contented faith, and to the new-born prosperity of all our people a better assured endurance.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, a large part of the time allotted to the discussion of this most important measure will, I assume, be occupied by members of the committee which framed it and by members of the House who have served upon the Committee on Banking and Currency. It is proper that this should be so.

For months and years they have been giving unselfishly of their time and efforts in the conscientious investigation and study of the currency question, and are fitted to discuss thoroughly and in detail the important features of this bill. In the short time given to me I do not take the floor with the expectation that I can add much of value to the discussion, but I should not be true to my own feelings nor to the constituency I represent if I did not take advantage of the opportunity offered me to express my appreciation of the work so faithfully performed by the committee, to state my gratification at the fact that this bill is being considered so promptly by the House, and to express publicly my hearty indorsement and approval of the measure itself.

The Republican party, of which I am proud to be a member, has fairly earned the reputation of being a party which does something—which not only makes promises, but keeps them. Throughout its entire life it has shown a steadfast purpose to be true to pledges solemnly made to the people of these United States. One of the pledges made during the Presidential campaign of 1896 was that the Wilson bill should be repealed and a protective-tariff measure be enacted. Without unnecessary delay the President immediately, upon his inauguration, summoned Congress in extraordinary session. The Dingley bill became a law. It was a bill which protected the interests of our manufacturers, our farmers, and our workingmen.

Confidence was restored to business. It is entirely within bounds to say that the prosperity existing throughout our country to-day is unparalleled in its history. The President of the United States in his message to this Congress has called attention

to the great increase in the volume and value of our foreign commerce; to the fact that the combined imports and exports for the year are the largest ever shown by a single year in all our history. He stated that our exports for 1899 alone exceeded by more than a billion dollars our imports and exports combined in 1870; that the imports per capita are 20 per cent less than in 1870, while the exports per capita are 58 per cent more than in 1870, and he cites the especially gratifying and significant fact that the only years when the product of our manufactures sold abroad exceeded those bought abroad were 1898 and 1899.

Another solemn promise made by the Republican party during the campaign of 1896 was that "it would remain unalterably opposed to every measure calculated to debase our currency or impair the credit of the country," and that it would keep all our currency as good as gold. The resolution adopted by the Republican party at its national convention that year was as follows:

> All our silver and paper currency must be maintained at parity with gold, and we favor all measures designed to maintain inviolably the obligations of the United States, and all our money, whether coin or paper, at the present standard, the standard of the most enlightened nations of the earth.

Whether the free and unlimited coinage of silver at a ratio of 16 to 1 should be the monetary policy of this country was submitted to the people in the great campaign of 1896 and decided by them in no uncertain tones. They were convinced that such free and unlimited coinage of silver cheated the depositors in our savings banks; that it would lessen the value of the pension of the veterans whose advanced years and increasing disabilities necessitated an increase rather than a decrease of the amount received from the Government; that it would reduce by more than 50 per cent the compensation paid to the wage-earners of this country, and that it would bring absolute demoralization to our business interests. Since that verdict was rendered there has been no question as to the position of the Republican party. It has been and is unqualifiedly in favor of the maintenance of the gold standard. It has held that upon the maintenance of that standard depended our prosperity and the welfare of our people. It has been its aim to adhere to a policy which would have American labor paid in the best money in the world.

In a message to Congress, submitted July 24, 1897, President McKinley said:

> Nothing was settled more clearly at the late national election than the determination upon the part of the people to keep their currency stable in value and equal to that of the most advanced nations of the world.

When in 1898 a Democratic Senate adopted a resolution declaring that "it is not in violation of the public faith or in derogation of the rights of the public creditor to restore silver to free coinage at 16 to 1 as a legal tender in payment of the principal and interest of the public debt," a Republican House of Representatives defeated that resolution by a party vote and kept its faith with the people. The resolution was a direct assault upon the public credit of the United States, a desperate effort to establish a policy by which our Government bonds should be paid in a depreciated silver currency.

It was not long after that resolution was offered in Congress that we were plunged into war and our people had a chance to gratefully realize what it meant to a country in time of trial to have a high public credit. At a time like that there is nothing save the valor and patriotism of the people themselves which so sustains a nation. A high public credit permits a government to equip armies, to build ships, to buy ammunition and supplies, and sustain itself, if need be, through long years of warfare until a triumphant peace is secured. It certainly should not be difficult to convince a citizen of Massachusetts who remembers the history of his own State in this respect of the fact that it pays for a State to maintain its credit and conduct its affairs with scrupulous honor.

During the civil war it did not pay the interest on its bonds in depreciated paper money as it might, but in gold. And it was not many years ago that Massachusetts bonds sold in the open market at a higher price than the bonds of the National Government. This is still more significant when we remember that our State bonds were subject to taxation. Then, too, a high public credit saves many millions of dollars to the people, because the Government is enabled to borrow money at a lower rate of interest. It is well for us at this time, when the Government can borrow money at so low a rate of interest, to remember the rates paid by President Cleveland, rates which he was compelled to pay, because it was understood that his party would, if it had the power, force the creditor to take depreciated silver in payment of the principal and interest on those bonds.

The higher rate of interest which we were obliged to pay at that time meant an added tax upon the people amounting to many millions of dollars. Yes, honesty is the best policy. It has been well said "that as no man in his individual transactions can afford to cheat or defraud his creditor, so no great nation like the United States can afford to deal otherwise than honestly with its creditor." On January 27, 1898, President McKinley said:

> That the United States Government would not permit a doubt to exist anywhere concerning the stability and integrity of its currency or the inviolability of its obligations of every kind. Whatever effort therefore is required to make the settlement of this vital question clear and conclusive for all time we are bound in good conscience to undertake and, if possible, to realize. It will not suffice for citizens nowadays to say simply that they are in favor of sound money. That is not enough. The people's purpose must be given the vitality of public law.

For the first time since 1896 the Republican party has a majority in the Senate and House of Representatives. This is the first opportunity it has had to enact a measure of monetary reform. It presses forward eagerly to the enactment of such a measure which will give to the people's purpose the vitality of public law. When the bill now under consideration, being a bill "to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States," is passed, as it will be by the close of the present week, then the Republicans of the House will have kept full faith and credit with the people and will have done their part in establishing the present gold dollar as the unit of value, and providing that all forms of our money shall be maintained at a parity.

The report submitted by the committee which framed this measure clearly states that in the consideration of the question it did not seek to arrange a complete scheme of finance, but that it confined its recommendations to those subjects of most pressing demand. The report states that in the opinion of the committee the most urgent subject was the question of a monetary standard and provision for its maintenance. The purpose of that committee, "to strengthen the public credit by the removal of all doubt concerning the policy and practice of the Government relative to the unit of value," and to provide "a complete guaranty of the quality and parity of all our money," has been admirably carried out in the bill now under consideration. Section 1 of the bill provides that the standard unit of value shall be the dollar, which shall consist of 25.8 grains of gold.

Section 2 provides that all interest-bearing obligations of the United States, all United States notes and Treasury notes, shall be deemed and held to be payable in the gold coin of the United States, as defined in section 1; and that all other obligations, public and private, for the payment of money shall be performed in conformity with the standard established in said section.

Section 3 provides for a division of issue and redemption in the Treasury Department, where the business of issuing and redeeming notes may be transacted; and provides for the retention in this division of a reserve fund equal to 25 per cent of the amount, both of United States notes and Treasury notes, issued under the act of July 14, 1890, outstanding, for the purpose of redeeming greenbacks and Treasury notes when presented.

Section 4 authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, for the purpose of maintaining said reserve fund, to sell bonds of the United States and to exchange gold coin for any other money issued or coined by the United States if at any time he deems it necessary in order to maintain the parity and equal value of all the money of the United States.

These four sections establish the gold standard in law. The leading commercial nations of the world have adopted gold as their standard of value. It is in very truth "the standard of the most enlightened nations of the earth." The law which we are about to enact does not establish a new policy for the United States, but it is intended to settle any doubt which may exist.

The purpose of the committee, which purpose is carried out by the bill reported, is that the United States shall by deliberate action take its place with those countries which have clearly and unequivocally adopted the gold standard by law. Sections 5 and 6 of the bill provide for the coinage of subsidiary silver coin, the recoinage of worn and uncurrent coins, and repeal the law which limits the aggregate amount of subsidiary silver coin and of fractional currency outstanding at any time to $50,000,000. The provisions are made because the everyday transactions of business have shown the necessity for a greater amount of small change. The report of the committee calls attention to the fact that so great has been the demand for small change that the law has been necessarily disregarded, and that the issue has so increased that on September 30, 1899, the total amount was $76,523,333.

Section 7 authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to issue or reissue United States notes or Treasury notes in denominations not less than $1, and makes provision that silver certificates in denominations only of $1, $2, and $5 shall hereafter be issued and paid out. This authority is demanded by the urgent need of money in small denominations. Section 8 amends section 5159 of the Revised Statutes of the United States so that national banks will be allowed circulation to the par value of the bonds deposited for their security. The amendment has been recommended by four Presidents and five Secretaries of the Treasury and is demanded by business conditions. The reason for limiting the note issue to

90 per cent of the bonds no longer exists. At the time such a law was enacted Government bonds were selling below par.

Section 9 repeals the tax upon circulation and places it upon the franchise of the national bank based on its capital, surplus, and undivided profits. This is not a reduction of the tax, but an equalization. In fact, the money received by the Government will be a little more than formerly. The tax upon circulation bore with special severity upon banks outside of our large cities. To meet the needs of our smaller communities, their banks were obliged to issue circulation, while banks in larger cities, on account of their great deposits, have not been under that necessity and so have escaped taxation. The last section of the bill (section 10) is also drawn in the interest of our small communities. It permits the organization of banks of $25,000 capital in places the population of which does not exceed 2,000 inhabitants. Banking accommodations are greatly needed in the sparsely settled districts of the West and South, and this provision is expected to meet that need.

As has been said, this bill is very far from furnishing a complete scheme of finance, but it is a very decided step in the right direction. So far as it goes it is satisfactory. More than any other piece of legislation which we are likely to pass during the present session of Congress will it contribute to the material well-being of the country. More than 90 per cent of our commerce is with gold-standard countries. This bill removes, for the present, at least, the danger that the United States may become a silver monometallic country like Mexico. It will be a tremendous factor in causing our present prosperity to be an enduring prosperity. It proves again that the Republican party is the party of progress—that it is the zealous guardian of the national honor. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, as there are but five minutes remaining before 5 o'clock, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HEPBURN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House bill No. 1, "to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes," and had come to no resolution thereon.

FIRST MEETING OF CONGRESS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of ten members of the House be appointed by the Speaker, who shall be authorized to act with the committees that have been appointed by the President, the Senate, or from the citizens of the District of Columbia, to prepare plans for an appropriate national celebration, in the year 1900, of the first session of Congress in the District of Columbia and the establishment of the seat of Government therein.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

CHANGE IN THE HOUR OF MEETING.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Speaker, in view of the pressure for opportunity to speak on the pending bill, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of this week the House convene at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that, commencing with Wednesday and ending with Friday, the sessions of this House shall commence at 11 o'clock, for the purpose of considering the special order. Is there objection?

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Speaker, that precludes the transaction of any other business except the consideration of the special order, does it not?

The SPEAKER. There will be nothing except the special order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE DANFORD.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, it is my painful duty to announce to the House of Representatives that on the 19th day of June the Hon. LORENZO DANFORD, a member of this House, died at his home in St. Clairsville, Ohio. He had been a Representative in Congress for ten years and died full of honors. I offer for adoption the resolutions which I send to the Clerk's desk, and at some later day will ask the House to set apart a time for the further consideration of the memory of our deceased colleague.

The resolutions were read, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with great sorrow of the death of Hon. LORENZO DANFORD, late a Representative from the State of Ohio.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House communicate these resolutions to the Senate, and that as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased this House do now adjourn.

The resolutions were agreed to; and in accordance with the terms thereof, the House (at 5 o'clock p. m.) adjourned until 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow, Wednesday, December 13, 1899.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting for the action of Congress the papers in the adjudicated pension claim of Magdalena, alleged wife of Jacob Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the journals of the Twentieth legislative assembly of the Territory of Arizona—to the Committee on the Territories.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Patchogue River, New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the journals of the council and house proceedings of the Thirty-third legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico—to the Committee on the Territories.

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a statement as to the report of Mr. Elmer L. Corthell as delegate from the United States to the Seventh International Congress of Navigation, held at Brussels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting additional estimates for the Government Hospital for the Insane—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of State submitting an estimate of appropriation to enable this Government to take official part in an international exhibit at Glasgow, Scotland—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Navy submitting an urgent estimate of an appropriation for observation of the total eclipse of the sun in 1900—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Patuxent River, Maryland—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of New Bedford Harbor, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of St. Jones River, Delaware—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Cotuit Harbor, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of a canal across Moccasin Bend, Tennessee River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors was discharged from the consideration of petition for light-house for Point no Point; and the same was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 3717) to make oleomargarine and other imitation dairy products subject to the laws of the State or Territory into which they are transported, and to change the tax on oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 3718) for the

preservation of the frigate *Constitution*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WATERS: A bill (H. R. 3719) to amend section 715 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, regulating the compensation and number of criers and bailiffs in the United States courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 3720) for the improvement of the New Haven (Conn.) Harbor breakwater—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3721) for the improvement of harbor of refuge at Duck Island Harbor, Connecticut—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3722) for the improvement of the Housatonic River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3723) for the maintenance and improvement of the Connecticut River below Hartford—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 3724) authorizing the purchase of a site for the accommodation of the Supreme Court of the United States—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 3725) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Saratoga Springs, N. Y.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 3726) granting 5 per centum of the land sales on military land warrants to the public-land States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 3727) authorizing a survey of Red and Sulphur rivers, in the States of Louisiana and Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 3728) to provide for the erection of a post-office in the city of New York, and making appropriation therefor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3729) authorizing the consolidation of independent post-offices in the boroughs of Manhattan, Bronx, Richmond, Kings, and Queens, New York, with the post-office at New York, N. Y., and making appropriations therefor—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin (by request): A bill (H. R. 3730) to increase a certain class of pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 3731) providing for the immediate coinage of silver into standard silver dollars—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 3732) in regard to brevets in the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 3733) to authorize the construction of a reservoir near San Carlos, Ariz., to provide water for irrigating Sacaton Reservation, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. LATIMER: A bill (H. R. 3734) to require preference to be given to citizens of the States and localities where the mails are to be carried in all mail lettings—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 3735) to amend section 1754 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. SIBLEY: A bill (H. R. 3736) to provide a safe and elastic currency, automatically expanding and contracting as the business needs of the nation may demand—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 3737) providing for the distribution of Government publications to agricultural colleges—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BARNEY: A bill (H. R. 3738) to extend the jurisdiction of admiralty courts of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 3739) for the erection of a public building at Logansport, Ind.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 3740) to construct a road from Springfield, Ill., to the national cemetery at Camp Butler, adjacent thereto—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3741) to provide for the erection of a public building at Decatur, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILSON of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 3742) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to the survivors of the Indian wars of 1832 to 1842, inclusive, known as the Black Hawk war, Creek war, Cherokee disturbances, and the Seminole war," approved July 27, 1892—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3743) establishing a United States mint at Boise City, Idaho—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3744) extending relief to Indian citizens, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3745) to prevent the unlawful killing of game by Indians, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3746) to ratify an agreement with the Indians of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, in Idaho, and making appropriations to carry the same into effect—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 3988) to reorganize and improve the United States Weather Bureau—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 3989) making an appropriation to enlarge the military post of Fort Meade, near the city of Sturgis, in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3990) confirming the title of mixed-blood Indians to their lands and allowing the same to be alienated under certain circumstances—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 3991) to provide for the erection of a public building at Washington, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JETT: A bill (H. R. 3992) providing for a trial by jury in the United States courts for contempt, and other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Texas, relating to a convention of the States for proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A memorial of the Indianapolis press, urging that the privilege of the floor of the House be extended to the Scripps-McRae Association—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SPERRY: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Connecticut, favoring an amendment to the act of May 4, 1898, which shall provide that only first-class battle ships and cruisers shall be named for the States—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MINOR: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring an amendment to the Constitution giving Congress concurrent jurisdiction with the several States for the suppression of trusts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 3747) to correct the muster of Benjamin F. Hasson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 3748) granting a pension to Samuel S. Boyer—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 3749) for the relief of Flora A. Darling—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3750) for the relief of Fred Weddle—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BOREING: A bill (H. R. 3751) for the relief of those suffering from the destruction of the salt works near Manchester, Ky., pursuant to the orders of Maj. Gen. Carlos Buell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURKETT: A bill (H. R. 3752) granting a pension to Mary A. Ellas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3753) for the relief of Wells C. McCool—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3754) granting a pension to Solomon Delzell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARNEY: A bill (H. R. 3755) to remove the charge of desertion against John J. Herlihy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3756) to increase the pension of John E. Hughes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Texas: A bill (H. R. 3757) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to adjudicate the claim of Wynona A. Dixon, and to remove the bar of the statute of limitations therefrom—to the Committeeon War Claims.

By Mr. CROWLEY: A bill (H. R. 3758) for back pay and increase of pension for Joshua Ricketts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3759) to correct the record of David Horner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3760) for the relief of Charles Sampson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3761) to remove the charge of desertion of John H. Neidigh—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3762) for the relief of Uriah Andrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3763) granting a pension to A. Crouch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3764) granting a pension to Martha A. De Lamater—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3765) to increase the pension of John R. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 3766) granting a pension to Leo Frey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3767) granting a pension to John W. Hartley—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3768) granting a pension to William C. Estill—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3769) granting a pension to Catherine Wolf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3770) to remove the charge of desertion against Isaac Drone—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3771) to remove charge of desertion against Ephraim H. Gallion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3772) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Peter Gehm, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment of Illinois Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 3773) for the relief of Edward P. Bliss—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3774) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen O'Rorke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STANLEY W. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 3775) granting an increase of pension to Robert Boston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS: A bill (H. R. 3776) for the relief of William H. Atkins, formerly commissary-sergeant, United States Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 3777) granting an increase of pension to Bernard Dunn, late private in Company A, Second Regiment Iowa Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3778) granting an increase of pension to Ellsey A. Sloane, late private, Company D, One hundred and second Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREER: A bill (H. R. 3779) to pension James B. Combs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3780) for the relief of Crispen M. Stone—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3781) to pension Curtis B. McIntosh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 3782) granting a pension to Eliza J. Mahurin, of Medora, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3783) to correct the military record of William T. Rominger, of Hartsville, Ind.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3784) granting an increase of pension to Linsay C. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAINES: A bill (H. R. 3785) for the relief of Susan N. Moore—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3786) for the relief of the heirs of James W. Fennell, deceased, and to give the Court of Claims jurisdiction, and to remove the bar of statute of limitations—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3787) for the relief of Morris F. Cawley—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HENRY of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 3788) for the relief of the estate of Henry E. Windley, of Hinds County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3789) for the relief of S. A. E. Bailey, administratrix of Richard Griffith, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3790) for the relief of L. D. McNair, of Hinds County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3791) for the relief of James Couch, of Claiborne County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3792) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. C. L. Shaifer, of Jefferson County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3793) for the relief of Emmit Hicks, deceased, late of Claiborne County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3794) for the relief of Ann M. Brown, of Claiborne County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3795) for the relief of the estate of Bryan Askew, deceased, late of Hinds County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3796) for the relief of Burwell V. McGuffee, of Hinds County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3797) for the relief of the estate of John Fisher, late of Hinds County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3798) for the relief of Mrs. Catherine P. Byrnes, of Claiborne County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3799) for the relief of Stanley Snodgrass, of Jefferson County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3800) for the relief of the estate of Charles H. Borland, deceased, late of Claiborne County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3801) for the relief of R. T. Cheek—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3802) for the relief of the estate of James S. Winters, deceased, late of Hinds County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 3803) for the relief of Olive M. Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LYBRAND: A bill (H. R. 3804) to correct the military record of Larkin Tongnet, Company F, Fiftieth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3805) to correct the military record of James E. F. Van Horn, Company D, Sixty-third Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3806) to correct the military record of John Boon, Company C, Eighty-first Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3807) to correct the military record of Eli Metcalf, Company F, Twelfth Ohio Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3808) granting a pension to Frances Coyner, widow of D. H. Coyner, late chaplain of Eighty-eighth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3809) granting increase of pension of Elisha B. Seaman, Company A, Sixty-sixth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3810) granting an increase of pension to James R. Rowley, Company C, Eighth Ohio Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3811) granting pension to Margaret R. Longbrake, widow of Jacob N. Longbrake, late of Company K, Fifty-seventh Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3812) granting an increase of pension to David H. McFadden, Company G, One hundred and ninety-seventh Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3813) granting pension to Wilhelmina Stout, mother of Alfred Stout, Company C, Seventy-eighth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3814) granting a pension to Andrew J. Murray, Company C, First Pennsylvania Reserve Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOVERING: A bill (H. R. 3815) granting a pension to Mrs. Sarah A. McInerney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLE (by request): A bill (H. R. 3816) for the relief of James R. Lafferry—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 3817) granting a pension to James M. Mauck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 3818) to increase the pension of James Moss—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 3819) for the relief of the widows and children of William Ryan and John S. Taylor, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARSH: A bill (H. R. 3820) to grant a pension to Edgar Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3821) granting a pension to Frances D. Best, widow of Lieut. Col. Joseph G. Best—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3822) to grant an increase of pension to John Beerman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3823) to grant an honorable discharge to Peter Hoots—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3824) for the relief of Stephen A. St. John—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3825) to grant an honorable discharge to Frederick A. Noeller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3826) to grant a pension to Henry C. Huff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3827) to grant an honorable discharge to Thomas Ward—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3828) to grant an increase of pension to Newton T. Burnett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3829) for the relief of Mrs. Charlotte A. Heavilin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3830) granting a pension to Eliza A. Bosworth—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3831) to grant a pension to Charles C. Leach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3832) to grant an honorable discharge to John A. Stanton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3833) for the relief of Eveline Pave—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3834) to grant a pension to Dennis L. Burford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3835) to grant an increase of pension to William Craig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3836) to grant an increase of pension to Fannie E. Morse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3837) to grant an increase of pension to Ross Rush—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3838) to grant an increase of pension to John I. Shauman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3839) for the relief of Isaac N. Strickler—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3840) granting a pension to Elizabeth Meier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MESICK: A bill (H. R. 3841) for the relief of Floyd S. Marvin, deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3842) for relief of Asa D. Babcock, Alma, Mich.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3843) to remove the charge of desertion against the name of William H. Collins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3844) to remove the charge of desertion against the name of Hiram A. Thompson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3845) to remove the charge of desertion against the name of Hiram Kinney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3846) to remove the charge of desertion against William Standish—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3847) to remove the charge of desertion against the name of Charles E. Combs—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3848) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against the name of Thomas Kelley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3849) to remove the charge of desertion against the military record of Thomas Dunsmore—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3850) to remove the charge of desertion against Ambrose Estell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3851) to remove the charge of desertion against the name of Charles E. Rogers, of Fishville, Mich.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3852) to remove the charge of desertion against the name of William H. Hanvey, Big Rapids, Mich.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3853) granting an increase of pension to George D. Spurrier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3854) granting a pension to John Drum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3855) granting a pension to Mrs. Armina Mallory—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3856) granting a pension to Matilda Corder, Vestaburg, Mich.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3857) granting a pension to Mrs. Sophronia Cummins, Bellaire, Mich.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3858) granting a pension to Mary Ann Kelley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 3859) for the relief of Jasper N. T. Hamilton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3860) for the relief of the widow of the late Capt. Daniel C. Trewhitt, of Chattanooga, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3861) for the relief of Jesse Millard, late corporal, Company G, Third Tennessee Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McDOWELL: A bill (H. R. 3862) for the relief of Thomas J. Sheppard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 3863) granting a pension to Alfred Dyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PUGH: A bill (H. R. 3864) for the relief of Bath County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3865) for the relief of J. E. Dickey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3866) granting a pension to William S. Spratt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3867) for the relief of John J. Evans—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3868) for the relief of Martin Lunsford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3869) granting a pension to Joseph H. Hamrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3870) granting a pension to Ella G. Hamrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3871) granting a pension to W. J. Worthington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3872) for the relief of the estate of Adaliza Snodgrass—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RIDGELY: A bill (H. R. 3873) for the relief of Issachar J. Davis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3874) for the relief of Capt. Henry C. Seaman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3875) for the relief of David Hogan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3876) granting an increase of pension to William T. March—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3877) granting increase of pension to Grandison Kelly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3878) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3879) granting an increase of pension to J. E. Ruark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3880) granting an increase of pension to John Zellers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3881) granting a pension to Jacob Rossman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3882) granting a pension to Campbell A. Howke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3883) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Ransom—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3884) granting an increase of pension to John Powell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3885) granting a pension to David W. Thurston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3886) granting a pension to John Loudabarger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3887) granting a pension to Marcus D. Watson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3888) granting a pension to George Diehl—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3889) granting a pension to William A. Williford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3890) to remove the charge of desertion against William T. Grady—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3891) granting a pension to John Heniff—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3892) granting a pension to Rebecca A. Kirkpatrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3893) granting a pension to O. C. Denslow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3894) granting a pension to Clara M. Keath—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3895) granting a pension to Patrick Lacy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3896) granting a pension to Barney Schriver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3897) granting a pension to James W. Dotson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3898) granting a pension to Evan Schriver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3899) granting a pension to Samuel McKinsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3900) granting a pension to Andrew J. Arnett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3901) granting a pension to Martin Stich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3902) granting a pension to Mary E. Bucklew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3903) granting a pension to Henry Gilham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3904) granting a pension to Mrs. J. J. Woods—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3905) granting a pension to Blanche E. Barlow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3906) granting a pension to Isaac N. Cisson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3907) granting a pension to William T. Buckner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3908) granting a pension to T. B. Limbocker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3909) granting a pension to Dennis B. Sanford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3910) granting a pension to Deborah Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3911) granting a pension to M. V. Strine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3912) granting a pension to D. C. McIntire—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3913) granting a pension to Dr. J. B. Thurman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3914) granting a pension to James P. Newton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3915) granting a pension to B. F. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3916) granting a pension to Jacob Marietta—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3917) granting a pension to Elizabeth Norton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3918) granting a pension to Zebadiah Robertson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3919) granting a pension to Mary Dehart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3920) granting a pension to James B. Stephens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3921) granting a pension to Capt. George F. Petit—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3922) granting a pension to Hattie A. Skinner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3923) granting a pension to W. J. Tims—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3924) granting a pension to Joseph F. Gracey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3925) granting a pension to Leonard Stillson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3926) granting a pension to Barney Manning—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3927) granting a pension to Charles W. Pool—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3928) granting a pension to George W. Wise—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3929) granting a pension to Mary Hadley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3930) granting a pension to Eliza Jane Fuller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3931) granting a pension to Josiah J. Dorris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3932) granting a pension to Catharine Killian—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3933) granting a pension to Martin V. Strine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3934) granting a pension to James B. Stephens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3935) granting a pension to Elbert Fitch—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3936) correcting the military record of Patrick Conlin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3937) granting a pension to Malinda Vance—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3938) granting a pension to William M. Vanhorn—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3939) granting a pension to Abraham Mann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3940) granting a pension to Isaac Newman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 3941) to restore the pension of Samuel B. Weeks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 3942) granting an honorable discharge to Charles Geer, ulias Lyons—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3943) granting a pension to Ezra G. Bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 3944) for the relief of the estate of Andrew J. Duncan, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 3945) granting an increase of pension to Burdette N. Cleveland, of Fremont, in the State of Nebraska—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHATTUC: A bill (H. R. 3946) for the relief of the Black Brigade—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3947) for the relief of Benjamin T. Burford, of Silverton, Hamilton County, Ohio—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3948) for the relief of Ann Fagin, widow of Christopher Fagin, late private, Company C, Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3949) for the relief of Minnie Gray, widow of Frank Gray, late captain, One Hundred and Twenty-fourth United States Colored Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 3950) for the relief of Eliza C. Armin, widow of Frank Armin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3951) for the relief of Pardon M. Bowen, late private in Company K, One hundred and thirty-eighth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3952) granting an honorable certificate of discharge to John M. James, late private in Company M, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3953) granting honorable certificates of discharge to certain officers and enlisted men of the United States Volunteer service who were called out by the proclamation of Gen. Lewis Wallace issued September 5, 1862—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3954) placing on the pension roll the name of John Kendall, late carpenter at Camp Nelson, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3955) directing the Secretary of War to issue to John A. Cassell a certificate of merit for distinguished service as cipher operator during the civil war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STARK: A bill (H. R. 3956) granting an increase of pension to George W. Plants, of Geneva, Nebr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3957) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin W. Walker, of Germantown, Nebr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3958) granting an increase of pension to Rollin Tyler, of Odell, county of Gage, Nebr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3959) granting an increase of pension to Josiah D. Fye, of Aurora, Nebr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3960) granting a pension to John Fisher, of Wilber, Saline County, Nebr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3961) granting an increase of pension to John F. Early, of Wilber, county of Saline, Nebr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3962) granting an increase of pension to Alanson C. Eberhart, of York, York County, Nebr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3963) granting an increase of pension to Chauncy Barber, of York, York County, Nebr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3964) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Simmons, of Beatrice, county of Gage, Nebr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3965) granting an increase of pension to George C. Maxfield, Fairmont, Nebr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3966) granting an increase of pension to David Talmon, of Wymore, county of Gage, Nebr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3967) granting an increase of pension to Griffeth Evans, of Beatrice, county of Gage, Nebr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3968) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Tharp, of Liberty, county of Gage, Nebr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3969) granting an increase of pension to Willis Webb, of Wymore, Gage County, Nebr.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SIBLEY: A bill (H. R. 3970) for the relief of C. H. Raymond—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3971) for the relief of Robert Brigham, late postmaster at Franklin, Pa.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3972) asking for removal of charge of desertion against Charles R. Keck, and asking for honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPIGHT: A bill (H. R. 3973) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Charity Clements, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3974) for the relief of John H. Record, of Marshall County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 3975) to pension Kate E. Ulrich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3976) to increase the pension of Benjamin F. Cox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 3977) for the relief of Robert M. Gardner—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 3978) to confer jurisdiction on Court of Claims in case of Elizabeth A. Gill, widow, Albert B. Gill, Emma B. Gill, William F. Gill, and Leonora Gill Thompson, sole legatees and heirs at law of William H. Gill, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SCUDDER: A bill (H. R. 3979) for the relief of the heirs of George L. Davis, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TONGUE: A bill (H. R. 3980) for the relief of Avery D. Babcock and wife, of Oregon—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3981) granting a pension to William Lyman Chittenden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 3982) for the relief of Eli R. Jones—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WACHTER: A bill (H. R. 3983) for the relief of the Merchants and Miners' Transportation Company of Baltimore, Md.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3984) removing the charge of desertion from the record of William Harig—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 3985) for the relief of

Julia McN. Henry, widow of the late Guy V. Henry, late a major-general, United States Army—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZIEGLER: A bill (H. R. 3986) granting a pension to Sarah Stoner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 3987) to pension Melvina J. Swiger, widow of Solomon J. Swiger—to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BROMWELL: Resolution of the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, concerning cable facilities between the United States and Cuba—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURKETT: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Lincoln, Nebr., relating to the sale of intoxicating liquors in Government buildings, etc.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BURTON: Resolution of the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, favoring the reorganization of the consular service of the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CROWLEY: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Uriah Andreck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Mrs. M. A. Delamatter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of David Homer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALZELL: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Pittsburg, Pa., indorsing House bill No. 1, on the currency—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DINSMORE: Petition of Samuel G. Magruder, of Siloam Springs, Ark., for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Charles White, of St. Paul, Ark., for a pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: Affidavits to accompany bill granting a pension to Melvina J. Swiger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Resolutions of the Boston Congregational, Methodist, and Universalist Ministers' Association, with regard to postage on books of public and incorporated libraries—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LITTLE: Resolutions of Duval Camp, Ex-Confederate Veterans, of Fort Smith, Ark., in opposition to pensioning surviving ex-Confederates—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MANN: Paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to Alfred Dyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MINOR: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, to amend the interstate-commerce law—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOON: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Jesse Millard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of the widow of the late Capt. D. C. Trewhitt, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OLMSTED: Petition of the Harrisburg Board of Trade, for cable facilities between the United States and Cuba—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHATTUC: Papers to accompany House bill placing John Kendall on the pension rolls—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Ann Fagin, widow of Christopher Fagin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Pardon M. Bowen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Eliza C. Armin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Minnie Gray—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Benjamin T. Burford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting an honorable discharge to John M. James—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting an honorable discharge to certain officers and enlisted men of the United States volunteer service who were called out by the proclamation of Gen. Lewis Wallace, September 5, 1862—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill directing the Secretary of War to issue to John A. Cassell a certificate of merit for distinguished service as cipher operator during the civil war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHELDEN: Petitions of citizens and surfmen of Michigan, relative to increase of pay and length of service of life-saving crews on lakes—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of railway postal clerks of the Second Congressional district of Connecticut, favoring a bill providing for the reclassification of the Railway Mail Service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SPIGHT: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of John H. Record—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEELE: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Robert M. Gardner—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TERRY: Petition of J. A. Vance and others, of Perry County, N. Y., in favor of a constitutional amendment against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Rt. Rev. William M. Brown, bishop of Arkansas, in favor of free government for the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WACHTER: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of the Merchants and Miners' Transportation Company—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, paper to remove the charge of desertion against William Harig, of Baltimore, Md.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Petitions, etc., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah were laid on the Clerk's desk and severally referred to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case, as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Resolutions of the Conversational Club of Dubuque and Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Athol, Mass., and protests of W. T. Brooks, of Huntsville, Ark., and the General Assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church.

By Mr. BURKETT: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Lincoln, Nebr., also petitions of P. B. Ruchan and others, of Stella and Sherbert, Nebr.

By Mr. BURTON: Petition of the Library Guild of Cleveland, Ohio.

By Mr. CAPRON: Petition of A. S. Hazard and others, of Allenton, R. I.

By Mr. CLARKE of New Hampshire: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Hillsboro, N. H.

By Mr. CRUMP: Petitions of citizens of Bay City, Mich., and others in the Tenth Congressional district of Michigan.

By Mr. DAHLE of Wisconsin: Petitions of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Mount Horeb and others, of the State of Wisconsin.

By Mr. FREER: Petition of E. B. Riggs and 32 others.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition of citizens of Lima, Ohio.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petitions of the First English Lutheran Church of Sharpsbury and D. B. Wilson and citizens of Allegheny and resolution of the League for Social Service.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania: Petition of Rev. J. A. Schaffer, of Allentown, Pa., and others.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of E. H. Beal and 27 citizens of Blaine, Ill.

By Mr. JETT: Petitions of S. E. McNeely, L. E. Alexander, and others, of the Eighteenth Congressional district of Illinois.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of George H. Swift and others, of Amenia Union, N. Y.

By Mr. LITTLE: Petition of Thomas Boley and many others, of Fort Smith, Ark.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petitions of 500 citizens of Bridgeton, N. J.; citizens of Elmer, and the National Antipolygamy League and 47 citizens of Ocean City, N. J.

By Mr. MERCER: Resolutions of the executive committee of the Christian Endeavor Union at Lincoln, Nebr.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petition of F. L. Nash and others, of National City, Cal.

By Mr. O'GRADY: Petitions of Edwin B. Olmsted, of Rochester, N. Y., and others.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Petitions of the Indianapolis News and citizens of Indianapolis, Ind.; Council of Women of Indianapolis, and citizens of Ripple, Ind.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Nebraska: Petitions of the Jamestown Union Sunday School, Methodist Episcopal Church of Clarks, W. J. Hill, M. F. Sims, and others of the Third Congressional district of Nebraska.

By Mr. RODENBERG: Petitions of W. V. Matthews and others, of Tilden, and others of the Twenty-first Congressional district of Illinois.

By Mr. SHOWALTER: Petitions of 100 citizens of the Twenty-fifth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, 57 citizens of Portersville, 25 citizens of Mercer, memorial of the Darlington Reformed Presbyterian Church, and others.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: Petition of C. B. Carr and other citizens of Addison, Mich.

By Mr. STARK: Protests of J. A. Boyd, John Gallagher, and other citizens of Seward County, Nebr.

By Mr. TERRY: Petition of Rev. J. C. Douglass and others, of Russellville, Ark.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: Petition of A. E. Hatch and others of the Eleventh Congressional district of Iowa.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: Petition of Rev. R. Kemp and others, of Horsecreek, Ala.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Petition of J. L. Wyatt and others, of Enfield, Ill.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of Charles W. King and other citizens of the Fifth Congressional district of New York.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Mrs. C. Wesley Wootton and others, of Philadelphia, Pa.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *December 13, 1899.*

Prayer by Rev. LUCIEN CLARK, D. D., of the city of Washington.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. HALE, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

FINANCIAL STATISTICS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 6th instant, a statement showing the number of ounces and the coining value of all of the silver bullion purchased under the act of July 4, 1890; the coining value of the seigniorage thereon; the amount of Treasury notes issued in payment thereof; the amount of silver dollars coined therefrom to March 4, 1897; the seigniorage thereon, etc.; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

DESERTIONS FROM THE ARMY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 6th instant, a printed statement showing the number of desertions each month in the Regular and Volunteer Armies from May 1, 1898, to June 30, 1899, and stating that the returns of the regiments of regular and volunteer troops serving in the Philippine Islands covering period since June 30 last have not yet been received; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

VIRGINIUS INDEMNITY FUND.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, pursuant to the act of Congress approved August 3, 1894, directing the payment to claimants of the amount of the accretions of the *Virginius* indemnity fund which had been received from the investment of the fund itself, stating that the sum of $16,494.44 was paid out during the incumbency of Mr. Kieckhoefer, late disbursing clerk of the Department, and that after an examination of the accounts by an expert bookkeeper there should be $4,691.87 in the fund, and urging that an appropriation be made to cover the deficiency on behalf of the claimants; which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. TELLER presented the petitions of William Boyle and sundry other citizens of Monument, S. B. Sansom and sundry other citizens, R. P. Coburn and sundry other citizens of Buenavista, Dan Wells and sundry other citizens of Pueblo, W. A. Hutchinson and sundry other citizens of Ward, J. D. Slater and sundry other citizens of Golden, O. A. Cramer and sundry other citizens of Montevista, W. P. L. Master and sundry other citizens, and of G. H. Merritt and sundry other citizens of Alcott, all in the State of Colorado, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PROCTOR presented the petitions of Rev. Thomas Tellies and 25 other citizens of Felchville, Albert H. Miard and 6 other citizens of South Stafford, Rev. J. R. Henderson and 8 other citizens of Roxbury, Judson A. Carr and 8 other citizens of Georgia Plain, Rev. J. R. Henderson and 8 other citizens of Roxbury, J. J. Estey and 10 other citizens of Brattleboro, C. S. Mudgett and 5 other citizens of Elmore, Horace E. Ferris and 25 other citizens of Middleburg, James Huntom and 34 other citizens of East Orange, Julian P. Laughlin and sundry other citizens of Bamet, Rev. J. P. Mawin and sundry other citizens of West Charleston, P. P. Mead and sundry other citizens of Salisbury, Edwin R. Bell and sundry other citizens, S. Knowlton and sundry other citizens of Danville, Earl S. Fox and sundry other citizens, G. T. Smart and sundry other citizens of Manchester, M. H. Randall and sundry other citizens of West Newbury, S. H. Barmim and sundry other citizens of Cornwall, Henry E. Loehlin and sundry other citizens of North Hydepark, and of S. N. Hazard and sundry other citizens of North Hydepark, all in the State of Vermont, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KYLE presented the petition of M. J. Dewey and 67 other citizens of Hot Springs, S. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Soldiers' Homes, immigrant stations, and all other Government buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented the petitions of C. G. Gunderson and 33 other citizens of Toronto, G. H. Chase and 44 other citizens of White, Ranson B. Hall and 45 other citizens of Gettysburg, Richard Jones and 29 other citizens of Faulkton, F. B. Ward and 32 other citizens of Carthage, E. S. Hatch and 6 other citizens of Howard, and of Rev. C. F. De Groff and 17 other citizens of Letcher, all in the State of South Dakota, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BATE presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Chattanooga, Tenn., praying that a franchise be granted to the Postal Telegraph Cable Company for laying a cable to connect the United States with Cuba and other West India islands; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DEPEW presented the petitions of R. B. Sackett and 197 other citizens, of George H. Swift and 75 other citizens of Akron, Fred W. Doughty and 18 other citizens of Poughkeepsie, Arthur N. Stafford and 6 other citizens of Brooklyn, William Reed and 22 other citizens of Troy, S. H. Oliver and 13 other citizens of Glenfield, L. P. Teachout and 19 other citizens of Waterford, M. W. Covell and 18 other citizens of Manchester, Rev. J. Marsland and 51 other citizens of Franklin, R. D. Calkins and 51 other citizens, W. H. Miller and 1 other citizen of Brooklyn, Lansing Bailey and 17 other citizens of Geneva, L. S. Shumaker and 15 other citizens of Buffalo; Mrs. Louise Haywood, of New York City; Carlton M. Sleght and 166 other citizens of Canandaigua, Henry A. Newell, jr., and 5 other citizens of New York City, E. P. Brigham and 32 other citizens of Conklin Center, G. W. Bushnell and 7 other citizens of New York City, S. L. Watson and 8 other citizens, Charles Robbins and 20 other citizens of Dolgeville, James Hetrick and 18 other citizens of Smithville, A. W. Jones and 72 other citizens of Woodhull, Henry Watchus and 50 other citizens of Trenton, Cassius Marsh and 33 other citizens of Antwerp, Thomas Little and 20 other citizens of New York City, Stanley Sloat and 18 other citizens of Patterson, W. L. C. Samson and 18 other citizens of Bovina Center, W. J. B. Williams and 33 other citizens of Holland Patent, W. J. Walker and 16 other citizens of Albany, Lewis H. Miller and 19 other citizens of Katonah, M. L. Royers and 11 other citizens of Watertown, Robert N. Ritchie and 18 other citizens of Lansingburg, Joseph K. Casterton and 14 other citizens of Vernon, Lindsay B. Longacre and 1 other citizen of New York City, D. E. Yarnell and 17 other citizens of New York City, F. Heartfield and 18 other citizens of Brewster, William P. Burnham and 3 other citizens of Brooklyn, A. J. Schroeder and 25 other citizens of Port Leyden, Rev. W. Dempster Chase and sundry other citizens of Carthage, J. A. McWilliams and 201 other citizens of Sing Sing, Alfred J. Saxe and 23 other citizens of Bellona, E. M. Munday, jr., and 24 other citizens of New York City, David J. Biggar and 44 other citizens of Vernon Center, Rev. D. E. Smith and 18 other citizens of Stone Ridge, Addison Gibbons and 19 other citizens of McConnellsville, Rev. J. C. Hendrickson and 5 other citizens of Tottenville, Rev. A. W. Battey and 44 other citizens of Nelson, A. H. Hathaway and 17 other citizens of Greendale and Hudson, Charles E. Tamkin and 18 other citizens of Brooklyn, Thomas B. Dale and 10 other citizens of Buffalo, J. W. Page and 4 other citizens of Brooklyn, Phillip Workman and 52 other citizens of Watertown, J. J. Fitzgerald and 9 other citizens of Brooklyn, William Smith and 8 other citizens of Farnham, Charles H. Colgrove and 28 other citizens of Unadilla Forks, C. J. Holmgren and 13 other citizens of Brooklyn, H. N. Van Deusen and 19 other citizens of Berkshire, James A. Thompson and 17 other citizens of Poughkeepsie, S. F. White and 18 other citizens of Rhinebeck, S. Burnham and 5 other citizens of Hamilton, George A. Bronson and 16 other citizens of Collamer, R. O. Allen and 20 other citizens of Stanfordville, T. H. C. Bain and 15 other citizens of Schaghticoke, William J. Dunlop and 27 other citizens of Hebron, Rev. J. E. Lyall and 17 other citizens of South Millbrook, Rev. J. W. Cole and 18 other citizens, F. A. Graves and 8 other citizens of Hecla Works and Vernon, Rev. R. G. Jones and 18 other citizens of Utica, and of M. E. Rutherford and 99 other citizens of Lisbon Center, all in the State of New York, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ROSS presented the petitions of Earl S. Fox and 17 other citizens of Vershire, J. W. H. Baker and 50 other citizens of Enosburg, S. Knowlton and 17 other citizens of Danville, M. H. Randall and 26 other citizens of Newbury, the congregation of the Congregational Church and the Mission of the Congregational Church of Chelsea, of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal and Congregational churches of Barton, of Edward T. Fairbanks and 19 other citizens of St. Johnsbury, of Edwin R. Bell and 49 other citizens of Royalton, of Henry A. Goodhue and 30 other citizens of Westminster, of Julian P. Laughlin and 124 other citizens of Barnet, of G. A. Smart and 25 other citizens of Manchester, of S. H. Barnum and 103 other citizens of Cornwall, of R. J. Barton and 25 other citizens of Salisbury, and of J. P. Marvin and 35 others, of Charleston, all in the State of Vermont, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented the petitions of A. Wilson and 21 other citizens of Indianapolis, of C. F. Thomas and 114 other citizens of Fort Wayne, and of S. M. Congill and 113 other citizens of Floyd County, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HOAR presented the petition of Joseph C. Sharkey and sundry other citizens of Massachusetts, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the memorials of Caroline H. Dall and 465 other citizens of Massachusetts; of Edward Dodd and 57 other citizens of Ohio; of Rev. J. P. Philips and 80 other citizens of Maryland; of E. H. Draper, of Rhode Island; of W. O. Bradford and 33 other citizens of Virginia; of E. W. Calvan and 487 citizens of South Dakota; of Sarah H. Hussey and 146 other citizens of New Jersey; of John H. Free and 104 other citizens of Illinois; of Charles Wilson and 19 other citizens of Texas; of F. B. Carby and 91 other citizens of Nebraska; D. C. Allison and 110 other citizens of California; and of H. S. Earle and 2 other citizens of Oregon, remonstrating against any extension of the sovereignty of the United States over the Philippine Islands, in any event, and over any other territory, without the free consent of the people thereof; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. McBRIDE presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Portland, Oreg., praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the entrance to Tillamook Harbor, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Progressive Commercial Association of Astoria, Oreg., praying for the construction of a free-portage railroad at The Dalles, to facilitate the navigation of the Columbia River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of 24 citizens of Athena, Oreg., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GILA RIVER INDIAN RESERVATION.

Mr. WARREN. I present the report of James D. Schuyler, consulting engineer, on the general conditions and cost of water storage for irrigation on the Gila River, Arizona, for the benefit of the Indians occupying the Gila River Reservation. I move that the report be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Mr. McMILLAN. I present a paper, being a catalogue of printed works relating to the District of Columbia. I move that the paper be printed as a document, and that 200 additional copies be printed and bound in paper for the use of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE.

Mr. PRITCHARD, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 8) construing the act approved June 27, 1890, entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," reported it without amendment.

REVISION OF THE PENSION LAWS.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, on the 25th of February, 1899, during the third session of the Fifty-fifth Congress, the following resolution was passed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Pensions is hereby authorized and directed, by a subcommittee appointed for that purpose, to carefully examine, during the recess of Congress, all general laws on the statute book granting pensions to soldiers, their survivors and dependents, and to pursue such other inquiries in connection with the matter of pension legislation as may be deemed advisable; report to be made to the Senate, by bill or otherwise, at as early a day as practicable after the assembling of the Fifty-sixth Congress, the expense incurred to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

The Committee on Pensions, through a subcommittee, have discharged the duties devolved upon them under that resolution, and I am directed to present the report. In doing this, however, I propose to read, for the information of the Senate and of the country, the report the committee have made, of course not including the testimony and other documents that are annexed. I beg that during this reading, which will not occupy many minutes, I may have the attention of the Senate.

"Pursuant to that resolution, the chairman of the committee visited Washington twice during the summer months and made careful examination of all laws bearing on the subject of pensions, with a view of determining what changes, if any, should be made in the existing statutes. He discussed the matter with the officials of the Bureau of Pensions and carefully noted their views. It was evident that, while the laws are broad and generous, much difficulty has arisen in their administration because of the obscure phraseology of some of their provisions, and the necessity for certain amendments was apparent. Subsequently, to wit, on the 29th day of November, a subcommittee of the Committee on Pensions, as provided in the resolution, consisting of Senators GALLINGER and HANSBROUGH, met in the city of Washington and took statements from the Secretary of the Interior, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Pensions, the First Deputy Commissioner of Pensions, and Col. George H. Patrick, representing the Grand Army of the Republic. These statements, which will be found exceedingly interesting and instructive, are printed in connection with this report.

"The officials who were interrogated all advocated the creation of a nonpartisan commission to revise and codify the pension laws with a view to making them more uniform and intelligible, thus rendering their administration less difficult and free from existing perplexities. It was also agreed on all hands that the wishes of the Grand Army of the Republic to give a pensionable status to widows under the act of June 27, 1890, who are in possession of an annual income not exceeding $250, in addition to the proceeds of daily labor, and that in estimating the pensionable status of soldiers under that act minor disabilities shall be aggregated should be complied with and the act amended accordingly. In the matter of aggregating minor disabilities the Commissioner of Pensions assured your committee that that is the practice of the Bureau of Pensions at the present time, so that there can be no valid objection to enacting it into law.

"The Commissioner of Pensions called the attention of the committee to his recommendation on page 21 of his last annual report, from which it appears that while pensions to soldiers commence from the date of filing the claim, pensions to widows date from the death of the husband. The law as to widows was changed in the appropriation act of June 27, 1888, which act removed all limitations as to the date of filing claims. The Commissioner recommends that that provision of the act of June 27, 1888, be repealed, in which recommendation your committee cordially concurs. The attention of your committee was also called to the fact that under existing law minors' pensions are being paid to people who have reached mature age, some of whom have been married and reared families. In these cases the minor did not apply for pension during the years of minority, but in after life, probably prompted by the ever-diligent pension attorney, application is made and in some instances pension has been granted. A large number of such cases are now held up in the Bureau pending a decision of the honorable Secretary of the Interior as to the pensionable status of such claimants. Your committee is constrained to believe that the law should be so amended that if a minor fails to make application before the age of 16 is reached, such claims should lapse.

"Your committee were instructed to report by bill or otherwise, and accordingly bills will be presented for the creation of a commission on revision and codification of the pension laws, for the amendment of the act of June 27, 1890, as urged by the representatives of the Grand Army, concurred in by the officials of the Interior Department, and, so far as the provision relating to widows is concerned, recommended by the President in his annual message to the Fifty-sixth Congress, and for the repeal of the act of June 27, 1888, relating to the time when widows' pensions shall commence. Later on other bills may be presented designed to correct inequalities and inconsistencies in the laws.

"Following the statements made to your committee there will be printed as an appendix amendments proposed by the Grand Army of the Republic to sections 2 and 3 of the act of June 27, 1890, the report of the national committee on pensions of the Grand Army of the Republic, and a synopsis of all laws enacted since the foundation of the Government on the subject of pensions.

"In conclusion your committee desire to emphasize their belief that a commission of learned jurists, one of whom shall be a representative and member of the Grand Army of the Republic, should be created without delay, to take into careful consideration

the entire pension system, in the hope that they may present a revision and codification that will free the statutes from ambiguities and uncertainties, and construct a code that can be administered to the satisfaction of both the beneficiaries and the Government. Believing that to be practicable, your committee will press the bill for the creation of a commission to early consideration."

Mr. President, I present this report, and as there will doubtless be a large demand for the document from various sections of the country, I ask that 1,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Pensions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator present also a bill accompanying the report?

Mr. GALLINGER. I present three bills in connection with the report.

The bills were read twice by their titles, and placed on the Calendar, as follows:

A bill (S. 1476) creating a commission to revise and codify the pension laws of the United States;

A bill (S. 1477) in amendment of sections 2 and 3 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890; and

A bill (S. 1478) to repeal so much of the act of June 7, 1888, making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes, as relates to the commencement of pension to widows under the acts of July 14, 1862, and March 3, 1873.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent for printing 1,000 additional copies of the report for the use of the Committee on Pensions. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GALLINGER subsequently said: In presenting a report a few moments ago from the Committee on Pensions, I asked that 1,000 additional copies might be printed for the use of the committee. Several Senators have suggested to me that it is a document which will be called for very freely from all over the country and that the number ought to be at least 2,000. I therefore now ask unanimous consent that 2,000 additional copies be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That refers to the report which the Senator made this morning?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire asks that of the report made by him this morning 2,000 additional copies may be printed. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

EXPENSES OF VICE-PRESIDENT'S FUNERAL.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. GALLINGER on the 11th instant, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay from the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by direction of the President pro tempore in arranging for and attending the funeral of the late Vice-President of the United States and President of the Senate, Garret A. Hobart, at Paterson, N. J., on the 25th of November, 1899, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS.

Mr. WETMORE, from the Committee on the Library, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That there be printed and bound in cloth 2,500 copies of the Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress, 1899, 500 for the use of the Senate and 2,000 for the use of the Librarian of Congress.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 1479) to provide for telegraphic communication between the United States of America, the Hawaiian Islands, Guam, the Philippine Islands, Japan, and China, and to promote commerce; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1480) to amend the military record of John H. Lamson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1481) appropriating money to reimburse Capt. B. Tellefsen; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1482) for the relief of Mrs. Louisa E. McLean; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1483) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States," approved July 24, 1897; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 1484) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to change the material to be used in the construction of the dry docks at the navy-yards at League Island, Pa., and Mare Island, Cal., from timber to concrete and stone; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1485) to provide for the entry and purchase of coal and oil bearing lands in Alaska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1486) for the relief of J. W. Leigh; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1487) referring the claim of Robert W. Dunbar to the Court of Claims; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1488) for the relief of Arthur L. Fish; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1489) granting an increase of pension to Robert C. Rogers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 1490) to amend the immigration laws of the United States relative to the insane; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1491) for the relief of William B. Fletcher; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 1492) removing the charge of desertion from the name of Calvin Weaver;

A bill (S. 1493) removing the charge of desertion from the name of Milton G. Markland;

A bill (S. 1494) removing the charge of desertion from the name of Jacob Bowman, of the National Military Home, Marion, Ind.;

A bill (S. 1495) removing the charge of desertion from the name of Thomas J. Nelson;

A bill (S. 1496) for the relief of Courtney Hays;

A bill (S. 1497) for the relief of Pollard Anderson;

A bill (S. 1498) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Jacob Clark;

A bill (S. 1499) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of William Cruse;

A bill (S. 1500) to correct the military record of Hiram A. Benefiel; and

A bill (S. 1501) for the relief of John Bass.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 1502) granting a pension to John S. Dukate; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WELLINGTON introduced a bill (S. 1503) for the relief of Charles H. Janney, administrator de bonis non of the estate of Joseph H. Maddox, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1504) for the purchase of the statue of Salmon P. Chase, late Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. MCCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 1505) authorizing and directing the return to the State of North Dakota of the arms and equipments of the First Regiment of North Dakota Volunteer Infantry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CAFFERY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1506) for the relief of Joe Carroll;

A bill (S. 1507) for the relief of P. Emile Arceneaux;

A bill (S. 1508) for the relief of W. G. Wheeler;

A bill (S. 1509) for the relief of Mollie S. Wossman;

A bill (S. 1510) for the relief of J. M. Charpentier;

A bill (S. 1511) for the relief of John E. B. Giquel;

A bill (S. 1512) for the relief of Julien Semaire;

A bill (S. 1513) for the relief of Alonzo L. Boyer;

A bill (S. 1514) for the relief of Joseph D. Mittelbronn;

A bill (S. 1515) for the relief of the estate of Dominigue Pochelu, deceased;

A bill (S. 1516) for the relief of Edward J. Kennon;

A bill (S. 1517) for the relief of the estate of John Shelton, deceased;

A bill (S. 1518) for the relief of the estate of Charles A. Slack, deceased;

A bill (S. 1519) for the relief of Marguerite Arnaud;

A bill (S. 1520) for the relief of Mary C. Cleveland;

A bill (S. 1521) for the relief of Harriet A. Mills;
A bill (S. 1522) for the relief of Thomas Kergon;
A bill (S. 1523) for the relief of the estate of Raymond Pochelu, deceased;
A bill (S. 1524) for the relief of Arther Taylor;
A bill (S. 1525) for the relief of the estate of Jean Delille, late of Winn Parish, La.;
A bill (S. 1526) for the relief of Belote Auguste Donato;
A bill (S. 1527) for the relief of the estate of F. O. Darly;
A bill (S. 1528) for the relief of the estate of Margaret E. Woodward, deceased;
A bill (S. 1529) for the relief of the estate of Patrick Gilfoil, deceased;
A bill (S. 1530) for the relief of Cornelius Donato, administrator of Joseph Gradengo, deceased;
A bill (S. 1531) for the relief of the estate of Charles Armelin, deceased; and
A bill (S. 1532) for the relief of estate of Phillip Poete, deceased.

Mr. KENNEY introduced a bill (S. 1533) granting a pension to David Carroll; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1534) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to rehear and render judgment in the case of William Donnelly and Patrick Egan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HALE. I introduce two bills relating to matters in the Navy Department. I ask that they be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and printed with the accompanying letters.

The bill (S. 1535) to provide for the examination of certain officers of the Navy, and to regulate promotion therein, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, with the accompanying paper; which was ordered to be printed.

The bill (S. 1536) to enable naval courts-martial and courts of inquiry to secure the attendance and testimony of civilian witnesses was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, with the accompanying paper; which was ordered to be printed.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 1537) for the relief of Daniel Martin; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1538) to provide for the reserves of national banks; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1539) for the relief of Sarah R. Dresser; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:
A bill (S. 1540) for the relief of David A. McKnight;
A bill (S. 1541) for the relief of Thomas Smith; and
A bill (S. 1542) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Sexton.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1543) for the relief of M. D. Crow; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1544) for the relief of Harry A. E. Pickard; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1545) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Cornelia I. Skiles;
A bill (S. 1546) granting a pension to Thomas Madden;
A bill (S. 1547) granting a pension to Cyrus A. Bowers;
A bill (S. 1548) granting a pension to James Byrne;
A bill (S. 1549) increasing the pension of Isaiah Mitchell;
A bill (S. 1550) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Kate Ezekiel;
A bill (S. 1551) granting a pension to John G. B. Masters;
A bill (S. 1552) granting an increase of pension to Helen L. Dent; and
A bill (S. 1553) granting an increase of pension to Samantha Barnes.

Mr. TELLER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:
A bill (S. 1554) granting an honorable discharge to George S. Raymond;
A bill (S. 1555) to correct the military record of Charles A. Wahl;
A bill (S. 1556) to remove the charge of desertion against Charles L. Thompson;
A bill (S. 1557) granting an honorable discharge to John Kinchlow;
A bill (S. 1558) for the relief of the First Colorado Mounted Militia;
A bill (S. 1559) for the relief of the estate of Emmet Crawford, deceased;
A bill (S. 1560) granting an honorable discharge to James Brown;
A bill (S. 1561) removing the charge of desertion in the case of John Holderby;
A bill (S. 1562) for the relief of Wilbur F. McCue;
A bill (S. 1563) removing the charge of desertion from the name of Frank A. Land; and
A bill (S. 1564) to reimburse the State of Colorado for moneys expended in the suppression of Ute Indian depredations during the year 1887.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 1565) for the relief of the estate of Dennis O'Dea, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1566) for the relief of Moses B. Smart; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ELKINS (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1567) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of the legal heirs of John Harper, deceased, to certain lands in the State of Virginia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1568) authorizing the President to appoint and retire George W. Harrison, with the rank and grade of captain and assistant quartermaster; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 1569) granting a pension to Mrs. Phebe E. C. Priestly; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present, to accompany the bill, the petition of Mrs. Phebe E. C. Priestly, née Humon, for relief for services as nurse, etc., verified by her affidavit with affidavits of William H. Dooley, William O. Mead, Sarah S. Ritchter, Josephine Nance, Joshua Frost, L. P. Crunk, Mrs. M. A. Scoggins, J. H. Garrison, Archibald Hopper, T. H. B. Dunnegan, L. Lindrey, James J. Akard, T. A. Wakefield, and G. H. Higginbotham.

I move that the petition and affidavits be referred, with the bill, to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KYLE. I reintroduce, with a slight change in the wording, the joint resolution which I introduced the other day, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to marriage and divorce.

The joint resolution (S. R. 40) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to marriage and divorce was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SHIP CANALS OF THE GREAT LAKES.

Mr. McMILLAN submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the Senate:

1. The number of days during the season of 1899 on which navigation was blocked by reason of an accident occurring in St. Marys River and in the St. Clair Flats Canal, respectively; also the approximate money loss to the vessel interests by reason of such delays.

2. Whether in his judgment additional canals should be constructed in the two waterways above mentioned, or in either of them.

ANNUAL REPORT OF MAJ. GEN. E. S. OTIS.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to print in excess of the 1,000 copies authorized by the act of January 12, 1895, 5,000 copies of the annual report of Maj. Gen. E. S. Otis, United States Volunteers, commanding the Department of the Pacific and Eighth Army Corps and military governor in the Philippines, dated August 31, 1899, 1,000 copies for the use of the Senate, 2,00 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 2,000 copies for the use of the War Department.

TEXT-BOOKS IN INDIAN SCHOOLS.

Mr. DANIEL submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Commissioner of Indian Affairs be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish the Senate the following information:

The name of each text-book used for instruction in the Indian schools under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department, and the person, firm, or corporation publishing the same;

The number of copies of each book so used, purchased by direction of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for use in the Indian schools during the fiscal years ending June 30, 1899, and June 30, 1900;

The gross amount paid each person, firm, or corporation publishing the books so used during said years, said amount to include the amounts paid to said publishers direct and the amount paid to agents or others selling their publications.

AFFAIRS IN THE PHILIPPINES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution relative to affairs in the Philippines, coming over from a former day, submitted by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW].

Mr. PETTIGREW. I ask that the resolution may lie over until to-morrow without prejudice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OFFICERS OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Calendar under Rule VIII is now in order. The Secretary will announce the first bill on the Calendar.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 330) to restore to their original status as to promotion officers of the Navy and Marine Corps losing numbers by reason of the advancement of other officers for exceptional and meritorious service during the war with Spain.

Mr. ALLISON. The bill may lead to some little debate. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. CHANDLER. I hope the Senator from Iowa will allow the bill to be passed. I do not think there will be any objection to it.

Mr. TILLMAN. It is one we have all agreed on.

Mr. ALLISON. I am not familiar with it; but I shall not interpose the motion at this time.

Mr. CHANDLER. It is a bill which passed the Senate unanimously at the last session, but was not acted on in the other House. It is a bill that is entirely proper and defensible, and I do not think any Senator will object to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I object,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. ALLISON. I renew my motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After forty-two minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, December 14, 1899, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 13, 1899.

GENERAL APPRAISER.

William D. Bynum, of Indiana, to be general appraiser of merchandise, to succeed Joseph B. Wilkinson, jr., resigned.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

William M. Hoey, of Indiana, to be collector of customs for the district of Arizona, in the Territory of Arizona, to succeed H. K. Chenoweth, resigned.

Charles M. Moses, of Maine, to be collector of customs for the district of Portland and Falmouth, in the State of Maine, in place of Weston F. Milliken, deceased.

INDIAN AGENT.

Maj. George W. H. Stouch, United States Army, retired, of Colorado, to be agent for the Indians of the Cheyenne and Arapahoe Agency in Oklahoma, vice Maj. Albert E. Woodson, United States Army, relieved from duty as acting Indian agent.

PROMOTIONS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

TO BE SURGEON WITH THE RANK OF MAJOR.

Capt. John R. Hereford, assistant surgeon, Thirty-second Infantry, United States Volunteers, December 4, 1899, vice Armstrong, Thirty-second Infantry, United States Volunteers, deceased.

TO BE ASSISTANT SURGEON WITH THE RANK OF CAPTAIN.

First Lieut. William H. Cook, assistant surgeon, Thirty-second Infantry, United States Volunteers, December 4, 1899, vice Hereford, Thirty-second Infantry, United States Volunteers, promoted.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

THIRTIETH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenant.

First Sergt. John Campbell, Company M, Thirtieth Infantry, United States Volunteers, December 11, 1899, vice Abbott, promoted.

PUERTO RICO BATTALION.

To be captain.

First Lieut. Allen D. Raymond, Puerto Rico Battalion, United States Volunteers, December 7, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

George H. Kearny, formerly a chief engineer in the Navy, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 3d day of March, 1899, under the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1899, entitled "An act to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States."

William S. Moore, formerly a chief engineer in the Navy, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 3d day of March, 1899, under the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1899, entitled "An act to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States."

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles T. Vogelgesang, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 11th day of June, 1899, to fill an existing vacancy.

Lieut. Commander George Cowie, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Commander Henry S. Ross, retired.

Lieut. Charles C. Rogers, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander George Cowie, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles B. McVay, jr., to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Charles C. Rogers, promoted.

Lieut. Commander Charles P. Howell, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Commander John L. Hannum, retired.

Lieut. John T. Newton, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander Charles P. Howell, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Lay H. Everhart, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. John T. Newton, promoted.

Lieut. Waldemar D. Rose, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander William H. Driggs, retired.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Claude Bailey, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Lieut. Waldemar D. Rose, promoted.

Lieut. Charles F. Pond, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander John H. Moore, retired.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John H. Dayton, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Charles F. Pond, promoted.

Lieut. Walter McLean, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander Hawley O. Rittenhouse, retired.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Lucius A. Bostwick, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Walter McLean, promoted.

Lieut. Washington I. Chambers, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander Robert G. Peck, retired.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William A. Moffett, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Lieut. Washington I. Chambers, promoted.

Lieut. James C. Gillmore, to be lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Lieut. Commander Herman F. Fickbohm, retired.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Julian L. Latimer, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. James C. Gillmore, promoted.

Lieut. Benjamin Tappan, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander Gustavus C. Hanus, retired.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Doctor E. Dismukes, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Benjamin Tappan, promoted.

Lieut. Charles A. Gove, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander Henry H. Barroll, retired.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John R. Edie, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Charles A. Gove, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Reginald R. Belknap, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 2d day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Franklin Swift, retired.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) De Witt Blamer, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 6th day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Walter M. McFarland, resigned.

Lieut. Commander Charles P. Perkins, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 8th day of July, 1899, vice Commander Richard Rush, retired.

Lieut. De Witt Coffman, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 8th day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander Charles P. Perkins, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John K. Robison, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 8th day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. De Witt Coffman promoted.

Commander Charles H. Stockton, to be a captain in the Navy,

from the 8th day of July, 1899, vice Capt. James Entwistle, retired.

Lieut. Commander Charles G. Bowman, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 8th day of July, 1899, vice Commander Charles H. Stockton, promoted.

Lieut. William G. Hannum, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 8th day of July, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Lieut. Commander Charles G. Bowman, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Arthur L. Willard, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 8th day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. William G. Hannum, promoted.

Capt. Alexander H. McCormick, to be a rear-admiral in the Navy, from the 9th day of September, 1899, vice Rear-Admiral Henry F. Picking, deceased.

Commander Asa Walker, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 9th day of September, 1899, vice Capt. Alexander H. McCormick, promoted.

Lieut. Commander William P. Potter, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 9th day of September, 1899, vice Commander Asa Walker, promoted.

Lieut. Richard Henderson, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 9th day of September, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander William P. Potter, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Edwin T. Pollock, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 9th day of September, 1899, vice Lieut. Richard Henderson, promoted.

Lieut. Commander William H. Beehler, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 22d day of September, 1899, vice Commander Robert T. Jasper, retired.

Lieut. Thomas D. Griffin, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 22d day of September, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander William H. Beehler, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Clark D. Stearns, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 22d day of September, 1899, vice Lieut. Thomas D. Griffin, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Henry C. Kuenzli, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 24th day of September, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Lieut. William H. Faust, retired.

Commander Oscar W. Farenholt, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 25th day of September, 1899, vice Capt. Joseph Trilley, retired.

Lieut. Commander Giles B. Harber, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 25th day of September, 1899, vice Commander Oscar W. Farenholt, promoted.

Lieut. Henry Minett, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 25th day of September, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander Giles B. Harber, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John H. Rowen, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 25th day of September, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Lieut. Henry Minett, promoted.

Capt. Albert S. Barker, to be a rear-admiral in the Navy, from the 10th day of October, 1899, vice Rear-Admiral Henry L. Howison, retired.

Commander Edward T. Strong, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 10th day of October, 1899, vice Capt. Albert S. Barker, promoted.

Lieut. Commander John B. Briggs, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 10th day of October, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Commander Edward T. Strong, promoted.

Lieut. Richard T. Mulligan, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 10th day of October, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander John B. Briggs, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Henry H. Hough, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 10th day of October, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Lieut. Richard T. Mulligan, promoted.

Commander Robert E. Impey, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 2d day of November, 1899, vice Capt. Nicoll Ludlow, retired.

Lieut. Commander Newton E. Mason, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 2d day of November, 1899, vice Commander Robert E. Impey, promoted.

Lieut. William Braunersreuther, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 2d day of November, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Lieut. Commander Newton E. Mason, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Milton E. Reed, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 2d day of November, 1899, vice Lieut. William Braunersreuther, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Harley H. Christy, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 21st day of November, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Lieut. Franklin B. Sullivan, retired.

Commander Eugene W. Watson, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 22d day of November, 1899, vice Capt. John Schouler, retired.

Lieut. Commander Arthur P. Nazro, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 22d day of November, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Commander Eugene W. Watson, promoted.

Lieut. Francis H. Sherman, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 22d day of November, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander Arthur P. Nazro, promoted.

To be lieutenants (junior grade).

John P. J. Ryan.
John R. Morris.
Chester Wells.
Irvin V. Gillis.
Ridley McLean.
Raymond Stone.
David F. Sellers.
Charles Webster.
John T. Tompkins.
John M. Hudgins.
Provoost Babin.
Simon P. Fullinwider.
Lewis B. Jones.
Boling K. McMorris.
Stephen V. Graham.
Alfred W. Hinds.
Ernest L. Bennett.
Roscoe C. Moody.
Fritz L. Sandoz.
Leland F. James.
John McC. Luby.
Ralph H. Chappell.
Joseph M. Reeves.
William P. Scott (subject to examination).
Arthur G. Kavanagh.
Ignatius T. Cooper.
Carlton F. Snow.
Henry T. Baker.
Frank Lyon.
Charles S. Bookwalter.
Hutch I. Cone.
Roscoe C. Bulmer.
Gilbert S. Galbraith.
Emory Winship (subject to examination).
Roscoe Spear.
Robert W. McNeely.
Walter S. Turpin (subject to examination).
George L. P. Stone.
William S. Whitted.
Robert H. Osborn (subject to examination).
Walter J. Manion.
George E. Gelm.
Clarence England.
Edwin H. De Lany.

POSTMASTERS.

Frank H. Hudson, to be postmaster at Clifton, in the county of Graham and Territory of Arizona, in the place of C. K. Holt, resigned.

Horace B. Gardiner, to be postmaster at Crockett, in the county of Contra Costa and State of California, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Harry E. Meyers, to be postmaster at Yuba City, in the county of Sutter and State of California, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Albert L. Paulsen, to be postmaster at Weaverville, in the county of Trinity and State of California, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

William P. Harbottle, to be postmaster at Salida, in the county of Chaffee and State of Colorado, in the place of F. W. Brush, resigned.

John F. Morgan, to be postmaster at Colorado City, in the county of El Paso and State of Colorado, in the place of C. A. Crane, removed.

Charles T. Wade, to be postmaster at Buena Vista, in the county of Chaffee and State of Colorado, in the place of C. H. Holt, removed.

Edmund E. Crowe, to be postmaster at South Norwalk, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut, in the place of G. W. Benedict, whose commission expires December 19, 1899.

William Holmes, to be postmaster at Shelton, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut, in the place of Horace Wheeler, whose commission expires December 19, 1899.

George Glass, to be postmaster at High Springs, in the county of Alachua and State of Florida, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

R. S. Hanna, to be postmaster at St. Petersburg, in the county of Hillsboro and State of Florida, in the place of W. A. Sloan, removed.

William J. Watson, to be postmaster at Marianna, in the county of Jackson and State of Florida, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Lizzie Hamilton, to be postmaster at Buford, in the county of Gwinnett and State of Georgia, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

George L. Walker, to be postmaster at Toccoa, in the county of Habersham and State of Georgia, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Hugh Bennett, to be postmaster at Coal City, in the county of Grundy and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Lucian Bullard, to be postmaster at Forrest, in the county of Livingston and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Addison B. Hallock, to be postmaster at Peotone, in the county of Will and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Oscar H. Harpham, to be postmaster at Havana, in the county of Mason and State of Illinois, in the place of F. A. High, removed.

James P. Mathis, to be postmaster at Toluca, in the county of Marshall and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Charles F. Renich, to be postmaster at Woodstock, in the county of McHenry and State of Illinois, in the place of J. A. Dufield, removed.

Amos A. Covalt, to be postmaster at Greentown, in the county of Howard and State of Indiana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Edward L. Maudlin, to be postmaster at New Carlisle, in the county of St. Joseph and State of Indiana, in the place of G. H. Service, removed.

Samuel H. Hedrix, to be postmaster at Allerton, in the county of Wayne and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Edward Madigan, to be postmaster at Clarksville, in the county of Butler and State of Iowa, in the place of J. J. Eichar, resigned.

Cornelius C. Platter, to be postmaster at Red Oak, in the county of Montgomery and State of Iowa, in the place of W. W. Merritt, whose commission expires December 18, 1899.

Lovett E. Sherwood, to be postmaster at Shellrock, in the county of Butler and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Joseph P. Bozarth, to be postmaster at La Grange, in the county of Oldham and State of Kentucky, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

George W. Evans, to be postmaster at Aberdeen, in the county of Harford and State of Maryland, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Minot Wales Baker, to be postmaster at Randolph, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts, in the place of G. W. Wales, whose commission expires January 7, 1900.

Charles H. Cummings, to be postmaster at Attleboro Falls, in the county of Bristol and State of Massachusetts, in the place of J. E. Doran, whose commission expires December 19, 1899.

George A. Hibbard, to be postmaster at Boston, in the county of Suffolk and State of Massachusetts, in the place of H. A. Thomas, resigned.

William L. Lathrop, to be postmaster at Orange, in the county of Franklin and State of Massachusetts, in the place of G. W. Merrill, removed.

Henry S. Moore, to be postmaster at Hudson, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts, in the place of Henry S. Moore, whose commission expires January 7, 1900. (Reappointed.)

Corydon Beach, to be postmaster at Galesburg, in the county of Kalamazoo and State of Michigan, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Archibald K. Dougherty, to be postmaster at Elk Rapids, in the county of Antrim and State of Michigan, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Willard E. Holt, to be postmaster at Bellevue, in the county of Eaton and State of Michigan, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Victor Gillrup, to be postmaster at Albert Lea, in the county of Freeborn and State of Minnesota, in the place of L. P. Lorenson, whose commission expires January 15, 1900.

Charles F. Hendryx, to be postmaster at Sauk Center, in the county of Stearns and State of Minnesota, in the place of W. O. P. Hilsdale, whose commission expires December 19, 1899.

Nels A. Lilyquist, to be postmaster at Winthrop, in the county of Sibley and State of Minnesota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

James H. McCune, to be postmaster at Benson, in the county of Swift and State of Minnesota, in the place of Julius Thorson, whose commission expires December 19, 1899.

Peter S. Nelson, to be postmaster at Argyle, in the county of Marshall and State of Minnesota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Charles W. Paige, to be postmaster at Dawson, in the county of Lac qui Parle and State of Minnesota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Charles F. Searle, to be postmaster at Milaca, in the county of Millelacs and State of Minnesota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Justin E. Stiles, to be postmaster at Wells, in the county of Faribault and State of Minnesota, in the place of Robert Andrews, whose commission expires December 19, 1899.

Samuel L. Stanchfield, to be postmaster at Camden Place, in the county of Hennepin and State of Minnesota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

David G. Dunlap, to be postmaster at Sardis, in the county of Panola and State of Mississippi, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

William A. Albright, to be postmaster at Kirkwood, in the county of St. Louis and State of Missouri, in the place of F. J. Heinemann, removed.

Eugene B. Pegram, to be postmaster at Montgomery City, in the county of Montgomery and State of Missouri, in the place of C. T. Hamilton, resigned.

Lewellen P. Robinson, to be postmaster at Breckenridge, in the county of Caldwell and State of Missouri, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Leon C. Olmstead, to be postmaster at Bigtimber, in the county of Sweet Grass and State of Montana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1898.

Edmund J. Burke, to be postmaster at Bancroft, in the county of Cuming and State of Nebraska, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Ambrose M. Colson, to be postmaster at Plainview in the county of Pierce and State of Nebraska, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

James McNally, to be postmaster at Edgar, in the county of Clay and State of Nebraska, in the place of J. D. Baker, whose commission expires January 15, 1900.

Jessie W. Phillips, to be postmaster at Table Rock, in the county of Pawnee and State of Nebraska, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Samuel H. Reesman, to be postmaster at University Place, in the county of Lancaster and State of Nebraska, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

J. D. Stine, to be postmaster at Superior, in the county of Nuckolls and State of Nebraska, in the place of J. F. Bradshaw, whose commission expires January 15, 1900.

Lewis W. Davis, to be postmaster at East Jaffrey, in the county of Cheshire and State of New Hampshire, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Ellen S. Griffin, to be postmaster at Franklin, in the county of Merrimack and State of New Hampshire, in the place of W. H. Stewart, deceased.

Fred S. Huckins, to be postmaster at Ashland, in the county of Grafton and State of New Hampshire, in the place of W. F. Hardy, whose commission expires December 30, 1899.

Lewis E. Jeffries, to be postmaster at Mays Landing, in the county of Atlantic and State of New Jersey, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Daniel M. Merchant, to be postmaster at Morris Plains, in the county of Morris and State of New Jersey, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Thomas H. Dickinson, to be postmaster at Champlain, in the county of Clinton and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

George T. Eveland, to be postmaster at Franklin, in the county of Delaware and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

George E. Marcellus, to be postmaster at Leroy, in the county of Genesee and State of New York, in the place of John Wiss, removed.

William Holden, to be postmaster at Portville, in the county of Cattaraugus and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Clarence E. Parker, to be postmaster at Nepera Park, in the county of Westchester and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Lillian I. Pearsall, to be postmaster at Sea Cliff, in the county of Nassau and State of New York, in the place of Lillian I. Pearsall, whose commission expires January 7, 1900. (Reappointed.)

Frank M. Preston, to be postmaster at Oswego Falls, in the county of Oswego and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

George L. Rapelye, to be postmaster at Corona, in the county of Queens and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Isaac S. Slaight, to be postmaster at Tottenville, in the county of Richmond and State of New York, in the place of R. W. Wood, whose commission expired July 18, 1898.

Hans A. Alm, to be postmaster at Hankinson, in the county of Richland and State of North Dakota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Millard F. Kepner, to be postmaster at New Rockford, in the county of Eddy and State of North Dakota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Mathew Lynch, to be postmaster at Lidgerwood, in the county of Richland and State of North Dakota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Clarence H. Ashar, to be postmaster at Carthage, in the county of Hamilton and State of Ohio, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Lee L. Cassady, to be postmaster at Dresden, in the county of Muskingum and State of Ohio, in the place of W. M. Miller, resigned.

Robert S. King, to be postmaster at Glouster, in the county of Athens and State of Ohio, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Edgar M. Kane, to be postmaster at Vermilion, in the county of Erie and State of Ohio, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Nellie F. Sheridan, to be postmaster at Somerset, in the county of Perry and State of Ohio, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Leonidas H. Smith, to be postmaster at Arcanum, in the county of Darke and State of Ohio, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Robert H. Robison, to be postmaster at Arlington, in the county of Gilliam and State of Oregon, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Robert S. Bowman, to be postmaster at Berwick, in the county of Columbia and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of L. J. Townsend, removed.

Lotta J. Kintner, to be postmaster at Wyalusing, in the county of Bradford and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

George D. Leonard, to be postmaster at Newberry, in the county of Lycoming and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

William H. Logan, to be postmaster at Clifton Heights, in the county of Delaware and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Samuel G. Wilson, to be postmaster at Bridgeport, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Alexander Griffith, removed.

John A. Allen, to be postmaster at Peace Dale, in the county of Washington and State of Rhode Island, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Lyman J. Bates, to be postmaster at Lake Preston, in the county of Kingsbury and State of South Dakota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

George G. Jennings, to be postmaster at Clark, in the county of Clark and State of South Dakota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Reuben Matson, to be postmaster at Brookings, in the county of Brookings and State of South Dakota, in the place of Joshua Downing, whose commission expires December 21, 1899.

David E. Ward, to be postmaster at Dell Rapids, in the county of Minnehaha and State of South Dakota, in the place of Augustus Huntemer, whose commission expires December 21, 1899.

Clarence V. Rattan, to be postmaster at Cooper, in the county of Delta and State of Texas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

E. R. Booth, to be postmaster at Nephi, in the county of Juab and State of Utah, in the place of Charles Andrews, resigned.

Catherine M. Dougall, to be postmaster at Springville, in the county of Utah and State of Utah, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Martha W. Arnold, to be postmaster at Bethel, in the county of Windsor and State of Vermont, in the place of Fred Arnold, deceased.

Harlow C. Ayer, to be postmaster at Richford, in the county of Franklin and State of Vermont, in the place of Oscar McGregor, whose commission expires December 30, 1899.

Henry G. Blanchard, to be postmaster at Newport, in the county of Orleans and State of Vermont, in the place of C. N. Brady, whose commission expires December 30, 1899.

Henry J. Fisher, to be postmaster at Morrisville, in the county of Lamoille and State of Vermont, in the place of D. C. Spaulding, who commission expires December 30, 1899.

Charles E. Hall, to be postmaster at Swanton, in the county of Franklin and State of Vermont, in the place of E. A. Ayers, whose commission expires December 30, 1899.

Edward J. Tyler, to be postmaster at Enosburg Falls, in the county of Franklin and State of Vermont, in the place of W. E. Fuller, resigned.

Oscar C. Truax, to be postmaster at Tekoa, in the county of Whitman and State of Washington, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Alexander Watt, to be postmaster at Cheney, in the county of Spokane and State of Washington, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

William Chambers, to be postmaster at Point Pleasant, in the county of Mason and State of West Virginia, in the place of G. B. Thomas, whose commission expires December 30, 1899.

William H. Glover, to be postmaster at Terra Alta, in the county of Preston and State of West Virginia, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Charles A. Booth, to be postmaster at Monroe, in the county of Green and State of Wisconsin, in the place of F. C. Bennett, whose commission expires December 30, 1899.

Wilbur H. Bridgman, to be postmaster at Stanley, in the county of Chippewa and State of Wisconsin, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

George W. Dodge, to be postmaster at Menasha, in the county of Winnebago and State of Wisconsin, in the place of Charles Reed, whose commission expires December 30, 1899.

John F. Gillmore, to be postmaster at Durand, in the county of Pepin and State of Wisconsin, in the place of P. J. Ryan, deceased.

Moses E. Williams, to be postmaster at Foxlake, in the county of Dodge and State of Wisconsin, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 13, 1899.

THIRD ASSISTANT POSTMASTER-GENERAL.

Edwin C. Madden, of Michigan, to be Third Assistant Postmaster-General.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

William M. Hoey, of Indiana, to be collector of customs for the district of Arizona, in the Territory of Arizona.

CONSULS-GENERAL.

Philip C. Hanna, of Iowa, to be consul-general of the United States at Monterey, Mexico.

John G. Long, of Florida, to be agent and consul-general of the United States at Cairo, Egypt.

CONSULS.

Julio Harmony, of New York, to be consul of the United States at Corunna, Spain.

Jay White, of Michigan, to be consul of the United States at Hanover, Germany.

Hugh C. Morris, of Michigan, to be consul of the United States at Windsor, Ontario, Canada.

Solomon Berliner, of New York, to be consul of the United States at Teneriffe, Canary Islands.

John Howell Carroll, of Maryland, to be consul of the United States at Cadiz, Spain.

Frank D. Hill, of Minnesota, to be consul of the United States at Amsterdam, Netherlands.

Adelbert S. Hay, of New Hampshire, to be consul of the United States at Pretoria, South African Republic.

Harlan W. Brush, of New York, to be consul of the United States at Niagara Falls, Canada.

Richard M. Bartleman, of Massachusetts, to be consul of the United States at Malaga, Spain.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

GENERAL OFFICERS.

To be brigadier-generals.

Col. Edwin V. Sumner (since retired from active service), Seventh Cavalry, March 27, 1899.

Col. Thomas M. Anderson, Fourteenth Infantry, March 31, 1899.

Col. Alexander C. M. Pennington (since retired from active service), Second Artillery, October 16, 1899.

Col. Royal T. Frank (since retired from active service), First Artillery, October 17, 1899.

Col. Louis H. Carpenter (since retired from active service), Fifth Cavalry, October 18, 1899.

Col. Samuel Ovenshine (since retired from active service), Twenty-third Infantry, October 19, 1899.

Col. Daniel W. Burke (since retired from active service), Seventeenth Infantry, October 20, 1899.

PAY DEPARTMENT.

To be Paymaster-General with the rank of brigadier-general.

Col. Alfred E. Bates, assistant paymaster-general, July 12, 1899.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

To be Chief of Ordnance with the rank of brigadier-general.

Col. Adelbert R. Buffington, Ordnance Department, April 5, 1899.

To be first lieutenant.

First Lieut. Edward P. O'Hern, Third Artillery, October 23, 1899.

QUARTERMASTER'S DEPARTMENT.

To be assistant quartermasters with the rank of captain.

First Lieut. George McK. Williamson, Eighth Cavalry, July 21, 1899.

First Lieut. Robert Sewell, First Cavalry, September 1, 1899.

First Lieut. Thomas H. Slavens, Fourth Cavalry, November 13, 1899.

GENERAL OFFICERS.

Col. Edgar R. Kellogg, Sixth United States Infantry, to be brigadier-general, December 5, 1899.

Col. Gilbert S. Carpenter, Eighteenth United States Infantry, to be brigadier-general, December 5, 1899.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

To be brigadier-generals.

Col. William A. Kobbé, Thirty-fifth Regiment of Infantry, United States Volunteers, December 5, 1899.

Col. J. Franklin Bell, Thirty-sixth Regiment of Infantry, United States Volunteers, December 5, 1899.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Capt. George W. Melville, United States Navy, to be Engineer in Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear-admiral, from the 3d day of March, 1899, until the 16th day of January, 1900.

Naval Constructor Philip Hichborn, United States Navy, to be Chief Constructor and Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear-admiral, from the 3d day of March, 1899, until the 18th day of December, 1901.

Capt. Arent Schuyler Crowninshield, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear-admiral, from the 3d day of March, 1899, until the 8th day of April, 1901.

Capt. Charles O'Neil, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear-admiral, from the 3d day of March, 1899, until the 1st day of June, 1901.

Capt. Royal B. Bradford, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Equipment, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear-admiral, from the 3d day of March, 1899, until the 18th day of December, 1901.

Medical Director William K. Van Reypen, United States Navy, to be Surgeon-General and Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear-admiral, from the 3d day of March, 1899, until the 18th day of December, 1901.

Civil Engineer Mordecai T. Endicott, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear-admiral, from the 3d day of March, 1899, until the 4th day of April, 1902.

Pay Director Albert S. Kenny, United States Navy, to be Paymaster-General and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear-admiral, for a term of four years.

Commander George E. Ide, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 25th day of March, 1899.

Lieut. Clifford J. Boush, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 25th day of March, 1899.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William H. Buck, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 25th day of March, 1899.

Capt. Benjamin F. Day, to be a rear-admiral in the Navy, from the 29th day of March, 1899.

Commander George M. Book, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 29th day of March, 1899.

Lieut. James H. Sears, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 29th day of March, 1899.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) George W. Williams, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 29th day of March, 1899.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Claude B. Price, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 2d day of April, 1899.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Montgomery M. Taylor, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 2d day of June, 1899.

Lieut. Abraham E. Culver, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 4th day of June, 1899.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Henry S. Ritter, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 4th day of June, 1899.

Commander Thomas Perry, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 11th day of June, 1899.

Lieut. Commander Julien S. Ogden, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 11th day of June, 1899.

Lieut. Henry T. Mayo, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 11th day of June, 1899.

Asst. Surg. Reginald K. Smith, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, from the 3d day of April, 1898.

Asst. Surg. Jacob C. Rosenbleuth, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, from the 14th day of October, 1898.

Medical Inspector Abel F. Price, to be a medical director in the Navy, from the 9th day of April, 1899.

Surg. James R. Waggener, to be a medical inspector in the Navy, from the 9th day of April, 1899.

P. A. Surg. Thomas A. Berryhill, to be a surgeon in the Navy, from the 9th day of April, 1899.

Medical Inspector Michael C. Drennan, to be a medical director in the Navy, from the 16th day of April, 1899.

Surg. Thomas H. Streets, to be a medical inspector in the Navy, from the 16th day of April, 1899.

P. A. Surg. Eugene P. Stone, to be a surgeon in the Navy, from the 16th day of April, 1899.

Asst. Surg. Robert S. Blakeman, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, from the 27th day of May, 1899.

Asst. Surg. George D. Costigan, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, from the 11th day of August, 1899.

P. A. Surg. George Pickrell, to be a surgeon in the Navy, from the 19th day of September, 1899.

Medical Inspector James A. Hawke, to be a medical director in the Navy, from the 24th day of September, 1899.

Surg. Manly H. Simons, to be a medical inspector in the Navy, from the 24th day of September, 1899.

Medical Inspector Robert A. Marmion, to be a medical director in the Navy, from October 25, 1899.

Surg. John C. Boyd, to be a medical inspector in the Navy, from the 25th day of October, 1899.

Medical Inspector Dwight Dickinson, to be a medical director in the Navy, from the 11th day of November, 1899.

Surg. George E. H. Harmon, to be a medical inspector in the Navy, from the 11th day of November, 1899.

Pay Inspector George W. Beaman, to be a pay director in the Navy, from the 9th day of April, 1899.

Paymaster William J. Thomson, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 9th day of April, 1899.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Henry E. Jewett, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 9th day of April, 1899.

Assistant Paymaster William T. Gray, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 9th day of April, 1899.

Paymaster Henry G. Colby, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 23d day of April, 1899.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Ziba W. Reynolds, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 23d day of April, 1899.

Assistant Paymaster George P. Dyer, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 23d day of April, 1899.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Eugene D. Ryan, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 3d day of May, 1899.

Assistant Paymaster Robert H. Woods, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 3d day of May, 1899.

Pay Inspector Arthur Burtis, to be a pay director in the Navy, from the 5th day of May, 1899.

Paymaster John B. Redfield, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 5th day of May, 1899.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Samuel McGowan, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 5th day of May, 1899.

Assistant Paymaster Robert H. Orr, to be a passed assistant paymaster, from the 5th day of May, 1899.

Pay Inspector Edwin Putnam, to be a pay director in the Navy, from the 7th day of May, 1899.

Paymaster Ichabod G. Hobbs, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 7th day of May, 1899.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Henry A. Dent, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 7th day of May, 1899.

Assistant Paymaster William A. Merritt, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 7th day of May, 1899.

Pay Inspector Robert P. Lisle, to be a pay director in the Navy, from the 6th day of June, 1899.

Paymaster Joel P. Loomis, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 6th day of June, 1899.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Walter L. Wilson, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 6th day of June, 1899.

Assistant Paymaster Franklin W. Hart, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 6th day of June, 1899.

Pay Inspector Leonard A. Frailey, to be a pay director in the Navy, from the 29th day of August, 1899.

Paymaster Henry T. B. Harris, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 29th day of August, 1899.

John Clyde Sullivan, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 16th day of June, 1899.

Pay Inspector George E. Hendee, to be a pay director in the Navy, from the 1st day of September, 1899.

Paymaster Stephen Rand, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 1st day of September, 1899.

Passed Assistant Paymaster William J. Littell, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 1st day of September, 1899.

Assistant Paymaster Harrison L. Robins, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 1st day of September, 1899.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Philip V. Mohun, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 15th day of September, 1899.

Assistant Paymaster Webb V. H. Rose, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 15th day of September, 1899.

Paymaster Lawrence G. Boggs, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 12th day of November, 1899.

PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE CORPS.

Capt. Cyrus S. Radford, United States Marine Corps, to be an assistant quartermaster in said corps, from the 8th day of March, 1899.

First Lieut. Robert P. Faunt Le Roy, United States Marine Corps, to be an assistant quartermaster in said corps with the rank of captain, from the 27th day of May, 1899.

First Lieut. William B. Lemly to be an assistant quartermaster with the rank of captain in said corps, from the 27th day of May, 1899.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE CORPS.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS.

From the 8th day of April, 1899.

George C. Thorpe, a citizen of Maine.
Smedley D. Butler, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
William B. Lemly, a citizen of North Carolina.
Henry Leonard, a citizen of the District of Columbia.
Charles S. Hill, a citizen of New Hampshire.
Robert M. Gilson, a citizen of Vermont.
Robert P. Faunt Le Roy, a citizen of Virginia.
David D. Porter, a citizen of the District of Columbia.
Frederick L. Bradman, a citizen of Montana.
Henry C. Davis, a citizen of the District of Columbia.
George C. Reid, a citizen of Ohio.
Robert H. Dunlap, a citizen of the District of Columbia.

From the 13th day of April, 1899.

Henry W. Carpenter, a citizen of Virginia.
Randolph C. Berkeley, a citizen of Virginia.
Arthur J. Matthews, a citizen of Rhode Island.
Charles G. Andresen, a citizen of New York.
Charles S. Hatch, a citizen of the District of Columbia.
James C. Breckinridge, a citizen of Arkansas.
Arthur T. Marix, a citizen of Illinois.
Philip S. Brown, a citizen of Maine.
Harry Lee, a citizen of the District of Columbia.

From the 26th day of May, 1899.

John F. McGill, a citizen of Virginia.
Frederic H. Delano, a citizen of New York.
Louis M. Gulick, a citizen of New York.
Hiram I. Bearss, a citizen of Indiana.
William H. Parker, a citizen of the District of Columbia.
Robert F. Wynne, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Edwin A. Jonas, a citizen of Louisiana.
Benjamin F. Rittenhouse, a citizen of Virginia.

From the 8th day of June, 1899.

Thomas F. Lyons, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

From the 1st day of July, 1899.

James T. Bootes, a citizen of Delaware.
Ernest E. West, a citizen of Georgia.
William G. Powell, appointed at large.
Logan Feland, a citizen of Kentucky.
William H. Clifford, jr., a citizen of Maine.
John H. A. Day, a citizen of New Jersey.
John S. Bates, appointed at large.
James W. Broatch, a citizen of Nebraska.
Benjamin B. Woog, appointed at large.
William Hopkins, a citizen of the District of Columbia.
Dickinson P. Hall, a citizen of Ohio.
Arthur E. Harding, a citizen of Illinois.
William W. Low, a citizen of Connecticut.
James W. Lynch, a citizen of Maine.
Charles H. Lyman, appointed at large.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS.

From the 1st day of July, 1899.

Charles C. Carpenter, a citizen of New Hampshire.
Norman G. Burton, a citizen of Massachusetts.
Louis M. Little, a citizen of Rhode Island.
Leof M. Harding, a citizen of Missouri.
Frederic M. Wise, jr., appointed at large.
Richard M. Cutts, a citizen of California.
Stephen Elliott, a citizen of South Carolina.
Harold C. Snyder, a citizen of Virginia.

From the 27th day of July, 1899.

Wirt McCreary, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

From the 2d day of October, 1899.

Richard P. Williams, a citizen of Arizona.
Wade L. Jolly, a citizen of Iowa.
Alexander S. Williams, a citizen of New York.
John N. Wright, a citizen of South Dakota.
Olof H. Rask, a citizen of Minnesota.
Richard G. McConnell, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Julius S. Turrill, a citizent of Vermont.
Lee B. Purcell, a citizen of Indiana.
James M. Huey, a citizen of Louisiana.

TO BE MAJORS.

Capt. Thomas N. Wood, United States Marine Corps, from the 18th day of June, 1899.

Capt. Littleton W. T. Waller, United States Marine Corps, from the 25th day of July, 1899.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONELS.

Maj. George F. Elliott, United States Marine Corps, from the 11th day of September, 1899.

Capt. Harry K. White, United States Marine Corps, from the 11th day of September, 1899.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Assistant paymasters to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy.

George Brown, jr.
Walter B. Izard.
David Potter (subject to examination).
Samuel Bryan (subject to examination).
George M. Lukesh (subject to examination).
John W. Morse (subject to examination).
Arthur F. Huntington.
Harry H. Balthis.
Charles Conrad.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

To be assistant paymasters.

George R. Venable, a citizen of Virginia, from the 6th day of March, 1899.
Howard P. Ash, a citizen of Pennsylvania, from the 6th day of March, 1899.
Hugh R. Insley, a citizen of California, from the 6th day of March, 1899.
James S. Barber, a citizen of Ohio, from the 6th day of March, 1899.
George M. Stackhouse, a citizen of South Carolina, from the 13th day of April, 1899.
Grey Skipwith, a citizen of Virginia, from the 13th day of April, 1899.
Trevor W. Leutze, a citizen of New York, from the 15th day of April, 1899.
McGill R. Goldsborough, a citizen of Maryland, from the 25th day of April, 1899.
David V. Chadwick, a citizen of West Virginia, from the 25th day of April, 1899.
Eugene C. Tobey, a citizen of Maine, from the 28th day of April, 1899.
Arthur H. Cathcart, a citizen of Minnesota, from the 15th day of May, 1899.
Jonathan Brooks, a citizen of Massachusetts, from the 22d day of May, 1899.
Eugene F. Hall, a citizen of Kentucky, from the 27th day of May, 1899.
Dexter Tiffany, jr., a citizen of Missouri, from the 31st day of May, 1899.
Franklin P. Sackett, a citizen of Rhode Island, from the 3d day of June, 1899.
David M. Addison, a citizen of Kansas, from the 3d day of June, 1899.
William T. Wallace, a citizen of Pennsylvania, from the 3d day of June, 1899.
Victor S. Jackson, a citizen of Indiana, from the 9th day of June, 1899.
John R. Sanford, a citizen of New York, from the 9th day of June, 1899.
Herbert E. Stevens, a citizen of Massachusetts, from the 5th day of July, 1899.
Charles R. O'Leary, a citizen of Pennsylvania, from the 18th day of September, 1899.
Charles W. Eliason, a citizen of the District of Columbia, from the 18th day of September, 1899.
Cuthbert J. Cleborne, a citizen of New Hampshire, from the 18th day of September, 1899.
Philip Delano, a citizen of the District of Columbia, from the 1st day of December, 1899.

To be assistant surgeons.

Barton L. Wright, a citizen of Pennsylvania, from the 13th day of May, 1899.
Ralph W. Plummer, a citizen of Illinois, from the 17th day of June, 1899.
Olin Martin Eakins, a citizen of New Jersey, from the 21st day of October, 1899.
Henry E. Odell, a citizen of Ohio, from the 8th day of November, 1899.
James S. Taylor, a citizen of New Jersey, from the 8th day of November, 1899.
Edwin Davis, a citizen of Kentucky, from the 21st day of November, 1899.

To be assistant naval constructors.

Naval Cadets William G. Du Bose, of Georgia, Ernest F. Eggert, of Michigan, and Ensign Joseph W. Powell, of New York, from the 1st day of July, 1899.

To be a professor of mathematics.

Milton Updegraff, a citizen of Iowa, from the 5th day of June, 1899, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade.

To be chief boatswains.

Charles F. Pierce, from the 7th day of May, 1899.
Henry Hudson, from the 27th day of August, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law).
Hugh Sweeney, from the 27th day of August, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law).
Michael Wogan, from the 21st day of October, 1899.

To be a chief carpenter.

Edward W. Smith, from the 7th day of May, 1899.

To be ensigns in the Navy.

Harry E. Yarnell, Iowa.
Harlan P. Perrill, Indiana.
David E. Theleen, Wisconsin.
Daniel S. Mahony, Michigan.
Arthur J. Hepburn, Pennsylvania.
Needham L. Jones, Mississippi.
Thomas C. Hart, Michigan.
Alfred W. Pressey, Nebraska.
William H. Reynolds, Georgia.
Cyrus R. Miller, California.
Orin G. Murfin, Ohio.
Leonard R. Sargent, Minnesota.
Luther M. Overstreet, Nebraska.
William R. White, Arizona.
Henry L. Collins, Pennsylvania.
Victor S. Houston, South Dakota.
David F. Boyd, Alabama.
Gilbert Chase, Virginia.
Louis C. Richardson, South Carolina.
Walton R. Sexton, Illinois.
Walter M. Falconer, Ohio.
Joseph W. Graeme, Pennsylvania.
Albert H. McCarthy, Iowa.
Frederic R. Holman, Iowa.
Henry N. Jenson, Wisconsin.
William D. Leahy, Wisconsin.
Andrew T. Graham, Illinois.
Arthur St. C. Smith, Iowa.
Peter L. Pratt, at large.
Oscar D. Duncan, Alabama.
Willis McDowell, Pennsylvania.
Austin Kautz, Washington.
Charles T. Owens, Pennsylvania.
Hilary Williams, Indiana.
Robert W. Henderson, Ohio.
William C. Asserson, New York.
Clarence S. Kempff, California.
Alfred C. Owen, District of Columbia.
Samuel G. Magill, jr., North Dakota.
Irwin F. Landis, Kansas.
Ernest C. Keenan, New York.

TO BE A FIRST LIEUTENANT IN THE MARINE CORPS.

George Van Orden, Michigan.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS IN THE MARINE CORPS.

Herbert Mather, New Jersey.
Henry L. Roosevelt, New York.
Fred M. Eslick, Tennessee.
Jay M. Salladay, Illinois.
Rush R. Wallace, Tennessee.
Macker Babb, West Virginia.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

John R. Brady, formerly assistant engineer, United States Navy, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy, from the 10th day of February, 1899, to the 3d day of March, 1899.

Clarence A. Carr, formerly passed assistant engineer, United States Navy, to be a chief engineer in the Navy, from the 24th day of February, 1899, to the 3d day of March, 1899.

Allen M. Cook, formerly assistant engineer, United States Navy, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy, from the 24th day of February, 1899, to the 3d day of March, 1899.

Edward H. Scribner, formerly passed assistant engineer, United States Navy, to be a chief engineer in the Navy, from the 28th day of February, 1899, to the 3d day of March, 1899.

Emmet R. Pollock, formerly assistant engineer, United States Navy, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy, from the 28th day of February, 1899, to the 3d day of March, 1899.

SUPERVISORS OF THE TWELFTH CENSUS.

James A. Place, of South Berwick, York County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Maine.

Samuel A. Eddy, of Canaan, Litchfield County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the —— supervisor's district of Connecticut.

George H. Webb, of Providence, Providence County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of Rhode Island.

Horace G. Wadlin, of Boston, Suffolk County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the ——— supervisor's district of Massachusetts.

Elmer P. Spofford, of Deer Isle, Hancock County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Maine.

Edmund L. Dunn, of Red Sulphur Springs, Monroe County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of West Virginia.

Thomas A. Brown, of Elizabeth, Wirt County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of West Virginia.

Walter B. Gates, of Burlington, Chittenden County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the ——— supervisor's district of Vermont.

John M. Cheney, of Orlando, Orange County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Florida.

Lamar C. Powell, of Fairmont, Marion County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of West Virginia.

Harvey W. Harmer, of Clarksburg, Harrison County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of West Virginia.

Charles S. Cairns, of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Minnesota.

Elmer E. Adams, of Fergus Falls, Ottertail County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Minnesota.

Richard Turnbull, of Monticello, Jefferson County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Florida.

James G. Hamlin, of Blue Earth City, Faribault County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Minnesota.

Lewis D. Frost, of Winona, Winona County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Minnesota.

Arthur N. Dare, of Elk River, Sherburne County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Minnesota.

John Blowe, of Camden, Camden County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of New Jersey.

Edward Yanish, of St. Paul, Ramsey County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Minnesota.

Harry B. Wakefield, of Hutchinson, McLeod County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Minnesota.

Samuel A. Smith, of Newark, Essex County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of New Jersey.

William L. James, of Riverton, Burlington County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of New Jersey.

James M. Denton of Paterson, Passaic County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of New Jersey.

Walter B. Atterbury, of Brooklyn, Kings County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of New York.

John H. Weastell, of Jersey City, Hudson County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of New Jersey.

Charles S. Tunis, of Imlaystown, Monmouth County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of New Jersey.

William B. Collins, of Gloversville, Fulton County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of New York.

Frank D. Cole, of Cairo, Greene County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of New York.

John Batchelor, of Utica, Oneida County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Thirteenth supervisor's district of New York.

Matthew A. Heeran, of Rensselaer, Rensselaer County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of New York.

Warren S. Hodgman, of Painted Post, Steuben County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifteenth supervisor's district of New York.

Edgar M. Gordon, of Port Jervis, Orange County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Tenth supervisor's district of New York.

Joseph Schnell, of Binghamton, Broome County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eleventh supervisor's district of New York.

John T. Roberts, of Syracuse, Onondaga County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Twelfth supervisor's district of New York.

John W. Hannan, of Rochester, Monroe County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Nineteenth supervisor's district of New York.

Charles S. Wilbur, of New York, New York County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of New York.

Frank S. Steenberge, of North Bangor, Franklin County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of New York.

James R. Stevens, of Cohoes, Albany County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of New York.

Reuben J. Myers, of Auburn, Cayuga County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourteenth supervisor's district of New York.

Frederic A. Weed, of Potsdam, St. Lawrence County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of New York.

James L. Williams, of Poughkeepsie, Dutchess County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of New York.

Albert J. Slaight, of West Sparta, Livingston County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighteenth supervisor's district of New York.

James A. Hamilton, of Buffalo, Erie County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventeenth supervisor's district of New York.

John A. Warren, of Fredonia, Chautauqua County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixteenth supervisor's district of New York.

POSTMASTERS.

Frank V. D. Bogert, to be postmaster at Paullina, in the county of O'Brien and State of Iowa.

Will B. Barstow, to be postmaster at Manilla, in the county of Crawford and State of Iowa.

William A. Kelley, to be postmaster at Story City, in the county of Story and State of Iowa.

William D. Jacobsen, to be postmaster at Lyons, in the county of Clinton and State of Iowa.

Simon D. Breuning, to be postmaster at Ackley, in the county of Hardin and State of Iowa.

Charles W. Rhinesmith, to be postmaster at Harlan, in the county of Shelby and State of Iowa.

James W. Miller, to be postmaster at Winterset, in the county of Madison and State of Iowa.

Charles F. Le Compte, to be postmaster at Corydon, in the county of Wayne and State of Iowa.

William F. Stahl, to be postmaster at Lisbon, in the county of Linn and State of Iowa.

Edward A. Snyder, to be postmaster at Cedar Falls, in the county of Blackhawk and State of Iowa.

Hamline W. Robinson, to be postmaster at Colfax, in the county of Jasper and State of Iowa.

John H. Bartlett, to be postmaster at Portsmouth, in the county of Rockingham and State of New Hampshire.

Benjamin C. Wise, to be postmaster at Cascade, in the county of Dubuque and State of Iowa.

Clarence P. Swarm, to be postmaster at Oakland, in the county of Pottawattamie and State of Iowa.

Henry Robinson, to be postmaster at Concord, in the county of Merrimack and State of New Hampshire.

Prescott B. Kinsman, to be postmaster at Somersworth, in the county of Strafford and State of New Hampshire.

Charles Eaton, to be postmaster at Littleton, in the county of Grafton and State of New Hampshire.

Irene Frazee Elliott, to be postmaster at Okolona, in the county of Chickasaw and State of Mississippi.

Katie Edwards, to be postmaster at Laurel, in the county of Jones and State of Mississippi.

Natt F. Roberts, to be postmaster at Farmington, in the county of Strafford and State of New Hampshire.

John R. Matthews, to be postmaster at Wesson, in the county of Copiah and State of Mississippi.

Thomas F. Logan, to be postmaster at Friar Point, in the county of Coahoma and State of Mississippi.

Andrew J. Hyde, to be postmaster at Meridian, in the county of Lauderdale and State of Mississippi.

Putnam Beckwith, to be postmaster at Wenona, in the county of Marshall and State of Illinois.

Thomas E. Ballinger, to be postmaster at Chenoa, in the county of McLean and State of Illinois.

David H. Baker, to be postmaster at Tiskilwa, in the county of Bureau and State of Illinois.

Lewis H. Miner, to be postmaster at Springfield, in the county of Sangamon and State of Illinois.

Samuel Mather, to be postmaster at Naperville, in the county of Dupage and State of Illinois.

Thomas S. Green, to be postmaster at Gardner, in the county of Grundy and State of Illinois.

Harry E. Spear, to be postmaster at Polo, in the county of Ogle and State of Illinois.

Richard R. Puffer, to be postmaster at Odell, in the county of Livingston and State of Illinois.

Chauncey H. Parmely, to be postmaster at Dundee, in the county of Kane and State of Illinois.

David F. Wilcox, to be postmaster at Quincy, in the county of Adams and State of Illinois.

William T. Thorp, to be postmaster at Litchfield, in the county of Montgomery and State of Illinois.

Robert B. Thomas, to be postmaster at Lacon, in the county of Marshall and State of Illinois.

Madison Thornburg, to be postmaster at Santa Maria, in the county of Santa Barbara and State of California.

Charles S. Graham, to be postmaster at Pleasanton, in the county of Alameda and State of California.

William B. Sampson, to be postmaster at Skagway, in the Territory of Alaska.

Fredrick G. McHarg, to be postmaster at Walsenburg, in the county of Huerfano and State of Colorado.

Charles A. Huxley, to be postmaster at Goldfield, in the county of Teller and State of Colorado.

Frank E. Baker, to be postmaster at Fort Morgan, in the county of Morgan and State of Colorado.

John A. Merritt, to be postmaster at Washington, in the county of Washington and District of Columbia.

John C. Twombley, to be postmaster at Denver, in the county of Arapahoe and State of Colorado.

Daniel M. Sullivan, to be postmaster at Cripple Creek, in the county of Teller and State of Colorado.

James L. Bradford, to be postmaster at Marion, in the county of Grant and State of Indiana.

William J. Turner, to be postmaster at Mountain Home, in the county of Elmore and State of Idaho.

Fred S. Stevens, to be postmaster at Blackfoot, in the county of Bingham and State of Idaho.

Charles C. Fesler, to be postmaster at Clay City, in the county of Clay and State of Indiana.

Floyd E. Farley, to be postmaster at Crown Point, in the county of Lake and State of Indiana.

Edgar H. Cole, to be postmaster at Knightstown, in the county of Henry and State of Indiana.

John C. Row, to be postmaster at Osgood, in the county of Ripley and State of Indiana.

Arthur H. Rockafellar, to be postmaster at Brookville, in the county of Franklin and State of Indiana.

William H. H. Pitman, to be postmaster at Hagerstown, in the county of Wayne and State of Indiana.

Joseph L. Worthington, to be postmaster at Tahlequah, in the Cherokee Nation of Indian Territory.

Frank D. Ungles, to be postmaster at Hartshorne, in the Choctaw Nation of Indian Territory.

Thompson Turner, to be postmaster at Walkerton, in the county of St. Joseph and State of Indiana.

Grenville G. Redding, to be postmaster at West Medford, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

William L. Nickerson, to be postmaster at Chatham, in the county of Barnstable and State of Massachusetts.

Paul R. Bridgman, to be postmaster at Ware, in the county of Hampshire and State of Massachusetts.

William C. Stoddard, to be postmaster at Fairhaven, in the county of Bristol and State of Massachusetts.

William H. Sprague, to be postmaster at Stoneham, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

Calvin W. Smith, to be postmaster at Wellesley Hills, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts.

Burton F. Browne, to be postmaster at Harbor Beach (late Sand Beach), in the county of Huron and State of Michigan.

Charles H. Baird, to be postmaster at Holly, in the county of Oakland and State of Michigan.

Charles E. Wallace, to be postmaster at Fitchburg, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts.

Charles A. Cline, to be postmaster at West Branch, in the county of Ogemaw and State of Michigan.

George Burkhart, to be postmaster at Saline, in the county of Washtenaw and State of Michigan.

Willard C. Brown, to be postmaster at Brighton, in the county of Livingston and State of Michigan.

William McGillivray, to be postmaster at Oscoda, in the county of Iosco and State of Michigan.

Edward F. Evarts, to be postmaster at Chesaning, in the county of Saginaw and State of Michigan.

Hutson B. Colman, to be postmaster at Kalamazoo, in the county of Kalamazoo and State of Michigan.

Loren A. Sherman, to be postmaster at Port Huron, in the county of St. Clair and State of Michigan.

Gerrit Van Schelven, to be postmaster at Holland, in the county of Ottawa and State of Michigan.

Charles Quick, to be postmaster at Lowell, in the county of Kent and State of Michigan.

Stephen P. Barker, to be postmaster at Richfield Springs, in the county of Otsego and State of New York.

Lewis O. Fullen, to be postmaster at Carlsbad (late Eddy), in the county of Eddy and Territory of New Mexico.

George Wever, to be postmaster at Marlette, in the county of Sanilac and State of Michigan.

George D. Davis, to be postmaster at Mount Kisco, in the county of Westchester and State of New York.

George L. Carver, to be postmaster at Lyons, in the county of Wayne and State of New York.

Henry R. Bryan, to be postmaster at Hudson, in the county of Columbia and State of New York.

Harry M. Glen, to be postmaster at Seneca Falls, in the county of Seneca and State of New York.

Delevan C. Ford, to be postmaster at Mohawk, in the county of Herkimer and State of New York.

Samuel G. Dorr, to be postmaster at Buffalo, in the county of Erie and State of New York.

George B. Harmon, to be postmaster at Brockport, in the county of Monroe and State of New York.

Henry E. Harms, to be postmaster at Allegany, in the county of Cattaraugus and State of New York.

Alonzo E. Hadley, to be postmaster at Springville, in the county of Erie and State of New York.

John C. Horrigan, to be postmaster at Depew, in the county of Erie and State of New York.

William Haynes, to be postmaster at Hoosic Falls, in the county of Rensselaer and State of New York.

Alexander M. Harriott, to be postmaster at Rye, in the county of Westchester and State of New York.

Milton A. Le Cluse, to be postmaster at Great Neck, in the county of Nassau and State of New York.

Clarence L. King, to be postmaster at Tupper Lake, in the county of Franklin and State of New York.

Charles C. Johnson, to be postmaster at Antwerp, in the county of Jefferson and State of New York.

Elbert E. Makepeace, to be postmaster at Alexandria Bay, in the county of Jefferson and State of New York.

Thomas A. McWhinney, to be postmaster at Lawrence, in the county of Nassau and State of New York.

Aloysius McArdle, to be postmaster at West Seneca, in the county of Erie and State of New York.

John Remers, to be postmaster at Lancaster, in the county of Erie and State of New York.

Samuel H. Parsons, to be postmaster at East Hampton, in the county of Suffolk and State of New York.

Charles G. Norton, to be postmaster at Bainbridge, in the county of Chenango and State of New York.

Willard F. Sherwood, to be postmaster at Hornellsville, in the county of Steuben and State of New York.

Alexander Ross, to be postmaster at Sherburne, in the county of Chenango and State of New York.

Webster M. Richardson, to be postmaster at Mexico, in the county of Oswego and State of New York.

Melvin H. Taylor, to be postmaster at Fredonia, in the county of Chautauqua and State of New York.

Orlando W. Sutton, to be postmaster at Bath, in the county of Steuben and State of New York.

Frank F. Simpson, to be postmaster at Highland, in the county of Ulster and State of New York.

John N. Van Antwerp, to be postmaster at Fultonville, in the county of Montgomery and State of New York.

De Witt C. Titus, to be postmaster at Hempstead, in the county of Nassau and State of New York.

Mortimer R. Tefft, to be postmaster at Greenwich, in the county of Washington and State of New York.

William G. Mitchell, to be postmaster at Minto, in the county of Walsh and State of North Dakota.

Wallace Galehouse, to be postmaster at Carrington, in the county of Foster and State of North Dakota.

Henry C. Dana, to be postmaster at Bottineau, in the county of Bottineau and State of North Dakota.

Emily McKinley, to be postmaster at Kingfisher, in the county of Kingfisher, Okla.

Elta H. Jayne, to be postmaster at Edmond, in the county of Edmond and Territory of Oklahoma.

John A. Regan, to be postmaster at Fessenden, in the county of Wells and State of North Dakota.

William M. Yates, to be postmaster at Hood River, in the county of Wasco and State of Oregon.

Edward B. Roll, to be postmaster at Woodward, in the county of Woodward, Okla.

Thomas J. Palmer, to be postmaster at Medford, in the county of Grant, Okla.

Elmer E. Waite, to be postmaster at Newcastle, in the county of Weston and State of Wyoming.

Benjamin B. Martin, to be postmaster at Warren, in the county of Bristol and State of Rhode Island.

William M. Gorham, to be postmaster at Bristol, in the county of Bristol and State of Rhode Island.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *December 13, 1899.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

CENTENNIAL OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the following Select Committee on the Establishment of the Seat of Government in Washington, as provided for by the resolution passed last night.

The Clerk read as follows:

Select Committee on the Establishment of the Seat of Government in Washington: Mr. J. G. CANNON of Illinois, Mr. WILLIAM W. GROUT of Vermont, Mr. JOEL P. HEATWOLE of Minnesota, Mr. JAMES S. SHERMAN of New York, Mr. JAMES A. HEMENWAY of Indiana, Mr. ROBERT J. GAMBLE of South Dakota, Mr. J. W. BAILEY of Texas, Mr. MARION DE VRIES of California, Mr. WILLIAM S. COWHERD of Missouri, and Mr. JOHN C. BELL of Colorado.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following joint resolutions were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

Joint resolution (S. R. 28) relating to the use of the rooms lately occupied by the Congressional Library in the Capitol—to the Committee on Rules.

Joint resolution (S. R. 26) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the use of the United States post-office and court-house building at Parkersburg, W. Va., by the circuit court and criminal court of Wood County, W. Va., sitting at Parkersburg—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with the special order the House will resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] will take the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider the bill H. R. 1. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BELL] is recognized for thirty minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, the bankers and bondholders of the world are now winning the greatest financial victory that ever has been achieved in the legislative arena of the world.

When Mr. Spalding drew his greenback bill in 1861 and gave it to the press, the Bankers' Association of the country sent to Washington a committee of nine of its members, who drew and pressed an interest-bearing bond substitute before the Secretary of the Treasury and the committees of Congress, but finally failed except in the compromise they obtained in placing the exception clause in the greenback, which enabled them to make untold millions out of it. From that day to this they have annually declared for the retirement of the greenback and for interest-bearing bonds, and for a quarter of a century for the gold standard, and now they are getting all any ordinary avarice could covet.

Sirs, if there had never been a national-bank note or an interest-bearing bond, there never would have been a silver question in the United States, as there never has been a just cause for such a question.

I do not wonder that our Republican friends are tired of the indictment of 1873. The records of this and of the other Chamber and the confessions of their own great leaders establish it as one of the "most mysterious and diabolical crimes of the century."

The deception and infamy concealed in this bill may divert the attention of the people for a season from the original crime, but as long as the people read the records of that transaction no bluff or denial will cause the defrauded public to forget or forgive the turpitude involved.

The arguments of the advocates of this bill are made entirely from the point of view of the bondholder and banker, which is just the reverse of that of the economic thinkers or the masters in monetary science.

Mr. Robert Barclay, in his work on Disturbance in the Standard of Value, says:

Monetary science is something different both from finance and from banking, and we know that the full study of it is as much shirked, both by merchants and bankers, as by other classes.

The banker does not study or master Government financiering, but is an adept in so handling private funds as to make the largest possible profits with the least possible expenditure of treasure and of human effort.

The banker's property is in money, bonds, and mortgages.

The scarcer wheat is in the market, the higher the price to the farmer. The scarcer workmen are, the higher the wages. The smaller the money supply, the more promiscuous property and necessaries of life will the dollar buy. Therefore, the money that serves the banker and bondholder best is least desirable to the Government, and that which serves the Government best is never most beneficial to the money-changing class.

The founders of our Government recognizing this doctrine, understood that no one dealing in national-bank stock or currency could occupy the position of Secretary of the Treasury.

When Hugh McCulloch was appointed from the banking circles it somewhat astonished the public, but from that day to this the bankers have generally dictated the policy of the Treasury Department.

The present Secretary of the Treasury, as good a banker and citizen as he may be, (and he must have been a good banker, because he has long managed one of the greatest national banks on the continent and been the president of the National Bankers' Association), can not be expected to be an ideal Secretary of the Treasury, because his duties here directly conflict with his interests and duties as a banker, and his teachings of a lifetime favor bank rather than national money. The handling of the bonds of the nation has been worth many millions to the banks of the country, and the Secretary's bank must have been a great beneficiary of his acts as an officer of the Government. It is expecting too much of him to expect him to be oblivious to the banking interests. As conclusive evidence that it was never intended that a national banker should control the Treasury Department, the national-bank act prohibits the Comptroller of the Currency or his deputy from being connected with any national bank, and they are under the direct control of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Their bonds are approved by him, and it would be preposterous to say that it is against public policy for the smaller officers to be interested in a national bank and that the larger one, in control, might reap such harvest as these banks have reaped under this and the last Administration where they never sowed.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] adopts the pretended banker's theory that "legal tender adds no value to money." This is not only contrary to all authors on government money, but utterly in conflict with common sense. As well might he say that you could destroy all electrical and steam power without increasing the value of the horse.

Mr. Muhleman, deputy United States Treasurer, in his splendid book entitled Monetary Systems of the World, opens his first paragraph with the sentence—

Perhaps the most important attribute of any form of money is its legal-tender power; that is, the power conferred by law to discharge a debt payable in money.

And this is the assertion of all men versed in monetary science. But the banker whose bank paper is not legal tender and those to whom he furnishes arguments must be expected to conflict with the disinterested monetary scientists.

The value of money is the salable or exchange value, and is governed by the law of supply and demand.

And so says every author writing upon monetary science. The value of money, its salable or money value, is governed by the law of supply and demand just the same as wheat or any other commodity is governed by the law of supply and demand. But few intelligent writers on this question ever refer to such a thing as intrinsic value, because it is becoming an obsolete term as applied to the value of money. You might as well talk about the intrinsic value of the air or the sunshine as to talk about the intrinsic value of gold and silver. Its value is chiefly as a money metal, but it has a salable or usable value for other purposes, but the great part of its value is occasioned by the world's demand for monetary purposes.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] also unfortunately dropped into the sophistical argument that prior to our present silver dollar we only had 8,000,000 silver dollars in the United States, and that by the act of 1834 we demonetized silver.

It is unfortunate that the gentleman at the supposed head of a great committee with a bill like this should descend to such an argument. These are not only misleading statements, but the latter is not based on a fact. It was the mere afterthought of Senator Sherman, who was floundering in the boiling indignation of the people for his part in the clandestine demonetization of silver, twenty years after it occurred, and he, like another traditional gentleman, pointed his finger at Andrew Jackson and says he committed the crime of 1834, and the bankers of the country took that up and said silver was demonetized in 1834.

No man had ever learned of it in Europe or America until silver was demonetized in 1873, or ever thought of such a thing for many years afterwards. Does not the gentleman from Indiana know that prior to the civil war we had practically no commerce, no railroads, no rich men in the nation, and that our transactions were small; that we had the most of our silver coined in pieces less than a dollar and that full legal-tender qualities were by law given to the Spanish milled dollar and to the dollar of all foreign nations, and that while we only had about 8,000,000 of silver dollars we had over 150,000,000 of full legal-tender silver circulating in our channels of trade up to the time of the demonetization of foreign coin?

Does not the gentleman realize that under the beneficent influence of the present silver dollar we developed our commerce, manufactures, transportation, and does he not know that in our changes in the value of the silver dollar that we were simply trying to make it correspond to the ratio of other countries, with no idea of any reference to the supposed intrinsic value of the two metals? England was doing the same thing. Every country in the world was trying to make the ratio correspond to the then French ratio of 15½ to 1 by adjusting their transportation charges to the different ratios.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] says that the divergence between the two metals caused the demonetization of silver. That is utterly fallacious. Everyone familiar with American finance knows full well that when silver was dropped from our coinage laws it stood at the ratio of 15½ to 1; that the people neither had knowledge of nor desire for demonetization. It is also well known that by reason of the mints of France being open at 15½ to 1, this fixed the price in every part of the world at 15½ to 1, less transportation to the French mint.

For eighty years, however much the production of gold might increase over the production of silver, or the production of silver over that of gold, the relative value of the two metals never materially changed. Not only this, but during the eighty years that the French mints were open to the world at 15½ to 1, causing the people of the United States and other countries with a ratio of 16 to 1 to move their silver to the French mint in bars, it proved no particular detriment to the nation exporting her silver, as she received gold or its equivalent in exchange for it or paid its foreign exchange in bar silver instead of in coined metal; and you do the same thing to-day if you send your coined gold to London. It is not taken as coin; it is weighed as bullion without detriment to the home government, and while the gold and silver were held at parity by reason of this open mint it had the same effect on commerce and prices as though the whole stock of gold and silver had been gold or had been silver alone, as the two metals conjointly measured the values of the world and conveniently made the exchange of the world.

Some seem to be alarmed at the increase of the gold production. However, this is incomparable to the scare of Europe when the great discovery of Australia and California caused the demonetization of gold in the German governments. When the Comstock was at the height of its silver production the European experts warned their governments to abandon silver, as these mines would soon be producing 500,000,000 ounces per year. These alarms were without foundation, as the present will prove.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] dropped into the further money changers' argument that we have too many silver dollars, and says we could not circulate them, while the facts are that in the panic of 1893 there were standing premiums posted in New York for silver dollars, and they could not be had; and there has been a scarcity recently, and as quiet as the gentlemen are upon this subject the Government is constantly coining the silver bullion in the Treasury at the rate of $1,500,000 per month.

Ah, but, says the gentleman, the people will not use the silver dollar; when they have any connection with it at all they use only the silver certificate. The banker's argument again. I ask my friend, the representative of the gold standard, if anybody in this country or any other country uses gold except through the gold certificate?

It is the rarest thing to find a gold piece or a silver dollar in circulation in the Eastern and Northern States, but you find the gold and the silver certificate freely circulating side by side.

The advocates of this measure glowingly console themselves in their general stultification in going from the bimetallic to the gold standard, because they say that the recent prosperous times have exploded all old theories.

The very reverse is true. By reason of the unprecedented crops in this country and a great shortage abroad, and by reason of the unexampled strides of the American people in the production and export of iron, steel, petroleum, and machinery, our balance of trade has been such, when taken with our domestic output of gold and the large coinage of the silver bullion in the Treasury, together with the wars, starting all the machine shops and gun and ship factories of the country, and taking up all of the idle men, either for work or for soldiers, that things have necessarily been reasonably prosperous, and the supply of money has been so abundant that it has raised the general prices, confirming beyond question our cardinal theory that every increase in the ratio of money to property or of working capital to labor increases the prices of property or labor, and every decrease in the ratio of money to property or labor decreases the price of property or labor under the unvarying law of supply and demand.

There really never has been a good-faith battle of the standards. The leading bankers and money changers never have cared any more for gold than for silver.

It has always been a question of bank paper and interest-bearing bonds, with as little Government money as possible, on their side.

Gold has never been sacred to the bimetallists, neither has silver, except that they have always believed that from their durability, their homogeneity, divisibility, portability, and comparative stability in values, they are the best materials from which to coin money, and as the two conjointly never have been produced in sufficient volume to furnish the money supply of the world, but from time immemorial supplementary paper money in large volumes has been necessary, therefore we insist that this paper currency should be a national currency instead of bank paper.

TRUSTS.

But, sirs, what benefit we should have had out of rising prices has been largely neutralized by the great syndicates and trusts so raising their prices that it absorbs the advantages of the people not having their products protected by a trust.

The Bowling Green Democrat has just gone through its markets and exposes the leopardlike prosperity appearing there.

It finds that October 13, 1898, wheat was worth 62 cents per bushel; October 13, 1899, wheat was worth 64 cents per bushel.

October 13, 1898, corn was worth 38 cents per hundredweight, and October 13, 1899, it was worth 28 cents per hundredweight.

October 13, 1898, 3-inch iron pipe was worth 5½ cents per foot, and October 13, 1899, it was worth 15 cents per foot, or nearly three times as much.

Nails on October 13, 1898, were worth $1.65 per hundred pounds, and on October 13, 1899, they were worth $3.40 per hundred, or more than twice as much.

Wire fencing, plain, in 1898, was worth $1.85 per hundred, and in 1899 it was worth $4 per hundred, or more than double.

On October 13, 1898, for 2⅔ bushels of wheat a farmer could buy 100 pounds of nails; on October 13, 1899, it took 5½ bushels, or about twice as much, to buy them.

On October 13, 1898, the farmer could buy 100 pounds of plain fence wire for 3 bushels of wheat, and on October 13, 1899, it took 6 bushels, or just twice as much.

Tin plate two years ago was worth $2.25 per box, to-day $5.30 per box.

Now, sirs, that is your trust prosperity, which robs the poor and further fills the coffers of the rich.

It is this blessed system for which so many of you so proudly stand sponsor.

Sirs, there are some curious things transpiring in this trust agitation as well as in this financial controversy.

For a generation the Republican party has persisted in acclaiming that it was the genuine friend and advocate of bimetallism, and secured all branches of the Government under this plea, then hurries its cohorts to the gold Democracy, the only party that has ever conducted a national campaign on the gold standard.

Senator THURSTON, the chairman of the last Republican national convention, which nominated President McKinley, said recently, in addressing the Republican clubs in Baltimore:

> Capital in every form, alarmed by the threatened disaster and danger of free and unlimited coinage at the forced ratio of 16 to 1 by this nation alone, rushed to the support of the Republican party, and it happened thereby that the financial jugglers and manipulators and great trusts and combined, that had always been with and of the Democratic party, were forced into the Republican party.

Notwithstanding this support, the President, in his recent message, with great political diplomacy, ingeniously referred to the decision of the Supreme Court upholding the Sherman anti-trust law and gave color to an inference that he favored curbing the trusts.

His personal and official defender on this floor, General GROSVENOR, has hurried to the same pedestal and acclaimed that he could think of nothing that could be added to this great Republican measure.

These things are significant from the fact that the stock operators of New York have been floundering in chaos and falling

prices, giving as a reason the message of the President and anti-trust decision.

This is significant, because for a quarter of a century this same class has been feigning to disturb values and wreck prices when any legislation was enacted or was threatened in the interest of more liberal financial legislation for the American people, and are now conquering the people in the securing of this measure, and the same tactics and results may be expected with the other trusts.

If one could not read the handwriting of the trained politician between the lines, he might be convinced that the President intended to "out-Bryan Bryan" on the antitrust agitation, as he did for a quarter of a century on bimetallism: but the trail of the golden serpent, indeliby embedded in his whole silver record, will be a burning warning to the often-deceived American voters. They must see that this bill will become the incubator of an untold number of money syndicates to oppress and further burden a patient and confiding people. And his action on other trusts will be the same as on this money trust.

Now, sirs, I construe the diplomatic utterances of the President in his message and the position assumed by his ever-ready representative here, General GROSVENOR, that the law is now sufficient, in their opinion, and that this Congress is to make no good-faith effort to further control the trusts. Enough has been done and enough has been said upon which to mislead the voter without hunting the trusts. It is hardly possible that the President and his party can be everything to all men on this question, as they have been on the silver question, without the deception being exposed.

STANDARD OF VALUE.

The first section of this bill makes the dollar consisting of 23.21 grains of pure gold the unit of value and gold the standard.

Adopting a standard of value, from the importance of money, is always a great responsibility, but establishing a new standard where many debts exist, created and payable under the old standard, is doubly important. No just standard can be devised for existing debts which permits the creditors to collect more than they lent or permits the debtor to pay less in value than he received. Such a standard must always be based upon full legal-tender money, and must be so fixed that in deferred payments or long-time loans the value paid will be equal always to that received.

BIMETALLIC STANDARD.

The present legal standard of this nation is bimetallic, or based on both gold and silver, and $18,000,000,000 of debts have been contracted under the bimetallic standard and $1,300,000,000 of United States obligations are now outstanding made payable specifically in coin of the standard value of July 14, 1870, the time when the act was passed which embraced the present silver dollar as well as gold coin. The correctness of this version is proved not only by the decisions of the Attorney-General, but by the declaration of the Matthews resolution, which passed both Houses of Congress with great unanimity in 1877.

PAYMENT OF DEBTS IN GOLD.

The second section of this bill provides—

That all interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the payment of money now existing or hereafter to be entered into * * * shall be deemed and held to be payable in gold coin.

What does the payment of these debts in gold which were contracted to be paid in gold and silver mean to the creditors of this nation?

It means that after a struggle of over a quarter of a century the money changers and speculators have secured such a change of the money standard as to give them hundreds of millions of dollars in value more than they really lent.

Sirs, this is not a matter of wild speculation; it is demonstrated through the actual offers of speculation for our bonds payable in coin or in gold alone. On February 8, 1895, President Cleveland sold $62,315,435 thirty-year coin bonds to August Belmont & Co., N. M. Rothschild & Sons, J. P. Morgan & Co., and J. S. Morgan & Co., and obtained an offer at the same time that if he would have Congress provide that they should be payable specifically in gold coin that they would reduce the annual interest payment $539,159, a saving in thirty years of $16,174,770.

President Cleveland upon this day in a special message to Congress said:

The arrangement just completed * * * develops such a difference in the estimation of investors between bonds made payable in coin and those specifically made payable in gold in favor of the latter, as represented by three-fourths of a cent in annual interest. In the agreement just concluded the annual saving in interest to the Government, if 3 per cent gold bonds should be substituted for 4 per cent coin bonds under the privilege reserved, would be $539,159, amounting in thirty years, or at the maturity of the coin bonds, to $16,174,770.

And this sum was offered the Government to make them payable in gold alone. Now, the same men who made this advanced bid for bonds made specifically payable in gold hold largely our other coin bonds. If it was worth to them over one-half a million dollars a year to have $62,000,000 made specifically payable in gold instead of in coin, then it was worth just as much in proportion to have the $1,300,000,000 outstanding coin bonds made payable specifically in gold; or the market value of the annual interest on the $1,300,000,000 coin bonds, if converted into gold bonds, would be enhanced in value over $9,000,000 per annum.

Now, sirs, there is no dodging the question. When this bill is passed, there is taken from the pockets of the people $9,000,000 per annum by Congressional legislation and without consideration, except love and affection, and which will be thrown into the opulent laps of the bondholders and national bankers of the country.

The legislation of money from the pockets of the taxpayers into the pockets of the syndicates now controlling legislation has become so common and so enormous that it is appalling.

The audacity of this move would be astonishing if Congress had not succeeded in the last few months in voting untold millions into the hands of these syndicates without arousing much public indignation.

Do you not think that the national-bank and bond syndicates have received enough through the vile popular loan scheme wherein there was voted them $200,000,000 bonds at par, when they were worth in the market at least from 105½ to 106, or $11,000,000 or $12,000,000 more on the market than face value? And they were voted to them as a gift under the false pretense that they were to go to the poor people of this country, as though they had a right to vote anyone these millions, whether rich or poor. Everyone knows now, and they should have known then, that it was the speculators' scheme to have the eleven or twelve millions of the people's money voted into the pockets of the syndicates. The whole thing was so gauzy and cheap that a great many banks condemned it as a damnable theft. The banks used their customers to subscribe for the bonds, but the banks paid for them and owned them at all times. On the 9th of this month these bonds were worth on the market 109¼, or $19,500,000 above par, a gift voted into the pockets of the purchasers.

The Speaker of this House, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. HEPBURN, and many other leading Republicans refused to vote to put "gold" in this issue, though we could save more than $16,000,000 thereby, because, as said by Mr. HOPKINS, the precedent would cost us a hundred million. However, now these same men are supporting this bill, with its gift of a hundred million, under the pressure of a party caucus and a party pressure.

One of the most essential attributes of a monetary system is to establish a stable standard of value, so that in case of deferred payments and long-time loans the creditor can not collect more than he lent or the debtor pay less than he received.

This standard must be based on full legal-tender money.

While a bank currency forms a good circulating medium when times are normal and confidence is unshaken, however it is credit money and it must be paid or redeemed in gold.

It has been the experience of the financial world that as the standard of value contracts and as confidence is disturbed, instead of bank paper or other redeemable or credit money expanding it contracts in sympathy with the money in which it is to be redeemed as a standard and as a means of storing values.

Because gold has been scarcer, it has generally been used for large payments and for storing great values; and silver, because more abundant, has been generally used for divisional coins and small payments and as a means of storing smaller values, and the two conjointly make an ideal currency for the masses of the people.

If this bill passes, the eighty-nine million Treasury notes, the three hundred and forty-six million greenbacks, and four hundred and eighty-two million silver dollars will circulate among the people or will be impounded as the whims of the dictatorship of some great banker at the head of our Treasury may direct.

The traditional ideas of this class are for scarce and dear money and cheap property, which is a synonym for misery and hard times. These things which so annoyed President Cleveland, lengthens even the endless chain system of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. BRUNDIDGE] is recognized for fifteen minutes.

Mr. BRUNDIDGE. Mr. Chairman, owing to the limited time which has been allotted for the purpose of debating this measure, I had at first thought that I would content myself with recording my vote against it; but when I consider its vital and far-reaching effect upon both the present and future welfare of this country, I deem it a solemn duty which every gentleman on this side of the House owes to the constituency which sent him here to raise his voice against its passage and denounce as unjust and criminal this scheme of plunder and bondage.

Some knowledge of the present financial condition of the people of this Government is possessed by every member upon this floor, and despite the oft-repeated statement and wild cry of prosperity that continues almost hourly to go up from some self-constituted patriot on the other side, the cold fact still remains that we are

to-day overwhelmed with both public and private debts. And to the consideration of these let us for a moment devote our attention.

When the present outstanding interest-bearing indebtedness of the Government shall become due and payable, as it will in the next few years, it will require in round numbers something near one billion five hundred million dollars to pay it. To this public debt must be added the vast bonded debt of cities, towns, and improvement districts, together with that of railroad transportation and other industrial corporations. And to this must still be added the more than six billions of mortgage indebtedness, as shown by our own statistics to exist upon our homes and farms. I doubt if twenty billion dollars, more than five times as much gold as is in circulation in the entire world, would be more than sufficient to pay off and discharge this public and private indebtedness. Let it be remembered that when a majority of these obligations were assumed and contracts made it was with the distinct understanding and agreement that they could be paid in the legal-tender money of this Government, either gold, silver, or paper currency; such was the law and such the contract, and so it should remain. No debtor should be required to pay otherwise, and no honest creditor should demand it.

By the terms of the second section of this bill, "all obligations, public and private, for the payment of money shall be performed in conformity with the standard established and payable in gold alone." Thus by an act of Congress it is proposed to not only establish the odious gold standard, but to go further and do what no court in the land would ever dare to do, violate the most sacred obligations of more than a million contracts by depriving the debtor not only of the means of payment, but by making him pay in a different and dearer money! If there were no other reasons, this one gross act of merciless injustice ought to be sufficient to consign this bill to defeat and oblivion.

There are others of no less importance. In section 4 of this bill the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to sell interest-bearing bonds, redeemable in gold alone, whenever in his judgment it is necessary to make the sale for the purpose of the maintenance of the reserve fund. Here the unparalleled and extraordinary power is given to one man to increase the interest-bearing bonded public debt whenever in his judgment it is necessary to do so! When before has Congress ever been asked to make a grant of any such power?

When you increase the public debt, a corresponding increase must be made in the heavy burden which is placed upon every industry and taxpayer in the land and will be bequeathed to our posterity. More than 70,000,000 people should rise up and protest against this attempted outrage. For myself, I am opposed to bonds and bond issues. I do not believe that in times of peace even Congress itself should have the power to increase the public debt, much less the granting of such a right to a single individual. But this is not all. By the same section the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized, at his discretion, to exchange gold for any other money issued or coined by the United States. And when so redeemed or exchanged said money shall be held in and constitute a part of the redemption fund. To get the gold for this purpose resort is again had to the sale of interest-bearing bonds; and at his discretion the Secretary may here add another increase to the public debt of more than a billion dollars. One can scarcely realize that such a grant of power would ever be thought of, much less tolerated. And yet the majority of this House are determined that it shall be made.

The only reason assigned so far for the consummation of this crime is that conditions have changed since the last election. I admit they have, and would remind you that they have changed in more ways than one. Let it be remembered that in the Congressional elections of 1898 you went before the country claiming that your party was then engaged in the prosecution of a most successful war. You begged and pleaded to be not repudiated, but that a Congress should be sent here that would be in harmony with the Administration and would sustain the President. In addition to this, the enormous sums of money which had just been spent by the Government in the preparation for and the prosecution of the war had increased the circulating medium and enabled you to make a show of returning prosperity.

Still, under these circumstances, your majority is reduced from more than 50 to less than 15 in the present House. Never but once before has any political party suffered such reverses under like conditions, and that was under Mr. Tyler's Administration in 1846. The one great cause which, in my opinion, largely produced this great change was the fear entertained by the people that the infamous Gage bill, or some similar measure, would be enacted, fixing the gold standard upon the country and giving to the banks the control of the currency. I can see but one good result that will follow your action: It will transfer the majority in the Fifty-seventh Congress to this side of the House, and in your places put good and true Democrats.

Some idea of the great advantages that will accrue to the bondholder can be gained by giving attention to the sale made by Mr. Cleveland in 1895 of $62,000,000 of bonds. The purchasers of those bonds offered to give a bonus of $16,000,000 to have them made payable in gold instead of coin. If at that time they could afford to pay $16,000,000 to have the word "gold" written in $62,000,000 of bonds, then you are, by passing this bill, making them an absolute gift of more than $250,000,000, when you make the whole governmental debt payable in gold, which now amounts to more than a billion dollars, as I have stated.

Hence, we see from whence comes the demand for this bill. And who is it that is clamoring for its passage? No party platform has ever declared for such a measure, nor has it ever been submitted to the people for ratification by their votes, and its advocates know full well that they dare not submit it, for the delay would mean its certain defeat.

The scheme is by no means new or untried. It has been the dream of more than a lifetime. It means untold millions and unlimited power to the national banks and the bondholders, and they see in its passage the consummation of long-deferred hopes. When it is passed (as it will be) and receives the signature of the President, it will become their deed, signed, sealed, and delivered to this Government. Their ownership, their power and control will soon become absolute. What they lost by the veto of the funding bill by President Hayes they have now more than gained with compound interest. They have gained the control of the entire currency of the country, and can fix the price of every product and commodity offered on the market. Every man with reasonable intelligence now knows that the prices of commodities are fixed and regulated by the currency in circulation. So when any men or set of men possess the power to expand or contract the circulating medium of the country they thereby necessarily have it in their power to raise or lower prices to suit themselves, and the people are helpless to protest against it. That this is true, Mr. Chairman, has been fully proven and demonstrated within the past few days and since this bill has been pending. The banks have caused a panic in the cities of New York, Baltimore, Philadelphia, and others, as will be seen from the following dispatch published in one of the leading papers of the city, which I now read as a part of my remarks:

ALMOST A PANIC IN STOCKS—BALTIMORE SECURITIES THROWN UPON THE MARKET AT ANY PRICE—GILT-EDGE HOLDINGS SUFFERED WITH THE REST, AND TRUST COMPANY GROUP WAS CONTINUALLY RAIDED—BANKS REFUSED AID AND CALLED IN ALL LOANS.

[Special to the Post.]

BALTIMORE, MD., *December 6, 1899.*

This was the most exciting day on the local stock exchange since last spring, though the movement was unlike the one then, in that prices declined instead of advanced. The market seemed to be honeycombed with selling orders. Stock after stock was raided, and important losses were scored throughout the list, many shares making new low-priced records.

No attention was paid to values. Gilt-edged securities were thrown upon the market and sold regardless of the prices they brought. The holders appeared to be panic-stricken.

The trust company group was the center of interest. The selling was heaviest and the losses most severe in that group, though the liquidation was not confined to that quarter.

Even bonds went down in the slump, and large blocks were thrown on the market without regard to price.

Mercantile Trust, Continental Trust, Guardian Trust, Fidelity and Deposit, Maryland Casualty, International, Old Line Real Estate, and American Bonding were severely depressed, declines ranging from 1 to 9 points. Consolidated Gas broke 1¼ to 51. United Railways issues were also notably weak, the income bonds breaking to 70¼ after selling at 71¼ in the initial dealings.

There was some support to the market in the final dealings, though it was not sufficiently large to stem the downward movement, which was in full progress when the market closed.

Nearly every stock sold went from 10 to 50 points below its book value. Heavy dividend payers like the Fidelity and Deposit, Maryland Trust, and Mercantile Trust went by the board at ruinous prices.

Absolutely no protection was given the market. United Brewery 6 per cent bonds, which are regarded as among the safest investments, sold at 85.

The brokers assign as a cause for the slump the action of the banks in calling in all loans and refusing to render any further assistance in carrying the securities.

Thus it will be seen that the banks now can precipitate a panic at their pleasure under the law as it now is. And they can do so with much greater ease after the passage of the present bill. The overshadowing danger that lurks beneath every legislative enactment which increases the power of monopoly, and especially the money monopoly, has been seen and recognized by wise and thinking men for many years past. Senator Windom, a Republican, and who a short time afterwards was made Secretary of the Treasury by President Garfield, on the 21st day of February, 1881, wrote to the Anti-Monopoly League of New York this letter:

I repeat to-day in substance words uttered seven years ago—that there are in this country four men who in the matter of taxation possess and frequently exercise powers which neither Congress nor any of our State legislatures would dare to exert—powers which, if exercised in Great Britain, would shake the throne to its very foundation. These may at any time, and for reasons satisfactory to themselves, by a stroke of the pen reduce the value of property in the United States by hundreds of millions. They may at their own will and pleasure disarrange and embarrass business, depress one city or locality and build another, enrich one individual and ruin his competitors and, when complaint is made, coolly reply, "What are you going to do?"

What was true then will be true now, even in a more potent sense. Delegate this power, and you will find it will be followed by financial depression, panics, bankruptcy, and ruin. The losses

in honest trade and the misery and want to honest labor will merit and elicit our just complaint, but the reply will only be, "What are we going to do about it?"

While on this line there is one other matter that I desire to speak of before I bring my remarks to a close.

During the Fifty-fifth Congress the same majority who are giving such ardent support to the present bill passed over our objections and earnest protests a bill which they said would protect the American manufacturer and at the same time raise a revenue for the Government. As a revenue-raising measure it was soon made quite clear that it was a failure, but as a protector to the manufacturer and monopolist it was a most dazzling success. Never before in any like period of our history did trusts, combinations, and monopolies spring into existence and being as fast as they have since the passage of the Dingley tariff act, until now you can name no kind of goods, wares, or merchandise that is not controlled by the trusts. Prices have been advanced on all the necessaries of life by these same combinations from 25 to 150 per cent, while thousands of men have been thrown out of employment and made dependent.

The unjust and unnatural advance in all commodities has aroused the just indignation of the American people, and they are being heard from in every State, and it is to be observed in the wonderfully reduced Republican majority in the Fifty-sixth Congress. But there are some amusing things connected with it. While the chairman of the Republican national committee, Mr. HANNA, boldly defends trusts and combinations upon the stump and declares them to be a blessing, and while the Attorney-General appointed by the President composedly informs the country that he is powerless to enforce the statutes and laws of the United States already passed against them and that the State governments must do what the United States can not do, President McKinley, in his recent message to this Congress, makes this most remarkable statement:

> Combinations of capital organized into trusts to control the conditions of trade among our citizens, to stifle competition, limit production, and determine the prices of products used and consumed by the people, are justly provoking public discussion, and should early claim the attention of the Congress.

It is to be regretted, Mr. Chairman, that the President did not find time to insert into this voluminous and peculiarly worded message some suggestions to Congress as to what he thought should be done by them in this important matter of trusts.

It is also a matter of regret that some of our great public men do not see these gigantic evils until it is entirely too late.

But we are now about to pass this measure, that will legalize and create one of the most stupendous, dangerous, and powerful trusts that has ever been formed—that is, the money trust. It has no equal, and will never have. It will enslave and pauperize its millions. It will spread its dark wings of ruin over this fair land like a blighting and withering curse, and yet it has the indorsement of the President of the United States!

If it must be done, and there is no way to avert it, then I suppose you are right in your hasty action, for the sooner we are over with the agony the better. My people will at least have their undaunted courage and bravery left them, and will continue to fight the great battle of life as best they can, and breathe the ennobling spirit of these beautiful lines:

> So live, that when thy summons comes to join
> The innumerable caravan which moves
> To that mysterious realm where each shall take
> His chamber in the silent halls of death,
> Thou go not, like the quarry-slave at night,
> Scourged to his dungeon, but sustained and soothed
> By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave
> Like one that wraps the drapery of his couch
> About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, how long am I recognized for?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for fifteen minutes.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, in the academic discussion of finance which has been going on here for the last day or so sight has been lost of the provisions of this bill. Members of the House know how this measure found its way here, but I doubt if there is one man in a hundred outside this Chamber who understands fully what the Republican party did and is doing to fasten the wrongful and ruinous provisions of this measure on our statutes. Those of us who served through the Fifty-fifth Congress know that the Committee on Banking and Currency was so constituted it either would not or could not make a report or present a bill, although the last Presidential election was fought on the subject of finance. It was claimed by the Democrats, and I think rightly, that the then Speaker of this House purposely organized the Banking and Currency Committee so it would never report, hoping in that way to shirk its party's promises made to the Gold-bug Democrats in 1896.

Upon the adjournment of the last session of Congress a Republican caucus named certain gentlemen to prepare a bill to reform the currency. This measure is the product of their labor. It was framed by no authority of this House. It was prepared when Congress was not in session, and the committee of Republicans who framed it held their meetings behind closed doors at Atlantic City, the most fashionable watering place on the Atlantic coast. Gentlemen may claim the meetings were held at Atlantic City because they were laboring during the summer and they sought a cool retreat, but this will not do. An examination of the membership constituting that caucus committee discloses that a majority come from the Northwest. A more pleasant as well as quieter spot could have been found nearer their homes. If the meeting place at Atlantic City was selected by accident, it was, to take the most charitable view, unfortunate. It is there that many of the most dangerously rich of New York and other places of this country spend their summers. There the committee would be most subject to and most easily reached by the sinister influences which we believe antagonistic to the great body of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, it was certainly the greatest man Missouri ever produced, and I believe one of the greatest America ever produced, who warned the American people against the influence of what he termed the "better element" in our politics. I am not of those who wish to taboo the potentiality of bankers, chambers of commerce, and rich men in shaping our financial and fiscal policy, but I think the artisan, laborer, and farmer should be as often consulted and as generously followed. There is not a member of this House who for three years has not received armfuls of papers, pamphlets, and letters from bankers, sound-money leagues, and other gold-standard associations urging the adoption of the single gold standard and the granting of greater privileges to the national banks, but I challenge any gentleman on either side of this Chamber to exhibit a half dozen letters from laborers or farmers asking for the passage of such a law. I have never received one.

In the campaign of 1896 the Democrats contended that as money increased in volume prices advanced and as it decreased values fell. This was denied by gentlemen on the other side. They claimed it was the quality and not quantity of money that fixed prices; but, sir, the position of the Democratic party has been vindicated by almost every gentleman favoring this bill. It is now admitted, even by the authors of this measure, that the increase in the output of gold during the year 1899 is the immediate cause of the advance in prices, and one gentleman [Mr. DOLLIVER] frankly admits this measure could not have been passed a year ago, or even now, unless the gold supply had increased. So, sir, we find the Republican party admitting that whatever there is of prosperity existing in this country is traceable to an increase of our circulating medium, establishing, as I think, the truth of our contention in the last Presidential campaign. The Democratic party is not hostile to gold. We care nothing for the color of our basic money, whether it be yellow or white; but what we want is a sufficient supply of money upon which to do the business of the country and to place beyond the control or influence of money sharks the product of labor, genius, and toil.

The total amount of gold produced in the United States during last year was $64,463,000, and of this sum $13,565,879 was used in the arts, leaving a little over $50,000,000 to be added to our stock of money, less than $1 per capita. Advocates of this bill point to the world's output of gold—$287,428,600—during the last year as evidence of the fact that there is plenty of gold. Over one-fourth of the gold produced went into the arts, and the world's supply of money gold during the last year only amounted to $215,000,000, in round numbers, less than $3 per capita if every dollar of gold produced in the world had been coined in this country.

Money is a commodity regulated by supply and demand as completely as wheat, corn, or tobacco; and while no man will deny that a great crop of corn or wheat makes the article cheap and a short crop makes them dear, the single-standard man, by logic I can not understand, for reasons utterly unsatisfactory, says, Destroy money and it will be plentiful; increase its supply and you will have none of it.

Sir, if the condition of the American people was as prosperous as the Republicans claim (and I deny there is any general prosperity) and should continue for months, it would not refute our position, because prosperity based on an increase in the supply of gold but proves our contention. If I felt sure enough gold would be mined in the next few years to supply the needs of the people I should not so seriously object to this bill, but I can not persuade myself to believe such a thing probable, or even possible. Mr. Chairman, there are millions of our people who believe the passage of such a measure as this little short of a national crime; and in view of this fact, as well as the further fact that our money is now as good as it is possible to make it, why pass a bill opposed by so many and whose friends claim will not alter existing conditions?

There are provisions in this bill wholly unjustifiable. We have no right to give to any set of men the power to contract or impound our currency—over $700,000,000—at will; and yet that is

exactly what is done. There is in our currency, according to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, $355,000,000 of greenbacks or Treasury notes. This bill provides that when greenbacks reach the Treasury they shall be held and not reissued except for gold. Now, if the great banks of this country wish to contract our currency they can gather up the greenbacks and demand gold from the Treasury on them. This ties up the greenbacks, and it will then remain only to lock up the gold paid out for the greenbacks and $700,000,000 have retired from circulation. In addition, the Secretary of the Treasury is directed by the third section of this bill to impound or hold—

the amount of United States notes held against currency certificates, the amount of silver dollars held against outstanding silver certificates, the amount in silver dollars and silver bullion held against outstanding Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890.

This provision ties up and retires over half the money of this country. How can a citizen, whatever his opinion on the subject of finance, vote for such a bill?

But, sir, not content with establishing the gold standard and with delivering the last blow at silver as money, the authors of this infamous measure absolutely invade the domain of private contract and forbid the citizens of this country to make any contract for the payment of money except in gold. It even goes further than that, and says contracts now entered into for the payment of money shall be discharged in gold. Yes, even though the contract says payment shall be made in silver or bank notes or greenbacks. A more drastic or oppressive measure was never considered by this body.

But, sir, I have yet to mention the most extraordinary, as it is the most infamous, provision of this bill. In the fourth section, defining the duties of the Secretary of the Treasury, this language is used:

He is hereby authorized to issue and sell, whenever in his judgment it is necessary to the maintenance of said reserve (gold) fund, bonds of the United States bearing interest at a rate of not exceeding 3 per cent per annum, payable in gold coin at the end of twenty years, but redeemable in gold coin, at the option of the United States, after one year.

What other country in the world would give such power to one man, and he not even responsible to the people whose destiny he controls. The right to sell bonds on the credit and faith of the people of this country without limit and without being responsible to any person for his acts is so enormously dangerous it seems incredible a representative of the American people would countenance such a suggestion. The bonded debt of this country now amounts to the great sum of $1,046,048,750, and of this enormous total $500,000,000 has been added since 1892, and $300,000,000 was added by Secretaries of the Treasury, as I think, without a line of law or shred of authority for doing so. The balance, $200,000,000, was added by the provision of the bill passed in 1898 and known as the war-revenue bill. The interest on this public debt exceeds $40,000,000 a year.

Our debt is well-nigh as great as it was in 1870, when we had just passed through a most disastrous and protracted civil war, and, sir, the most distressing feature of the matter is, it is constantly increasing. The power to issue bonds for some one else to pay is too dangerous to intrust to any one man. The reason and purpose for conferring such unlimited and dangerous power on one man may be plainly seen by reading the subsequent sections of the bill. It proceeds to create a national-bank trust of the latest and most approved pattern, and whatever rights the people had remaining over their money after they were through with the Secretary of the Treasury it turns over to the banks. The Democratic party is not hostile to banks, but it is unalterably opposed to banks of issue. We believe the right to coin, issue, or make money is the highest prerogative of sovereignty and should never be dislodged from the source of all power—the people. This bill grants to the national banks a demand they have sought for twenty years—the right to issue money to the par value of bonds held by the bank.

I have briefly stated the worst features of the bill; it contains many if not all the objectionable features embraced in the bills advocated by the gold-standard press and champions in recent years. Instead of taking the Government out of the banking business, a thing the Republicans claimed they wished to do, it forms a permanent partnership between the United States and money changers. I would perhaps be going too far to say national bankers are the enemy of the Republic, but in the light of history and experience I am justified in characterizing them as not its friend. The most persuasive argument is an appeal to our selfishness and to contend that enlarged powers to banks is in the interest of the people is against both the judgment and experience of mankind. Had it not been for the iron patriotism of Jackson, seconded as he was by the great Benton, once before in our history a national bank would have had us by the throat; as it was, to break its hold and crush its power gave a shock to our Government second only to civil war.

Sir, when Napoleon's sword was red with the blood of every people, when England alone, gasping for breath, remained free and almost single-handed staked its existence on the destruction of the most powerful as he was the most dreadful despot of the ages, the governors of the Bank of England calmly informed the younger Pitt that no more gold would be furnished to carry on the war, and the salvation of the Empire was insured only by the issue of paper money. This bill practically eliminates all kinds of money but gold and national-bank notes, and both are controlled by national banks. Should the prediction of the Republicans be realized and $280,000,000 of gold produced in the last twelve months grow to $500,000,000 annual product; should the Rand and Yukon prove as rich as is claimed, the sincere advocates of this bill are destined to grievous disappointment. It is dear money, not gold money, the monometallist seeks.

In 1847 Australia began to furnish gold; in 1849, California. The output became so great the money kings of Europe became alarmed and sent to this country a committee to investigate the possible extent of the gold deposit. A report from that committee that gold existed in great quantities so alarmed the very rich that Germany, Portugal, and Holland in 1853 demonetized gold and established silver as the only metal fit for use as money, and the same argument was then made against gold that is now used against silver. Sir, I shall welcome the day that brings so much gold into the world it can not be cornered or controlled by a few, and every believer in the free coinage of silver would learn with delight that Alaska and South Africa were producing a billion of gold each year. Since this discussion commenced $17,000,000 of gold has been shipped from New York to London, and more is leaving every day. The Bank of England has raised the price of exchange until gold can be shipped from this country at a profit, and the money sharks, hastening to take advantage of it, are sending hundreds of thousands of gold by every ship. Berlin, in fact all Germany, is suffering for want of gold, and in our own country the Secretary of the Treasury is depositing money by the millions in various banks daily in order to prevent a panic, and yet gentlemen calmly go on pressing a bill that contracts our money supply and forever destroys the legal-tender quality of all our money except the gold. The passage of this bill does not settle the question. The American people are yet to be heard from.

The Democratic party can not be suspected of selfish motives in taking the position it occupies. We realize to the full ours is a dangerous way, for every powerful money institution, not only of this country but the world, is against us. Every selfish interest, every intrenched wrong, every special privilege is fighting us. We are fighting a desperate contest. Beginning with Great Britain in 1816, every country of continental Europe has struck colors to the money devil, and, although our people have fought long and hard, we at last are about to go over to him. But, sir, I have an abiding faith in the wisdom and justice of my countrymen. Our retreat is not a surrender. The people will again resume their own. If I looked only for party advantage, I could ask nothing better than the passage of this bill, for I verily believe it will return to "plague its inventors" before another summer is past; but the want and wretchedness it will entail, the unhappiness it will bring to the millions of working people, arouse emotions far more serious and, I trust, nobler than mere partisan advantage.

The establishment of the gold standard will do no harm to the rich; it will make their pathway easier; but, sir, we are not here to legislate for the rich, but for all the people. One circumstance that may well arouse the suspicions of ordinary people is that the provisions of this bill have been advocated by bankers and gold-standard champions for twenty years. These people are manifestly seeking legislation beneficial to themselves, and if their pet measure was alike beneficial to all, no advantage would accrue from its enactment. No one but the philanthropist would press legislation equally advantageous to all but not changing the relative position of men as now existing. The pamphlets, the arguments, resolutions, and speeches constantly emanating from sources deeply interested in large money institutions mean something, and that something is those institutions expect an advantage over other people by the establishment of the gold standard. No country ever had too much metallic money, and the authors of this bill warn us of dangers to be feared not experienced from bimetallism.

In 1884 there was $917,884,668 of paper money of all kinds in circulation; in 1899 this amount had only increased $73,000,000, and of the total amount of paper money in circulation in 1899, $184,000,000 was issued in bills of $500 and upward to $10,000 and of course never circulated among the people. In 1890 the so-called Sherman law was passed, and the Secretary of the Treasury commenced to buy silver bullion and issued certificates against it. Our total stock of paper money in 1890 was $1,004,886,724, and in 1899 $1,144,256,891. Of this sum, $406,085,504 is secured by silver held in the Treasury and $237,832,594 by bonds deposited by national banks, leaving a little over one-half to be secured by the faith and credit of the Government, as well as by the gold held in the Treasury. Each dollar of both the metallic and paper money is good and received by all our people for all debts, so there is

absolutely no justifiable excuse for cutting from under our paper circulation the legal-tender silver that now aids in supporting it.

I wish again, sir, to say something about the bond feature of this measure. I can not conceive how gentlemen will explain an affirmative vote to their constituents. What legal right have we to change the terms of a contract made thirty years ago? You propose to make all of the bonds of this Government payable in gold. Not one of them says so in the bond itself. Who is benefited by such a law? I have not the exact figures at hand, but know that 4,500 banks of the United States hold a large per cent of the bonds. Now, what is it you do? "First," you say to the banker, "buy bonds and you will get interest on the bond, and, moreover, you may issue and loan money to the full face or par value of the bond; second, we will change the contract so as to make your bond payable in gold, although the bond says coin (silver or gold); third, we will destroy silver as money and double the value of your bond and also the money they are to be paid in." Sir, who can justify such conduct? During Cleveland's last term he informed Congress if it would authorize him to insert the word gold in a $62,000,000 bond issue, he would make for the people $16,000,000, but his proposition was at once rejected, and you now propose to do for nothing that which even Cleveland admitted was worth $16,000,000. But, sir, it seems idle to take up further time in discussing this matter. Men's minds are fixed, and anything short of an actual trial will change no one.

In advocating the free and unlimited coinage of silver the Democratic party seeks advantage of no man. Our fundamental tenet is equality before the law for every citizen of the Republic. We have learned, from bitter experience, the difference between a splendid and a happy people. The accumulation of great fortunes is menacing to the spirit of democracy. The policy of the Republican party has well-nigh stifled competition in many avocations, and the gravest problem before the American people is how to prevent the trusts from engulfing our commercial life. The practical destruction of $355,000,000 of greenbacks and the utter annihilation of silver as money builds up, by operation of law, a bank trust that will dominate the very existence of the people. There should always be enough money in circulation (I mean debt-paying legal-tender money) to enable the farmer to market his crop without mortgaging it for the manufacturer to sell the product of his mill without hypothecating it to some bank for money to operate upon. A few men in New York or London can produce a panic in this country whenever it suits their purpose. This is not even denied by gentlemen on the other side, but they say the output of gold is increasing so rapidly there will soon be enough to supply the world with sufficient money. But is it not better to wait until that time comes before acting?

From 1847 to 1855 the increase in the output of gold was relatively as great as now, but we have not even yet a sufficiency. It requires, Mr. Chairman, far more statesmanship to foresee an evil and provide a preventive than it does to suggest a remedy for an existing and apparent one. The Republicans, taking advantage of a slight increase in the supply of gold, are gathering lessons from the hour which overturn the experience and judgment of years and centuries. If the gold standard will discriminate against labor, if it will aid the creditor and oppress the debtor, if it will depress the products of man's toil and raise the value of money, then the bill should never pass; but you will pass it. You have the power and will use it; your promise made to every selfish interest in 1896 must be redeemed. I am opposed to the principle and every section of the bill. I stand by the declaration of my party and declare nothing short of the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at the ratio of 16 of silver to 1 of gold will ever settle this question with the people.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended for five minutes.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I understood the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] to tell me that I had twenty minutes. I will ask the gentleman how long he understood that I was recognized for?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I understood for fifteen minutes. If I had more time, I would give it.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I am not complaining, but I did not understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FOWLER] is recognized for thirty minutes.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this measure with satisfaction because of the first fourteen lines and notwithstanding practically all that follows.

If there had been any possibility of this bill becoming a law as it now stands, I should have offered at the proper time as a substitute the following:

A bill to determine the standard of value, to fix the measure or unit of value, and to establish the parity of all legal-tender money.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the standard of value shall continue to be gold, and the measure or unit of value shall be, as now, the gold dollar, which shall contain 25.8 grains of gold nine-tenths fine or 23.22 grains of fine gold.

SEC. 2. That all interest-bearing obligations of the United States now existing or hereafter entered into, and all United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the law of July 14, 1890, shall be, and hereby are, made redeemable in the gold coin of the United States; and when any of said notes shall have been redeemed in gold coin they shall not be paid out again or exchanged except for gold coin.

SEC. 3. That all the legal-tender money of the United States shall, at the option of the holder thereof, be, and is hereby, made interchangeable at the subtreasury of the United States in New York City, and at such other places as the Secretary of the Treasury may from time to time designate.

SEC. 4. That for the purpose of meeting the requirements of this act the Secretary of the Treasury shall set aside and maintain in gold coin or gold coin and gold bullion a reserve fund of $150,000,000; and he is hereby authorized and required, whenever necessary to maintain said fund, to issue and sell bonds of the United States bearing interest at a rate not exceeding 3 per cent per annum and payable in gold coin at the end of twenty years, but redeemable at the option of the Government at any time after the expiration of one year.

SEC. 5. That all national-bank notes shall, at the option of the holder thereof, be redeemed in gold coin; and that the fund deposited by the national banks in the Treasury of the United States for the redemption of their notes shall, from and after the passage of this act, be in gold coin.

SEC. 6. Nothing in this act contained shall be construed or held to affect the present legal-tender quality of the United States notes, Treasury notes, the silver dollar, or of the subsidiary or minor coins, or the law making national-bank notes receivable and payable for certain public debts and dues and obligations between national banks.

For more than sixty years our standard of value has been gold, in actual practice, and to the Democratic party we are indebted for that wise and beneficent selection. Since then the entire civilized world, with a single exception or two, has reached the same conclusion, though at times they, like ourselves, have suffered and paid the frightful cost of change, of hesitation, and of doubt even.

We no longer mention the countries which have adopted the gold standard, but invariably say all have adopted it except Mexico and a few half-civilized and some heathen nations. The benefits of an unequivocal standard, and that the standard of the civilized world, are being reaped in every line of employment and production and in every nook and corner of this great Republic. Never in the history of any nation has there been such a contrast in the same length of time as the years of 1896 and 1899 disclose. This miraculous, indeed almost incomprehensible, change is very largely due to the verdict of the people in 1896.

What was that verdict? It was against the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio 16 to 1, and was written in these words:

We, the people of the United States, do find that all our silver and paper currency must be maintained at a parity with gold, and we favor all measures designed to maintain inviolably the obligations of the United States and all our money, whether coin or paper, at the present standard, the standard of the most enlightened nations of the earth.

Does the measure before the House carry that verdict into execution beyond the peradventure of a doubt? I do not believe that it does. Let us see. On page 4, beginning in line 9, we find these unfortunate, these fatal words:

If at any time the Secretary of the Treasury deems it necessary, in order to maintain the parity and equal value of all the money of the United States, he may, at his discretion, exchange gold coin for any other money issued or coined by the United States.

While in an earlier part of this same section he is commanded to redeem United States notes and Treasury notes in gold coin, he is in this subsequent clause remanded to his discretion whether he will exchange gold coin for the same United States notes and Treasury notes, leaving his position precisely where it is to-day. The section, no doubt, taken altogether, would authorize and impel a conscience and discretion leaning toward the gold standard to maintain the parity of all our moneys. But what about a conscience and a discretion that are hostile to the gold standard and wedded in fact by all political associations to silver and, as he may choose to term it, the bimetallic standard?

I am deeply impressed with the fact that the American people are tired of doubts, tired of interrogation points, tired of political straddles, and are looking wistfully for a law so clear and unequivocal that every intelligent citizen can understand it; a law that can not be construed to suit the conscience or discretion of any Secretary of the Treasury; a law that needs no judicial interpretation; a law that is the undoubted echo of the people's verdict in 1896.

The verdict of the people was that "all our silver and paper currency (silver as well as paper) must (not may, at the discretion of a bimetallic Secretary of the Treasury) be maintained at a parity with gold." With that injunction upon us, can we at this session of Congress do anything less than make our silver and paper interchangeable with gold?

Can any man who cares for his reputation as a candid and honest thinker attempt to explain to an American audience why he made a United States note which is worth in and of itself only the value of the paper upon which it is printed, and the Treasury note which is secured with about 80 cents' worth of silver bullion, redeemable in gold coin, while he made no provision for the current redemption of a silver dollar which is worth only 40 cents; unless, forsooth, the silverized fancy of a bimetallic Secretary of the Treasury happened, perchance, to suggest such a thing as the redemption of a silver dollar in gold coin as a wise exercise of his discretion? If we can take them at their word, their discretion

will never work in that direction, for they have already said, from Candidate Bryan and Populist Allen down, that the only policy for the Government to pursue was to simply refuse to pay gold and pay out silver and the parity would thereby be maintained; in fact, that that very act would be the maintenance of the parity.

It would seem, therefore, that this act was specially drawn for just that kind of an experiment. Indeed, one of the best thinkers of this House declared that silver would go to a discount immediately if this measure should become a law as it now stands. He forgot, however, for the moment, that the Republican party was in power, but I fear he spoke with prophetic vision if the latter-day Democratic party should by any mischance come into power and be given the opportunity of exercising a silverized discretion.

The bill before the House provides, on page 1, line 14, that all other obligations, public and private, for the payment of money shall be performed in conformity with the standard established in said section, referring to section 1, which means gold payment or its equivalents. From the statement of facts already set forth it is clear, to me at least, that since silver is a legal tender the Government might be compelling its citizens to take silver dollars which were below par, while they in turn would be compelled to pay their creditors gold or its equivalent, thereby losing the difference, which would range anywhere from 1 to 60 cents on each dollar of their obligations.

This Government can not afford to ask or demand a higher degree of honesty on the part of its citizens than it proposes to practice itself. Therefore, why do we attempt, through the legerdemain of words, to escape the responsibility of being absolutely honest with regard to our silver as well as our paper obligations? In his New York speech the President well said more than a year ago:

> It will not suffice for citizens nowadays to say simply that they are in favor of sound money. That is not enough. The people's purpose must be given the vitality of public law.

When this is done and all the legal-tender money of the United States is made interchangeable, no legislation will be necessary with regard to contracts, public or private.

Again, on page 4, line 10, we find these words:

> Except as hereinbefore in this section provided.

What is the inevitable effect of this clause? Simply this: To leave the Government just where it is to-day with regard to the United States notes and Treasury notes. The endless chain is perpetuated, and the net result can only be to insert a swivel or two to lessen the friction, extract gold as usual, and contract the currency of the country.

I for one have thoroughly misunderstood the American people or else they desire to break the endless chain of demand obligations and set the endless chain of gold coin in motion.

The President, referring to this very subject in his message, said:

> Let us remove the only remaining cause by conferring the full and necessary power on the Secretary of the Treasury and impose upon him the duty [not give him the discretion] to uphold the present gold standard and preserve the coins of the two metals on a parity with each other, which is the repeatedly declared policy of the United States.
>
> In this connection I repeat my former recommendations that a portion of the gold holding shall be placed in a trust fund, from which greenbacks shall be redeemed upon presentation, but, when once redeemed, shall not thereafter be paid out except for gold.

No member of this House, including the committee itself which prepared this measure, will contend that the United States notes and the Treasury notes which may have been redeemed in gold coin can not again be put into circulation in the ordinary course of business and without the deposit of an equal amount of gold coin.

The American people are opposed to a continuation of this dangerous and destructive policy, and have so declared themselves. Let our courage prove a fit counterpart to their honesty and intelligence.

Again, it is not a matter of discretion whether a man shall be honest in the payment of his debts. Nor is it a matter of discretion whether a bank or other commercial company or municipal corporation or State shall be honest in the discharge of their respective obligations.

What is true of the man, the bank, the business company, the city, the county, and the State is equally true of this Government. And if there could be such a thing as comparative honesty in the payment of a debt, the nation should stand as the ideal.

Some of the silver dollars now in circulation were worth 100 cents when coined, and for all of them—now approximating 500,000,000 in circulation, or represented in circulation by silver certificates—the Government has received full consideration for the face value; therefore, whatever depreciation the silver dollars have undergone is a loss of the Government, and should be sustained by it and not by the individual who may happen to have silver dollars in his possession. The citizen who holds a silver dollar has commercial value of 40 cents and a claim against the United States Government for 60 cents, and the dollar itself is the evidence of it and a proper check for the balance due. So long as the Government keeps that dollar as good as gold the people will continue to use it freely as a fit tool with which to accomplish their commercial work. Therefore, let the Government frankly, honestly, bravely, boldly admit that the loss on the silver dollar is its own loss, and that its citizens shall not be called upon to bear any portion of it under any circumstances, however adverse, even under a Democratic Administration.

Let not this Government assume that there can be any discretion about paying an honest debt. Much less let it gamble upon the political chance of giving that discretion to a silverized bimetallic politician who has declared that he would exercise that discretion to the discredit and everlasting dishonor of this great nation. Let us, before this session closes, make all the legal-tender money of this Government interchangeable, remove the last possible doubt, eliminate the remotest chance, and eternally settle the question beyond the power of any man or party, unless the people shall thereafter will it, of which there will be or can be no possible chance until the world moves simultaneously to some other standard; for the American people are honest, they are the most intelligent and potent nation in the world, and are superlatively brave if their public servants will but blaze the way.

Mr. Chairman, I could have hoped that the committee had accurately defined the scope of its work in these words, taken from its report:

> The committee did not consider the general subject of banking, nor did it seek to arrange a complete scheme of finance, but confined its recommendations to those subjects of most pressing demand, as evidenced by the pledges of the Republican party and the general policy of the Republican Administration.
>
> In withholding recommendations relative to the general subjects of banking, bank currency, and the control and general supervision of banks, and also the question of the retirement of the greenbacks, the committee does not want to be understood as having considered such subjects at all nor as passing judgment upon them, but rather to have left the same to the usual channel of consideration through the proper committees of Congress.
>
> The committee was of the opinion that the most urgent subject was the question of a monetary standard and provision for its maintenance. The strengthening of the public credit by the removal of all doubt concerning the policy and practice of the Government relative to the unit of value is of paramount importance. To effect this result by a complete guaranty of the quality and parity of all our money, without any disturbance by change in the quantity or kind, was the chief purpose of the committee.

It is evident from these words that the committee has proposed many things in its excursions into the fields of coinage and currency whose full effect they did not contemplate, and therefore I shall refrain from making any observations upon the other subjects covered by this bill, hoping that at the proper time and place they will be wisely adjusted or omitted for the present to await more deliberate consideration.

Had I said less upon this occasion I should have been recreant to my duty, to my country, my State, and my constituency; and, what is more and more important still to me, untrue to my convictions and unworthy of myself.

I shall vote for this bill, because it is an upward and onward step in the right direction, and because I have absolute confidence that the measure which shall go into the statute books will have the clear and unequivocal ring of a gold coin and will not be marred by marks of indirection, evasion, subterfuge, or paraphrase, suggesting even remotely the possibility of doubt or the faintest recollection of bimetallism; that the measure will be worthy of the great impending problem, worthy of the glorious history of the Republican party, and worthy of the honesty, intelligence, and courage of the American people. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] is recognized for thirty-five minutes.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this debate, particularly to that on the Democratic side of the House, with great interest. I was amazed at the utterances of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND], who aspired to the leadership of that side of the Chamber, when he assured us that in the campaign of 1896 McKinley and the Republican party won because members of the Democratic party had either been intimidated or had sold out. That was an astonishing utterance coming from a leader upon that side of the House.

Mr. BERRY. Will the gentleman from Iowa allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. LACEY. Yes.

Mr. BERRY. Does the gentleman think the Republican party could have won without the aid of the recreant Democrats who voted for the gold standard?

Mr. LACEY. That is another proposition. The gentlemen to whom my friend refers as the "recreant Democrats" who voted for the gold standard neither sold themselves nor were they scared. From the other side were drawn the votes unquestionably that won in that election, and a more honorable body of men never stood up to be counted than the Gold Democrats of 1896. Six and a half million votes were cast for William J. Bryan and for the experiment of free silver. Seven million votes were cast for sound money, protection, and prosperity, and the Gold Democrats who cast their lot with us have had their reward.

Mr. SULZER. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. LACEY. Certainly. I will hear now from another one of these leaders.

Mr. SULZER. Were those 7,000,000 votes all of them cast for the single gold standard?

Mr. LACEY. They were cast for the declaration for gold in our platform, and the controversy among Republicans to-day is as to who had the honor of writing the word "gold" in the St. Louis platform. The newspapers are full of that discussion. I see across the aisle to-day an increase in the Democratic membership over the last Congress. Where does it come from? It comes from New York, from Massachusetts, and from men who have secured their election by trampling under foot the Democratic platform of 1896.

Mr. DALY of New Jersey. That is not so in New Jersey. We will not stand by that in New Jersey. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LACEY. Perhaps not in New Jersey. New Jersey was for a long time out of the Union, but in the last Congress they were unanimously for the Republican cause.

Mr. SULZER. How about Nebraska?

Mr. LACEY. Nebraska! The most pitiable thing in all history is for Nebraska to stand up and be laughed at by Kansas. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

The Republican party, like all other such organizations, is a party of promises; unlike many of such organizations, it is also a party of performance.

Its position upon the great question of our national standard of value is well known. Favorable to the upbuilding and fostering of American industries as it has always been, it has attempted, while maintaining the parity of all our money, to "do something for silver."

It has resisted all the attempts that have been made under the name of "bimetallism" to place the country upon the Asiatic and Mexican silver standard. In seeking an "international agreement" it has in good faith attempted to aid the silver producer in securing a wider range of uses for his product. But all these attempts have been in vain. The commercial nations of the earth have accepted the logic of events and have determined to use silver in a subsidiary form and maintain it, when coined, at the standard of gold. The concession that gold is sixteen times more valuable than silver is an admission that there is a proportionate value which must be taken into consideration.

The only actual silver question grows out of the commercial variations in that ratio.

Experience has taught us, as it has taught other nations, that we can only maintain both metals in actual circulation by coining the cheaper one on Government account and redeeming it, either directly or indirectly, or exchanging it on demand for gold. It remains as good as gold only as long as it can be converted into gold.

The silver question has been so fully discussed that it seems idle now to go into details. The country has become thoroughly tired of it.

In the Fifty-fifth Congress the House of Representatives could readily have passed a bill of the general import of that now under consideration. All the bills presented involved numerous matters of detail, and it was perfectly evident at the time that no bill on the subject could pass the then free-silver Senate. Members of this House were averse to taking up and studying the details of a measure that it was obvious could never become a law. The Spanish war intervened, with all its exciting episodes, and there was enough for that Congress to do without attempting the impossible, and the question of settling the standard by law was relegated to the Fifty-sixth Congress.

The settlement of the question by law in the Fifty-fifth Congress was also rendered the more difficult by persistent attempts to couple with it radical, experimental banking legislation. The "gold Democrats" of 1896 abandoned Mr. Bryan and his Chicago platform, and, while supporting General Palmer, they, with great unanimity, voted for "McKinley and prosperity."

These men were anxious in the last Congress that permanent law should take the place of the present plan of maintaining the parity of our money by executive action. It is now declared by law that all our money shall be kept equal, and with a gold-standard President and Secretary of the Treasury the law has been found fully adequate to that end.

With parties divided as they are now, and under existing law, the election of a free-silver President could place this country on the silver standard in thirty days and shipwreck every business interest in the country during the readjustment following the declaration of the people in favor of the change in the standard of value. If our party were to view this subject from a purely selfish standpoint it would be better for it if the question were left open and the country should be compelled to choose between Republicanism and the gold standard and Democracy and the fluctuating standard of silver.

On this question, with the experience of the last four years before their eyes, the people would choose, as they did in 1896, to "open the mills instead of the mints." Viewed from the standpoint of party selfishness, it might be well to leave the statute as it now is—the subject of Presidential good faith. A sound-money President is absolutely essential as the law now stands. Mr. Bryan and his followers stand pledged to redeem the Governmental obligations in the cheapest money that will fill the letter of the contract. They broke permanently with Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Carlisle because the Administration refused to take the chances of redeeming our promises in silver.

On this issue the country has declared in favor of the policy of the Republican party. It is the duty of that party to redeem its pledges, as the Treasury redeems its promises, in the full measure of its party platforms. The party platform of our party in 1898 in the State of Iowa, upon which the Speaker of this House and the other members of its unanimous delegation were chosen, speaks clearly the views of the majority of the people of Iowa.

I will read it:

IOWA PLATFORM, 1898.

That the experience of the past two years has fully approved the gold standard policy of the Republican party as declared by the national convention of 1896. We recognize the necessity of comprehensive and enlightened monetary legislation. The monetary standard of this country and the commercial world is gold. The permanence of this standard must be assured by Congressional legislation, giving to it the validity and vitality of public law. All other money must be kept at a parity with gold. Our money, like our institutions, should be maintained equal to the best in the world. In this plank we invite the support of all voters who desire honesty and stability in business affairs and an immediate and permanent settlement of the question of the standard of value.

There is the declaration of the Republicans of the State of Iowa, and sound-money Democrats cast their votes in favor of that proposition. Iowa emphasized its position again in 1899, and a majority of nearly 60,000 were recorded upon the side of the gold standard and of sound money.

The other day I had a letter from one of the sound-money Democrats of Iowa. Said he:

It is reported that the Republicans will not redeem their pledges given to the Democratic sound-money, gold-standard men, because under the present law it is necessary to elect a Republican President in order to maintain the pledges of parity.

I answered him:

DEAR SIR: Your letter is at hand. On next Monday, at 12 o'clock, Washington time, we intend to pass the gold-standard bill; and it will be just 11 o'clock Iowa time. Look out for it.

And we intend to redeem that pledge, my friends, notwithstanding it relieves you from some of the dangers of the campaign of 1900, and may enable you to go to the country and say: "Elect Bryan; he can not do any harm." [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the Republican party is passing this measure so hastily because they apprehend that Bryan will be elected because he is in accordance with the sentiment of the American people, and they are going to put it beyond their power to undo the harm that will have been done?

Mr. LACEY. The gentleman's statement is so full of misunderstanding that he does not do credit to the speech which he has just made. I say, sir, that we are about to put in the form of statute law the standard that is now upheld by good faith on the part of the Executive of this country. Mr. Cleveland maintained the gold standard; so has Mr. McKinley.

The Republican party promised to give you this kind of legislation, and propose to carry it out, whatever the consequences to the party may be. Now, the gentleman to my left, the distinguished leader from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND], told us also that we were having "prosperity in spots." Is there any gentleman on the other side of the Chamber now that will rise—I will yield him time to do so—and tell us that he represents "a spot" not now prosperous? [A pause.] Where is there one of those barren spots of the Republic? I asked my friend from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] on yesterday, and he seemed to rejoice that Tennessee was having pretty good times, without free silver and under the Dingley law.

We must not forget, my friends, what took place just a few short years ago by the very threat that our standard of value was to be changed and the existence of a silver basis was proposed. You seem to forget the Coxey army that encamped under the shadows of this Capitol and that were "kept off the grass" by the police just a few years ago. I visited that body of Bryanites when they came to this city. I went with a number of Congressmen. We asked one of them, an intelligent-looking man, what they wanted. He said, "What we want is more money." I asked, "How do you expect to get it?" "Print it." "How are you going to put it in circulation?" "Build roads and canals with it." "Well," said I, "how much do you intend to issue?" "Five hundred million dollars." "You mean to put the stamp of the Government on it?" "Yes." "How are you going to redeem that money?" And he looked at me with a pitying smile, and said, "Redeem her? Never! Just print her, and let her go." [Laughter.]

The people if called upon to recruit a Coxey army or a Kelly navy now would reply: "Too busy! Too busy!"

Experience has proved that the doctrine of sound money and honest recognition of national debts is the best economy. The nation which pays to the uttermost farthing is sure of good credit and a low rate of interest.

The same country where, under threat of the silver standard, the whole world demanded immediate payment of all obligations, national, corporate, and individual, finds itself at this time with sound credit and a surplus in the Treasury.

Good money is the surest foundation for a healthy national financial condition, whilst depreciated money is like blood poison in the system.

In 1892 our opponents denounced protection as a "policy which fostered no industry but that of the sheriff."

In 1893 the sheriff increased his force of deputies, for he was the only busy man in the nation except the free-silver soothsayers. The people voted a want of confidence in the Republican party in 1892. The old augurs of the Democracy prophesied and saw visions, and their young men dreamed dreams and talked and talked, but business men refused to invest, and the goddess of confidence deserted our shores until she was recalled by the decree of the people in 1896. Those were the longest four years in our history.

Out of the old fields of protection and good money comes the new corn of prosperity.

You will remember the great cartoon of McKinley "opening the mills instead of the mints," and of the title bestowed upon him by my colleague [Mr. DOLLIVER] of "the advance agent of prosperity."

The mills have been opened, labor is employed, wages advanced; every promise has been performed and every pledge redeemed. Now let us write in the statutes of the country with the force and effect of permanent law the good faith of our party to the American people, who have so greatly trusted us.

The people of America expect much and demand much from the Republican party. They do not expect impossibilities. We declined in the Fifty-fifth Congress to attempt impossible legislation upon this subject. In the present Congress the situation is very different. We are now in a position of power, coupled with corresponding responsibility in both branches of the legislative body and at the White House. We are now in a position to perform our agreements. The time for talk has passed by, and the hour for action has arrived.

A legislative milestone should now be erected to mark the progress of national thought.

This bill will serve that purpose. With its provisions upon the statute books, any President must obey the law until it is repealed, and no mere Executive order could then overturn the standard of commercial value.

The sound-money Democrats, who aided us by their votes and influence in 1896 and 1898, will see by our action that the party with which they have been temporarily associated is worthy of their permanent support.

In 1900 the attempt to overthrow the legislative settlement of this question will be resented by every business interest in the United States, and labor will insist on keeping good the standard of wages, too. One more contest must be fought out upon this issue.

With our position fortified by the enactment of law, the attempt of our opponents to overturn existing conditions will be displeasing alike to the wage-earner, the farmer, and the business man.

Even after the lapse of so short a time as has passed since 1896 it is hard to recall the desperate conditions that surrounded our people at that time. Under the threat of free silver, and under the actual existence of the Wilson-Bryan law, business was paralyzed and the free-silver orators were demonstrating that cheap money was the only cure for the financial ailment of the nation.

Thousands of workingmen who had been thrown out of employment by the Wilson-Bryan law and by the attack upon our monetary standard rallied around Mr. Bryan and, deceived by his plausible words, skipped over twenty-three years of time and charged the existing calamity to something that the Republican party had done in 1873. Napoleon's maxim for success was, "Audacity! Audacity!!"

The cool audacity of the Populistic-Democratic fusion of 1896 swept thousands of lifelong Republicans off their feet, but the campaign of education that followed brought the business interests of the country into line, and the workingmen took their second thought, and the victory of 1896 came, followed by its gratifying results.

It would seem that in the light of past events the silver question ought not to be fought over again. But our opponents require plenty of time to catch up with the procession. Mr. Bryan and most of his supporters now eulogize Lincoln. Even a good word for Garfield and Blaine may occasionally be heard from them, but all this takes time. Usually their greatest difficulty is found in fully comprehending the death of an issue.

That splendid old Democrat, Andrew Jackson, fought the battle of New Orleans on January 8, 1815. His victory was of the type that has made Dewey famous in modern times and Joshua in ancient days. Twenty-six hundred of Jackson's enemies bit the dust, and only 13 Americans were killed and wounded. It was, indeed, a notable deed, one that did honor to the American arms, and we all join in sounding the praise of Old Hickory.

But you will recall that this battle was fought before the days of Atlantic cables, and the treaty of peace was signed at Ghent fifteen days before the fight, and the slaughter was, indeed, an unnecessary one. That was in the old days, when sailing ships, with their woven wings, slowly carried the message of peace across the deep. The gallant Jackson got so much and such well-deserved glory out of this victory that the party that now claims to represent his principles emulates his example and continues to fight its battles after the war is over, when all questions in dispute ought to be forever set at rest.

Merritt and Dewey stormed Manila after the protocol, but the cable had been cut, and they, like Jackson, did not know that the war was ended.

But the result of 1896 is known to all men, and there is no excuse of ignorance to justify fighting anew the battle of the standards in 1900.

Colonel Bryan has again sounded the tocsin of 1896. But there must be proper adjuncts to justify a renewal of this contest. In 1896, surrounded with the wreckage of 1893, 1894, and 1895, he pointed to 1873 as the belated cause of it all and made one of the most notable Presidential campaigns in our history.

Free silver was then the financial Keely motor by which wealth, like power, was to be produced by vibrations of sound.

But in 1899 it takes a bold man to attempt to form the lines again for such a contest.

The smoke of the battle of 1896 has cleared away, and the peaceful smoke of the factory and the forge now again rises and floats over the scene.

It is hard to look with becoming seriousness upon the proposition of our opponents to renew the contest upon the issues of the Chicago platform.

That platform is what Dickens would call "the deadest and buriedest" of all the things of this world.

In 1896 we had an abundance of prophecies upon which to draw. Evil, and that continually, was the foreboding of our opponents, if the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1 and consequent silver standard were not adopted.

We were told that the "bryanide of silver" was our only remedy for the ills which all knew to exist. We were assured that the gold standard would result in widespread bankruptcy and ruin, just as in 1878 we were assured that the resumption of specie payments would lead to universal financial calamity.

In 1896, as in 1878, our opponents' evil predictions were not justified by the event.

Many Republicans were swept off their feet in 1896 by the word "gold" in the St. Louis platform. Thousands of them went over to the other side; and without the purchase of votes, but by appealing to the judgment of men in the Democratic party, they came over and not only made good the loss, but aided to cast that half million of majority which has been rewarded by the prosperity which you now enjoy. No man has risen in his place in this House to say that his district is not prosperous. How would that have been but a few years ago, when this silver campaign was going on? On every hand the cohorts of calamity would have appeared and would have borne witness to hard times. The South is rejoicing in prosperity, and I am glad to see it. The price of cotton has gone up along with other products, and as I see my friend from Texas rising to interrupt me, I will ask him if they are not having good times down in Texas?

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman from Iowa to be a frank man, and I desire to ask him a question and trust that he will answer that question frankly. Do you say that the prosperity now in the country is due to the fact that the Republican party is controlling the destinies of this country?

Mr. LACEY. It is due to two causes.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. The Republican party and the God of the universe?

Mr. LACEY. To both. The God of the universe works through terrestrial things. The Republican party is one of those things through which He has worked prosperity in this country. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] My friend would say when the price of cotton was down that the cheapness was due to the Republican party, and now when cotton rises he says the Almighty did it.

Mr. SLAYDEN. As the gentleman from Iowa has just mentioned the fact that the price of cotton has risen, does he not know, and does not every man know, that the price of cotton has advanced somewhat this year because the crop is supposed to be short from 25 to 40 per cent as compared with the production of last year?

Mr. LACEY. Now, I am inclined to think that my friend is

suggesting only one of the reasons. A few years ago the gentlemen on the other side, if the price of cotton was down, said that was because they did not have free silver; that it could never rise under a gold standard. Now, when cotton rises without free silver, they attribute it to something else.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Oh, no, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LACEY. What is the number of bales raised this year?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I do not know; no man knows.

Mr. LACEY. Has there been any marked decline in the production?

Several MEMBERS. Oh, yes.

Mr. LACEY. My friends on the other side attribute it to a short crop. A few years ago, when the price was low, they ignored the question of the size of the crop and referred all their misfortunes to the crime of 1873.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. LACEY. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that cotton is lower now than it was in 1896?

Mr. LACEY. I am not sure of that. What is it selling at now?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. About 7¾ cents a pound.

Mr. LACEY. It is selling for more than it did a year or two ago.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Will the gentleman from Iowa allow me one question more?

Mr. LACEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. The gentleman has attributed the present prosperity to the Republican party. In 1897 wheat sold for a dollar a bushel, and in 1899 at 65 cents a bushel. How do you reconcile that?

Mr. LACEY. I do not reconcile it at all. No political party can make a fixity of prices. I am talking about the general situation of the country. Wheat will go up and wheat will go down, cotton will go up and cotton will go down, whether the Democrats are in power or the Republicans are in power; but a condition of general prosperity and confidence following upon a change of policy involving great industrial and financial issues is worthy of recognition even upon the part of those who opposed the change. Distrust growing out of unwise laws and the threat of still more unwise laws was removed by the election of 1896.

Let us be glad of the result, and as far as possible provide by law against a recurrence of the condition from which we have happily emerged.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman from Iowa permit me to answer the question which he asked a moment ago?

Mr. LACEY. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I understood the gentleman to inquire if there had been any material decline in the yield of cotton this year. It is estimated that the decrease in the yield is not less than 2,600,000 bales, which will account for the very moderate increase in value. I want to say that cotton to-day is selling at unremunerative figures in the great State of Texas. It is bringing 3½ cents a pound less than what was thought to be a remunerative price.

Mr. LACEY. The increase in the cotton product, I think, has been largely due to free labor in the South, and the decline in price has been due largely to the great increase in its production. It is the greatest product of the South, and it is now joining in the general advance. I rejoice at it, and regret that the gentlemen who were so ready to blame the decline in price upon Republican policies are now unwilling to attribute their improved conditions to what seems to us to be so evident.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield to me for a question?

Mr. LACEY. I can not now; my time is getting limited. The enactment of this law, Mr. Chairman, will not change the standard of value. We have declared in favor of sound money in the past; we have never attempted to write into the statute law an explicit declaration as to what sound money is. Sound money is that which you can convert into the standard of the world.

No more prosperous Treasury report has ever been exhibited in the history of the United States than at the present time. With $1,043,128,288 cash on hand and a net balance of $286,216,439, and with revenues exceeding the current expenses of the Government, notwithstanding the fact that we have just passed out of one war and have nearly concluded another, with all of this immense mass of revenue at our disposal, I say what more remarkable record has been written in the history of the world than is shown by the Treasury report of to-day?

A few years ago we were discussing in this House a bill to extend the Union Pacific and the Central Pacific railroad bonds at 2 per cent for one hundred years, in the hope that thereby we might receive something of the amount due to the Government from these roads. To-day the last dollar of the Union Pacific indebtedness of $56,000,000 has been paid, and payments are rapidly being made on the Central Pacific, and the entire amount of all of this indebtedness about which we felt so much doubt and uncertainty a few years ago will soon be paid in hard cash into the Treasury.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, redeems the pledges of the Republican party made to the people in the past and clarifies the political atmosphere for the year 1900. It is true that Nebraska has gone Populistic—Democratic, if you please. It is true, however, that in other parts of the country the policy of the old party of sound money has received the sanction and the approval of the people at the polls.

A MEMBER. How did Ohio go?

Mr. LACEY (continuing). And on yesterday the city of Boston, almost continuously Democratic for so many years back, has retaken its place in the old fold.

Mr. GAINES. And defeated a Gold Democrat for mayor.

Mr. LACEY. Now, the gentleman from Tennessee has sought to interrupt me. He lives in the State of Tennessee?

Mr. GAINES. Certainly. And the expenditure of $262,000,000 to carry on the war created an enforced demand for certain commodities in the South.

Mr. LACEY. Then the gentleman from Tennessee is willing to admit the suggestion that there is "prosperity in spots?" [Laughter.]

Mr. GAINES. Undoubtedly, because you sent there and bought everything in the world which was necessary to carry on the war.

Mr. LACEY. Let me ask the gentleman in what part of the State does he live?

Mr. GAINES. In the blue-grass region of Tennessee, where the Democrats believe in the Constitution of the United States, and believe in the issue of gold and silver currency, and are unwilling to demonetize either. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LACEY. Well, are you not doing pretty well, under the circumstances?

Mr. GAINES. Yes, we are; but not owing to Republican legislation.

Mr. LACEY. My friend thinks that his part of the country is doing well, but the people there want to do better. Let me recall the old epitaph on the tombstone of one who tried experiments in life. It read, "I was well, but wanted to be better. I took physic; now I am here." [Laughter and applause.] Now, you want to be better.

Mr. GAINES. We will give you more "physic" in 1900.

Mr. LACEY. In 1892 the people, like the Israelites of old, grew tired of quails and wanted to go back to the leeks and garlic of Egypt.

And the people that year tried the experiment of voting the Democratic party back into power, believing that Grover Cleveland, with his sound-money ideas, would be able to hold them in check. But the first thing that was done when they took possession was to begin that crusade upon our standard of value which paralyzed the industries of this country, and from which we were not relieved until the people in 1896 resolved to return again to the successful policy of the past.

The Republicans have urged two policies as necessary to the national welfare. One was protection, giving employment to the American people. The other was sound money and a gold standard, to pay for that employment with the best money in the world. With these two principles sustained at the polls we have seen a change come. We have seen a change that is as wide as the country, as broad as the land itself, and even my friend from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES], radical as he always is, hesitated a while to state which kind of a spot he lives in.

Mr. GAINES. The good spots are mighty scarce, I want to say, and the longer your party keeps in power the scarcer they will get. I do not go where anything is wrong, and hence I am against your policy and your party. I stand on the side of right, here and everywhere.

Mr. LACEY. I always admire the judicial severity of my friend's comments upon any question. A few years ago he criticised us for the hard times, and now that the blue-grass region of Tennessee enjoys good times he admits it, but says he wants them to be better. They will not improve by lowering the standard of money. He is easy to please when one party is in power, and it is impossible to satisfy him when another party is in. But my friend has simply wandered off after this silver fetich. It is remarkable how that has captured the imagination of the people in the Southern States.

And yet, gentlemen, you have to abandon the East, the business interests and the manufacturing interests of the whole country in order to gratify that sentiment. Localities that have been heretofore strongly Democratic could only be carried now by declaring against the policy of that party to-day. I have heard but little said about the ratio of 16 to 1 upon the other side. I am not sure even that my friend from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] is still in favor of the sacred ratio of 16 to 1.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I am, and so is my party.

Mr. LACEY. You are still for it?

Mr. GAINES. Congress fixed the ratio and we have the right to make it, and you have supported that ratio time and time again and so has your party.

Mr. LACEY. We have declared in favor of the present ratio

many times, but we have declared also in favor of maintaining all the money that is coined at a parity with gold. This side of the House has endeavored to aid the silver producer. Silver is an American product, and we have gone almost to the verge of business destruction in our efforts to do something for that metal. We have bought nearly sixteen thousand tons of silver under the Bland-Allison law and under the Sherman law in the vain effort to stem the tide and to bring back once more the old parity between silver and gold at a ratio substantially that which had previously been in use.

Mr. RIDGELY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LACEY. Yes, I yield to what is left of the Populist party from Kansas. [Laughter.]

Mr. RIDGELY. The gentleman says that his party is pledged to maintain the silver dollar at a parity with the gold dollar. I ask him if he takes the position that the only way in which it is possible for this nation to do that is to make the silver dollars redeemable in gold dollars at the will of the holders?

Mr. LACEY. They must either be redeemable directly or indirectly. We have maintained the parity heretofore by an indirect redemption. That which can be converted into gold will be as good as gold. We have maintained the parity of the silver dollar and of the silver certificate with gold by the fact that you can convert the same into gold, and without that it will be utterly impossible.

Mr. RIDGELY. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. LACEY. My time is almost up, and I can not yield.

Mr. RIDGELY. This question bears directly on the first one.

Mr. LACEY. Well, I will yield once more to the gentleman.

Mr. RIDGELY. Does this bill provide directly for the redemption of silver dollars with gold dollars?

Mr. LACEY. It does not.

Mr. RIDGELY. Indirectly, then?

Mr. LACEY. The law heretofore has provided indirectly for substantially the same thing for years. We have long since provided directly for the redemption of half dollars, dimes, and quarters, and the various small coin.

This bill provides for indirect redemption of the dollar and direct redemption, if necessary to maintain it at a parity with gold, and still leaves its legal-tender qualities. By limiting the number of silver dollars we have been able to maintain them in circulation at a parity with gold.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, we coined 18,000,000 of these silver dollars, which is 10,000,000 more than had been coined in the eighty-five years prior to "the crime of 1873."

Now, before I close I want to call the attention of gentlemen on the other side to a Democratic platform of a few years ago, on which they well-nigh carried the country. It reads:

> We denounce the failure, for all these eleven years of peace, to make good the promise of the legal-tender notes, which are a changing standard of value in the hands of the people, and the nonpayment of which is a disregard of the plighted faith of the nation.

That is the Democratic platform of a few years ago. To-day, when we are providing practically for the redemption of the greenbacks, our friends say that it should not be done. They throw their hands up in horror, and they say that the thing that they said in this platform ought to have been done years ago ought not to be done now. But let us see the further inconsistency of Democratic platforms:

> We denounce the improvidence—

That is, of the Republican party—

> which in eleven years of peace have taken from the people in Federal taxes thirteen times the whole amount of the legal-tender notes * * * and made no provision for resumption.

And then they wind up by saying:

> And as such hindrance we denounce the resumption clause of the act of 1875, and we here demand its repeal.

Those gentlemen, after denouncing us for not resuming specie payment, then demanded the repeal of the law which provides for the specie payment of those notes, and they demanded its repeal on the ground that it would be a hindrance to specie payment. They were in favor of resumption, but opposed to fixing a day. They were like that very great candidate for the Presidency on the platform I have just read, Mr. Tilden. He was in favor of getting married, but opposed to fixing the day, and died a bachelor.

You agree with us already in some things. I believe in your hearts you agree with us upon this money question. I am not here to speak of the Democracy like my friend from Missouri spoke of us. He assumed that everything we do on this side we do from some depraved or immoral purpose. I do not so regard the Democratic party.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. LACEY. I can not yield to the gentleman, as my time is about to expire.

Mr. COX. From what platform were you reading?

Mr. LACEY. From the platform of 1876. I believe there are good men on that side of the Chamber.

Mr. COX. Of course there are.

Mr. LACEY. I think you all are, and I do not believe you want our country destroyed. I do not believe even my friend from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] thinks gentlemen on this side of the House want their country ruined or are willing to buy Democrats with money or intimidate them by force. That is talk for one of the "spots" in Missouri for the campaign of 1900. We all desire to do what is best for our common country. We have had experience and the example of what followed from 1896 down to the present time. Do you dare strike down that which you are enjoying? I do not believe you will dare to make a campaign on free silver. You may talk about it bravely now, but when you come to meet your happy, prosperous, and contented people you will not again discuss the propositions involved in the Chicago platform of 1896. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to first call attention to the provisions of this bill:

First. You, the majority, propose by legal enactment to establish the single gold standard.

Second. You make every bond or interest-bearing obligation payable in gold.

Third. You make United States notes (greenbacks) redeemable in gold and prevent their being again paid out except for gold.

Fourth. You make the Treasury notes issued under the law of 1890 and paid out for silver bullion payable in gold.

Fifth. You make all other debts, public and private, which now exist or that shall be contracted payable in gold.

Sixth. You make a division of issue and redemption into which you dump $760,000,000 for redemption purposes.

Seventh. You compel the Secretary of the Treasury to keep $50,000,000 additional in the general fund.

Eighth. You authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds, payable principal and interest in gold, to enable him to keep this $810,000,000 shut up in the Treasury.

Ninth. You make silver exchangeable for gold (redeemable).

Tenth. You authorize the Secretary to coin the silver seigniorage into small money, but you require him to cancel and destroy an equal amount of Treasury notes.

Eleventh. You give power to the Secretary to name the size of the Treasury note bills.

Twelfth. You make it obligatory that silver certificates shall only be issued in one, two, and five dollar bills, destroying silver's power to be used except in small transactions.

Thirteenth. You permit national banks to issue the par value of their bonds, and you reduce their taxes.

Fourteenth. You permit national banks to organize in villages with $25,000 capital, which will have the effect to destroy private banks.

Mr. Chairman, the financial notions and demands of the moneyed class have nearly all been incorporated in the bill before us. The majority have, as near as they dared, followed the demands of the Indianapolis monetary convention. Briefly stated, this bill proposes to enact into law the payment of the entire bonded indebtedness of the Government, principal and interest, in gold, the permanent retirement of the greenbacks and Treasury notes issued under the law of July, 1890, by redeeming them in gold, the redemption of silver with gold when demanded, and the final substitution of national-bank paper for every kind of paper money now in circulation. In other words, the scheme is to make gold the money of final payment for everything and to permit corporations to issue and control the entire paper circulation.

As the representative of a brave, enlightened, honest people I protest against this scheme. I believe it to be un-American, unbusinesslike, unconstitutional, and hurtful to the wealth producers of our country. It means the degradation of the silver money we now have and pledges the money world that we will coin no more. It means the ultimate destruction of one of the constitutional coins of our Government. It means appreciation in the purchasing power of gold and the lowering of prices for the products of labor. It means the contraction or expansion of the paper currency at the will and pleasure of the national banking corporations and consequent paralysis of the business men of small means—the farmer, miner, and mechanic.

It means the weeding out of the middle classes, the bone and sinew of free government, and leaving us two classes, the very poor and the very rich. It means, as I read it, the enslavement of the farmer, miner, country merchant, small banker, mechanic, and day laborer to the money power. This last brings a sneer to the face of the defender, advocate, and apologist of this class, and we are asked, Who and what is the money power?

> It is a combination of great bankers and bond owners of Europe and the United States who are neither American, English, French, Belgian, nor German in their real allegiance, but must be regarded as a law unto themselves and a separate power gradually but steadily strengthening their remorseless grip upon the destiny of governments. It is that power that permitted the

Turks to murder Armenians, that made terms of peace between Greece and Turkey so as to preserve the solvency of Turkish bonds, that is dismembering China—

that has forced this republican Government, in violation of every sentiment of liberty, humanity, and Christianity, to go into world politics, spit on our great past, and deny liberty to a struggling people, and through it all has carried its blood-stained banner of per cent of profit without regard to the claims of justice or the cause of liberty and right.

For twenty-five years there has been slowly but surely developed a determined and unrelenting purpose on the part of the holders of our bonds in Europe and the United States, and of capitalists who control the national banks, to make the bonds of this Government payable in gold, to circumscribe the legal-tender power of silver, and to destroy every kind of paper currency except that of national banks.

In spite of assertion to the contrary, this bill is intended to and will contract the currency, and history teaches that a contraction of capital invariably produces adverse and distressing times, while an abundance of money creates prosperity. But you insist that the payment of bonds and redemption of paper in silver would not be honest, because silver is far below gold. Who is to blame for the price of silver? The men who are demanding the present legislation. You stopped the coinage of silver in 1873. You only permitted a crippled coinage under the law of 1878. You again killed coinage of silver by the law of July, 1890.

Every Administration for more than twenty-five years has tried to destroy the virility of silver. The oft-told tale has been repeated in this debate that the Secretary can not get silver to circulate. The general stock of silver coined amounts to $482,622,376. The statement of the Treasury Department on December 1, 1899, was that there was on that day in circulation in silver dollars $76,232,454, and of silver certificates $394,292,800, or a total of $472,525,250, nearly the whole amount of silver ever coined. But we are told that there has been such an unexampled yield of silver during the last twenty-five years that a tremendous fall in its value has been forced upon the commercial world and has no reference to its not being coined.

Mr. Chairman, this old worm-eaten chestnut has been made to do duty in every debate on the financial question for more than twenty years. In the debate in this House in the Fifty-fifth Congress on the Teller resolutions, it was dragged from its hiding place and paraded as the crowning reason why we should not return to coinage of silver. But the facts do not bear gentlemen out in this contention. The total product of gold and silver from the mines of the United States, 1873 to 1897, inclusive, is, gold, $970,751,327; silver, coinage value, $1,299,000,000.

In that same period the world's production of gold was $3,160,000,000 and of silver $3,281,000,000, coinage value, and the gold production has wonderfully increased since then. From 1801 to 1850 the total product of gold and silver in the world in each hundred dollars' worth of coin was of gold, 36.7, and of silver, 63.3. I pass over the period when Californian and Australian gold discoveries made it so plentiful.

From 1874 to 1896 it was 48 per cent of gold and 52 per cent of silver. Is there any unexampled overproduction of silver in these figures? Gentlemen can satisfy themselves of the truth of these figures by looking at the reports of the Director of the Mint from year to year, and silver has not had a friendly Director of the Mint since I have mixed in politics.

You propose by this bill to make $346,681,016 of United States notes (greenbacks), $89,026,280 of Treasury notes, 482,622,376 silver dollars, and $1,037,049,690 of United States bonds payable in gold—a grand total of $1,955,379,362 made to depend on the ever-changing home of gold and $918,329,672 to be mere token money, the whole amount to depend on the good will of the gold gamblers of the world.

You have not been quite bold enough to declare outright for demonetization of silver and the cancellation of greenbacks, but your bill does propose to have the Treasury exchange gold for silver and to redeem the greenbacks and Treasury notes in gold, which means that every dollar so redeemed will pass out of circulation for all time if you continue in control of the Government. This bill proposes to shut up in the Treasury, in the division of issue and redemption, at one fell swoop, about $760,000,000, and $50,000,000 more must be kept in the general fund. Of this, $260,000,000 must be in gold coin. This will inevitably contract the circulating medium.

And in section 4 of this bill you extend the glad hand to the bondocrats by authorizing the Secretary to issue United States bonds at his own sweet will. You tear down all barriers that have heretofore protected the plain people against the demands of the holders of idle capital, who want to escape taxation by investing in nontaxable bonds. It appears at first glance that the majority intended to expand our money a little by coining the silver seigniorage into subsidiary coin, but they carefully look after that by declaring that a like amount of Treasury notes shall be canceled and not reissued.

Again, the bill before us strikes a deadly blow at all forms of paper currency issued by the Government by giving authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe what sized bills of United States notes and Treasury notes shall be issued, and by declaring that silver certificates shall hereafter only be issued in bills of one, two, and five dollars. The meaning of all this is made plain by the reading of sections 8, 9, 10, and 11 of this bill, which absolutely and without reserve turn over the supreme control of the paper currency of the United States to the national banks.

For seventy years the "money power" has worked and waited, toiled and planned, for the "glad day" which this bill promises. The day is upon us for which Nicholas Biddle and his clan toiled and schemed, prayed and bulldozed, begged and demanded—the control of our monetary system by national banks. You of the majority hope that the banks will buy bonds of the Government and fill the vacant places of silver, greenbacks, and Treasury notes with national-bank paper and expand the currency to meet the demands of trade. You will find that a "hope long deferred," which will "make your heart sick."

I stand with the Democratic party, and with the Populists as well, in never-ending opposition to granting further power to national banks. We find here and there a man who affiliates with the Democracy in favor of such banks and who is willing to see their power augmented. But when you do find such a man he is either uninformed as to the history of our party or he is willing to forego party principles for the sake of gain to himself or his friends. Thomas Jefferson is one of the world's immortals.

Here and there, as we read the history and biography of the centuries, we find a man of marvelous qualities standing out in advance of his fellows. Among them all no finite man outranks Jefferson. As an exponent of human liberty, of individual rights, of government by the people, he is the Colossus of the ages. The honest, the faithful, the natural Democrat goes to his teachings for inspiration to acts of integrity. The Declaration of Independence and his first inaugural address are examples of his wondrous faith in the plain people, and his whole life lessons were in the direction of giving every man an equal opportunity.

The keen foresight with which he had been gifted enabled him to see the dangers of a currency which was controlled by the greed of corporate wealth, and his knowledge of the Constitution, his intense desire to protect our country, impelled him to say:

That Congress has no power to charter a United States bank; that such an institution is one of deadly hostility to the best interests of the country, dangerous to our Republican institutions and the liberties of the people, and calculated to place the business of the country within the control of a concentrated "money power" and above the laws and will of the people.

[Applause.]

Having faith in the immaculate democracy of the founder of our party, another great exemplar of American democracy, Andrew Jackson, destroyed the old national bank of the thirties. No less than eight times has the party in national convention indorsed the theory of Jefferson and the action of Jackson. It is a cardinal principle of our party that the Federal Government should not surrender its sovereignty and farm out to corporations the making and control of our paper currency. We are opposed to it because we find no warrant in the Constitution for the Government surrendering its own sovereignty to corporations made up of private individuals. Some vigilant champion of gold and national banks may demand of us why, if we believe what we preach, we do not carry the questions to the courts and have settlement.

Alas, Mr. Chairman, we have learned by bitter experience that he who pleads for the plain people on these great questions rarely reaches the ear of the courts. The power that is to make gold the unit of value and that demands that corporations shall make and control the paper currency has had much to do with making the personnel of the courts. The recent decision of the highest court of our country on the income tax teaches us that judicial precedents and constitutional guaranties cut no large figure these latter days.

We oppose national banks because their charters are special privileges not given other classes of citizens. It is now proposed to enlarge the power of the national banks by issuing to them their full 100 per cent of their bonds and to reduce the taxes on them. Retire the greenbacks and Treasury notes as is suggested, and this will give the control of the currency issue into the hands of the national banks, with power to expand or contract the issue at will. This is a surrender of sovereignty to corporate interests which has been damaging to the interests of the common people in the past; that has helped to unsettle values and brought disaster to business of all kinds.

Let it not be forgotten that in 1881, when Congress attempted to reduce the interest on bonds, these banks retired in one day without notice $18,000,000 of their currency. It is too much power to give to corporations. In this connection I may be pardoned for quoting from one who had some character and standing

among the public men of sixty years ago. In a speech in the United States Senate in 1831, this language was used by a Democratic Senator, referring to the United States bank:

The Government itself ceases to be independent, it ceases to be safe, when the national currency is at the will of a company. The Government can undertake no great enterprise, neither of war or peace, without the consent and cooperation of that company; it can not count its revenues for six months ahead without referring to the action of that company—its friendship or its enmity, its concurrence or opposition—to see how far that company will permit money to be plentiful or make it scarce; how far it will let the moneyed system go on regularly or throw it into disorder; how far it will suit the interests or policy of that company to create a tempest or to suffer a calm in the moneyed ocean.

The people are not safe when a company has such power. The temptation is too great, the opportunity too easy, to put up and put down prices; to make and break fortunes; to bring the whole community upon its knees to the Neptunes who preside over the flux and reflux of paper. All property is at their mercy. The price of real estate, of every growing crop, of every staple article, is at their command. Stocks are their playthings, their gambling theater, on which they gamble daily with as little secrecy and as little morality and far more mischief to fortunes than common gamblers carry on their operations. It tends to aggravate the inequalities of fortunes, to make the rich richer and the poor poorer, to multiply nabobs and paupers, and to deepen and widen the gulf which separates Dives and Lazarus.

If there was aught of truth in this picture, made nearly seventy years ago, when we had one United States Bank, how much more potent must be the influence of thousands of national banks which we now have and which are held together as a great trust "by the cohesive power of public and private plunder." As their charters expire, they should be compelled to go out of business as national banks, instead of us enlarging their powers and becoming subject to their baleful influence. Gentlemen on the other side take party credit for the better times in the country. You are persistently following the commands of your former leader, Mr. Blaine, to "claim everything."

The marvelous production of gold in the world during these years, a great deal of which came from our mines, the large demand for our meats and bread in Europe, together with the fact that our manufacturers have gone into the markets of the world with their wares and have successfully competed with foreigners, has given us a mighty balance of trade which, after paying our interest charges abroad, has left us some hundreds of millions more money than we had three years ago. It proves our contention that "more money" makes better prices. But you can not expect this to continue always. One extra large foreign crop will glut our home market, the balance of trade will be against us, gold will flow from us, and under the provisions of this bill we will be bound hand and foot, with every debt made or to be made payable in gold.

Mr. Chairman, who demands this legislation? How many raisers of wheat, corn, cattle, cotton, hogs, tobacco, and fruit appeared before your partisan committee to ask that this proposed bill become the law? How many private bankers, country merchants, miners of coal, lead, and zinc came before you and pleaded for it? How many of the millions of Americans who earn their bread by honest labor have asked you to pay the bonds in gold and cancel Treasury notes and strike down silver? How great was the throng of old Federal soldiers who saved the Union that have begged you to impound and destroy the greenbacks?

Who besides the money changers demand the retirement of the greenbacks? What small country banker or merchant demands it? Who among the millions of farmers have asked it? What great army of laborers want greenbacks redeemed in gold or, in fact, redeemed at all? It is a safe, a sound, a stable currency, and, besides, it was issued by our Government in the exercise of its constitutional sovereign power. It paid the soldiers who fought for and saved the Union. This money bought the bonds which by law are now to be payable in gold. I assert that there is no general demand among the people for the present redemption of greenbacks, but there is a general opposition to their being redeemed in gold and permanently retired.

I was trained and educated to believe that the only legal-tender money authorized by the Constitution was silver and gold, but a Supreme Court dominated by your party declared that Congress had the right to make paper money a legal tender as well. Therefore, with that authority given Congress, I insist that the sovereignty of the Government should be exercised when we need paper money, and not given over to national banks.

When the leaders of gold monometallism bore down the young Ajax from Nebraska, with threats, predictions, prophecies, with unlimited money, with desertions from our party, and with soothing promises of "international bimetallism," they thought the battle over and the "silver craze" forever killed. But they may learn from their own platform of 1892 that "the American people from tradition and interest favor bimetallism." We have seen the commission sent to treat with foreign countries "backcapped" from the Treasury and by the President when he sent in his recommendation to Congress on July 24, 1897.

The people now see clearly that they were buncoed in 1896 with false promises, and now, feeling bold, the Administration, by its pliant Congress, dares to proclaim its purpose to "more firmly establish the gold standard." We welcome the gage of battle. We believe this compact minority will come back to the Fifty-seventh Congress a compact majority and will so demean itself as to be a triumphant party on the Democratic platform of 1896. [Loud applause on Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. FOX] is recognized for twenty-five minutes.

Mr. FOX. Mr. Chairman, the financial problems of a great Government like this are by many considered too abstruse and complex for ordinary mortals to grasp. It may be so, but anybody who can tell "a hawk from a handsaw" can see the dishonor and infamy in this bill.

Section 1 of the bill makes the gold dollar the standard unit of value.

Section 2 provides:

That all interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the payment of money now existing or hereafter to be entered into, and all United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the law of July 14, 1890, shall be deemed and held to be payable in the gold coin of the United States as defined in section 1 of this act; and all other obligations, public and private, for the payment of money, shall be performed in conformity with the standard established in that section.

According to the recent annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury, there are now outstanding—

United States notes, or greenbacks	$346,681,016
Treasury notes, 1890	93,518,240
Silver certificates	406,085,504
Interest-bearing debt	1,046,068,850

The greenbacks and Treasury notes are, under the law and by the express terms of the contract, payable either in gold or silver, at the option of the Government. The silver certificates are mere certificates of deposit, and payable only in silver.

In supporting this measure, which makes all these obligations payable in gold, gentlemen on the other side repudiate that provision of their platform of 1896 which declared in favor of bimetallism. They even have the effrontery to confess in this debate, what we always knew, that the plank in that platform declaring for the double standard by international agreement was and is a humbug. The distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] admits that he was humbugged and declares with emphasis that he will be humbugged no longer.

But this is not all. Gentlemen have a right to change their minds. More eminent gentlemen, or at least gentlemen in more eminent positions, have changed their minds quite as suddenly. The gentlemen who are sent here as the representatives and agents of the people, who are the real debtors who owe all these outstanding obligations, have no right to sit here as the agents of the creditors of the people and repudiate their contracts by striking down half the money of final redemption, thereby making money scarcer and dearer and the terms harder.

Let it be remembered that the people and not the Government are the real debtors. The Government has nothing of its own. Not a cent goes into the United States Treasury except from the pockets of the people through taxation. The Government is simply the agent of the people and negotiated these loans and issued these promises to pay for the people. The holders of these obligations are really the creditors, not of the Government, but of the people. Congress is supposed to sit here as the representatives of the people and not of their creditors; but those who vote for this bill ignominiously desert the people who elected them and sent them here as their representatives, and go over to the creditors of the people, and as their agents and acting under their orders, repudiate their most sacred contracts.

Section 2 of this bill is rank repudiation.

Mr. LINNEY. I should call it extortion.

Mr. FOX. It is absolute repudiation. My friend says it is extortion. I say it is just as much repudiation to require the people to pay more than the contract stipulates as it is to compel the creditor to take less. It is just as dishonest for the creditors to demand more as it is for the debtor to pay less.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It repudiates the contract.

Mr. FOX. It does repudiate the contract. All these obligations are contracts, Mr. Chairman; every one of them. Every promise to pay and every interest-bearing bond is a contract, the holders being the creditors on the one side, and the people being the debtors on the other side; and these contracts may be repudiated by the creditor as well as by the debtor. Whenever a creditor brings about a condition of things which makes it harder for the debtor to pay these debts, it is repudiation.

Whenever he changes the contract so as to enable him to demand more or dearer money, it is just as much repudiation as it is for the debtor to refuse to pay. If the honor of the nation demands that good faith shall be kept with its creditors, still higher and more sacred is the obligation to keep faith with the people, through whose hard toil all the money is raised to pay these creditors. To do less is infamous. It is worse; it is treason.

This section, in so far as it is constitutional and can be made operative in the courts, completely destroys the legal-tender quality of greenbacks and Treasury notes by making all private as

well as public debts payable in gold. Nobody will want this money if it will not pay debts, and this provision will, as it was intended to, hasten the retirement of all the paper money, as provided in section 4.

The crowning infamy of this bill is the provision in section 4 for the absolute redemption in gold and retirement of all greenbacks and Treasury notes, to the amount of $440,000,000, at the will of the holders, and the redemption in gold and the retirement of $400,000,000 silver certificates and 57,000,000 silver dollars at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, thus retiring from circulation $900,000,000 of the people's money.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. FOX. Certainly.

Mr. GAINES. You said a while ago that these bonds were payable in coin?

Mr. FOX. They are payable either in gold or silver.

Mr. GAINES. Is it not a fact that the Supreme Court of the United States, in the decision given in 7 Wallace, page 26, held that they were payable in coin?

Mr. FOX. It has never been disputed. I understand that it is the very purpose of this bill to change the contract. They are now payable in the coin of the realm, which means either gold or silver. It has been so held by the Supreme Court and by resolutions of both Houses of Congress. It has never been denied by anybody.

Mr. GAINES. Let me read a part of the decision.

Mr. FOX. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but my time is limited.

Mr. Chairman, we have had in this country many distinguished financiers from Alexander Hamilton down to the present day, but it has remained for the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET], the distinguished author of this bill, to discover for the first time in the history of government, here or elsewhere, that you can strike down and cancel and destroy $900,000,000 of the currency of the country and not decrease the volume of that currency.

When asked the question if it would not decrease the circulation to that amount to redeem $500,000,000 of silver certificates and silver dollars in gold, he replied that it would not, because the Treasury would release the same amount of gold, which would go into the circulation in place of the silver and silver certificates that were taken into the Treasury. A most astounding proposit on, Mr. Chairman! The gentleman seems to think that the United States Treasury is an inexhaustible gold mine, from which the Government may take freely without cost and supply any deficiency in the volume of money.

He forgets that the Government is a pauper and can not get a dollar except by taxation or by the issue and sale of bonds. It all comes from the pockets of the people. He forgets that his own bill provides for the sale of bonds at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, whenever it becomes necessary to purchase gold with which to take up this silver and redeem these greenbacks and United States Treasury notes. Where is this gold to come from, Mr. Chairman? It will be purchased from the banks and the people and taken out of circulation, and the circulation will be decreased to that extent. And when the gold is paid out in the redemption of paper currency and silver, they will in turn be taken out of circulation, thus reducing the volume of the currency by $900,000,000.

It is true the bill provides that "the notes and certificates so redeemed or exchanged shall be held as a part of the redemption fund," but it also provides that "they shall not be withdrawn or disbursed except in exchange for an equivalent amount of the coin in which said notes or certificates were redeemed or exchanged."

And this means that they are to be perpetually impounded, and might as well be canceled; for who will return gold for this paper currency? No provision whatever is made for the disposition of silver taken in exchange for gold. It is safe to assume that the country will never see it again.

To-day, when our commerce and trade are expanding and there is an unprecedented demand for money, it is a startling proposition to decrease the volume of currency, as is proposed in this bill, by $900,000,000. The quantitative theory of money has been much discussed in this debate and in every debate on the money question, but recent events have conclusively demonstrated that we have not money enough now. The Secretary of the Treasury, a few weeks ago, in order to relieve a stress in the money market, saw proper to pay a year in advance all interest on United States bonds and to purchase $25,000,000 of bonds at the market price. In their annual reports just made the Secretary of the Treasury and the Treasurer of the United States distinctly recognize the quantitative theory of money. The Treasurer in his report says:

It is fair to point out that the Treasury, in this as in previous seasons, has striven to the utmost to meet the demands for currency for moving the crops and for general business. It has exhausted all its resources, and these ought not to be increased by more Government issues. The vast inflow of gold into circulation has been an unmixed blessing and has helped out every industrial and financial interest. This is a legitimate and permanent contribution to our money. It is likely to continue and to grow. Beyond such increase in gold the national banks must solve the problem of adding to the volume of currency.

Referring to the recent stress in the money market, the Secretary of the Treasury in his report says:

Interest, or, more truly speaking, the bank's charge for exchanging its credit against private credit, rose from 2½, 3, and 4 per cent to 10, 15, 25, and 40 per cent. The elements of the currency which bank credits furnished was contracted within a period of nine weeks to the extent of $84,000,000. In common parlance, deposits were reduced to that extent. Put in the shortest form: In order to supply the interior with the use of a medium of exchange for a few weeks, to the amount of $23,000,000, havoc was wrought in the regular on-going of our commercial life.

But you say it is expected that under the enlarged privileges given to national banks by this bill they will supply the deficiency by a larger issue of bank notes. You stand on the recommendation of the Treasurer, which I have just quoted, that the "national banks must solve the problem of adding to the volume of currency." You have no assurance that they will do this. But suppose they do? The issuance of legal-tender money is a function of the Government. It has been so declared by the Supreme Court. It is a constitutional prerogative and duty. Why abdicate that prerogative and turn it over to private corporations?

Last summer, in his tour over the United States, the President of the United States frequently boasted that we had a safe, sound currency, every dollar of which is as good as every other dollar. Why change? Why give the banks a monopoly of issuing money, thus forming the most gigantic trust of the age, a money trust, that will give a few corporations absolute control of the currency of the country? Of course, gold will not circulate. It, being the only money of final redemption, will all be locked up in the banks, and bank notes will be the only money in circulation, and its volume will be entirely in control of the banks.

Certainly bank notes are not safer than United States notes. Behind the greenbacks are 70,000,000 of people and the unlimited resources of this great country, with the taxing power of Congress to fill the Treasury with money of final redemption. It is a curious thing that it is insisted by the capitalists of the country that there should always be sufficient gold in the Treasury to redeem outstanding obligations when presented, and yet we have the present distinguished Secretary of the Treasury for authority that banks rarely pay any debts they owe in money, but pay them in their own promises to pay. In his recent annual report he says:

It is a popular delusion that the bank deals in money. Money is an incident in its dealings—an important incident, no doubt—but, truly speaking, an incident only. The bank deals in credits. For a consideration, varying according to time, place, and circumstances, it gives to the people with whom it deals its own debt obligations in exchange for the debt obligations of its dealers and customers. The obligations of the bank thus created are generally evidenced by a credit upon its books to the dealer, who has the right to draw upon it by his checks or drafts and as his convenience may be served.

The constant interchange of credits between the bank and its dealers, with the enormous volume of checks and drafts passing between buyer and seller, constitutes in the broadest sense the currency of the country. It is these instruments which trade uses in much the larger part of all its operations. Money—real money, gold or silver—plays but a small part in the multitudinous exchanges.

He further says:

It is impossible for anyone to name a good reason why the indebtedness of the banker in the field of exchanges should not be expressed as freely in his notes of hand of convenient size as in one consolidated entry to the credit of his dealer upon his books of account. It is precisely at this point that difficulty, embarrassment, and loss are occasioned. What would be a natural economy and effective operation is, by the inhibition and restriction of law, now made impossible. In a state of freedom the extraordinary wants of the country at harvest time would be largely, if not wholly, met by the conversion of bank balances not available for these general purposes into bank notes or paper money.

Referring to the fact that great masses of money had to be sent out recently into the country to move the crops and to meet the demands of the great industrial movement in the country, he says:

If the New York banks could have issued their notes in the form of paper money, they would have furnished them and thus discharged the credits standing upon their books, and this would have entirely satisfied interior and Western needs. In that case there would have been no expansion of credit. By so much as notes were issued by so much book credits would have been canceled. The bank statement would have been expressed in different form with no material change in fact.

Two important deductions may be made from these extracts:

First. There is a real demand for more instead of less money.

Second. The banks are not satisfied with the United States notes, with gold and silver in the Treasury for their redemption. They are not willing for an increase of this currency. They want to use their own promises to pay, and keep all the real money in their vaults. They complain because they had to send so much money into the country.

It is a fact that there is more money in actual circulation in the country to-day than ever before since the war, and it is due to this fact, that the country is perhaps more prosperous than ever before. It is the amount of money in circulation that makes prosperity, rather than the volume of money. Money locked up, that does not circulate, contributes nothing to the prosperity of the country.

Mr. Chairman, it is a dangerous policy to surrender to the banks the control of the money of the country. Those who control the currency of the country and dictate its financial policy can control the business and government of the country. They can raise or depress prices. They can create a bounteous plenty or a ruinous panic. They can make money scarce or abundant. They can dictate the wages of labor. They can elect governors, Congressmen, legislators, and judges. This bill creates the greatest of all trusts and makes possible all trusts.

In a recent magazine article Bishop Potter, of New York, said:

In the great industrial and financial combinations which are the special feature of our day it must be admitted that it is the gain of the few and not the equities of the many which are chiefly kept in view.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the utterance of a politician appealing to the prejudices of the masses. Nor was it spoken by a toiler who was blinded and maddened by the hard conditions of his life. It is the candid admission of a gentleman who preaches, not in country meetinghouses or in the slums of the city, but in palatial cathedrals to the richest congregations on earth. It is the truth.

I would excite no prejudice against capital. Large fortunes and even combinations of large fortunes are necessary to carry on the great enterprises of the world. But they should keep their hands off of government. They have no business to control legislation, the administration of the laws, or the financial policy of government. Bishop Potter is right. Human nature is selfish.

Bankers are no worse and no better than the balance of mankind, and in their great financial and business operations they think not of the "equities of the many," but are looking solely to their own gain; and I want to warn you now that you commit the greatest crime of the closing century when you rob the people of their dearest constitutional prerogative and surrender to the banks the right to control the currency and dictate the financial policy of the country.

While capital should be protected, it is not the only sacred thing in the country. We must have some regard for the muscle that toils, the back that bends under its heavy burden, and the brain that grows weary with unremitting labor. "The man with the hoe" is as much entitled to consideration as the man with the bonds.

Mr. Chairman, my friends on this side of the Chamber say that the people will call you to account in the next Presidential election. I do not think so. They would if they were free; but they will be shackled hand and foot. The laborer in the mines and factories will be at your mercy. You will control the money of the country, and therefore control labor and wages. With your hand on the throat of the laborer, he dare not thwart your wishes. He is absolutely at your mercy. You can crucify him, and will do it if it is necessary. You will buy everybody that can be bought and intimidate everything that can be bulldozed.

What will the end be? As sure as God reigns, right will finally triumph. Many close students of history say that every great step forward in the progress of the world is made through bloodshed and revolution. Is it not possible for this cup to pass from us? For the sake of humanity and the Carpenter's Son, who died for humanity, I appeal to you gentlemen who represent the wealth of the country to avert this great calamity. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, although I am as strong an advocate of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 as any member upon this floor, I can not see from the provisions in this bill that the questions of bimetallism and free coinage of silver at a ratio of 16 to 1, or any other ratio, are involved. As I understand it, it is simply a proposition to change the monetary conditions as they exist in the United States to-day. The questions of bimetallism, the free coinage of both gold and silver, are not involved, except what is the difference between them and the single gold standard. This bill proposes to do that which no party has ever dared to say in its national platform.

While I appreciate the fact that the Republican platform of 1896 said that it favored the gold standard unless bimetallism could be obtained through international agreement, yet we all know that the solemn pledge of the Republican party was not as expressed in this bill. I desire, before I begin in the main what I shall have to say, to show how the Republican party upon this floor has departed from the pledges and promises as made by the candidate of their party, President McKinley, in his letter of acceptance in 1896. This is what he said, and when I have read it I desire to call the attention of the gentlemen on the other side to the pledges of the President of the United States in regard to the silver and paper money in this country.

This is in part the letter of acceptance of President McKinley:

It is not proposed by the Republican party to take from the circulating medium of the country any of the silver that we now have. On the contrary, it is proposed to keep all of the silver money now in circulation on a parity with gold, maintaining the pledge of the Government that all of it shall be equal to gold. This has been the unbroken policy of the Republican party since 1878. It is inaugurating no new policy. It will keep in circulation and as good as gold all of the silver and paper money which are now included in the circulation of the country.

That was the written pledge of Candidate McKinley in connection with the platform of his party, and you pledged through him, when you asked the votes of the people of the United States in 1896, that not only the silver dollar but all paper money in the United States should be kept in circulation.

We have the solemn pledge of your candidate, to which I have just referred. How is it with regard to the pending bill? Will any gentleman on the other side of the House stand up and deny that any of the provisions of the bill complies with the declaration of your President? On the contrary, we are told by gentlemen on that side of the House that at a given hour on Monday next the House is to pass this bill, the effect of which is that when the greenbacks are taken to the Treasury and redeemed in gold they will never be reissued or taken from the Treasury unless gold is presented and demand made for their exchange.

Dare any gentleman on that side of the House stand up and say that that is not withdrawing the greenbacks from circulation and reducing the currency of the people to that extent? Can any of you do it? I pause for an answer. Is there any man on that side of the House who dares to stand up and risk his reputation in denial of this proposition?

What else do we find? That the Treasury notes, which under the Sherman Act were issued for the purchase of silver bullion, are to be retired in like manner as the greenbacks. In section 3 of the Sherman Act of 1890 is the following language:

The Secretary of the Treasury shall each month coin 2,000,000 ounces of silver bullion, purchased under the provisions of this act, into standard silver dollars, until the 1st day of July, 1891, and after that time he shall coin of the silver bullion purchased under the provisions of this act as much as may be necessary to provide for the redemption of the Treasury notes herein provided for.

From this it will be seen the purpose of said act was that these Treasury notes should be redeemed in standard silver dollars; but this purpose was ignored by the Administrations of Harrison, Cleveland, and McKinley, and they have persistently been redeemed in gold, helping to make what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] has called the "endless chain."

The inquiry I put to the gentleman who has charge of the bill now before the committee, Mr. OVERSTREET, of Indiana, and the colloquy arising thereupon, which I adopt as a part of my remarks, explains itself:

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Yes.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. In reference to the silver dollars, when they are taken to the Treasury and redeemed in gold, what is to become of them after they have been received by the Treasury? Are they to be paid out again or not?

Mr. OVERSTREET. There are two alternatives. The first is, they may be returned to trade upon the presentation of gold for their exchange, or they may be transferred by the Secretary of the Treasury from the redemption fund to the fiscal fund and used in the discharge of Government expenses.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Then if they are paid out in due course of trade and transferred to this fund that the gentleman speaks of, do they not then become an endless chain in themselves, the same as you say the greenbacks and Treasury notes do?

Mr. OVERSTREET. No, sir; for the following reason——

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Will the gentleman answer that? If they are paid out in the due course of trade, can they not be taken back and gold demanded, and then go the round again for another endless chain, like the one the gentleman has talked of in reference to greenbacks and Treasury notes? I would like the gentleman to make that clear.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I am perfectly willing to answer the gentleman's question. I may say that I think I have answered it very conclusively in the argument I have prepared, but in order to deal with entire fairness with the gentleman I will answer his question now. Under the present law an endless chain is created, because the greenback is reissued immediately and may again seek its way to the Treasury for a second redemption. That is stopped by the proposition which I have just elaborated in my argument. Under the proposed law the silver dollar, if exchanged for gold, would be returned to trade upon presentation of gold for another exchange of the silver, or it may be returned from one fund (the redemption fund) to another (the fiscal fund) by the Secretary of the Treasury. Just at that point is to be found the reason why an endless chain of silver dollars can not occur. It is the Secretary of the Treasury who has that option and right to transfer the silver dollar and pay it out, and it only goes out in the payment of the expenses of the Government.

What was his reply? He said that when the silver dollars are exchanged for gold they will go into the redemption fund; that they can not be reissued unless by an order of the Secretary of the Treasury transferring them to the general fund.

In section 3 of this bill I find the following:

SEC. 3. That there be established in the Treasury Department, as a part of the office of the Treasurer of the United States, a division to be designated and known as the division of issue and redemption, to which shall be assigned, under such regulation as the Secretary of the Treasury may approve, all records and accounts relating to the issue, redemption, and exchange, as herein provided, of the several kinds of United States money. There shall be transferred from the general fund in the Treasury of the United States, and taken up on the books of said division as a redemption fund, the amount of gold coin and bullion held against outstanding gold certificates, the amount of United States notes held against outstanding currency certificates, and the amount in silver dollars and silver bullion held against outstanding Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890; and an amount of gold coin and bullion to constitute a reserve fund equal to 25 per cent of the amount, both of United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890, outstanding. The gold and silver coins and bullion transferred from the general fund in the Treasury, as herein provided, shall be increased or diminished, as the case may be, in accordance with the provisions of this act and in no other way.

From which it will be seen all the silver dollars and silver bullion in the "general fund," as designated by this bill, are transferred to the "redemption fund," never again to reach the channels of trade unless the Secretary of the Treasury, by special order, transfers them to the general fund to be paid out upon the expenses of the Government. And this, Mr. Chairman, I take it for granted this Republican Administration will never do. For has not the President, Mr. McKinley, in his message to Congress, recommended the impounding of the greenbacks and Treasury notes to stop what the Republicans and gold-standard advocates call the "endless chain?" So, if you are honest in your contention to stop the endless chain, the silver dollars must be as effectually impounded as the greenbacks and Treasury notes.

To-day there are in the Treasury of the United States, in round numbers, 400,000,000 of silver dollars, represented by outstanding silver certificates, less $6,000,000 of silver certificates in the Treasury; standard silver dollars of 1890, in round numbers, $7,000,000. The total amount of standard silver dollars, in round numbers, coined to date is 490,000,000, leaving between seventy-five or eighty millions of silver dollars in circulation.

Mr. Chairman, at this point the thought presents itself, What, under this bill, will become of the $394,000,000 of outstanding silver certificates? A reference to the bill shows they are to receive the same fate as the standard silver dollars, or they will become an endless chain, and of course you gentlemen on that side have provided in this bill against any such contingency.

In section 4, page 4, from line 6 to line 19, inclusive, is the following, to wit:

> The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and required to use said reserve fund in maintaining at all time the parity and equal value of every dollar issued or coined by the Government; and if at any time the Secretary of the Treasury deems it necessary in order to maintain the parity and equal value of all the money of the United States, he may at his discretion exchange gold coin for any other money issued or coined by the United States. The notes and certificates so redeemed or exchanged shall be held in and constitute a part of said redemption fund and shall not be withdrawn therefrom nor disbursed except in exchange for an equivalent amount of the coin in which said notes or certificates were redeemed or exchanged, except as hereinbefore in this section provided.

We see that a knock-out blow has been provided for the silver certificates. In order to do what this bill calls "maintaining the parity and equal value of all the money of the United States," the Secretary of the Treasury may, at his discretion, exchange gold coin for any other money issued or coined by the United States. When silver certificates are taken to the Treasury and gold demanded, they must be paid in that money or the gold advocates will cry out that the parity of our moneys is not preserved and the credit of the Government is in peril; so into the redemption fund the silver certificates must go to keep company with the silver dollar.

By a little addition we see that when the purposes of this bill are carried out, the currency of the country will be contracted to the extent of the greenbacks, Treasury notes, and silver dollars—in amount exceeding $800,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, is there any truth in the contention of the advocates of the gold standard that if the Secretary of the Treasury exercised the right of the Government to pay the greenbacks and Treasury notes in silver—they being payable in coin at the option of the Treasurer—this would in any way affect the parity of our money or the credit of our Government? I assert here that it would not. We have before us the example of the French Government, with a population of less than 38,000,000 people, who has in her financial system 900,000,000 silver 5-franc pieces (or dollars), a full legal tender for all debts, public and private, and which, with gold in nearly equal amounts, constitutes the reserve of the Bank of France. The notes issued by the bank, like our greenbacks and Treasury notes, are payable in standard coin. The bank to-day, as it has done since 1873, pays either gold or silver coin in redemption of its notes at its option, and has never surrendered to the holder of its notes this right. And whenever an effort is made to trench upon the gold part of the reserve of the Bank of France the bank pays those who present her notes 95 per cent in silver and 5 per cent in gold.

Mr. Chairman, for fear that some Republican member may be doubtful upon this subject I will give good Republican authority. During the extra session of the Fifty-third Congress, called by Grover Cleveland, Mr. Hendrix, a banker, gold-advocate Democrat, member of this House from the State of New York, was discussing the evil results to the Government by the so-called endless chain, by its having to redeem the greenbacks and Treasury notes in gold, and if it refused its credit would be ruined, when a distinguished Republican member interrupted him and denied that if the Secretary of the Treasury exercised his option, instead of surrendering it to the holder of the greenbacks or Treasury notes, and paid in silver dollars, that this act would affect the credit of our Government or the value of our money, and cited the example of the Bank of France that I have just mentioned above, and this gentleman is the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. HEPBURN, of Iowa.

Mr. Chairman, if John G. Carlisle, while Secretary of the Treasury, had refused to pay out gold for the greenbacks and Treasury notes at the demands of the "gold gamblers," and had exercised the option which the law gave him to pay in either gold or silver dollars and had paid in silver, the burden of two hundred and sixty millions of bonded debt which he issued would not now be fastened upon the taxpayers of this country; and if President McKinley had made his Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Gage, exercise this option in favor of the people instead of surrendering it to these same gamblers, it would not have been necessary for him to place an additional two hundred millions of bonded debt upon the country.

What member upon this floor, who has any regard for the truth, will contend that if ex-Secretary Carlisle or Secretary Gage had refused to pay gold for the greenbacks and Treasury notes when presented for redemption, but had paid silver dollars, that either our credit or money, at home or abroad, would in the least have been affected? Can not this, the most powerful nation in the world, with only four hundred and ninety millions in silver dollars and not less than seventy-five millions of population, do what the Bank of France is doing every day, and maintain the parity of value of all our money?

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana has told us that the reason the standard silver dlolar is worth 100 cents in gold is because, under the parity clause of the law, there is a gold dollar behind every silver dollar. I tell the gentleman that the first time the "parity clause" ever appeared in the statutes of the United States was in the Sherman act of 1890, and I challenge him, or any member on that side, to mention a time when a standard silver dollar was ever worth less than one hundred cents in gold, and for thirty-six years was worth from 1 to 3 cents more than a gold dollar, and I tell him that, in all the past history of the Treasury of this Government not one standard siver dollar has been redeemed in gold. Even Cleveland's Administration did not dare do this, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] told us in his speech that Grover Cleveland was the archenemy of silver. Yes; he was.

I agree with the gentleman. No man, not even excepting the discarded statesman from Ohio, Mr. Sherman, has been a more bitter enemy of the white metal than Grover Cleveland. He perverted the principles of his party and prostituted, with the gilt of offices, men high in the councils of his party. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I agree with you that Grover Cleveland was the archenemy of the Democratic party [applause on the Democratic side], for he came near wrecking it; but the people wrested his control from him and cast out the men who had followed him, and, so far as I am concerned, if they want to come back into the Democratic party let them come back and take their medicine and be Democrats. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, section 1 of this bill provides that the standard unit of value shall be the gold dollar, and shall consist of 25.8 grains of gold nine-tenths fine, or 23.22 grains of pure gold, being the one-tenth part of the eagle.

Section 2 of the bill is as follows:

> SEC. 2. That all interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the payment of money, now existing or hereafter to be entered into, and all United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the law of July 14, 1890, shall be deemed and held to be payable in gold coin of the United States as defined in section 1 of this act; and all other obligations, public and private, for the payment of money shall be performed in conformity with the standard established in said section. Nothing herein contained shall be construed or held to affect the present legal-tender quality of the silver dollar, or of the subsidiary or minor coins, or of the paper currency of the United States, or the laws making national-bank notes receivable and payable for certain public debts and dues and obligations between national banks.

Thus we see, if this bill becomes a law, all the obligations of the Government, past and future, all the private debts of our people, past or future, are to be paid in gold.

Mr. Chairman, every bond of the Government, including the two hundred and sixty millions issued during Cleveland's Administration and the two hundred millions issued by this Administration, are payable in standard silver and gold dollars, and have stamped upon each bond, "payable in standard coin of the weight and value of the act of July 14, 1870," and to-day the four hundred and eighty-two millions of standard silver dollars are a legal tender for all debts, public and private.

Section 4 of this bill gives the Secretary of the Treasury the authority—

> to issue and sell, whenever in his judgment it is necessary to the maintenance of the said (gold) reserve fund, bonds of the United States bearing interest at a rate not exceeding 3 per cent per annum, payable in gold coin at the end of twenty years, but redeemable in gold coin at the option of the United States after one year.

This section of the bill gives the Secretary of the Treasury unlimited power to issue gold bonds.

By sections 8 and 9 of this bill the national banks are authorized to issue notes to the par value of these bonds.

Section 10 removes the tax on national-bank notes and puts a tax of one-fifth of 1 per cent upon their franchises, measured by their capital stock, undivided surplus, and profits.

Section 11 is as follows:

SEC. 11. That section 5138 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 5138. No association shall be organized with a capital of less than $100,000, except that banks with a capital of not less than $50,000 may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, be organized in any place the population of which does not exceed 6,000 inhabitants, and except that banks with a capital of not less than $25,000 may, with the sanction of the Secretary of the Treasury, be organized in any place the population of which does not exceed 2,000 inhabitants. No association shall be organized in a city the population of which exceeds 50,000 persons with a capital of less than $200,000."

From which we see that banks with not less than $50,000 capital, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may be formed in places which do not exceed 6,000 in population, and banks with not less than $25,000 capital, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may be formed in places where the population does not exceed 2,000. Under this section the Secretary of the Treasury, if he so desires, can punish a community by refusing to grant banking privileges, a power no Secretary should have.

When this bill becomes a law what will be its effect upon the people? It establishes the single gold standard; retires all the greenbacks, Treasury notes, silver dollars, and silver certificates; gives the Secretary of the Treasury the power to place upon the people a perpetual debt, and makes them the prey of the gold trust and the national banks. The Republican party in this House and in the Senate, we are told, will pass this bill with all its aggravated evils; gentlemen of that side boast that when in caucus considering it not a single Republican voted against it. You turn your backs upon your records, which so far have been in opposition to every provision of this bill, and the only excuse you give is that you have changed your minds, that you are a progressive party, and that we upon this side of the House are, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] puts it, "not up to date." The proudest boast on this side is that we still worship the eternal principles in the interest of mankind as enunciated and taught by Jefferson, Jackson, and the fathers of the Democratic party. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You are doing now what John Sherman years ago warned you not to do. On page 533 of Sherman's Autobiography you can read:

I think that America by deciding in favor of the double valuation would not only save the world at large from an abyss and prevent the accomplishment of a stupid general crime whose authors humanity would some day learn to curse, but that she would advance her own interests more than may be supposed possible.

On page 531 of the same book he uttered these memorable words:

These two metals, gold and silver, have traveled side by side from the beginning of time. The records of human history do not go back to a time when they did not move together. They have varied in value, sometimes one and sometimes the other being higher, but they have gone on, gold the money of the rich, silver the money of the poor, the one to measure acquired wealth, the other to measure the daily necessities of life.

You are doing now what William McKinley, speaking at Toledo, Ohio, on the 12th day of February, 1891, warned you not to do. He said:

You are setting up "gold, the money of the rich," and you are destroying "silver, the money of the poor;" you are destroying one of our precious metals, one of our own products, destroying silver and enhancing the price of gold. You are determined to contract the circulating medium, limit the volume of money among the people, "make money scarce and therefore dear."

When this bill becomes law you will have "increased the value of money" and will have "diminished the value of everything else." You are determined you will make "money the master everywhere, everything else the servant."

I warn you that this evil brood which you are about to turn loose upon the people will before long return to plague you, and its multiplied evils upon the people will bring them to the realization that their only hope of relief is in the success of the Democratic party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] has told us, in his usual impressive way, that immediately succeeding the election of Cleveland by the Democratic party in 1893, "Confidence fled and depression and hard times were felt by all the industrial interests of the country." I admit this was true, but these results were not caused by Cleveland attempting to carry out and enforce Democratic principles. The daily press of New York and of the Eastern cities, through the Associated Press, told how the Cleveland Administration, in connection with the great metropolitan bankers of New York, Boston, Chicago, and the "solid communities" of the East, combined to bring about the hard times which cursed this country during all Cleveland's Administration.

In the Washington Post of the 28th of April, 1893, and every other Eastern daily that received the Associated Press dispatches, there appeared the following account of Secretary Carlisle's conference, Mr. Cleveland at that time being in New York with the New York bankers:

WASHINGTON, *Friday, April 28, 1893.*

Carlisle meets bankers. No issue of bonds unless all other expedients fail. A New York conference. The Secretary frankly enlightens prominent financiers as to the policy of the Government and states that nothing will be left undone to secure the repeal of the Sherman law when Congress assembles. Result of conference.

NEW YORK, *April 27.*

Secretary Carlisle decided this morning to have a talk with the New York bankers. Late on Wednesday evening, after his arrival from Washington, he conferred with Assistant Treasurer Jordan and ex-Assistant Treasurer Charles J. Canda. As a result the Secretary this morning suggested that he meet the bank presidents and private bankers at 4 o'clock in the afternoon. The postponement of the naval review because of the storm caused some delay, as Secretary Carlisle accompanied President Cleveland on the *Dolphin*. The Secretary landed with the Presidential party at the foot of Ninety-sixth street, and was there met by the Columbian reception committee, including President J. Edward Simmons, of the Fourth National Bank. The Secretary and Mr. Simmons were driven to the home of President George Williams, of the Chemical Bank, and chairman of the Clearing House Association, at No. 34 West Fifty-eighth street.

The conference between the Secretary and the bank presidents lasted somewhat over an hour. There was the utmost good feeling displayed and the Secretary said he was there to make a frank, free, and open statement of what he believed to be the financial policy of the Government.

As the Secretary outlined the policy of the Government, it was shown nothing would be done that in any way would retard or check the determination of the Cleveland Administration concerning the repeal of the Sherman law. The Secretary went over the currency laws of the country and said that they were in bad shape and needed revision. He said the revision would start with the Sherman law. There is a determination also to show the miners of silver the evil effects of the Sherman law in their fortunes.

President Cleveland's advisers have told him that the only way to induce the Western and Southwestern Senators and Congressmen to consent to a repeal of this Sherman law is to demonstrate to their constituents that they are losing money every day that this law is in operation. The missionary work in that direction has been started by a number of the bankers in the solid communities of the East. They are daily refusing credits to the South, Southwest, and West.

The Chicago bankers, it was said, are carrying out the same line of policy. Secretary Carlisle, in his talk with the bankers, made his stand very clear. It is to be heroic treatment all the way through.

The bank presidents, replying to Secretary Carlisle, cordially informed him that they would be ready at all times to cooperate with him in the successful administration of the financial policy of the Government. Everybody shook hands and there was harmony all around.

Here we have President Cleveland and his Secretary of the Treasury, on the 27th day of April, 1893, less than two months after his inauguration, in conference with the great millionaire bankers of New York, devising "ways and means" to bring on a financial panic in the United States. How? By "daily refusing credits to the South, Southwest, and West" and the Chicago bankers "carrying out the same line of policy," and every member upon the floor knows this policy was adopted by the banking corporations, great and small, throughout the United States. "Secretary Carlisle, in his talk with the bankers, made his stand very clear." "It is to be heroic treatment all the way through." "Everybody shook hands, and there was harmony all round."

Mr. Chairman, was there ever a more infamous compact against the interest, well-being, and happiness of our people? The great Republican and gold standard press of the country joined in the hue and cry that the silver bullion purchase and coinage clause of the Sherman Act of 1890 was the cause of the want of confidence in the country. I have already met and shown the fallacy of this contention in the policy of the Bank of France.

In furtherance of this evil compact many of the great tariff-protected manufacturing corporations began to reduce the wages of their employees, and many of these establishments closed their doors for months at a time, throwing out of employment thousands of men, and brought want and misery to hundred of thousands of people.

The smaller banks of the country pursued the same policy, forced in their loans, refused credit to their former customers, and wrecked the fortunes of thousands of honest, deserving men, and brought their families to actual want. In order that we might have, as these corporations claimed, "sound money" and "an honest" dollar, Cleveland and Carlisle, with their Republican allies, were doing that which in 1891 William McKinley had denounced as "destroying one of our precious metals, one of our great products, discrediting silver and enhancing the price of gold," limiting "the volume of money among the people," "making money scarce and therefore dear," "increasing the value of money and decreasing the value of everything else," "making money the master and everything else the servant."

The gentleman from Ohio has also told us that when the Republican party again came into power by the election of President McKinley in 1896, confidence was restored, wages of the employees in the manufactories began and have continued to be increased, and that these things were due to to the success of the Republican party.

Mr. Chairman, who are the recipients of the prosperity that the gentleman so much boasts of? I assert here that the average wages of the employees in the tariff-protected manufacturing industries are not as high to-day as they were on the 1st day of January, 1893, in the face of the fact that the manufacturers have put up the price of their products in the past twelve months from 100 to 200 per cent and in some instances 300 per cent.

Take iron, nails, fencing wire, barbed and woven wire, etc., over 300 per cent; every article that the laborers and farmers have to buy enormously increased in price; coal, wall paper, agricultural implements, furniture, food products, rubber goods, queen's ware,

glass—in fact, every article controlled by these trusts, almost too innumerable to mention, have been arbitrarily increased in price by these corporate trusts to pay dividends on fictitious capital, as ex-Senator Ingalls says, "By methods that make larceny respectable."

Mr. Chairman, I ask gentlemen on that side, Why is it that there has not been a corresponding rise in the prices of the products of the farm? The reason is easily given. These trust combinations of corporate wealth meet and fix the price of their manufactured products, and the farmers and laborers must do without them or pay the trust prices. So they meet and fix the price of what the farmers have to sell, and they must take it or their products go unsold.

Unless the history of the financial legislation of the past reverses itself, the adoption of the single gold standard by this country and the striking down of our silver money, greenbacks, and Treasury notes will result most disastrously to the people of the United States. England destroyed silver in 1816, and its effects, as given by the great English historian, Alison, I quote:

> The effects of this extraordinary piece of legislation were soon apparent. The industry of the nation was speedily congealed, as a flowing stream is by the severity of an arctic winter. The alarm became as universal and widespread as confidence and activity had recently been. The country bankers, who had advanced largely on the stocks of goods imported, refused to continue their support to their customers, and they were forced to bring their stocks into market. Prices in consequence fell rapidly, that of cotton, in particular, sank in three months to half its former level. * * * The effects of this sudden and prodigious contraction of the currency were soon apparent, and they rendered the next three years a period of ceaseless distress and suffering in the British Islands. * * * The effect upon prices was not less immediate or appalling. They declined in general within six months to half their former amount and remained at that low level for the next three years. Distress was universal in the latter months of 1819, and that distrust and discouragement were felt in all branches of industry which are at once the forerunner and cause of disaster.

I need scarcely recur to the demonetization of silver and the suspension of the free coinage of silver in 1873–74 by the United States and Germany, and the consequent contraction of the standard money of the world, and the financial panic in the United States for a period of five years, until the Bland Act of 1878 was passed, restoring the full legal-tender quality of silver dollars and providing for the coinage of $2,000,000 worth of silver bullion into standard dollars per month. The effect of this legislation was an expansion of the money of the country, followed by rising prices in every industry of the United States; again, in 1890, upon the passage of the Sherman Act, which added four millions of Treasury notes to the circulating medium by the purchase of silver bullion. The effect of this act is described by President Harrison in the following language (message to Congress, December, 1890):

> It is gratifying to know that the increased circulation secured by the act has exerted, and will continue to exert, a most beneficial influence upon business and general values.

Admitting that a few of the products of our farmers are higher than a few years ago—wheat and corn are lower now in price than at this time last year—does this prove that the election of Mr. McKinley brought about these results? Did the success of the Republican party make a short cotton crop in the South in 1899? Did it make bounteous crops in one section and short ones in another? Did it produce the famines in India and some parts of Russia? Did it make the gold output rise from $33,000,000 in the United States in 1892 to $64,000,000 in 1898, and in the world from $138,000,000 in 1892 to $287,463,000 in 1898?

Mr. Chairman, had it not been for this enormous increase in gold enlarging the volume of standard money, who can doubt the disastrous financial results that would have irresistibly overtaken this country? The world's production of gold shows that these large yields only last for a few years, and when this large output has ceased, as it surely will, the evils of this bill will convince the Republican party that it has "courted fate" once too often. Allison, from whom I have already quoted, wrote of the results of the discoveries of gold and silver in the '40s in America and Australia, as follows:

> The annual supply of gold and silver for the use of the globe was by these discoveries suddenly increased from an average of 10,000,000 pounds to one of 35,000,000 pounds. The era of a contracted currency and consequent low prices and general misery, interrupted by passing gleams of prosperity, was at an end. Prices rose rapidly and rose steadily; wages advanced in a similar proportion; exports and imports enormously increased, while crime and misery as rapidly diminished. Wheat rose from 40 shillings to 55 shillings and 60 shillings; but the wages of labor advanced in nearly as great a proportion; they were found to be about 30 per cent higher on an average than they had been five years before. In Ireland the change was still greater, and probably unequaled in so short a time in the annals of history. Wages of country labor rose from 4 pence a day to 1 shilling 6 pence or 2 shillings; convicted crime sank nearly half, and the increased growth of cereal crops under the genial influences of these advanced prices was for some years as rapid as its previous decline since 1846 had been. At the same time decisive evidence was afforded that all this sudden burst of prosperity was the result of the expanded currency, and by no means of free trade, in the fact that it did not appear till the gold discoveries came into operation, and then it was fully as great in the protected as in the free-trade States.

Mr. Chairman, if this bill becomes a law the Republican party will have carried out its contract with the millionaire bankers and corporations—the price they paid, giving their millions to secure the election of William McKinley, President of the United States, with the further condition that they are to contribute again to the Republican campaign fund of 1900.

When this bill becomes a law, these are the evils that will be fastened on the people: The single gold standard, and all debts, public and private, now payable in any lawful money of the United States, gold, silver, greenbacks, and Treasury notes, made redeemable alone in gold; the contraction of the currency $8,000,000; authority given the Secretary of the Treasury to issue gold bonds in an unlimited amount, fastening upon the people a perpetual interest-bearing debt as a basis for the national banks; the placing the people of the United States in the ruthless clutches of the gold trust and the national banks by giving to the banks the authority to issue their bills as the only paper money of the country, making them the rulers of the people and the masters of the price of labor and the fruits of labor. [Great applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, the adoption of the gold standard by the progressive nations of the earth is inevitable. No arbitrary act or conventional arrangement leads to this result. It is a feature of that evolution which is characteristic of the age. We have made the mistake of ascribing too much importance to legislative enactments for the demonetization of silver, and have given too little attention to the working of those underlying forces and principles whose behest legislators and finance ministers must obey. It is not a matter of perversity of legislators or conspiracy of financiers; it is the logic of events.

In bringing about this condition three great central facts are prominent. First, the necessity in this present era for selecting for the operations of trade and industry the simplest and most convenient instruments. That means that we will select the lighter metal rather than the heavier, or other qualities giving equal advantages, the one which has the greatest value with the least weight. Second, the impracticability of bimetallism as a principle. Third, the great growth in gold production in the last fifty years, which has made possible the adoption of the changes promoted by the first two facts.

First, in regard to the selection of the simplest instruments, historically speaking, diverse commodities have been selected and abandoned for use as money. Tobacco and a great variety of articles which I need not name have been used, but the evolution has been to select metals, and then among metals the lighter. Iron gave place to copper, copper to silver, and by that same rule silver must give place to gold. In the year 1896 I carried about with me a copper coin of Sweden of 1732 for $2. That coin weighed 4 pounds and 3½ ounces. It was abandoned for the lighter metal, just as the farmer abandons the clumsy old wagon with the wooden hub for the more convenient and lighter vehicle. Bimetallism has also proven impossible with modern commercial progress. The concurrent use of two metals at a ratio of 16 to 1 or 15½ to 1, or any other ratio, with modern development is impossible.

I will concede that for nearly two hundred years—from 1687 to 1874—these metals ran together at approximately the same ratio, with a maximum relative value for silver of 14.14 to 1 in 1760 and a minimum relative value of 16.25 to 1 in 1813. I will concede the very considerable influence which the use of a metal as money has in increasing its value; but conditions have radically changed. Among the factors which have caused the change are the following:

First. The larger proportion of the precious metals used for the arts and the larger transactions in gold and silver as independent commodities. Formerly the whole production of both gold and silver was eagerly sought for monetary use. This was particularly true of the first half of this century, when trade was increasing rapidly but the quantity of gold and silver was not.

Second. The larger use of metallic money for international exchanges and its lesser use for local circulation. A prominent use of metallic money is for the settling of balances between countries.

Paper money in a greater degree is used as a substitute in ordinary transactions. Then there is another influence—the great increase in the production of gold and silver in recent years, the increased production of gold beginning before that of silver. Formerly the annual product or even the product of a decade was an insignificant share of the accumulated stock, so that the production from year to year exercised but little influence upon the relative value of gold and silver.

This brings us to the consideration of the third fact named—the great increase in the production of gold in the last fifty years or more. According to the best estimates, the total quantity of gold mined from the discovery of America to and including 1850, a period of more than three hundred and fifty years, was $3,314,000,000. In the twenty-five years from 1851 to 1875, inclusive, the total quantity mined was $3,317,000,000, almost exactly the same amount.

We can confidently predict also that in the twenty-five years from 1876 to 1900, inclusive, the total production will exceed $3,500,000,000. This increase has made possible the adoption of the single standard. These comparative figures will be even more

emphatic when we notice that the production of gold in 1898, $287,000,000 (Report of the Secretary of the Treasury for 1899, page 17), was more than one-half as much as for the whole of the sixteenth century; nearly one-half as much as for the seventeenth century, almost one-fourth as much as for the eighteenth century, and very nearly as much as for the first thirty years of the nineteenth century.

A pamphlet was published by Dr. Suess, of Vienna, about 1877, in which he maintained that the fields available for gold production were nearly exhausted and thereafter the supply of gold must decline. This pamphlet was republished as a Senate document and has afforded a basis for many of the arguments in favor of the remonetization of silver. His forecast has proven to be entirely wrong.

Improvements in engineering and machinery, and more especially in chemical processes, together with the discovery of new fields in South Africa and the northwesterly portion of this continent, have greatly increased the gold supply. A steady increase began in the year 1891. There is no present prospect that this added annual supply will be slackened, though it may be temporarily diminished by the present disturbances in South Africa. The prospect of an increase is so well established that it is safe to make calculations upon the present and prospective increase as a basis for action in coinage laws.

In the year 1898 the value of gold mined was more than the total value of both gold and silver mined in any year preceding the year 1891, valued at the coinage ratio of 16 to 1, and more than the total quantity of both metals, valued at the commercial ratio in any year preceding 1894, in which year the commercial value of both gold and silver mined was almost exactly equal to the gold mined in 1898.

Nothing but a marked decline in the production of gold would afford any justification for a reopening of this question of the coinage of silver as legal-tender money. Should such a situation arise, it will then be time for agitation in favor of a change of regulations.

One feature of the situation, it must be admitted, has given a great deal of justification for the arguments in favor of a larger use of silver as money—that is, the diminished quantity of gold mined from 1871 to 1890 as compared with the preceding twenty years. Had it not been for the increased quantity mined since 1891 the question would assume an entirely different aspect from that which it presents to-day. A charge of inconsistency can not be justly made against those who argued for the remonetization of silver during that period or until the increased production of gold became a settled fact, because existing conditions were radically different.

Notwithstanding the very general adoption of the gold standard by the more civilized nations during the last quarter of a century, silver has been coined on a very large scale. During the twenty-five years ending in 1897 the total quantity of silver money coined was $3,210,000,000. The total stock of silver money in existence at the expiration of the period named was $3,977,000,000. After making due allowance for recoinage it is evident that the greater share of the silver money now in existence has been coined since the demonetization act of 1873.

So it has not been an abandonment of the coinage of silver which has caused it to go down. It has rather been other forces more potent which we must recognize. How useless is it, then, to talk about being friendly to silver. Silver is a commodity; gold is a commodity. Each must take the value given to it in the markets of the world.

A great deal has been said in this discussion about basic or primary money. What is basic or primary money? It is money which as a commodity has intrinsic value equal to the amount that it carries on its face.

The silver dollar is not basic money. We have three kinds of money or currency in this country: First, gold money, which has intrinsic value; second, the credit or paper money, which has no intrinsic value; third, the silver money, partaking of the nature of each of the other kinds, which has intrinsic value to the extent of 45 cents and rests upon the credit of the Government to the extent of 55 cents.

Primary money is that which is not confined in its circulation to any special location, which does not depend upon the protecting influence of any Government, but that which, by reason of its intrinsic value, is available all over the globe in exchanges between countries. Under this test what is the comparison between gold and the silver dollar? The gold dollar, if I may personify it, comes to the mint and says, "Here I am. I need no stamp of king or emperor to give me value; I am worth 100 cents. Cast me into the crucible and melt me in the fiercest flame, and when I have gone through that process I am worth 100 cents." The silver dollar says, "Here I am; 45 cents. Put the dollar stamp upon me; put on me that sacred motto 'In God we trust,' and set me in circulation; and avoid that profane motto, 'The devil take the hindmost.'" [Laughter.]

I appeal to Democrats on this subject. The Democratic party in the days of Jefferson and Jackson was a hard-money party. In speaking of conditions in President Jackson's time Michel Chevalier, a French economist, who spent some years in this country, said:

> Gold is called Jackson money. The national mint has been set to work with extraordinary activity to strike off gold pieces, half eagles and quarter eagles. The chief journals, in the interest of General Jackson's party, pay all their workmen with gold; the warm friends of Administration keep nothing but gold in their pockets; and whenever you see a man with coin in his pocket you may be sure he is a Jackson man. Lately the President went to his country house of Hermitage, in Tennessee; all along the road he expended nothing but gold; the Globe, his acknowledged organ, took especial care to let it be known to the public; and at a great banquet which the inhabitants of Nashville gave to him he drank as a toast, "Gold and silver, the only representatives of wealth recognized by the Constitution."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Does the gentleman from Ohio mean to say that General Jackson ever advocated in any manner a single gold standard or the demonetization of silver?

Mr. BURTON. Not at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi (continuing). What the gentleman really means, then, is that General Jackson advocated a legislative ratio which would insure the circulation of gold coin throughout the United States.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Is it not a fact that the then Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Ingham, favored a single silver standard at that time in his reports?

Mr. BURTON. I think not.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. That is an absolute fact. A single silver standard was advocated by him.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman from Texas may be right in regard to that. What I am now seeking to emphasize is the fact that President Jackson insisted upon money which had intrinsic value, and would tolerate no other.

One of the arguments most persistently urged in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver has been the quantitative theory of money, or the theory that prices rise and fall with the increase or decrease of the amount of money in circulation. A quotation has been made from Mr. John Stuart Mill in favor of this theory. On this subject I wish to quote another passage from Mr. Mill. He says:

> The proposition respecting the dependence of general prices upon the quantity of money in circulation must be understood as applying only to a state of things in which money is the exclusive instrument of exchange, and actually passes from hand to hand at every purchase, credit in any of its shapes being unknown. When credit comes into play as a means of purchasing, distinct from money in hand, the connection between prices and the amount of the circulating medium is much less direct and intimate, and such connection as does exist no longer admits of so simple a mode of expression.

Mr. Tooke, the author of a standard work on prices, also says in this connection:

> There is not, so far as I have been able to discover, any single commodity in the whole range of articles embraced in the most extensive list of prices the variations of which do not admit of being distinctly accounted for by circumstances peculiar to it. * * * Circumstances do frequently operate with such force as to reduce prices in the face of an expanding currency and to advance prices when the currency is diminishing. In point of fact, the expansion is frequently rather an effort than a cause of enhanced prices.

I read also from Adam Smith on the Wealth of Nations, wherein he uses this language:

> Upon every account, therefore, the attention of government never was so unnecessarily employed as when directed to watch over the preservation or increase of the quantity of money in any country.
>
> No complaint, however, is more common than that of a scarcity of money. Money, like wine, must always be scarce with those who have neither wherewithal to buy it nor credit to borrow it. Those who have either will seldom be in want either of the money or of the wine which they have occasion for. This complaint, however, of the scarcity of money is not always confined to improvident spendthrifts. It is sometimes general through a whole mercantile town and the country in its neighborhood. Overtrading is the common cause of it. Sober men whose projects have been disproportioned to their capitals are as likely to have neither wherewithal to buy money nor credit to borrow it as prodigals whose expense has been disproportioned to their revenue. Before their projects can be brought to bear their stock is gone and their credit with it. They run about everywhere to borrow money, and everybody tells them that they have none to lend.

What is the correct theory as to the circulation of money among nations? Every nation obtains that share of the world's money—that is, money which has intrinsic value—which its trade and wealth demand. The different nations of the earth in this respect have been compared to reservoirs connected by a system of pipes. If one nation has more than its share, the level lowers for the benefit of another. If any nation attempts to put money into circulation, paper money, fiat money, or that which is half fiat money and half actual money, beyond its share, what is the result?

Prices rise in that country and a period of inflation and speculation begins. Exports decrease and imports increase. They do not ship abroad as they did before, but they buy from abroad; and I wish to call attention to a fact that I should like to hear explained: If prosperity depends upon the quantity of money in circulation, why is it that in 1837, a year of panic, we had the largest volume of money and the largest volume per capita up to that time? Why is it that in 1857, another year of panic, we had the

largest volume and, with the exception of one year, 1854, the largest amount per capita?

Why is it that again in 1873, the next year of panic, the quantity per capita was quite at the maximum? Why is it that in 1893 and prior thereto, when we had an abundant currency and were issuing silver certificates of an amount equal to the value of four and a half million ounces of silver a month, gold was being exported in enormous quantities? It was because we had a vicious currency system. Part of our metallic money had intrinsic value; part did not. The better form of money went abroad and the worse remained at home, a fruitful parent of speculation.

What is the explanation of the great increase of money since 1897? Not that more has been issued, but because of the change in the balance of trade and the impetus given to the commerce and industry of the country. This brought money at home into circulation and caused the import of large quantities of gold from abroad. Increased prosperity and confidence have been the moving factors to produce this result. If you had put the cart before the horse and issued a large volume of money, it would have been absorbed in speculative enterprises and withdrawn when those enterprises failed; but instead of that policy the Government has maintained the gold standard, and McKinley's election gave the assurance that it would be permanently maintained.

Then there came a revival of industry. It is useless to suppose that we can gain prosperity by opening up the mints to a debased coin or issuing paper money in larger quantities. We might be here all night with the best presses and issue millions of dollars of paper money, and yet the world would not be any wealthier than it was before; but if we were to use our skill in the manufacture of something that is useful, that met a demand, it would add something to the wealth of the world.

One thing is essential, not only to the prosperity of this country, but to its standing among nations. We can not remain out of line with these nations which have taken a stand for the single gold standard. Prior to 1896 nearly all advanced nations adopted it. Since then the drift has been entirely in the same direction. Russia, the most isolated of all the civilized countries, tried the experiment of a debased currency and failed, and recently adopted the gold standard. Peru, whrre the chief piled up the silver to the top of a room as his ransom, has abandoned the silver standard and adopted the gold standard. Far-off Japan, the most progressive of all the nations of the Orient, has adopted the gold standard.

Even Mexico, the country which would naturally longest adhere to the silver standard, has been compelled to recognize the current of events. It has funded its debt of more than a hundred millions of dollars, and what has it done? Though its mints have been at work for three centuries and a half and have coined over three billions of silver dollars, a large share of which has gone to the Orient, it has decided that those bonds shall be made payable in gold coin. Can all this occur without the necessity on our part of keeping abreast with the times and basing our currency upon a rock which shall stand? [Applause on the Republican side.]

I have two criticisms to make upon this bill. It would seem better to confine the issuing of notes of $5 and less to the silver certificates issued against silver in the Treasury and not allow the issuance by national banks of notes of a less denomination than $10. The total quantity of silver dollars represented by silver certificates of various denominations on the 30th of June last was, in round numbers, $406,000,000. The total quantity outstanding of notes of $5 or less was, of greenbacks, silver, bullion certificates, and silver approximately $302,000,000; of national-bank notes, $74,000,000; in all, $376,000,000.

Everyone must realize that the problem in our monetary system will be to make use of the silver coinage in such a way as to prevent disturbance or an undue strain upon the gold reserve. From these figures it appears that the aggregate of notes of $5 and less, including national-bank notes, is thirty millions less than the total quantity of silver certificates depending upon silver dollars. Why not restrict five-dollar notes absolutely to these silver certificates? There is every prospect that they would afford an ample supply of smaller bills, and at the same time would solve this perplexing problem of utilizing a large quantity of silver money not having full intrinsic value.

A second criticism: It would seem to be an improvement to provide more definitely that the national bank shall redeem their bills in gold. Each national bank must now provide a redemption fund of 5 per cent of its bank bills outstanding. Why not provide that this redemption fund shall be in gold and that at some central agency they shall redeem their bills, when presented, in gold? In case of a large demand upon the Treasury for gold in exchange for Government currency the pressure might be so great as to cause embarrassment. This embarrassment would be greatly relieved if the national banks share with the Treasury the burden of providing gold. Under present conditions it may not seem probable that this would occur, but our monetary system should provide for all possible contingencies.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] is recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, the argument on this bill is largely an argument after the fact. The people of the United States on the day of the last national election entered into their election booths, after hearing the arguments on both sides and reviewing the evidence, and returned the Republican party to power. By that verdict they pronounced against the clipping of coin by legislative enactment and in favor of a dollar true to name and true to the value stamped upon it, and that will not shrink on exposure to salt water in crossing the ocean. This bill simply enters judgment on the verdict of the people.

This bill declares that the standard unit of value shall, as now, be the dollar. This is a legal declaration of a historic fact.

In the act of April 2, 1792, passed pursuant to Hamilton's report, in which he and Jefferson agreed, the word "unit" was employed as the equivalent of "dollar."

The value of this unit was to be measured both in gold and silver. The dollar was therefore neither exclusively a gold nor a silver dollar, but was a dollar into which gold might be made and a dollar into which silver might be made.

Gentlemen have talked through at least two campaigns about going back to the silver dollar of their ancestors and at times have worked themselves and their audiences into a state of feeling over the antique. But the dollar of their ancestors was no more silver than gold.

It was then, as now, a well-known law of coinage that with unlimited coinage of both metals at a fixed ratio the metal worth more at the mint than elsewhere would go to the mint and be coined, and the metal worth less at the mint than elsewhere would stay away. This is the so-called Gresham law, which takes its name from Thomas Gresham, once master of the mint under Queen Elizabeth.

It is perfectly apparent that I would be foolish to pay my debt of $10 in gold if with $5 in gold I can buy silver bullion, have it coined into $10, discharge my debt of $10, and have $5 in gold left.

Hence it is clear that silver under a mint ratio whereby it is given a value which it does not commercially possess will go to the mint and be coined and that gold will stay away.

Under such conditions it is clear that there can be no bimetallism, but only monometallism; that is, there can be no circulation of both metals as money side by side, but the cheaper metal will fill the channels of trade.

FORTY YEARS OF THEORY, BUT NO BIMETALLISM.

In April, 1790, Congress had referred certain matters relating to the establishment of a mint to Alexander Hamilton, then Secretary of the Treasury, and in January, 1791, he submitted a report advocating the dollar as the unit and recommending the ratio of coinage at 15 to 1. In this report Jefferson, then Secretary of State, concurred.

Pursuant to such recommendation Congress passed the law of 1792, section 11 of which provided—

That the proportional value of gold to silver in all coins which shall by law be current as money within the United States shall be as 15 to 1.

In fixing this ratio it was intended to make the mint ratio conform to the then commercial ratio. It was not then supposed that by any mere paper enactment any single nation could compel silver and gold to go yoked in any arbitrary ratio.

However, soon after the passage of the act of 1792 silver became comparatively cheaper than gold, so that by 1809 1 pound of gold was worth in the market 16¼ pounds of silver. Gold therefore became a commodity and was shipped abroad to pay for imported goods.

The comparative cheapness of silver stimulated its coinage, and it superseded gold as a circulating medium.

Nor did silver dollars remain long in circulation, but went to Mexico and the West Indies in exchange at par for Spanish dollars, which were about 3 grains heavier than our own. Their dollars were brought to our mints and recoined for reexchange for the 3 grains of profit involved until the further coinage of our silver dollars was stopped, May 1, 1806, by order of Thomas Jefferson, then President.

At that time there had been coined 1,439,457 silver dollars.

No more silver dollars were coined until 1836.

Under the ratio of 15 to 1 gold had gradually been expelled from circulation, and the coinage of silver having been prohibited under the order of Thomas Jefferson, worn, fractional Spanish money, supplemented by bank notes, furnished most of the circulation.

By 1830, as appears from a report of a committee of Congress appointed to consider the condition of the currency, the mint had coined since its establishment in 1794, in all, about $37,000,000, of which about four-fifths had been exported, leaving only seven or eight millions in the United States.

This was the net result of the free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the ratio of 15 to 1 for about forty years.

During that time there had never been bimetallism for a day, although theoretically it had been provided for.

THEORETICAL BIMETALLISM AGAIN A FAILURE.

By the acts of 1834 and 1837 Congress provided for the coinage of silver and gold at the ratio of 16 to 1, but again the legal ratio did not conform to the commercial ratio. This time gold was overvalued at the mint and went to the mint to be coined, while silver was attracted to Europe by a French ratio, which declared that it took only 15½ ounces of silver to be worth an ounce of gold, while the United States had declared that it took 16 ounces.

The acts of 1834 and 1837 in effect demonetized silver. This was done under the Administrations of Jackson and Van Buren.

Then, too, up to 1853, in the Administration of Mr. Pierce, silver subsidiary coin, viz, half dimes, dimes, quarters, and halves, which had theretofore been made proportional to the weight of the silver dollar and had been full legal tender, was reduced in bullion and limited as legal tender to the amount of $5.

This was because subsidiary silver was worth more than 16 to 1 and was rapidly finding its way from mint to melting pot.

From 1834 down to the Bland-Allison Act of 1878 the country was on a gold basis, without coinage on Government account, except during the period of our civil war, when we were on a greenback basis and cheap paper drove both silver and gold out of circulation and went down at times to 38 cents on a dollar.

During that period there was never bimetallism for a day, although theoretically it had been provided for, except that the subsidiary silver provided for by the law of 1853 did circulate with gold.

The gentlemen on the other side in advocating the ratio of 16 to 1 call themselves bimetallists, but they are not entitled to be so called. The only practical bimetallism in our financial history has been wrought out by the Republican party under a gold standard, and history makes it clear that the free coinage of silver and gold at the ratio of 16 to 1 would result only in a silver monometallism of fluctuating and reduced value, whereby a fluctuating half dollar would be called a dollar, whereby the purchasing power of a day's work would be reduced, the pensions of soldiers and widows would be cut in two, the value of existing life-insurance policies would be reduced to the injury of widows and orphans, whereby savings deposits and loan investments would be repaid in clipped dollars, and executors and administrators might file their final accounts and be discharged on payment of depreciated money and thereby legally defraud their wards and trust estates.

It is difficult to believe that any reading, thinking man can sincerely advocate the free coinage of silver and gold at the ratio of 16 to 1 as a means of obtaining bimetallism.

Indeed, sir, the theory that silver and gold would circulate together if free coined at 16 to 1 is only theory, with no historic precedent to sustain it, and which the mere wisdom and experience of the past have long ago refuted.

Since, under the operation of the Gresham law, silver drove gold out of circulation under the law of 1792; since gold drove silver out of circulation under the law of 1834; since cheap paper drove both gold and silver out, and since the so-called Gresham law is only common sense, which operates though not invoked, what possible assurance can gentlemen on the other side have that we would be exempt from its operation now?

HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF.

Shakespeare makes Jack Cade promise Dick the butcher, Best the tanner, Smith the weaver, and his other followers that seven half-penny loaves should be sold for a penny; that the three-hooped pot should have ten hoops; that all lands should be held in common; that the educated and wealthy should be degraded, poverty abolished, and that all lawyers should be killed.

Speaking of one William Lowndes, who lived in the reign of William III, Macaulay says:

He seriously believed, incredible as it may seem, that if the ounce of silver were divided into seven shillings instead of five, foreign nations would sell us wines and their silks for a smaller number of ounces.

He had a considerable following, composed partly of dull men who really believed what he told them and partly of shrewd men who were perfectly willing to be authorized to pay a hundred pounds with eighty.

Of our own condition in 1786 McMaster says that there were those who thought that a state could, by merely calling a bundle of old rags a hundred thousand pounds, really add £100,000 to the wealth of the community.

So there are men now who believe that our Government can by calling half a dollar a dollar add to our national wealth. It is singular how history repeats itself. There are still those who propose to make a half equal to a whole; to regulate value by legislation; to compel 7 half-penny loaves to be sold for a penny; that lands ought to be held in common, and that the man with a dollar ahead ought to be disciplined.

Every age renews the problem and every generation breeds its demagogues to operate upon the passions and prejudices of their cotemporaries.

THE STANDARD.

This bill provides that the standard unit of value shall, as now, be the gold dollar.

The term "gold standard" has been much misunderstood and much misrepresented.

By it it is not intended to say that all money shall be made of gold, and it does not control the amount of money in use and circulation. This is one of the hallucinations, like that that 16 to 1 means bimetallism, which has been vociferously encouraged.

Nothing is absolutely fixed, settled, and determined; nothing is changeless.

The Pyramids are slowly crumbling.

But gold has become by common consent of the business world a standard of value because it fluctuates less than other metals.

The word "standard" means something definite, fixed, settled, and established. Obviously there can not be two standards, either of length, of weight, of value, or of any other thing.

By this bill, as by existing law, the gold dollar is the standard of value.

By this standard we buy and sell and borrow and loan, make contracts and make wills.

Around it all our complex business transactions, big and little, are carried on day by day.

It measures the market in which wheat, pork, stocks and bonds, and every commodity grown and produced are bought and sold.

If I enter into a contract to-day to pay you $1 or $1,000 one year from date or ten years from date, you want to know and I want to know that I am to repay you just what I promise to pay you; and with a fixed standard you know and I know; but if your standard bobs up and down from day to day like a cork on the wave, fluctuating in the markets of the world, subject to the caprice of public confidence, the element of chance enters into every transaction and trade is demoralized.

A safe standard is not only the unchanging measure of all transactions, but is the solid bottom on which business confidence is built.

If there is anything in our system of Government that ought to be built upon a sure foundation, it is our system of finance, especially now that we are increasing our territorial limits and including under the scope of our control more multifarious conditions.

Soon after the fall of Santiago Cuban merchants refused to take our silver dollars at their face value, insisting that they were worth only the silver composing them. They had not yet learned, perhaps, that the United States stands pledged to maintain its silver dollars at the value stamped upon them, or perhaps they had learned that there were those in the United States who were bending every energy to bring about a condition where these same dollars would be worth only the silver composing them and preferred to take no chances, just as the Philippine insurrectionists have learned that there is a party in this country who are seeking to cripple our Government in its efforts to restore order there and establish a stable government.

We are extending our power. The Nicaragua Canal will be dug. Hawaii, Guam, and the Philippines, strung together by a Pacific cable, will be stepping-stones for the advancement of American trade and American ideas and American liberty westward. Mr. Seward's prediction that the Pacific Ocean, its shores, its islands, and the vast region beyond will become the chief theater of events is rapidly being fulfilled.

Wherever our flag goes up, there our standard ought to be sure and steadfast.

CONFIDENCE MAKES BUSINESS—BUSINESS MAKES PROSPERITY.

Our financial system—

In the language of William McKinley—

needs some revision; our money is all good now, but its value must not further be threatened. It should all be put upon an enduring basis not subject to easy attack nor its stability to doubt or dispute.

Our financial system needs strengthening, not weakening.

When our credit is rendered doubtful our whole system is affected.

We have now a per capita circulation of over $26, but the per capita circulation is not the chief index of business.

Ninety per cent of the business of this country is done by checks, drafts, bills of exchange, and other instruments of credit.

It is only the smaller transactions in which cash is used.

Any uncertainty as to standard tends to contract the circulation of money; and money driven to cover by panic and hidden away in fear builds up no enterprises and furnishes no employment to labor.

He who establishes order and confidence multiplies money in circulation.

He who foments disorder produces a famine in money. Hence it will be remembered that in the period from 1893 to 1897 banks were unsuccessfully offering 4 and 5 per cent on deposits to lure money out of hiding, while under this Administration banks are burdened with deposits without interest.

One man takes another man's note because he believes in his honesty and ability to pay.

The people take a nation's bonds and notes because they believe in the nation's honesty and ability to pay and redeem them.

Honesty makes confidence, confidence makes business, and business makes prosperity.

Under a sound money policy we passed into a state of actual war with scarcely a ripple in financial circles; but no one at home or abroad would have been willing to lend to our Government with the knowledge that the loan would be repaid in 40-cent dollars.

The plain people the country over took our bonds and asked for more; some of them did more—they gave their sons; some of them did more—they gave their lives.

Every man who bought a bond testified his confidence in our Government, and no man who holds a bond will vote to have his Government repay him at 40 cents on the dollar.

On the 8th day of May, 1898, a resolution was introduced in this House appropriating $50,000,000 for national defense, and every man—North, South, East, and West, Republican, Democrat, and Populist—voted "aye;" but that appropriation would not have been impressive at 40 cents on the dollar.

Public confidence, on which the whole superstructure of commerce stands, would have been demoralized at the first approach of war, and disastrous panic would have followed where instead prevails national solvency and national pride.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN COINAGE ON GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE ACCOUNT.

This bill provides that all bonds now or hereafter existing, all United States notes and Treasury notes of July 14, 1890, and all obligations, public and private, shall be payable in the gold coin defined therein and in conformity with the standard established therein.

There is a wide difference between this bill and the resolution of January, 1898, by which it was declared that all bonds of the United States are payable in silver dollars coined at the ratio of 16 to 1.

By that resolution it was proposed to take silver then standing temporarily at the ratio of 33 to 1 with gold, coin it into dollars arbitrarily and without limit at the ratio of 16 to 1, and pay debts with the money so created.

That was the so-called Teller resolution, and it was voted down at the ratio of 183 to 133.

There are at least two sides to every question—a right side and a wrong side—and as a rule the right people get on the right side and the wrong people get on the wrong side.

Our silver dollars are sustained at parity with gold by coinage on Government account because by coinage on Government account the Government may limit the output of silver dollars within its powers of redemption and because behind every dollar stands the promise and pledge of this great nation to maintain silver and gold at parity with each other at the present legal ratio or such ratio as may be provided by law.

For illustration, if I am the owner of 40 acres of land over and above debts, liabilities, and exemptions worth $2,000, my promissory notes up to $1,000 or $1,500 would be considered good because behind my notes would be property of the value of $2,000 liable to levy and sale; but if I increase my indebtedness my credit would begin to be scrutinized and my notes if taken at all would be taken at a discount.

To make the illustration more complete, suppose I should set up in my house a press capable of printing my promissory note at every turn of the wheel and allow everybody to turn the wheel and take my notes away, it is obvious that my notes could have no value beyond the material composing them.

The object of coining money is simply to certify the weight and fineness of the piece.

Individuals may not coin money, but if they might, and I might allow to be stamped at my house silver promises to pay instead of paper at every turn of the wheel and allow everybody to turn the wheel, it is equally obvious that my silver promises would be worth only the intrinsic value of the silver composing them.

If the policy of coinage on Government account were swept away and a policy of free and unlimited coinage on private account were inaugurated, the Government would be absolved from obligation to keep and maintain gold and silver at parity, and both metals would thereafter stand, rise, or fall according to their intrinsic bullion value. If your grocer should advertise to pay 25 cents a dozen for eggs, eggs being worth on the market 10 cents a dozen, eggs would be worth 25 cents a dozen in that vicinity so long as your grocer remained solvent and continued to pay the price.

So long as Mr. Leiter was able to pay $1.50 a bushel for wheat, wheat was worth $1.50 a bushel. But if your grocer should simply say: "Gentlemen, we have exceptional facilities for counting eggs; bring on your eggs and we will count them for you free of charge," this could have no possible effect on the value of eggs; or if Mr. Leiter had said: "Gentlemen, we have exceptional facilities for weighing wheat; bring on your wheat and we will weigh it for you free of charge," this could have had no effect on the value of wheat.

Under free and unlimited coinage the Government buys no eggs. It simply certifies that there are 12 in a dozen. It buys no wheat. It simply certifies that there are 60 pounds in a bushel.

It buys no bullion. It simply says to the owners of bullion: "Bring on your bullion, gentlemen, and we will stamp it into coin for you free of charge, and will certify that each dollar contains 412½ grains of standard silver, but we do not guarantee its value, and are under no obligations to maintain its value."

And when so stamped the coin would not belong to the Government, nor to you, nor to me, and we could not get a dollar of it without work or value received; but it would belong to the mining corporation or the man who brought the bullion to the mint.

The man or the corporation whose bullion had been so coined could then take his dollars so coined and pay off his past-due debts at 40 cents on the dollar, or whatever the bullion composing the silver coin was worth in the market, and could pay his laboring man at 40 cents on the dollar until they refuse to work longer unless their pay was raised as measured in such money.

But the laboring man could compel no one to receive these dollars at 100 cents in current trade.

The merchant would simply say, "This dollar is worth the bullion it contains—no more. For it we will give you 40 cents' worth of sugar, coffee, tea, or clothes."

Besides this the merchant would be obliged to charge something for holding in his till over night a coin of fluctuating value.

I am on record as having said, and I reaffirm the proposition, that a free, open mint is only a place run by the Government where bullion goes into the hopper bullion and comes out coin; and if a free, open mint can pull the price of silver up to parity with gold, then a free, open thrashing machine can raise the price of wheat, and a free, open sawmill can raise the price of basswood up to rosewood or mahogany.

If the touch of the Government stamp can create value, why waste silver and why coin at 16 to 1? Why not coin at 8 to 1 or 1 to 1, or why not stamp paper? Why longer permit poverty, since by mere act of Congress the distinction between the tramp and the millionaire can be obliterated?

The most iniquitous thing about the so-called free-silver contention is that it proposes that sovereign government shall take a metal of depreciated and fluctuating value, stamp it into money, and by its sovereign power make it legal tender for all debts, public and private, pay its own debts at 40 cents on the dollar, or whatever the bullion value of the metal may be, and make it legal for its citizens to do so. If any man should fail to do so under such law, he would be more honest than his government advised him to be.

Fortunately, sir, I have no fear that this proposition, so earnestly and so persistently advocated, will prevail either in Congress or at the polls.

In the language of William McKinley:

> The United States has never repudiated a national obligation either to its creditors or to humanity. It will not now begin to do either. It never struck a blow, except for civilization, and it never struck its colors.

The bill further provides for the coinage of bullion purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, into subsidiary coins, takes off the fifty-million limit of the aggregate amount of subsidiary silver and fractional currency that may be coined, and provides for the cancellation of Treasury notes issued on the cost of such bullion Thereby our subsidiary and fractional currency will be increased, and we shall be able in a measure to guard against loss on bullion purchased in a falling market under the law of 1890. It provides permanently for the recoinage of worn and uncurrent coins, so that our circulation shall suffer no loss thereby.

It provides for an increase of silver certificates of small denomination to meet the demands of a vastly increasing business.

Pursuant to the recommendations of four Presidents and five Secretaries of the Treasury, it amends existing law so as to permit the issue of bank certificates to the par value of the bonds deposited for their security.

THE END OF THE ENDLESS CHAIN.

It puts an end to the "endless chain." The resumption act of 1875 directed the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare and provide for the redemption of United States notes in "coin" on and after January 1, 1879, and for that purpose he was authorized to use any surplus in the Treasury and to sell bonds as provided in the refunding act of 1890.

From the bonds sold pursuant to this authorization $96,000,000 were realized, since known as the "gold reserve." This reserve has not been authorized by law, but has been established by usage.

Such usage is legalized by this bill by a provision that a reserve of gold coin and bullion equal to one-fourth of outstanding United States notes and Treasury notes shall be transferred to the division of issue and redemption.

At present one statute requires the Secretary of the Treasury to redeem legal-tender notes in coin on presentation, and another

requires him to pay them out again that they may return again for redemption again. This is the so-called "endless chain." This bill makes it impossible for any future syndicate to sell gold into our Treasury and pump it out again at will by providing that redeemed notes and certificates shall not be paid out again except in exchange for their equivalent in the coin in which they were redeemed.

This can result in no contraction of the currency, because while notes are being so held their equivalent in coin is in circulation.

Besides, the very fact that a run on the "gold reserve" is fully provided against will prevent such run.

It will be the old story over again of the man who did not want his money if he could have it, but if he could not have it he wanted it bad.

Such runs are not likely under a Republican Administration, but in time of prosperity and safety it is best to guard against contingencies.

THE USES OF DISCIPLINE.

In His inscrutable wisdom, the Omnipotent Ruler of the destinies of men and nations permits lapses and reactions in human history.

Prof. John Fiske has lately elaborated a cheering argument to the effect that the existence of evil in the world is so that man as a free moral agent may choose between good and evil; that if the world were wholly good, each man would be a good automaton, with no power or volition to select other than good, and therefore without merit for such selection; that, given the power of selection, he may at last present a character formed from buffeting with evil—rugged, worthy, and appreciative. [Applause.]

So nations, in the fullness of time, in the evolution of events, by experiment, by reverses, and by experience, evolve a national character.

On such hypothesis the office and functions of the opposition on the other side of this Chamber and that which it represents is explanable.

PROSPERITY.

We got down to the intrinsic bullion value of our national morality in the last election. We preserved our national self-respect and the respect of the world.

We have been successful ever since, and we have thereby demonstrated the truth of Washington's declaration in his Farewell Address, that honesty is the best policy for men and nations.

Our war bonds have been taken everywhere by our patriotic people, whose purchase is a pledge of their devotion to our common country.

The gentlemen on the other side urged free trade because they said the price was increased to the consumer by precisely the amount of the duty exacted, and things were too high.

In illogical conjunction with this demand, they urged free silver because they said more money would make higher prices, and prices were too low.

They sympathized with the laboring man because they said he was paying too much for his bread, and wept on the neck of the farmer because he was not getting enough for his wheat out of which the laboring man's bread was made.

They affirmed that wheat and silver were going down hill together, joint victims of the same inexorable law; then wheat went up and silver went down.

To certain minds it is evident that it is immaterial whether their major and their minor premises lead to a logical conclusion if their major premises make votes and their minor premises other votes.

They declared that there could be no prosperity which did not result from the free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the ratio of 16 to 1; and here we are in the midst of an unprecedented prosperity, so great, so ample, so all pervading as to smother denial. Gentlemen, why put back the clock while the sun goes on.

Your talk about "bogus prosperity" is as worthless as the wind and rain tattered fragments of one of your last campaign posters. When gentlemen say they stand where they did three years ago, that tells the whole story so far as they are concerned. The country has moved on.

We are buying less and selling more than ever before.

We are conquering, winning, and annexing the markets of the world, and the more there is sold abroad the more there is made at home, and the more there is made at home the more labor employed at home, and the more labor employed at home the more wages paid at home.

And yet to certain minds prosperity is but a false pretense.

"ALL THINGS ARE YELLOW TO THE JAUNDICED EYE."

Crops may be large, but the more we raise the more trouble it is to harvest them; besides, is it not clear that there would be more if we could call a half bushel a bushel?

Prices may be large, but is it not evident that they would be larger if we could call 50 cents a dollar?

We are paying our debts, public and private, but we could pay them faster at 40 cents on the dollar.

Our whole condition is improved. Men are making money, and many men are getting rich, but some are poor, and is it not obvious that everybody ought to be prevented from getting a living in order that some may be prevented from getting rich?

Our export business is increasing enormously, but that brings no cheer, because is it not obvious that when we have traded all our products for gold, stocks, and bonds, we shall have nothing to eat but gold, stocks, and bonds and people will starve until they have only strength enough left to curse McKinley for restoring prosperity and then perish by millions?

And then while the earth swings carelessly through eternal space and "the sun climbs up and on and over," above the dumb despair of our prosperous destruction will be heard the growls of the trust monster crunching the bones of its emaciated victims.

To avert this awful cataclysm we are advised to vote for free trade because things are too high; to vote for free silver because things are too low; to come home from the Philippines; to give up the task Providence has set for us; to bring back our flag trailing in retreat from duty and proclaim ourselves forever incompetent.

This is a government of majorities, but if such things are done they will never be done by a Republican majority—never.

From the eminence which a century of growth, development, and expansion has builded the nation stands to-day with uplifted brow facing the dawn of a new century, whose years, let us hope, in God's providence, shall be shining steps in the upward march of the greatest nation on earth to grander and more glorious achievement. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN] is recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is with a feeling of hesitation and somewhat of timidity that I will not endeavor to conceal that I rise at this time to speak for a moment only on the pending measure. I am not moved to this action by the egotistic belief that I can add anything to what has been said in support of this great measure by the Republican members on this side of the House.

I have marched under the banner of the single gold standard so long and championed that cause when it was despised and renounced by all political parties alike that I can not refrain from raising my voice for an instant in gratification in the hour of the triumph of that policy in this Hall.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] was on yesterday arraigning the members on this side of the House for what he chose to call their change of front and for fear they were not carrying out the wish of their constituents in voting for this bill. It will not be necessary for me to spend any of the few brief moments of my time in trying to square my record on the financial question. In the year of 1888, when I first spoke on the financial question, I said—and that speech was printed and given currency against me—that I believed the free coinage of silver was a delusion and a snare; a thing that had the sound of fabulous wealth, but in reality contained the essence of poverty; and that a double standard of value was as impossible as a double and different standard of length or a double and different standard of time. From that day to this I have never wavered or faltered in my belief, or the expression of it, upon this proposition.

And as to the second proposition, whether, in recording my vote in favor of the single gold standard, I will be reflecting the views of my constituents, I would say the gentleman need give himself no uneasiness upon that point, for the reason that the Republicans of the State of Washington wrote the word "gold" in the platform of that State long before it ever appeared in the Republican national platform. And when I was indorsed for the nomination for Congress and asked to express my views upon the declarations to be placed in the platform, I said:

> I do not assume to speak for my party or my State at this time, nor to in any way foreshadow the declarations of my party on any subject. But if I were asked to write a platform for my party in this year of 1898—a year rich in glorious memories and heroic deeds—I would write away up at the top a ringing declaration in favor of sound money, and when I said sound money I would say gold standard, and say it without stuttering.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

And that is what we wrote in the platform, and then the good Republicans of my State, one and all, buckled on their armor and faced a hostile majority of 14,000 votes in a State that casts but 80,000 votes. Two years before the free-silver forces had carried it by almost 14,000 majority, and the Republicans of my State, assisted by many loyal Democrats, reversed that majority in 1898 and wrote 3,000 majority in favor of sound money and national honor. And when I cast my vote upon this question it will reflect the unbiased and intelligent sentiment of my State.

There would be no greater inconsistency to me in hearing a man talk of biyardism, biquartism, or bibushelism than to hear any one discourse on the beauties of bimetallism in the sense of using both metals as a standard. I admit that both metals can and will be used in common, and each will be a measure of value,

but one metal only can or will ever be the standard at any one time.

Having come honestly to this conclusion, I have not been occupying my time, like the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND], in looking about me to see whether I had reached a popular belief. The one feature of this question that has chiefly agitated my mind was not whether I had reached a popular conclusion, but whether I had reached a right conclusion.

Speaking for myself alone, I had rather go down to the bottomless ocean of irretrievable political disaster battling for an immortal principle than to ride into the haven of political safety under the flag of repudiation and at the expense of the honor of my country! [Applause.]

In 1892, under the Republican Administration of President Harrison, the American people were so busy making money that they did not have time to think. They voted a Democratic Administration into power, and then they had plenty of time to think! [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] They had little else to do during the next four years except to think; and while they were thinking and starving, and starving and thinking, they made up their minds that what they wanted was a high protective tariff and a sound-money circulation.

In 1892 they preached a crusade against all the industries of the land and whispered into the willing ear of the deluded voter that he was not really prosperous, but under the law which they proposed to give him he would be. In an unhappy hour for American labor they placed their trust in that party, and it tore down the barrier of protection, closed the workshop and the factory, threw American labor out of employment, and turned American men and women into the streets to wander, idle, hopeless, and hungry. By the enactment of that free-trade law they robbed the laborer of his employment on the one hand, and robbed the farmer and the producer of their customer on the other; and then, when they had reduced both to beggary by their false economic theories, they turned around in the next breath and told both that the trouble was not with the industrial system, but with the financial system. Told the American people that all at once they were being crushed by our financial system; the same financial system under which for twenty-three years immediately prior to that time the American people had enjoyed the greatest prosperity that ever blessed mankind from the day that Noah left the ark! I remember, and every member on this floor remembers, the pitiful condition of affairs in this country in 1894 and 1895—the condition that was everywhere apparent to the human eye. In fact, you did not have to see it; if you were similarly situated with me, you could feel it! [Laughter.]

In the year of 1896 the Democratic party found itself standing in the midst of a country with its industries paralyzed, its people hopeless and desperate. Did the Democratic party in that campaign attempt to justify the economic free-trade measure which had brought about this condition of affairs? It did not. It immediately turned its back upon all its promises of the past, refused to discuss the free-trade question, but immediately furnished the American voter with a brand-new soap bubble, filled with Nebraska wind, and asked them to chase that off over another financial and industrial precipice. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

We are surrounded in this country to-day by a prosperity that is as general and as genuine as the all-prevailing air, and gentlemen on the other side will make no serviceable political capital by endeavoring to make out that prosperity is not with us. The prosperity of the busy mill, the bustling factory, and the roaring forge are everywhere in evidence. What a contrast to the dark days of 1894 and 1895. One of the most eminent men it has been my fortune to know was a psychologist, a student of the human mind. That gentleman once said to me that one of the most difficult traits of the human mind to develop was that of remembrance. He said that first came idleness, then came poverty, then came want, then came starvation, then came despair, and then came remembrance. [Applause on the Republican side.] During the four long, long years that intervened between 1892 and 1896 the American people passed through all the different stages of that psychological proposition until they at last arrived at the stage of remembrance. [Laughter.] It will prove a difficult task for the gentlemen on the other side to figure out of American mind and memory the recollection of those dark days.

The gentleman from Missouri went far back into history in his remarks; in fact, beyond all recorded history into the gray dawn of the universe, when "the morning stars sang together." I wish at this time in my remarks to allude to a time greatly anterior to even that remote period. I wish at this time to go so far back into the misty past that no single Democrat on this floor has ever been able to recall the time. The period I allude to is the year of 1896 A. D. [Laughter.]

In the midst of your prophecies and predictions of to-day I wish to impress upon the American memory, with all the emphasis that this time and occasion will permit, that you also made prophecies and predictions in the year of 1896. Everything you at that time said was going to happen failed to happen. Everything you said would not happen did happen. Do you know what I would be doing if I stood in your place to-day? I would be keeping still. Yes, I would be keeping still in six different languages and praying to a just and merciful God that the American people might forget the promises and prophecies that I made two years ago. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

I desire now for a moment to refer to a little financial history. I presumed when I began listening to this debate that the gentlemen on the other side were attempting to make votes. Perhaps I am wrong in my impression on that point; but if I am right in that impression, I will now give you a life-sized opportunity to make one vote, and make it right now. There are a few points in this financial problem that I have never yet been able to get any gentlemen of your political faith to answer. My failure in that regard heretofore may be accounted for because I have lived away out in the boundless West, far from the throne of grace and the mighty reservoirs of distilled financial wisdom. But now, standing here in the midst of the brightest men of the silver party, I have a perfect right to ask that out of the accumulated store of your wisdom you shed a little light on one or two of the cloudy spots in my poor mind.

I desire to ask one question in regard to this famous theory of 16 to 1; and if there is any living human being on that side of the House within the sound of my voice who will give me an answer to this one question, and your answer when given is true, and likewise is consistent with your theory of free coinage at 16 to 1, I hereby promise, in the presence of this august assembly, to vote against the pending measure and for the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1. That is fair, isn't it?

In the first place, let me briefly recite a little financial history. The Republican party is contending that the ratio between silver and gold was merely a commercial problem and that the relative values of the metals was not and could not be regulated by law. The free-coinage advocates have always insisted that it was not a commercial problem, but was regulated by law, and that whenever we open our mints to the free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the ratio of 16 to 1, this legal enactment will at once make the gold and silver dollars coined under that law of the same value; that each will be equal to the other in value because the law makes them so.

Well, we had the free coinage of gold and silver in this country all the time from 1792 until 1834—the absolute free coinage of both metals all the time at the fixed legal ratio of 15 parts of silver to 1 part of gold.

Now comes the question: If it is the law which regulates the value of these coins under a free-coinage system, what was it that caused the purchasing power of the gold dollar to rise above the purchasing power of the silver dollar between those two dates? What made them separate? [A long pause, but no reply.] My Democratic friends, you are now "up against the real thing!" [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have asked that question a number of times, and I have always received the same answer which I received just now! [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

I have always observed when I hear a Democrat discussing the free-coinage question he will start out at the beginning and move along down the line very logically until he gets right square up to the sticking point, and then he will spread his wings in the form of a beautiful oratorical metaphor and soar away up into the air and come down gracefully on the other side—and proceed! It has been the frequent observation of this peculiarity that has led me to try and get the organized Democracy of this country "up against the real thing."

I desire to press this question home upon the conscience and the intelligence of this House and the American people. If the law did not regulate the value of the two coins in the days when we had free coinage, what right has any man to say that the law will be powerful enough when reenacted to produce the result which it failed to produce when it was on the statute book before? That law was passed establishing the ratio at 15 to 1 when 15 to 1 was the commercial ratio. Then after the law was passed the purchasing power of the two coins separated; they separated not by reason of the law, but in spite of it. Some free-silver advocate may say that the two coins only separated in purchasing power about 1¼ cents. They separated by exactly the amount represented by the difference in the bullion value of the two metals at that time.

Another beautiful and falacious theory that I desire at this time to puncture is the statement that has been continually made on this floor and elsewhere, that under a free-coinage system if one of the coins rises in value a trifle above the other, that this difference in value will immediately transfer the demand to the cheaper coin, and this increased demand will immediately raise the value of the cheaper coin to a parity with the dearer. That is a beautiful theory, and it is frequently illustrated with a drawing

showing two tanks of water joined by a connecting pipe which always insures an exact level of the water in both tanks. It is insisted that if the bulk of silver on the one side and the bulk of gold on the other are joined by a connecting pipe, to wit, a free-coinage law at a fixed ratio, this law will operate like the connecting pipe and keep the value of both metals at the exact relative value recognized by the legal ratio. It is all very well for the Democratic members of this House to stand up before the American people and tell them what is going to happen in the future, but what I want you to do is to explain to them here and now why the thing you say is going to happen under a free-coinage system in the future did not happen under a free-coinage system in the past.

I reiterate that for forty years under a free-coinage system of 15 to 1 the gold dollar was always above the value of the silver dollar. Where was that theoretical increased demand of yours that was going to raise the value of the cheaper coin? Why did it not operate and get in its work between the years of 1792 and 1834?

That law proved powerless to hold the two coins equal in value when their value was at an equality at the time the law was enacted. Yes, more than this, throughout forty years of our financial history that law failed to establish an equality of value between the two coins, and this at a time when the two coins were only separated in value by a cent and a quarter. Now, then, my free-coinage prophets, will you please tell me what ground you have for the belief that that same law which has proved powerless to raise one coin in value by a cent and a quarter in forty years is now going in a single day to establish an equality between the same two coins when they are separated in value by a difference of 53 cents? Why do you not answer that?

Mr. Chairman, as was said by a much wiser man than I in days gone by, "I have no lamp to guide my feet save that of experience." If I stand on the shore of a lake and throw 99 rocks in and they all sink, when I poise the hundredth rock to cast it out above the shimmering surface of that lake I have an established and well-grounded right to prophesy that that one is going to sink too. My Democratic friends, what right have you to prophesy that that one is going to float?

They tell us that they have faith that the equality of the two dollars will be thus established under free coinage at 16 to 1. Faith is a human attribute that I greatly admire and commend if it is founded on anything, but this particular kind of faith must be a sample of that faith which is said to have moved mountains.

I defy any member of this body, or any man on earth, to point out to me a single instance in the financial history of the world where any free-coinage coin ever floated at a purchasing power greater than the bullion value of the metal that was in it, or where the free-coinage privilege being given to it ever raised its bullion value or value as a coin after being minted.

And yet the free-coinage advocates on this floor are standing on the shore of time and looking backward into the six thousand years of the world's recorded financial history and are flying boldly into the very face of every financial fact and monetary precedent established during all that time by all the nations of the earth, and are to-day boldly affirming that the laws of finance, which are as universal as the laws of gravitation, are all going to be suspended and cease to operate because, forsooth, the Democratic party of the United States has written a financial falsehood in its platform. [Applause.]

In the discussion of the financial question many men insist in commencing the argument at the wrong end of the subject. It is business activity that creates and causes the circulation of money, and not the creation of money that causes business activity. And the men who begin the discussion of this question at the other end are simply arguing from effect back to cause, and not from cause forward to effect. And to that other class of financiers who are continually drawing comparisons between the amount of money in existence in this country and what they are pleased to term "the indebtedness of the country" I have to say that no light can be shed on the financial question by any such comparison. If A owes B $10, B owes C a similar amount, and C owes B a similar sum, one ten-dollar bill passed around the circuit will destroy the entire $30 of indebtedness, and—mirabile dictu—the ten-dollar bill will still be left, and it can continue to circulate and pay debts or buy commodities.

The exact function of a dollar is the point in this question which so many participants in this debate seem to continually overlook. When you pay a debt with a dollar, that destroys the debt; but the dollar is left. Like the old gourd at the spring around which I played in childhood—everyone who came along took a drink out of it; but they didn't eat the gourd. That continued to remain and served as the modest utensil that assisted in quenching the thirst of the thousands of weary pilgrims who followed that way. I claim that there can be no exact ratio fixed between either the amount of debts in a country and the amount of money in existence in that country; or the amount of business done in a country and the amount of money in existence in that country. If money exists in a country and is buried in the earth or driven into hiding by the just financial fears of mankind, that money for the time being performs no commercial function and does no man any good. It is the amount of money in circulation and the rapidity with which it circulates that is the index of any nation's prosperity.

The amount of money in existence in the United States to-day shows no great proportionate increase over the money in existence in the dark days of 1893, when we were cursed with a financial panic. The marked difference between these two periods of time is caused by the fact that the money of the United States, in response to a business revival and a just sense of financial security, has come forth from hiding, and is to-day filling to the brink all the varied channels of trade and industry. The nimble American dollar is to-day chasing itself around the circle of varied human employment, too lucrative to go abroad and too honest to go into hiding. [Applause.] That, in my humble judgment, is the most potential factor in American prosperity to-day.

One of the great war cries of the famous campaign of 1896 was that we needed an increased amount of money per capita. I heard that statement reiterated on every stump throughout that entire campaign; but, Mr. Chairman, the American people have come to understand from actual experience that they are not so much interested in the amount of money in this country per capita as they are interested in the amount of money per pocket! [Laughter and applause.]

In the campaign of 1896 I contended that the relative value of gold and silver and all other commodities was regulated by the universal law of supply and demand. I especially urged at that time, the price of grain being low, that this was the result of that law of supply and demand. This proposition of mine at that time was frantically and hysterically denied by every free-coinage advocate. They all said, in substance, that prices were no longer regulated by the law of supply and demand, but by the monopoly and control of the money of the world; and that it was impossible for prices to rise, because there was not money enough in existence to permit them to rise, and they never would rise until the volume of money was increased.

Just after they had thoroughly demonstrated to the American people the utter impossibility of the rise in the price of commodities without the free coinage of silver, many commodities, and particularly wheat, rose enormously. And immediately every free-silver claqueur on earth commenced to yell, "Famine in India!" "Shortage in Russia!" "Crop failure abroad!" and to say these were the reasons for the rise in the price of wheat.

Mr. Chairman, I know they are not right in this contention, because the shortage abroad and the crop failure elsewhere have to do with the law of supply and demand, and that is the very law the operation of which they were denying two years ago, and now you are very busy affirming what you denied two years ago! [Applause on the Republican side.]

The other day I met one of the gentlemen whose personality ornaments the other side of the House and he admitted to me in a mournful sort of way that one or two commodities had risen since the Republican party had gone into power. That is right, my friend; when the Republican party went into power several things rose; wheat rose, pork rose, beef rose, land rose, labor rose, humanity rose, the flag of the nation rose, everything from one end of this nation to the other rose except the Democratic party, and you bet your life that has been going downhill. [Laughter and applause.]

There is a great deal of difference, Mr. Chairman, between theory and fact. It is an easy thing to theorize, but it is a difficult thing to create. Any fool can prophesy, but it takes genius to create and brains to execute. I sometimes think the greatest party on earth to theorize is the Democratic party. I know that the Republican party is the greatest party witnessed in all history to produce results.

I recall one little incident that illustrates very aptly the exact difference between theory and fact. Out in my State there once resided a very eminent gentleman who was learned in the law and skilled in the sciences. During one of his vacations he made a voyage from Tacoma to San Francisco. When the ship passed out of sight of land the captain took the reckoning in order to correctly locate the ship on the chart. My friend was very much interested, and having studied geometry and higher mathematics, he asked the captain if on to-morrow he might be permitted to locate the ship; all of which the captain readily granted, and at the same time explained to him how it was done, to wit, by pointing one angle of the instrument at the sun, the other at the horizon, measuring the intervening angle, and taking the time of day, and from these given and ascertained points to figure out by a mathematical calculation the latitude and longitude, which point could then be located on the chart.

My friend was intensely interested. On the next day he got out

the instrument and proceeded to locate the ship. He pointed one angle at the sun, the other at the horizon, measured the intervening angle, took the time of day, and then proceeded to figure it out. And when he finally ascertained the exact latitude and longitude of the ship he took his pencil and on the chart ran down one of the meridians and across one of the parallels to the point of intersection and then proudly remarked: "There she is, Cap; right there." Then he stopped to look at the point on the chart where he had located the ship, and, bless your innocent hearts, he had her located 700 miles in the middle of the mountains of Idaho. [Great laughter and applause.] And then he turned and looked all about him, and on every side, as far as the human eye could reach, he beheld the blue and beautiful waves of God's boundless ocean. That was the almighty and undeniable fact, that all the figuring and theorizing on earth could not refute. And you, my friends [turning to the Democratic side], theorized the people of the United States into a condition of opulence and plenty, but unimpeachable history has recorded the fact to be that you left them stranded on the financial rocks and commercial shoals 700 miles from the shore of prosperity. [Great applause.]

A number of the advocates of free coinage in this debate have said that their desire for free coinage was based upon a desire to "get back to the money of the Constitution." The first time I heard the expression "the money of the Constitution" used in connection with a free-silver argument I did not remember any provision in the Constitution in favor of free silver, and it occurred to me that possibly I had never read the Constitution. So I went home and took the document down, carefully blew the dust off of it, and proceeded to read it. And when I had finished I came to the conclusion that it was the other fellow who had not read the Constitution.

I hold in my hand now the Constitution of the United States. I deny that it provides for free coinage of silver at 16 to 1; I deny that it provides for the free coinage of silver; I deny that it provides for the coinage by the Government of silver at all in any way, shape, or manner. There are just two provisions of the Constitution that refer to the coining and issuance of money; no more. Section 8 of the United States Constitution provides that "Congress shall have power to coin money and regulate the value thereof." That provision means that Congress shall have power to coin money and fix the relative value of different coins in accordance with the different bullion value contained in each. That clause of the Constitution does not mean that Congress has power to coin a copper wash boiler into twenty-dollar gold pieces.

The other provision of the Constitution regarding money, the one most frequently referred to, is section 9, the one immediately following. The clause of this section to which I refer reads as follows: "No State shall * * * make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts." Every student of the Constitution knows that that instrument contains two great divisions. One portion of the Constitution defines and limits the powers and duties of the whole United States; the other division defines and limits the powers and duties of the separate States. The last provision, which says, "No State shall make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts," is a provision that limits the powers of the separate States and does not define a duty of the General Government. And when the instrument says that the separate States shall not do a certain thing, this is not equivalent to saying that the Government shall do that particular thing. When the law forbids the doing of a certain thing on the one hand, it does not necessarily command the performance of the opposite of that thing on the other. For instance, the law of the land says that "no man shall have more than one wife." But it does not say that every man in the United States shall have a wife. [Laughter.]

If there was builded here to-day a bright and shining pyramid of silver dollars, whose base was as broad as the known earth and whose glittering top towered amidst the eternal stars, neither you nor I nor any other man could get a single dollar of it without giving up a dollar's worth of labor to get it. Then when they destroyed by false economic theories and hostile legislation the industries of the land, they robbed the American laboring man of the only avenue through which he could secure a single dollar. Then they immediately began to prate to him about relieving his distress by the coinage of more dollars—which he would have no opportunity to get.

In all this endless talk on the beauties of 16 to 1 I have as yet failed to hear a single statesman advance a single sound argument or detail a reasonable theory as to how this money is to be placed in circulation when it is once coined. Employment comes to a man first, and then money as a payment for that employment. The acquisition of money follows, but does not precede, the employment.

As I have witnessed the progress of this financial debate I have seen the advocates of the free and unlimited coinage of silver driven from one position to another until with common action they seem to have sought refuge behind and planted their case upon the enormous production of gold in this country in the last two years. Every time the statement is made that the economic and financial measures of the Republican party have been the potential causes of the now abundant prosperity it is a sufficient answer for them to aver that the production of gold is a matter not controlled by any party (which is true), and that this enormous production of gold in the past two years is alone responsible for the return of prosperity.

I hold in my hand a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury which came to my desk only a few moments ago, which letter I now propose to read:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., December 13, 1899.

SIR: Replying to your inquiry of even date, I herewith inclose you a table showing the total production of gold in the United States for the years 1891 to 1898, inclusive:

1891	$33,175,000
1892	33,000,000
1893	35,955,000
1894	39,500,000
1895	46,610,000
1896	53,088,000
1897	57,365,000
1898	64,465,000

Respectfully, yours,

LYMAN J. GAGE,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Hon. FRANCIS W. CUSHMAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

That table shows that there was an increase or decrease in the production of gold in the United States during those years, as follows:

In the year 1892, a decrease of	$175,000
In the year 1893, an increase of	2,955,000
In the year 1894, an increase of	3,545,000
In the year 1895, an increase of	7,110,000
In the year 1896, an increase of	6,478,000
In the year 1897, an increase of	4,275,000
In the year 1898, an increase of	7,100,000

Cast your eye on those figures, my Democratic friends, and then charge, if you can, that it was the great production of gold in 1897 and 1898 that brought prosperity to this country. There has been an increase in the production of gold in the United States during all the years enumerated above, but that production was not proportionately greater in the years of 1897 and 1898 than it was in 1895 and 1896, while the greatest increase in production made in any of these years was in the year 1895, when the panic was on and every business concern in the United States was embarrassed and every workingman in the nation was starving.

Now, the point upon which I desire information is this: If it is the greatly increasing production of gold in this country that has brought this change, and an increase in that production of $7,100,000 in the year 1898 has been sufficient to bring about all this marvelous change for the better that you say now exists, why did not the increase in that production in the year 1895, which was the greatest increase of any single year, to wit, $7,110,000, bring prosperity to this land in the year of our Lord 1895? [Applause.]

It will do very well for you to talk to the men from the East about the mighty production of gold in Alaska—and, by the way, I am glad to state on this floor that those reports have not been exaggerated—but I live in the city of Tacoma, on Puget Sound, the very gateway of the Alaskan country, and I know that months and months before the newspapers had even announced the marvelous discoveries of gold in Alaska and long before any of that gold had gone into circulation that Bradstreet's and Dun's commercial agencies had reported a wonderful advance in financial and business activity, and even the Democratic papers of the country generally had conceded that times were much improved.

I welcome to the American people, to all parties alike, without distinction, all the increased prosperity which may have been brought to them by the discovery of gold in Alaska, but as long as I am on this floor I am going to deny the right of the Democratic party to allege that prosperity, like a seer or a fortune teller, gazed into the unwritten future and ascertained that gold was going to be discovered in Alaska, and returned in anticipation of the event. Mr. Chairman, the discovery of gold in Alaska was an incident (a happy one, I admit), but it was an incident which accidentally followed the return of prosperity and was not a potential and controlling cause which preceded it.

The distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] who preceded me in this debate made a touching and appropriate reference to the message of cheer that went forth to the laboring men of this nation "from the little vine-clad porch at Canton."

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] has attempted to brush aside with a contemptuous sneer that sentiment which he could not meet in argument. Sneer about it all you will, my Democratic friend, the mighty and unassailable fact still remains recorded in 80,000,000 grateful and patriotic hearts that there did go forth from that "little vine-clad porch" to the waiting ears of the millions of his idle and helpless countrymen a message that was sweeter to their ears than the chimes of angelus. The American

people to-day recognize their benefactor. It was he who put employment to their hands, bread into their mouths, hope into their hearts, and set the nation's flag forever in the sky. [Applause.]

I lived out in Nebraska a number of years ago, and I am acquainted with the gentleman whose name is breathed with so much reverence on the other side of the House—William Jennings Bryan. I know him. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I know him as well as if I had been through him with a lantern! [Loud laughter on the Republican side.] It has been my fortune to hear the gentleman on several occasions. In the campaign I now refer to I heard the gentleman make one speech on the financial question—and survived it. [Laughter.]

The gentleman was ornamenting the rear end of a freight train at that particular time. That was the campaign in which we had two men running for the Presidency, one of them running around over the country on the tail end of a freight train in a fruitless endeavor to find the American voters, and the other one sitting at home like a statesman and a patriot while the American voter was making a successful effort to find him. [Applause.]

The gentleman at that time, in discussing the financial question, said: "We are going to give you the free coinage of gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, because the gold dollar now buys too much. We are going to bring down the price of the gold dollar to the point where the silver dollar now is." And everybody threw up their hats. Then he walked over to the other side of the platform and said: "We are going to give you the free coinage of silver; and when we have the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1, that will lift the value of the silver dollar up to the point where the gold dollar now is." [Laughter.] And everybody threw up their hats again. [Renewed laughter on the Republican side.]

The same speech, Mr. Chairman, from the same platform and to the same audience. On the one side he told them that free coinage would drag down the value of the gold dollar to the value which the silver dollar then had, and on the other side he told them that free coinage would lift up the value of the silver dollar to the value which the gold dollar then possessed. And the truth of the whole matter is that the trouble with the immortal William Jennings Bryan, and with most of you gentlemen on the other side, is that in your arguments you are so crooked you can not walk around the block without meeting yourselves on the other side! [Prolonged laughter and applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN] who has just concluded his remarks made a clever Republican stump speech, not entirely applicable, however, to the question under discussion, but apropos of the story he told I think I can say in this regard that if he took his political bearings at the present time he would find that he was "700 miles" and more out of his latitude. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, in discussing this bill I desire to protest with all the emphasis in my power against its hasty and precipitate consideration. The bill is being rushed through as a strict Republican party measure. The rights of the Democratic minority have been infringed. The fact is, this bill—a most important and momentous one—has never been referred to a committee of this House. It was carefully prepared last summer by a few Republicans, assisted, no doubt, by able representatives of the money power and the national banks. No one on this side of the House had an opportunity to see the bill, to consider it, or to discuss it before it was introduced, the first day of this session, by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET]. The unparliamentary procedure pursued by the Republican party in the consideration of this important legislation is in violation of all legislative rules and every precedent of a deliberative assembly. Under the rule adopted this bill can not be amended or perfected. It must pass just as it is, and passed within a week. Why this unseemly haste?

The Republican party has made this bill a party question. You made it a caucus measure, and under the spur of king caucus you hold your members in line to vote for it, and under the party lash you intend to pass it because you have the physical power to do so. For one, I am glad it is a Republican party bill, and that at last you have thrown off the mask of political hypocrisy on the financial question and stand before the people of this country in your true colors.

Many of the gentlemen on the other side, I am informed, never read this bill and never saw it until it was introduced, and I have no doubt that if you now expressed your honest opinions and your sincere convictions about it many of you would be against the bill, and instead of voting for it you would openly denounce the many vicious provisions it contains. Every one of you, however, must vote for it because it is a part of the programme and a part of the policy of the Republican party.

The leaders of your party demand its passage, and in order to prevent you from acting according to your convictions and for the best interests of your constituents they have made it a party measure and will pass it under the rule of the party caucus. For these reasons alone no Democrat should vote for it.

You are going to pass this bill, not because it is a good bill or a proper measure, but because the money power to-day behind the Republican party demands the enactment of this legislation. It is the final consummation of the contract made in the campaign of 1896 between Mark Hanna, representing the Republican party, and the national banks. It is the carrying into effect of the last and the most villainous act in the great political drama of the last national campaign. By this act the Republican party surrenders unconditionally to the sordid greed of the money power.

Mr. Chairman, I am absolutely opposed to the passage of this iniquitous bill and shall vote against it. It is one of the most vicious political measures ever attempted to be passed through Congress. The bill commits the Government unalterably by law to the single gold standard and makes all obligations, public and private, payable in gold. It strikes out the word "coin" in all Government bonds, which means gold or silver, inserts in its place the word "gold," and in addition thereto it authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds *ad infinitum* whenever he pleases and makes the bonds payable in gold. The bill violates the obligations of the contract between the Government and the bondholder and provides that the finances of a mighty people shall be turned over to the national banks of the country and gives them the right at will to expand or contract the currency.

The bill does much more, but very briefly these are its most sweeping, vicious, and objectionable features. It is the most startling and the most daring departure from time-honored and well-fixed financial principles ever made in our history, and the result will be as disastrous as it is far-reaching. I say to you and to the Republican party that if this measure is enacted into law it reverses our financial system, repudiates the platforms of both parties, and revolutionizes the monetary methods of the whole country.

In order, sir, to show how the Republican party has changed its attitude on the financial question, let me quote the financial plank from the Republican national platform of 1888. It says:

> The Republican party is in favor of the use of both gold and silver as money and condemns the policy of the Democratic Administration in its efforts to demonetize silver.

In the national Republican platform of 1892 you say:

> The American people from tradition and interest favor bimetallism, and the Republican party demands the use of gold and silver as money.

What a difference between the Republican party now and then!

And, again, in the national Republican platform of 1896 you say substantially that you favor free coinage by international agreement, which you pledge yourselves to promote. Let me ask if you are doing that now?

What a change from those professions to this treacherous act of perfidy!

Let us see how William McKinley, the Republican President of the United States, has progressed on the money question.

In 1878, as a member of Congress, he voted for the Stanley Matthews resolution in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 and declaring in favor of the payment of all bonds, principle and interest, in gold or silver at the option of the Government.

On the 24th of June, 1890, in a speech in this House, before William McKinley saw the light of the money power and experienced a change of heart, he said:

> I am for the largest use of silver in the currency of the country. I would not dishonor it; I would give it equal credit and honor with gold. I would make no discrimination. I would utilize both metals as money and discredit neither. I want the double standard.

Why is he opposed to it now? Let him answer! The record speaks for itself, and on that record we appeal to the people for judgment from President McKinley in the White House, the agent of the money trust, to William McKinley, a candidate for reelection in the great contest next year. The people understand this question; they know what is going on; they will answer next year.

William McKinley in the last election did not stand on a gold-standard platform, but on a bimetallic platform to be brought about by international agreement. You promised the people to get rid of the gold standard. You then pretended to favor international bimetallism. In that campaign the gold-standard candidate for the Presidency only polled about 134,000 votes. But now you throw off the disguise and declare unequivocally against bimetallism, independently or by international agreement, and for the single gold standard. Up to the present time the Republican party and its leading thinkers and speakers have always been in favor of bimetallism and against monometallism.

Against my friend from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] I appeal to the RECORD, and I quote James A. Garfield, who said, in his inaugural address, March 4, 1881:

> By the experience of commercial nations in all ages it has been found that gold and silver afford the only safe foundation for a monetary system.

Against my friend from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET], who has charge of this bill, I quote that stalwart Republican, James G. Blaine, who said:

> I believe gold and silver to be the money of the Constitution—indeed, the money of the American people anterior to the Constitution, which that great

organic law recognized as quite independent of its own existence. No power was conferred on Congress to declare that either metal should not be money. Congress has, therefore, in my judgment, no power to demonetize silver any more than to demonetize gold; no more power to demonetize either than to demonetize both.—*James G. Blaine in the Senate*, February 7, 1878; Congressional Record, volume 7, part 1, page 820.

Against my friend from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], whose specious plea for the gold standard will deceive no impartial student of the facts, I quote from the great expounder of the Constitution, Daniel Webster, who said in the Senate December 21, 1836:

I am certainly of opinion, then, that gold and silver, at rates fixed by Congress, constitute the legal standard of value in this country, and that neither Congress nor any State has authority to establish any other standard, or to displace this.

Against my friend and colleague from New York [Mr. DRIGGS], whose speech I attentively listened to, I cite that sterling Democrat, Thomas A. Hendricks, who said:

That gold and silver are the real standard of value is a cherished Democratic sentiment, not now or hereafter to be abandoned.

And President Andrew Jackson, who said to the American people in his farewell address:

My humble efforts have not been spared during my administration of the Government to restore the constitutional currency of gold and silver; and something, I trust, has been done toward the accomplishment of this most desirable object.

And grand old Allen G. Thurman, who eloquently told the story in the Senate on the 6th day of February, 1878, when he said:

Has there ever been, so far as we know, a more prosperous country than were the United States from 1789 to 1861? Did any nation ever exceed the progress we made in population, wealth, education, refinement, and the general well-being of the people in those seventy-two years? And yet during all that period we had bimetallism, for we gave no preference to gold over silver or silver over gold.—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, volume 7, Part I, page 787.

And to all my Republican friends who must vote for this bill, no matter what they honestly think of it, listen while I read to you again from a speech of James G. Blaine, delivered in the Senate February 7, 1878:

I believe the struggle now going on in this country and in other countries for a single gold standard would, if successful, produce widespread disaster in the end throughout the commercial world. The destruction of silver as money and establishing gold as the sole unit of value must have a ruinous effect on all forms of property except those investments which yield a fixed return in money. These would be enormously enhanced in value, and would gain a disproportionate and unfair advantage over every other species of property.—*Congressional Record*, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, volume 7, Part I, page 821.

Can anyone here get up and honestly deny that statement?

The position you gentlemen occupy on this question before the people of the country to-day is, indeed, an unenviable one. Why do you stultify yourselves? What has compelled you to go back on your record? What power, what influence, has compelled you to change front on this great question, affecting as it does all the people of the land? I will tell you. It is the money power, the bondholders and their agents, the trusts, the syndicates, and the plutocrats. They favor the passage of this bill. They are in favor of changing the terms of the contract so that they shall hold the option instead of the Government. They would commit treason against the Government in order to gain a monetary advantage.

The Republican party to-day is the mere agent of the money trust and in every department of the Government carries out its wishes and registers and records its decrees.

Mr. Chairman, let me say again what I have always said and which I strenuously maintain, that I am now, always have been, and always will be a sound-money Democrat. I stand to-day on the financial question just where I have always stood and just where I always expect to stand—for hard money, for gold and silver as the ultimate money of redemption, freely and independently coined at a ratio to be fixed and determined by Congress. I believe now, as I always have done, in the sound money of the Constitution, and I take my stand on the side of all the leading Democrats of our party from Thomas Jefferson, its illustrious founder, to Andrew Jackson, from Wright and Marcy, from Seymour and Tilden down to the present time. We stand, sir, where they stood—on the safe and the sound side—for bimetallism.

When we became members of this House we took a solemn oath to support and defend the Constitution, and everyone here knows that the fundamental law of the land provides for gold and silver, the money of the fathers and of all our glorious past.

I am an old-fashioned Democrat. I believe in the fundamental principles of the Democratic party. I believe in sticking to your party. I am no bolter. I stand squarely on the Chicago platform, and I have no apologies to offer for my support of William J. Bryan, or for my loyalty to the principles enunciated in that magnificent document. In my judgment it is the best platform the Democratic party ever adopted, and notwithstanding all you have said against it, I believe the day is not far distant when every principle enunciated in it will be enacted into law. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I know that some of my colleagues from the State of New York differ with me on the financial question. I have no controversy with them except that of honest opinion. They claim the right to their convictions on this question as much as I claim the right to mine. I concede to them what I claim for myself, the right to hold and express my honest and sincere opinion on the greatest question to-day in American politics. They think I am mistaken; I think they are. It is an honest difference—that is all. Time will tell who is right. Let me say to my friend from New York [Mr. LEVY] that I am a Jeffersonian Democrat and stand to-day on the financial question just where Thomas Jefferson stood when he agreed with Alexander Hamilton and said "that the unit of value must stand on both metals." I know my friend favors the single gold standard, and he knows I favor the unit resting on the double standard of Jefferson and Hamilton. "There is no safety for the national finances," said that grand old Democrat, Thomas H. Benton, "but in the constitutional medium of gold and silver."

Sir, the history of all the past teaches in unmistakable terms that gold and silver at a fixed ratio was the basis for the currency of the world. I am neither a gold monometallist nor a silver monometallist. I am a bimetallist. I believe in both gold and silver, and I would not destroy or demonetize either. Both precious metals should be admitted to the mints of the country and freely coined, not for the Government, but for and on account of the depositor. Herein is the distinction and the substance of the whole matter. The act you do to-day will not destroy silver as a part of the money of the world, but will only be an additional incentive to every true friend of humanity to work harder and more earnestly for the free and unlimited coinage of both precious metals. There will be no sure, no lasting, and no permanent prosperity until it is done.

Make no mistake, gentlemen. The passage of this bill will not settle the controversy, but will only define more certainly the issue, make it more clear, and bring about more quickly its ultimate triumph. No great question is ever settled until it is settled right. Bimetallism, sir, is a living issue, and will be of paramount importance to mankind as long as civilization uses money for trade and commerce. Gold never was the friend of liberty. It never fought a battle for humanity. No people in a great crisis ever found it a faithful ally. It has been the agent of every panic, the minister of despair, the advocate of calamity, and the high priest of cruelty, misery, and woe. I am against the gold standard. If it comes by means of this bill, it will only come as a curse to rob us, to plague us, and to enslave us. In time it will have to go. The passage of this bill simplifies the fight.

But, Mr. Chairman, this bill does much more than firmly commit the Government by law to the single gold-standard policy of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury. All our Government obligations are now payable in "coin," and the word "coin" is written in every bond. When these bonds were sold it was understood and agreed by law that they should be redeemed, at the option of the Government, in either gold or silver. This bill strikes out the word "coin" in all our bonded indebtedness and writes in its place the magic word "gold." It is well known and can not be denied that this will greatly enhance the value of all outstanding bonds and put millions and millions of dollars of unjust profit in the pockets of the bondholders. It is an admitted fact that if "gold" had originally been put in the bonds they would have brought a much higher price.

You remember the special message President Cleveland sent to this House in which he asked us to do this very thing. You refused—every one of you. The amount of bonds issued at that time, I believe, was only $62,400,000, and yet Mr. Cleveland said they would bring sixteen millions more if the word "gold" was substituted for "coin." You refused to do that at that time, but now you intend to write the word "gold" in all the bonds outstanding against the Government, and strike out the word "coin." You are going to change the terms of the contract in favor of the creditor and against the debtor; you make a new contract for the benefit of the bondholder.

You say you are in favor of honest money, but you know this is dishonest money. It is a fraudulent transaction in the interest of the bondholders against the people and an outrage on the taxpayers of the country. When you do this you make the debtor pay more than he agreed to pay when the debt was contracted. By virtue of law you make a gift—a dishonest gift—of millions and millions of dollars to the bondholders, foreign and domestic, of the Republic. I protest against this injustice. I cry out with all the vehemence of my nature against this outrage on the people. I am opposed to any law that robs the many for the benefit of the few, and especially so when it is done under the subtle cloak of national honor and the euphonious phraseology of "honest money." If you are in favor of "honest money," why do you do this dishonest thing?

We denounce your action and warn you that the people will never submit to such a surrender of their rights. We will pay the bondholders the same money they paid the Government for

the bonds. No denunciation of the money power will deter us from doing our duty. As John Sherman once said:

The bondholder can only demand the kind of money he paid, as stipulated in the bond, and he is a repudiator and extortioner to demand more valuable money than he gave.

We stand by the terms of the contract. That is all the Democratic party wants to do, and it will resist with all its power any effort on the part of the Republican party to do anything contrary. On this question the Democratic party stands on the side of the people and demands absolute fair play for the debtor as well as exact justice for the creditor. The Republican party has taken its stand on the side of the money lender and the bondholder.

If your political policies were as honest as your professions, you would oppose the passage of this bill and refuse to commit this unpardonable crime on the toilers of this country. I am in favor of living up to the letter of our national obligations and maintaining them inviolate according to their spirit. I believe in carrying out the contract as it was made, doing no injustice to the bondholder, no injury to the taxpayer, favoring neither the creditor nor the debtor. The law of the land now is the act of 1878, and reads as follows:

That all the bonds of the United States issued or authorized to be issued under the said acts of Congress hereinbefore recited are payable, principal and interest, at the option of the Government of the United States, in silver dollars of the coinage of the United States.

That is a Republican law, and William McKinley, then a member of Congress, voted for it.

Let me say to my colleagues from New York and to other members on this side of the House who believe in the single gold standard that in my judgment you violate no promise to your constituents expressed or implied if you vote against this iniquitous measure. The Republican party now tells us, and the President and the Secretary of the Treasury reiterate it, that the country is on the gold standard. If that is so, then why enact this bill? Is it because you fear defeat next year? Is it because you think William J. Bryan is going to be the next President of the United States and you want to tie his hands? Or is it because you want to surrender the Government now and for all future time to the money power?

If this bill did no more than simply enact the gold standard, I can understand how some of my colleagues who believe in that standard could support it, but it goes much further. It enacts legislation in many respects a thousand times worse, and that will, in my opinion, ultimately cause more woe, more poverty, more distress, and more misery than any other act in all our history. Every Democrat should be opposed to the sweeping banking privileges contained in this bill.

A Democratic Representative who favors the gold standard can honestly and I believe consistently vote against this bill without straining a conviction or violating an obligation to his constituents. Every Democrat should also vote against the bill because it gives the Secretary of the Treasury the power to issue bonds without let or hindrance—a very dangerous power to delegate to one man. Congress should not abdicate its constitutional powers. We, the representatives of the people, should not lodge in the discretion of any man the right to mortgage future generations.

Remember, my gold-standard Democratic friends, the Republicans compel you to vote for this bill just as they have prepared it; gold standard, unlimited bonds, contracted currency, national-bank government, and all. If they were fair and honest about it, do you not think they would give you a chance to offer a substitute, or to at least amend it to meet your approval and to conform to the wishes of a great majority of your constituents? They do not need your votes. It is their bill—their party bill—and they will pass it no matter what you do. I believe the misguided Democrat who listens to the siren song of the money changers and votes for this bill will live to regret it.

My friends, one of the worst features, to my mind, of this bill is that part of it which consummates the alleged bargain made by MARK HANNA with the national bankers of Wall street during the campaign of 1896. They aided the Republicans then, and now they receive their share of the spoils. For three years the Republicans have waited and hesitated to pass this abomination, fearing the wrath of an outraged and indignant people. But another national campaign is near at hand. You need their help again, and in order to get it you abjectly and unconditionally surrender to the money power and turn the finances of a great Government over to the national banks. This bill delivers the goods bargained for. It is awful to contemplate, and the result can not be overestimated.

The powers this bill gives the national banks are far-reaching and most dangerous. It turns over to them the finances of the people—the lifeblood of trade and commerce—and gives them the right to contract or expand the currency at will. This right should never be surrendered by the Government. I say to you, and time will demonstrate it, that if you give the control of the money supply to the national banks they will soon absorb the wealth of the people and own the Government.

It is an enormous power; a power that can cause panic or prosperity, happiness or misery, to thousands and millions of people. I say it is too great a power to be given to any corporation, and if once given and set in motion for selfish ends and for sordid motives will be a fruitful source of woe and bankruptcy to hundreds and to thousands of our fellow-citizens. The audacity of this feature of the bill shows to what length the Republican party is now willing to go. Ten years ago this measure in my opinion would not receive 10 votes in this House.

Sir, you talk against trusts. This bill creates the greatest trust the world has ever seen—a national-bank trust, controlling the finances of a mighty people. Pass this measure, and the banks will be supreme. They will act in accord for a common purpose and be one great gigantic trust, octopus-like, with tentacles reaching all over and to every part of the land, holding, squeezing, and controlling every other trust, every other industry, and all the people. This bill marks a long stride in the gradual progress of the money power to enslave the industrial masses of the country.

If you enact this legislation, the banks will ere long own, control, and run the Government. It gives them the power to help or destroy, to make or to unmake. They can raise or lower the price of stocks and staple commodities whenever it is to their interest to do so. They can cause the stock market to go up or to go down and make for themselves or their beneficiaries fortunes out of helpless people and the unsuspecting public. They will have at their mercy the producers and the products of the land. They can boom stocks to the highest point, withdraw their support and send them tumbling down. They can mortgage every home, destroy competition, regulate prices, paralyze industry, stagnate commerce, and enslave toiling humanity.

In my opinion the secret motive for the passage of this bill is to confer these sweeping and unlimited powers on the national banks. It has been said that the national banking act is the greatest scheme ever invented by the ingenuity of man to rob his fellowman. If that is not true now, this bill will make it so.

My friends on this side of the Chamber, I appeal to you in the name of justice, in the cause of humanity, and for the best interests of Democracy to vote against this iniquitous scheme of the Republican party. Every friend of the people, every sincere patriot should vote against this bill. Let us all stand together and present a united front to this assault of the money power to enslave the industrial masses.

To-day, in the face of what is going on, every earnest, every honest, and every loyal Democrat should stand firm against the encroachments, on the rights of the people, of the national banks. They menace our Republic to-day and jeopardize the perpetuity of our free institutions. They are against the people, and their powers should be curtailed instead of extended. Jackson waged the most bitter and relentless war of his life against the United States Bank and finally destroyed that gigantic monopoly. If he had not, it would have destroyed the Republic. One of the greatest acts of his life was the veto of the bill extending the charter of that bank trust. In the light of what is going on now that veto message should be read by every citizen in our land.

This is a Republican bill and the Republican party stands sponsor for it. If it should become a law, it would give the monopoly of issuing money to the national banks, and hence the right to expand or contract the currency of the people whenever it suited their convenience. No corporation should have this power to make or destroy. It would deprive the Government of one of its greatest attributes of sovereignty and give to the national banks the right to paralyze, at their own will, every industry in the country. It is the most daring attempt the banks have ever made by law to seize one of the greatest weapons for good or evil known to civilized man. For the Government to surrender this prerogative and delegate away this power would be a crime against every citizen in this land and work woe and misery to millions yet unborn.

I am opposed to the Government delegating away its powers to the national banks. The Democratic party should vigorously oppose conferring any additional powers on or granting any greater privileges to the national banks. In my judgment they already possess entirely too much power. They are doing precisely to-day, only to a greater extent, what the United States Bank did in the days of Andrew Jackson. The right to coin and issue money is one of the greatest prerogatives of the Republic and one of the highest attributes of its sovereignty. It should not be delegated, transferred, assigned, or set over to any national bank, to any trust, or to any monopoly. As Democrats we should resist the encroachments of national banks on the liberties of the people with the same zeal and the same courage that Andrew Jackson in his day resisted the audacious claims of the United States Bank. And when the national banks impudently declare that the Government should go out of the banking business, we should answer that the banks should and must go out of the governing business.

In Jackson's day there was only one Nick Biddle. To-day there is a Nick Biddle in every national bank in the land. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have ten minutes more.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may be permitted to proceed for ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would suggest that if that is done it will disarrange the entire programme on that side.

Mr. SULZER. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD] is recognized for fifteen minutes.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, Mr. GROSVENOR, if I remember rightly, challenged any man on this side of the Chamber to repeat a single statement made in a Democratic campaign speech of 1896 that was still true, other than the opening remark, "Ladies and gentlemen." As long as he leveled that challenge at the leaders only I did not feel that it was necessary for me to reply; but when the gentleman challenged the members of this side from the highest to the very lowest in the ranks, I felt that in the concluding words he had about gotten my range and that his shells were falling in my neighborhood.

I had the pleasure of reading the campaign speech of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, delivered in the city where I reside, in 1896, and it was a very good campaign speech from the Republican standpoint; and when I read it, Mr. Chairman, and saw that he claimed, as Republican orators always do, that every good thing that ever came to the United States came from the Republican party—that it was the Republican party that caused the rain to fall and the grass to grow; that it was under the beneficent influence of that party the sun shone and the grain brought forth a hundredfold—I said in my campaign speech the next day that I thought his was the boldest effort to traffic in the power of the Almighty since Simon, the sorcerer, tried to buy from St. Peter the gift of the Holy Ghost. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

After listening to the arguments of gentlemen on that side of the Chamber on the question now before us, I submit to the gentleman from Ohio that statement will bear the test of time. If I rightly understood the gentleman from Iowa this morning, when we have a big crop at home and there is famine abroad and we get good prices for the crop, it is the Republican party that gives both the crop and the price, but when we have a small crop and get a good price because of the reduced amount of the crop, then it is the Lord that cuts down the crop and the Republican party that puts up the price.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that sort of argument needs no refutation; nor do I care to go into any general discussion of the question of finance. I think there is some truth in the statement that the people of the country are not caring very much for financial discussion; not because they have less interest in the subject, but because they are fully informed upon it and have made up their minds how they are going to vote.

There are, however, some features of this bill to which I desire to call the attention of the House, because I believe it bears embodied in it a more serious menace to the business interests of this country than was ever contained in the wildest scheme of finance yet presented to the people. After establishing the gold standard and practically making every debt, public and private, payable in gold, you proceed then, in order to make the gold more valuable, to lock up in a public pound, created in a department of the Treasury, every vagrant dollar that dares trespass in any way on the sacred territory of the gold reserve.

I hardly think my good friend from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] is entirely frank in his statement of that proposition; for when pushed to the question as to whether this money so redeemed was to be reissued, except a gold dollar was substituted for it, if I rightly understood him, he said that the Secretary of the Treasury in his discretion could exchange one fund for another; it could be transferred from the redemption fund to the fiscal fund and used in the discharge of Government expenses. I submit that the terms of the bill provide that the Secretary of the Treasury may exchange any money so redeemed for one purpose, and only one, and that is for the purpose of maintaining the gold reserve in the Treasury.

He can exchange this fund only as he can issue bonds and sell them; and if he can only exchange them in order to maintain the gold reserve, then I ask the gentleman from Indiana how and in what other way could he exchange them except by an exchange of greenbacks, Treasury notes, or silver certificates for the gold itself? I submit to you that under the terms of this measure whenever a dollar, however redeemed, has got into that division of issue and redemption, it never can go out again except a gold dollar comes into that pound, giving bond for the good behavior of that dollar so reissued. That is the fact. Now, what is the result of it? If this bill is enacted into law, we have a right to believe that the logical and natural consequences will follow.

Gentlemen say that money will not be redeemed; that no one will desire or attempt to redeem our present currency, whether it be silver certificates, Treasury notes, greenbacks, or silver dollars. If this bill is passed, the means by which they can be redeemed is furnished, the bankers get the power to compel redemption, and in the very same bill they are given a motive for the retirement and locking up of this money. You propose to substitute the national-bank currency for the currency now in existence, thus supplying the very strongest motive the national banks could have to lock up all other currency except their own, in order that their currency may be more valuable, and in order that no paper currency may be outstanding in the business world as a rival of their own.

How does it lie in your mouths, when you pass a measure proposing to lock up this currency and put into the hands of a powerful class both the right and the motive to lock it up—how does it lie in your mouths to say that that will not be done? I submit, Mr. Chairman, that in the ordinary and usual course followed by these men we will find in a few years a larger part of the United States notes and the Treasury notes and the silver certificates and the silver dollars locked up in the division of issue and redemption, and what will we have to take their place? Let us see. I do not remember the figures of the gentleman from Indiana, but I have the figures taken from the last report of the Treasurer of the United States applicable to conditions existing June 30, 1899.

There were outstanding then something over $310,000,000 of United States notes, commonly known as greenbacks, $92,000,000 of Treasury notes, $401,000,000 of silver certificates, and about $80,000,000, as given by the gentleman from Indiana, of silver dollars. When this redemption takes place, we will have locked up over $875,000,000 of currency, for which you tell us there will be in circulation an equal amount of gold taking its place. How did we get that gold? By selling $875,000,000 of bonds, on which we are to pay every year more than $26,000,000 of interest in order to get money to substitute for what you admit is now the currency of the country, meeting all the business needs, providing every use and function of money.

But of course it will not be done at once. If it were possible to bring to the door of the Treasury every silver certificate, every silver dollar, every greenback, and every Treasury note to-morrow, and to exchange them for gold, and place in the hands of the men now holding them the equivalent in gold, there would be no security that within five years from this date 50 per cent of that amount of gold would still be within the territorial limits of the United States. Gold is the one money that is cosmopolitan. It is the one that has no local habitation, no fixed place of abode. We settle with Europe a trade balance in our favor, and the banks of the country are full of gold. We pay the trade balance, and our gold eagles are winging their way to other lands. England raises the price of exchange, Russia desires to fill her war chests, and the gold of the United States is promptly drawn out and flies across the ocean in every vessel.

But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] has said that there are no balances to be paid when the Republican party is in power. He has said that we export gold only when we pay trade balances abroad, but that the trade is always in our favor when the Republican party is in power. I hold here the review of the foreign commerce of the United States, as published by the Bureau of Statistics, and I notice that from 1866 to 1876, every year a Republican year, there was but one year in all that time when the balance of trade was in our favor.

I wish to call the gentleman's attention also to the figures on the question as to whether gold is only exported to pay balances of trade. I find that in 1876 the balance of trade was more than $79,000,000 in our favor, and we exported $23,000,000 of gold. I find in 1884 the balance of trade was $72,000,000 in our favor, and we exported $18,000,000 in gold. In 1886 the balance of trade was $44,000,000 in our favor, and we exported $22,000,000 in gold. In 1891, another good Republican year, the balance of trade was $39,000,000 in our favor, and we exported $68,000,000 of gold.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Will the gentleman state the importations of gold for those years?

Mr. COWHERD. I am stating the excess of exportation over importation. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Let me say that in 1896, a Democratic year, and I offer this to show that the questions of importation and exportation of gold, as well as the balance of trade, are not affected by a question of Democratic or Republican office holding.

In 1896 the balance of trade was $102,000,000 in our favor, and the excess of exportation over importation of gold was $78,000,000. So I say that if you could make this exchange to-morrow there would be no security that in five years from this date 50 per cent of the gold so paid out would remain within the territorial limits of the United States. But it will not be done that way. Every man knows the way in which it will be done is this: The banker wishes to pay a balance in London. The merchant wishes to pay for a bill of goods in Germany. The broker can sell gold to advantage in Europe. They come to the vaults of the Treasury with five, ten, or fifty million dollars of greenbacks, Treasury notes, or

silver certificates, and the Treasurer takes the currency and pays them the gold.

The currency is locked up in the public pound, and the gold is promptly shipped to a foreign country. By that means the circulating medium of the United States is reduced by the amount of every dollar so exported and so exchanged, and this will go on year after year, just as necessity demands or just as exportation is profitable, until there is locked up in the vaults of the Treasury a large proportion of what is now the circulating medium of the country, and gold, instead of being out to take its place among the people, has been exported to pay foreign debts and balances. But gentlemen say that if we do not have the gold we will have instead of it a national banking currency.

I submit to you, gentlemen, that there is no security that you will have a national-bank currency under the provisions of this bill. Nor is there any justification for this great Government of the United States saying to the people it will surrender to any particular person or any combination of individuals or corporations the first and greatest power of a government and its most important function—the issuing and the coining of money. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Dangerous as it would be to surrender this great power to the banks, thus creating a money trust in addition to those now preying upon the people, and more powerful than all combined, yet even this would be less hurtful than the contraction your bill makes both possible and probable. For how under it can we be assured that even bank notes will be issued to take the place of the currency withdrawn? The bonds sold may never find their way into the hands of the banker.

When the bonds issued under the war revenue bill were sold it was the boast of the Administration that they had gone not into the hands of the national banker, but into the hands of the investor; that people of moderate means largely consumed the issue, and that the Government had so regulated its sale that they might go into such hands. If we should issue a half billion dollars in Government bonds, what is to prevent the great estates of the country taking at least half of that amount and holding them simply for the purpose of investment? But even should the bonds be bought by the banks, there is nothing to compel their use as a basis for the issuing of currency.

Bankers and brokers, like other men, will use the law, and legitimately use it, if the law is open to such use, to their advantage. If it rests in the hands of the holders of these bonds to contract the currency by their will, then what is to prevent them locking the bonds up in the vaults, secure in their investment and in the interest to be drawn on them, contracting the currency until ruin and disaster have swept over the business interests of the United States, and then bringing forth the bonds, issue currency upon them to the full face value, and with the money so issued buy for a song the property whose value was destroyed by the very contraction of the currency thus brought about?

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, this in the end would be the logical result and workings of the bill now before the House, and believing, as I said, that it is more dangerous to the commercial and business interests of the United States than the wildest scheme of finance ever devised or seriously offered to the American people, I shall surely vote against the measure.

Mr. OTEY. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the danger of permitting any coquetting with Republicans, and yet I will vote for this bill, provided you strike out all after the words "Be it enacted," etc., and substitute the words "the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to open at once the mints of this country to the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at the existing ratio of 16 to 1," and then add a resolution to suppress the explosions of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] and curtail the expansion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER]. [Applause.]

Taking them in reverse order, let me say that the eloquence of the gentleman from Iowa always rivets my attention and commands my admiration. I find much to commend in his gestures. [Applause and laughter.] He has expanded from the respectable white dollar, to be seen in every mart, to a disreputable mulatto standard, to coin which is a penitentiary offense. [Great laughter and applause.]

His eloquence on expansion reminds me of an old man in my town who was called on to explain "expansion." Mounting a goods box, he said: "This great Republican bird has plumed its wings and soared aloft and taken a view of this little world, and then lit, with one foot on the Asiatic shore, the other on the golden walls of California; has flopped its tail in the Arctic Ocean and pecked Filipinos off of the island of Luzon." [Laughter and uproarious applause.]

Mr. Chairman, a bird with such a stride must split somewhere or lose its footing on the one shore or the other. [Laughter and applause.] My genial friend, for I esteem him highly, is not certain "where he is at," has been, or whither he is going, and he answers queries like a man at the county court starting to leave. He bridled his horse and put on the saddle. He put the saddle on hind part before. A bystander said, "Mister, you've got that saddle on wrong end foremost." He looked at the meddler and said to him, "How do you know, sir, which way I'm going." [Great laughter and continued applause.]

As for my friend from Ohio—I call him friend because he is so friendly in his disposition generally—he has again exploded, and he has deposited his explosive prosperity all over this country on 25-cent corn, 20-cent oats, and the farm products generally, and the other farming interests—a kind of nervous prosperity. He reminds me of a stammerer, who, seeing a man with a parrot, walked up to him and said: "Sa-a-y, m-is-is-te-te-r, ca-ca-can tha-tha-tha-that p-p-p-p-arrot taw-taw-tawk pros-pros prosperity?" "Well," says the man, "if he couldn't talk better than you I'd kill him." [Laughter and uproarious applause, long and continued.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, no one would suppose that we had a great financial measure before us, judging by the remarks of the two distinguished gentlemen, but that we were again in the campaign of 1896.

Before I have anything to say on the pending bill, let me remind them and this House of a few salient points respecting that great campaign.

The white people of this country are composed of the German, Swede, Irish, Jew, Italian, and Anglo-Saxon. They are Caucasian—all Americans. The Anglo-Saxon predominates, and this race in this country is increasing with more certainty and with more rapidity than any other race on earth.

It is not subject to the causes (or has not hitherto been) which check the growth of races elsewhere, such as war, famine, and pestilence. Its inventive genius has lessened the devastation and destruction of war. Commerce, reenforced by steam and electricity and our own natural resources, has made famine impossible, and medical science has minimized pestilence and disease

We are the largest part of this great race, and in another century no people will rival the American people, if we but tempt not Providence too far.

This country is to be the great home of the white race, the principal seat of his power, the center of his life and influence. Our nation in what comprises wealth, viz, lands, mines, timber, horses, cattle, sheep, hogs, merchandise, railroads, etc., stands ahead of the world. Mulhall places our wealth at $82,000,000,000, the United Kingdom coming next with $59,000,000,000.

The English have grown great by attending to and interfering with the business of others, while we have outstripped her by attending to our own business.

Where does the intelligence, the cultivation, the genius, the industry, the integrity of character, the tenacity of purpose, and the bone and sinew reside? I say, in the white man of the United States.

You admit this, Mr. Chairman; and now, for the benefit of the statistician from Ohio, I desire to call his attention to the fact that William Jennings Bryan, whom he belittles, and whom the gentleman from Iowa ridicules, received just a little over 1,000,000 more of the votes of these great people than did William McKinley.

Yea, the Chicago platform received the approval of 1,000,000 more of these white citizens than did your St. Louis platform.

And I am slow to believe that the people of this country who think for themselves will run away with their sound judgment in the glamor of a little "cheap John" prosperity cry from the gentleman and join in the slogan of the other side of this House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill and shall vote against it.

First. Because its banking feature is a delusion and a snare; one not demanded by the country, and one which was originated for the benefit of the few to the injury of the many.

Second. Because I believe the gold standard in this country is iniquitous, contrary to the Constitution of our country, and certain to curtail the circulating medium of the country and hence certain to bring misery and suffering to the masses of the laboring people, especially to the conservative farming element of this land.

I am not opposed to banks, sir. They are as necessary as railroads. They are beneficial to communities. They should be encouraged. A nation of enlightened and advanced ideas can not do without them. The limited time at my disposal does not admit of a lengthy discussion of this feature of the measure, and yet to do so briefly would be to leave it undone.

I may advert, however, to a few of the effects of the workings under this bill should it become a law unamended. It is proposed to make national banks the only source of issue. It might be well to recall the fact that the greatest bank that ever existed was the Bank of Venice, which lived for three hundred years and never issued a note. In making the national bank the only source of issue you not only deprive the Government of the sovereign right to issue money, but you destroy $346,000,000 of the legal-tender money familiarly known as the greenback and the $150,000,000

Treasury notes, all money which our people love. The Government surrenders its prerogative, which no sovereign can relinquish with safety.

Banks of discount and deposit are blessings to a community. Where are the thousands of State banks which to-day can not issue a note? Where are the thousands of bankers who can not issue a note? We are told that the note holder is made secure. True; but was not the holder of a greenback, of a Treasury note, of a silver certificate, of a silver dollar secure?

The national bank deposits a Government bond as security for the note holder. Is not the note of an individual banker as secure when a deposit is made for the security of the note holder of the individual banker; and if so, why should not an individual banker be entitled to $100,000 of currency if he deposits $100,000 United States bonds as an association of gentlemen when they deposit $100,000 United States bonds?

Indeed, sir, if a poor widow and a frugal farmer have each a $1,000 United States bond, and the one is pinched with poverty and wants money, and the other needs money with which to replenish his stock, why, tell me, should not both be permitted to deposit these bonds with the United States Treasury and receive currency—greenbacks, if you please—and be thus favored, as well as an association of business men?

His bonds are as good as the bonds of an association. The note holder of neither can lose.

And do not banking associations fail as often as individual bankers?

I notice that the Comptroller's report shows that since 1865 387 national banks alone have failed.

That is not quite 1 a month for thirty-four years, or 11 every twelve months during thirty-four years.

It is a well-known fact that no such number of private or individual bankers failed in the same period.

It is true that 17 of these 387 were found solvent and were permitted to resume business. The claims proved against the remaining 370 amounted to $127,002,895, an average of about $350,000 each, all of which, even if eventually paid in dividends—which was not the case—crippled individuals and associations, widows, and orphans irretrievably. But it was never all paid, for a deficiency of $44,000,000 existed; 236 of the 370 had been wound up, 134 still undergoing the process of being wound up.

So we are led to inquire, Is this great concession to associations in banking desirable? Do the existing institutions invite or invoke it? Will it inure to the benefit of their customers? Will it inure to their own benefit?

In the nature of things this bill must of necessity contract the circulating medium. Let us suppose that it is determined to start a national bank in a town, the capital stock to be $150,000. The whole circulating medium in the town is $150,000; $150,000 is paid in on the capital stock.

The bank proposes to issue $100,000 currency. By reason of the gold-standard enactment into law United States bonds have risen to 50 per cent premium. The bank pays $150,000 for United States bonds, deposits them with the Treasury, and gets $100,000 circulating notes. The circulating medium is reduced to $100,000, or 33⅓ per cent, in this little town by the operation. It has $100,000 national-bank notes, now its only circulation, whereas before it had $150,000. The stockholder, it is true, will get 4 per cent on its bonds, equal to $4,000, and say 6 per cent on its circulation, equal to $6,000, a total of $10,000, while 6 per cent on the $150,000 alone would have yielded only $9,000. But would this be a beneficence to the people of that community? is the question.

I remember well when United States bonds reached the point that circulation was so little profitable that banks with $1,000,000 capital issued only $45,000 currency, no more than a national bank of $100,000 issued. Now, we all remember that when President Cleveland issued his last, the $62,400,000, bonds, he sent a message to Congress requesting Congress to have the word "gold" inserted, stating that if this were done he could get $16,000,000 more for the issue, an increase of 25 per cent. Congress refused by a majority vote on both sides of this House. This bill proposes to insert the word "gold" in all past, present, and future United States bonds.

If the word "gold," inserted when Mr. Cleveland suggested it, would have increased the selling price of bonds 25 per cent, will not the passage of this bill have a like effect on all the bonds now unpaid?

If so, can banks afford either to purchase bonds at 25 per cent advance over present prices, or to hold those they have with 25 per cent dead capital, in order to issue currency even at the face value?

If banks find that they can not afford to issue circulation, of course they will not do so, and hence banks with over $150,000 capital will issue only $50,000, and banks under to an amount one-fourth of the amount of their capital, and we will have bank circulation to an amount of about $95,000,000, all told, a contraction which would of necessity bring to the point of failure many customers of the banks.

Do all banks demand this law? Let us see what other banking interests there are in this country and compare their standing:

There are 3,583 national banks in the country.

There are 6,349 other banks in the country.

United States bonds owned by national banks	$346,114,413
United States bonds owned by other banks	173,973,738
Other bonds owned by national banks	305,428,927
Other bonds owned by other banks	1,353,621,422
Surplus and profits of national banks	342,321,752
Surplus and profits of other banks	418,798,087
Deposits of national banks	2,522,157,509
Deposits of other banks	4,246,500,852

National banks are banks of issue.

Other banks are banks of discount and deposit only.

But the system of taxation may be an inducement to banks to invoke the passage of the bill, for the Comptroller, as shown by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GILBERT], demonstrates that the burden of taxation will be less.

But however advocates of banking systems may want banks of issue, however profitable it may be, is it for the best interest of our people for the Government, to surrender to them that which is claimed to be a good and profitable thing for them, and yet deprive itself or the people of the same benefit?

If good for the corporation, then why not good for the Government?

The gentleman from Minnesota, to whom I always listen with great pleasure, a gentleman whose courtesy in debate is equaled only by the force with which he presents his views—I refer to the Hon. Mr. MCCLEARY—said that credit was an easier method of settlement than cash; that the vehicle of credit was the note; that if he owed a man $100, what law, said he, should forbid him to give his note if the creditor would accept it?

So if two, three, or more owed a debt, who was there or what law ought to step in and forbid the three joining in a note and giving it? And so, analyzing further, he said the issue of a national bank was nothing but the association loaning its credit.

Now, I quote him from memory and while I have not his exact words I state in effect what he said.

I would like to ask him—but he is not in his seat—why, if your proposition is sound, and I believe it is, should not State banks be allowed to issue their notes, too, for the same reason given by you? You will not say because the United States must protect the citizens of a State from wild-cat money; you stultify your own proposition if you do. You know that State banks can and would be organized, with all the light before us, that would issue as good money as any national bank could issue. You know that the national-bank system is modeled after the banks of Louisiana as they existed before the war.

But you also know that were you to permit such an amendment to this bill that it would break the backbone of the gold trust and the agency of the monster would be powerless.

Banking ought to be free. No more impediment should be placed in its path than in the unobstructed course of the merchant, the artisan the professional man.

By one stroke of the pen after next Monday William McKinley will destroy not only the money of the Constitution, but the money made constitutionally a legal tender by the edict of the Supreme Court.

Talk of endless chain. There never can be a more complete one than the one forged by this bill. Even standard silver dollars are made redeemable in a standard the coinage of which is to-day under our laws a felony.

There is no gold dollar known to our laws of coinage.

That banks are a benefit to us no one can deny. That I make no war on them is my purpose not to conceal. That they should have every encouragement and that the law should be so framed that humble individuals in the smallest villages should have the mantle of such benefits thrown over them by the agency of their own people in such associations as they may deem proper, regulated by wholesome laws, I contend is right. But to organize a giant monopoly by the Government farming out its financial prerogative to a few giant institutions in a few of the large cities of this country is not only a dangerous experiment but one the exercise of whose power will shake the very foundation of our Republic. But even this power dwindles into insignificance when we contemplate the misery in store for the millions of our people when once the inexorable gold standard is fixed on us. No country in the world has ever had such a drastic measure as the one contained in this bill, and the only hope is that the people will rise up and demand its obliteration.

Who is to suffer from the gold standard? Is it right that the bonds of the United States, the debts of the people, should be by legislation increased in value 25 per cent at one fell swoop? Is it honest? Is it just? Can such things be?

Here lies old Thirty-three per cent.
The more he got the more he lent;
The more he lent the more he craved.
Good Lord, can such a soul be saved?

So it will be said of the Republican Congress of 1899–1900.

The honorable gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCLEARY], whose speech in reply to the Hon. Charles A. Towne in the Fifty-fourth Congress was an effort worthy of his high standing, and came nearer answering the incomparable argument of his great colleague than any speech on the Republican side in that splendid debate, is lacking, I think, in candor when he attempts to show that Thomas Jefferson was in favor of the gold standard because, as he claims, he stopped the coinage of the silver dollar.

He says not a single silver dollar was coined from 1805 to—his speech has not yet been put in print—a certain time, say 1834. I think I quote him correctly.

Now, to illustrate the want of frankness of the foremost advocate of the gold standard on the Republican side, I want to say that the Bible says "there is no God," and I announce a truth indisputable as far as it goes, just as his assertion is true, thus limited.

But how uncandid do I appear when called to task and I say I omitted the context and should have said, "The fool in his heart hath said, 'There is no God.'"

Now, I asked him was it not a fact that there never was a single gold dollar coined till 1849? He admitted this was true.

The inevitable inference from his assertion was that no legal-tender silver was issued from 1805 to 1834. The inevitable inference followed from my question was that no legal-tender gold was issued till 1849. Both statements left out, "The fool in his heart hath said," etc.

Now, what are the facts? That from 1805 up to 1853 all the silver coined was legal tender, but it did not happen to be in dollar pieces; and all the gold coined up to the same time was legal tender, but did not happen to be in dollar pieces. And up to 1873 as much legal-tender silver had been coined as legal-tender gold.

I deny that Jefferson stopped the coinage of legal-tender silver, and my friend knows that he did not.

But, Mr. Chairman, I pass on. Who are to be affected by this great wrong? We are living in an age of mortgages. Why should the plow and the hoe be emblems of poverty? My answer is mortgages. Why should the laboring man bow to the whim of the plutocrat? Because of mortgages. Why should the mechanic build the great edifice and live in a hut? He is mortgaged. Why should the artisan build the carriages and go afoot? He is mortgaged. Why should the miner delve in the mines and unearth the coal while his children shiver in the cold? He is mortgaged. Why should the machinist erect the electric light and go to bed with a kerosene lamp? He is mortgaged. Why should the builder construct the splendid organs and church edifices and go to an humble meeting house? He is mortgaged. The pick of the railroad laborer, the tools of the carpenter, the engine, the cars, the carriages, the horses, the farm, the cabin, and the huts are mortgaged. Will the gold standard help them? The palace and incomes of the princes only are free.

The latest statistics that I can find show, in the United States:

Number of farms mortgaged	4,747,078
Amount borrowed	$4,896,771,112
Number of acres so mortgaged	581,054,962
On lots, number of mortgages	4,770,669
Amount borrowed	$7,198,106,681
Number of lots so mortgaged	8,027,031
The total acreage of farm lands	623,218,619

This does not include railroad mortgages, as you will see, nor other semipublic mortgages, as I may term them.

These will no doubt double the mortgages referred to.

Now, while our friends are boasting of prosperity I wish to invite their attention to the fact that whatever there may be of it, it is all on borrowed money. For we are told that we have some $2,000,000,000 in circulating medium in this country. Even if true, which I neither believe nor admit, it is every dollar borrowed. Not only do we owe it as a nation, but wipe out all national, State, and corporation indebtedness, and we have standing against farm lands alone double the amount of the alleged circulating medium, and, including mortgages on other lands, five times the amount.

What does this mean? Does it not mean that the time is coming when the Klondike and our own mines will fail to supply our wants measured by gold? And does it not mean that our mountains, swelling almost to bursting with the white metal, must and will be utilized?

What if we have $400,000,000 more gold now than we had in 1896? What if this did produce prosperity?

Has not the Democratic party always contended for volume of money? Has it not always (and was not that its slogan in 1896) demanded more money? Has not the Republican party always claimed that there was a sufficiency and that low prices were an evidence of prosperity—an evidence of sound finance? And yet now do they not claim that more money has produced more prosperity?

What if $385,000,000 additional gold has produced some prosperity? Would not an addition in three years of $150,000,000 of silver dollars only have added to this prosperity?

The leaves of memory served to make a mournful rustling in the dark ways of Republican finance.

The Republican leaders, the great men in the ranks, have repudiated all such measures as this bill. Mr. McKinley did it when a member of Congress. He did it when he accepted the nomination on the St. Louis platform. He did it when he sent a commission to Europe to secure international agreement.

There must be awful memories as the light of bygone days flashed from the graves of your great men. "Take heed to yourselves, my Republican friends, that your hearts be not deceived and go turn aside and serve other gods and worship them."

In the language of Ezekiel, "I have given you up to the delusions of your own heart and justly left you to your own blindness that you shall not discern your own self-deceivings."

You are perpetrating a wrong on your country that is now without remedy. It will be corrected in time, and that in the no distant future.

But I am one whom you have not deceived. I began my service in Congress by sounding the danger signal, and I have kept it up without intermission; and now that this bill marks the climax of Republican treachery to the people of this country, I may feel at least some satisfaction in having attempted to avert this disaster.

In 1895 I published the following circular and sent it out to our people. Thousands of them were returned to me, and the signatures to them were numbered by thousands. And there is no surprise in my State at the exhibition of deception on the part of the Republican party as evidenced by this bill:

The undersigned, deprecating the combination of the money power of this country and England with the Republican party to enforce the single gold standard and to further contract the currency, believing that we voice the sentiments of the Democratic party of the great West and South, hereby declare:

I. That we demand the free coinage of silver at the existing ratio of 16 to 1.

II. We oppose the efforts of this combination—

1. To retire the $347,000,000 legal-tender notes (greenbacks).

2. To retire the $152,000,000 Treasury notes (issued under the Sherman bill).

3. To issue in their stead $500,000,000 gold interest-bearing bonds, as an additional and unnecessary burden on our already overburdened taxpayers, and especially iniquitous as against the best interests of the agricultural industry of our country.

4. To destroy the existing volume of silver money by restricting it to a mere subsidiary or token money, stripped of its legal-tender functions.

III. That this combination conceals its determination to contract the currency by retiring $500,000,000 greenbacks and Treasury notes, in which, if successful, then to retire the $400,000,000 silver dollars and to prevent any further increase of currency by a continuance of the 10 per cent tax on State banks, thus leaving the country with gold and national-bank notes as "the money of the realm" and the only circulating media; and we believe that the success of such action will cause a further reduction in prices and wages, prove disastrous to our industrial interests, and precipitate another panic the like of which this country has never experienced.

The currency or House bill No. 1 completes the crimes charged in this indictment. In 1895 I believed it was the purpose of the Republican party to do just what this bill provides; so I then predicted and so it is decreed.

No amendments will be permitted. It must go through just as a solid shot. Examine the bill. Compare it with this circular, and it will be seen that the bill provides, virtually in the language of this circular, that "gold and national-bank notes are to be the only money of the realm," and that bonds are to be issued, principal and interest payable in gold! gold!! gold!!!

But again, is this country ready for contraction of the currency? Can even the Republicans stand this? We know that plutocrats are their masters and trusts are their protégés; that expansion is their allurement and imperialism their poem. But what of contraction? To take out of circulation $346,000,000 of greenbacks, money that all people want and that the Supreme Court said was good as the best; to retire the Treasury notes, $157,000,000; redeem the silver dollars, $500,000,000.

Is the country ready for this? They will recall that there were twenty Presidents, beginning with George Washington, down to Grover Cleveland, every one of whom was opposed to the single gold standard. They will recall that not a single illustrious man that this country has produced has advocated the single gold standard. There was not one of them who did not believe in bimetallism and the free coinage of gold and silver; not one who did not conform to our Constitution, which provides that Congress shall have power to coin money and regulate the value thereof and that no State shall make anything but gold and silver coin a legal tender.

Not one who did not believe that the "power to tax was the power to destroy," and hence opposed to discrimination in favor of gigantic trusts and corporations, of which the gold trust (now to be inaugurated in the beginning of the twentieth century) is the most gigantic and dangerous of all. Not one of them who was not the friend of him who follows the plow and hoes the hill, and ever endeavored to lift him up and not press him down.

You tell us of prosperity. Where is it? Do you find it in the humble home? Your eyes are fixed, not on the hut, but on the palace; not on the laboring man, but on the banker; not on the

pinched and careworn face of the toiling mother, with her hungry children, but on the queens of society and the gifts of royalty.

A war was thrust upon us. Armies had to be fed; armies had to be transported and clothed. Speculation became rife. The great trusts took charge of William McKinley, body and soul, and of the Government. Idle labor was employed. Money hitherto locked up was turned loose. The great cotton fields of the South, the grain of the farmers of the West, the products of the fields were put in motion, and the agricultural exports brought in a golden harvest of trade balance—$385,000,000 added to our money. Spindles had to be started, furnaces went into blast, iron advanced. More money was the mainspring that started the wheels of industry. Then sporadic prosperity ensued.

Is it "fait accompli" for all time? God grant that it is. But must it be said that the cruel monster war accomplished that which thirty years of profound peace and abundant harvest failed to accomplish? Must we resort to war to produce prosperity when peaceable means are always within our grasp, if we use those means which a kind Providence has given us? God forbid. Must we measure the flow of human blood by dollars and cents? Are you prepared to be Anglicised? Is all this simply to be an ally of England? It tends that way, Mr. Chairman.

Is our great farming interest to be sacrificed to the greed of conquest? Where is England's boasted agricultural interest of 1800? Where the thrift of her farmer of 1816, when the gold standard was fastened partially on her people?

"Gone where the woodbine twineth," in the language of a New York banker.

With the Romans agriculture was the fundamental idea. A tract of land was allotted to each citizen. Senator Curias said:

> I am not counted a good citizen, but rather a dangerous one to the State, because I can not content myself with 5 acres of land.

Cato, distinguished orator, general, and statesman, was loudly commended for having written a book on farming. The senate ordered the 28 books on agriculture of Mago to be translated into Latin for the use of the Roman farmers; and so in other nations of the world the farmers' interest was considered and protected, and yet in the Congress of the United States he is forgotten, neglected—aye, despised. The business man of the bank counter, the industrial head of the trust, is honored and worshiped. The superstructure must be erected, while the foundation is neglected. Can such an edifice stand? It is not the per capita of circulation that tells the tale of the needs of a nation, but it is the proportion of circulation to wealth. And we must note the distinction between wealth and money.

What matters it about circulation in a country barren of wealth? The per capita of $100 would matter little with no wealth to move.

On the other hand, what matters wealth without an abundant medium of exchange?

We find from Mulhall that our wealth is $82,000,000,000. On this basis we have in this most progressive and the wealthiest of all nations $1 of circulation to $40 of wealth; in France, $20; in England, $15.

Now, let us suppose our circulation was distributed. Here is a farmer whose farm is worth $10,000. This is his wealth—his proportion of the $82,000,000,000. What would his proportion of the circulation be?

If $40 wealth gives $1 circulation, how much ought $10,000 be entitled to? Two hundred and fifty dollars to run a farm worth $10,000. He must make a start, and he must borrow. If the circulating medium was $1 for every $20 of wealth, he could borrow $500 with as much ease and at the same cost as he could $250 when wealth was 40 to 1. If the circulation was one dollar for every ten of wealth, he could borrow $1,000 as easily as he could $250 under existing conditions. Four billion dollars of circulation to-day would about put us on a par with France. If we had $5,000,000,000, we should be about on a par with England. And when we remember that our circulation is congested in the cities and manufacturing districts, how much more unjust to the farmer is our contraction of the currency.

If the bill goes into effect our circulating medium will be only $1 to every $80 of wealth, and the pinching will be renewed.

The people of this great country are to silently submit to such nefarious schemes to advance the interests of trusts, Mr. Chairman, and there is a death struggle going on. Trusts will conquer the people, and their manhood will be assassinated and their liberties will be gone, or the people will kill and conquer the trusts. Which will it be? It is for the intelligent, industrious, and courageous white American citizen to say at the ballot box. Which will they choose?

Why should we model after England? Why should we not, without waiting for precedent, not only command the gold but the silver of our country to do duty? We can pay with commodities every demand from foreign countries.

We have 70,000,000 people; 3,600,000 square miles of territory on which the sun never sets, for as it rises in Maine its golden rays are just dying out in the twilight of Alaska.

Our trade between the States is greater than the whole foreign trade of Great Britain. And this is free trade, too; and we need all the silver as well as gold of our own mines to continue our development and trade, yet in their infancy. Texas, at the one extreme, the largest of our States, an empire in itself, would make 212 States the size of Rhode Island, the smallest of our Commonwealths.

Rhode Island wants the single gold standard. Texas wants bimetallism. In the Senate Rhode Island neutralizes the vote of this great empire of the South, within whose confines the New England borough might be lost beyond the hope of discovery.

The cotton of the South, the grain of the West, furnish the balance of trade that gives the trade balance, the gold, on which the alleged prosperity so generally diffused is based.

Yet these great producers of the South and West appeal in vain for the money guaranteed them by the Constitution, while New England and the trusts hold the conscience of the imperial power of a once free Republic and decree Gold! Gold!! Gold!!!

Every man, woman, and child in the world could settle in Texas and have each a lot 50 by 100 feet and not be crowded as much as New York City, and she can raise all the food products and cotton needed in the world.

We have about as many miles of railroads as the rest of the world combined, one of which alone transfers more tonnage annually than all the ships of England.

The tracks of our railroads, if laid parallel, would encircle the world seven times, and trains run over them every year traverse a distance four times the distance from our earth to the moon.

One-fourth of our area is still in virgin forests, and our annual cut of lumber, if measured in dollars, is more than all the gold, silver, coal, iron, copper, lead, and zinc mined in the United States, and yet we are ahead in mining. From 194,000 acres of coal lands we produce one-third of all the world's output.

The product of 1898 would have taken a bin to hold it which would have measured 10 feet by 45 from New York to San Francisco.

We have 75,000 to 80,000 post-offices—double that of any other nation—and of the 9,000,000,000 letters the United States mails carry one-half. Our farming interest is ahead of that of all nations; it is one-fifth of our national wealth, and yet stifled by financial legislation.

Our boast has been that the classes in other nations rule the masses; that in other nations the peasant is the slave of the landlord; the mechanic and laborer are the tools of the taskmaster; that both are shut out from aspirations. No future lies before them but dependence or want.

But that here—

> My country, 'tis of thee,
> Sweet land of liberty,
> Of thee I sing.

Take care, Mr. Chairman, lest this bill causes a revulsion to—

> My country, 'tis of thee,
> Land of plutocracy,
> Of thee I moan.

The last words of Washington were, "It is well." Of Napoleon, "Tête d'armée."

The one dying in the light of liberty achieved for his people, beloved and honored, the first in the hearts of his countrymen, the exponent of a free and prosperous people and happy in the confidence of their giant strength and confident of that growth of power that was to astonish an admiring world and jealous of the glorious name of American.

The other on his lonely rock of St. Helena, sighing for his freedom; a caged lion, feared by friends and despised by foes.

> A desolator desolate,
> A victor overthrown;
> The arbiter of others' fate
> A suppliant for his own.

And like your party, Mr. Chairman, which this bill dooms to destruction, as the torch at Moscow doomed his brilliant career, he thought not of the millions of desolate homes, of sighing widows and weeping orphans, but only of the army, his instrument of power and tyranny; but dies recalling the fact that there was an element that had spoken and destroyed him.

> But where is he, the modern, mightier far,
> Who, born no king, made monarchs draw his car;
> * * * * *
> Whose game was empires, and whose stakes were thrones?
> Whose table earth—whose dice were human bones?

But I have faith in the American people. I do not believe that they will indorse this measure. It may be that Providence, in its inscrutable wisdom has started the Republican party on this path that it may accomplish its own undoing, and in the language of Isaiah I would say as he said to the king:

> Let not Hezekiah deceive you; for he shall not be able to deliver you.

[Applause.]

I present here as part of my remarks the admirable bill of the Hon. W. C. ADAMSON, of Georgia.

A bill to provide a uniform and stable currency for the United States of America.

Be it enacted, etc., That the lawful currency of the United States of America shall consist of such standard silver dollars as have been or may hereafter be coined, and such gold coins of any denomination as have been coined (since July 31, 1834), or may hereafter be coined at the mints of the United States; such fractional subsidiary coin of silver, nickel, or copper as has been emitted or may hereinafter be provided by law; such legal-tender United States notes, called greenbacks, as have been or may hereafter be issued; the Treasury notes issued under the law of July 4, 1890, and coin certificates as hereinafter provided. All of said forms of currency, except the subsidiary coin, shall be full and absolute legal tender for all debts and dues, public or private, without exception or reservation and regardless of contract, stipulations, or efforts to evade. Of the subsidiary currency the copper coin shall be legal tender at its nominal value to the amount of 25 cents, the nickel coin to the amount of $1, and the silver to the amount of $10.

SEC. 2. That the standard of value shall be the dollar of silver and its multiple of gold (eagles or $10, half eagles or $5, and double eagles or $20) at the present legal ratio and of the weight and fineness now provided by law, which coins, and no others, shall be coined and issued from the mints of the United States for any persons who may deposit at the mints for coinage on private account either gold or silver bullion, all of which shall be received when offered in lots of not less than $100 in value, and coined without charge for mintage, the silver into dollars and the gold into their multiples, all of which coin shall have and bear such devices and inscriptions as are now provided by law for such coins, and the coins shall be delivered to the depositor of the bullion from which they were coined.

SEC. 3. That any person depositing at any mint either gold or silver bullion for coinage may, as soon as it can be assayed and its value ascertained, receive certificates of deposit for so many dollars of coin as the bullion would make when coined. For this purpose there shall be kept at the mint a supply of coin certificates furnished by the Secretary of the Treasury. When the bullion for which certificates are issued is coined, the coin shall be covered into the Treasury. Any person depositing at the Treasury any number of dollars of either gold or silver coin in amounts exceeding $1 shall receive from the Treasurer like coin certificates for as many dollars as are deposited. There shall never be issued a certificate for gold or silver as such, but all of such coin certificates used at the mints and the Treasury shall be of the same form and expressly for coin, and shall be redeemable in coin on demand at the Treasury when presented in sums not less than $100.

SEC. 4. That the fractional subsidiary coin now authorized by law shall be manufactured on Government account from bullion and metal purchased at its market price, paid for with legal-tender coin or Treasury notes. The amount of fractional currency shall be increased until $200,000,000 shall have been emitted, up to which amount it shall be kept in circulation among the people by using it to the amount of its legal-tender limit in every payment and disbursement made by the Government; which fractional currency may at any time be exchanged at the Treasury, in sums not less than $100, for legal-tender coin or Treasury notes.

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall prepare and issue in denominations of $5 and multiples thereof legal-tender Treasury notes of the United States, commonly called greenbacks, which, like those heretofore issued, shall be convertible on demand at the Treasury into legal-tender coin, and shall keep such Treasury notes in circulation to the amount, including those now in circulation, of $500,000,000 by paying them out upon all dues and disbursements of the Government. No more than $500,000,000 of such Treasury notes shall be in circulation at one time, and whenever the amount outstanding is below that sum they shall be paid out in all disbursements by the Treasurer.

SEC. 6. That all obligations of the United States, whether bonds, Treasury notes, or coin certificates, when presented for payment shall, as now provided by law for all existing liabilities except gold certificates, be payable at the option of the Government in any legal-tender coin in the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall so exercise that option as to pay out the coin of that metal which is more plentiful in the Treasury and more easy and likely to flow in and remain plentiful.

SEC. 7. That section 3412 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, edition of 1878, is hereby repealed, and it shall not hereafter be lawful for the Government in any wise to participate in, control, or assume responsibility for the issue or redemption of circulating notes of any bank; nor shall any bank of issue, State or Federal, be required to pay any tax to the United States Government upon notes issued and paid out, whether its own or those of other banks.

SEC. 8. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall, as rapidly as possible, cause to be coined at the mints of the United States into standard silver dollars all the silver bullion in his custody, both corpus and seigniorage, cover the coined dollars into the Treasury, and to pay them out when coin is needed to redeem any paper of the Government payable in coin.

SEC. 9. That it having been heretofore "declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money," and "to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, to be secured through international agreement or safeguards of legislation," and that "the efforts of the Government should be steadily directed to the establishment of such a safe system of bimetallism," the Congress now redeems those pledges by this enactment, which provides all the safeguards of legislation necessary to secure the desired end. All other nations which desire to do so are at liberty to adopt the same system, with the assurance that fluctuation in the values of the two metals can not be prevented by discriminating legislation against either, but that permanent stability can be assured only by according the two metals the same legislative consideration and reestablishing that equality of condition which allows the people, in making their payments, the unrestricted use of either or both. To this righteous and honest course the United States of America will adhere in future, regardless of the machinations of speculators or the policies of other nations.

SEC. 10. That all laws and parts of laws in conflict with this act or any part thereof are hereby repealed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] is recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Chairman, before I touch upon the merits of this bill, I feel it my duty, having been a member of the Fifty-fifth Congress, to give to the members, especially the new members, of this House and the people who are to suffer by it, some of the history of this proposed legislation in the Fifty-fifth Congress. You will remember, Mr. Chairman, that in 1897 we were called here in extra session a few days after we were elected, about March the 15th, and that the Speaker of this Republican House refused to appoint any committees except those he wanted, the Committee on Rules and the Committee on Ways and Means. You will remember further that all through this session of the Fifty-fifth Congress, though it sat here from the 15th of March until the last of July, all it did was to pass the unfortunate Dingley bill, which perpetuated a deficit in the Treasury which had been inherited from the bond-producing McKinley bill under the Administration of President Harrison.

You will remember that from day to day, after the passage of that bill in this House, the Democratic party urged the Republican majority and the Speaker of this House to appoint the committees in order that we might proceed in due course to the investigation of the important questions proposed for legislation by both Democrats and Republicans. The Speaker was upheld in his reckless and revolutionary assumption of power. No other business was permitted. The House met daily only to adjourn, and then, growing tired of this useless frivolity, the Republicans adjourned it for four days at a time, which was unquestionably in contravention of the Constitution, as was then abundantly shown. At last the President ended this unprecedented folly by sending in, just ninety minutes before the hour for final adjournment, a message recommending the passage of a currency bill, and it was immediately passed without having been referred to any committee and without the slightest deliberation or discussion. I have before me that message. He recommended for passage the Indianapolis gold-standard bill, designed to rivet more permanently upon the statute books the gold standard, and that too while the Wolcott monetary commission was in Europe, at the President's instance, trying to induce other nations to help us drop the gold standard. The President said:

A notable assembly of business men, with delegates from 29 States and Territories, was held at Indianapolis in January of this year. The financial situation commanded their earnest attention, and after two days' session the convention recommended to Congress the appointment of a monetary commission. I commend this report to the consideration of Congress.

The report, thus indorsed and commended by the President, said in part:

This conference declares that it has become necessary that a consistent, straightforward, and deliberately planned monetary system shall be inaugurated, the fundamental basis of which shall be, first, that the present gold standard should be maintained.

Notwithstanding this measure involved the determination of an issue of most transcendent importance, the President advised Congress to give it no thought or consideration, well knowing that within the few minutes left to it before adjournment it could not do so, urging its immediate passage thus:

This subject should receive the attention of Congress at this special session. It ought not to be postponed until the regular session.

If the President was working in good faith for international bimetallism, he should never have sent, as long as he was so laboring, this message to Congress. Not content with that, he appealed for immediate legislation thereon. It must seem to any fair-minded man that it is a plain case of duplicity and bad faith on the part of the President.

In addition to this, he appointed Mr. Gage, an ultra gold monometallist, Secretary of the Treasury, who indorsed personally and officially the gold plans of the Indianapolis convention, which in turn were indorsed and recommended by the President, as I have shown, to Congress for immediate action. Here was a complete surrender by the President to Mr. Gage's gold monometallic plans, and very naturally it destroyed all practical hopes of success of the Wolcott International Bimetallic Commission then at work in Europe. We are not surprised that Senator WOLCOTT in his speech in the Senate took to task Mr. Secretary Gage, and I shall expect him now to be equally as painstaking in condemning the President for following in the steps of Mr. Gage in urging the passage of the bill we are now considering. Senator WOLCOTT said in the Senate:

Here, Mr. President, I should naturally end this account of our negotiations, negotiations which are still pending and undetermined. The extraordinary statements, however, lately made by the Secretary of the Treasury, and which, unexplained, must seriously affect the future of any further attempts toward securing international action, require some reference at this time.

When Congress convened on the 6th of last month the President, in his reference to the subject of international bimetallism, spoke earnestly and anxiously of his desire to see an international bimetallic agreement consummated. His assurances gave renewed hope to bimetallists all over the country, and seemed final and conclusive answer to those who had claimed that the President was not in earnest in his efforts toward international bimetallism. For myself, I needed no such proof. I had again and again been made to know how genuine was the President's devotion to this settlement of the vexed question. Within a fortnight after this, with no event meanwhile which would change existing conditions, the Secretary of the Treasury, in support of a bill which he has prepared respecting the currency, said as follows to a committee of Congress:

"The objects I have in mind in the series of provisions offered by me are four in number:

"1. To commit the country more thoroughly to the gold standard, remove, so far as possible, all doubts and fears on that point, and thus strengthen the credit of the United States both at home and abroad."

The two statements are utterly at variance and contradictory to each other. They can not be reconciled. This is not the proper occasion to analyze the bill of the Secretary. It will reach limbo long before it reaches the

Senate. He proposes to capitalize the premium on our bonds sold recently and to make of them, with others to be issued, a security definitely payable in gold.

The Secretary forgets that only a few months ago, when the country was in dire distress, we were compelled to pay $9,000,000 for the privilege of keeping the word "gold" out of some of these very bonds. He ought not to forget, for the bank of which he was president, it was said, got some of the bonds and received some of the proceeds of that deplorable transaction. But I do not intend to discuss the bill which the President's message specifically does not indorse, and it is premature to criticise the Secretary's Republicanism, for his advent into the party and the Cabinet were practically contemporaneous. We must accept the situation.

In my opinion, the great majority of the members of the Republican party are bimetallists, and the fact that they are misrepresented by a Cabinet officer is not pleasing, but it is endurable. The selection of the members of his official household is the President's own affair, and so long as he stands upon the question of bimetallism where he has ever stood there is no serious ground for apprehension. But even in the inconceivable event that the Chief Magistrate of this people should, in the exercise of his judgment, determine to countenance the final fastening upon this country of the burdens of the gold standard, I trust we may still warrant for faith and hope in the pledges of the party and the wisdom of its counsels.

We will cross our bridges when we come to them. The time when this country will submit to the final imposition of gold monometallism is far away. Whatever differences of opinion may exist as to the ability of this country to maintain alone the parity between silver and gold, there is no question that the concurrence of other nations would help and not hinder the cause of bimetallism in the United States, and efforts to secure it ought to receive the cordial support of every citizen who is opposed to gold monometallism.

Senator WOLCOTT at that time undertook, as you see, to defend the President as a friend in good faith of international bimetallism, but he will now see that the President was even then, as now, as much in the mud as Mr. Secretary Gage was and is now in the mire.

The bill we are now considering is the outgrowth of a Republican caucus, a caucus which was so very intelligent and learned as to be able to pass on, digest, and adjudge in one night's session that this, above all others, is the proper bill to be enacted into law. Of course it must have been submitted to the President and approved by him, and will finally receive his approval as President.

It can not truthfully be said that this is a continuation of the existing gold standard, and the President can not hide behind that plea, for it makes all our public obligations (now payable in gold or silver, or both, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury) payable in gold and gold only, and that, too, by law, the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury being abrogated entirely.

And more, this bill further demonetizes all of our other legal-tender silver coins. It says in effect they are not and shall not be tender money in payment of our past, present, or future public obligations. They may remain as they are, tender in the payment of the plain man's obligation, but they are not good enough for the bondholder, who must be paid in gold and gold only. This bill debases and discredits our silver and paper tenders, which of course tends to destroy their usefulness to a very great extent. This bill, then, does not and can not perpetuate the "existing gold standard," but extends and makes it apply, and by law, to each and all of our public obligations, which has never been the law heretofore. But I shall later on allude to this view of the bill.

The currency bill of 1897, sent by the President to that extra session of the Fifty-fifth Congress just ninety minutes before the adjournment for the session, was, by the edict of the Speaker and a willing Republican majority, passed by the House without examination then and there, and went to a Democratic Senate, where it sleeps.

During the last session of the Fifty-fifth Congress the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures and the Committee on Banking and Currency, dominated by the Republican party, being unable to agree upon a currency bill among themselves, were unable to report one here that they could even debate decently without falling out among themselves and denouncing each other here on the floor of the House to such an extent that one of the bills which they brought in here was sent back to the committee.

So divided were they upon the proposition of riveting the gold standard upon the country that the chairman of the Republican caucus, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] took it upon himself to appoint a committee of Republicans only, who should sit through the summer at Atlantic City and prepare a bill. But not one of the members of that committee was a member of either the Committee on Banking and Currency or the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures of the Fifty-fifth Congress. It was charged here on this floor, March 3, 1899, by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Walker, a Republican and member of the Fifty-fifth Congress, whose speech I hold in my hand, and it is a notorious fact, that not a member of those two committees of the House was appointed a member of the committee which was to prepare this bill. It is "reported" by a committee of Republicans, not a committee of the House, to a committee of the Republican caucus.

Mr. Walker in his speech quotes the action of the caucus as given in the Post and Star, the latter being an Administration paper. The facts then given by Mr. Walker are undisputed even by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], who was present and heard Mr. Walker's speech. I will insert in the RECORD that portion most pertinent which Mr. Walker read in the presence of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], reading only the explanation the gentleman from Ohio made of this unprecedented practice:

[Washington Post, February 3, 1899.]

A CAUCUS ON FINANCE—STRONG SHOWING FOR MONETARY LEGISLATION IN HOUSE—TO NAME A COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN.

General HENDERSON made a strong speech in support of the plan embodied in his resolution, and pointed out the advantage of having this important subject committed to a body serving both in this Congress and the next, and representing the various sections of the country, and, as far as possible, its diverse business and economic interests.

CANNON IN DOUBTFUL MOOD.

Mr. CANNON said he did not think any financial legislation could be carried through until after the next Presidential election.

Representative PAYNE said it would permit careful consideration of the question during the coming months, and the preparation of such a well-matured plan as would commend itself on all hands.

Resolved, That a committee of eleven members of the present House of Representatives, who are members of the Fifty-sixth Congress, shall be appointed by the chairman of this caucus for the purpose of considering monetary legislation and submitting their recommendations to a Republican caucus at the first session of the Fifty-sixth Congress, with authority to confer with a like committee from the Senate. Adopted.

[Washington Evening Star, February 16, 1899.]

FOR CURRENCY REVISION—REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE SELECTED BY REPRESENTATIVE GROSVENOR.

Representative GROSVENOR, of Ohio, chairman of the Republican caucus, has announced the appointment of the following Republicans of the House as members of the committee provided by the resolution of the Republican caucus on currency legislation: Representatives HENDERSON, of Iowa; PAYNE, New York; DALZELL, Pennsylvania; KERR, Ohio; HAWLEY, Texas; LOVERING, Massachusetts; OVERSTREET, Indiana; CURTIS, Kansas; LOUD, California; BABCOCK, Wisconsin, and MORRIS, Minnesota.

It will be observed that no member of the Banking and Currency Committee or the Coinage, Weights, and Measures Committee is put upon this committee. Referring to this fact, Representative GROSVENOR said:

"I made the appointments in that way after full and free conference with most of the members of the committees and with prominent members of the House. It must not be for a moment understood that the omission of members of these committees from the caucus committee was intended to in any wise reflect upon the distinguished gentlemen who compose these two great committees, and, on the contrary, the idea prevailed that inasmuch as any bill or bills which might be agreed upon by the Republican caucus would have to go to one or both of these committees for their final action and report, it would be unwise to ask these gentlemen to make any decision or take sides in any way upon any dispute of policy or detail, and it was deemed wisest and best that the committees should remain wholly independent and noncommittal as to the details of the report, and be free to act independently, with the final judgment of each member uninfluenced and unaffected by the action of the caucus committee. In this way we will ultimately have the opinion of the caucus committee of 11 members of the House and of such committees as the Senate may see fit to provide, and then the deliberate judgment of the proper committee of the House."

I charge that the gentleman from Ohio, the leader and representative of the President on the floor of this House, promised to report his Atlantic City offspring not to the House, but to the "proper committee of the House," and I charge that he has broken his promise not only to his party but to the people at large. The members of the Fifty-sixth Congress are deprived by this action of "the deliberate judgment of a proper committee of this House on this bill." It was the first bill introduced in the House and is "No. 1" on the Calendar. It was never "reported" by any committee of this House. Briefly put, the history of this bill outside of the House, before the House had any jurisdiction of it whatever, is about as follows:

This caucus committee of the Fifty-fifth Congress, all Republicans—named by the caucus chairman, Mr. GROSVENOR—last summer repaired to Atlantic City for the consideration of this vital and fundamental legislation that reaches down into the pockets of every taxpayer of the land and conserves the private welfare of the bondholder—the running mate of the Republican party. After due consideration they swallowed their past records in behalf of bimetallism and the Constitution, washing their hands of "gold and silver;" and after "due consideration," before breakfast, "*Resolved*, That the hungry and naked bondholder must be clothed and fed as never before. We will say this time gold, gold, much fine gold, must be writ by the heavy hand of the law in the face of his bond of the past, the present, and the future. The people be damned. The bondholders put us in power and we must stick by them."

And they are like a band of brothers. The secretary of the national Republican committee of 1896, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. OVERSTREET, the friend of Wall street, brings their bill to this House—not to a committee of the House—introduces it; the Rules Committee fix a time—"twelve hours on a side"—for debate by 357 members of this House, and then it is to, as it will, "pass the House without the deliberate judgment of the proper committee of the House," but only the "judgment" of a dumb, driven Republican caucus. Such is the history, so far, of this bill, which later, as law, is to draw the lifeblood of the nation that the bondholder and money ghoul may feast.

I desire now to call your attention in a brief way to the attempts which have previously been made to force "gold" bonds upon the American people.

Congress, in an effort to strengthen our public credit by an act entitled "An act relating to the public debt," endeavored to make

our "public indebtedness" payable in gold, just as it tried to do by this bill, but the amendment was defeated in the Senate by a vote of 8 to 34, as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Cole, Davis, Henderson, Morton, Pomeroy, Robertson, Ross, Spencer—8.

NAYS—Messrs. Anthony, Cattell, Conkling, Conness, Corbett, Cragin, Dixon, Edmunds, Ferry, Fessenden, Frelinghuysen, Grimes, Harlan, Harris, Howard, McDonald, Morgan, Morrill of Maine, Morrill of Vermont, Nye, Osborn, Patterson of New Hampshire, Sawyer, Sherman, Stewart, Sumner, Thayer, Tipton, Wade, Warner, Welch, Willey, Williams, Wilson—34.

We are not surprised at this, as it is a fact our war bonds "sold for 60 cents on an average."

Later, in 1869, Congress passed an act entitled "An act to strengthen the public credit," making our "public indebtedness" payable in coin, which, in the language of the Supreme Court, means the gold and silver dollar, the option belonging to the Government to pay in either or both coins.

Senator Edmunds voted against making our bonds payable in gold only in 1869, but reversed himself in 1878 and offered an amendment in the Senate making our bonds by law payable in gold only; but properly his measure was defeated by a vote of 18 to 44.

The amendment read as follows:

That all the bonds of the United States issued or authorized to be issued under the said acts of Congress hereinbefore recited are payable, principal and interest, in gold coin or its equivalent; and that any other payment, without the consent of the creditor, would be in violation of the public faith and in derogation of his rights.

Those voting "yea" were:

Anthony, Barnum, Bayard, Burnside, Christiancy, Conkling, Dawes, Eaton, Edmunds, Hamlin, Kernan, McPherson, Mitchell, Morrill, Randolph, Rollins, Sargent, Wadleigh.

Those voting "nay" were:

ALLISON, Armstrong, Bailey of Tennessee, Beck, Booth, Bruce, Cameron of Pennsylvania, Cameron of Wisconsin, Chaffee, Coke, Conover, Davis of Illinois, Davis of West Virginia, Dennis, Dorsey, Eustis, Ferry, Gordon, Grover, Hereford, Hill, Howe, Johnston, Jones of Florida, JONES of Nevada, Kirkwood, McCreery, McDonald, McMillin, Matthews, Maxey, Merrimon, MORGAN, Oglesby, Paddock, Plumb, Saunders, Spencer, TELLER, Thurman, Voorhees, Wallace, Windom, Withers.

Absent 14:

Blaine, Butler, COCKRELL, Garland, Harris, HOAR, Ingalls, Kellogg, Lamar, Patterson, Ransom, Saulsbury, Sharon, Whyte.—*Record*, page 558, volume 27.

The second effort—a foul conspiracy—to force the payment of these war bonds in gold only was made by stopping the coinage of the old silver dollar in 1873 and by stripping the existing silver dollars of their full legal-tender quality in the revised statute of 1874. A panic followed and the people recoiled. They rose in their wrath and demanded a remonetization of silver for their general welfare and to pay these bonds. The people succeeded in partial remonetization in 1878 by passing the Bland-Allison law, for general purposes and to resume specie payment, while a few days before the Stanley Matthews (now known as the Teller) resolution was passed, declaring that it was just, legal, and proper and not in derogation of good faith with our creditors to remonetize and pay these bonds in the old silver dollar. These measures were all passed through the efforts of the Democratic party, and the Bland-Allison law over the veto of President Hayes, who contended that it was the agreement and right, legal, and just to pay these war bonds in gold only.

Again, on February 14, 1895, President Cleveland's plan of issuing bonds payable in gold only, by law, met with disastrous defeat in this House by a vote of 120 yeas to 167 nays. We find the following members of the present House, Republicans, who bitterly opposed and voted against gold bonds then who now favor and will vote for this bill, to wit: BROMWELL, CANNON, COOPER, CURTIS, DOLLIVER, FLETCHER, GRIFFIN, GROSVENOR, GROW, HENDERSON (the Speaker), HOPKINS, HITT, HEPBURN, HULL, LACEY, LOUD, MARSH, McCLEARY, MERCER, TAWNEY, VAN VOORHIS.

On that eventful day the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Mr. CANNON, said:

I believe in preserving the national faith. I believe that every obligation of this Government, under well-settled law as construed for almost two decades by all Administrations, and as it is to be enforced by virtue of an honest sentiment of an honest people, is payable, at the option of the holder, in gold or its equivalent.

I stop to say, in 1876 he said:

Our bonds were payable in *silver* or gold at the option of the *Government*.

He continued:

Coin means gold in the Government obligations at the *holder's option*. The country has so understood it; and the world so understands it to-day. * * * Bear with me a minute while I state briefly my reasons for voting against this bill. I am not going into ancient history. Let us go into modern history—last month and this month.

He then proceeded in his usual powerful way to condemn President Cleveland for proposing this gold-bond measure, and continued:

Now, then, Mr. Speaker, if the President in good faith put in this reserve, if in ten days gold bonds were authorized specifically by Congress—if it was done—it made them no better. Did he do it in good faith? No. Why, then, was it put in? To muddy the waters and to deceive the country, while the favorite syndicates go away with the ten millions of dishonorable profit. [Applause on the Republican side.]

His time was extended and he finished his speech in a way that is extremely appropriate for every patriotic member of this House to close his. He said:

Now, with all these facts standing around, I say it in sorrow that I can not look with pride on the performance of the Executive of the nation. I say further that if it were a Republican Secretary of the Treasury that had made this contract this Democratic House in my judgment would have impeached him. Yet these gentlemen say our credit is gone. Why, right here I have a telegram, received this morning, that the 4 per cents due in 1907, payable in coin, command in the markets of the world a premium of 10¼ to-day—now—at this moment. [Applause on the Republican side.]

This same class of bonds sold December 5, 1899, at 112¼.

This same question was up for consideration in this House on July 13, 1876, when the distinguished gentleman from Illinois took the very opposite position and said that our obligations were payable legally, equitably, and morally in the standard silver dollar, and cited as conclusive proof, which it was, an opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States (7 Wallace, page 26), all our bond-issuing statutes pertinent, and the report of the Treasurer, and wound up his argument in this language:

THE LAW AND JUSTICE.

The nature of the obligation resting upon the Government under these acts is tersely set forth in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury to Congress, as follows:

"But the purpose and meaning of the acts in question are not left open for forensic discussion, having been authoritatively settled by the unanimous opinion of the highest judicial tribunal known to our Constitution. As soon after the termination of the war as 1868 it was argued before the Supreme Court that the legal-tender notes of the United States were issued as money, a substitute for metallic currency, and that, having been made legal tender in payment of all debts, including (with certain exceptions) the Government's own, of course, when presented for payment, if similar notes, being legal tender, were offered in exchange for them, the debt would be discharged by a delivery of new notes of the same kind, and so on ad infinitum. To this argument the court replied:

"Apart from the quality of legal tender impressed upon them by acts of Congress, of which we now say nothing, their circulation as currency depends upon the extent to which they are received in payment, on the quantity in circulation, and on the credit given to the promises they bear. In other respects they resemble the bank notes formerly issued as currency.

SUPREME COURT.

"But, on the other hand, it is equally clear that these notes are obligations of the United States. Their name imports obligation. Every one of them expresses upon its face an engagement of the nation to pay the bearer a certain sum. The dollar note is an engagement to pay a dollar, and the dollar intended is the coin dollar of the United States—a certain quantity in weight and fineness of gold or silver, authenticated as such by the stamp of the Government."

This authoritative declaration of the Supreme Court defines clearly and precisely the meaning and intent of Congress in the acts which authorized the issue, and should be accepted as conclusive of the obligation and duty of the Government to provide for the payment in specie of all such issues.

Nor is this all. Subsequent to this decision, and for the purpose of putting a quietus upon the mischievous discussion of the subject, Congress, on the 18th day of March, 1869, declared by public act that "the United States solemnly pledges its faith to make provision at the earliest practicable period for the redemption of the United States notes in coin." (7 Wall., page 26; Chase, C. J.)

MR. CANNON'S OPINION.

I have referred to these acts of Congress and the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States for the reason that on the part of certain gentlemen upon this floor and a great many throughout the country there appears to be a misapprehension as to what the contract is between the Government on the one hand and its creditors upon the other; and from the above references to the law, as well as a careful examination of the text of the different acts, I am prepared to state— (7 Wall., page 26; Chase, C. J.)

LAW AND CONTRACT.

First. That there is not one dollar of the indebtedness of the United States, interest bearing or noninterest bearing, bond or greenback, but what the Government has the right, legal, equitable, and moral, under the contract to pay in coin, and that coin is gold or the standard silver dollar of the fineness and weight provided by law at the time the indebtedness was made.

Second. It further appears that the faith of the Government is pledged to collect duties on imports in coin (either gold or silver, or both) for the payment of interest upon the public debt.

Third. That the faith of the Government is pledged, until the redemption of the greenbacks, never to issue more than $400,000,000 of the same.

Having shown the right under the contract to pay our debt in gold and silver, or either, let us inquire briefly as to the policy of paying our debts in silver as well as in gold.

He had already said:

THE BOND CONTRACT.

Mr. Speaker, I have very great respect for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Garfield], and also many gentlemen on the other side of the House who oppose the legislation spoken of, but I do not agree with him in denouncing the proposition to remonetize silver and paying our debts with it as swindling, and his stigmatizing silver with the term "cheap and nasty."

Sir, it has with gold been used as money for ages past, and will be, in my opinion, for ages to come. It is in common with gold the money of the Constitution, and whether it has grown less valuable or gold has grown more valuable is not the question. By the letter and spirit of the contract we have the right to pay every dollar of the indebtedness of the United States in standard silver dollars weighing 412½ grains, nine-tenths of it fine silver and one-tenth of it alloy, as well as in gold, and I should like to know what right the gentleman has to denounce as swindling a proposition to do what we contracted to do. I suppose if gold were cheaper than silver, then the gentleman would say it is swindling to pay in gold.

If the gentleman owed me $10,000, and by the contract had the option to pay it either in gold dollars or silver dollars, and had to be industrious and economize to pay either, does he claim that it would be swindling to pay me in silver dollars because they were the cheapest?

If the gentleman did business in that way on his private account, before six months had elapsed any court would appoint a conservator to take charge of his property and manage his estate.

This distinguished statesman declared silver was not "cheap" and "nasty," but that it was the money of the Constitution, and good enough for anybody, and that to remonetize the white metal we could more easily pay our bonds and that free coinage would bring about a parity. He said:

FREE COINAGE WILL CAUSE A PARITY.

Now, then, let us remonetize silver. There is, as before shown, about as much silver in value in the world as there is gold. The result will be that silver, as compared with gold, will grow more valuable; gold, as compared with silver, will grow less valuable, and they will meet, each traveling half-way, at about the value of the greenback; and thus we would have silver at par with gold, gold at par with silver, and the greenback at par with gold and silver.

WE SHOULD REMONETIZE SILVER.

But the objection is made that the United States may remonetize silver, and that Germany and the other nations will not. In answer, I say so much the greater necessity for the United States remonetizing silver; that is the only way we can get even, for by adopting the gold standard only they have made the dollar more valuable than it was when they bought our bonds and loaned us their capital; and silver ceasing to be used as money, silver coin is thrown upon the market, and has depreciated as compared with gold. Now, if we remonetize silver that will create a demand for it here, and it will flow into this country in exchange for our products, and we will in turn use it in paying our debts in common with gold as between each other, and in paying the $50,000,000 to $70,000,000 of annual interest upon our foreign debt.

He also decapitated the "theorist," the "politician," the "speculator," and the gold lover generally in the following very lucid and comprehensive, patriotic language:

But I want to say to the other side of the House that one-tenth part of the time given to the maturity and consideration of this measure that is used in the effort to make capital for the fall campaign will suffice to perfect the details and pass the bill.

There is another reason why this legislation should be had at once. It would settle the money question permanently. If there is any one thing more than another that paralyzes business it is the power Congress has, with our unsettled condition of finance, to tinker with the currency; it sets the theorist, the politician, and the speculator to work proposing all manner of schemes to better our condition, nine-tenths of which are purely impracticable or thoroughly selfish; the producer and the trader are kept in a state of feverish excitement, doubtful as to what bad results may follow from unwise legislation.

THE WAY OUT.

There is but one way out of it: Restore the money of the Constitution by remonetizing silver; give the Government and each individual the chance to comply with its or his contract; nothing more and nothing less. Then the laws governing demand and supply will regulate the money and the credit of the country as they regulate the production of corn and wheat; and under the operation of that primal law imposed upon man by the Creator, "By the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread," each individual, under stable laws and stable money, will work out his own salvation, and as a people we enter upon a secure and stable era of prosperity.

We here see that the opinion of this distinguished son of Illinois has changed, but I ask him if the Constitution has been changed? If the Supreme Court has reversed the 7th Wallace case? If the word "coin" means gold only? If silver is too "cheap" and "nasty" to pay the bondholder?

Mr. Chairman, a man's opinions may change, but the Constitution and the authorities the gentleman cited have not been changed or reversed, and I am at a loss to know how the gentleman from Illinois reconciles his two opposing positions, based as they are upon constitutional grounds, and that, too, when the credit of the Government is as good, if not better, than ever before; we have no "run" on the Treasury as in 1895, when he voted against gold bonds and said that if the Secretary of the Treasury in 1895 had not been a Democrat the then Democratic House would have impeached him for insisting on gold bonds.

Now, I ask him what he thinks on the question of impeachment of our present officials, who, backed by the bondholder, demand the passage of this infamous bill? We will not assume the high privilege, Mr. Chairman, of impeaching them now; we will leave to the unterrified, unbent, and unbought people of this great country that pleasing task when their tribunal sits in November, 1900. But, Mr. Chairman, this noble son of Illinois had to aid him in 1895 the eloquent, the ever-present, powerful, and distinguished son of Ohio, Mr. GROSVENOR, in opposing this gold issue of 1895. In a speech in this House, found at page 2185, volume 27, of the Fifty-third Congress, third session, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] said:

One of the main stipulations is that it is to be paid in gold because it is better than coin. Why better than coin? * * *

He then demonstrated that it was not, and continued:

And when you have steered away from the landmarks of the Republican party, and the Democratic party, too, since the war, you have started in to begin the destruction of bimetallism as perfectly as if every silver dollar upon the earth were destroyed. [Loud applause.] We stand here as Republicans, pledged in our national resolutions to maintain the parity between the two metals. [Applause.] We come here and are asked by a bribe of sixteen and a half million dollars, payable in thirty years, to make the discrimination between the gold bonds and the coin bonds. Fellow Republicans, let me read to you our platform, the declarations of our principles upon which we have marched both to victory and defeat.

In 1888 we said: "The Republican party is in favor of both gold and silver as money, and condemns the policy of the Democratic Administration in its efforts to demonetize silver."

In 1892 we said: "The American people, from tradition and interest, favor bimetallism, and the Republican party demands the use of both gold and silver as standard money, with such restrictions and under such provisions, to be determined by legislation, as will secure the maintenance of the parity of values of the two metals, so that the purchasing and debt-paying power of the dollar, whether of silver, gold, or paper, shall be at all times equal." * * *

These are the declarations of our party, and those are the principles of the Republicans of the United States. And, Mr. Speaker, for one, faithful to these platform declarations, I will not vote for this measure. [Loud applause.] I believe that it is fraught with dishonor and not with honor. I believe that the people of the United States, when they look beyond the mere temporary expressions of this Presidential message, will stand by the men who in this storm have stood by the people and against this combination of European financiers. They will stand by the men who have stood faithful to the principles and the landmarks of their party. [Renewed applause.] No man will stand longer or fight harder for the Government than I will; but I will not permit the prostitution of the powers of this Government to the building up of one interest in this country or in any other country to the destruction and overthrow of all the interests of the people of this country. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

The distinguished speaker had already cited at length the gold contract proposed, etc., and said:

Our answer, Mr. Speaker, to all this ought to be that we will not do it. For the first time in the history of this country we are to put the word "gold" in our long-time bonds, and we do it for the purpose, with the stipulation that there is a difference of three-fourths of 1 per cent between "gold" and "coin." That means something. This syndicate does not offer $16,500,000 for nothing. This syndicate does not understand that one bond is as good as another. It means more than that they will make a difference of sixteen and a half millions of dollars in the cost to the Government of these two loans.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], who in the same debate opposed gold bonds, but who now favors this bill, said:

And I want to call his [Mr. PAYNE of New York] attention to the fact that he proposes in his rescue, or attempt at rescue, the change of the whole policy of his party, to go back upon all the declarations of his party, and to institute a new method, a new policy, and call for new following.

There has never been a day since this party of his has been in existence that it has not contended for the equal status of gold and silver in the United States. [Applause.] If there is one proposition more certainly impressed upon the minds of the Republicans than another it is that we will as a party, by all means within our power, see to it that these two metals have equal potency in this land.

Here is a new departure. I am told that the Secretary of the Treasury, in his interview yesterday with a committee of this House, admitted that if this bond was issued, if this country now enters upon a policy of gold bonds, no other kind of bonds would probably ever be known in its entire history. Are we ready for that? [Cries of "No! No!"]

He then read the Democrats' and Republicans' platforms on the gold and silver question and commented on the last lines of the Republican plank about—

the maintenance of the parity of the two metals, and the purchasing and debt-paying power of the dollar, whether gold, silver, or paper, shall at all times be equal—

And with great force said:

Equal, and here we are called upon now to declare that this dollar of ours, this silver dollar of ours, has not the same debt-paying power that a gold dollar has. I affirm, notwithstanding the language of the gentleman [Mr. PAYNE] who stood here a few moments ago where I stand now, and said that our indebtedness was payable in gold alone, I say not so. [Loud applause.]

There is no obligation of the United States save gold certificates that may not honestly be paid in silver dollars [applause], and every creditor of the United States knew the fact when he permitted himself to become a creditor of the Government.—*Record*, volume 27, part 3, Fifty-third Congress, page 2198.

He says that in 1895, and in 1899 he speaks for gold bonds now and hereafter.

Mind you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Cleveland wanted to "issue" bonds and make them payable by law in gold only, which by doing he contended we would save $16,500,000, a certain syndicate making the proposition to take all these bonds. This House bill No. 1 proposes to make our bonds already issued and those hereafter issued and all our public obligations, past and future, payable by law in gold. Now, I ask, What syndicate is behind House bill No. 1? How much will the bond owners make without turning their hands, if this bill becomes a law, on their existing bond holdings? Millions untold! We give them almost an incalculable sum without a single recompense on the bonds already issued, while a similar profit will follow on obligations issued hereafter under this bill. I hope a calculation is possible in the near future showing how much the bondholders will make by this measure, and that, too, as stated, without raising their hands.

The last effort at gold bonds that I recall was in the Fifty-fourth Congress, when an effort was made in some Territorial obligations, then payable in lawful money, to make them payable in gold only. On a rising vote the proposition was overwhelmingly defeated, both parties voting in the main against it.

The Hon. Edwards Pierrepont, in a letter to the New York Times of April 14, 1884, said not one of our bonds had any proviso for their payment in gold only. He said:

There is not an outstanding bond, coupon, or greenback issued by the United States which may not be lawfully paid in silver. Not one of them on its face or back, or in the statute authorizing the issue, or in declaration, or in resolution of Congress, has any proviso that they shall be paid in gold. And the act of February 28, 1878, directing the coinage of silver dollars, declared that such dollars shall be a legal tender at their nominal value for all debts and dues, public and private, except where otherwise expressly stipulated in the contract.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote with great pleasure against this bill. I am a bimetallist. I believe in the free coinage of both gold

and silver at a legal ratio in full-tender coin. I believe that bimetallism is the policy and the law of the Constitution, and being founded in the Constitution it can not be repealed by any statute we may pass. The Constitution can not be repealed by statute. Gold and silver are admittedly the money of the Constitution. No unselfish, enlightened man disputes this. Therefore I contend that Congress has no power to stop the coinage of silver or gold, and that if it has the power to stop either, it can stop both, and thus deprive the people of the money of the Constitution, as well as the States, counties, and cities of our land, who do and must necessarily make and pay debts in performing their respective functions.

If the States, as they have, have the right to make both "gold and silver tender in the payment of debts" without the intervention of the United States, what right has Congress, though having the exclusive right to coin money and regulate its value, to stop the coinage of gold and silver, or either, thus directly prohibiting the States from using gold and silver or either in the payment of their debts? No such right or power was granted to Congress.

Indeed, the States, under the Confederation, and therefore before the Constitution, had the right to coin the money of our colonial and Revolutionary fathers, and when the Constitution was formed they reserved to themselves, the States, expressly in the Constitution the right to make, and therefore the right to have, gold and silver full legal tender, simply surrendering to the Congress the power and right to "coin money and regulate the value thereof." Previous to the Confederation, as a colonial inheritance, anterior to the Constitution, as now, I contend, the people had and always reserved to themselves as their own personal and collective right the privilege—nay, more the right—to take their money metal, gold and silver, to the public mint and have it made into money whenever they chose to so do. They fought for and wrested from Mother England this right. It came with our independence more than a century ago. It is theirs, and it does not belong to the Congress nor the States, and never did, to shut up the mints and shut off the people from the high privilege of taking their money metal at will to the mints for coinage.

There are three terms in the Constitution that refer to money. They are "gold and silver," "money," and "dollars," and appear in the following form, to wit:

The Congress shall have the power to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coins.

No State shall coin money, make anything but gold and silver tender in the payment of debts.

By amendment to the Constitution, Article VII, it is ordained:

In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved.

The term "money" was used, as shown by Elliott's Debates, in framing the Constitution, as synonymous with "gold and silver." They meant then one and the same thing. The term "gold and silver" was settled upon at the same time, as shown by Elliott's Debates, after grave and many discussions. The word "and" is clearly conjunctive and not disjunctive. Unsuccessful efforts were made during these debates, as they show, to insert the word "or" where "and" now appears, but finally abandoned, and the conjunctive word "and" was used to fasten the two metals together in the Constitution, as they now read—gold and silver—there to remain until amended, and not to be disjoined by a statute, State or national. Bimetallism is therefore a part of and embedded in the Constitution. The money unit is there in the same way. It rests on both metals.

And Mr. Hamilton, in his report on the Mint, quotes the Constitution as I have, except amendment 7, and upon that, as well as a wise policy, fixed the money unit on "both metals," which Mr. Jefferson approved and all of our Presidents down to the crime of 1873, when gold only was made the money unit, which is being perpetuated in the present measure. In support of these contentions I take pleasure and pride in citing the speeches of some of the greatest statesmen we ever produced—Hamilton, Jefferson, Webster, Gallatin, Hunter, Jackson, Garland, John Randolph Tucker, Morgan, Beck, Pierrepont, Thurman, Coke, Maxey, Isham G. Harris, VEST, COCKRELL, and, strange to say, President Hayes. President Hayes, in his fourth annual message, 1880, said:

The Constitution in express terms recognizes both gold and silver as the only legal-tender money. To banish either of these metals from our currency is to narrow and limit the circulating medium of exchange, to the disparagement of important interests.

President Hayes saw the error of his veto message in 1878, and before his time expired we find him thus speaking and urging Congress to perpetuate the coinage of the silver dollar, so prosperous had our country become under the influence of the Bland-Allison law, which he had vetoed.

Mr. Blaine, in a speech on February 7, 1878, said:

First. I believe gold and silver coin to be the money of the Constitution—indeed, the money of the American people anterior to the Constitution, which that great organic law recognized as quite independent of its own existence. No power was conferred on Congress to declare that either metal should not be money. Congress has therefore, in my judgment, no power to demonetize silver any more than to demonetize gold; no power to demonetize either any more than to demonetize both. In this statement I am but repeating the weighty dictum of the first constitutional lawyers. "I am certainly of opinion," said Mr. Webster, "that gold and silver, at rates fixed by Congress, constitute the legal standard of value in this country and that neither Congress nor any State has authority to establish any other standard or to displace this standard." Few persons can be found, I apprehend, who will maintain that Congress possesses the power to demonetize both gold and silver, or that Congress could be justified in prohibiting the coinage of both; and yet in logic and legal construction it would be difficult to show where and why the power of Congress over silver is greater than over gold, greater over either than over the two. If, therefore, silver has been demonetized, I am in favor of remonetizing it. If its coinage has been prohibited, I am in favor of ordering it to be resumed. If it has been restricted, I am in favor of having it enlarged.

On the money unit Mr. Blaine said:

I believe the struggle now going on in this country and other countries for a single gold standard would, if successful, produce widespread disaster in the end throughout the commercial world. The destruction of silver as money and establishing gold as the sole unit of value must have a ruinous effect on all forms of property except those investments which yield a fixed return in money. These would be enormously enhanced in value and would gain a disproportionate and unfair advantage over every other species of property. If, as the most reliable statistics affirm, there are nearly seven thousand millions of coin or bullion in the world, not very equally divided between gold and silver, it is impossible to strike silver out of existence as money without results which will prove distressing to millions and utterly disastrous to tens of thousands. Alexander Hamilton, in his able and invaluable report in 1791 on the establishment of a mint, declared that "to annul the use of either gold or silver as money is to abridge the quantity of circulating medium, and is liable to all the objections which arise from a comparison of the benefits of a full circulation with the evils of a scanty circulation." I take no risks in saying that the benefits of a full circulation and the evils of a scanty circulation are both immeasurably greater to-day than they were when Mr. Hamilton uttered these weighty words, always provided that the circulation is one of actual money and not of depreciated promises to pay.

In the report from which I have already quoted Mr. Hamilton argues at length in favor of a double standard, and all the subsequent experience of well-nigh 90 years has brought out no clearer statement of the whole case nor developed a more complete comprehension of this subtle and difficult subject. "On the whole," says Mr. Hamilton, "it seems most advisable not to attach the unit exclusively to either of the metals, because this can not be done effectually without destroying the office and character of one of them as money and reducing it to the situation of mere merchandise." And then Mr. Hamilton wisely concludes that this reduction of either of the metals to mere merchandise (I again quote his exact words) "would probably be a greater evil than occasional variations in the unit from the fluctuations in the relative value of the metals, especially if care be taken to regulate the proportion between them with an eye to their average commercial value." I do not think that this country, holding so vast a proportion of the world's supply of silver in its mountains and its mines, can afford to reduce the metal to the "situation of mere merchandise." If silver ceases to be used as money in Europe and America, the great mines of the Pacific slope will be closed and dead. Mining enterprises of the gigantic scale existing in this country can not be carried on to provide backs for looking-glasses and to manufacture cream pitchers and sugar bowls. A vast source of wealth to this entire country is destroyed the moment silver is permanently disused as money. It is for us to check that tendency and bring the continent of Europe back to the full recognition of the value of the metal as a medium of exchange.

Mr. Blaine, as did the gentleman of Illinois, Mr. CANNON, found the money unit is fixed on both metals by and in the Constitution.

The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. CANNON, took the same position of Mr. Blaine, citing the same authorities, Hamilton and Jefferson, in his speech in 1876, and said in addition:

And let me here say that we have just as much right under our contract to call silver the unit or standard of value and par and to say that the greenback is above par by 11 per cent and gold above par by 24 per cent as advocates of the gold standard have to claim that gold should be the unit or standard of value and that greenbacks are below par and that silver is below par.

Now, sir, we all remember that a few days ago the distinguished gentleman [Mr. CANNON] said to my colleague [Mr. RICHARDSON] that he was living in the present, and not living with "the ghouls in the graveyards." I want to know if the distinguished gentleman has placed the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, which in 1876 he stood by, in the grave with the money ghouls? I want to know if he has placed the Constitution of his country in the grave with the money ghouls? He said that under the Constitution and under our laws and under the common law gold and silver were full legal tender when coined by our Government, and in concluding his speech he said all would be well if we restored silver to its time-honored place. [Applause.]

Entertaining, Mr. Chairman, these views, based, as they are, upon the wise policy of bimetallism as set forth in the Constitution, which I am sworn to support, I must vote against this bill. It is contrary to the Constitution and its principles and the welfare of the people, and is framed and driven through this House by the bondholders, who would desecrate these sacred principles to fill their pockets with money poured into our coffers by the taxpayers of their country, who are soon to groan under its heavy burdens. This bill perpetuates gold as the money unit. It perpetuates the single gold standard. It perpetuates and intensifies the further demonetization of the old silver dollar. It demonetizes, debases, and restricts the money uses of silver, and casts suspicion over all our other moneys. It puts the bondholder and his rights above the masses and their rights. It bleeds the plain people for the aristocratic bondholder. It is a plutocratic measure throughout.

The express policy of this Government on finance is to keep our two money coins on a parity, and so determined are our people on this that Congress has expressed this policy in an old and now existing statute that is the law of the land. This bill does make

inevitably a disparity between the two coins by the mighty hand of the law. It disarranges that parity between the two coins our statutes were enacted to maintain. The bill is, therefore, contrary to public policy as expressed in our statute law and at the ballot box. I oppose the bill for that reason and for turning the people, very largely, over to the national banks for their paper money. You know the banks can let out and call in their bank issues, and by doing so can make or break the surrounding communities and States. Andrew Jackson successfully opposed such a menace to the public welfare. He was right then, and the principle is right now.

Make our bonds payable in gold only, and at once the bondholder loses all interest, if he has any, in the silver bullion or silver coin. He becomes silver's enemy at once. Why? Because his bond, once payable, can no longer be paid, in silver coin, but is payable in gold only. He would rather bear than bull the price of silver, because it would increase the price of gold, make his gold dollar worth that much more of silver.

He would further divorce the price of the two coins, the very thing the Government is pledged to maintain and encourage. Continue our bonds as coin bonds, and we continue the selfish interest of the bondholder with our efforts to maintain the parity of the two coins. Again, make our obligations payable in gold only, and we make the owner thereof the personal and political enemy of domestic bimetallism and international bimetallism, because in such event silver would become the equal in fact of gold—that is, meet each other halfway, and thus reach what we call a parity.

You can see at once that gold bonds will become the stumbling-block in our endeavors to maintain the established policy of our Government, expressed by existing statutes, of maintaining the parity of the two coins and to the achievement of bimetallism, which the people want. This bill, when law, intervenes and cuts off all hope of any such arrangement, in the face of the fact that the Bryan and McKinley vote combined in 1896 favored international bimetallism if it could be had, while in addition the Bryan vote was for bimetallism without waiting for the consent of any nation.

This law is the straw that breaks the camel's back. But bimetallism by and through the Republican party is now an abandoned policy, and this measure is conclusive proof of the fact. We must look to the Democratic party, that ever has been and ever will be, so long as it remains true to its past history, the friend of the masses in truth, for that bimetallism with which our forefathers were familiar, planted by them in the Constitution.

Again, this bill, making all of our past, present, and future public obligations payable in gold only, creates, I contend, unnecessarily an increased demand and call for our gold coin and gold metal, and thus the immense increase in our gold production will be gobbled up in paying off these gold obligations, thereby necessarily turning this large gold increase from the everyday channels of trade and commerce into Wall street and the stock jobbers' recesses.

In this way the good effects of our increased amounts of gold money are reduced and fall short of the happy effect that would follow if we continued the payment of our bonds and public obligations in coin, gold and silver, or either, and in the discretion not of the payee but payor, as at law, and as it should be and was until the Republican party gave the option to select the money of payment to the payee.

Much has been said in the House about prosperity. When war was declared against Spain the Dingley tariff was proving a failure as a revenue producer. The issue of bonds to pay the necessary expenses of the Government were almost in sight when war was declared. A war tariff was imposed on our people, and everything in sight, except a few rich concerns that were able to control legislation, was taxed.

The Government then sent its purchasing agents throughout this country and said to the owners of any war paraphernalia, "What is your price? We want your property to carry on this war." The owner set his own price, and the Government paid it, spot cash. In this way not only large sums of money were scattered throughout the country, but large prices were given, as we all know—some outrageously exorbitant. This increased demand and sudden dissemination of money throughout the country started the wheels of many a closed manufactory and caused the sale of many products that had been lying on the shelf for a long time.

There is a difference, Mr. Chairman, in saying to a party, "How much will you take for your property?" and paying at once the price demanded, and a property owner going out and looking for a purchaser and begging some one to buy at any price. Again, war was declared and the President called for over 200,000 volunteers. They were, and must have been, able-bodied and, in the main, fine business men. They were swept into the camps of the country and detained there for a long time. Their places had to be and were filled by those left behind, who were idle and had been for months, if not years. In this way idle labor was absorbed and increased wages demanded and received, for urgent orders were had, war orders, that had to be filled in a certain time.

The result was that in places prosperity and an increase of wages followed. I hope it may continue, but I doubt it. This prosperity is a war prosperity. We had the same thing north of the Ohio River during the civil war thirty years ago. Labor, as you all remember, became so scarce that Congress appropriated several millions of dollars and sent agents to Europe to encourage foreign labor to come to the United States, and succeeded. Here is a case where history is repeating itself, except we had enough idle labor at home to do our work. I hope this prosperity has come and come to stay, but I doubt it. What I want, Mr. Chairman, is general prosperity, a prosperity for everybody, and one that will come and stay.

I desire here briefly and hurriedly to reply to some statements made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET], who led off in a set speech.

First. "That the Spanish mill dollar was never coined in America"—but it was coined in foreign countries and brought to America in immense amounts, and served our colonial and Revolutionary fathers faithfully and for many years.

Second. "That the act of January 18, 1837, changed the ratio from 1 to 16 to 1 to 15.988 by again modifying the quantity of metal in the coin." This statement is misleading. The amount of fine silver in the old silver dollar was never changed, while the amount of fine gold in the gold coins was reduced twice—1834 and 1837.

Third. The coinage act of February 21, 1853, did not discontinue the double standard nor the free coinage of the old silver dollar or the gold coins. It simply reduced the amount of fine silver in the half-dollar, quarter, dime and half-dime, and limited their tender of the coinage thereunder—for what? To prevent their exportation, while the Government assumed the right to buy bullion and coin these small coins to increase their coinage and secure a much-needed small change. The half-dollar, quarter, and dime coined up to the act of 1853, amounting to $85,436,376, were and remained full legal tender up to the act of 1874. In none, no, not one, of our coinage laws, up to April 1, 1873, was standard silver demonetized. Free coinage of the gold and silver dollars and eagles was cautiously guarded and continued down to 1873. Even the trade dollar was given the right of free coinage.

Fourth. The gold standard begun with us April 1, 1873, when the coinage act of February 12, 1873, took effect. Previous to this date the people could take either or both their gold or silver untrammeled to our mint and have it coined in the full legal-tender money. It is false that we were previous to 1873 on a gold standard. These facts can not be successfully disputed, though often smeared over by the gold advocates and the truth ignorantly, if not corruptly, perverted to mislead a confiding public. I quote again, in conclusive proof of my contention, from the very high authority on any subject in this House, from the speech of the honorable Representative from Illinois, Mr. CANNON, in this House July 13, 1876. This he said:

> And, strange to say, the United States being the debtor nation, having the right to pay that debt in gold and silver of a certain fineness, with her vast mineral wealth, especially of silver, that is being developed by the labor, pluck, and energy of the Americans, under the lead of science and experience, has unwittingly assented to the demonetization of silver. This legislation was had in the Forty-second Congress, February 12, 1873, by a bill to regulate the mints of the United States, and practically abolished silver as money by failing to provide for the coinage of the silver dollar.
>
> It was not discussed, as shown by the RECORD, and neither members of Congress nor the people understood the scope of the legislation. The result is that gold has become the only standard by which values are measured, silver ceasing to be used as money, and gold as compared with silver has become more valuable, and silver as compared with gold has become less valuable, so that if we actually pay in gold, not having the privilege to pay silver, we have decreased our ability to pay by at least from 20 to 30 per cent; in other words, we decrease our ability to pay by the amount of silver we have to pay with, it no longer being available to us to pay in the discharge of our indebtedness the same as gold. * * *

He then quotes from a leading Republican official, as follows:

> Dr. Linderman, Director of the Mint, fully understood this, for in his report for the year 1873, page 21, he says:
>
> "The gradual adoption of the gold standard and consequent demonetization of silver will, of course, be followed by an increase in the value of gold, or, what is the same thing, a decrease in the price of articles measured by it. Indeed, it is quite certain that this effect is already perceptible in some portions of Europe."

I may add that Dr. Linderman, in his book, Money and Legal Tender, at page 44, says:

> The declaration in the coinage act of 1873 that the gold dollar was thereafter the unit of value, and the omission of the silver dollar from the coins to be struck under the provisions of that act, placed the United States upon the single gold standard.

This is clear and explicit.

Again, up to at least 1857 we had the foreign silver coins full tender in immense quantities, and the $77,015,348.50 half dollars, quarters, dimes, and half dimes coined before 1853, that were full tender up to 1874, and the old silver dollar was still open to free coinage.

The gentleman from Indiana, Mr. OVERSTREET, in his speech of Monday, says:

Prior to 1873, when the gold standard was adopted, there had been issued by the Government only 8,031,238 silver dollars.

Here he admits the advent of the gold standard was in 1873, but is unfair enough to state that we coined only 8,031,238 silver dollars, which is clearly misleading, and at most a half truth, for, in addition to that number of silver-dollar pieces, we coined before the act of 1853, in half dollars, dimes, and half dimes, $77,015,348.50 which was full legal tender, as much so as the silver or gold dollar.

The amount of these small coins and their full-tender quality is overlooked by the gold advocates, and hence this reference. The following official letter is given, which is self-explanatory:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF THE MINT.
Washington, D. C., December 15, 1892.

SIR: As requested by you, I append herewith a statement of the coinage of fractional silver (excluding 3-cent pieces) from 1792 to June 1, 1853, and the coinage of silver dollars from 1792 to February 12, 1873.

Coinage of fractional silver—1792 to June 1, 1853.

Half dollars	$66,492,644.50
Quarter dollars	4,606,595.50
Dimes	4,016,731.10
Half dimes	1,899,377.40
Total	77,015,348.50
Silver dollars, 1792 to February 12, 1873	8,031,238.00
	85,046,586.50

Respectfully,

GEO. E. ROBERTS,
Director of the Mint.

Hon. J. W. GAINES,
House of Representatives.

We then had current legal-tender silver coin before 1873, $85,046,586.50 and oceans of foreign full-tender silver coins, which well served the people and bondholder alike.

In 1806 the old dollar coinage was suspended by Mr. Jefferson, but the legal right remained to coin it nevertheless, and in addition, on April 20, 1806, ten days previous to this order of suspension, May 1, 1806, President Jefferson approved a bill making foreign gold and silver coins full legal tender in the payment of debts, which more than took the place of the suspended silver-dollar coinage and supplied every want of the people.

At no time did Jefferson suspend the coinage of standard silver money. On the contrary, in the order suspending the old dollar coinage he continued the free coinage and urged the coinage in large amounts of the half-dollar, quarter, dime, and half-dime, which, as I have stated, were full legal tender in the payment of all debts, public and private. It is a foul aspersion upon Jefferson's patriotic deeds and his democratic acts to say that he thus abused the bimetallic principles planted in the Constitution, which he helped to write, as well as the first mint report, in which he said to Mr. Hamilton:

I return you the report on the mint. I concur with you that the unit must stand on both metals.

And yet by this bill the fraud of 1873, which put the unit on one metal, gold, must be perpetuated, and all our public obligations, past and future, are to be paid in gold only. Here is the language of the order suspending the old dollar coinage, found in the Secretary of State's office in 1878:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *May 1, 1806.*

ROBERT PATTERSON, esq.,
Director of the Mint.

SIR: In consequence of a representation from the directors of the Bank of the United States that considerable purchases have been made of dollars coined at the mint for the purpose of exporting them, and as it is probable further purchases and exportations will be made, the President directs that all silver to be coined at the mint shall be of small denominations, so that the value of the largest pieces shall not exceed half a dollar.

I am, sir, etc.,

JAMES MADISON.

President Jefferson did this:

First. Twenty days before (April 20, 1806) he stopped the dollar coinage (May 1, 1806) he created a substitute entirely acceptable by making foreign silver full tender for all debts, the Spanish milled dollar being already a full tender.

Second. He stopped the silver dollar coinage thereafter to prevent its exportation and to encourage and give place to the increased coinage of the full-tender small silver coins to supply change much needed.

Third. The free coinage in increased quantities of full legal-tender silver coins was continued and they were coined in larger amounts.

Fourth. He perpetuated the bimetallic double standard of the Constitution, because the half dollar, quarter, dime, and half dime were full legal tender and left open to free coinage.

Fifth. He continued the money unit on both metals and the full tender quality to all old silver dollars and foreign silver coin.

Mr. OVERSTREET says:

The debates in Congress just prior to the passage of the act of February 21, 1853, clearly marked the change of sentiment against the further effort to maintain a double standard.

This I deny, because, first, the double standard was perpetuated; second, the increased use of silver was provided for; third, the free coinage of gold and silver was continued; and, in addition to that, Senator R. M. T. Hunter, of Virginia, as chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate, denounced the adoption of either one of the metals alone as ruinous to the welfare of the people. He declared:

The mischief would be great indeed if all the world were to adopt but one of the precious metals as the standard of value. To adopt gold alone would diminish the specie currency more than one-half; and the reduction the other way, should silver be taken as the only standard, would be large enough to prove highly disastrous to the human race.

Again, Mr. Sanford, of New York, by a report made to the Senate in the Twenty-first Congress, amongst other things, said:

The necessity of occasional adjustments is a small inconvenience when compared with the great inconvenience of using only one of the metals, and such has been the experience of mankind.

Strange, indeed, must be that policy which can tolerate 500 different kinds of paper money and can not tolerate both gold and silver.

The Constitution of the United States evidently contemplates that the money of this country shall be gold and silver. Our system of money, established in 1792, fully adopts the principle that it is expedient to coin and use both metals as money, and such has always been the opinion of the people of the United States.

Albert Gallatin, banker, financier, and statesman, favored the double standard and, in speaking of England demonetizing silver, said:

Even if the precedent were good, it could not be conveniently adopted by the United States. To the exclusion of silver there are great objections. The American dollar, or 371¼ grains of pure silver, is the unit of money and standard of value on which all public and private contracts are founded.

Again, Mr. OVERSTREET says, in speaking of the Bland-Allison Act.

With all the ills which this measure (act of 1878) brought upon the country, it was far to be preferred to an absolute free-coinage bill.

Mr. Chairman, I deny there were any ill effects from that law. Prosperity throughout this gold-standard-cursed land came, and promptly, to the humble and exalted, the sweater and the bondholder, the States and the Federal Government. And I challenge the gentlemen to show a single message or Thanksgiving proclamation of President Hayes that does not support my declaration. We accumulated over four hundred and seventy millions of gold in the Treasury. Our coin bonds were sought for. The rate of interest was reduced. The Treasury was overflowing. Resumption was made easy. The public credit was good, and better than ever before, and President Hayes stated the facts and figures supporting it in his messages.

The Bland-Allison Act was passed over the veto of President Hayes, who wanted our "public indebtedness" paid in gold. In his veto message, as in his former messages, he said in effect that to remonetize silver would destroy the business of the country and to pay our bonds with silver dollars was "an act of bad faith." In vetoing the Bland-Allison law President Hayes said:

The right to pay duties in silver or in certificates for silver deposits will, when they are issued in sufficient amounts to circulate, put an end to the receipt of revenue in gold, and thus compel the payment of silver for both the principal and interest of the public debt. One billion one hundred and forty-three million four hundred and ninety-three thousand four hundred dollars of the bonded debt now outstanding was issued prior to February, 1873, when the silver dollar was unknown in circulation in this country and was only a convenient form of silver bullion for exportation; $583,440,350 of the funded debt has been issued since February, 1873, when gold alone was the coin for which the bonds were sold, and gold alone was the coin in which both parties to the contract understood that the bonds would be paid. The sum of $225,000,000 of these bonds has been sold during my Administration for gold coin.

In the face of the fact that this $1,143,493,400 of bonds were issued prior to 1873, when the old silver dollar was unknown in circulation, but still open to free coinage and a full tender, yet they were all coin bonds, not gold bonds only, or silver bonds only, but coin bonds. In the face of the fact that $583,440,350 of the funded debt was issued since 1873, and before the Bland-Allison law was passed and when the silver-dollar coinage was stopped, still they were coin bonds, not gold only or silver only, but coin bonds, and payable in gold and silver, or both, or some of each. And in the face of the further fact that $225,000,000 of these bonds were sold after 1873, as President Hayes said, for gold coin, they, too, were made coin bonds, not gold only or silver only, but coin bonds. Now, it would have been easy for Congress, particularly from 1873 to 1878, to have said, by law, as you are now trying to say, that these bonds were payable alone in gold; in fact, making the bond payable on its face in gold; but it did not. And why not? Because the Government rightfully reserved to itself the alternative which the term "coin" gave—that is, to pay in either coin, or both, whichever was easiest, cheapest, and best to be paid at the time.

But now this alternative is being surrendered, so that the Government will be compelled to pay in gold only, regardless of whether it has gold on hand at the time of payment or not. More bonds will be issued and sold for gold, with which to keep up these endless gold payments and satiate the money ghouls' "run" on his country's Treasury.

In the face of the prophecies that dire destruction would follow to the business of the country if silver was remonetized, we find

President Hayes, on the 30th of October, 1878, in his Thanksgiving proclamation, saying:

Exuberant harvests, productive mines, ample crops of the staples of trade and manufactures have enriched the country. The resources thus furnished to our reviving industry and expanding commerce are hastening the day when discords and distresses through the length and breadth of the land will, under the continued favor of Providence, have given way to confidence and energy and assured prosperity.

President Hayes, in his last annual message, December 6, 1880, says:

The condition of the financial affairs of the Government, as shown by the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, is very satisfactory. It is believed that the present financial situation of the United States, whether considered with respect to trade, currency, credit, growing wealth, or the extent and variety of our resources, is more favorable than that of any other country of our time, and has never been surpassed by that of any country at any period of its history. All our industries are thriving. The rate of interest is low. New railroads are being constructed. A vast immigration is increasing our population, capital, and labor. New enterprises in great number are in progress, and our commercial relations with other countries are improving.

He further says:

The continuance of specie payments has not been interrupted or endangered since the date of resumption. It has contributed greatly to the revival of business and to our remarkable prosperity. The fears that preceded and accompanied resumption have proved groundless. No considerable amount of United States notes have been presented for redemption, while very large sums of gold bullion, both domestic and imported, are taken to the mints and exchanged for coin or notes. The increase of coin and bullion in the United States since January 1, 1879, is estimated at $227,399,428.

December 7, 1878, in his annual message, President Hayes says:

We are at peace with all other nations. Our public credit has greatly improved, and is now perhaps stronger than ever before. Abundant harvests have rewarded the labors of those who till the soil, our manufacturing industries are reviving, and it is believed that general prosperity, which has been so long anxiously looked for, is at last within our reach.

In this same message President Hayes says by its terms—that is, by the act of February 25, 1862—

the public debt should have been reduced between 1862 and the close of the last fiscal year, June, 1878, $518,361,806.28; the actual reduction of the ascertained debt in that period has been $720,644,729.61, being in excess of the reduction required by the sinking-fund act, $202,282,923.33.

The amount of the public debt, less cash in the Treasury, November 1, 1878, was $2,024,200,083.18, a reduction since the same date of the last year of $23,150,617.39.

In the face of this happy result of the remonetization the President adds this:

The progress made during the last year in refunding the public debt at lower rates of interest is very gratifying. The amount of 4 per cent bonds sold during the present year, prior to November 23, 1878, is $1,270,900, and 6 per cent bonds, commonly known as five-twenties, to an equal amount have been or will be reduced as calls mature.

The President stated that the gold coinage for the last fiscal year was $52,798,980, and the silver dollars coined under the act of February 28, 1878, to the 23d of November, amounted to $19,814,550. He then continues:

With views unchanged in regard to the act under which the coinage of silver proceeds, it has been the purpose of the Secretary faithfully to execute the law and to afford a fair trial to the measure.

And we see the happy results of a faithful execution of the law. He then continues:

In the present financial condition of the country I am persuaded that the welfare of legitimate business and industry of every description will be best promoted by abstaining from all attempts to make radical changes in the existing financial legislation.

On the 3d of November, 1879, President Hayes, in his Thanksgiving proclamation, said:

At no recurrence of the season which the devout habit of a religious people has made the occasion for giving thanks to Almighty God and humbly invoking His continued favor has the material prosperity enjoyed by our whole country been more conspicuous, more manifold, or more universal.

Again, on December 1, 1879, the President begins his message at a period, as he said—

calling for mutual congratulation and grateful acknowledgment to the Giver of all good for the large and unusual measure of national prosperity which we now enjoy. The most interesting events which have occurred in our public affairs since my last annual message to Congress are connected with the financial operations of the Government, directly affecting the business interests of the country. I congratulate Congress on the successful execution of the resumption act. At the time fixed, and in the manner contemplated by law, United States notes began to be redeemed in coin.

Since the 1st of January last they have been promptly redeemed on presentation, and in all business transactions, public and private, in all parts of the country, they are received and paid out as the equivalent of coin. The demand upon the Treasury for gold and silver in exchange for United States notes has been comparatively small, and the voluntary deposit of coin and bullion in exchange for notes has been very large. The excess of the precious metals deposited or exchanged for United States notes over the amount of United States notes redeemed is about $40,000,000.

The resumption of specie payments has been followed by a very great revival of business. With a currency equivalent in value to the money of the commercial world, we are enabled to enter upon an equal competition with other nations in trade and production.

Further on in his message the President says:

Since the resumption of specie payments there has also been a marked and gratifying improvement of the public credit. The bonds of the Government bearing only 4 per cent interest have been sold at or above par sufficient in amount to pay off all of the national debt which was redeemable under present laws. The amount of interest saved annually by the process of refunding the debt since March 1, 1877, is $14,297,177. The bonds sold were largely in small sums, and the number of our citizens now holding the public securities is much greater than ever before.

The amount of the national debt which matures within less than two years is $792,121,700, of which $500,000,000 bears interest at the rate of 5 per cent, and the balance is in bonds bearing 6 per cent interest. It is believed that this part of the public debt can be refunded by the issue of 4 per cent bonds, and, by the reduction of interest which will thus be effected, about $11,000,000 can be annually saved to the Treasury. To secure this important reduction of interest to be paid by the United States further legislation is required, which, it is hoped, will be provided by Congress during its present session. The coinage of gold by the mints of the United States during the last fiscal year was $40,986,912. The coinage of silver dollars since the passage of the act for that purpose up to November 1, 1879, was $45,000,850, of which $12,700,344 have been issued from the Treasury and are now in circulation and $32,300,506 are still in the possession of the Government.

President Hayes, in his Thanksgiving proclamation of November 1, 1880, says:

At no period in their history since the United States became a nation has this people had so abundant and so universal reasons for joy and gratitude at the favor of Almighty God or been subject to so profound an obligation to give thanks for His loving-kindness and humbly to implore His continued care and protection. Health, wealth, and prosperity throughout all our borders; peace, honor, and friendship with all the world; firm and faithful adherence by the great body of our population to the principles of liberty and justice which have made our greatness as a nation, and the wise institutions and strong frame of government and society which will perpetuate it—for all these let the thanks of a happy and united people as with one voice ascend in devout homage to the Giver of All Good.

If such a condition of our public credit and condition of the people as President Hayes states existed throughout his term of four years is to be called a period of "ills," I am at a loss to know what a prosperous era is.

APPENDIX.

Money question reviewed by Percy Kinnaird, of the Nashville bar—1897.

The cupidity and rascality of certain classes in this country since its first settlement have brought evil and disaster upon the people and tended to overthrow and change the theory and form of our Government. On the other hand, the practical wisdom of the people, as expressed in experiments of the Government, has demonstrated what is the correct method of issuing money. Each has, at different periods, had their turn in issuing money, and though the first-named class, with bank notes, has always succeeded in entailing loss and disaster upon the people and it has been imperative for the Government to issue Treasury notes to repair this loss and save the property of the people, the Government has grown none the wiser.

Notwithstanding the number of times the Government has been forced to issue Treasury notes to protect the people from serious loss and to preserve its very existence, and which has demonstrated that the sole motive for so issuing money was to subserve in the highest degree the interest of the people by accommodating them in the easy exchange of their products, so soon as this has been accomplished bank notes have invariably returned and driven the Treasury notes out of circulation. The sole motive for the issue of money should be to accommodate in the highest degree the exchange of products among the people.

Whenever money has been issued for this purpose alone and made a legal tender or solvent of debts, both public and private, it has invariably served the interests of the entire people with the highest efficiency until it received the blow of hostile legislation of those who desired to substitute their bank notes in the place of the Treasury notes.

Whenever money has professedly been issued to accommodate the people in making their exchanges, and has only been made a legal tender in part, viz, for public, not private, debts, the friends of bank notes have always refused to receive it and in some instances have influenced the Government not to receive it, and thus forced it to a discount, and then demanded its retirement and the issue of bank notes. If it is conceded, as it must be, that the basic idea and dominant motive for the issue of money at all is the purpose to accommodate the people in making the exchange of their products, then certainly it should never be lost sight of or departed from in the formation of a financial system.

As civilization expands the country enlarges, population increases, and exchanges become intricate and on a magnitude that forces the abandonment of cash transactions. We are compelled to realize that this condition of affairs has to be met and provided for.

This is a natural and advantageous growth in the affairs of humanity that everyone should welcome and encourage with voice and hand, but not if it is at the expense of any portion of the people from the abuses of governmental legislation.

If a people can grow into the development above described with advantage to themselves, the country, and to humanity, it is well and good; but if this growth is at the expense of the many and enriches the few, creating distinctive and noxious class interests, threatening to the peace of society, it were well to discover the cause and remedy it before revolution, as it will, cures or makes worse the evil.

It may truthfully be said that the growth of the issue of money in a country is the growth of its civilization and that in this sense "moral growth is real growth; moral decay is real decay." Applying this thought, if a correct one, to the civilization of this country, and the inclination is strong to examine into the growth of our financial system and ascertain wherein and in what particulars it has taken on the excrescences that engendered all the corruption of that enhanced class interest which has grown so bold and shameless in its determination to keep what it has appropriated.

It is easily seen that under an advanced civilization the exchange of products that could not possibly be made by barter and trade could easily be made with a legal-tender currency. It is also easily seen that as population increased and the diversity of occupations enlarged the growth of cities would project the completion of large contracts into the future and create the debtor and creditor classes. Under this condition there was cash payments and future payments to be made in cash or credit. In both these instances actual cash payments were made. As the number of people increased and exchange of products became more intricate notes, bills, and drafts were used, but final settlements were made with the actual use of legal-tender money.

Finally there came a time in the transactions of this country, as is the case with all countries of advanced civilization and great power, when the magnitude of exchange made it a physical impossibility to transact business in the expectation or with the idea of making settlements with the actual use of legal-tender money. The only way in which business of this magnitude could be carried on at all was by a system of "bookkeeping" that had grown up in keeping an intelligent record of the manifold and almost incomprehensible variations of the daily, monthly, and yearly transactions which were taking place in the different parts of the country, and in some cases throughout the world, or wherever man went in his propensity to trade.

This system of "bookkeeping" is called the "credit system," as contradistinguished from all other methods of making exchanges, and should never be confused with credit.

The distinction between the "credit system" and all other modes of making exchanges and payments for same commences at that point where the settlement of balances and the liquidation of accounts in legal-tender money is an annoyance and undue expense in the actual handling of legal-tender money.

Just here lies the error of our present financial system. Notwithstanding the magnitude of many business interests in every State in the Union, and especially in the East and the more immediate Western States, has long been such that it is ridiculous to think of them handling legal-tender money in their business, except in the limited use that may be made to pay current expense, and that their business is conducted necessarily by the "credit system," or the "bookkeeping" theory, yet in contemplation of law all that vast and almost inconceivable volume of exchange of products is payable finally in legal-tender money.

Consequently whenever the ringleaders in this country or in Europe want to, for holy or unholy purpose, they make the demand for cash payments and precipitate a catastrophe that the Government is unable to ward off, even if the public officials attitudinizing as servants of the people were not the agents and tools of the ringleaders.

The growth of the business of this country has long since reached such proportions in many lines that the individual is completely barred.

It has been given over to chartered companies, and as it increased, the possibilities under our financial system and legislation are such that trusts and combines are naturally entered into with a purpose of complete absorption of that business.

The individual is thus driven from one field of employment to another and is fast becoming so restricted in his opportunities that he is being rapidly reduced to the condition of a wage slave more intolerable than that of chattel slavery. If the business of the country in many instances has grown to such proportions that it is ridiculous to think of their payments and settlements being made in the actual use of legal-tender money, and the use of such plebeian methods are not even contemplated in their business affairs, why should it not be separated from and made independent of a system that is the lifeblood of the business of the people?

They laugh and jeer at the idea that it makes any difference whether there is much or little money in circulation, claiming that only 4 per cent of the volume of all business is carried on by money, and the balance, 96 per cent, by the "credit system."

They deride the idea that if the volume of money is reduced it makes any difference, claiming that if you give much for it, either in labor or products, it will reimburse you when you part with it for the equivalent of what it cost you.

They claim that they have little or no use for money, because the bulk of their transactions are carried on by the "credit system," and that there is plenty of money to carry on the cash transactions, which are only 4 per cent of the volume of business.

If this is so and they do not need and do not use actual cash in their business, which is 96 per cent of the volume of all business, it is a false policy to leave the system so that at any time they want to they can demand the payment of this 96 per cent of the volume of all business in actual legal-tender money, and thereby precipitate a financial catastrophe that they call an object lesson.

The only way to disarm them and take this powerful engine of oppression from their use is to separate the "credit system" from cash and credits.

This would leave both systems to be used by those who used the "credit system," and secure cash and credit to the actual users of money, undisturbed by the rascality and manipulation of those who use the "credit system." But so long as the people can be cajoled into maintaining the present system that leaves the money class the enjoyment of the "credit system," and in addition the right and power to formulate, control, and direct the money system, with the added power, at any hour, to demand the payment of all their vast business and indebtedness in actual legal-tender money, the conversion of the property and products of the people will go forward until in the near future they will be the masters and the people serfs.

This separation of the "credit system" from the system wherein there is actual use of money, and taking away from the "credit system" the right to demand legal-tender money whenever cupidity may incline, has been done in the history of the race (notably in the Bank of Venice), and can and will be done again when statesmen and not the mere politicians are at the helm. Not satisfied with this control and domination over the volume of business and the method and manner of payments, they demand the right to issue their bank notes in the place of the greenbacks and the silver dollars, and they deny the right of the Government to issue money direct to the people.

This right to issue bank notes is maintained to-day by the threat to demand payment in legal-tender money of the vast indebtedness due them, and whenever and at such times as Congress attempts to pass contrary legislation, the call for payment in legal tender in vast amounts is made, precipitating in embryo a catastrophe that is termed an object lesson, and which is relieved so soon as Congress has been deterred from acting in the interest of the people. There was one of these object lessons in 1893, when it was decided to force Congress to repeal the purchasing clause of the Sherman law and cease the coinage of silver, and there will be another and more serious one this year in the attempt that will be made to induce Congress to retire the greenbacks and silver dollars and pass a banking law. To determine how this will be of advantage, and why it is regarded as so necessary, can be best shown by a cursory examination of the history and growth of the issues of money in this country.

It is unnecessary to consider the first two hundred and fifty years of our financial experiments, except to state that it consisted of all forms of barter and the use of the most primitive kinds of money; that as the country gradually took on the forms and assumed the manners of a higher civilization, it enlarged its purchases from Europe. This required the use on the part of the colonist of the same money that was current in Europe, and the demands for the metals became imperative.

This demand for metal money first affected Massachusetts, because of its higher advancement in civilization, and in 1649 that State, in order that it might secure the needed coins, demonetized beads that had been legal tender.

So great was the necessity at that time for metal money that the people of that State were glad of an opportunity to open up business relations with the buccaneers of the Spanish main.

This association of the much-lauded Puritan with the buccaneers of the Spanish main to secure a full supply of metal money did not secure enough for foreign use and local purposes, and in 1690 they were compelled to issue $55,000 of paper money. This was forced upon the State after the return of an unsuccessful expedition against the French in Canada.

The soldiers had come back without any spoils of war, were in a miserable condition, and so clamorous for their pay that this paper money had to be issued. It was made redeemable in any stock at any time that might be in the treasury, and for twenty years it circulated at par until it was redeemed.

In 1709 Massachusetts made a second issue of $75,000 of paper money that was made a legal tender for private debt.

In 1716, $750,000 more of paper money was authorized to be issued on real-estate security for ten years at 5 per cent interest.

In 1720, $250,000 more was issued.

During this time South Carolina, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Maryland, Delaware, and some of the other colonies under similar pressure for money for local need that the metals might be used in foreign trade had also issued paper money, and in most instances it was made a legal tender.

The Bank of England was organized in 1691, and in 1773 it suspended payment.

In its preparation and effort to resume the coin of the American colonies was needed and it was drawn across the ocean in the same peremptory manner that the East has drawn the coin out of the South and West since 1893 to keep their banks from suspending.

All the coin left Pennsylvania, though the colony passed laws raising its value. It was therefore forced in 1723 to issue treasury notes to supply the demand for local currency, and the notes were made a legal tender and redeemable only in payment of taxes. In 1740, notwithstanding the previous issues, the necessity for additional money was such that the colony of Massachusetts endeavored to secure more currency by establishing a land bank. It was denied this right by the governor of the colony, who claimed that it was unlawful and pernicious, contrary to the act of Parliament, and to his instructions.

The people of Massachusetts were beginning to feel the iron hand of the financiers of England, and in their extremity they laid aside their Puritan principles, called to their aid the characteristics of their buccaneering ancestors, and in 1745 made a predatory incursion upon the French and captured Lewisburg, on Cape Breton, which they despoiled.

The British Parliament so highly approved this exhibition of their buccaneering propensities dominating the heretical puritanic convictions that it ransomed Lewisburg from the colony, paying therefor a large sum of silver and copper.

Thereupon the colony of Massachusetts (that had received but small assistance from the other colonies), with the greater share of this ransom money, announced the intention of paying off her paper money and going to a sound-money basis.

This action of Massachusetts had the effect of drawing a large part of the trade of the other colonies to its market, and consequently was calculated to depreciate the value of the paper issues of the other colonies.

It was most disastrous to New Hampshire and Rhode Island on account of their proximity.

This loss of their trade checked their progress, lessened the demand for the use of their paper money, deprived them of the specie that it would have brought them, and the natural consequence was that the value of specie increased and their paper money was forced to a discount.

This was Massachusetts' first taste of the blood of humanity, drawn by financial buccaneering, and not with the buccaneer's sword and its attendant dangers, and was so much more in consonance with their professed puritanical principles that they have followed it every since.

The people realized fully the advantage that had accrued to them and the colony from the ransom money of the despoiled city and the use they had made of it at the expense of their sister colonies, and indifferent then as now and as they have ever been to the wail of suffering humanity, if it was caused by schemes that advance their prosperity and increase their wealth, does anyone doubt that they began secretly to influence the financiers of the Bank of England that the colonies ought not to be allowed to issue paper money?

From the use and enjoyment of a full supply of legal-tender paper money from 1690 to 1745, and then the capture, despoilment, and sale of a city, assisted by the method in which they used their ill-gotten gains at the expense of their sister colonists, the people of Massachusetts succeeded in clearing up their sterile and rocky lands and were far advanced on the road to material prosperity and riches.

Appreciating, as they must, the disadvantages they had suffered from and labored under so long in their trade relations with England and the necessity there was for them to secure sufficient metal money at any and all cost to carry on trade at home and abroad, and fully realizing that a full supply of legal-tender paper money for local use was the main cause of their success, it would naturally be supposed that solicitude for the younger, weaker, and struggling colonies would have prompted them to take no action that would injure or be detrimental to their sister colonies.

On the contrary, however, they at once proceeded to use the specie they had received for looting a city to go to a sound-money basis, conscious of the fact that in so doing they were applying to the other colonies similar impositions to those England had so inhumanly applied to them. From that time to this at first Massachusetts, and subsequently the East, has preyed and fattened off of the South and the West as it came into existence.

Going to a specie basis and the consequent despoilment of the other colonies of a large portion of their trade inured so much to the benefit of Massachusetts that by 1773 that colony had paid off all its paper money and debts and was on a specie basis.

The effect upon the other colonies was that their trade had decreased, their debts had increased, their paper money was at a discount, and they had to borrow from the people of Massachusetts.

This had been caused to a great extent by an act of Parliament in 1751, prohibiting the colonies from issuing paper money.

This prohibitive act seems to have had only the effect intended, that of depreciating the value of paper money and increasing the trade of specie-paying Massachusetts, for it appears that Virginia first issued paper money in 1755, notwithstanding the act.

This failure on the part of the colonies to obey the act of 1751, as Massachusetts was doing in gradually retiring her paper issues because it was to her interest, caused the British Board of Trade, in 1764, to object to the use of legal-tender paper money by the colonies, on the ground that "every medium of exchange should have an intrinsic value, which paper had not."

The British Board of Trade, the financiers of the Bank of England, and the people of Massachusetts finally succeeded, and in 1773 Parliament passed an act that took away from the colonies their representative money, commanded that no more paper money should be issued and that they should cease to be a legal tender, and demanded payment of taxes in silver.

This contraction of the currency paralyzed all the industries of the people. "Ruin seized upon these once flourishing colonies; the most severe distress was brought home to every interest and family; discontent was urged on to desperation, till at last 'human nature,' as Dr. Johnson phrases it, 'arose and asserted its rights.'" Thomas Pownal, M. P., of England, who had acted as governor and commander in chief of all the provinces, in a book written by him in 1768, says in regard to this colonial system of money: "In a country under such circumstances money lent to settlers creates money. Paper money thus lent upon interest will create gold and silver principal, while the interest becomes a revenue that pays the charges of the government. This currency is the true Pactolean stream which converts all into gold that is washed by it."

The desperation caused by this destruction of the colonial currency, and which contracted the volume of currency to such an extent that all enterprise perished, and the realization that the colonists would soon lose all their possessions and virtually become serfs of the English money lenders, brought on the Revolution. The English owners of gold and silver, in the folly of their mad avarice and the false assumption that if Massachusetts could go to a specie basis the other colonies could also, made the Revolution a certainty by the

following act of Parliament passed in 1775, viz: "That all promissory or other notes, bills of exchange, or drafts, or undertakings in writing, being negotiable or transferable, for the payment of any sum or sums of money less than the sum of 20 shillings in the whole, * * * shall be, and the same are hereby, declared to be absolutely void and of no effect."

Two years after this was followed by an act extending these provisions to all sums under £5. This was going to a hard-money basis with a vengeance.

The poor man was denied the right to make any trade to be paid in the future, but was forced to pay in cash in all transactions under $5 at first, and subsequently in all transactions under $25. This was too much for Massachusetts even. A sound-money basis of her own selection—and that was a good scheme for her people, although at the expense of her sister colonists—was well enough, but when she realized that all the transactions of her people under $5 must be in cash, and appreciated that a specie basis of that kind was detrimental to her interests, they were keen for the fighting to commence.

Therefore, when the English officials demanded of the people of Massachusetts the stamp tax upon the tea in specie, after they had made the use of specie a necessity in all local trades under $5, they realized, in the scarcity of specie, that English greed had outwitted them, and that they were going to be deprived of all the gains they had hoped to make off of their sister colonies in going to a specie basis.

Thoroughly enraged that English greed should gather the inhuman profits they were willing to take from the other colonists, their inherited buccaneering courage backed up their Puritan ideas of independence and freedom, and they threw the tea into the sea, declaring undying war to the tyrants.

Ostensibly the people of Massachusetts fought for independence and freedom from love of liberty and patriotism, but it was the freedom and liberty to despoil the other colonies it fought for, unrestrained and without fear of English interference.

This is clearly evidenced in the influence of that colony as to the manner of the issuance of paper money to fight the war of the Revolution; in the action of its delegates in framing the financial part of the Constitution; in the action of her public men in and out of Congress ever since in all financial legislation, and in the attitude of its people at the present time, demanding bank notes and the gold basis.

In preparing for the war the act of June 25, 1775, passed by the provisional government authorized the issue of $2,000,000 in notes that read as follows:

"This note entitles the bearer to receive —— Spanish milled dollars, or the value thereof in gold or silver, according to the resolution of the 10th of May, 1775."

Entering actively upon preparation for war with Great Britain because the acts of Parliament in 1773 and 1775 had forced them to a specie basis when, according to the best estimate, the colonies only had five millions of gold and silver, they are guilty of the fatal error of issuing six millions in notes redeemable in gold and silver.

In their ignorance of finances, or from ulterior motives of some powerful and sinister influence, their first issue of money inflicts upon the people the very grievance that was driving them to war with Great Britain. This manner of issuing notes was not the Pennsylvania method inaugurated by Franklin and of which Thomas Pownal thought so favorably.

It was not the method of the colonies that made the notes a legal tender for all debts, public and private, and made them redeemable in taxes.

It was not the method which provides and arranges for a safe, full, and acceptable money for local uses and makes it possible to have all the gold and silver for trade with foreign nations that Massachusetts had availed itself of from 1690 to 1773.

But it was the buccaneering policy of Massachusetts glossed over with hypocritical Puritan professions of patriotism and love of liberty that she thought had been fastened upon her sister colonists at the time she went to a sound-money basis. They were not made a legal tender in payment of public or private dues. After the war was over her delegates were instrumental in having the power denied to the States and withheld from Congress of emitting bills of credit or paper money and giving to Congress only the right to coin gold and silver.

The result of this has been that whenever money was needed banks have been given the right to issue notes, and the country has through all its history been inflicted with their worthless issues.

Whenever new territory was settled and money was needed, as Massachusetts did in her early days, instead of being able to do as Massachusetts did for such a while and so advantageously, they have been forced to borrow from Massachusetts and the East, until the East in this manner has absorbed nearly all the surplus wealth of the South and West. Her public men were instrumental in demonetizing silver and repealing the purchasing clause of the Sherman law, with the purpose of enhancing the value of the debt due Massachusetts that was forced upon the people of the South and West in being forced to borrow money of her people.

Her public men and people to-day are active and vociferous in demanding the retirement of the greenbacks, the withdrawal from circulation of all silver dollars, and the adoption of the gold standard in order that a banking law may be passed, so that they can issue their notes in the place of the greenbacks and the silver dollar.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I find an interview in the Washington Post this morning that purports to have been had with Mr. W. J. Bryan, now at Austin, Tex., on the subject of the bill before the House, and he closes the interview as follows:

It should certainly never be permitted to pass the House, because it is not in the interest of Democracy.

I have heard the criticism made by the gentleman who has taken his seat as to the manner in which this bill is before us. It seems to me it would be higher statesmanship on the part of gentlemen on the other side to discuss the effect of this bill on the country rather than its effect either upon the Republican or Democratic party. I propose to attempt to discusss it in that way. The discussion on my part will necessarily be a dry one, and I ask the considerate attention of the House for a while.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. One moment——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut yield to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. HILL. I will.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman read an interview, and I think inadvertently. As I read it, Mr. Bryan said it was because it was not in the interest of the people.

Mr. HILL. This interview says because it is not in the interest of Democracy.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Will the gentleman from Connecticut read the whole interview?

Mr. HILL. I have practically. I shall have to ask not to be interrupted, because my time will not allow me to complete my remarks.

Webster's Dictionary gives several definitions of the word "standard;" one, "That which is established as a rule or model by respectable authority, by custom, or by general consent;" another, with relation to coinage, "The proportion of weight of fine metal and alloy established by authority."

Our coinage law uses it in the latter sense only, and as such it is applied to the quality or fineness of both gold and silver alike, declaring "that the standard for both gold and silver coins shall be such that of 1,000 parts by weight 900 shall be pure metal and 100 of alloy." But it adds "that the one-dollar piece, at the standard weight of 25.8 grains of gold, shall be the unit of value."

The law of 1878 provides for the coinage of a silver dollar of the weight of 412½ grains troy of standard silver, but it nowhere makes this another unit or measure of value.

By common usage in the political discussions of the past three years the word "standard" has been applied to the metal and not to the fineness or quality of the metal, and, singularly enough, in the title of the bill under consideration, as well as in the Senate bill, the word is used with its broader meaning, referring to the basis of our financial system, and then in the first section of both bills in a restricted or specific sense, describing a peculiar characteristic of that basis and defining certain conditions which shall pertain to it.

I think it is this double use of the term standard rather than any ambiguity of the law itself which has caused doubt to exist in the minds of so many of our people as to the legal status of the measure of value in this country.

There is no question whatever that under the law since 1873 the only standard unit of value here has been, and is now, the gold dollar, consisting of 25.8 grains of standard gold or 23.22 grains of pure gold, and the fact that a silver dollar is a legal tender under certain conditions does not make it another standard unit of value any more than it makes a dollar greenback possessing larger legal-tender qualities a standard unit of value also.

Both of these are only means of payment or commercial tools, but both must be measured by the established unit of gold.

The purpose of this bill is not to fix another unit, or, using the common acceptation of the term, to establish another standard, but rather, at the demand of the people of the country, to recognize and emphasize the one we have and provide some way by which all of our currency and our whole commercial system shall be put and kept in accord with it.

That gold has been the touchstone, as it were, by which all other things have been tested from the earliest recorded times needs no argument now, and that as civilization has advanced to higher planes gold has by its inherent qualities demonstrated its superiority to everything else as a medium of exchange is beyond dispute.

The only question remaining is whether it now exists in quantities sufficient to be the only medium of exchange throughout the world, for if all forms of money are made exchangeable for it at the will of the holder it thus becomes the universal solvent.

This was disputed in this country three years ago, and even now the arguments then advanced are oozing out at intervals to sustain a dying cause; but while the controversy has been going on the miner's pick and dynamite have solved the problem, and to-day 89 per cent of all international trade is settled by the use of gold.

The question now is, Is there enough for us; and if so, how can we best use it as our medium of exchange in our domestic trade?

I do not use the word "enough" as in any way connected with the quantitative theory of money, for I do not accept that theory; but I mean enough, together with the other instruments of trade, to conveniently provide for the necessities of to-day.

Six years ago our silver friends said that gold and silver both were needed as redemption money, and the commercial value of the world's product of both was then $280,055,900.

In 1898 the product of gold alone was $287,428,600, and in the past six years, from 1893 to 1898, $1,267,271,100 have been added to the world's constantly accumulating supply of an imperishable money metal.

I have often thought that our timid bimetallic friends believed, or acted as if they did, that the crop of gold, like the world's food supply, was wholly consumed each year, instead of accumulating as it has through all the ages; but the proof is clear and plain that the great bulk of gold produced goes into and remains in money use.

The known, visible holdings of gold in the banks and treasuries of twenty-two countries of Europe increased from 1893 to 1898, inclusive, $503,323,711.

Of this increase they lost in 1898 $190,025,073, but it was almost wholly from the Russian Imperial Bank and treasury, and was, in the process of gold resumption, distributed among the Russian

people. But Mr. De Witte, the Russian minister of finance, says in his annual report that "there has been an actual increase in the general amount of gold in the country during the year 1898."

Assuming that this is correct, and adding the known increase to the stock of gold in the United States for six years prior to the 1st of July, 1899, which was $365,800,699, and we have accounted in these countries alone for $969,124,410 increased money supply out of the world's product of a little over twelve hundred millions in these six years.

But why weary the members of this House with dry statistics to prove that which even the casual observer of the world's progress now admits—namely, that the gold supply is rapidly approaching, if it has not already reached, the point where it meets the necessities and convenience of the world?

How is it in the United States?

In 1873 the per capita stock of money was $21.36, being $3.24 of gold, 15 cents of silver, and $17.97 of paper. On December 1, 1899, it consisted of $1,018,133,208 in gold, or $13.25 per capita; $644,491,755 in silver, or $8.38 per capita; $590,523,084 in paper, counting no certificates or Treasury notes, or a per capita of $7.68; making a total of $2,253,148,047, or a per capita of $29.31, of which 45 per cent is gold and 55 per cent is silver and paper, which we propose by exchangeability to make and keep as good as gold.

This is the task which we have undertaken, and it is a tremendous one.

That its greatness may be more clearly understood, let me call the attention of the House to the fact that, according to the latest statistics which I have, in 1897 the monetary stock of Great Britain consisted of 72 per cent of gold and 28 per cent of silver and paper; of France, 58 per cent of gold and 42 per cent of silver and paper; of Germany, 66 per cent of gold and 34 per cent of silver and paper.

Since adopting the gold standard, Germany has reduced her per capita of silver from $7.47 to $4.07, in 1897, and now she is about to recoin the greater part of her legal-tender silver into subsidiary coin.

She has found her burden, though small compared with ours, too great for her to carry. When the bullion in the Treasury is all coined, as is now being done under the law, we shall have $601,339,276 of legal-tender silver.

In the presence of this distinguished company of financiers, for we can all be thus classified this week, I hesitate even to offer a suggestion; but is it not a serious question whether, in time of panic, or with the balance of trade running strongly against us, or with a deficit in our Treasury, we can maintain gold redemption and exchangeability of gold with silver, unless some permanent disposition of the greenbacks is made and more rigid methods provided for holding our excessive volume of silver in circulation as change money among the people?

I shall vote for this bill with great pleasure, for, even as it is, it is far in advance of any former step taken by this House, and gives great promise for the future; but the country is calling for mandatory provisions where this bill allows discretion, and is demanding that the question of the maintenance of parity shall be so definitely settled now that it will require the united action of the Executive and both Houses of Congress ever to disturb or break it.

In September last I was present at the annual meeting of the American Bankers' Association at Cleveland, an organization representing a very large proportion of the State banks, trust companies, and national banks of the country and attended by more than a thousand delegates, representing nearly every State and Territory. This resolution was passed unanimously:

Resolved, That the bankers of the United States most earnestly recommend that the Congress of the United States at its next session enact a law to establish more firmly and unequivocally the gold standard in this country by providing that the gold dollar, which under the existing law is the unit of value, shall be the standard and measure of all values in the United States; that all obligations of the Government and all paper money, including the circulating notes of national banks, shall be redeemed in gold coin, and the legal-tender notes of the United States, when paid into the Treasury, shall not be reissued except upon the deposit of an equivalent amount of gold coin.

Mark the language. The banks themselves demand that their own notes shall be redeemable in gold, and that Government notes once coming in for redemption or paid in in the ordinary course of business shall not be reissued except upon the deposit of an equivalent amount of gold coin, making practically gold certificates of every one of them.

This done, and your silver given the whole field of change money by the limit of $10 placed upon circulating notes, your endless chain would be broken, and bond issues would be unnecessary if a Republican Administration and excess revenues continued for another four years.

Oh, that the timidity of the legislator might give place to the courage and confidence of the people of this land!

Nevertheless I rejoice in voting for this bill, for it makes every obligation for the payment of money an obligation to pay gold or its equivalent, and that puts the poor man's wage and the bondholder's coupon upon an equal footing.

It writes upon the face of every life-insurance policy and across the cover of every savings-bank book "Payable in gold."

While it means lower interest rates on mortgages and bonds, it means larger dividends on stocks, for every currency obligation will be gold, and the accumulated capital of the Old World will be drawn to the fixed investments of the New, so that the money now locked up in waterworks, sewers, completed railroad construction, and public works of all kinds where the necessity for employing labor is exhausted can be transmuted into live capital for new construction and further development and the employment of the home capital at greater profit in untried risks.

It will open up new mines, build more ships, dig more canals, and do more than any other one thing to render permanent the prosperity which abounds to-day.

A few months ago I received a letter from a gentleman in Connecticut, from which I wish to quote as touching this point:

The people are constantly calling for more money, but at the same time some of them are doing their utmost quite effectually to lessen the volume, as may be seen from the following facts: Early in September in London I asked one of the largest dealers in money in the world why England did not take all of the stocks in the market of such character as St. Paul preferred, New York Central, New York and New Haven, and those of other first-class roads that would net more than 4 per cent interest, instead of investing in European securities that pay less than 3 per cent. His reply was, "Because they are currency obligations, and Europe is still in doubt whether the basis of the currency of the United States is to be gold or silver. The London market is destitute of American railway shares of an investment character. They have all been sold and sent home, and had I an order to buy them I should be obliged to fill it in New York."

The day I left Liverpool for home one of the finance committee of the Liverpool, London, and Globe Insurance Company, a gentleman who knows this country well, told me it was useless to suggest in committee a larger investment in American securities, "because of the danger of silver legislation; remove that danger and hundreds—yes, thousands—of millions of European money would come like a flood for investment."

Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, section 2 of this bill removes that danger by declaring that every obligation for the payment of money shall be discharged with gold or its equivalent, and I do not propose to quibble now over the details of sections 3 and 4, for behind this declaration will stand the majesty, the honor, and the conscience of 75,000,000 of people, who will demand under all political changes that the spirit as well as the letter of the law shall be enforced.

In dropping further consideration of this topic and passing to the banking features of the bill, may I not express the hope that the same unanimity of opinion that characterized the committee which had the honor of compiling this bill may, after more extended deliberation and before its final enactment into law, prompt them to eliminate all discretionary provisions and make the exchangeability of all forms of money at the will of the holder absolute, unequivocal, and mandatory, for I believe that the unquestioned maintenance of parity will irresistibly drive every Secretary who administers this law in good faith to precisely that course of action.

The pending bill, so far as it relates to banking, touches three subjects: First, increased circulation; second, taxation; third, minimum limit of capitalization.

During the past four years, whenever any proposition relating to national banks has come up for action in this House, I have noticed the remarkable unanimity which has characterized the unvarying opposition of the Democratic membership, and have wondered whether this antagonism was toward all banks or only to the national system.

In the attempt to solve the doubt I have briefly noted the declarations of that party in its national platforms since 1836 relating to banking and currency. They are as follows:

Platform of 1836:

We declare unqualified hostility to bank notes and paper money as a circulating medium, because gold and silver are the only safe and constitutional currency.

Platform of 1840:

Resolved, That Congress has no power to charter a United States bank.

Platform of 1844: Resolution of 1840 reaffirmed.
Platform of 1848: No expression.
Platform of 1852:

Resolved, That Congress has no power to charter a national bank, etc.

Platform of 1856: Same resolution reaffirmed.
Platform of 1860: Same resolution reaffirmed.
Platform of 1864: No resolution.
Platform of 1868:

One currency for the Government and the people, the laborer and the officeholder, the pensioner and the soldier, the producer and the bondholder.

Platform of 1872:

The public credit must be sacredly maintained, and we denounce repudiation in every form and guise. A speedy return to specie payment is demanded alike by the highest considerations of commercial morality and honest government.

Platform of 1876:

As such hindrance we denounce the resumption clause of the act of 1875, and we here demand its repeal.

Platform of 1880:

Honest money (the strict maintenance of the public faith), consisting of gold and silver and paper, convertible into coin on demand.

Platform of 1884:

We believe in honest money, the gold and silver coin of the Constitution, and a circulating medium convertible into such money without loss.

Platform of 1888: No currency resolution.

Platform of 1892:

We recommend that the prohibitory 10 per cent tax on State bank issues be repealed.

Platform of 1896:

Congress alone has the power to coin and issue money. We therefore demand that the power to issue notes to circulate as money be taken from the national banks and that all paper money shall be issued directly by the Treasury Department.

The only conclusion that I can draw from these declarations is that in its early youth the Democratic party was opposed to any form of paper money, and especially to bank-note issues.

In middle life and vigorous manhood it fell in love with State banks and note issues without limit or supervision, and now in its old age and declining years it demands that all paper money shall be issued directly by the Treasury Department, with no provision for payment except that it shall be receivable for public dues.

Is it not true in this, as in another historic case, that "the last state of that man is worse than the first?"

I have no authority to speak for anyone but myself, but my belief is that the only safe currency system for this country, or indeed for any country, is gold for its legal tender, a subsidiary coinage of silver for change money, and bank-note issues for commercial instruments; and all such notes should be issued by banks under the direct supervision and control of the General Government, and under such provisions of safety, either by the deposit of bonds or other guaranties, that there can be no possibility of loss to the holders thereof.

A government can not put money into circulation except in payment of debts already contracted, and when it pays with notes it has no returning stream of assets with which to meet them, for, while it often borrows, it never lends.

It can impose taxes, but can not adjust the time of payment to meet its notes, for, if they circulate as money, they must be on demand.

With a bank it is not so. It lends its credit in exchange for that of others, and for every dollar note that it puts out, at the time it does so it receives another back on which it expects to realize either on demand or at a fixed date in the future.

Again, the issue of notes by a government in payment of its debts has no relation to the business necessities of the people or the needs of trade, but a bank can only issue notes legitimately in response to commercial demands.

And yet we count a Government note as money, and in the statement of the condition of the United States Treasury, which the members of this House receive each day, millions of them are classed as cash on hand and counted as a part of the available cash balance, when, as a matter of fact, for every one put out a new obligation is at once created.

The absurdity of the whole thing is shown by the fact that a national bank is forbidden by law from counting its own notes as cash on hand, notwithstanding it has previously deposited with the Government its own bonds as security for their payment.

But the question here is, Shall a national bank be permitted to issue circulation within the limit of its capital to par of the bonds deposited as security?

The proposition is a plain one.

It is simply this: Will the United States accept its own bond of $100 as good security for $100 or only for $90?

Think for a moment what this means.

By the exercise of its taxing power, this Government says to its own people, "You shall not organize banks and issue notes unless you do it under the national banking system, and if you do it under that system you shall buy the bonds of the United States Government to a certain amount.

"We will not take less than $100 for a single bond, but when you have bought it we refuse to accept it as collateral security for more than $90."

What would be thought of an individual who had another in his power and made such a proposition as that to him?

I fancy that Shylock in his palmiest days never dreamed of such a bargain, even when the mosquitoes of Venice were singing him to sleep on the banks of the Grand Canal.

It would seem as though the simple statement of the proposition would be the best demonstration of its utter absurdity, and yet for thirty-five years this has been the effect of this law, and for all that time it has locked up millions of dollars of margin and premium that under any business treatment of the case would have been active working capital and used in developing the industrial and commercial resources of this nation.

Almost as much as the entire monetary stock of Canada and Mexico combined is lying idle here because this great Government still clings to the idea that its own bond is not absolutely safe for what it sells at.

It may not be known to all that the national-bank law, as originally drawn, February 25, 1863, provided for issuing circulation—equal in amount to 90 per cent of the current market value of the United States bonds, but not exceeding the par value thereof, if bearing interest at 6 per cent, or of equivalent United States bonds bearing a less rate of interest, but limited by the capital stock.

This provision remained in force until the act of June 3, 1864, which limited the issue of notes based on bonds bearing not less than 5 per cent interest to "not exceeding 90 per cent of the amount of said bonds at the par value thereof," and with this act began a series of attempts to fetter and control the banking capital of this country, every one of which has been a complete and total failure and most of which have been repealed.

Complaint is made to-day that the national-bank system does not measure up to the financial requirements of the times; that its note issues are insufficient and nonelastic; that it locks up capital instead of sending it out free and unencumbered to do its beneficent work, and in some respects the charge is true; but this is not due to the system itself, but rather to the miserable and senseless restrictions that have been placed upon it, which during all these years have held it as in a vise.

Twice it has come to the rescue of his nation—first, when it made a market for our bonds and supplied the means to carry on the war, and, second, when it made resumption possible, and gratitude alone should prompt at least a recognition of its usefulness.

In 1864 the limit of circulation was fixed at three hundred millions, when at that very time there were eighty-six millions of capital in the national and four hundred and five millions in the State bank system.

The minimum limit of capital stock was fixed and still remains at $50,000, and in 1865 the privilege of issuing notes was graded from 90 per cent down to 60 per cent, according to the capital of a bank.

This same year an attempt was made to distribute arbitrarily circulation among the States and Territories, which was about as effective in its results as the seed distribution was last year upon the crops of 1899.

In 1870 the amount was increased to three hundred and fifty-four millions and a redistribution attempted on the basis of the census of that year, and the limit for any one bank was fixed at $500,000.

Taxes were laid on deposits and circulation, and reserves of 15 per cent and 25 per cent ordered to be held against both.

Most of these restrictions proved to be total failures, and in 1875 the separate and aggregate limit and the provisions for the distribution were repealed, and now the only limit of capitalization of a bank is the necessities of commerce, and of circulation 90 per cent of capital stock. The reserve against circulation has been removed and the tax taken from deposits, and should be from circulation, for there is no more reason for taxing money than there is for taxing air and water, for money is the life-blood of trade and commerce.

In 1892 another turn of the screw was made and laws were passed making it impossible to issue and withdraw notes at will, with the result that when the pinch came in 1893 and a currency famine made excessive calls for notes it took months to supply the demand, and then the trouble was over and months more passed by before withdrawals could be made.

Is it surprising that a system so hampered and tied down should not in every case respond to the business wants of this great nation?

Is it not a greater wonder that it has survived at all? And it would not if it had not possessed elements of vitality and strength that made it indestructible.

In 1882 Comptroller John Jay Knox advised an increase of circulation to 95 per cent of the market value of the bonds he'd, and every Comptroller, Republican and Democratic, from that day to this has repeated the recommendation in a more or less modified form.

In my judgment, the wise course would be to permit an issue of notes to the market value of the bonds, for behind this is the first lien upon all of the assets of the bank, and the liability of the stockholder added, so that no possible loss could ever come to a bill holder if such a plan were adopted.

But this bill provides for an issue to par only, and its probable immediate effect would be to add about twenty millions of national-bank notes to the currency of the country.

Furthermore, by giving a possibility of a slight profit on circulation, it may stimulate the taking out of circulation by banks which now have none, and may encourage the organization of small banks in the West and South.

We have more banks in New England now than we need.

As the law now stands the profit on note issues based on a 4 per cent bond of 1907 is less than one-third of 1 per cent, but that result is only obtained by having all money loaned all of the time and all at 6 per cent, which in actual experience is utterly

impossible, and the probabilities are that very few banks can to-day show any profit on circulation.

The best proof of this is that in New York City alone there is a note issue of but seventeen millions against forty-nine millions of capital, and in the whole country there are four hundred and thirteen millions of unused privilege.

The special benefit to be derived from this change in the law seems to me to be the impetus it will give to the organization of small banks in the newer sections of the country.

The average capitalization as I found it a year or two ago under the national banking system was $178,000; under State laws, $88,000, and of private banks, $31,000.

Reduce the limit of possible capital to $25,000, give circulation to par of the bonds, withdraw all taxes from it, and I have no doubt but that large numbers of State and private banks will reorganize under the national system with results that would be exceedingly beneficial in many ways.

When I last examined this subject 66 per cent of our population resided in communities of less than 4,000 inhabitants.

By the last census there were 2,810 towns of from 1,000 to 4,000 people.

The national-bank system would give to them not only lower rates of interest but larger capital, and, what is of more importance, far greater security for deposits than most private banks can offer.

Protected by Government supervision and control, the capital of other States would flow in for investment where it would never be sent to be subject to State legislation or individual management.

Three years ago the report of the Comptroller showed that of the 525 banks in Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska, one-third of the capital was contributed by Eastern stockholders. Of the 144 banks in Dakota, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Utah, Washington, Wyoming, and Arizona, one-half was from the same source; and of the 410 banks in the South, one-sixth was from the North and East.

It is utterly impossible that this could be, except under the national system.

But not only would this bring in the capital of nonresidents, but it would develop a habit of depositing in banks the money which is now carried in the pocket and kept in the home in those sections where such facilities are not afforded, and every dollar so placed at once becomes an addition to the loanable funds of the community.

Such a system would soon become a splendid contribution to the business of the larger banks in the reserve cities and would furnish exchange between different points at far less cost than now.

Unite with these national banks in the small towns of the West and South the mutual savings-bank system of New England under the same management and without additional cost, as our laws permit, until the aggregate of deposits reaches half a million dollars, and the best featureof New England life will be transplanted to those sections of our country where now the use of pennies is unknown.

Such a community will soon become self-developing and self-reliant.

I refer with pardonable pride to the results of a system grown up from such beginnings in my own State.

The population or Connecticut is 746,258, and its savings-bank depositors number 375,810, with an average deposit of $435.01 each and the splendid total of $163,482,498.52. Match it in this Union if you can. This is where our 54,000 majority came from in 1896. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Last year 52,589 accounts were opened and 43,443 closed, and in ordinary years following up each closed account may be found a separate cottage built, a home furnished, or a child educated, and back of the open account—a guaranty against days of adversity or times of sorrow and a constant incentive to industry—economy and thrift, the virtues which are worth far more to a State or nation than mines of gold and silver or untold millions of legal-tender paper notes, which we sometimes call money.

It may be inferred from what I have said that I am in favor of the organization of small banks, and so I am, if nothing better can be had, but I would greatly prefer the branch-bank system.

It is a popular idea that, by the reduction of the minimum of capital to $25,000 in small towns, banking facilities will be provided in communities where there are not deposits or business enough to justify a larger capital.

Of course those are agricultural communities.

Instead of less than one-third of 1 per cent profit on circulation under the present law, assume, under the provisions of this bill, that in 6 per cent localities 1 per cent could be made.

It needs no argument to show that at any reasonable rate of interest on $25,000 it is impossible to maintain an independent organization, provide the management and equipment for a national bank, and return a reasonable profit to the investor.

It follows, therefore, that deposits must be added to a considerable amount or very heavy rates for discounts charged to even meet expenses, and where such rates of interest can be charged and are paid it is more profitable to loan capital direct than to invest it in low-interest bonds, bought at a high premium, on which to issue circulation.

Hence, in such communities the private banker has full sway and makes his own terms for loans, and will continue to have control until, by a system of branch banking, agencies for large and strong institutions are permitted to come into competition with him.

Deposits of at least double the amount of capital will be necessary to maintain an independent existence.

There is another fact which should be considered with reference to this feature of the bill.

The strength of a bank is its capital.

The deposit is a liability.

While deposits provide loanable funds, less the reserve required, the margin of safety to the depositor is in the precise proportion which capital bears to deposits.

A bank with $100,000 of deposits and $50,000 capital is twice as safe as one with the same deposits and $25,000 capital.

We are apt to look at the enormous deposits of some of our city banks and think how great and strong they are, but the prudent depositor will turn to the capital account and judge of the margin of safety to himself.

I would suggest to the gentleman in charge of this bill whether it might not be well to provide, at the organization of these small banks, for a compulsory increase of capital when a certain amount of deposits is reached.

Four years ago I came here a believer in the small independent bank, and I prefer it now to none at all; but the experience of every commercial nation except ours has demonstrated the wisdom and economy of the branch system.

It needs no argument to show that a large bank in a market town or commercial city and a hundred agencies established among country stores or with branch offices in small communities, and all connected by telephone or telegraph with the parent office, can do business far more economically, and hence serve these communities far more effectively, than a hundred independent organizations.

There is no more reason for objecting to it than there would be in passing a law forbidding a manufacturer establishing offices and salesrooms for his product in any number of cities in the country or anywhere else where he could find a market for his goods.

Any individual can go into any State and loan money, and if he can get credit he can borrow. Why should not five men associated together as a national banking association and under Government supervision and frequent inspection be allowed to do the same thing?

The claim here is that the country would be drained of money and the cities would be clogged; but the experience of other nations shows that by the branch-bank system the parent bank would receive money where it was not needed and interest rates were low and distribute it where it was wanted and interest rates were high, and, like the irrigating plants of the West, carry life and health and strength by a hundred little channels to what would otherwise be dry and thirsty ground.

As it is now, the country banks, with their city reserves and system of rediscounts, are practically branches of the banks in the reserve cities, but the business is done at greatly increased cost, and the country customer pays the bill.

Branches in other countries are the commercial drummers of their banking systems.

One of the conditions on which the charter of the Bank of France was recently renewed was that it should agree to establish a branch in each political division of the country.

Here we put our banks in a strait-jacket and wonder why money is so cheap in some places and dear in others.

I do not believe that the branch system would equalize rates in all parts of the country, for there are many important factors in that problem, but it would very materially help to improve present conditions.

Mr. Chairman, the subject of taxation is the important one, for it is upon the final decision of this question that the fate of the national system rests.

Contrary to the common thought upon the subject, I believe that the exercise of the power of note issue is a duty which a bank owes to the community rather than a privilege to the bank itself, and so believing, it seems to me to be absurd to tax it. A bank note is equivalent to the bank's check on its own redemption fund.

Taxes should be laid on property, and a bank note or a check is not property, but only a convenient instrument for the transfer of property.

As a war measure, a stamp tax on checks or anything else is justifiable.

On principle, there is no excuse for it.

One set of men organized a grocery firm, another a bank.

Each should pay a tax on their investment.

In the first case this is represented by the average stock on hand, plus average accounts due them, minus average accounts owing and notes outstanding.

The bank should also pay on its investment, which can only be represented by capital, surplus, and undivided profits.

But exactly here is the trouble with our national system.

The strongest competitor which the national bank has to-day is the trust company, organized under our State laws, with liberal privileges and all banking powers except that of note issue, and with practically unlimited power of maintaining branches anywhere in the world.

The taxes of the trust company are paid by the company.

It pays no national tax, and the stockholders pay no local tax on the shares which they own.

When the company is assessed locally under the national law, it can and does claim exemption from local taxation to the extent of its holdings in Government bonds.

With the national bank it is not so.

Its national tax is specifically on circulation.

Its local tax is on the shares of its stockholders, and as the bank, not the individual stockholders, owns the bonds held, no exemption can be claimed for the individual tax.

It makes no difference whether the stockholder pays his own tax or whether the bank pays it for all; the result is the same.

To anywhere nearly equalize the two, no tax whatever should be charged by the Government, but the actual cost of issuing the notes and maintaining the redemption bureau should be assessed pro rata upon the banks taking out circulation.

Even then the trust company and State banks would have a great advantage in local taxation.

The only remedy that I can see, and possibly the only salvation for the system, is to exempt the shares of national banks from all taxation, and to permit the investment in national banks to be taxed locally, as all other investments are, and paid by the banks themselves, with the same right as a trust company to plead exemption on Government bonds.

I am satisfied that the plan proposed here is much more just than the present 1 per cent tax on circulation, for under the present system the large city banks which do not take out circulation contribute nothing to the support of the Government, and have not since they succeeded in having the tax taken off from deposits.

If, instead of driving them out of the national system, it brings them to using their great influence toward securing a more equitable distribution of the burden between the city and country banks and the trust company, all will be well.

In closing, I beg the pardon of the House for having thus gone into the dry details of this measure.

I am a believer in a national banking system, not necessarily as it is now, but a system always under the watchful supervision and careful inspection of the National Government.

I am utterly opposed to the old State banks, with 45 different charter powers and 45 different kinds of note issues.

We are a great people, rich now beyond the dreams of our fathers and growing richer every day.

In many lines of industry we already lead the world.

Under the stimulus of protection other triumphs are awaiting us.

The sea is ours to conquer, if we will, and American genius will yet prove itself equal to the task.

But the dominant power of the globe will always be the one which controls the financial exchanges of the world.

Gentlemen, the victory will never come to us while our currency and banking system continues to be the sport of politics and the plaything of demagogues.

The one supreme purpose of this bill is to lay in standard gold a solid foundation upon which another Republican Congress may erect the splendid superstructure of a national-banking system, reorganized and improved, ready and fit to contest with the Bank of England for the financial supremacy of the world.

The bill is worthy of the affirmative vote of every lover of his country and every believer in her future greatness. [Great applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HEPBURN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT FOR HOLIDAYS.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Wednesday, December 20, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, January 3, 1900.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. PAYNE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a recess be taken to-morrow in order that we may join with the President and Senate in paying proper tribute to the memory of George Washington and that we take the vote on Tuesday instead of Monday. I ask unanimous consent that the order may be made to that effect.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the House adjourn over to-morrow for the purpose of paying tribute to the memory of George Washington and that the vote on this bill be postponed from Monday until Tuesday next.

Mr. DALZELL. At the same hour on Tuesday?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I want to inquire if that would interfere with the vote on Monday?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am willing that Monday shall be substituted for Saturday for the five-minute debate, and then the vote be taken immediately after the reading of the Journal on Tuesday.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Has it not been the experience of the gentleman from Tennessee through to-day that with the night sessions and the additional hour in the morning three days will be sufficient time for the remaining debate, without carrying the vote over for another day?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not think so.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I think it will be better to take the vote on Monday. I have no objection to the other part of the request.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Everybody who wishes can go to the celebration, and the debate can go on in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. OVERSTREET. It will be in Committee of the Whole and no other business can be done.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think the House, out of respect to the memory of the first President of the United States, ought to adjourn over.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think if Washington were alive to-day he would stay here in the House, if he was a member of it, and finish the consideration of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects.

UNVEILING THE STATUE OF DANIEL WEBSTER.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. SULZER. I suppose this is read for the information of the House.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That a committee consisting of three members from the Senate and five members from the House of Representatives be appointed to make arrangements for the reception and unveiling, on January 18, 1900, of the statue of Daniel Webster presented to the United States by Mr. Stilson Hutchins and erected on Massachusetts avenue, in the city of Washington.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we have just refused to suspend our business out of respect for the memory of the most illustrious American, we ought not to be asked now to suspend our rules to honor a less illustrious one. To-morrow marks the 100th anniversary of the death of the first President of the United States——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas object?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will designate to act as Speaker this evening the gentleman from South Dakota, Mr. GAMBLE.

The hour of 5 o'clock having arrived, the Speaker declared the House, in pursuance of its previous order, in recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

The recess having expired, the House, at 8 o'clock p. m., was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. GAMBLE.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the order of the House for the session this evening the House will now resolve itself into

Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. HEPBURN, will please take the chair.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. HEPBURN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the bill H. R. No. 1—the financial bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the House of Representatives is now engaged in the discussion of one of the most important subjects of legislation that has occupied its attention in the later history of our country. Important it is, for the powers are here to fasten the gold standard upon our people. The design is clearly expressed in this bill to retire from circulation the greenbacks, "the people's money," and to clothe the national banks with the power to issue paper money in lieu of the Government greenbacks, and to make all United States bonds and obligations of the Government redeemable in gold instead of in "coin."

This plan is but the beginning of that policy the successive step in which will be the destruction of silver as money, save as subsidiary coin.

The Reed rules, ever elastic, always powerful, fashions the mode of procedure by which this infamy is perpetrated upon the country. The Rules Committee, the imperial progeny of the rules themselves, the representative of the greatest autocratic power that ever fastened itself upon a republic, is the agency through which the work is accomplished.

Without committee consideration, indeed without committees being appointed to consider, this measure is presented, important and far-reaching to all our people, and a rule is fixed for debate in this body which accords to each member of the minority here less than five minutes, on the average, for discussion, though this bill comprehends within its scope a change of the entire banking and financial concerns of the country.

In the usual and orderly procedure questions of such vitality and importance have taken weeks for deliberation, have gone to committee composed of members of both political parties, been there considered, and received in this House on reports of such committee.

But now all safeguards are set aside by the rules and by the Rules Committee to speedily pass this measure at the behest of the special interests.

Upon the first day of our assembling here this Congress, with one-third of the membership of the House not members of the former Congress, you saw fastened upon you, with no opportunity for debate and amendment, and before the committees were appointed, this code of rules which bind you down like slaves so long as they are continued.

You heard stated here by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] that a reason for their adoption thus was that they had been the rules of the former Congress; but he did not then state, what you yourself do know, Mr. Chairman, and what every member of that Congress knows, that they were passed the first day of the Fifty-fifth Congress, without committee consideration, under the operation of the previous question, without the opportunity for a half minute's debate, and with no opportunity for amendments. The reason stated by the gentleman, when the facts are known, becomes a most cogent one, does it not, new members of the House, for you to thus shackle yourselves, as you of the majority did, in supporting them by your vote on that day?

The time I have will not permit a discussion of the great questions of money and finance, but I shall content myself in the few moments I have with offering some observations which, under the operation of the previous question, I was denied making on the day the whilom Rules Committee refused to have a discussion of the rules, and which can be so appropriately made at this time, as every power of the rules has been invoked here to force this measure upon the House and upon the country.

The disfranchisement of constituencies under the mode of legislation enforced by the Reed rules, which for years have czarized this body, is not a new subject of complaint either on this or on the Republican side of the House.

Our fathers established for us a republican form of government, and with it transmitted to us the House of Representatives, republican in form it has remained, but how changed in fact.

For years the most popular branch of the American Congress has been governed with a rod of iron, under the sanction of iron rules. These rules were enforced by a Speaker of the House once, and his name will go thundering down through all ages as a ruler of great sapience, a man of iron nerve, iron will, while his colleagues on this floor were buried, as were the rights and appeals of their constituencies, in a grave of oblivion, unheard of and unknown, save as they are recorded in the roll calls of the House, for they were vouchsafed the right to vote. This was not a survival of the fittest, but a triumph of the powerful.

History records that we have a republican form of government, but the evidence of it is not found in the House of Representatives. Scourged in conscience and in action, with party fealty making cowards of you all, you members of the majority, who were members then, and your constituencies were disfranchised, while this body existed only as a relic of a proud and historic form of people's government, intended by our fathers to have been transmitted to their posterity.

Read the proof in the earlier and later history of our country, in the earlier and later records of the House; read it, gentlemen, honor bright, read it in your own hearts and minds and in your consciences, you who had the power in this Congress to change those rules if you had had the courage.

Under these rules and practices in the last Congress more time was given for the discussion of the smallest appropriation than could be had to discuss the great questions of currency and finance; more time given to discuss whether a member used or intended to use the word "many" or "most" in debate than was given to discuss the great questions of international law; more time given in opposition to the President's civil-service laws than was accorded for the discussion of the great questions of national taxation.

The Committee on Rules, with its great choking coils like huge anacondas intertangling and stifling legislation, disfranchising free men and Americans, is a fitting background for a picture of the throne.

The Rules Committee is all powerful; such rules as these are drastic; but withal, they seem to be flexible enough in their enforcement to well serve party ends and private purposes. Not only are such rules subject to great criticism and complaint, but the peculiar and eccentric enforcement of them is still more subject to criticism and complaint. Such a power of facility and expedience is found within them that they can be and have been used to thwart not only the will of the American people, but the Senate of the United States expressing that will.

Under those rules, in the second session of the Fifty-fifth Congress, when the people of the country and their Representatives in Congress wanted to pass a measure for Cuba, the magic powers of the rules were invoked to suppress and dishearten; when the Senators of all political parties—Republican, Populist, and Democratic—passed a joint resolution for Cuba, it came to the most numerous branch of the American Congress, and there, under the mysterious influence of the Reed rules, it went to sleep in the catacombs of the House. On the other hand, when it was desired by the power that was to pass a measure, it was rushed through the House by a meteor process, without discussion and debate, as was shown by the monetary-commission bill, passed in the dying hour of the special session of the preceding Congress.

Under these rules the objection of a single member last session of Congress prevented the passage of a law to stop the importation of Chinese and cooly laborers, under contract, into the Hawaiian Islands, and thousands have in the meantime been brought, practically as slaves, to those islands of recent acquisition.

If this is not proof of monarchy, show me the one-man power more potent than this.

I need not say that a single man, a single power and influence, dominated this House. It is true that one man under these rules can govern and control it; all others are subjected to his sweet will, and this denial to the people of full representation makes their Representatives in Congress, to serve their constituencies in any degree, act not as self-respecting and independent men, but as cringing sycophants to the one-man power.

This situation, so depressing to independent manhood, so dangerous to the Republic, is known throughout the land, is a subject of daily comment in the press, in the coordinate branch of Congress, and in this House, and yet those who complain and have the power hesitate to correct this dangerous evil that threatens our existence. They raise their hands, but have not the courage to strike the blow.

The party in power, as individuals, admit these evils, confess this abuse of the individual rights of members; yet as a House they are pleased or forced to let their party spirit and partisanship overcome their judgment and continue these wrongs that tend to sap the foundation of our Government.

Do you ask why we should have the right to discuss and amend? The answer is found in one of the blackest pieces of legislation that ever blotted American legislative history, passed because it was unknown, not discussed. I refer to the demonetization act. One of the evils of all deliberative bodies is the danger of the passage of measures without a full understanding. If the leading statesmen Senators could be deceived in that body, where they have full and free debate, how much more are we entitled to the right of full and free discussion in this body, so clearly and so closely representative of the people. Were not Congress and the people deceived by a failure to discuss?

Let me give you the burning evidence of statesmen witnesses, living and dead. I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Referring to the act demonetizing silver in 1873, they spoke in Congress as follows:

Judge Kelley, of Pennsylvania (see RECORD, volume 7, part 2, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, page 1605):

I was ignorant of the fact that it would demonetize the silver dollar. * * *

Mr. Blaine (see RECORD of February 15, 1878, page 1063):

I did not know anything that was in the bill at all.

Mr. Voorhees (see RECORD of February 15, 1878, page 1063):

I frankly say that I did not.

Also, Mr. Voorhees (see RECORD of January 15, 1878, page 332):

Its enactment * * * unknown to the people and to four-fifths of Congress.

Senator Beck, of Kentucky (see RECORD of January 10, 1878, page 258):

Illegal and unconstitutional consummation of a fraud.

Also, Senator Beck, of Kentucky (see RECORD, volume 7, part 1, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, page 260):

It was never understood by either House of Congress.

Mr. Burchard, of Illinois (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 13, 1876, volume 4, part 5, page 4560):

Unaccompanied by written report, * * * unknown to members of Congress, who without opposition allowed it to pass.

Judge Holman (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 4, part 6, Forty-fourth Congress, first session, Appendix, page 193):

Its passage * * * was a colossal swindle.

Mr. Bright, of Tennessee (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 7, part 1, second session Forty-fifth Congress, page 584):

It passed by fraud in the House; * * * passed without discussion, debate being cut off by operation of the previous question. It was passed to my certain information under such circumstances that the fraud escaped the attention of some of the most watchful as well as the ablest statesmen in Congress at the time.

Senator ALLISON of Iowa (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 7, part 2, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, page 1058):

The bill was doctored. * * *

Senator Hereford, of West Virginia (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 14, 1877, page 205):

One of the most remarkable and to my mind one of the most fraudulent pieces of legislation this or any other country ever saw.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 4, part 6, Forty-fourth Congress, first session, Appendix, page 197):

It was not discussed, as shown by the record, and neither members of Congress nor the people understood the scope of the legislation.

Why allow discussion and amendment? Look at the appalling results of a failure to discuss.

If measures of such widespread import and great disaster can be enacted without knowledge, because not discussed and debated, how many evils, great and small, can be ingrafted on our legislation when protected by the rule of no discussion?

Time will not permit me to discuss the desired remedies and the changes in the rules necessary to secure the rights of members; these are known to those who have come beneath their crushing power.

An abrogation of the Rules Committee would place all public matters of legislation regularly introduced and pending before the House on equal terms.

Annulment of rules in derogation of liberty of debate and amendment measurably would secure to each constituency represented on this floor rights that heretofore have been denied and in a marked degree to new members of the House.

The effect of the Reed rules is known, and if they are continued a time may come when a Brutus, a Cromwell, some bad man, may use this power to subvert the Republic. Mr. Chairman, I register my protest and my voice against such a dangerous system. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, if any impetus were needed to push the money question into the front of national issues, no greater could be wanted than the passage of the bill now before the House. While its advocates indulge in the vain hope of taking this great question out of the arena of politics and public discussion, they are really adding fuel to the flame of this burning issue and adding strength to the Democratic position and making it impregnable at the coming national election. A discussion of this bill is calculated to arouse the people once more to the realization of the dangerous tendency of gold monometallism and all its attendant evils in a degree that will not only surprise our adversaries, but which must sweep the Republican party from power, or else eventuate in the complete overthrow of our present economic system.

If I were asked to define the scope and effect of this bill, should it be enacted into law, I would say that it was to contract the volume of our primary money, to perpetuate industrial combinations and monopoly, build up and maintain plutocracy, firmly establish imperialism upon the nation, and place the masses at the mercy of the classes. That such is the intention of all its advocates I can not believe, yet that such is its effect I can not doubt. That it will pass this House is a foregone conclusion, and all its opponents can hope to do is to call the attention of the country to its sweeping provisions and its blighting and disastrous results, so that the responsibility of its enactment may be placed where it belongs.

First of all, it involves a complete abandonment of bimetallism and aims to fix indefinitely the gold standard upon this country, thus proclaiming to all the nations of the world that no further effort is to be made by the United States toward international agreement on the question of bimetallism. It is a complete surrender by this nation of its independence in her fiscal affairs to the European or English financial policy. Moreover, it is a complete reversal of the policy of the national Republican party, which declared for bimetallism by international agreement and which now ignores its platform professions and yields to the demands of the gold monometallists.

It is a complete vindication of the leaders of the national Democratic party when they predicted the fallacy of the Republican position and insisted upon independent bimetallism, and will present in the future the clean-cut proposition whether the American people favor the single gold standard or the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 by this nation alone, as laid down in the Chicago platform.

But the bill does not stop at fixing the gold standard. It further provides that all interest-bearing obligations of the Government (United States bonds) and all United States notes (greenbacks) and Treasury notes (Sherman Act silver notes) shall be redeemed in gold, and that all other obligations, public and private, for the payment of money shall be payable in gold.

The Secretary of the Treasury must maintain the gold-reserve fund for the redemption of all United States notes and Treasury notes, and he may, at his discretion, exchange gold coin for any other money issued or coined by the United States. The United States notes and Treasury notes can not be withdrawn except for gold. No silver bullion can be coined except in subsidiary coin, and the Treasury notes upon said bullion shall be canceled and not reissued. In the event the reserve fund is insufficient for redemption purposes, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to issue and sell 3 per cent twenty-year bonds to replenish the reserve fund. The national banks are permitted to issue bank notes to the full amount of their bond deposit without further security, and the tax on national banks is reduced to one-tenth of 1 per cent.

That the effect of this measure is to produce contraction is too evident to be denied by its friends and advocates. In the first place, it absolutely suspends the coinage of another legal-tender silver dollar and confines silver coinage to that of subsidiary coin, which is only legal tender to the limited amount of $10, and thus further depreciates the mint value of all silver bullion. It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury practically to redeem even the silver dollars, if he deems it necessary, so that silver is virtually taken out of circulation as primary money and is degraded to a mere token money for change, like the nickel and the penny, and can henceforth have but little effect on the prices of commodities. Everything is based on gold and gold alone as a standard of value, and all other forms of money are virtually redeemable in gold, and the prices of all commodities are measured in gold. Not only so, but all obligations, both public and private, are payable henceforth in gold. In fact, when eventually the purposes of this bill are attained, all the Treasury notes, United States notes (greenbacks), and silver certificates and silver dollars will go out of circulation and there will be no other full legal-tender money for the payment of public and private contracts except gold. Can the purpose and tendency of this measure be anything else but to counteract the increasing influx in the world's production of gold and to check and contract its volume?

Not only is this the purpose, but it is evidently the further purpose of the contractionists to reduce the volume of full legal-tender silver money and thus to contract the general volume of full legal-tender money. Such a course is bound to result in an undue contraction of the circulating medium and enhance the price of money on one side and decrease the price of commodities, except such as are protected by a trust, combination, or monopoly on the other side. While population increases and commerce should expand on one side, the volume of primary money contracts on the other, and the inevitable result must be falling prices of wages and all commodities not in a trust and enhancing in value of the standard dollar; in one word, dear money and hard times.

It has been the recent boast of our Republican friends that by the great influx of gold, prices have gone up and money has gone down. We do not deny it. But now we are led to believe that our friends are apprehensive that there may be too much money and it must be made scarcer to enhance its value. It looks like

the holders of the obligations of our people, both private and public, are afraid that unless there is a contraction of the volume of money that they will not receive enough. It looks like the creditor is afraid that the debtor will not pay him enough, and his cries seem to have been heeded by the Republican party and this measure is proposed to give him relief—surely will give him relief—even if it must be done at the great sacrifice of the debtor. Let us see how our ledger stands:

Gold coin, including bullion in Treasury	$963,498,384
Standard silver dollars, including bullion in Treasury	563,697,082
Subsidiary silver	74,866,552
Gold certificates	34,297,819
Silver certificates	406,085,504
Treasury notes, act July 14, 1890	93,518,280
United States notes	346,681,016
Currency certificates, act June 8, 1872	21,355,000
National-bank notes	241,350,871
Total	2,745,350,508
In circulation:	
Gold coin	679,738,650
Standard silver dollars	61,481,426
Subsidiary silver	69,065,824
Gold certificates	32,655,919
Silver certificates	402,130,617
Treasury notes, act July 14, 1890	92,561,764
United States notes	308,351,842
Currency certificates, act June 8, 1872	20,275,000
National-bank notes	237,805,439
Total	1,904,071,881
In Treasury, all kinds of money	841,278,627

The total outstanding principal of the public debt, as per statement of the Secretary of the Treasury, is $1,991,927,306.92. In this sum is included the following items, classified as part of the public debt:

Amount outstanding:	
Treasury notes of 1890	$93,518,280
Silver certificates	406,085,504
Legal-tender notes	346,681,016
Total	846,284,800
Total interest-bearing debt	1,046,048,750

It must be observed, at a glance at these figures, that the effect of this measure will be to place the entire stock of our different classes of money, to wit, the sum of $1,781,852,124, upon the amount of gold coin in the Treasury, to wit, the sum of $963,498,384, and that it virtually demonetizes the $563,697,082—silver dollars and bullion—in the Treasury. Not only so, but it further contracts the volume of our primary money by providing for the redemption and practical retirement of the $346,681,016 of United States notes, commonly called greenbacks. But it does not stop there, but further strains the gold standard by making the total interest-bearing bonded debt, to wit, the sum of $1,046,048,750, and now payable in either gold or silver, payable in gold alone.

Now, it may be said by our adversaries that this bill does not contain any provision for the redemption of the silver dollar or the silver certificate in gold coin, but we reply that such must be the ultimate effect of this measure, for in section 4 it is provided:

> The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and required to use said reserve fund in maintaining at all times the parity and equal value of every dollar issued or coined by the Government; and if at any time the Secretary of the Treasury deems it necessary, in order to maintain the parity and equal value of all the money of the United States, he may at his discretion exchange gold coin for any other money issued or coined by the United States.

What is this but a discretionary power in the Secretary of the Treasury to practically retire every silver dollar and every silver certificate and every greenback or Treasury note, even down to the subsidiary silver? The word "exchange" as here employed is synonymous to "redeem," "retire," or "withdraw;" for no one doubts that if by some legerdemain the silver dollar, the silver certificate, the Treasury note, or the greenback should fall in value as measured by gold, that a hostile Secretary of the Treasury could and would "exchange" them by paying out gold for them, and then placing them on the retired list until they could, by a little further stretch of authority, be placed in the smelting pot or macerator, and then sell them at public or private sale as curios. Whenever a greenback or other Government paper money or silver dollar is redeemed or exchanged it goes into the maw, never to see daylight again; for nothing can get it out but an equivalent in gold.

But to go back to the relation between debtor and creditor as affected by this bill: There is besides the public debt a large private debt which may now be paid in money resting on the bimetallic standard, which will further enhance the price of the gold dollar after this bill becomes a law, and which will add to the burden of the debtor, the taxpayer, and producer outside of the trust. It is estimated that this debt, consisting of bonded debt of railroads and industrial combinations, State, municipal, and other corporate bonded debt, and mortgage indebtedness, ranges anywhere from fifteen to twenty billions in this country.

Again, the interest on this indebtedness amounts to nearly a billion dollars a year. Besides there remain the taxes and other fixed charges to be paid by the people in an enhancing gold standard amounting to something like a half million annually. In contemplating these figures the people can realize somewhat the gain of the creditor and the loss of the debtor, for it can not be denied that the people—that is, the small producers and the wage-earners—must ultimately pay these debts in labor or products and that it is not the larger operator or monopoly which pays them. These, it is true, pay them, but they pay them with the higher monopoly charges wrung from the people.

The railroads owing this debt, and all other corporations, will pay them with additional charges paid by the people, and after all the toiling masses must respond to the grinding exactions of the classes. Were these debts, public and private, paid in the money in which they were contracted, under the bimetallic standard, they would amount to no more than their face value, but under the enhancing value of the single gold standard they will require almost double the amount of products or labor to pay them, for when commodities and wages are pressed down by falling prices or limited production it requires an equivalent of greater effort or amount of commodities to pay existing and continuing indebtedness or to perform a required task of labor.

Thus we are brought face to face with the great economic question involved in this measure, to wit, the contraction of the volume of primary money and the corresponding fall of prices of commodities.

When money is plentiful and keeps pace with the demands of commerce, enterprise flourishes and is buoyant, prices tend upward, and enterprise is active and courageous in exploiting old and new activities, thus stimulating the division of labor in various directions and paying higher wages to the individual laborer. Thus the power to purchase and consume is augmented and production increased. The result is prosperity and the uplifting of the toiling masses. When money is scarce and insufficient for the demands of commerce, enterprise languishes, prices tend downward, wages decrease, labor is only partially employed, and laborers and consumers lack the means to purchase commodities. The result is hard times; the aggregation of large capital to control production ensues; trusts, combinations, and monopoly take the place of diversified labor; and the formation of the classes and the masses takes place, and industrial life is thrown out of its equipoise.

This was the condition of affairs a year ago and even some time before, when, chiefly owing to the low price of commodities, individual enterprise sought shelter under the trust or combination; in the meantime prices were stimulated by inflowing gold, partly attracted by low prices and partly augmented by larger production of gold. Short crops abroad in the staple products, too, had their effect in drawing gold to this country, and both low prices here and a want of agricultural products abroad, together with the stimulating effect of more primary money, although slight in its effect, stimulated our exports and brought into circulation among our people more money and has placed us in possession of a temporary partial prosperity.

But at what sacrifice did it come and how long will it last? In the first place, it is partial only, because prices have now been driven up chiefly by means of combination and monopoly, and the good prices our farmers are receiving for their products and our laborers for their labor are wasted again in buying their commodities at extravagant trust prices. That the present so-called prosperity is short lived can not be doubted, for as soon as the present natural stimulus subsides, the present fit of good times, of which our Republican friends delight to speak, will be at an end. Large wheat and cotton crops at home and abroad will bring lower prices to the farmer and lockouts in the factories and other industries under the trust, under the scheme of limited production, will affect the laborer in his wages, and to add to all these causes a contracting volume of money inaugurated in this measure will do the balance, and hard times will once more be upon us, only with the aggravating evil of the trusts added to our ills.

Then it will be when this measure will produce its most blighting effects. The industrial combinations called trusts will then exercise full sway and by reason of the scarcity of money and falling prices and the extinction of competition reap their full crop of exactions and repressions. Individual enterprise will languish and be crowded from our industrial system and the owner of a small business or smaller factory will seek shelter under the trust, or, being entirely dependent, seek employment as a wage-earner of the trust and place himself at its mercy, or drop into the vast army of the unemployed or partially employed. Equal opportunity to the individual to earn according to his capacity will be a thing of the past, fair competition will be gone, and unfair competition will only lead to greater and speedier combination. Democracy will be on the wane and plutocracy will raise its hideous head and clamor for imperialism to protect and defend it.

But, say our friends, we have authorized the national banks to issue their notes to the full amount of our national bonded debt, and instead of having the present $241,350,871 of national-bank notes we will have at least a billion of national-bank notes in circulation to do the business of the country; when money is scarce the national banks will increase their issue and when it is too plentiful the banks will contract. But we reply in the first place the principle of the national banks is wrong, because it encourages the increase and perpetuation of the national bonded debt; that the national-bank notes are after all backed by the credit of the nation and would not have the quality of money without; that they are only a limited legal tender and finally dependent upon their metallic money basis; that they receive a bonus from the Government which the Government could dispense with and issue the notes itself, etc.; but that after these objections and many more have been urged the fact remains that it is not true that the national banks will expand their issue when money is scarce and contract when it tends to plethora.

The very reverse is true, namely, that they will expand the issue during expansion and contract during contraction. This was never more true than during the great panic of 1893, when the national banks refused not only to expand, but drew in their deposits and thus increased the panic. The truth is that it is their interest to contract during panics to save their depositors as well as their assets. This is a rule that national banks as well as private banks observe, and the only relief at last can come from the Government, as but recently demonstrated, when the Secretary of the Treasury resorted to the purchase of United States bonds in advance of their maturity to relieve the money stress in New York money circles.

What this measure will accomplish is to create the greatest paper-money trust under the sun, one which will insist upon the constant augmentation of the national debt instead of its reduction, because its very life is dependent upon such a course. It will further conduce to substitute it for all the private banks and extend its ramifications to every hamlet and village, and will in time absolutely dictate the fiscal policy of the Government. What that policy may be is foreshadowed in the fact that the present bill sprang from the brains of a coterie of national bankers who have faithfully followed a foreign fiscal policy and who are opposed to anything that savors of an independent American policy.

But it may be said that the very fact of establishing a large gold reserve fund will give such confidence that there will be no necessity to redeem any other class of money, and all will circulate and remain in circulation at a perfect parity. This, too, is contradicted by past experience. If the redemption of the greenbacks had not been stayed, they would long have been out of existence. As long as the Government discriminates itself between the different classes of its money, and holds out an inducement to issue more interest-bearing gold bonds, whenever a run is made upon it, so long will money changers continue to present themselves with money which can either be redeemed or exchanged for gold and demand the gold until the last dollar other than gold is out of circulation.

Such is the inevitable logic of the situation. So that to whatever side we turn we are met with contraction and the specter of a rising gold standard and a proportionate falling of prices of all farm products, raw material, and wages, and a consequent rise of trust articles. Is it not worse than folly, amounting to hollow mockery, for our Republican friends to declare against trusts and in the next breath urge the passage of this bill, which is the mother of all trusts?

True it is that other forces go toward building up and maintaining the trusts, such as unfair and unrestricted competition, especially in transportation and in other industrial activities, and also unequal taxation, and, indeed, even remote cosmic forces; but giving equal opportunity to all and special privileges to none presupposes the existence of an equitable monetary system which produces neither undue contraction nor undue inflation; but a monetary scheme which fosters absolute contraction can only eventuate in an undue distribution of wealth, with a constant and growing tendency toward enriching the few and impoverishing the many, and is therefore the very base and life of combination, trust, and monopoly.

On the other hand, rising prices form the strongest antidote to trusts and combinations. In such an atmosphere the trusts can not thrive well, because all enterprise, however small, is stimulated to growth and advancement and equipped for the arena of a fair competition. On a falling market, however, enterprise is paralyzed and must hide itself under the cloak of combination and restricted production, thus deadening fair competition. The trusts are, moreover, the advocates of expansion and imperialism. Their interests lie in the direction of commercialism and the exploitation of distant and dependent colonies.

Not satisfied with a depressed home market and the regular reciprocal relations that foreign trade affords, they clamor for the enforced traffic with colonial dependencies, and, apprehensive of the growing unrest among the people and their employees, they cry for a large standing army, the keystone in the arch of imperialism. Devoid of patriotism, they become the enemies of free institutions, with no other motive than greed and worldly power. No wonder that they are anxious to turn to world policies in order to divert the attention of the people from their ills at home; it is their supreme interest to do so. It is thus that we find the friends of this measure closely allied to the schemes of territorial expansion and imperialism. Both are the offspring of foreign policies and utterly un-American in their tendencies.

If there is one fact more prominent than all others it is that while this Administration has increased taxation and the bonded indebtedness of this nation it is now about to reduce the volume of money with which to pay these burdens; to place its function of issuing paper money in the hands of a gigantic bank trust protected by the credit of the Government; to turn all industrial production and private enterprise into the clutches of monopoly. To do the bidding of monopoly it proposes to substitute imperialism for democracy and to reduce the great masses of the people to poverty and make them dependent upon the crumbs that may fall from the table of monopoly. In the name of the common people, in the name of democracy, I protest! Gentlemen of the majority, you may pass this bill, but the American people are apt to reverse your judgment in 1900 by the election of W. J. Bryan and a Congress which will stand by the Chicago platform. You are sowing the wind, you will reap the whirlwind. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The passage of this bill will not settle the great money question. Before it can be settled it must be settled right, and it will not be settled right until bimetallism is restored, and bimetallism can only be restored by the independent action of this nation as declared by the Chicago platform. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. LINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I feel some little embarrassment in attempting to discuss the matter before the House, but I think I see the way, and the thoughtful way, too, by which my course can be justified. I voted for the Teller resolution in this House, and was the only Republican in the House that did so. Now, I expect to vote for this bill, and I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is a matter of duty to vote for it. I have reasoned myself to the conclusion that I will best serve my country by voting for this proposition, laying aside entirely the question of my loyalty to the Republican party. [Applause.]

Sir, this financial question has been discussed for twenty long years. The sprightly, eloquent gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] complained of the "gag law." Why, the discussion began in 1873, and there has been a constant, unrestricted, unrestrained, unobstructed flow of argument in the shape of periodicals and eloquence extending from the far and woolly West to the Atlantic Ocean, as steady in its course as the roar of the mighty Columbia River over the Cascades or of the Niagara over the cataracts. [Laughter and applause.] Yet the gentleman complains that he has been "gagged." [Laughter.] Why, the whole thing has become hoary with age. It is the grandfather question now in these United States. [Renewed laughter.]

It is said that man changes his entire being every seven years—the nails, and every particle, every tooth in him, and every hair upon his head is turned to something else. Seven into twenty-six goes three and nearly four times. Over three generations, taking the measure of that length of time, have been spending their energies and the best part of their life in discussing this great question. Every child has become familiar with some of the expressions, some of the favored ones, some of those that glittered, the diamonds of thought that came along from the free and unlimited coinage of silver orators throughout the country, so that "16 to 1" has been known for more than twenty years by every child from 1 to 20 years.

I heard some little girls myself in the town of Taylorsville not long ago. There were five in the group and one little boy. One said, "I do not know another little boy in all this end of the town, and I don't know why it is." Another said, "Why, on our side of town there are 16 to 1—16 girls to 1 boy." [Laughter.] So that the truth is that no question has ever attracted the attention of the people of the United States for so long a period; no question has had as many teachers and as many influences employed on the mind, taking both sides of it, in trying to enlighten the people, in trying to analyze the question, in trying to get at the ideal system of finance that will bring to this country and its people the greatest possible blessing as this question, in which we have the free coinage of silver on the one side and the gold standard on the other.

Mr. Chairman, we ought to have the ideal system. The American people are entitled to the best in everything, because the American man is the best man. Why happens it so? The commingling of the blood of the best tribes of humanity throughout

this entire universe has produced an entirely new type of manhood. In settling this new country of ours and in overcoming all the obstructions to civilization and solving them it required the most hardy representatives of the varied tribes of humanity in the world. They came from every tribe, from every nation, and almost from every tongue. From every phase of humanity the most hardy, courageous representatives of these various tribes came. They came here to this glorious land under the inspiring influence of our system, that has been properly called "the world's best hope." They put forth their best possible effort within the range of human possibility.

The commingling of the blood of the various representatives of the various tribes of the world produced this distinct species of man, the American type. It is the greatest and grandest, as it has recently shown itself, in arms, for there is no people in the world who can fight us. I do not want to brag too much of our folks, but it begins to look as if no nation of the world can now stand before the courage of this matchless American soldier, American energy, and American brains.

Then, I say, we are entitled to the best system of finance—the ideal system—if we can get it. Let us see whether we have it or not. I understand the selecting of everything that is best, whether in human character or in a system, and excluding every infirmity so as to form a type or model, is what we call the "ideal."

Now, what is the true test as to whether you have attained to an ideal system in anything, to the ideal touching human character, to the ideal touching any system? The true test is this—if I understand it—the extent of its success. Let me illustrate: Suppose "A" were to contend that he had discovered a theory by which the speed of the horse could be increased, and he argues the excellence of that theory. It might be that no human being would be able to meet his arguments in its support, but did not agree with him. But suppose that in this conflict of opinion, this war of thought touching that simple question of the increase in the speed of the horse, that some one says, Well, let us try it. Why theorize any further on it? And they put the horse upon the track and they apply to him the spurs to quicken his diligence in the race; and here is the test. If he surpasses all other horses in the race, makes better time than has before been made, there is no further room for argument, you have settled it all by actual experience.

So, Mr. Chairman, with this question. In order to determine whether we have an ideal system now and whether this bill will improve it, whether this is to be the finishing touch that makes it the best we ever had, we must try the experiment. An experiment is a trial deliberately instituted. A practical test, proof. John Adams, in speaking of political experiments, said: "Political experiment can not be made in a laboratory nor determined in a few hours. A political experiment can only be made by applying the proposed theory to the test, practical experiment." Now, then, a few years ago it was alleged that this idea of a single standard would not do. I thought so. A distinguished gentleman who sits beside me—a Democrat—also thought so, except he was a little wilder on the subject than I was, and he went for the free and unlimited coinage of silver, and I wanted the limited coinage—the American product. Hundreds and thousands of the best men in this Republic thought that the double standard was the only way by which you could approach a perfect system of finance.

I followed the ordinary processes of reasoning; maybe they were simple, but still I followed them. My idea was that in order to afford the citizens the greatest possible opportunities in life there should be the largest possible amount of money in circulation that could be kept good. My notion touching it was that two agencies constituting basic money could come nearer meeting the demand of business than one, just as I thought that two men could bear a burden of 100 pounds better than one; just as I thought that two baskets of fish could meet the demand of hungry appetites of a multitude of a thousand better than one basket, if one basket was catfish; and arguing along that line of thought, I reached the conclusion that the money or redemption money of the country, that which we denominate the standard, should be a double standard and not a single. That is the conclusion to which I had come. I acted upon it.

When we come to put it to the actual test of practical experiment, it is a fact that has been established that the single standard is best. Let me see if I can not prove it.

I find, Mr. Chairman, the best definition of the ideal system of money is embraced in the message of the President of the United States, and I invite the attention of the House to it. He says: "Increased activity in industry, with its welcome attendance—a larger employment for labor at higher wages—gives to the body of the people a larger power to absorb the circulating medium."

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. LINNEY. Yes.

Mr. COX. I want to predicate my question on this extract, which I will read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Fifty-fifth Congress:

As a creditor, no holder of any bond has any right to demand one cent more than the contract entitles him to, to wit, payment in coin. To pay less than the debt is repudiation. To force the taxpayer to pay more is an extortion. Coin is defined to be a piece of metal on which certain characters are stamped, making it legally current as money. Therefore gold and silver, at the discretion of the debtor, is the money in which, under the contract, the bonds may be legally and morally paid.

Has the gentleman shed his toe nails since he made that speech? [Laughter.]

Mr. LINNEY. That is by no means a question of importance in connection with the pending question. My friend will have no difficulty in settling that question for himself. It has no connection with the argument that I am making.

It is further true that year by year, as the President says—

Increased activity in industry, with its welcome attendant—a larger employment for labor at higher wages—gives to the body of the people a larger power to absorb the circulating medium. It is further true that year by year, with larger areas of land under cultivation, the increasing volume of agricultural products, cotton, corn, and wheat, calls for a larger volume of money supply. This is especially noticeable at the crop-harvesting and crop-moving period.

In its earlier history the national banking act seemed to prove a reasonable avenue through which needful additions to the circulation could from time to time be made. Changing conditions have apparently rendered it now inoperative to that end. The high margin in bond securities required, resulting from large premiums which Government bonds command in the market, or the tax on note issues, or both operating together, appear to be the influences which impair its public utility.

The attention of Congress is respectfully invited to this important matter with the view of ascertaining whether or not such reasonable modifications can be made in the national banking act as will render its service in the particulars here referred to more responsive to the people's needs. I again urge that national banks be authorized to organize with a capital of $25,000.

Now, sir, the question to which I call the attention of the House, and which I believe to be the important question in this connection, is this: Is not the suggestion of the President of the United States touching the finances of the country the ideal in finance? No reflecting mind in this body can escape that conclusion.

There has been an increase in the population of this country during the last five years of at least 6,270,000 people. There has been an increase in the revenues of the country—the circulating medium—during the same period of $302,103,408, unless the figures which have been presented to me are erroneous. They are taken from and founded upon the report of the Secretary of the Treasury. The increase during the last five years of money in circulation has kept pace with the enormous increase in population and business of the country.

Who would have dreamed during the last ten years that the existing gold standard could have the effect of thus increasing the circulating medium? Even the wildest greenback inflationist could not have claimed more for his pet financial system than has already been attained by the existing gold standard.

Now, sir, the question to which I desire to call the attention of the House is simply this, and let us see whether I am correct or not in the assertion that the ideal system embodied in the declaration of the President in the message I have just referred to has been approved by the thoughtful men of this age and commends itself to the thoughtful people of the country. Now to the proof. We can easily recur to the period and to the financial conditions existing in 1860. We had at that time in operation State banks in almost all of the States of the Union, and you all know the effect of their operations. The circulating medium of the country aggregated a per capita of about $13.85. I have examined the reports of the Secretary of the Treasury, made at that time, and believe that this statement, touching the amount of the circulating medium, is correct. On the basis of that examination I assert, and I believe I am correct in the assertion, that the aggregate per capita circulation of the country was only $13.85; in 1861, only $13.98; in 1862, $10.23; in 1863, $17.84; in 1864, $19.67; on down, in 1873, $18.10. Get down within five years of the present period and the amount is $22.93; four years ago, $21.10; three years ago, $22.49; two years ago, $22.66. This year, with $1,904,071,881 of circulating medium and with 76,148,000 people, the highest ever reached in the history of this Republic from the time of the organization of the first State in it, the unprecedented per capita circulation of $25 was reached, and that, too, under the gold standard. In the face of these facts, toe nails or no toe nails, any gentleman who has intelligence enough to cross the Mississippi River, or Coon Creek, so far as that is concerned, ought to be willing, it seems to me, to yield his preconceived views touching the matter and as a man accept the truth. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Gird up your loins, gentlemen; face these facts. Take this ideal standard, which no one can possibly deny. Follow the record, and you are as certainly led to the conclusion that I reach as that you have an existence. Figures do not lie. I know lawyers can make a great deal of harm out of figures sometimes, but in the hands of honorable gentlemen upon this floor, who will always be caught if they get wrong, they point us with absolute certainty to the truth. Twice two make four. That is absolutely

certain. Whether A died is a moral question, depending upon the evidence. I rely upon this kind of conclusion, which is absolute to a mathematical certainty, founded upon figures that no man controverts. Now, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman answer just one question?

Mr. LINNEY. Why, certainly, my friend, with pleasure.

Mr. SIMS. In the extract that was read from your speech of less than two years ago, in which you said that to force debtors to pay a better money or higher-priced money than that named in the contract was extortion—how do you avoid such effect if this bill passes?

Mr. LINNEY. I am glad my friend called my attention to that. I was just coming to that anyway; but give me time and I will answer it. Being the only Republican upon this side that voted for the Teller resolution, I ought to be able to give a reason for it, which I will do. I believed then and I believe now that there are two crimes in this country touching finance. Repudiation is a crime. That means the failure or refusal of the debtor class to pay the last cent that is due. Extortion is likewise a crime, recognized in inspiration, recognized in the law books when it assumes a certain character touching official relations. I believe now, as I believed then, that extortion is a greater crime than repudiation; and I believe now, as I believed then, that for the Government of the United States to require its debtors—bonded debtors or otherwise—to pay more than is due is extortion.

But hear my answer further. What are the conditions now? The very moment that this gold standard is established and by this bill is settled, every dollar in the United States is gold. Your greenbacks are gold, your silver is gold, your subsidiary coin is gold. Why so? Because upon the simple gold standard when they go out gold must come in for them, and people, even under the gold standard, would in many instances rather have the subsidiary silver or the greenbacks in preference to the gold. Silver and greenbacks will still be used, but the standard by which they are measured is gold. It legally follows, therefore, that unless these bonds are repudiated they must be paid in gold, as all other debts are paid, so that there is no strain of extortion in the transaction. Let me elucidate that by a simple illustration. Yesterday morning I went to a store. I happened to have a twenty-dollar gold piece. I parted with it at once for greenbacks and for small silver coin. One day recently, in a bank, I saw the bank officers approach a man who had loaned them $1,600, and who was holding the bank's note at 4 per cent interest. The bank officers said: "You must take your money. We would rather pay our debt in gold than to pay the 4 per cent interest." The gold was paid, the notes taken up, and the bank relieved of the 4 per cent interest. At any time within the last fifteen years prior to 1898, 8 per cent could have been obtained anywhere. So that the increased volume under the gold standard has reduced the rate of interest.

But, recurring to the suggestion of the gentleman about my views as expressed when the Teller resolution was before the House, it should be kept in mind we have now but one kind of money. It must of necessity apply to all bonds made before this and made now. Why, you have got but one sort of money to pay them in. I thought when I first looked at this bill there ought to have been this provision in it: "*Provided*, That the bonds executed and issued before the passage of this bill shall be paid in coin." But that was a surface view of it. I had not thought about it in the right light. I was like the gentleman who asked me the question a while ago. With his immense intellect, he has not made use of it, because if he will just reflect a little he will see that you have got but one money now with which to pay anything, and you can not pay for a drink of whisky anywhere now in the United States except you pay in gold or money measured by gold. [Laughter.] And so when you come to examine it you will see that it must apply to everything—to bonds past, present, and future. And the great mind of the President presents an equity in favor of the bondholder. We sold these for gold. What wrong is there in paying gold for them?

Mr. SIMS. If all contracts are payable in gold under existing law, and if this language in the present bill specifying that they are to be paid in gold is mere surplusage and useless, then why put it in there if debts are already payable in gold?

Mr. LINNEY. Why, it was put in, I suppose, to strengthen the credit of the United States and to make the bonds more readily salable.

Mr. SIMS. Then there is a suspicion——

Mr. LINNEY (continuing). It appears in the face of the paper. They put in the face of the paper the voice of the law.

Mr. SIMS. Then there is a suspicion that under the existing law they might be paid in silver, which might affect their value.

Mr. LINNEY. None in the world. For you could state nothing but the truth, and it just states it. A great government can only state the truth, and it is not ashamed to state the truth. [Applause.] Therefore they put to be discharged in gold, and every bond as a necessary legal inference and legal result is also to be discharged in gold. So that I saw the foundation on which I stood was too metaphysical—does not exist and can not exist with the gold standard. What was my duty? Why, my duty was to cease to act upon a faulty argument that any man who will reflect a moment can see through.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one other idea yet about this matter. I think that these wonderful results have been accomplished under the present law. Well, let us apply a little bit of cornfield reasoning, as they say in my country, to that. The present law has accomplished these wonderful results. The present law has met the demands of increased population, has met the increased diversified industries and everything of that sort; and it is wonderful. There are in my State two streams, the Catawba and the Yadkin, running through it with laughing, rippling waters, and they both run over 50 miles. I suppose in these streams there are at least 500 shoals.

These splendid shoals and the countries immediately around them have been inhabited only by the bat and owl ever since man existed and ever since the morning stars sang together. What is the condition now? Industry has been stirred up; new life has been given; more money has come into the country and more labor found good employment at higher wages, and capitalists are seeking investments in that country on those shoals, until now in all that large area we have fabulous prices, thousands, tens of thousands, and hundreds of thousands of dollars in some instances, offered for the barren rocks and sterile hills in the Catawba and Yadkin valleys for shoals that have lain there from the foundation of the world to the present without turning a spindle or yielding a solitary cent for the State of North Carolina. It is not an extravagant dream picture to expect that within the next ten years, under the stimulating effect of the system of revenue and finance now existing, millions of dollars will be invested there by sound-money capitalists to bless and cheer the noble boys of Carolina by opening up new lines of hope founded in the existence of these great enterprises.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in view of these wonderful results, surpassing in realization the wildest dreams of the most enthusiastic American that now exists or anything ever thought of, we have an idea of what has been accomplished. But the suggestion has been made during this discussion that if all this has happened or resulted from the present revenue or financial policy of the Administration, why pass this bill; why not let well enough alone? The answer is this: Much as the existing law has accomplished, still better results are within our reach.

There is an infirmity in the system as it now exists. Who has pointed it out? Both parties in this country have pointed it out. President Cleveland pointed it out. I believe he was the author of the expression "the endless chain," was he not? Since that time President McKinley has pointed it out, and the experts of finance in this country, the business men, who are most interested in maintaining the highest business activity, have analyzed it, and they say that this is the only infirmity the system possesses to-day. This bill is intended to correct this infirmity and make it a perfect system. To do so we remove the infirmity; and it is the salvation of the South and West. I do not see how any Southern or Western man can hesitate to give his vote to, or how any North Carolinian can think of voting against, this proposition.

Here is a proposition that allows communities in the South and West having only 2,000 population to organize banks on a capital, I believe, of $25,000. The present law requires a minimum of $50,000. So it works it down. Why, we had State banks. By some they were considered good things. That unquestionably was a mistake; but when you can organize a national bank on a capital of $25,000 that is absolutely secure, the State bank will be a thing of the past, and our people will resort to these new facilities—increased facilities—of being furnished with abundant supply of money by reason of this new banking provision here. Without this provision in favor of the people who do not live in the great centers of wealth—the South and West—the national banks possibly had it in their power to contract the currency. With this new feature the tooth of usury and extortion can not bite too much.

Mr. Chairman, the wisdom of the revenue and financial policy of the Government no longer rests on theory. It has been put in operation. The machine has been tested not in a "laboratory," as Adams said, but by being commanded to answer satisfactorily the demands of the business requirements of 76,000,000 of living souls for the last ten years. Our Democratic brethren can not now with any show of reason or fair play criticise it. When the new machine was launched, they with commendable industry and intelligence searched for mischiefs which they imagined lurked within it. Each and every one imagined that he had discovered its entire unfitness for the great work of restoring business life to the country, but they also had the manhood then to admit that if it proved a success they had nothing more to say.

The conservative clear leader of the Democratic side now, the

gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], denied that any increase of prosperity would ever be felt. It would be an interesting bit of history to collect all the interrogations they put almost every day in this House. "Where is your promised prosperity? The increase has not touched us yet."

In a speech delivered in this House by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] even as late as the 25th of January, 1898, that cool-headed statesman said:

I believe it will be admitted by all economists everywhere that there can be no general prosperity.

This is found on page 988 of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, second session, Fifty-fifth Congress.

From this and hundreds and thousands of declarations closely akin to it, made by the illustrious leader's associates, the inference is irresistible that they were willing then to bow to the results of a trial of these laws. That trial has been had. The wisdom of the laws proven, and now they refuse to bow to the truth and will not be comforted. Not only has actual experiment overturned their position, but the voice of the people of these United States at the last general election was as potential as the results of an actual trial. The gentleman from New York, Mr. DRIGGS, a Democrat, informed his colleagues as to the extent of the verdict of the people of these United States on this question in the following language, which I read from page 250 of the RECORD of this session:

The popular majority throughout the whole Union—600,000—against us was the greatest ever recorded against any party in this country. Above all else the Democracy has to-day not a governor, not a State legislature, not a United States Senator in or from any State north of Virginia and Kentucky or east of the Mississippi River. No such condition of affairs existed before in our political history, for in the war election of 1864 New Jersey, Delaware, and Kentucky held true to the Democracy and several Democratic governors and legislatures were elected. Even in the disastrous Greeley campaign of 1872 Delaware cast its vote for the regular Democratic candidate, Mr. Hendrix. The year 1896 was indeed a disastrous year for the Democracy.

If, Mr. Chairman, an actual trial of the policy of the Administration with the most glorious results, coupled with the verdict of the people (for the recent State elections are more pronounced in favor of the Administration even than the picture drawn by the gentleman from New York), does not satisfy the Democratic members of this House that they were and are in error, there is poor encouragement, indeed, for anyone to offer them any further proof of the wisdom both of the revenue and financial policy of the Administration. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. RIXEY. Mr. Chairman, this bill may be regarded as more thoroughly representing the party policy of the Republican party than any other which could have come before the House in any other way. It comes not simply with the indorsement of a majority of a committee composed of 17 members, but as the result of the unanimous voice of the entire Republican membership of the House, as shown in their party caucus.

This bill is not as innocent as at first blush it appears. It provides that the standard unit "shall, as now, be the gold dollar." If this is true, why assert it. A careful reading of the bill and a little reflection, however, will convince one that its consequences and effect are intended to be most far-reaching. I have ever deprecated any attempt to arraign one class of our people against another, but this is class legislation of the purest kind. It is brimful of benefits to the creditor class. There is not in this bill one single provision in the interest of the debtor. I am not one to arraign the debtor against the creditor or vice versa, but I do desire and demand that the one class shall be treated with the same consideration as the other.

In this bill the creditor's property is magnified and the value of his holdings increased. An increased value is added to the value of the United States bonds already outstanding, and valuable concessions are extended to the national banks, while their burdens are lightened. I am opposed to this bill because you have literally followed the saying, "To him that hath shall be given, and to him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath."

The first section provides that the "standard and unit of value shall, as now, be the gold dollar." The committee who formulated the bill says:

By the first and second sections of the bill which is here recommended it is sought to legalize the gold standard by a plain and definite statute, which will remove the question from all doubt and so establish the standard that it can be changed only by Congressional action, in this way giving the people's purpose the vitality of public law.

This shows that, notwithstanding the bold statement in the bill that the standard unit of value is now the gold dollar, it has never been so declared by law. On the contrary, Congress has solemnly declared that it was not. The Stanley Matthews resolution, which passed this House on the 28th day of January, 1878, under a suspension of the rules, declared as follows:

Whereas, by the act entitled "An act to strengthen the public credit," approved March 18, 1869, it was provided and declared that the faith of the United States was thereby solemnly pledged to the payment in coin or its equivalent of all the interest-bearing obligations of the United States, except in cases where the law authorizing the issue of such obligations had expressly provided that the same might be paid in lawful money or other currency than gold and silver; and

Whereas all the bonds of the United States authorized to be issued by the act entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt," approved July 14, 1870, by the terms of said act were declared to be redeemable in coin of the then present standard value, bearing interest payable semi-annually in such coin; and

Whereas all bonds of the United States authorized to be issued under the act entitled "An act to provide for the resumption of specie payments," approved January 14, 1875, are required to be of the description of bonds of the United States described in the said act of Congress approved July 14, 1870, entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt;" and

Whereas at the date of the passage of said act of Congress last aforesaid, to wit, the 14th day of July, 1870, the coin of the United States of standard value of that date included silver dollars of the weight of 412½ grains each, declared by the act approved January 18, 1837, entitled "An act supplementary to the act entitled 'An act establishing a mint and regulating the coins of the United States,'" to be a legal tender of payment, according to their nominal value, for any sums whatever: Therefore,

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That all the bonds of the United States issued or authorized to be issued under the said acts of Congress hereinbefore recited are payable, principal and interest, at the option of the Government of the United States, in silver dollars, of the coinage of the United States, containing 412½ grains each of standard silver; and that to restore to its coinage such silver coins as a legal tender in payment of said bonds, principal and interest, is not in violation of the public faith, nor in derogation of the rights of the public creditor.

It is clearly to be seen that the gold dollar has never been recognized as the only money in which the Government could pay its debts, and the construction of the Secretary of the Treasury to pay only in gold was unauthorized.

We deny that it is the "people's purpose" that this gold dollar, as the sole unit of value, should now have "the vitality of public law." It may be and is "the purpose" of the bondholders and banks, but not necessarily of the people.

Section 2 provides that—

All interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the payment of money now existing or hereafter to be entered into, and all United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the law of July 14, 1890, shall be deemed and held to be payable in the gold coin of the United States, as defined in section 1 of the act.

These obligations of the United States are now all payable in coin; by which is meant gold or silver coin, at the option of the Government. They were all placed upon the market and sold upon that construction. When the Cleveland Administration was forced to issue bonds, President Cleveland asked Congress to permit the bonds to be written payable in gold, and stated that the bonds could be sold at a higher rate and realize to the Treasury many millions of dollars more, the amount being estimated at about $16,000,000. Congress rejected the proposition, and the bonds were sold, as all others have been to the present time, payable in coin.

During the present Administration $200,000,000 of bonds, payable in coin, were sold at par, and those who were fortunate enough to have idle capital by them to purchase these bonds were able to dispose of them the same day at an increase of 5 per cent. A clear gift of $10,000,000 of the people's money. No wonder the moneyed classes of this country continually do cry for bonds, more bonds.

The amount of bonds now outstanding, all payable in coin, to be hereafter payable in gold under this bill, is $1,182,149,050. As a matter of fact, many of these millions were sold for greenbacks when they were worth less than par, many at par, some above par. But supposing only the ratio, as stated by President Cleveland, will be added by this bill declaring that they should be paid in gold, the amount that will be given to the holders of these bonds will be in excess of half a hundred million of dollars. Why this donation to the holders of the Government bonds without one iota of concession by them? Under this system of legislation Government bonds would continue to be good paying investments if they carried no interest. It is no secret that the bond-holding portion of the country are, to a very large extent, adherents of the party in power, and dominate and control it.

Sections 3 and 4 provide for the division of issue and redemption and the issue of gold bonds at the discretion of the Treasury. These sections provide, in effect, that the silver certificates, silver coin, United States notes, and Treasury notes, now outstanding, may be redeemed in gold, and when so redeemed shall not be reissued except for gold. The present law provides, not that said notes may be again paid out, but shall be. Mr. Cleveland argued that because the holders of the notes could go to the Treasury and get gold for them and that the Government had again to pay them out, when the same process might be gone over, it was an endless chain, and urged that it was necessary to stop it by a change in the law.

I with diffidence submit that this is not the correct view. It is no more an endless chain than any other class of money would be, and there is no more danger from it. After these notes are covered into the Treasury the only way they can get out is as money, in pursuance of appropriations made by law and in payment of the debts of the Government. It is now proposed to take from the Government the right to pay its debts with these

notes, only the right remaining of exchange for gold. The ultimate effect of this will be to withdraw from circulation all of the silver certificates now outstanding—

Amounting to	$394,292,800
Silver dollars	71,361,740
United States notes	346,681,016
Treasury notes	87,441,680

forcing a contraction of the currency of over $800,000,000.

What a change does this make in currency legislation in a few years! Up to 1873 we had the free coinage of silver as well as gold. The Bland-Allison Act was passed February 28, 1878, to coin not less than $2,000,000 per month. This was followed by the Sherman law, July 14, 1890, repealed in 1893, under which the Government purchased and put in circulation annually, in payment of its debts, about $54,000,000. Under these laws the circulating medium was very largely increased. The Sherman law was repealed in 1893, and now this bill will in time retire what is already issued of this vast sum and withdraw it from circulation.

Much of the money of the people is to be destroyed, and this is to be accomplished by the authority given to the Secretary of the Treasury, unlimited as to amount, to sell gold bonds whenever he thinks it necessary to effect this planned contraction of the currency. We are to have the currency contracted, but the circulation of bonds increased. Increasing the bonds and contracting the currency seems to be the prevailing policy of the party in power.

The power to sell the bonds of the Government is too serious and fraught with too great consequences to be lodged with any one man. Congress alone should have this power. Its members are the servants of the people, and to them they would be answerable. But to whom would the Secretary of the Treasury be answerable for an error of judgment? If we were sure that all Secretaries of the Treasury would be the purest, best, and most disinterested of men (rather a violent presumption), this power would be too great to give to any one man. High-minded pure men are influenced by their associates and their surroundings. Frequently the president of some great banking institution is at the head of the Treasury Department of this Government. Trained in the banking business, he naturally looks at everything from the banker's point of view.

Sections 8 and following are the provisions containing the concessions to the national banks, and are a step in the direction of the Republican policy that the Government should not only cease to issue paper money to circulate among the people, but should give that vast and valuable privilege to the national banks. These national banks are required to purchase United States bonds to the extent of one-fourth of their capital; but there is no limit to the maximum amount. These bonds are to be deposited with the Treasurer, who is to deliver to said banks bank notes to the par value of said bonds. Under the operation of this law a national bank with a capital of $1,000,000 could deposit a million dollars of bonds with the United States Treasury, upon which it would draw interest, and in addition would receive from the Treasury $1,000,000 in bank notes, which it could lend out and for the use of which it would receive its usual discount. If all of these notes were kept in circulation the banks would thus receive double interest on the amount it had invested. The only tax the bank is required to pay to the Government is one-fifth of 1 per cent on the value of its franchise, "as measured by the aggregate of its capital, surplus, and undivided profits."

Not one cent upon the bank notes, which are printed and furnished at the expense, and the payment of which is guaranteed by the Government, without any consideration whatever. Why should this be done? Why should the Government abdicate its sovereign right to issue the money of the country? Why surrender to the moneyed power this mighty engine for good or evil to the people?

It is stated that while this bill was being considered by the Republican caucus one of the leaders said that he objected to the increased concessions to national banks, and gave as a reason that he was himself the holder of stocks in two national banks, and he did not care to appear before his constituents as an advocate of these features favorable to national banks. It is presumable that as soon as the reasons were made known to his associates—many of whom, possibly, were equally fortunate—they all at once and with great accord approved these features as eminently meritorious and proper.

At the last Congress a banking bill known as the McCleary bill was reported to the House; its object was very similar to the present measure so far as it relates to banks. In effect it was to take from the Government the right to issue the paper money and give it to the banks. The bill was not pressed to a vote. The occasion was thought not to be ripe for it. But now this measure, more far-reaching and destructive in its consequences than the discarded McCleary bill, is proposed.

Apart from the great benefits accorded the national banks and the special favoritism shown them, what may we reasonably expect as the practical operation of the control and ownership by the banks of the entire paper money of the country?

Banking institutions are organized and managed for the money that can be made. In flush times its money will, as far as possible, be kept in circulation, and customers will be urged to keep the loans; but in times of panic, even of doubt and uncertainty, what will be the practice of the banks? They will demand their money. A tight money market will be made tighter, and many a man with plenty of property but little ready money will be forced to the wall and into bankruptcy. The tighter the market, the more urgent the demand of the banks for their money. Not so would the Government deal with the people. In times of panic and stringency in the money market it has put money in circulation by buying its bonds, lending money to banks, giving people employment on public works, and other ways; but all of this is to be changed, and by surrendering the right to issue the paper currency of the country we are to be turned over to the tender mercies of the national banks.

But we are told now is the time to make a change which we denounce as inimical to the best interests of our people. We are told that the country is prosperous, and the Republican party is lauding itself to the skies as the particular guardian, promoter, and protector not only of the public credit but of flush times. If we consider that the bonded indebtedness of the Government has increased in amount from $585,034,250, as of March 1, 1893, to almost double this immense sum, or $1,037,049,690, as of November 30, 1899, or an increase on an average of about $65,000,000 a year, one can form some idea of what the Republicans mean by prosperity. But to the holder of stock in trust combines, in national banks, and to the thousands of newly commissioned officers drawing salaries for service in the Spanish, Cuban, and Philippine wars it is flush times.

To the people who are the recipients of the difference in the expenditures of the Government in 1899, $605,072,179.05, over 1897, of $365,774,159.57, amounting to $239,298,019.48, it is flush times. Under the war-revenue bill about $150,000,000 have been taken in one year from the people. Two hundred million dollars have been borrowed upon the bonds of the people. All these vast sums wrung from the people, the bonds yet to be paid by them, make flush times for somebody. But where are the flush times for the farmer and the laborer? While the products he raises have to be sold in the open market at about the same price, the trust-protected products, fostered by the most outrageous and most unconscionable of all tariffs, have in some instances more than doubled in price.

Any spendthrift thinks he is prosperous as long as the money he has borrowed holds out, but how will it be when the money is exhausted and the day of reckoning comes? Will not the people turn from the false gods after whom they have been clamoring to the principles of an honest and economic administration of the Government; to Jeffersonian simplicity; to a reasonable standing army in times of peace; to the Monroe doctrine, confining ourselves to the Western Hemisphere, conceding the Eastern to the other nations of the earth; to the doctrine that the right to issue money and to declare the value thereof is an attribute of sovereignty and should be exercised only by the Government and not by corporate banks; to the sound proposition of a tax for revenue only, and not one that enables trust combinations to rob the people; to the reasonable demand that capital shall contribute its reasonable pro rata of taxation, by means of an income tax, to the expenses of the Government?

For these reforms we can only look to the Democratic party. Much extravagance and long lease of power have made the Republican party absolutely reckless and regardless of the rights of the people. They have surrendered at the behest and to the dictation of the great banks, trusts, and aggregations of capital which furnished the financial assistance which secured the Republican party's triumph in 1896. But an indignant people will shake off its indifference; they will be on their guard. Money will not have the power in 1900 that it had in 1896 to thwart the people's will. We know the attempt will be made, but forewarned is forearmed, and believing that "thrice is he armed who hath his quarrel just," the Democracy, while entering the coming contest with a full realization of the immense financial resources of the Republican party, will prosecute the fight upon principle and with a determination that right and justice shall triumph.

Mr. COONEY. Mr. Chairman, last Friday, when the rule for the discussion of this bill was before the House, a very able gentleman on the other side of the Chamber took occasion to felicitate himself, his colleagues, and his party on the happy and merry attitude they hold toward this bill and legislation in general. He said:

Our past is behind us, our present conditions we are proud of, our future we feel to be assured.

There is every indication that the gentleman faithfully expressed the prevailing mental attitude of Republicans. They have reasonable ground for pleasure. We are just finishing up our Spanish war, in the progress of which, if disaster had at any time befallen our arms, that party in the absolute control of affairs could not

have escaped the penalty due to its position. Our arms having achieved uninterrupted success, it is entitled to enjoy the felicity that is due to a party that holds the post of responsibility.

But, sir, I would warn Republican members that there is no reason for the exultant exhibition of joy that here gives evidence of the fact that they have reached that pinnacle of self-congratulation from which there is no ascent and there is a mighty fall.

"We rise to fortune by successive steps; we descend by only one." And I believe the enactment of this bill into law is that one step which Republicans are taking in their descent from power. I have heard of individuals who have laughed themselves to death and of those who died in the moment of their ecstacy. Violent delights have violent endings. Well-tempered assurance is always an element of success, but the cachinnation with which Republicans have dropped this "serpent's egg" in the House, and the glee with which they undertake to hatch it out, are certain symptoms of mortality.

This bill is a breaking of faith in its very foundation, and there is not a promise in the whole political life of the Republican party that does not sustain a fracture by the convulsion. "Our past is behind us" is an old and familiar announcement made by Republicans when they are about to crush the hopes they have created and violate the promises they have made. It is a favorite topic for their animadversion that the Democratic party holds to the past.

Sir, the past of this Republic is a great treasure house of the virtues and achievements of its most illustrious citizens. The men who built this Government and the principles that animated them still flash their light from out the past along the pathway of the present and the future. To the Democratic party the past is as alive with promises made to humanity as the future is pregnant with gifts to be revealed and enjoyed. To the Republican party the past is but a graveyard in which to bury broken vows and abandoned principles, and the funeral processions of that party never allow the dust to settle on the road to it.

For years the voters of the Republican party have had the gold standard pressed on them as the Old Testament of faith. It taught them the wisdom of John Sherman and all the great prophets of the single standard and parity. They had scarcely accepted it upon the conditions of the St. Louis platform when the veil of hypocrisy was rent in twain, and this bill is given to them as a New Testament of "currency reform," which they are to receive, on faith alone, as a revelation from a power higher than themselves. It will perhaps induce Republicans to receive it by having some knowledge of its antecedents.

The men who are sent here to legislate for the people could not make this bill. They did not know how to draft its provisions to meet the objects aimed at by those who desired the law. It was not made by Congress or any committee thereof, and for that reason may be the more acceptable to the people. A few men interested in national banks conceived it and drafted its provisions at Atlantic City last summer amidst the frivolities of fashion, the pomp of wealth, the gluttony of luxury, the conspiracy of greed, and all the heartless hilarity of a fashionable summer resort, where our plutocrats doth congregate. From then until this Congress met it was guarded from the public eye in that holiest of holies, the vault of a national bank. It was dispatched here in secrecy, and in secrecy its contents were revealed only to Republican members.

The gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber, who could not or would not draft this bill themselves, called a caucus to consider it. The caucus was resolved into a wild west show, in which their Buffalo Bills, already booted and spurred for the occasion, mounted and broke in all the mustangs and bronchos in the herd. They then convened in an old-fashioned protracted meeting, where the broken-spirited sinners were called to the mourners' bench to strengthen their newly-found faith in a final wrestle with their conscience and the national banker. I do not ask for the result of that spiritual wrestling match. In the case of a Republican member it is easily predicted, for where in one Testament it is written, "Resist the devil and he will flee from you," in this new testament of "currency reform" it is written, "Resist the banker and he will go for you."

Sir, I anticipate that the martial wave upon whose crest Republicans build their hope for the future will find in this bill the rock on which it will split. They have turned their back on their own party and its declared principles, and without authority from the people or necessity from the condition of the times they propose to revolutionize the finances of the country, and for the sole profit of a class to permanently install institutions that were originally created only for temporary purposes. The national bank means a national debt. Is the Republican party getting ready to perpetuate and increase our national debt?

If this bill stopped with the legal establishment of the gold standard it might possess the fair appearance of authority from the platform on which the present administration was elevated to power. The gold standard is now and has been for many years in practical operation in this country, not by force of law, but against it. It has been put in force and maintained by the policy of the respective administrations. They could with absolute legal authority have adopted and maintained a policy that would have destroyed the gold standard and substituted that of bimetallism. But the policy adopted was ratified by the Republican convention of 1896. Under certain limitation that convention declared for the then existing gold standard, but its smile of approbation did not extend a hair's breadth further.

The first two sections of this bill make legal what was before considered by many as illegal; they establish the gold standard absolutely and beyond cavil. But these two sections constitute only a one-ninth part of this bill. What is the subject of legislation treated of by the other eight-ninths? The establishment of the gold standard? Not in any particular. Eight-ninths of the bill is wholly devoted to the construction of a legal framework within which the Secretary of the Treasury can, and is invited to, wipe out the last vestige of our paper currency and replace it with the paper issue of the national banks.

The power that this bill gives to redeem and impound our currency, to mix, exchange, and shuffle up the various funds like a pack of cards in the hands of a professional gambler, to issue and sell Government bonds, to create and extend national banks and force an increase of their paper issue upon the people, is all left absolutely to the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury to judge the times and occasions when to act with dispatch and move in harmony with the spirit of this bill to the ultimate change in our currency and to the realization of the happiest golden dream of the national bank.

The disposition of the Secretary of the Treasury in the use of the immense discretion and powers given him in this bill can be predicted from his past history. He is himself a national banker, and for years he has officiated as high priest to currency reformers. In 1894, to those who were aiming to "tinker" with the currency under Cleveland, he wrote the following from his national bank in Chicago:

> I believe the "Baltimore plan" carries the true principles of a credit currency, but we can not reach it by any step, and years may intervene before it could be realized. In the meantime the way of the Government to step out of the currency business and place the burden of redemption on the banks is plain—authorize the issue of $250,000,000 of 2½ per cent bonds payable at such time as Congress may elect (twenty-five years desirable), to be offered to subscribers at par. Accept in payment United States legal-tender notes or Treasury notes, the same to be canceled. Amend the national-bank act so that banks can obtain note issue to the face value of bonds deposited as security for circulation. Reduce the tax on circulating notes to one-half of 1 per cent. This done, national bank notes would make good the vacuum caused by the retirement of Government notes. The problem is this: To take the Government out of the note-issuing business.

And again, a year before the election of McKinley, Mr. Gage, in a speech before a currency-reform club of bankers in Chicago, said:

> Our whole monetary system is the resultant of makeshift legislation and unscientific compromises. It is time that reform began. I do not assume here to offer final remedies. In my own opinion the greenbacks should be permanently retired. The silver purchased under the Sherman act should be gradually sold and the Treasury notes redeemed and canceled. Some well-guarded system of bank-note circulation, broader and more elastic than the present national-bank act provides, should be inaugurated.
>
> To sum up, the defects of our present currency system are: (1) A confusing heterogeneity, which needs simplification. (2) The greenback controverts the principle of paper money. (3) The Treasury note is a standing evidence of a foolish operation; it lies open to the just charge of being both idiotic and immoral. (4) The national-bank note nearly conforms to the true principle of paper money. (5) The silver certificate encourages the use of silver to a larger extent than consists with the safe preservation of that metal on a parity with gold.

I read the foregoing expressions of faith, belief, and purposes of the man who now rules our finances—expressions made public by him years before McKinley selected him as the representative of his financial policy—to make it clear what construction is now to be placed on the provisions of this bill. From Mr. Gage's point of view there is not a single defect in our currency but what this bill will eliminate; that part of our currency he said destroy this bill destroys; what he advised as a substitute it substitutes, and in its iconoclasm it goes further and hastens the retirement of the silver dollar by providing for its redemption in gold. Clearer than any explanation that has yet been given by those who espouse the cause of this bill in this House; briefer, more pointed, with less humbug, and with less confusion of intelligence as to its purposes, Mr. Gage has already placed his construction on the bill; and he will not shirk a duty that is so pleasant to him as enforcing all its provisions at every opportunity.

Mr. Gage is not a politician. He is neither a Republican, a Democrat, a mugwump, nor a copperhead, but at different times he has been each and all of them. In every position his politics and religion have been the intrenchment and perpetuation of the national banking system in this country. He bolted the Republican party in 1892 and labored for the election of Cleveland for the purpose of securing the repeal of the Sherman law and driving another rivet of strength into the gold standard. He assisted at the birth of the Baltimore plan and was in constant consultation with Cleveland, Carlisle, and Springer, devising means to

bring that plan before Congress and forcing it on the country. That scheme came tumbling down upon him and for the moment buried him out of sight beneath its ruins.

When MARK HANNA came along in 1896 he rescued him from the débris and started him forth again to organize the national bankers into a phalanx of taxgatherers, which, in aid of McKinley's election, collected the biggest corruption fund that the world has ever seen to buy place or power for any man. He is now the ambassador at the McKinley court for all those incorporated organisms that deal in the earnings of credit, stocks, bonds, and mortgages, the elements that are most directly interested in the total destruction of silver as money, the absolute maintenance of the gold standard, and the complete substitution of national-bank paper for our present currency. They belong to no political party permanently; no party can purchase them; they are not on the market for sale, but to buy. They purchase political parties themselves.

Their connection at the present time with the Republican party can scarcely be said to have been formed on the basis of an alliance. They spent too much time and money to effect the success of that party and that party has broken too many of its pledges to the people to rebut the presumption that it is acting under force in supporting this bill. The people, whose servants we are, have not seen this bill. Its provisions have never been discussed by them, nor in any form has the change of our currency for that of a national-bank paper been passed upon by them. No party has ever submitted that question to its constituents. On the hustings and elsewhere Republicans have been charged with secretly harboring this design, but it was indignantly denied as often as charged.

One of the most familiar and potent arguments of Republican orators in favor of the gold standard during the campaigns of 1896 and 1898 was that it preserved the greenbacks, Treasury notes, and our other forms of currency intact; that it made each dollar of them equal to a dollar in gold. You told them that you wanted the gold standard to make their old historic greenback equal to gold; you did not tell them that you also wanted to retire the greenback. Why didn't you?

In considering this bill it would be well to keep before our eye the kind, quantity, and character of our currency that it marks out for slaughter. I take the report of the Treasury Department for December 1, 1899, which shows the outstanding currency in circulation on that date to be as follows:

Gold coin	$627,480,101
Standard silver dollars	78,232,454
Subsidiary silver	76,322,965
Gold certificates	150,908,202
Silver certificates	394,292,800
Treasury notes (act July 14, 1890)	87,441,680
United States notes (greenbacks)	317,811,976
Currency certificates (act June 8, 1872)	13,605,000
National-bank notes	239,835,786
Total	1,985,930,964

Here is what this bill is calculated by degrees, but eventually, to eliminate from the foregoing:

Standard silver dollars	$78,232,454
Silver certificates	394,292,800
Treasury notes (act July 14, 1890	87,441,680
United States notes (greenbacks)	317,811,976
Currency certificates (act June 8, 1872)	13,605,000
Total	891,383,910

This amounts to nearly one-half of the currency available for circulation. It is that part of the currency which does in fact circulate and upon which falls the chief burden of exchange and business of the people; for if we add to this the subsidiary coinage and national-bank notes, amounting to $316,158,751, we would have $1,207,542,661 as the total sum of the currency that enters into practical circulation.

The two other so-called media of circulation in the Treasury statement as outstanding and in circulation, namely, gold coin and gold certificates, circulate intermittently and on crutches. They have a peculiar and very valuable use of their own as reserves and deposits for banks and individuals, but it is not the money that circulates among the people; and it may be well to say here that the $627,480,101 in gold said to be in circulation is not correct, but is the amount which has been coined from the foundation of the United States Mint, and is not now held as reserve in the Treasury.

The statement does not subtract the amount that during a long period of years has been lost, exported, or used in the arts. Now, the exercise of the power given in this bill to redeem and retire $891,383,910 of our currency must have one of two results—Government bonds must be issued as a basis for national banks to supply the vacuum in our country, or there must be an immense contraction in the currency, either one of which will be a national evil that will approach to a national curse; and I defy any man to show a different result.

The chief object of the bill is, as Mr. Gage before this expressed it: "To take the Government out of the note-issuing business." By which he means that the Government shall stop issuing anything in the nature of paper currency and turn that privilege wholly over to the national banks. Out of all these millions of currency there are only $239,835,786 that are issued by the national banks, and represent a debt upon which they can draw interest from the Government, while $891,383,910, representing silver money and Government notes, is active, running at large and popular with the people, issued by the Government, and not producing a single cent of usury to the national banks.

When the currency robber looks on that $891,383,910, carrying blessings to humble homes, animating with hope the toil-worn paths of labor, thrusting the torch of comfort into the dark corners of wretchedness and poverty, and maintaining its mission of love and charity, absolutely free from the finger of the usurer, thoughts come over him like those that came to General Blucher, when, after the battle of Waterloo, he was taking in the sights of London. That city so impressed the old freebooter, with its "confusing heterogeneity" of wealth and splendor, that he was constrained to remark to his English guide, "Mine Gott, vat a vine city to sack!"

If the American people can be induced to issue $891,383,910 of Government bonds with which to retire this currency, then the national banks will have a basis for circulating their own notes put the best investment on earth for $891,383,910 of their capital. The prospect which now invites their perseverance is the most alluring that has tempted the imagination since that which struck the gaze of Christ from the mount to which the devil took him. In a country the richest and greatest the sun ever shone upon, where royalty is unknown, the national bank, tempted by the same old devil, aims to enthrone itself as absolute monarch and quarter its stockholders permanently upon the people's wealth and enterprise.

The national bank is the organized power that gives life and movement to this conspiracy against the people. It has many and powerful allies, who, on account of fear, favor, or connection, are in sympathy with all its objects. Its attitude to-day makes it easy to understand the indignation of Jefferson when he declared that a national bank was more dangerous to the liberties of the people than a hostile army; and how Andrew Jackson was prompted to set his iron heel on the neck of the old national bank and grind the life out of it.

Ever since the present national bank was organized down to the present time it has been a disturbing element in our finance. It is not too much to say that did it not exist the people would have been saved from the bitter strifes and disastrous results of the conflict that has been waged on the money question during the past twenty-six years. No one can examine the many conflicts and acts of Congress on money, finance, and currency without being impressed with the irrepressible strife that has been waged between it and the people for supremacy over the nation's currency.

Through all this strife, whether waged on silver, gold, bonds, currency, or other kindred subject, it has been animated by but one unceasing purpose, and that is, to grasp from the hands of the Government the constitutional power of issuing currency for the people and exercising that power exclusively by itself. That "confusing heterogeneity which needs simplification," as Mr. Gage terms our existing currency, has been brought about by that very conflict. It is the epitomized history of the strife, and in it can be read what the people have preserved and what their enemy has gained. And I challenge the whole history of that conflict for an instance where the national-bank power has been successful in changing the law of our money or currency that has not been followed by disaster, depression, panic, or individual ruin from which there was no recovery until such action was reversed or its force broken by some remedial act.

Whatever is legal tender is, for all practical purposes, money in our currency. It will buy what each one wants, and, what is more to the purpose, the creditor is bound to accept it in discharge of his debt. Besides gold, we now have a billion legal-tender dollars for circulation with which every man can pay his debts everywhere. This bill provides that it shall retain the same legal-tender quality; but when, under the provisions of the bill, it is redeemed and retired from circulation, what is to take its place? Republicans laugh at such a simple inquiry and answer that if redeemed in gold, as provided in this bill, the gold will take its place in circulation. That is an evasive answer. Gold will not circulate when men deal in it as a commodity to make commissions and profits and collect it for purposes of reserve.

As I observed before, the purpose is to replace it with national-bank notes. National-bank notes are not a legal tender, nor does this bill provide them with that quality. If, then, our present currency is changed to a national-bank currency, the people will have nothing with which to pay their debts but this bank currency. That the creditor is not bound to receive. John Smith has given William Brown a mortgage on his farm. When interest day comes, John gathers up $100 in national-bank notes—there is

nothing else in circulation—and takes it to William to pay his interest. William refuses to accept it. Why? Because it is not a legal tender. John says to William, "Take them; they are just as good as gold. We now have the gold standard; you can get them redeemed in gold, dollar for dollar." "I know that," says William, "but I do not have to take those notes, but you go and get them redeemed in gold and bring it to me; I will have to take the gold." John goes to town, enters the national bank, presents his $100 of bank paper and calls for gold in exchange. The banker looks at the notes and says, "Well, Mr. Smith, these notes have not been issued by this bank. One of them was issued by the First National Bank of New Orleans, one by the First National Bank of St. Paul, one by the First National Bank of San Francisco, and the others by the First National Bank of Boston. I have no doubt but if you present these notes at the respective banks that issued them they will redeem them in gold; or you might take all of them to the United States Treasury and have them redeemed in bulk. If, however, it is inconvenient for you to make the trip, there is old Money Bags around the corner, who will pay you the gold for them at a reasonable discount."

That is an illustration of what is made possible in ordinary transactions by the provisions of the bill you now aim to make law, when under it our present legal-tender currency shall have been wiped out and the gold-redeemable nonlegal-tender paper money of the bank is substituted in its stead. It is the glory of our present currency that there is sufficient legal tender in it to save the people from the expenses and inconvenience of redemption in the free use of it in their transactions.

The national-bank notes now pass without exception and as freely as our legal-tender currency, but that is the result, to a considerable extent, of the fact that its quantity is small in comparison with the legal-tender currency, is redeemable in a large part of that currency, and is sustained and carried along by the force of its relation to the whole volume of currency. When it becomes practically the sole currency, depending upon gold redemption at inconvenient places, it will not, under the law as it now exists, nor when this bill becomes law, stand the storms of depression and panics.

It may be that future legislation will change the quality of the national-bank note and make it a legal tender. I apprehend that the American people will never be satisfied with a currency that is less than legal tender. If the national-bank note is made a legal tender, it is then no better than our present currency, while at the same time the people will have to pay for it in millions of bonds and interest.

That part of the currency which you aim to destroy you have stigmatized as fiat money. Our support of it you declare to be Populism. We are proud of the accusation. There is but one system that is free from fiat. That is where there is a dollar of real money or bullion held in reserve to redeem every dollar of paper money permitted to circulate. If $2 of paper currency is permitted to circulate upon $1 of redemption money, there is $1 of fiat money in circulation.

This dollar may sustain its power of exchange by legislation, by confidence, by methods of business, or otherwise, for an hour, a day, a year, or forever, but so long as it circulates it carries with it the quality of irredeemability, of fiatism, which in our currency has been an object of aversion to national banks and now of ridicule by Republicans. There does not and there can not exist among a civilized people a system of currency without more or less of such fiatism in it. When this fiatism is placed in the currency issued by the Government the national banker hates it; when it is injected into his own national-bank currency he loves it.

This fiatism can not be eliminated from our financial system. The presumption of irredeemability, even if limited in time, must to a large and increasing degree remain with that system. It may be shifted from one part of the system to another, but it can not be taken out of it. No one knows that better than the national banker. It is the center of this whole financial struggle. It is the profit-producing part of the system. If it is left with the currency issued by the Government directly, all the people will reap profits; it saves them from Government bonds—a perpetual national indebtedness and the payment of interest to the national banks.

If the national banks can transfer that fiatism to their own paper issue and into a national bonded indebtedness, which they will surely hold, then they and their successors for all time to come will reap the profits. This bill makes that transfer. It enlarges the opportunity for fiatism in the hands of the bankers, while it makes the whole system dangerous and top-heavy by making gold alone the basis of redemption.

So far as the gold-standard feature of this bill is concerned, I am opposed to it. No matter what events have changed the opinions of gentlemen on the other side of this House within the last few years, to my mind there are no grounds for discussion and debate on that subject. If gentlemen have changed, the Constitution has not. The adoption of the gold standard by this Government has been effected by a long campaign of organized corruption.

In that campaign many a "needy hired man" has made his fortune at the expense of his country and his conscience. Many a metropolitan newspaper has been kept upon its legs by the sale of corrupt opinions. Ministers of state and persons in high political positions have been financially profited, and there has not been an impecunious scoundrel who has sold his services to the gold trust but has become wealthy or advanced to political, professional, or commercial position to keep him from want.

Even this Republican Administration reaches out the helping hand to those two ragged and hungry fugitives and tramps from the Democratic party, William Bynum and Josiah Patterson, and places them in some of the most profitable positions in the Government because they were the more serviceable that they were traitors.

I congratulate the people of the United States on the heroic and protracted struggle they have made for financial freedom and that this is the last of all the great nations to succumb to the corruption and injustice by which the gold standard has been everywhere enacted into law. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ZENOR. Mr. Chairman, the Republican party, in its St. Louis platform in 1896, declared against the free coinage of silver—

except by international agreement with the leading commercial nations of the world—

Which it pledged itself to "promote." It further declared that—

until such agreement can be obtained the existing gold standard must be preserved, and all our silver and paper currency must be maintained at parity with gold.

It further and lastly, and as a corollary to what precedes, declared that the party would favor—

all measures designed to maintain inviolably the obligations of the United States, and all our money, whether coin or paper, at the present standard, the standard of the most enlightened nations of the earth.

Mr. Chairman, in this plank of the Republican platform it was and is now assumed that the country was and is upon the gold standard, and with this knowledge and the experience of more than forty-six years of the actual operation and effect of this policy—for the distinguished gentleman from the State of Iowa, Mr. DOLLIVER, and others upon that side of the Chamber have declared in the course of this discussion that the gold standard which is now proposed to be crystallized into statutory law has virtually been in force since 1853, and my distinguished colleague, Mr. OVERSTREET, from Indiana, says it has been recognized in practice for more than half a century—with all this knowledge and experience, the Republican party felt called upon when it assembled in national convention at St. Louis in 1896 to emphasize the fact that the gold standard was not satisfactory, and in language and phraseology deliberately and carefully chosen explicitly declared their preference for bimetallism and pledged their party in the most solemn manner to use every honorable means to secure its reestablishment by an international agreement. Opposed to this declaration was the declaration of the Democratic party, in these words:

We demand the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at the present legal ratio of 16 to 1, without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation. We demand that the standard silver dollar shall be a legal tender equally with gold for all debts, public and private, and we favor such legislation as will prevent for the future the demonetization of any kind of legal-tender money by private contract.

This is not all. We went still further. We declared—

We are opposed to the policy and practice of surrendering to the holders of the obligations of the United States the option reserved by law to the Government of redeeming such obligations in either silver or gold coin.

With the positions of the two parties thus defined and along the lines thus drawn the great contest upon this question was waged in 1896. I dare say that if the Republican party in that contest had declared that in order to preserve the alleged existing gold standard it was necessary to retire the greenbacks or impound them in the United States Treasury and substitute for them national-bank notes and redeem the silver dollars or silver certificates with gold, as has since been advocated and is now openly avowed, and especially if its leaders, advocates, and champions had announced their purpose, if elected, to reverse the unbroken practice of the Government for more than eighty years of its proudest history and to crystallize into law the usurpations and vicious practices inaugurated by the Secretaries of the Treasury of later years, without warrant and in defiance of the plain letter of the statute, by the passage of such a measure as the pending bill, Mr. McKinley would not have carried a half dozen States of the Union.

The President in his first message told the country our money was all now perfectly good, but that "currency reform" was needed to remove alleged doubts and ambiguities in our financial system. He signally failed, however, to point out the defects supposed to exist, and he proposed no plan of reform, but contented himself with calling attention to the scheme of his Secretary of the Treasury then pending, or soon thereafter introduced, before the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

He neither indorsed, criticised, nor disapproved it. He must have known what the commission of the monetary convention of Indianapolis proposed. He could not have been ignorant of the plans of currency reform introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Walker, and the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. FOWLER, and Mr. MCCLEARY, of Minnesota; and yet the President publicly expressed no opinion about any of them. He said in his banquet speech in New York City, shortly after his inauguration, that his interpretation of the victory of 1896 was that the people commissioned the Republican party "to enact such laws as would not permit a doubt to exist anywhere concerning the stability and integrity of our currency or the inviolability of our obligations of every kind."

If this was his view at that time and he was convinced that the remedy was the establishment of the gold standard, then it was his plain duty to put the money question to the front and to have had some measure of reform ready for submission to Congress. Instead of this, however, he sent a high-salaried commission abroad on a junketing tour to the capitals of Europe to secure foreign consent for us to do what we are well capable of doing for ourselves, and then called an extra session to reenact the McKinley tariff law to legislate the country prosperous. The result is not prosperity for the great mass of the people, but for trusts and monopolies, which have forced up the price of practically everything the farmers of the country are compelled to buy in the way of necessary supplies without a corresponding increase in the price of their products and what they have to sell, and an estimated deficit of more than $18,000,000 for the fiscal year ending 1901, with continued war taxes and probably more bond issues.

In his banquet speech the President dropped bimetallism by international agreement and made no suggestion of what he thought ought to be done to "reform our currency." His whole address was nothing if not a well-formed and eloquent group of glittering generalities and pleasing platitudes. As Hamlet said to Polonius, "Words, words, words." He did not say the bonds or other obligations should be paid in gold, for fear of driving off the bimetallic Republicans, but said they must be paid in the "best money of the world," to hold his gold supporters. The President said:

> Nothing should ever tempt us—nothing ever will tempt us—to scale down the sacred debt of the nation through a legal technicality. Whatever may be the language of the contract, the United States will discharge all of its obligations in the currency recognized as the best throughout the civilized world at the times of payment.

Mr. Chairman, this is remarkable language. The rights of the parties—the United States and the bondholders—are not to be determined by the terms of the contract; not even paid in our own money, whatever it may be at the time of payment, but in the money of other nations if it is thought to be "better" than ours! Shylock refused his principal and demanded his "pound of flesh" because it was "so nominated in the bond." The President proposed to give more than is "nominated in the bond," the "pound of flesh" cut from over the heart of the American people, blood and all!

And now his party proposes in the pending measure to carry out this policy and fasten upon the country the gold standard and thereby give to the owners of Government securities an unearned increment of millions of dollars. But when, without any submission of the question to the great mass of the people, like a similar contribution made to their greed and avarice in 1873, you have done this grateful service to the bondholders, it will arouse such a storm of indignation as will cause the modern Shylocks to exclaim with Shakespeare's prototype, "Give me my principal and let me go."

And in his later messages the President is even less explicit, if possible, than he has been on the currency question. He speaks no word of commendation of the views of his Secretary of the Treasury in his report to Congress, and contributes nothing of importance to help in forming public opinion on this momentous issue.

Secretary Gage and Comptroller Dawes have openly antagonized each other on the money question, which has doubtless led the President to be more guarded and less aggressive, looking out for the first chance to return to his first love and prepared for the opportune moment.

The truth is, the President has had no well-defined and fixed financial policy.

The President has really been in an uncomfortable dilemma on this money question. The record of his whole public life has been and is for silver. He voted for the Bland-Allison bill over the veto of President Hayes in 1878, and for the Matthews resolution of the same year, passed again by the Senate in February, 1898. He voted for the Sherman purchasing act of 1890, and was one of the most vigorous advocates of free silver on this floor. When his party surrendered to the money power at St. Louis he was confronted with this silver record, and first sought to have the platform avoid the use of the word "gold;" but his friends failing in this, his next and only remaining resort was to speak in vague generalities from his porch in Canton about "sound money" and "making every dollar as good as every other dollar."

But when the time for action comes his eloquent periods and captivating appeals upon the subject of sound money will not do, and he apparently has no plan. He has endeavored to placate his turbulent bimetallic friends in the form of promises to continue negotiations with other nations for bimetallism, while his Secretary is known to have laughed at it as folly, and emphasizes his opposition to it by making the primary purpose of his financial bill "to commit the country more thoroughly to the gold standard and remove as far as possible all doubts and fears on that point."

Secretary Gage seems to be of a different composition from his chief, and has omitted no occasion to define his views. In speeches and public interviews he has repeatedly declared that the only solution of our difficulties is the permanent establishment of the single gold standard. In his "statement" of December 17, 1897, before the House Committee on Banking and Currency, the Secretary said:

> A bimetallic standard does not exist anywhere on earth. A bimetallic currency, as I understand bimetallism, does exist in the United States now. The firm establishment of our system upon the gold standard and the recognition of silver by the Government in the way of such interchangeability as may be necessary to keep it equal to gold will better maintain bimetallism on the general principle I have just outlined. This has, in a manner, been going on for eighteen or nineteen years. There is nothing at all in the proposition to more firmly establish the gold standard to prevent us from doing all reasonable things to accomplish such an increase in the value of silver money as will bring it to a natural parity with gold, and thus relieve the Government from the expense of artificial maintenance and the embarrassment which has prevailed for many years and which will perhaps prevail for many years to come in our financial system.

That is to say, what silver dollars we now have or may hereafter coin must be exchangeable or redeemable in gold, for which, perhaps, bonds will have to be issued to secure enough of it, in order to have a true bimetallic currency. This is the theory now sought to be enacted into law. For such bimetallism, of course, no international arrangement would be necessary, because the ratio would be wholly immaterial.

But if there was any doubt at any time about the position of Secretary Gage on this subject, there could be none whatever about the position of the Indianapolis commission, which represented the gold wing of the Republican party as well as the Gold Democrats. In their report they said that the object of their plan was to remove all doubt at once and forever about the stability of our currency by establishing the gold standard in a permanent form; and to do this, among other things, they contended that the coinage of silver dollars must cease. They said:

> Many of our fellow-citizens have hoped in all sincerity that the problem of the standard would be solved by international bimetallism. An earnest effort has been made to realize that hope, but it must now be abandoned.

Senator WOLCOTT, one of the commission, in his speech in the Senate reviewing the work of the commission in that behalf, declared that he and his colleagues met a serious obstacle in their efforts to secure the cooperation of foreign nations for bimetallism in the fact that it was believed that the United States did not really desire the success of the commission, and that this belief was founded on the expressed opinions in public interviews of Secretary Gage and minor official representatives of the Administration.

Mr. Chairman, the American people have a right to know whether there has been double dealing in this important matter. Has the President been "running with the hare and holding with the hounds?" Has he and his party been giving lip service to bimetallism and secretly stabbing it? However this may be, it is certain that Secretary Gage has not disavowed any of the alleged interviews, nor has he withdrawn his bill or statements from the committee of the House, and he still remains the close friend and financial adviser of the President in the Cabinet.

To placate the suspicious silver Republicans, the President has removed Mr. Preston, Director of the Mint, who made bold to speak out on the futility and absurdity of any attempt to secure international bimetallism; but this was a very weak "apology" to his clamorous silver followers of the Republican persuasion. The people will draw their own conclusions from these damaging facts, and the President and his party must answer to the country for their good faith in their attempt to redeem this pledge of their platform.

Why this sudden and almost hysterical cry for a "reform" of the currency and strengthening of the public credit? Where is the source of danger to the credit of the nation, and who is complaining of the currency? The President assures the country that all our money is perfectly good, and Secretary Gage informed us by a telegram to ex-Secretary Fairchild during the silver debate in the Senate in the winter of 1897–98 that the obligations of the Government were being paid indifferently in gold, silver, or paper, and this assurance has since been quite often repeated.

The gold reserve in the Treasury is about $240,000,000 and constantly increasing. The balance of trade is largely in our favor and gold is pouring into the country in quantities never before known in our history. The open and avowed purpose of the pending bill

is to fasten the gold standard permanently on the country. The people of the country thoroughly understand the movement, and while powerless for the time to successfully resist the passage of the present vicious and revolutionary measure, the time will come when they will enter their indignant protest at the ballot box.

The act of November 1, 1893, repealing the purchasing clause of the act of July 14, 1890, declared it—

to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, such equality to be secured through international agreement or by such safeguards of legislation as will insure the maintenance of the parity in value of the coin of the two metals and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts.

This law was passed by the votes of Democrats and Republicans on this floor and in the other branch of Congress. This is the solemn declaration of policy of the United States on the money question, and it still stands on the statute book. The Republican party now repudiates and abandons that wise policy. The Democratic party will adhere to it. Admitting that "international agreement" has failed and is entirely hopeless, must we give up and sink under the blighting influence of the single gold standard?

It is not true that gold was the "existing standard" when the St. Louis platform was adopted, or at any other time by any authority of law. The act of 1873 discontinued the coinage of legal-tender silver dollars, but the acts of 1878 and 1890, whereby about 500,000,000 silver dollars were coined and made a full legal tender for all debts, public and private, necessarily repealed that act and reestablished the bimetallic system. Really, technically speaking, there never has been any such thing as a money standard of value.

The Supreme Court of the United States in the legal-tender case declared:

It is hardly correct to speak of a standard of value. The Constitution does not speak of it. It contemplates a standard for that which has gravity or extension; but value is an ideal thing. The coinage acts fix the unit as a dollar, but the gold or silver thing we call a dollar is in no sense a standard of a dollar; it is a representative of it. There might never have been a piece of money of the denomination of a dollar. There never was a pound sterling coined until 1815, if we except a few coins struck in the reign of Henry VIII, almost immediately debased, yet it has been the unit of British currency for many generations. It is, then, a mistake to regard the legal-tender acts as either fixing a standard of value or regulating money values.

This is the language of the highest judicial tribunal in the world.

The more zealous advocates of the "gold standard" insist that there can be no successful establishment of that standard in our monetary system until the gold unit is regarded precisely the same as the unit of the measure of weight or length. The absurdity of the contention is easily exposed by reference to everyday transactions in business. A pound or a yard is the same in the Klondike country as in the States; but a dollar, whether of gold, silver, or paper, will not purchase one-fourth as much flour or meat in Dawson City as in Washington.

Money has two functions—it constitutes the circulating medium and at the same time acts as a measure of value, or price, rather. No "standard of value" is conceivable independent of the circulating medium. The measure of price or value depends on the quantity of all the money in circulation, not on the quality of any particular portion of it. Greenbacks were necessarily the "standard" until the resumption of specie payments, because gold and silver had disappeared, and because all business was conducted and prices determined by the paper circulation.

When resumption was accomplished, all debts, public or private, were payable in gold or silver, because the word "coin" in the refunding act of July 14, 1870, meant both gold and silver. Until 1873 both gold and silver, in contemplation of law, were the "standards," or, perhaps more accurately speaking, the "standard," and had been since 1792, the date of the first coinage act, although one of the metals had more or less disappeared from circulation from time to time, leaving the other the controlling currency, along with the notes of banks.

The safeguards of our own laws are still left us under this statute of 1893 to establish and maintain the double standard of gold and silver without the "aid or consent" of any foreign nation. When the bill to repeal the purchasing clause of that act was under discussion on this floor, the friends of silver made motion after motion to so amend the law that the ratio might be made to conform, as far as practicable, to the relative commercial value of the two metals, but the Republicans joined hands with the misguided followers of President Cleveland to vote them all down, because the purpose was then, as it is now, to place the country on the single gold basis.

No "safeguards" will be required other than the natural operation of the automatic system of bimetallism at the ratio established by law. The Democratic party believes, as I understand it, that the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 will not drive gold out of the country nor send it to a premium; that it will not impair the public credit or disturb values, but, on the contrary, preserve both, as it always did before silver was stricken down. The act of 1873 was not the only crime against the people, but, supplemented as it was by the surrender by our Secretaries of the Treasury of the option conferred by law to pay public creditors in either gold or silver coin, constituted an essential part in the final culmination of this great wrong.

The Democratic party believes that with both gold and silver as primary money, supplemented, if necessary, by the issue of Government notes, a volume of currency can always be had adequate to the wants of business and necessary to give activity to trade and employment to labor. The Democratic party believes that the adoption of the single gold standard will have one of two effects—either to further contract the currency, cripple industry, and reduce prices, or else, with the banking schemes proposed to be hitched onto gold, will inflate credit money to a degree dangerous to the people by causing suspensions of specie payments and periodical panics. These are fears, if well founded, well calculated to cause hesitation and challenge thoughtful consideration even among those who feel inclined to favor some well-guarded measure of currency reform, in giving their support to the pending bill.

In 1841 Thomas H. Benton, referring to the overthrow of the Bank of the United States, said: "We have driven the tigress to the jungle, but I fear that some day she will return, bringing her whelps with her." The prediction was realized. The "whelps" did return. The country was flooded with "wildcat" banks, carrying suspensions and panics in their course. During the war (1863) came the national-bank system, and now come various schemes to extend, perpetuate, and enlarge their powers. The Democratic party takes its stand against all these measures. They are all obnoxious to the fundamental objection that the Government prerogative and exclusive function of establishing the currency of the people is to be surrendered to private corporations.

The greenbacks are to be withdrawn or impounded and bank notes substituted. An interest-bearing debt is to be created in the place of one bearing no interest and the silver money of the people ultimately destroyed. Approached by many cross paths, winding in and out in bewildering mazes, like the labyrinth of Grecian mythology, which concealed the Minotaur that fed on human flesh, the monster gold standard has its fixed habitation in this proposed measure to do its deadly work in safety.

A Theseus will yet be found to penetrate this modern labyrinth of the artful money power and slay its monster. The Gage bill, the original monetary-commission bill, the Walker bill, and the Fowler bill all proposed a partnership between the Government and the banks, in which the banks were to make all the profits and the Government assume all the responsibility. The pending bill, a compromise of the conflicting views and opposing opinions of the Republican members of this House, necessarily involves some sacrifice of the more radical element of the Republican party of their extreme ideas upon the subject of currency reform, and yet it embraces the basic principle of their contention, viz, the establishment of the "gold standard" and other provisions claimed to be necessary to carry it into effect.

Why all this indirection and circumlocution of detail when the Government can supply all the paper money needed? All did not seem to be lovely in the gold camp at Indianapolis. One of the delegates, a Mr. Cross, a banker, I suppose, and an expert in the mysteries of banking, was thus quoted in the public press while the Indianapolis convention was sitting:

Mr. Cross said there was little chance of the bill ever passing, so the matter would be allowed to rest for the present in its present shape. He said under the plan it would be possible for swindlers to organize a chain of banks, place the stock in irresponsible hands, loot the concerns with straw investments, and leave the honest banks to bear the loss.

The representatives were averse to talking on account of their agreement with the leaders of the movement to maintain silence at this time. The New York delegations organized without recognizing the "Merchants' Association" representatives. Their silence at this time is with the distinct understanding that the bill will never become a law in its present form. Should there be any chance of its becoming a law, the fight will be opened against it. Every effort was made to keep the opposition a secret during the convention.

The great Pitt once declared: "Let the Americans adopt their funding system and go into their banking institutions, and their independence will be a mere phantom." Yet, with all the instructive experience of England and our own as imitators, it is proposed not only to continue a false and disastrous system, but to extend and render it permanent. These "reform" measures, "so called," are perhaps as well guarded as human ingenuity can devise to prevent abuse, but the fatal weakness of credit money can never be cured by human laws. The foundation is fiction, not capital.

The Bank of England is probably as perfect a system as has ever been devised; yet the first year after it opened, in 1696, it suspended specie payments. The catastrophe was repeated thirty-seven times afterwards, ruining the merchants and business in England with panics and bankruptcy. These suspensions disastrously affected the banks of this country by withdrawing our gold and involving our people in the common ruin. It was the greenbacks that saved us in the suspension of 1866, because they were the medium of exchange, and the $45,000,000 of gold that

was shipped for the use of the Bank of England did not cause the slightest ripple in the business affairs of this country.

The Bank of England furnishes us another instructive lesson. The bank suspended from 1797 to 1823 by permission of Parliament, and having no gold or silver, or at least only in insufficient quantities, for twenty-five years the bank issued paper currency not made redeemable, nor even made a legal tender. The historian Sir Archibald Alison thus speaks of this period:

The next eighteen years of the war—from 1797 to 1815—were, as all the world knows, the most glorious and, taken as a whole, the most prosperous which Great Britain had ever known. Ushered in by a combination of circumstances the most calamitous, both with reference to external security and internal industry, it terminated in a blaze of glory and a flood of prosperity which have never since the beginning of the world descended upon any nation.

Prosperity, universal and unheard of, pervaded every department of the Empire. Our colonial possessions encircled the earth. Agriculture, commerce, and manufactures at home had increased in an unparalleled ratio; the landed proprietors were in affluence; wealth to an unheard of extent had been created among the farmers; the soil, daily increasing in fertility and breadth of cultivation, had become almost adequate to the maintenance of a rapidly increasing population; our exports, imports, and tonnage had more than doubled since the war began; and though distress, especially during 1810 and 1811, had at times been severely experienced among the manufacturing operatives, occasioned by Bonaparte's decrees against British goods, yet upon the whole and in average years their condition was one of extraordinary prosperity.

But this pleasing picture was soon destined to be overcast. England had her "resumption of specie payments," so called, as we have had ours, and the same historian thus describes the results:

The effects of this extraordinary piece of legislation were soon apparent. The industry of the nation was speedily congealed, as a flowing stream is by the severity of an arctic winter. The alarm became as universal and widespread as confidence and activity had recently been. The country bankers, who had advanced largely on the stocks of goods imported, refused to continue their support to their customers, and they were forced to bring their stocks into the market. Prices in consequence fell rapidly; that of cotton in particular sank in three months to half its former level. The Country Bankers' Association was contracted by no less than five millions sterling ($24,000,000), and the entire circulation of England fell from $235,545,000 in 1818 to $174,385,000 in 1820, and in the succeeding year it sank as low as $142,757,000.

The effects of this sudden and prodigious contraction of the currency were soon apparent, and they rendered the next three years a period of ceaseless distress and suffering in the British Islands. The accommodation granted by bankers diminished so much in consequence of the obligation laid upon them to pay in specie, which was not to be got, that the paper under discount at the Bank of England, which in 1810 had been $115,000,000 and in 1815 not less than $103,000,000, sank in 1820 to $23,360,000 and in 1821 to $13,610,000. The effect upon prices was not less immediate or appalling. They declined in general, within six months, to half their former amount and remained at that low level for the next three years. Distress was universal in the latter months of 1819, and that distrust and discouragement were felt in all branches of industry which are at once the forerunner and cause of disaster.

If this truthful writer had been in the United States during the hard process of "resumption" in this country, he would have drawn the picture of ruin and distress in no modified terms. Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, Thomas H. Benton, and all the original lights of Democracy, are safe to follow. Jefferson said:

Bank paper must be suppressed, and the circulating medium must be restored to the nation, to whom it belongs. It is the only fund on which they can rely for loans; it is the only recourse which can never fail them, and it is an abundant one for every necessary purpose. Treasury bills bottomed on taxes, bearing or not bearing interest, as may be found necessary, thrown into circulation, will take the place of so much gold and silver, which .ast, when crowded, will find an efflux into other countries, and thus keep the quantum of medium at its salutary level. Let banks continue, if they please, but let them discount for cash alone or for Treasury notes.

Jackson fought the old United States Bank mainly on the ground that Congress had no constitutional power to clothe a corporation with the Government function of issuing paper money.

John Sherman, when he first entered the Senate, and before he took sides with the money power against the people, used this language, in February, 1862:

I much prefer the credit of the United States, based as it is upon all the productions and property of the United States, to the issues of any corporation, however well guaranteed and managed. The only objection to the issue of this paper money [the greenbacks] is that too many may be issued. If, in our Revolutionary war, the amount of the Revolutionary scrip, and in the French Revolution the amount of assignats, had been confined to a small sum in proportion to the wealth of the country—if, for instance, it had been limited to one-tenth of the annual production of the country—there would have been no danger.

The doctrine thus announced by Thomas Jefferson and John Sherman is the doctrine of the Chicago platform of 1896. But the two men are quite different. Jefferson was the friend of the people; Sherman is the associate of the rich and the defender of capital. No man in the United States, if he had followed the principle he announced in the Senate in 1862, could have been of more service to his country. As it was, no man has done more harm. His name is identified with every movement during and since the war to enhance the value of a dollar in the hands of the rich by the stealthy establishment of the gold standard and to bring distress by his contraction schemes to the homes of the poor. He and his associates mutilated and took the life out of the original greenback in the Senate by putting in the "exceptional clause" that the Government notes would not be receivable for interest on the public debt or for customs dues.

Under the disguise of "strengthening the public credit" and "resuming specie payments," he doubled the public debt and made one currency for the people and another for the bondholders. The scathing arraignment of Catiline and Verres by the eloquent Cicero was mild in comparison to what the great Roman orator would have used against our sleek offender if he had been the subject of accusation. Catiline sought only to change the form of a doubtful government, which would probably have flourished as well under one as another. Verres plundered a single province. But men of high positions, trusted officials, and statesmen of reputation and renown during this era of ruthless riot and licentious reign of the money power conspired against the people of a whole nation. Alexander Hamilton went into public life a poor man.

In his funding schemes he could have made millions, as his friends did. He retired to practice his profession, because he could not afford to hold public office. Webster was in the Senate longer than Sherman, and many other public men since his day, and went back to Marshfield poorer than he left it. History will furnish the names of some men since prominent in the annals of legislation who entered public life comparatively penniless and retired with handsome fortunes, if not multimillionaires. People involuntarily remember the opportunities for money getting during the war and since; the position of chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate; the rise in securities as a result of legislation; the "rings" and combines of all kinds that were formed to loot the Treasury and enrich their members.

People will not unjustly conclude that the immense fortune of a public man who comes in poor and goes out rich was never acquired by methods compatible with the responsibility and dignity of a public trust.

Mr. Chairman, the act of July 14, 1890, declared it to be "the established policy of the United States to maintain" the two metals on a parity with each other upon the present "legal ratio (16 to 1) or such ratio as may be provided by law." It is on this provision of the statute that the Republicans rely for the pretense that it is necessary in order to preserve parity that silver dollars should be redeemed by gold dollars or exchanged for gold dollars at the will of the holder.

It furnishes also the pretense for the charge that, as the legal ratio does not express by at least one-half the commercial ratio between gold and silver bullion, it is impossible to have free coinage of silver without putting the Government to vast expense or without accepting silver alone as the standard of value, for the reason that gold and silver would not circulate together at such a wide disparity. The Democratic party contends, on the other hand, that legitimate parity does not mean that silver dollars must be redeemed with gold dollars or that the relative commercial value of the two metals has any necessary connection with the coin or money values of the two metals.

If the contention of the gold people were true, and if 16 to 1 does not express the real commercial ratio, the statute does not limit the coinage at that ratio, but expressly provides that some other ratio may be established by law, so that free coinage need not be abandoned simply because the present legal ratio is not deemed to be the proper one. Under the constitutional power to regulate the value of our coined money the ratio may be changed or the alloy in gold increased and the number of fine grains in silver increased, as was done in the mintage act of 1837, and thus the commercial parity be preserved sufficiently for all practical purposes.

Now, if it is not necessary to pay in gold instead of silver, nor to redeem silver dollars with gold dollars in order to maintain parity, the whole argument against free coinage falls to the ground. Preceding the clause which I have quoted from the act of 1890 is the following language:

That upon demand of the holder of any of the Treasury notes (for the purchase of silver bullion) herein provided for the Secretary of the Treasury shall, under such regulations as he may prescribe, redeem such notes in gold or silver coin, at his discretion.

But so far as these particular notes are concerned, the Secretary has no discretion, because it is further provided in section 3 of the act that after the 1st day of July, 1891, the Secretary of the Treasury is directed—

to coin of the silver bullion purchased under the provisions of the act of 1890 as much as may be necessary to provide for the redemption of the Treasury notes therein provided for—

showing that it was the intention of Congress that this class of notes at least was to be redeemed in silver coin.

To redeem or exchange or swap silver dollars for gold dollars at the option of either the holder or the Government is not parity; it is substitution. Such a process does not preserve parity; it destroys it, because the discrimination against silver makes it less desirable. The discredited dollar is merged in the preferred one, and in reality there is then but one money metal. What gives the silver dollar value is its legal-tender quality and use in a money function. The true way, therefore, to have preserved the parity between gold and silver dollars would have been for

the Government to pay out silver instead of gold, kept it in circulation, and given it the widest employment as money, as ex-Secretary Carlisle fully explained it could have been done if the practice had been inaugurated and maintained by the Secretaries after the resumption of specie payments.

Secretary Manning, in Cleveland's first term, was right when he told the New York bankers if they undertook to raid the Treasury to get its gold he would pay them in silver. This was the end of his campaign with Wall street, and gold neither went to a premium nor left the country. If his successors had adopted the same policy, we never would have had any trouble with our finances. If we had gone along with the original policy of Hamilton and Jefferson, paid all public creditors with silver or gold at the option of the Government, we never would have had this agitation on the money question nor heard of the single gold standard.

The panic of 1873 was caused by a greater crime, if possible, than the demonetization of silver. It was brought on by the policy of contraction consequent upon the resumption of specie payment, and to aid in the accomplishment of the scheme to ultimately place the country upon the single gold standard then contemplated by John Sherman and Hugh McCulloch, Secretary of the Treasury, at the instigation of the money power, aided and abetted by the Republican party. On the 1st of July, 1865, the total amount of available currency in the country was estimated at about $1,999,388,995.16, consisting of gold, silver, State bank notes, national-bank notes, and Government issues of all kinds.

I here insert a tabulated statement taken from the official records of the Treasury Department showing paper and currency circulation for years 1864, 1865, 1866, and 1867, marked Exhibit A.

TABULATED STATEMENT A.

Paper-money circulation.

Exhibit A of the paper-money circulation in the United States from 1864 to 1867. Prepared from official reports of the Treasury Department by Hon. F. M. COCKRELL, Senator from the State of Missouri.

Title.	June 30, 1864.	June 30, 1865.
State-bank circulation	$179,157,717.00	$142,919,628.00
National-bank circulation	31,235,270.00	146,137,860.00
Demand notes of July 17 and Aug. 5, 1861	780,999.00	472,603.00
United States notes (legal tenders), Feb. 25 and July 11, 1862, and Mar. 3, 1863	431,178,670.84	432,687,966.00
One and two 5 per cent notes, Mar. 3, 1863	153,471,450.00	42,338,710.00
Compound interest 3-year notes, Mar. 3, 1863, and June 30, 1864 (6 per cent)	15,000,000.00	193,756,080.00
Fractional currency, June 17, 1862 (including postal currency)	22,894,877.25	25,005,826.76
United States Treasury notes of 1857, 1860, and 1861	174,000.00	15,200.00
Seven-thirty Treasury notes, July 17 and Aug. 5, 1861, payable in 3 years	109,356,150.00	139,155,650.00
Seven-thirty Treasury notes, June 30, 1864, Mar. 3, 1865, payable in 3 years		671,610,400.00
Temporary loan certificates, Feb. 25, Mar. 17, and July 11, 1862, and June 30, 1864	72,330,191.44	89,717,061.40
Certificates of indebtedness, Mar. 1, 1862, and Mar. 3, 1863	160,729,000.00	115,772,000.00
3 per cent certificates, Mar. 2, 1867, and July 25, 1868		
Total paper circulation used as money	1,176,308,325.53	1,999,588,995.16

Title.	June 30, 1866.	June 30, 1867.
State-bank circulation	$19,996,163.00	$4,484,112.00
National-bank circulation	281,479,908.00	298,020,000.00
Demand notes of July 17 and Aug. 5, 1861	272,162.00	208,432.00
United States notes (legal tenders), Feb. 25 and July 11, 1862, and Mar. 3, 1863	400,619,208.00	371,783,597.00
One and two 5 per cent notes, Mar. 3, 1863	3,454,330.00	1,123,630.00
Compound interest 3-year notes, Mar. 3, 1863, and June 30, 1864 (6 per cent)	159,012,140.00	122,394,480.00
Fractional currency, June 17, 1862 (including postal currency)	27,070,876.96	28,307,523.52
United States Treasury notes of 1857, 1860, and 1861	13,000.00	6,800.00
Seven-thirty Treasury notes, July 17 and Aug. 5, 1861, payable in 3 years	139,301,700.00	139,315,350.00
Seven-thirty Treasury notes, June 30, 1864, Mar. 3, 1865, payable in 3 years	806,251,550.00	488,647,425.00
Temporary loan certificates, Feb. 25, Mar. 17, and July 11, 1862, and June 30, 1864	120,176,196.65	20,225,070.00
Certificates of indebtedness, Mar. 1, 1862, and Mar. 3, 1863	26,391,000.00	36,000.00
3 per cent certificates, Mar. 2, 1867, and July 25, 1868		
Total paper circulation used as money	1,984,938,232.61	1,475,157,419.52

For verification of above table see report of the Secretary of the Treasury for years 1865, 1866, and report for 1867 on page iv.

That was a per capita of about $58 for 34,000,000 people. By the policy of contraction as thus inaugurated for monetary strangulation, in order to reach a gold standard, our money circulation was reduced in 1869 to less than $700,000,000, and up to December 1, 1873, the total reduction was $1,230,999,085.

The armies of both North and South had disbanded, and from consumers and destroyers they became producers. The time was propitious for renewal of all branches of industry, but the means were taken away, and the consequence was hard times. On the 1st of January, 1877, 3,000,000 people were out of work. Tramps filled the highways for the first time in our history, and labor strikes and riots with red torch lighted up the country from Pittsburg to Chicago. The financial ruin and distress were only paralleled by those of England at the close of the Napoleonic wars so graphically described by the historian from whom I have quoted. How plain was the path of duty for Secretary McCulloch.

It was to save the American people all the interest on their debt that could be carried in "legal tenders;" to pay the principal as fast as practicable in gold or silver "coin," according to the terms of contract with the public creditors, and to fund the rest of the debt from time to time, guarding against contraction injurious to business. In the performance of this sacred duty there was glory enough for any human being. But he fell under sinister influences and preferred to retire to Lombard street to share as a banker the fruits of his policy with the sharks and shylocks of the money power.

What was the cause of the panic and hard times of 1893? It was pretended that a doubt had arisen as to the effect upon public credit of our large coinage of silver and that confidence was disappearing. With this view, President Cleveland convened Congress in extraordinary session to repeal the purchasing clause of the act of July 14, 1890. His wishes were obeyed, but the panic continued. The repeal proved no remedy. The fact is, it was a senseless proceeding, based on a false and erroneous conception of the real cause of the trouble. In an interview with the Senate Finance Committee in March, 1879, John Sherman said there would be no danger from free silver if the coinage did not exceed $100,000,000. Beyond that he was quite certain gold would leave the country and financial disturbance would ensue. We coined $500,000,000 under the acts of 1878 and 1890, and no such thing happened.

President Hayes was equally confident when he vetoed the Bland-Allison bill of 1878 that its passage into law would drive all the gold out of the country. Prophecy again failed. Is it not fair to assume, in view of all the false prophecy of the past by Republican seers concerning silver money, that they may be unreliable in the future? The report of the Director of the Mint for 1889 shows that, instead of leaving the country, gold flowed in, the increase from 1878 to 1890 being $592,000,000. There was never any lack of confidence in our financial system until Hayes and Sherman, Harrison and Foster, Cleveland and Carlisle invited gold raids upon the Treasury by announcing the policy officially and privately to the money changers of Wall street and elsewhere that the greenbacks would be redeemed in gold and all public obligations would be discharged in gold.

The panic of 1893 was caused by a hypochondriacal clamor of the money sharks, who set up a howl against the soundness of the currency and the stability of public credit. They locked up their money, contracted credits, and paralyzed the business of the country. They made a rush upon the Treasury for the gold reserve and for the issue of gold bonds. Cleveland yielded and came down with $262,000,000 of gold bonds.

The Republican party applauds his act, and McKinley and the Republican party is ready to repeat it.

Let us briefly notice one of the many important things proposed in this bill. The bill contains eleven sections. In the first section it is proposed to establish permanently the gold standard. Recognizing as we do the power of the dominant majority to write their will and record their arbitrary decree upon the statute books of the nation, it may yet be well to pause and reflect whether—even if the unit of value is to be permanently fixed at 25.8 grains of gold, nine-tenths fine—the moment is yet opportune for this nation to crystallize the same into statutory law.

We have recently observed the statement reputed to have been made by the Secretary of the Treasury that he hopes in the near future to be able to refund the interest-bearing obligations of the Government on a 2 per cent basis, and the friends of this measure claim that it will very much facilitate the accomplishment of this much-desired object. This would be an undertaking that would challenge the eager and unhesitating approbation of all, regardless of party division and party differences of opinion upon the merits of this bill, and with this in view our paramount duty is to exercise wise judgment, that nothing may now be done in the way of hasty legislation to embarrass the consummation of this much-desired purpose or make it more difficult of accomplishment.

In a message submitted to this House by President Cleveland during the Fifty-third Congress in which he expressed his determination, in order to meet the exigencies of the situation then confronting the country, to issue $62,000,000 bonds, he said that if Congress would authorize the insertion of the word "gold" instead of "coin" in the bonds the bidders for these securities would give $16,000,000 more for them. In other words, the bond

speculators and money magnates of the world placed their own estimate upon the difference in value between a bond payable in "coin" and one payable in "gold."

Congress refused to yield to the demand. Now, you do not suppose, do you, that this difference in valuation was a mere chance guess, or the theoretic deduction of some visionary politician? No, sir; it was the careful and reliable estimate of the most skillful and best-informed financiers of the whole world. By this bill we are now asked not only to violate the solemn terms of written contracts—the written contracts between the people of the United States and the bondholders—but to voluntarily contribute to them, not upon sixty-two millions of bonds alone, as we were asked to do under the Cleveland Administration, but upon the enormous sum of $1,046,000,000, the difference in value between the bonds as they now stand, payable in "coin," and the bonds as they will be under the terms of this bill, if it shall pass, payable in "gold."

The estimate made by the world's best financiers, and has been carefully made and stated upon the floor of this House pending this discussion in the able and eloquent speech of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCCLELLAN] upon the difference in value of gold and coin bonds of the par value of $62,000,000 was sixteen millions, or about 25.92 per cent, which valuation, if extended to the total issue of interest-bearing bonds now outstanding, would mean an enhancement of value to the holders of such obligations of more than $260,000,000.

This, Mr. Chairman, is but one of the many vicious features of this remarkable measure. And yet our distinguished and eloquent friend from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] boastfully declares upon this floor that it would be the proudest moment of his life if he could witness the passage of this bill before the holidays and its presentation made to the American people as a Christmas gift.

When the Government came to adopt the first mintage act, in 1792, Hamilton, then Secretary of the Treasury, with the concurrence of Jefferson, Secretary of State, adopted both gold and silver as standard money. They called it a double standard. Three hundred and seventy-one and one-fourth grains of fine silver was one money unit, and 25.8 grains of fine gold was the other.

Hamilton said there were reasons, if but one of the metals should be selected, in favor of gold as the most suitable metal, but that these reasons were overbalanced by the advantage of having both metals, because the selection of one to the exclusion of the other would narrow the money basis and lead to contraction. It is true Hamilton consulted the markets to find the relative value of the two metals when he put the ratio at 15 to 1, but this was more for convenience than for any idea or expectation that the money values of the two metals would always correspond with their bullion or commercial values.

Experience soon showed that was impossible. "Fifteen to one" were words of description rather than of value. The same purpose would have been accomplished if he had provided that the silver dollar and the gold eagle (for there was no gold dollar coined) should be described by some superficial measure as diameter and circumference. Money is the creation of law. When a material is selected for money purposes which has an intrinsic or commercial value as a commodity, it operates under two laws. One regulates its value by legal-tender quality, quantity, and demand; the other determines its commodity value.

To illustrate: Gold was undervalued at the ratio of 15 to 1 and disappeared to a large extent because more valuable for circulation in other countries and for manufacturing purposes. It went to the melting pot or was exported. It is claimed that under free coinage instead of more money we will have less, because about $625,000,000 of gold would disappear. In the same breath we are told that all the silver in the world would come to our mints and make money so plentiful that it would be worthless.

Both objections are ridiculous. Why should gold go out of circulation? Hoarding would be ruinous to the holders, and it would not go to the melting pots for manufacture into plate and ornaments beyond the demand, because that would bring the price down to a losing point. It could not go into foreign circulation without a demand for it, and, if no demand, the gold supply would be overstocked and a decline in purchasing power be sure to follow. Silver would not come in excessive quantities, because that would defeat its own object, and the continued use of it in other countries as currency would make it more profitable than to send it here. All these false specters can be safely left to the operation of economic laws.

In 1834 the ratio was changed to 16 to 1, but this overvalued gold, and silver largely disappeared. It was next tried to preserve both metals in circulation by putting more alloy in the gold coin and more grains of pure silver in the silver coins, 412¼ instead of 371¼, but this failed to establish absolute commercial equality. And so, in 1853, subsidiary silver coinage was made less valuable as money by limiting its legal tender to $5. But all plans failed, and silver dollars were few in circulation, until finally silver rose to 4 per cent preminm, for many years before the act of 1873 was passed.

After the increased alloy in the gold coins double eagles were 6 per cent less valuable than before, but $94 in these eagles paid debts of $100 in eagles contracted before the act of 1837. When the Matthews resolutions of 1878 passed this House and the other branch of Congress the silver dollar was 8 per cent less in metal value than the coin value, and yet Republicans and Democrats voted that it was no breach of faith to pay public creditors in 92-cent dollars. McKinley himself voted to commit this act of repudiation.

Jefferson did not suspend silver coinage in 1806 to destroy silver money like the act of 1873, but to preserve bimetallism, because his object was to prevent exportation of the silver coins. The act of 1853 was not to abandon the "double standard," but to make silver less valuable as money and bring it back to circulate with gold. Notwithstanding this disparity in commercial value and the temporary disappearance of first one coin then the other, there was always abundance of both metals for money use. Up to 1873 the Government had coined 8,031,238 silver dollars and about $76,734,964.50 of subsidiary coins, and a much larger quantity of gold, which, in proportion to mining resources and facilities and population, was sufficient for all business purposes with the bank notes in circulation.

Political economists of the highest authority discard the theory of the intrinsic value of money. Thus speaks Aristotle:

> Money by itself has value only by law and not by nature; so that a change of convention between those who use it is sufficient to deprive it of all its value and power to satisfy all our wants. But with regard to a future exchange (if we want nothing at present), money is, as it were, our security that it may take place when we do want something.

Thus Locke:

> Mankind having covenanted to put an imaginary value upon gold and silver by reason of their durableness, scarcity, and not being very liable to be counterfeited, have made them, by general consent, the common pledges whereby men are assured, in exchange for them, to receive equally valuable things to those they parted with, for any quantity of those metals; by which means it comes to pass that the intrinsic value regard in those metals, made the common barter, is nothing but the quantity which men give or receive of them, they having, as money, no other value but as pledged to procure what one wants or desires.

Thus John Stuart Mill:

> The pounds or shillings which a person receives are a sort of ticket or order which he can present for payment at any shop he pleases, and which entitle him to receive a certain value of any commodity that he makes choice of.

Mr. Chairman, if it is objected that I am advocating "fiat money," I reply that, according to the very best authority, there never was any other kind of money in the world. The greenback is fiat money. The difference between the bullion and coin value of our silver dollar is fiat. It is fiat that makes one of our silver dollars worth two Mexican dollars, though they contain several grains more of pure silver.

In 1763 the British Parliament declared all colonial acts for the issue of paper currency to be void. "Every medium of exchange," said the British Board of Trade, "should have an intrinsic value, which paper has not." Dr. Franklin appeared before the board and completely exploded this nonsense. He said:

> However fit a particular thing may be for a particular purpose, whenever that thing is not to be had, or not to be had in sufficient quantity, it becomes necessary to use something else, the fittest thing that can be got in lieu of it.
>
> Bank bills and bankers' notes are in daily use here [in London] as a medium of trade, yet they have no intrinsic value, but rest on the credit of those that issued them, as paper bills in the colonies do on the credit of the respective settlements there. Being payable in cash upon sight by the drawers is indeed a circumstance that can not attend the colony bills, their cash being drawn from them by the British trade; but the legal tender being instituted is rather a greater advantage to the possessor, since he need not be at the trouble of going to a particular bank or banker to demand the money.
>
> At this very time—

Continued Franklin—

> the silver money in England depends on its legal-tender quality for a part of its value—that part which is the difference between its real weight and its denomination. A great part of the shillings and sixpences now current are, in wearing, become 5, 10, 20, and some of the sixpences even 50 per cent too light. For this difference between the real and nominal you have no intrinsic value; you have not so much as paper; you have nothing.
>
> It is the legal tender, with the knowledge that it can easily be repassed for the same value, that makes threepenny worth of silver pass for sixpence. Gold and silver are not intrinsically of equal value with iron, a metal in itself capable of many more benefits to mankind. Their value rests chiefly in the estimation they happen to be in among the generality of nations, and the credit given to the opinion that the estimation will continue. Otherwise a pound of gold would not be the real equivalent of even a bushel of wheat.

It is said that law can not create value. Law certainly does create the money value of anything adopted for currency, because it can not exist without law. In the legal-tender cases the majority of the Supreme Court of the United States first held (opinion delivered by Chief Justice Chase) that Congress had no constitutional power to pass a legal-tender act by which paper money could be substituted for gold and silver, and that gold and silver were the money of the Constitution, because of their intrinsic value. But on a rehearing of the cases this decision was reversed, the majority holding (opinion by Justice Strong) that the money of a people was a creation of the legislative power.

The court says that Congress can not legislate commercial value into valueless things, but they do say, in effect, that it is competent

to use any material as the representative of values. The Constitution does not say in the article about money that Congress can not make something else a legal tender besides gold and silver. This prohibition is addressed to the States. It is not the value of gold and silver as bullion that Congress regulates under the Constitution, which it would be powerless to do, but the value of the money made from it, and the value of foreign coins introduced into the United States.

Roman law did not create sheep and oxen, nor give them their commercial value; but the law did create the money function of the "pecus" (flock), from which we derive our word "pecuniary." It is tiresome to hear this "rot" about "50-cent dollars." As well talk of a "two-dollar" dollar in gold, because with the double standard it is as proper to measure the gold by the silver as to measure the silver by the gold. But in the performance of a money function both are 100-cent dollars, because the unit in one is fixed by law as equivalent to the unit in the other. It is the same yard of cloth whether measured by a tape-line or a wooden yardstick; it is the same bushel of wheat whether the bushel measure is of oak or walnut; it is the same pound of flour whether the scales be constructed of iron or steel; so it is the same price or value whether measured by gold or silver dollars of equal monetary function.

Our present silver dollar contains about 46 cents worth of silver, but it pays as much debt or buys as much goods as any other dollar, not because a gold dollar is under it, which is all fiction, but because the legal-tender quality with the stamp of the Government gives it a money function. The Mexican dollar is only worth with us the amount of silver in it, because it is not legal-tender money in this country, but at home it is a full dollar. Its legal-tender quality can not travel beyond the jurisdiction of the Government that coins it. An Englishman could not pay for a dinner in this city with a "sovereign" except at its exchangeable rate as bullion. There is no such thing as international currency, or "money of the world." We pay for our imports by our exports, and settle balances against us, as do all other nations, by gold or silver bullion as commodities, not as money.

But suppose the fiat theory of money is unsound, and that our gold and silver dollars depend on the intrinsic value of the metal contained in them, will the fact of free and unlimited coinage at 16 to 1 with the quality of full legal tender and the free opportunity for use as money restore parity? I think it will. There was practical parity before demonetization of silver, and if the cause of disparity is removed the effect will cease. For four thousand years the ratio between gold and silver was never less than 11 nor more than 16 to 1, until silver was demonetized by the principal powers of the world. The relative amounts of the world's stock of gold and silver has remained about the same through all time and is now about $4,000,000,000 each.

Our stock of gold is about $696,260,542, of silver about $634,509,780. In the United States from 1873 to 1896 there were only two years, 1892 and 1896, when the stock of silver was greater than that of gold, showing that the decline in silver must be due to some other cause than overproduction. What was that cause? Evidently the lessened use of silver as a money metal, because the use in the arts and manufactures has rather increased than diminished the world over.

But it is said that if the restoration of silver as a standard money metal would bring its value up or gold down to the old ratio of 16 to 1 it could not be done without the cooperation of those nations who have united in demonetization. True, not to the same extent, but the tendency would be in that direction, and the vast increase of gold production by the rich discoveries of the Klondike regions, in South Africa, and in the increased output of our own mines by improved methods of production will soon so enlarge our stock of gold as to materially reduce its price compared to silver.

Natural conditions must be trusted to restore the equilibrium. Demonetization did not occur by any international agreement, and no such agreement is required to undo the wrong. France alone by her own policy has kept the two metals at a ratio of 15½ to 1 for one hundred years, and she maintains that ratio now with a relative stock of gold and silver about the same as ours. She has not demonetized but only suspended silver coinage since 1876. She maintains parity by paying gold or silver at the option of her great bank, and floats eight hundred millions in paper without any provision whatever for redemption. Her paper is a pure case of fiat money.

France differs from both England and Germany in her money system, and although nominally classed with the gold-standard countries, she is not really so. With the independent action of the United States for the free coinage of silver and gold at about the same ratio as France an impetus would be given to bimetallism that would soon bring the other great commercial powers into line in self-defense. The weakness of the Latin Union—Belgium, Switzerland, Holland, Greece, and Italy—in 1867 to maintain the bimetallic system was in the very attempt at union. Each was differently situated, and when each attempted to control the money affairs of the others the whole thing broke down.

The gold standard was established in Germany in 1871 in the interest of the moneyed classes, but the masses of the people in the Empire had always been used to silver, and would prefer it now if their voice could be heard. Bismarck has said the change from the old order of things was a great mistake and that he had been deceived into its support. India has become restless under the gold standard foisted upon her people by the selfishness of England and is moving towards the restoration of the white metal.

The absorption of our island populations of Hawaii, Porto Rico, the Ladrones, and the Philippines, aggregating more than 10,000,000 souls, is a long step toward bimetallism. For more than two hundred years the Spanish portion of the islands has been accustomed to silver money, and they must of necessity use the silver coinage of the United States in commercial transactions among themselves and with us, now that the Spanish authority has disappeared. Whatever may be the fate of Cuba, her people are most familiar with silver money, though nominally under the gold standard.

Every achievement of American enterprise and industry in developing the rich resources of these islands will compel important additions to the volume of silver currency. Such conditions will go far to establish our silver-mining industry and force up the price of the metal perhaps to commercial parity with gold. Added to this, it must be remembered that we are reaching out, if not for more territorial acquisitions, at least for increased trade with the balance of the West Indies, with the Central and South American States, and with China and Japan, all of which are silver-using countries and will be identified with us in our money policy.

The attempt to establish the gold standard in Russia, Austria-Hungary, Italy, Brazil, the Argentine Republic, Chili, and Japan is a complete failure. In each large amounts of bonds have been issued to buy gold, but the experiment has only worked to oppress the people with heavy taxes, contract the currency, and introduce indescribable distress. The reason of the failure is not far to seek. By the necessity of the case exchange is always against poor and indebted countries and in favor of rich creditor nations, which in this way ultimately absorb the wealth of the debtor country. The gold standard is a luxury which none but rich nations like England, dominated by money kings, can afford to have.

The day may not be far distant when England will be crucified on her cross of gold, and the commercial and money centers of the world will be transferred from London and Liverpool to New York and San Francisco. New York now leads London in the amount of annual commerce, while the instructive fact appears that the exports of England are constantly diminishing, while those of the United States are constantly increasing. Truly has it been written that the nations which rule in unrighteousness shall perish from the earth. Who knows but a time will come when the proud mistress of the seas shall realize the picture of Macaulay, when a New Zealander of some future day will sit on a broken arch of London Bridge to contemplate the ruins of St. Paul?

The new policy of colonial expansion, full of difficulties and dangers as it undoubtedly is, may not be without its compensatory advantages. "The stone that was rejected by the builders may become the head of the corner." Both free coinage and free trade are involved in it. The "open door" for the Orient with a Chinese wall for ourselves will never work together. Those "twin relics of barbarism," protection and restrictive navigation laws, which have closed against us the markets of the world and destroyed our merchant marine and carrying trade, will be left behind in the march of events.

The only practicable way to secure international bimetallism is for all the gold-standard countries to act separately and independently. International "agreements" or "arrangements" can never fix commercial ratios. Let two great powers like the United States and France set the successful example of free coinage and bring the two metals to an equilibrium by equalizing coinage value and the others would soon follow. We want neither the gold basis nor the silver basis, neither a cheap dollar nor a dear dollar, but the broad basis of the money of the Constitution established by the fathers.

Let the old greenback that successfully conducted the country through the most gigantic war of modern times, and gave the country such prosperity after its close as it never had, stand as a model paper money. Let the seigniorage of silver now in the Treasury be coined. Let certificates under existing laws issue for the silver dollars coined or to be coined at the option of the holders. Abolish the national bank and substitute Government notes for their currency; pay out to public creditors all kinds of lawful money; open the mints to free coinage without the aid or consent of any foreign nation; and all will be well. And to secure the ultimate accomplishment of this great achievement I hope and

trust that this bill will be defeated and thereby prevent the establishment of the gold standard permanently upon the people of this country.

The Democracy of the United States stands as it has always stood upon these questions, and will oppose to its utmost the propositions embraced in this measure. In the name of the six and a half millions of voters who supported William Jennings Bryan in 1896, we will hold our banners aloft, full high advanced, with the inspiring inscription, "By this sign shall ye conquer." The campaign of 1896 was but a skirmish for position; the great struggle will be fought to a finish in 1900. Then again will be unfurled the same colors that went down in honorable defeat in 1896, and our tried and trusted leader, that great advocate of the people's cause, William J. Bryan, will once more challenge to battle the mercenary cohorts of the money power and appeal to the honest yeomanry of his country to rally round the standard of the masses against the classes. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I would not speak at this late hour were it not for the fact that, you being in the chair, there is a presumption that a quorum of the House is present, and for the further fact that the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] in charge of the pending bill is also here, so that I shall assume that I am speaking to the entire body of Republicans of this House.

This bill is not the product of this House or any of its committees, though this Republican House is going to adopt it. A caucus of the Republicans made a committee last winter, who during the summer met at Atlantic City under every influence calculated to induce them to approve the monetary views of the great national banks of the large cities, and prepared this bill. On the meeting of this Congress the Republican caucus decided to pass it without amendment. Its avowed purpose is to place the financial question, so far as the retirement of the greenbacks and the enlargement of the powers and privileges of the national banks are concerned beyond the reach of the next Administration should it be Democratic, as they hope the gold-standard national bank influence will predominate the Senate for the next four years. Fearing our success, they determine to yield to the demand to pay the debt their party owes to the moneyed shylocks of Wall street while they have the power. If the people are susceptible to the teachings of great lessons, if they hate extravagance, if they cherish liberty and revere the principles of our Revolution, if they love humanity and humanity's rights, then it is more than probable that they will intrust this Government again in the hands of the Democratic party at the next election. The Republicans in the last thirty years have not carried the country in any two successive Presidential elections. In this bill they attempt to deprive the people of the country of the natural fruits of the next Democratic success.

There is one consolation in this measure to the American people, and that is that the Republican party has thrown off the mask which it has so frequently worn in the last few years upon this great financial question. No longer can they pretend to be the friends of bimetallism. Heretofore when we charged them with hostility to silver, they replied by proclaiming great love for it. Two years ago in this Hall I charged that the Republican party was bound soul and body to the gold standard. The Secretary of the Treasury had already outlined the policy.

The President of the United States, at the rich manufacturers' banquet in New York City, had foreshadowed it, and, notwithstanding all that, there were many Republicans in this country who honestly believed, because they were misled, that there was friendship in the Republican party to silver and to genuine bimetallism. They were misled because the Republican platform of 1888 had denounced "efforts to demonetize silver." The Republican platform of 1892 said that the "American people, from tradition and interest, favored bimetallism." In 1890 Major McKinley, now President of the United States, had spoken strongly and clearly in favor of silver. In this House he had voted for silver. In 1896 the Republican party, in its national platform, had again expressed friendliness to silver. No longer can they pretend it.

The gold standard, and especially the bond-holding interests, have at last induced the Republican party to come out from the entanglements of duplicity and boldly take its position against the best interests of mankind on the great question of bimetallism and the Government's surrender to corporations of its sovereign power to issue paper currency. It has listened to the siren's song and turned deaf ears to the people's needs.

Who is it that has demanded this bill? Who is it that has sent his petition here for its passage? Who was it that met in the Indianapolis convention in its behalf? Who was it that lent the caucus committee his influence? It was not the cotton grower and it was not the laborer that worked in the cotton fields. It was not the tobacco grower nor the laborer that worked in the tobacco fields. It was not the wheat grower nor the laborer who worked in the wheat fields. It was not the blacksmith. It was not the wood workman. It was not the carpenter nor the brick mason. It was not the mill man nor the operatives that work in the mill. None of these demanded it; none of these ask it. It was the trust magnate. It was the great banker, the great bondholder. It was the great national shylock. His influence was in the last Republican convention. His influence surrounds this bill. He rejoices that he controls the party now in power.

What is this bill? It is a repudiation of the Stanley Matthews resolution. It is a repudiation of the policies of Blaine and Garfield. It is a reversal of a national policy. It is intended to be the final death blow to silver. It is intended to diminish the volume of standard money. The great principle for which we contend is an increase in the volume of standard money. A Republican majority may strike this principle to the ground, but when it touches the people, Antæus-like, it will rise with greater power.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LINNEY] has said that the Southern members ought to vote for this bill. Mr. Chairman, not only ought not the Southern members to vote for it, but they and the Western members, and all men who love right and justice throughout the country, ought to vote against the bill and in favor of common justice between the creditor and debtor, between the people and the bondholders.

Mr. McKinley, in his letter of acceptance in 1896 of the Presidential nomination, when he was going before the people for votes, used this language:

It—

The Republican party—

has inaugurated no new policy. It will keep in circulation and as good as gold all the silver and paper money now included in the currency of the country.

That is the promise he made to the American people when he was after their support. Here is the demand he sent to Congress in his last message:

In this connection I repeat my former recommendation that a portion of the gold holdings shall be placed in a trust fund from which greenbacks shall be redeemed upon presentation, but when once redeemed shall not thereafter be paid out except for gold.

Then he promised to keep them in circulation; now he demands that they be impounded. If it is to be paid out only for gold, then it is dead as a greenback, for it will be but a gold certificate, and the circulation will be decreased. One can get a gold certificate at any time for his gold. He proposes not only to destroy the greenback, but to do it in such manner as to mislead the unthinking.

Let me call attention to the fact that in regard to the establishing of the gold standard the President in his message made two distinct recommendations, but when considering the trusts, which are drinking the lifeblood of the industry of the country's best people, he has no recommendation, but merely expresses a few indefinite hopes.

The first section of the pending bill declares the gold dollar shall be the standard of value. No longer does the other side attempt to deceive the people with international-agreement propositions. It is now going to, as Secretary Gage said, "commit the country more thoroughly to the gold standard." Having in the last Congress given an argument against the gold standard and in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver, I have not the time now to repeat it, but I shall endeavor to show that this bill is freighted with disaster and oppression to the great body of the American people. I admit that its first section is practically law now, and is one of the laws against which the great silver forces of the country are at war. This bill is intended to more thoroughly fortify it, but all the battlements that can be raised around it can not protect it against the power of a free people's will when once their understanding is thoroughly informed and that will thoroughly determined against it.

The second section declares that all interest-bearing obligations of the Government, now over $1,000,000,000, and all United States notes and Treasury notes, now about $440,000,000, shall be payable in gold coin. All these are now payable in coin, gold or silver. By their very terms they are so payable. Written in the face of every Government bond it is declared they are "redeemable in coin of the standard value of the United States on July 14, 1870," at which date the silver dollar was a standard coin. This bill further provides that all other obligations, public and private, for the payment of money shall be performed in conformity with the standard established by the bill. Mr. Chairman, a reading of the bonds and then a reading of section 2 by a simple, honest-minded man, unused to the financial world, untrained in Republican politics, would shock his moral sensibilities.

The bond contracts say they are payable in coin, gold or silver. This bill says they shall be payable in gold only. It has heretofore been estimated by gold-standard advocates, I believe, that having the simple word "coin" instead of "gold" in those bonds cost the Government $60,000,000. In other words, that from their sale the Government received that amount less than it would have

received if gold had been the payment money. If that be true, it becomes dishonest to afterwards write the word "gold" in those bonds when it cost the people $60,000,000 to leave it out.

If some friend of the people were to suggest that the word "coin" be stricken out of those bonds and in its stead write the word "greenbacks," a shout of indignation would be heard in every money center in all the land. If we were to propose to amend the law so as to make all those bonds payable in greenbacks, charges of dishonesty and anarchy would fill the air between this Capitol and Wall street until we could no longer hear a humble man's petition in the matter. As it would be wrong to change the contract and make them payable in greenbacks, it is wrong to change it to make them payable in gold. No law ought to be passed by Congress that would impair the obligation of a contract. In this respect this bill violates a constitutional principle. Under the Constitution no State can pass a law impairing the obligation of a contract.

Congress should not violate the principle. It is as morally wrong for Congress to impair the obligation of a contract as it is for a State to do so. The Federalist says that laws impairing the obligation of a contract are "contrary to the first principles of the social compact and to every principle of sound legislation." For these reasons I denounce this measure as subversive of the common principles of public integrity, which should be preserved for the interests of taxpayers and to prevent extortion in the interests of bondholders. Lawmakers, Mr. Chairman, should even be more jealous of the rights of the masses, for they require and deserve more protection than the fortunate few.

Mr. Chairman, I hope I am not a pessimist; I hope that I am not inclined to look on the dark side of all matters, but in this age of greed for gold, when so many men of wealth and influence lend themselves to great undertakings whose moral principle is bad, whose effects are injurious to the people, when so many corruptions are charged upon men in high places, and these corruptions so frequently proven to a moral certainty without serious effect upon their standing in the public estimation, I sometimes think that public fidelity and loyalty to the inflexible and eternal right in all things is not of that high character which we attribute to the fathers of our Republic. Representatives, I fear, coming into this gay and magnificent city, listening to the glorious tales of a full Treasury, hearing the shoutings of prosperity, often from trust quarters, are prone to forget not only in what manner the Treasury is filled and from what sources it derives its revenue, but also the struggling man at home in his district who is striving to make an honest living by the sweat of his face. If one can forget that man, then I can easily understand how he can vote for this bill; I can then understand how he can vote to change the country's contract in favor of its creditors and against its people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This bill confers on the Secretary of the Treasury the unusual power to sell bonds when he thinks it necessary to preserve the gold reserve. Such power should not be given to any one man. Congress has the power to borrow money, and its judgment should be exercised upon the necessity of each and every loan. It should not have and in my judgment has no rightful authority to delegate to the Secretary of the Treasury this general and practically unlimited power to sell bonds. It is not necessary to intrust to him the extraordinary power to issue bonds in time of peace, and I enter the protest of as good constituency as exists in this Union against giving him the power to sell bonds to get gold to exchange for silver dollars in order to perpetually imprison those silver dollars.

The power to borrow money conferred by the Constitution was intended to be and should be used only in case of necessity, as, for instance, to carry on a just war or to pay current expenses or other necessary expenses. No good lawyer on the other side will deny this. No man can successfully contend that it is a necessary expense to swap gold for silver dollars. To borrow money for the purpose of killing or retiring the silver dollar is a wrongful use of power. The silver dollar under the Constitution is the equal of the gold dollar, and it is contrary to principle and the interests of the people to load them with debt to get gold to destroy silver.

Although at present it will take more than twice as much of any of the great agricultural products, such as cotton, wheat, and tobacco to pay off one of the Government's $1.000 bonds, as it would have taken in 1873, when the first stab was given to the white metal, yet a great purpose of this bill is to render that bond more valuable, and the result of it will be to make it harder to pay. And, under this bill, as that bond becomes harder to pay, so will all other indebtedness—public and private—become harder to pay. All this is to be done for the benefit of a few wealthy money lenders, and it is done under the name of national honor. The highest honor to which any government can attain is to treat its great masses with absolute fairness and justice. The greatest shame to a government should be placed upon it by every intelligent man of honesty when it deliberately writes into its statutes laws which militate against its masses in the interest of a few, which place heavier burdens upon its poor that it may gratify the demands of the rich.

Section 4 is intended to kill the greenbacks. The United States notes and Treasury notes are to be redeemed in gold and there in the Treasury held securely until someone wants to give the Government gold for them. As I have said, they are practically destroyed, for thereafter they can be used only as a gold certificate, and whether they are in existence or not the Government would give anyone a gold certificate for his gold, just as is now done. So this section in reality gives the death blow to $440,000,000 of paper money and when in the judgment of the Secretary it is necessary gives him the power to sell $440,000,000 of gold bonds, thus changing four hundred and forty millions of money which serves the people well, which facilitates their exchanges, which has built the churches and schoolhouses and homes of this land into an interest-bearing debt, to be paid by us and our posterity. More than that, under this bill the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to sell gold bonds, if he sees fit to do so and the occasion presents itself, to the additional sum of $490,000,000, and with this money impound the $490,000,000 of silver dollars which have been coined, thus altogether withdrawing from circulation more than $900,000,000 and adding to our public interest-bearing indebtedness that vast sum.

These silver dollars, if the Secretary of the Treasury should see fit, may be transferred to the fiscal department and paid out and give him the opportunity of selling more bonds for gold with which to again redeem them, and thus the "endless chain" will continue to exist under this bill. Not a dollar of silver should ever be redeemed. It is money itself. It needs no redemption. It is an outrage on the rights of the people to treat it as a promise to pay.

But this bill gives the right—no, not right, for nothing can make it right, but gives the power—to retire it. How does that accord with the President's letter of acceptance? Mr. Chairman, my observation has taught me that the Republican party is the only party and its leaders the only leaders who boast of their inconsistencies. It is the juggler who glories in deceiving his spectators, and congratulates himself that his trick is performed in their full view. I venture to say that the political history of the world can not discover another example of a party of equal changes upon great and fundamental questions within a quarter of a century as to-day ornaments the Republican party.

Mr. Chairman, if these vast powers are ever exercised by the Secretary of the Treasury, if these greenbacks and silver dollars are retired from circulation, if this vast increase of the public indebtedness shall be made, ruin and disaster will overtake the farms and factories of this land, and the dread specter of panic will again visit the industries of our people. The dollar, under the increased demand for gold, will go up, and prices will go down, and as hard times touch the great consumers of our country their terrible influence soon affects all who toil and all whose happiness depends upon industry of any kind.

The Republican party hopes to avert the evils to which I have alluded by bestowing greater favors and privileges upon the national banks. I admit that the banks may under this bill, if they see fit, increase their circulation as the greenbacks and silver dollars are retired, and thus in a large measure prevent these evils. But it is supreme folly for the Congress, which ought to hold the interests of the people at heart, to surrender those interests to the mercies of those whose object is to make private profit from money traffic.

The Government should not delegate the sovereign right to issue currency for the benefit of the people to any man or set of men. Whatever paper money the business of the country requires, and it requires more than we now have, should be issued by the Government, and I know of no form of currency better than the existing greenbacks. I would make them full legal tender for all debts and dues. If there is no escape from the national banking system, if we are to forever endure its possession of special privileges, then I see no objection to allowing the banks to issue notes to the par value of the bonds deposited, and I think small towns should have the privilege of having national banks, and I do not think that whether such banks should be established in small towns or not should be left to the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury.

But such power as is given in this bill to the national banks has never before been bestowed upon them. It is a dangerous power—the power to expand and contract the currency at will. It is a power such as no monarch has, such as the President himself does not to-day have. How easy it will be for the national banks to form an immense bank trust! Nothing in this bill will prevent it, and the Republicans will not allow an amendment to it to prevent the formation of a gigantic trust to control all banks. How certainly will a few of the larger banks control the entire banking business of the country! Allow the banks, as is the purpose of

this bill, to put out and control our paper currency, and they can create a panic at a day's notice.

Let a President be in the chair whom they wish to destroy; let a bill be proposed in Congress which they oppose; let any measure be pending which they desire to force through, and in order to accomplish their purposes they can, under organization and the possibilities afforded by this bill, cause such a panic as the world has never felt. The head man of the banking trust could touch a button and immediately the circulation from the remotest corners of our land would contract, loans would be called in, business would be paralyzed, products would be sacrificed on the altar of debt, and every evil known to the lack of money would curse the people, until they and their representatives should either in suppliance yield to the demands of the banks or else their lion nature assert itself in the destruction of their oppressors.

My countrymen of the Republican side, let me appeal to you to grant no such possible powers and privileges to the banks. You may be turning loose upon your country a power that may curse your children and which your older age may regret but may not remedy. Let our Government issue more greenbacks. Let it, and it alone, issue our national paper money. It will not decrease its circulation for profit. It will not hold a terrible power over the people and their representatives to constrain their wills and violate their judgments.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] asked what prophecies we made in the last campaign had come true. Mr. Chairman, we predicted that if the Republicans elected McKinley, they would make the bonds payable in gold. This was denied by Republican orators. To-day you are doing it. We predicted that you would retire the greenbacks. This was denied. To-day you are doing it. We admit, however, that it is most difficult to foretell the conduct of a party which changes its position upon great questions so easily. The only means by which we foretold these two things were that we knew from what sources it drew its sustenance.

Throughout this debate Republicans have talked of maintaining the parity of the silver dollar with gold. Mr. Chairman, the standard silver dollar has never been below par, and, further, our paper money, which was full legal tender, never went below par. I refer to the $60,000,000 of greenbacks or United States notes issued in 1862, which were full legal tender for all debts. Our other paper money, which was not legal tender for customs dues and interest on the public debt, did go below par. It is the legal-tender quality of the silver dollar that keeps and will forever keep it to hundred-cents point. Let it retain this legal-tender quality; keep your laws intended to disgrace it from your statute books, and never will it be begging for help in order to remain a hundred-cents dollar. As long as it retains its life as money, unshackled and unpoisoned by Republican policies, just so long will it bear the fearless Goddess of Liberty throughout the land to make homes happy and be at par wherever in all the wide world it goes.

Strike the life out of it by law, and it falls to the earth 50 cents' worth of silver. Place the life back into it by law, and it rises to the hundred-cents value at once. Open the mints of the greatest country the world has ever known, give all silver these great rights to bless mankind, and all silver rises, and then will be fulfilled that purpose set out in the Republican national platform from which the President in his late message quoted—that is, the maintenance of the parity of the values of the two metals, not coins, will be attained. The parity of the two coins has been maintained and will forever be under our existing laws. Under free coinage the parity of the metals will exist.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a few words about prosperity, and I am done. In the last Presidential campaign our cry was for more money, and the especial means we advocated was free coinage of silver. Our opponents and our gold-standard friends all said the country had plenty of money. You could not get any gold-standard advocate to admit that the country did not have money enough, and yet now Republican speakers are daily speaking of the increased money in circulation. The gentleman from Iowa says under this Administration our circulation has increased more than $300,000,000, and every Republican says, "Behold the prosperity of the land!"

Yes, the money has increased. The present conditions prove that we were right in demanding more money; and, Mr. Chairman, if our mints during this time had been freely opened to both gold and silver, our prosperity would to-day be unrivaled in all the branches of our industry. Yes, our people are better off, take the country altogether, than they were two, three, or four years ago. The Almighty has blessed this land. Our people, compelled by hard times, have learned to depend more upon themselves and not so much upon the merchant for their supplies. A war authorized by Congress took tens of thousands of men into our Army. It caused the purchase of millions of goods. It caused the expenditure of tens of millions of dollars. It created a $200,000,000 debt on the people, borrowed that money, and placed it again in circulation.

The President's war in the Philippines continues these vast expenditures. A war is prevailing in South Africa between a free people and a European monarchy. That such conditions as I have just recited bring a degree of prosperity for the time being is familiar knowledge. It followed our civil war. As such conditions are not permanent, the prosperity they cause is not permanent. It may be that if the Republican party can have its way in their imperialistic desires, it will see to it that the expenditures shall be sufficient to uphold the prosperity for several years. They have an idea, it seems, that you can tax a people into prosperity. They forget that the people are to-day groaning under war taxes, under the stamp taxes, under the tobacco taxes.

Has it occurred to you that tobacco, a great agricultural product, is taxed probably to twice its value to the farmer? That tax ought to be reduced. It adds 12 cents per pound to the manufactured article. This lessens the demand for it. Reduce the tax greatly and the demand will be stronger for tobacco, and a large mass of our agricultural people will be benefited, and especially will this be true if the power of the American and Continental Tobacco companies to control the trade and prices of so much of that great crop can be destroyed.

Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to think that we are in the course of a long era of prosperity. Nothing can more thoroughly gratify one who loves his country than to know that the toilers of the land, the tillers of the soil, the workmen in the shops, and all artisans and all professional men are happy and prosperous. To know that manufacturers and traders are prosperous and happy and on a sure foundation is a source of happiness to every patriot. With genuine, safe prosperity on an enduring foundation, civilization and progress will go forward.

The humble citizen will educate his children. He will help build his church and schoolhouse. He will, withal, be independent and self-respecting. He will not be dissatisfied. I know, Mr. Chairman, and it is with great pleasure that I am able to say it, that the manufacturing industries of the South are almost universally prosperous. Usually it is a superior class of business men who are in that industry, and they are situated in the most advantageous position in all the world. To prophesy that for many years they will remain prosperous and in a few years control the cotton goods world is not a rash but a pleasant prediction. But let no one think that the farmers of this land are enjoying the same degree of prosperity or that theirs is upon so sure a foundation.

The Republican candidate in the next campaign will find little consolation in the rural districts in proclaiming prosperity in support of this bill. Here are some plain figures, all taken from the monthly summary of Commerce and Finance of the Treasury Department, a copy of which was sent to each member of this House to-day, except the quotations for yesterday's prices, which I take from to-day's paper. Cotton, our great export crop, was selling on the 6th day of November, 1896, the week of McKinley's election, in New York for 8¼ cents per pound. Yesterday, December 12, 1899, it was there selling for 7$\frac{11}{16}$ cents per pound. In other words, to-day cotton is about one-half cent lower now than it was when McKinley was elected. On November 5, 1896, wheat was selling for 86 cents per bushel.

On March 4, 1897, the day of McKinley's inauguration, wheat was selling for 94 cents per bushel; yesterday wheat was selling for 74 cents per bushel in the same market; so wheat was 20 cents a bushel more when Mr. McKinley became President than it is to-day. In this summary I find no tobacco prices farther back than October, 1898. The average domestic value of our export tobacco for that month was 10 cents per pound. Since then there has been a general decline in price, so that the average price of export tobacco for October, 1899, the last price given, was only 8$\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound, or a decline of 19 per cent in the last year; and, Mr. Chairman, while I have been unable to verify my opinion by departmental statistics, I think that since March 4, 1897, when the Republicans took charge of the Government, tobacco prices have declined so that tobacco is not worth as much to the Carolina and Virginia farmers as it was three years ago.

Each tobacco farmer must be his own judge as to the relative price of tobacco now and in former years. It is universally conceded that the tobacco grown in North Carolina and Virginia does not sell for more than half what it brought ten and fifteen years ago. No doubt much of this decline is due to trusts, of which I shall probably speak hereafter. So much for prices of farmers' products. Let me quote from the same high authority prices at wholesale on some articles for which farmers have to exchange their produce directly or indirectly. Many of these articles are controlled by trusts, which fact, no doubt, in a large measure accounts for the great rise in their prices. Manila, hemp, and jute have under their administration increased more than 100 per cent. Manila was worth 4 cents per pound on March 4, 1897.

On November 27, 1899, the last price given it was worth 14 cents per pound. Since McKinley's inauguration common leather has risen from 20 cents to 25 cents per pound. Rubber has in that time risen from 80 cents to $1.04 per pound. Iron and steel have doubled in price since McKinley's inauguration. Kerosene oil has risen in price from 6½ cents per gallon to 9½ cents. Sugar, on March 4, 1897, was $3.98 per 100 pounds; on November 16, 1899, the last date given in the summary, sugar was $4.82½ per 100 pounds. Tin plate has advanced since McKinley's inauguration from $3.75 to $4.87½. Nails have increased in price in the last twelve months from $1.90 to $2.60.

Such, Mr. Chairman, are some of the prices disclosed by the Treasury statistics. I give them that gentlemen may have their benefit in discussing prosperity. They deserve the careful consideration of the country. But, Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to talk so much of prices. I rose for the purpose of giving my reasons in brief for considering this bill a dangerous one. Having done so, I must content myself with voting against it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I can not permit this bill to pass without recording my unequivocal protest against it. There are some things which are clearly evident in regard to this financial question. Prior to the year 1896 no political party ever dared to mention the words "gold standard" in its platform, except to declare against and repudiate that standard. In that year the Republican party declared in favor of it only until international bimetallism could be secured. Since that year the Republican party have advanced on the subject and have now forsaken international bimetallism.

It is strikingly significant that this bill was not brought forward at the last session of Congress and pressed to a passage. And, again, it is worth our while to note that while this bill resembles very much the Gage bill that was before the Banking and Currency Committee, it omits his feature of funding the Treasury notes of 1890, the greenbacks, and the bonded indebtedness of the United States into long-term interest-bearing gold bonds. Why is this omission made? Sir, it is for the purpose of first enacting the gold standard into statutory law to test the temper of the people. Then, if the sentiment of the people be not aroused against it, either at this session or after the next election the Republican party will resort to that same infamous scheme of funding all of the paper money and Government obligations in long-term gold bonds, to last for all futurity as a footing for the national banking system. This bill is the first step, and the funding project will come next. Then the toiling millions, the brawn and muscle of the honest yeomanry, will be chained for years to come as financial serfs to the money oligarchy of the nation.

When the Constitution of 1789 was adopted the framers of that instrument wrote in it that "no State shall make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in the payment of debts." By this expression they intended that no State should be permitted to say that anything except gold and silver shall ever be a legal tender in the payment of debts, and, furthermore, that the Federal Government would forever enforce the provision that both gold and silver should be legal tender, and that no public obligation or private contract should or could discredit and demonetize either metal. This constitutional provision was designed to perpetuate both metals as the coined money of the nation. This bill, however, permits, either by public obligation or private contract, the complete elimination of silver as a legal tender. It strikes down the fundamental law in regard to our coinage.

After the first section, defining that the standard shall be gold, the second section says that all obligations, public and private, for the payment of money shall be performed in conformity with the standard established—the gold standard. In other words, hereafter all obligations of the Government and all private contracts entered into by individuals shall be performed and paid in the gold coin of the country. It is fair to presume that the framers of the bill meant to make this section retroactive and prospective and to require all debts, public and private, past and future, to be paid in gold. They prohibit a contract to pay in anything but gold. A contract to pay in anything else is intended to be a nullity.

This act will curse the nation and the debt-burdened people more than any measure ever placed in the statutes. I would not be honest with myself if I failed to characterize such legislation in terms in harmony with my feelings and denounce it as oppressive, cruel, infamous! This section will immensely increase the demand for gold and enormously enhance its value. It is estimated that the public and private indebtedness of the United States to-day amounts to about $50,000,000,000. Hereafter it will amount to much more than that and every dollar must be paid in gold coin according to this new statutory standard. We have now only about seven hundred millions of gold in existence in the United States. Hence the strain upon gold will be terrific and cause it to rise continually in value.

Sections 3 and 4 provide for impounding the silver certificates, all the silver dollars, the Treasury notes of 1890, and the greenbacks in the Treasury of the United States, and that they there remain, to be paid ont for gold only at the sweet will of some great banker at the head of the Treasury Department. Then gold and national-bank notes will be the only money in circulation, and will be controlled and manipulatad by the moneyed ring. All the Government paper money and silver will be locked up in this great public pound to make way for gold and national-bank currency. It contracts the money volume and crushes the people.

Section 4 confers unlimited power upon the Secretary of the Treasury. While the people are denied the right of having unlimited coinage of silver, this official may, under the new law, issue without limit gold bonds and fasten them upon the resources of the country. This act says:

> He is hereby authorized to issue and sell, whenever in his judgment it is necessary to the maintenance of said fund, bonds of the United States, bearing interest at a rate not exceeding 3 per cent per annum, payable in gold coin at the end of twenty years, but redeemable in gold coin at the option of the United States after one year.

This section empowers the Secretary of the Treasury to issue gold bonds to the extent of $100,000,000, $500,000,000, a billion or two billion dollars, and so on, without let or hindrance, without authority from Congress or any other power in this Government. No such power has ever heretofore been conferred upon the Secretary of the Treasury or any other official in the Government. No man in this Republic or in any government should be intrusted with such unbridled power. This immense authority should remain in Congress, to be exercised at the instance of the people, and should not be handed over by them to some official selected by the money trust and bondholders. The act is calling down a curse upon the people, the true repository of sovereignty and all power. The people will feel the effects of this surrender of authority to their eternal detriment and misery.

When we were about to declare war against Spain to free the Cubans I voted for the appropriation of $50,000,000 to be placed in the hands of the President of the United States to inaugurate the war. Every Democrat, I believe, voted for the measure. This, sir, invested the President with a great power and reposed the highest confidence in his integrity. Yet it did not compare in magnitude to the authority here given the Secretary of the Treasury. And when the conflict was waging, when the great naval victory of Santiago was achieved and the Spanish ships were swept from the seas, and Winfield Scott Schley appeared before the world as the real hero of that memorable battle, I was proud that I voted for thus appropriating the $50,000,000! [Loud applause.]

Why is it necessary to give this power to the Secretary of the Treasury? Let us return to the coinage laws as they existed prior to 1873, as the founders of the Republic made them. Let us coin both gold and silver, free and in unlimited quantities, and whenever we issue paper money make it redeemable in both these coins, and it will not be necessary to clothe the Secretary of the Treasury with such high privileges, nor will it be necessary to issue bonds.

Mr. ADAMSON. It will break the chain.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Yes, and it will break the chain.

With the free coinage of both metals and paper money redeemable in such coins we could have fought the war against Spain without issuing one dollar in gold bonds. The issue is at last clearly presented between those who believe in the gold standard and those who are opposed to it. For the first time in our history Congress has an opportunity of voting squarely upon the proposition, and for my part I feel renewed hope when we go before the people in 1900 on the same incomparable platform and with the same intrepid leader. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The masses now clearly perceive the hypocrisy of the Republican party in declaring in favor of international bimetallism in 1896 and turning their backs upon it in 1899. The plain truth is that in 1866, after the civil war had ended, the banking fraternity of this nation inaugurated a crusade and warfare against the greenbacks and paper money of the Government in favor of giving the banks the privilege of issuing all of the paper money. That war has unceasingly continued since that year, and this bill is the very acme of their highest ambition in that direction.

First, they enormously increased their investments by procuring the passage of the act of 1869 strengthening the public credit of the United States in declaring all Government obligations payable in coin. This more than doubled the value of their investment. Next silver was demonetized in 1873, and the one coin being discredited the other doubled in value by being more in demand. The gold owners and bondholders alone profited by that change in the monetary standard. Then, next, they clamored for the retirement from circulation of all the Government's paper money, and that they be endowed with the supreme function of issuing all the paper money and controlling the currency.

They cared not then, nor do they care now, particularly about

gold or silver; they only wish to seize hold of the money-issuing business of the Government and appropriate it to their own control. By this act they secure the imprisonment of the silver and paper money in the newly created division of issue and redemption, and their rights and privileges are greatly amplified and augmented with reference to national banks. Beyond the peradventure of a doubt, this bill clothes the banks and moneyed few with the power of dominating and controlling the money volume of America.

A brief reference to recent political history is here interesting. In 1888, it is said, Mr. McKinley, now the President, wrote this language in the Republican platform:

The Republican party is in favor of the use of both gold and silver as money, and condemns the policy of the Democratic Administration for its effort to demonetize silver.

If they were honest then, they are not honest now in their pretension for the gold standard and their enmity to free silver.

Again, in 1892, they declared in favor of gold and silver as standard money, and in 1896 they declared for international bimetallism. And now they have openly abandoned their position upon that question and say to the American people that they did not mean what they said when they promised it. As surely as God reigns, such action will be rebuked by the enlightened consciences of a free people! The American people of all parties are honest and believe in good faith, and when they record their verdict in 1900 it will not be the one expected by the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber. This will be the first American statute to contain the term gold standard, and it involves more to the masses of the American people than many of you gentlemen think.

You deluded many by the false hope of international bimetallism in 1896. Many voters believed you sincere. It is well understood by the people that from 1792 to 1834 we did have the free coinage of both metals at the ratio of 15 to 1; that from 1834 to 1873 we had the free coinage of both metals at the ratio of 16 to 1, and that when silver was demonetized it was at a premium over gold. These facts the people do know and understand, and when they vote in 1900 they will again manifest their undying friendship for the constitutional money of this country, that served us for nearly a hundred years. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

A review of bimetallism in this country will disclose the hideous features of this gold-standard measure.

BIMETALLISM.

Money is governed by the law of supply and demand, just as any other commodity. We buy money with commodities in the same sense that we buy commodities with money. When we say cotton is worth so much money, we say money is worth so much cotton. They are equal to each other. Then we know that whatever causes dollars to go up in value must necessarily cause commodities to go down. Hence, whatever causes money to come down in value causes commodities to risein value. We must ever keep this central idea in our minds, that money is bought and sold just as cotton, wheat, and other commodities.

Inevitably, then, whenever the supply of money in a country is decreased its value is increased. Then commodities measured by this supply of money must decrease in value as the money becomes scarcer. Undoubtedly, then, to increase the supply of money will be to increase the value of commodities, because the value of money is falling. The gold-standard advocates thoroughly understood these truths when they demonetized silver. They destroyed one-half the supply of money and doubled the value of the remaining half by creating a greater demand for the half supply left. Hence they demonetized silver in 1873 to decrease the supply of money and create a double demand for the remaining quantity of money left. The gold money at once went up in value and commodities measured by it went down in value.

John Locke stated the true theory of money when he said:

The value of money in general is the quantity of all the money in the world in proportion to the trade.

And Ricardo said:

The demand for money is regulated entirely by its value, and its value by its quantity.

It is the unanimous opinion of political economists that the quantity of money in the country regulates the prices of commodities. Without understanding this unanswerable and unanswered truth it is idle and vain to undertake to understand the science of money. No man has ever given happier expression to these thoughts than Senator JOHN P. JONES. He says:

There is one principle of monetary science that, if held steadfastly in view, will constitute an unerring guide through what would otherwise be a path of inextricable difficulty. That principle is that the value of the unit of money in any country is determined by the number of units in circulation. In other words, the value of every dollar depends on the number of dollars out. The greater the number of dollars out, other things being equal, the less will be the value of each dollar; the fewer the number out, other things remaining the same, the greater the value of each, and this without any regard whatever to the material of which the dollars are composed. This is the key to the financial situation of the United States. Much more, it is the key to the financial situation in many lands. Without this key it is in vain that the student attempts to unlock the door leading to the arcanum of monetary knowledge. Unlike many of the locks made by men, the lock on that door is unpickable.

Is his proposition true? If so, a dastardly crime indeed was perpetrated against the people in 1873, when silver was demonetized and one-half of the quantity of money in this country was destroyed. It was an infamy to thus send up in value the other half of the quantity of money belonging to the few gold owners and send down the values of the property and products of this country.

Take the statements of the following eminent gentlemen and see with what striking unanimity they vie with each other in proclaiming the eternal truth that the demand for money goes according to its value and its value by its quantity:

To annul the use of either of the metals as money is to abridge the quantity of circulating medium, and is liable to all the objections which arise from the comparison of the benefits of a full, with the evils of a scanty, circulation.—*Alexander Hamilton, Report on the Mint, 1791.*

I concur with you that the unit must stand on both metals.—*Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Hamilton*, February, 1792.

Wolowski says:

The sum total of the precious metals is reckoned at 50 milliards, one-half gold and one-half silver. If, by a stroke of the pen, they suppress one of these metals in the monetary service, they double the demand for the other metal, to the ruin of all debtors.

Cernuschi says:

The purchasing power of money is in direct proportion to the volume of money existing.

Prof. Francis A. Walker, in his work on Money (page 57), says:

The value of money in any country is determined by the amount existing.

Sir James Graham says:

The value of money is in the inverse ratio of its quantity, the supply of commodities remaining the same.

John Stuart Mill (Political Economy) says:

The value of money, other things being the same, varies inversely as its quantity, every increase of quantity lowering the value and every diminution raising it in a ratio exactly equivalent.

Ricardo (reply to Bosanquet) says:

The value of money in any country is determined by the amount existing. * * *

That commodities would rise or fall in price in proportion to the increase or diminution of money I assume as a fact that is incontrovertible. * * *

The famous gold-standard advocate of England, Lord Overstone, said:

A reduction of circulation must tend to lower prices.—*Lord Overstone's Tracts*, page 202.

And the distinguished gentleman, Mr. Robert Giffen, who declaimed against our theory, said:

To say that the quantity of money regulates prices is only the same thing as to say of any article that is bought or sold that its quantity is a material factor in determining its value.—*A Chapter on Standard Money, Giffen.*

The authorities verifying this quantitative theory come from Aristotle to the present time. During all these years every political economist of any note has announced the theory as being true, and none, living or dead, has refuted it. To-day no Republican of repute denies it. They all boast of the verification of its truth in the recent increased output of gold and say it has made times better.

BIRTH OF BIMETALLISM IN THE UNITED STATES.

The advent of bimetallism in the United States was coeval with the birth of liberty in this Republic. It blessed mankind for nearly a century of our march of freedom and happiness.

Without a long-spun argument, it will suffice to simply state that money arose out of necessity. It was found necessary to find some intermediary to supersede the barter and exchange of commodity for commodity and to serve as a standard or measure of values or prices, if you please, a pricing instrument for the commodities. After the human family had resorted to many things for use as money, it finally fixed upon gold and silver as a natural money. Our Government was formed in 1789, and our written Constitution plainly and unequivocally perpetuates both gold and silver as the money of the American people. True and lofty patriots wrote these words in our Constitution for the benefit of themselves and their posterity to follow. The United States in Congress assembled shall have the power "to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin," and "no State shall make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts."

Now, this last clause means that no State, nor the United States, could or should permit anything or any one metal but gold or silver to be legal tender; and it ought to embrace a clear prohibition of gold contracts, and I believe it was so intended and does interdict them. Thus, gold and silver were constitutionally embedded into our theory and system of Government as a measure of values and pricing instruments for all commodities and property. On April 2, 1792, the United States Mint was established by the act of Congress. It gave us a bimetallic money system. It contained these provisions, that we ought to keep constantly in our minds:

SEC. 9. That there shall be from time to time struck and coined at said Mint coins of gold, silver, and copper of the following denominations, descriptions, and values, viz: Dollars or units, each to be of the value of a Spanish milled dollar as the same is now current, and to contain 371 grains and four-sixteenths part of a grain of pure, or 416 grains of standard silver.

This act provided for the coinage of certain other gold and silver coins to be reckoned from this dollar unit.

It placed us upon a bimetallic basis. Section 11 fixed the ratio at 15 of silver to 1 of gold. Section 14 provided:

That it shall be lawful for any person or persons to bring to the said mint gold and silver bullion in order to their being coined; and the bullion so brought shall be there assayed and coined as speedily as may be after the receipt thereof, and that free of expense to the person or persons by whom the same shall have been brought.

This was "free" coinage, and it was "unlimited" coinage of both gold and silver. This is what free and unlimited coinage means.

Section 16 provided:

That all the gold and silver coins which have been struck at, and issued from the said mint, shall be a lawful tender in all payments whatsoever, those of full weight according to the respective values herein before declared and those of less than full weight at values proportional to their respective weights.

This made both gold and silver coins of equal debt-paying power; there was no discrimination against either, and this was true and genuine bimetallism, which we enjoyed until 1873, when the unit of value was changed. The change was as follows, and I put it here in order that we may distinctly and sharply contrast the two laws in regard to the unit of values. Here is the section of the silver demonetization act of 1873:

SEC. 14. The gold coins of the United States shall be a dollar piece, which, at the standard weight of 25.8 grains, shall be the unit of value.

The unit of value adopted by our fathers was changed in a very few simple words. The standard silver dollar by that act was dropped from the coinage laws and the trade dollar substituted with legal-tender qualities limited to $5. And I now propound this query to the Goldite, to anyone, to the enemies of silver. Why was the unit of value changed from silver to gold? It seems to honest thinking men now that it was done to benefit those whom it has benefited, the creditor classes and the gold holders, for they have profited by it and reaped the fruits of the crime. And this is the surest way of locating a criminal—to find the person benefited by the commission of a crime.

Then the legal-tender qualities of the silver dollar were limited to the amount of $5. Here silver was demonetized, and one-half of our money metal was stricken down and made incapable of measuring values, and destroyed as a standard money and money of ultimate redemption. And this bill makes all the paper and silver money redeemable in gold.

FALLING PRICES.

What effect did this act of 1873 have upon silver? My contention is that it placed silver along with other commodities to be measured with the gold standard. It ceased to become a pricing instrument and is priced by the gold unit. It is now a mere representative money and promise to pay. Gold at once began to appreciate in value and to become dearer. From that fatal day there began and continued a deadly fall of prices of all the commodities produced by the laboring classes, including the agriculturists.

Now, since silver has been placed along with other commodities, let us take it together with wheat and cotton and see how these three commodities have fallen. Here are the figures from a book issued by the Treasury Department of the United States called the "Coinage Laws of the United States, 1792 to 1893, with an appendix of statistics relative thereto," and it is to be presumed that this book is correct, coming from Mr. Carlisle's Department.

Depreciations of wheat, cotton, and silver since 1873.

Year.	Wheat.	Cotton.	Silver.
		Cents.	
1872	$1.47	19.3	$1.32
1873	1.31	18.8	1.29
1874	1.43	15.4	1.27
1875	1.12	15	1.24
1876	1.24	12.9	1.15
1877	1.17	11.8	1.20
1878	1.34	11.1	1.15
1879	1.07	9.9	1.12
1880	1.23	11.5	1.14
1881	1.11	11.4	1.13
1882	1.19	11.4	1.13
1883	1.13	10.8	1.11
1884	1.07	10.5	1.01
1885	.86	10.6	1.06
1886	.87	9.9	.99
1887	.89	9.5	.97
1888	.85	9.8	.95
1889	.90	9.9	.95
1890	.83	10.1	1.04
1891	.85	10	.90
1892	.80	8.7	.86
1893	.50	7.2	.75

And we all know in 1894, 1896, and 1897 cotton came down to 4 cents per pound. This ought to be convincing that silver, cotton, corn, wheat, and other products have continually fallen in value since 1873; in other words, that gold, the unit of value, has continually risen in value. Now, it will be contended that this fall in values has not been an injury to anyone. Mr. E. Benjamin Andrews, president of Brown University, a member of the International Monetary Conference at Brussels in 1892, and a great international bimetallist, says:

The decline in prices now going on in itself marks no advance in civilization. One may, indeed, speak of a fall in prices as a sign of economic advance, while under the world's present economic system it often is, but never as itself an element in such advance, for this it is not. That many manufactured articles have long been decreasing in intrinsic cost is a great blessing, and articles of this class would doubtless have gone down more or less under an ideal system of money. But it was not necessary that general prices should fall; and this fall, I maintain, has been an absolute and unmitigated curse to human civilization. Mark, it is not low prices which I condemn; low prices once established are as desirable as high. That is to say, the words "high" and "low" in respect to prices are not absolute but relative terms.

The continual fall of prices, the act of sinking, is the accursed thing. None profit from it but such as are annuitants without being producers; and we may be sure that no civilized state is going to legislate to keep prices falling when it is once seen, as it must soon be seen, that the fall injures all but the very few unproductive people who live upon their incomes. Bankers and money lenders, as such, are not interested to have prices fall and the value of money increase. What enriches bankers is lively business, plentiful trade, demand for capital, high interest—phenomena which never accompany appreciating money, and in the nature of the case can not do so.

This is from a great authority, and a thorough study by any person conscientiously seeking the truth will be convinced of the absolute verity of Professor Andrews' remarks. The fact is that it is only the creditor classes, the money lenders, the persons with fixed income, and the annuitants that are benefited by falling prices and the rise in the value of money.

All other classes are injured. Let us take the farmer, for instance. There are certain fixed charges that have never been reduced for him. Taxes are the same, railroad freights, salaries, pensions, schooling for his children, and interest for borrowed money are the same. He does not get the benefit of falling prices, for he sells at reduced prices and pays about the same fixed charges he always paid. This class constitutes over 45 per cent of our population, and if the agriculturalist happens to be in debt, owing a balance on his farm, as many do, he is only plunged in deeper woe by the falling prices of his products, and yet he must pay the same upon his debts and fixed charges.

STANDARD OR MEASURE OF VALUES; WHAT IS IT?

With this we pass on to another phase of the question. It is contended by the gold-standard advocates that we can not have a double standard. That we must either have a single gold standard of values or a single silver standard of values. The greatest writers upon the question of money now concur in this fundamental principle: the value of money in a country, other things being equal, varies inversely as its quantity, every increase of quantity lowering the value and every diminution raising it in a ratio exactly equivalent.

Therefore it follows beyond dispute that if the act of 1873 demonetized silver, destroyed it as a standard or measure of values, the other half of our metallic money, being gold, was doubled in value. Property would be worth just half what it was before. Now, suppose you restore silver to its rightful position that it occupied before 1873, you double the value of all property by making silver real money, and doubling the quantity of our real money puts us back upon a genuine bimetallic basis and not upon a so-called double standard.

It is the quantity of real legal-tender debt-paying money that determines the values of property, and not the "two-yard sticks" theory so flippantly asserted. All real thinkers upon this point have arrived at this conclusion. Accordingly, so long as we are upon a gold unit of value, the prices of property and commodities must continue to fall and remain low. Restore silver to its position as standard money, and prices will rise, industries will be stimulated, factories will hum, labor will be justly rewarded, and a great era of new prosperity will dawn upon us.

ANOTHER DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE—AMERICAN BIMETALLISM.

The United States is able to maintain her own independent bimetallic system without leaning upon any other country. In the first place it is admitted that we are the greatest silver-producing country in the world. I will argue this question of the ability of the United States to maintain bimetallism from three standpoints: First, that there is no danger of a silver deluge; second, that 96 per cent of our commerce is domestic and we should legislate in favor of our home industries and commerce, and third, that there is no prospect of any international agreement or international bimetallism. It is estimated that the silver and gold money today of the world amounts to about $8,000,000,000, of this amount $4,000,000,000 being in silver and $4,000,000,000 being in gold.

Now, this is the metallic money of the world. In the United States only gold is redemption money, the other money being merely credit money redeemable in gold—simply a promise to pay in gold. Now, in the United States we have in all kinds of money, gold, silver, and paper, about $1,800,000,000. One-third of this is silver money, to wit, $600,000,000. This money, by the act of 1873, ceased to be the unit of values and passed to the stage of credit money, or representative money. Many say they would be willing to join with us in the free coinage of silver if they were

not afraid that we would be made the "dumping ground" for the silver of the world—that they are afraid of the silver deluge. A great many honest men believe this to be a real and good objection.

Mr. Mulhall, the English statistician, views the matter in this way in regard to the relative production of gold and silver: In 1848 there were 31 tons of silver to 1 ton of gold in the world. In 1880 there were 18 tons of silver to 1 ton of gold, and in 1890, 18 tons of silver to 1 ton of gold. Now, you see, from 1848 to 1880 the relative supply of silver decreased, and from 1880 to 1890 it just about held its own. Since this time there have been no newly discovered mines from which this deluge of silver is to come, and the old ones have been worked until it is now unprofitable to work most of them.

Think what relation the increase of money bears to the increase of population—business industries and enterprises calling for an augmented volume of money! The statement of the proposition makes an unanswerable argument. Where is this increase of silver coming from? The gold-standard advocates are challenged to state where. It is admitted by all thinking and investigating men that there is not for sale in the world to-day enough silver bullion to create an overproduction of money in the United States. Examine carefully the figures and you will convince yourself that this argument about a silver deluge is only an assertion, and that there is no possibility of too much money coming into circulation in proportion to the increase in population and business.

John G. Carlisle—the Carlisle that used to be a friend of the people—when he was honestly seeking to represent his people and made earnest investigation for their benefit, said:

> I know that the world's stock of precious metals is none too large, and I see no reason to apprehend that it will ever be so. Mankind will be fortunate indeed if the annual production of gold and silver coin shall keep pace with the annual increase of population and industry. According to my views of the subject, the conspiracy which seems to have been formed here and in Europe to destroy, by legislation and otherwise, from three-sevenths to one-half the metallic money of the world is the most gigantic crime of this or any other age. The consummation of such a scheme would ultimately entail more misery upon the human race than all the wars, pestilences, and famines that ever occurred in the history of the world.
>
> The absolute and instantaneous destruction of half the entire movable property of the world, including houses, ships, railroads, and other appliances for carrying on commerce, while it would be felt more sensibly at the moment, would not produce anything like the prolonged distress and disorganization of society that must inevitably result from the permanent annihilation of one-half the metallic money of the world.

These utterances were made in 1878 in the halls of Congress, before Mr. Carlisle felt the blighting touch of Wall street, the Rothschilds, the Morgan syndicates, and the coupon clippers. Has that deluge of silver come? Call on Mr. Carlisle's report again. Here are the figures from his Department:

According to the revised figures the world's production of gold and silver for the last three years has been as follows:

Year.	Gold.	Silver.
1890	$113,149,600	$172,234,500
1891	120,518,800	186,755,000
1892	130,816,600	196,605,200

These figures show that up to the time of the repeal of the Sherman law there was no overproduction of either gold or silver and that the annual entire output of the money of the world would just a little more than pay our yearly pension roll of $150,000,000. These figures ought to convince any person honestly seeking information that there is no danger of getting too much silver in circulation. The foreign nations would not bring the silver here to be coined, because their ratio is 15 to 1. They would not lose the difference in the ratio and then pay shipping charges, insurance, and other expenses, for this would not profit them one particle. Hence the mere statement of these facts carries an abundant argument with it.

The fact is that the sum total of the amount of gold and silver that could be added each year to the world's metal money can not much exceed $200,000,000. It is only a little more than 2 or 2½ per cent of the present volume of silver and gold. This annual increase, added to the total amount of money in the world, is not adequate for commercial needs and business enterprises. History does not record a country in all time that had too much metallic money.

AMERICAN CURRENCY FOR AMERICAN COMMERCE.

It is estimated and can not be disputed that 96 per cent of our commerce is domestic commerce, and only 4 per cent is with foreign nations and 2 per cent of that is with silver-using countries. Let us relieve the distress at home by enlarging our money volume and putting new life into our home commerce. Official reports show that our commerce with foreign nations amounts to about $1,714,000,116, and our domestic commerce amounts to something over $110,000,000,000. We have transactions at home that amount to more than fifty times the transactions we have abroad.

New enterprises are springing up, corporations are making large investments, railroads are making vast extensions and building new lines, commercial schemes are in operation all around us, and they all demand more money—money at home. I say do not impoverish our domestic commerce, but take the shackles off and give us an increased supply of money. We need it here, and we ought to stand by our own homes and firesides first. Give us all the money of our mines as standard money, and we have a place for it. We can use it. We are large enough, grand enough, and progressive enough to absorb it.

In his balance sheet of the world Mr. Mulhall, the statistician of the Royal Society of England, says:

> It would be impossible to find a parallel to the progress of the United States in the last ten years. Every day the sun rises upon the American people it sees an addition of $2,500,000 to the accumulation of wealth in the Republic, which is equal to one-third of the daily accumulation of all mankind outside of the United States.

Thus one-third of the world in daily productive power is here represented, and will it be argued that such a power can not sustain its ancient, its much-needed money?

We produce more than two-fifths of the silver of the world and we can use it as redemption money.

We should not wait for England or any other country to join with us in going to bimetallism. The European countries are not ready to join us. England never will. She is a creditor nation. There the bondholders and coupon clippers live, and they have the mother country by the throat. There the Rothschilds live, and they own one-half of the gold of the world. They want to make their gold go up in value and not go down.

They well know that scarcity of gold appreciates its value. We owe England. She wants to depreciate the value of our silver and agricultural products, and knows, since they are measured by gold, she can do so by retaining the single gold standard, and make her gold coming from her Australian gold mines go on rising in value, and measure our products by this enhancing standard. She well knows that so long as her standard of values is measuring our products and still rising the prices of our products are declining, and she is getting our silver, cotton, wheat, rye, barley, and other products for smaller and smaller prices, and Shylock continues to fatten. Then why should she take the initiative when it is profit and all profit to her constantly?

If we but announce to the civilized world that we propose to coin all the gold and silver obtainable alike and make them primary money, the other nations, knowing our capacity to produce gold and silver, will join hands with us. It is estimated that England harvests from us annually as interest on bonds, mortgages, and other securities the sum of $200,000,000 in gold. Three years would take all the gold we use as money in America, for we only have $600,000,000. Then where is the money to circulate at home and pay off private debts and carry on our own transactions? It is understood that England alone holds more than $5,000,000,000 of our railroad bonds, municipal bonds, and other securities. The interest is payable in gold. This bill makes the principal and interest of all obligations payable in gold.

INTERNATIONAL BIMETALLISM.

The delusive hope of international bimetallism has vanished, and no sane man any longer holds out this false promise. Mr. McKinley's bimetallic European exploiters have returned bearing no fruit. The Aunt Nancy party, conceived and brought forth at Indianapolis, announce, through their monetary commission's report, that the prospects for international bimetallism have faded away like a dream. The Secretary of the Treasury and his avaricious cohorts say that we must be chained to the gold standard as a purely American policy.

In 1892 there was a monetary conference in Brussels, Belgium, and England there boldly and candidly, through her delegates, stated her position upon monetary units and standards. She demonstrated clearly that she had no idea of abandoning the gold standard, and it seems to me that this ought to be an indisputable and everlasting answer to those who hope for international bimetallism. Here is her answer, and it satisfies me that England is eternally set upon the gold standard under present conditions. I take this from the Report of the International Monetary Conference, held at Brussels, page 113. Sir Rivers Wilson, delegate from England, said:

> In order to avoid all misunderstanding, I desire, on behalf of Sir Charles Freemantle and myself, to make in the face of this assembly our profession of faith. Our faith is that of the school of monometallism pure and simple. We do not admit that any other than the single gold standard would be applicable to our country.

Do you want any further answer from England? But this bill repudiates international bimetallism; hence that question is eliminated.

When I say that I favor returning to our monetary system that existed prior to 1873, I mean that we ought not to make one metal dollar redeemable in another metal dollar. The dollar ought to be the redeemer, not the redeemed. Both gold and silver dollars ought to be made by our laws redeemers, and then they will be

treated alike. This is bimetallism. The true essentials of bimetallism are these: A legally fixed ratio between the two metals; impartial coinage at that ratio.

They should be legal tender for all debts. They should be collected and paid out alike. And both should be used as standards and redemption money.

16 TO 1 SHOULD BE THE RATIO.

I favor the ratio of 16 to 1 because it is our present legal ratio, and it would be a great expense to change the ratio, and the amount of pure silver in the silver dollar has never been changed since 1792. I believe in keeping the gold and silver dollars at a parity, and I believe 16 to 1 will do it. It did exist on a parity at that ratio for 200 years, according to the very best statistical authorities. Take the shackles off silver and it will come up to an even value with gold according to our ratio. Our Treasury Department has published the figures showing that gold and silver were at a parity at the ratio of 16 to 1 up until 1873, when silver received the fatal blow. It then went down under the operation of a cruel law, and not because it was an inferior money.

If bimetallism succeeded this way for nearly a hundred years, I am willing to try it again. If the ratio does not prove correct, it will then be time enough to try something else. Until the goldites unfold the ratio they propose, which they have never yet done, I shall stay by the old time-tried ratio. We do not contend that the law can absolutely fix the values of gold and silver, but we contend that it can liberate certain economic forces which will make gold and silver regulate their values at about the ratio of 16 to 1.

We recognize the law of supply and demand. A child can understand that if Congress passed a law saying that no hogs should be killed for food, nor eaten by any person in the United States, the price of pork would go down and the price of beef and mutton would go up. So with silver. The law depressed its value by saying it should not be used as money, and gold went up. Suppose the law should decree that it should be no longer legal to use gold as money or to use it in the arts. Do you not know it would go down in value?

We had the free coinage of gold and silver from 1816 (when England went to the gold standard) until 1873, and the two metals were at a parity at our legal ratio. We did not need England then, and we do not need her help now. Again, for seventy years France walked alone with her bimetallic standard and maintained the ratio of gold and silver at 15½ to 1, and even drew our gold from us, and did not need the help of England. How did France with her financial environments compare with the mighty resources and energies of our country in its grandeur? Double our money volume and fix our own ratio, and gold and silver will counterbalance and regulate each other, and the argument of experience demonstrates it.

It can not be denied truthfully that silver has been ill treated by many nations and gold has been fostered and legislated in favor of. The gold and silver bimetallism that Sir Isaac Newton recommended for England was destroyed in 1816, and Lord Liverpool succeeded in placing England upon the gold basis. The bimetallism that France enjoyed and that Napoleon favored has been destroyed, and in 1874 France went upon the gold standard. In 1873 Germany planted herself upon the gold standard, and in 1873 the Latin Union, along with France, adopted the gold standard. In 1873 the Democratic bimetallism that existed in the United States, the true bimetallism of Jefferson, Hamilton, and Jackson, was crushed out and our country laid prostrate at the feet of gold-standard England.

Now, India, with her millions of population, has wiped out silver coinage. The demand for gold has become immense, while the rejection of silver as money has gone in another direction in a corresponding degree. So that since these demonetization acts more than 500,000,000 people are fighting for and demanding gold for their standard of values when the supply of gold for monetary purposes is trifling. This we know—that since these acts of 1873 legislating against silver we have had panics, distress, strikes, falling prices, and misery all over the globe. They have not been confined to our own country, but have been felt in England and throughout the civilized world.

What people have these acts benefited? None, save only the moneyed few, the bondholders, and money lenders. We do know that since about 1873 we have had evil days everywhere. Here is a studied report of a royal commission created by England in 1885. This ought to be read and pondered over by every patriotic citizen in this country. It will change the minds of some honest men. The commission reported:

1. That the depression dated from the year 1873, or thereabouts.
2. That it extended to every branch of industry, including agriculture, manufactures, and mining, and that it was not confined to England, but had been experienced in a greater or less degree in all the industrial countries of the world.
3. That no adequate cause for this state of things was discoverable, unless it could be found in some general dislocation of values caused by currency changes and which would be capable of affecting an area equal to that which the depression of trade covered.

The panic has come, and it has come to stay until bimetallism is restored.

SILVER WILL NOT DRIVE OUT GOLD.

It is urged that to restore silver to the position of redemption money would drive gold out of circulation. This same prediction was made when the Bland-Allison Act was pending, and the gold-standard advocates said that it would drive all of the gold out of the country, but the official reports show that immediately upon the passage of that act our gold stock went up from $230,000,000 to $700,000,000. These are facts and can not be denied, and yet the gold men tell you and expect you to believe that the rehabilitation of silver will drive gold out of the country. What if it did? Would not we have a good volume of silver money, and would not other money come to take the place of the gold? And if gold does leave the country when we restore silver to its proper functions is that a sound argument against raising the prices of our products by remonetizing silver? Sir, we this day have a gold panic in this country and we are now on the gold standard.

The estimated wheat crop of the world for the year 1891 was 2,432,000,000 bushels; for 1892 it was 2,403,000,000 bushels; for the year 1893 it was 1,904,000,000 bushels. With a reduced crop for 1893 the Liverpool price has gone down from $1.15 per bushel in 1891 to 77 cents a bushel in 1893. In the United States the wheat crop in the year 1892 was 516,000,000 bushels, and for 1893, 396,000,000 bushels. In 1892 the cotton crop of this country was 6,717,000 bales, and for 1893 it was 6,600,000 bales. The price went down from 8.4 cents a pound in 1892 to 6.89 cents per pound in 1893, and we all know that in 1894 it went down as low as 4 cents a pound. Prices in cotton, wheat, and other farm products have steadily declined in value since 1873. Ought this decline to be stopped, and can it be done?

The fall in prices began in 1873, when our standard was reduced by striking off one-half the quantity of our standard—striking off the silver half—reducing the dimension of the standard that priced our commodities. Then, if this be so, restore that standard to its normal proportions and you restore prices to their normal conditions. The scramble for gold has made it go up in value, and we have to pay more of our products for it. John Locke said years ago:

> The greater scarcity of money enhances its price and increases the scramble, there being nothing that does supply the want of it. The lessening of its quantity always increases its price and makes an equal portion of it exchange for a greater of any other thing.

Then, if this be true, coin gold and silver just alike; make one metal just as good as another; make no law apply to one that does not apply to the other; make both redemption money, and coin them at a proper ratio in our country, and prices of agricultural products will rise, trade will be restored, and we will once again feel the life of a new era in all our business transactions.

OUR LOSSES SINCE 1873.

The demonetization of silver when it was at a premium of 3 cents over gold lost annually the producer on cotton and wheat $155,550,000, while the mine owner lost only $13,000,000 annually. Carefully analyze the following statement:

LOSSES CAUSED BY THE DEMONETIZATION OF SILVER, 1872 TO 1893.

Loss to silver producers, $198,617,908.

Loss to wheat producers, $3,900,542,602, or $19,638 for every $1,000 lost by silver producers.

Loss to corn producers, $9,441,525,243, or $47,536 for every $1,000 lost by silver producers.

Loss to cotton producers, $4,810,210,344, or $24,218 to every $1,000 lost by silver producers.

Or for every $1,000 to the silver producers caused by the demonetization of silver, the wheat, corn, and cotton producers lose $91,392, to say nothing of the wool and pig-iron producers and all the other labor products of the country.

The average population of the United States for the period from 1872 to 1893 was 50,000,000. The loss during that time, caused by the demonetization of silver, upon the three great staple products of the country—corn, cotton, and wheat—amounted to $18,152,278,189, or a loss per capita of $363; so it is safe to assume that the loss to all industries has been at least $1,000 per capita.

It is not a question of benefiting a mine owner. It is a question of reinvesting one of the elements of nature's God with its ancient money function and restoring the prices upon our drooping and depressed products. It is a question of liberating silver as a pricing instrument from the tyrannical heel of gold as a robbing standard. Yes, all the metallic money in the world does not exceed $8,000,000,000, and to raise the amount of our primary money $4,000,000,000 would enhance the value of our property many billions of dollars by simply doubling the value thereof, while the profit to all the miners in the world would hardly be noticeable compared to this immense increase in the value of our property and commodities.

Think of the proposition and take it home with you. We must do something to relieve this distress. The 35,000,000 people we have engaged in agricultural pursuits (the prices of their products continually falling) will have nothing to purchase the products, wares, and merchandise of those persons engaged in other pursuits, and the factories will have to stop and many industries

call a halt. The farming class must get something for its products to buy from the other classes, for if the agriculturist can not buy the other classes can not sell to many others, and business must be paralyzed. Then the wages of all the laboring classes must fall and in many instances cease altogether.

Falling prices must be arrested or ruin is close at hand for millions of people. But bimetallism is coming; the people are aroused and will resurrect the silver of their fathers. The young men of this country will live to see our Republic again blossom as the rose under true bimetallism.

The Democrats have always favored the coinage of gold and silver as the standard legal-tender money of the country, and in the fullness of time the patriotic hearts and minds of the American freemen will revivify the coinage laws of the builders of our Republic that blessed mankind for nearly a century. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The hour of 10.30 having arrived, under the order, the committee will now rise.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. GAMBLE having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HEPBURN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 1 and had come to no resolution thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The hour of 10.30 having arrived, the House, under the order, will stand adjourned until to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, recommending an increase of the employees of the heating and ventilating department of the House wing—to the Committee on Accounts, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, presenting a detailed statement of the expenditures of all appropriations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 3993) providing for the adjustment and payment of the accounts of laborers and mechanics arising under the eight-hour law—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 3994) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at East St. Louis, in the State of Illinois—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 3995) for removal of Diamond Reef—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 3996) to provide for the erection of a public building at McKeesport, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 3997) authorizing the Secretary of War to cause to be erected monuments and markers at Gettysburg, Pa., to commemorate the valorous deeds of certain regiments and batteries of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 3998) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Walla Walla, in the State of Washington—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 3999) for the erection of a public building at Mansfield, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BELLAMY: A bill (H. R. 4000) to authorize the Southeastern Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Lumber River within the boundary lines of Robeson County, N. C.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 4001) authorizing the adjustment of rights of settlers on the Navajo Indian Reservation, Territory of Arizona—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: A bill (H. R. 4002) to incorporate the Frederick Douglass Memorial and Historical Association—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 4003) making an appropriation for the purchase of the scale known as Fairbanks's infallible American gold and silver coin scale and counterfeit coin detector, for use in the post-offices throughout the United States—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 4004) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Spartanburg, in the State of South Carolina—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 4005) to establish a national military park at the battlefield of Cowpens—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 4006) to authorize the Union Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Monongahela River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 4007) making an appropriation for experimental rural free delivery of the Post-Office Department—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 4008) to establish a light and fog signal to mark the main southern entrance of the new breakwater at Buffalo, N. Y.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BELLAMY: A bill (H. R. 4009) to provide for the education and support of the children of the Croatan or Hatteras Indians, in the southeastern part of North Carolina—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 4010) making further provision for a civil government for Alaska—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 4024) to further define the duties of the Federal courts concerning contempt and punishments therefor—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4025) to provide for the assessment, by jury, of the punishment of persons found guilty of felony in courts of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 4026) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to change the material to be used in the construction of the dry docks at the navy-yards at League Island, Pa., and Mare Island, Cal., from timber to concrete and stone—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 4027) to provide for the purchase of a site for barracks and other buildings required for troops garrisoning fortifications at Galveston, Tex.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4028) to establish a marine hospital at Galveston, Tex.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 4029) appropriating money to pay the claim of the Western Paving and Supply Company for paving streets adjacent to the post-office and court-house of the United States at Indianapolis, Ind.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 4144) making appropriations for site, pedestals, and statues of Gens. Francis Marion, Thomas Sumter, and Andrew Pickens in the city of Columbia, State of South Carolina—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 74) authorizing articles imported from foreign countries for the sole purpose of exhibition at San Antonio International Fair and at the Texas State Fair and Dallas Exposition, to be held in the cities of San Antonio, Tex., and Dallas, Tex., to be imported free of duty, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 75) to amend act of Congress approved July 1, 1898, making provision for the sundry and civil expenses of the Government—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ACHESON: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 76) authorizing the enlargement and improvement of locks 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 in the Monongahela River, Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ESCH: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring American shipbuilding and merchant marine—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 4011) to correct the military record of John E. McCollough, of Florence, Washington County, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4012) granting a pension to Mrs. Maggie J. Garrett, Nineveh, Greene County, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4013) to correct the military record of W. H. Palmer, of Homestead, Allegheny County, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4014) to correct the military record of John Blue, of Uniontown, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BENTON: A bill (H. R. 4015) to place Daniel M. Page, late first lieutenant, Thirty-eighth United States Infantry, on the retired list of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 4016) granting an increase of pension to Oliver J. Lyon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRENNER: A bill (H. R. 4017) granting pension to Hiram Johnson, late Company F, One hundred and fifty-sixth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4018) granting pension to Mrs. Elizabeth Dinnon, widow of the late John Dinnon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 4019) for the relief of Jonathan J. Totten—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 4020) for the relief of William Burke—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CROWLEY: A bill (H. R. 4021) to correct the military record of Albert Boker—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARMACK: A bill (H. R. 4022) for the relief of J. P. McGaw, sr., of Maury County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 4023) to correct the military record of William Parsons—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 4030) for the relief of Minnie and Lotta M. Coleman, helpless children of Thomas R. Coleman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 4031) to authorize the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of the legal representatives and assigns of the firm of Carpenter & Plass against the United States of America for munitions of war and labor and materials furnished the Government and claims arising under contracts made by said firm with the Government of the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4032) to remove the charge of dismissal standing against William H. Harlin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4033) for the relief of Eliza Percival—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4034) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Christopher Mullen, late of Company D, Fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4035) granting a pension to Annie Fowler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4036) granting a pension to John J. Griffin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4037) granting a pension to Mrs. Annie M. Churchward, widow of William F. Churchward, late private, Company H, One hundred and fifty-ninth New York Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4038) granting an increase of pension to James Fitzpatrick, late a private, Company F, Fifth Regiment New York Heavy Artillery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4039) removing the charge of desertion from the record of John Groom, late private, One hundred and sixty-fourth New York Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4040) increasing the pension of James Hands—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4041) granting a pension to Margaret Donovan, widow of Patrick H. Donovan, late private, Fourteenth New York Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4042) granting a pension to Matilda and George J. Gammel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4043) for the relief of Daniel W. Perkins—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4044) for the relief of the estate of F. Z. Tucker—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4045) to increase pension of John Hillbert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4046) for the relief of James E. Simpson and others—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4047) granting an increase of pension to James S. Jordan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4048) granting an increase of pension to David H. Greene—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4049) granting an increase of pension to Catherine V. Chevallier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4050) to pension Edward B. Webb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4051) for the relief of Robert D. Benedict—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 4052) for the relief of Thomas Rosbrugh—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4053) for the relief of Mrs. S. E. Edwards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4054) for the relief of W. S. Hutchinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4055) for the relief of James B. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILBERT: A bill (H. R. 4056) for the benefit of H. P. Bottom, of Perryville, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4057) for the benefit of George Price, of Simpsonville, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 4058) granting a pension to Carroll A. McKnight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 4059) for the relief of John H. McLaughlin—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4060) granting a pension to Peter Lynch—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 4061) for the relief of Hannah E. Boardman, administratrix of William Boardman, deceased, surviving partner of the firm of Boardman, Holbrook & Co., of the Neptune Works—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: A bill (H. R. 4062) to remove the charge of desertion against Thomas J. Cooper—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4063) to remove the charge of desertion against Joseph M. Black—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4064) to remove the charge of desertion against Benjamin F. Cox—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4065) to remove the charge of desertion against David Edwards—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEDGE: A bill (H. R. 4066) for the relief of R. A. Schellhous—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 4067) to remove the charge of desertion against Patrick Cassidy, of Amboy, Ill., late private, Company C, Thirty-fourth Ohio—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4068) granting an increase of pension to Maria N. Flint—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACK: A bill (H. R. 4069) to restore the name of Julia A. Kinkead to the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4070) granting a pension to William Love—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 4071) to remove the charge of desertion against James McCombs—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4072) granting a pension to Jefferson Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 4073) granting a pension to Edgar C. Trowbridge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANE: A bill (H. R. 4074) for the relief of Fritz Horn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4075) granting a pension to Hester A. Godman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4076) granting an increase of pension to John W. Case—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4077) granting an increase of pension to Solomon C. Payne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4078) granting a pension to John D. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4079) granting a pension to Mahala Alexander—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4080) granting a pension to James E. Arvin, Teresa Arvin, and Anna Arvin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4081) for the relief of William J. Alexander—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4082) granting a pension to Peter Ballenger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4083) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Brim—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4084) granting a pension to Mary Case—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4085) to correct the military record of Edward Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4086) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Lockwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4087) to correct the military record of Cornelius Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4088) granting an increase of pension to John Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4089) granting a pension to Emily Burke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4090) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4091) granting an increase of pension to August Eckstein—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4092) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4093) granting a pension to Sarah Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4094) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4095) for the relief of George A. Exline, of Sullivan, Ind.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4096) granting a pension to Milton Roseberry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 4097) to increase pension of David L. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4098) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William R. Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 4099) for the relief of the Marion Trust Company, administrator of the estate of Samuel Milliked, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: A bill (H. R. 4100) for increase of pension to Martha A. Gould—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4101) to remove charge of desertion against Lucius O. Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4102) granting an increase of pension to Abram O. Kindy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 4103) granting a pension to Mary P. Broughton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4104) granting a pension to Mary Bunting—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4105) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of George W. Leland, late a private in Company H, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, in the war of the rebellion, and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4106) granting an honorable discharge to Robert Henry McNeal—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4107) to pay claim of David Reed, deceased, to Prentiss B. Reed and Lucretia H. Reed Regnier, his only surviving children—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4108) for the relief of William H. Schriver, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-sixth Illinois Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4109) granting a pension to William Holgate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4110) for the relief of Capt. Jefferson Dickerson, of Fort Wayne, Ind.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RYAN of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4111) granting a pension to Elizabeth P. Sigfried—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 4112) granting an increase of pension to Arabella L. Tucker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4113) granting a pension to Mrs. Helen M. Hamilton, widow of William J. Hamilton, late chief engineer in the United States Navy in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4114) granting an increase of pension to William B. Johnson, late of Company K, One hundred and thirty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 4115) to increase the pension of Walter P. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4116) to correct the military record of Joachim Buenz—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4117) for the relief of Nathaniel M. Ayers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4118) granting an increase of pension to Enos H. Kirk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4119) to correct the military record of Miles Durkee—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 4120) to pay Eliza R. Crawford the amount of a United States loan certificate issued in 1779—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHOWALTER: A bill (H. R. 4121) to correct the military record of Stewart Hodge, late of Company K, Sixty-third Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4122) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the military record of Andrew Donaldson, Company F, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Provisional Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4123) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of James W. Denniston and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4124) to correct the military record of William Daniels, late of Company F, One hundredth Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4125) to correct the military record of Perry Childs, late of Company I, Fifty-seventh Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4126) for the relief of John Evans—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4127) granting a pension to H. S. McGown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4128) granting a pension to Jane Patterson, widow of the late Samuel R. Patterson, late of Company E, One hundred and thirty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4129) granting a pension to David Potts, late of Company G, Forty-sixth Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4130) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary Clark, widow of Calvin B. Clark, late of the One hundred and fifth Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4131) increasing the pension of Lieut. James A. Morrison, late of Company E, Fourth Pennsylvania Veteran Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4132) increasing the pension of Elijah Baxter, late of Company H, One hundred and first Pennsylvania Volunteers, and Company M, One hundred and fifty-second Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4133) granting an increase of pension to William Ewing, late of Company E, One hundredth Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4134) granting an increase of pension to Findley Brandon, late of Company C, One hundredth Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4135) increasing the pension of Dewitt C. Ayers, late of Company I, One hundred and second Pennsylvania Veteran Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4136) increasing the pension of Mrs. Mary W. Townsend—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 4137) to increase the pensions of Mrs. Margrett B. Shipp, widow of Lieut. William E. Shipp, who was killed at San Juan, and Mrs. Louise D. Smith, widow of Lieut. William H. Smith, who was killed at San Juan—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 4138) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Hyatt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4139) granting a pension to Jennie Mills—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: A bill (H. R. 4140) to place the name of Henry Weifenbach upon the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER: A bill (H. R. 4141) granting a pension to Mary Ann Fell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4142) to increase the pension of Katharine R. Prince—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WACHTER: A bill (H. R. 4143) granting a pension to Laura V. Swearer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 4145) authorizing and permitting J. H. Heyward, of Greenville, S. C., to lay and maintain a walk way upon the Government lot at Greenville, S. C., and to lay, maintain, and repair sewer, water, and gas pipes thereunder—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4146) for the relief of George W. Fisher—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4147) for the relief of the heirs of John P. F. Scott—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4148) for the relief of Edward P. M. Robinson, of Fairfield County, S. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4149) for the relief of F. G. Fuller and J. A. Mitchell, executors of the will of John O'Dell, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4150) for the relief of Mount Zion Society—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4151) for the relief of Capt. Martin Hammer—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petitions of Carrie E. Phillips and others, of Washington, D. C.; C. A. Wrikeman and others, of the District of Columbia, for the antipolygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON: Papers to accompany House bill to correct the military record of William Parsons—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CROWLEY: Papers to accompany House bill granting an honorable discharge to Albert Baker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DRIGGS: Paper relating to the claim of James E. Simpson and others—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of St. Paul, Minn., protesting against the present duty on hides and asking that the same be abrogated and that hides be again placed on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROUT: Testimony in the matter of granting an increase of pension to Carroll A. McKnight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, testimony relative to the removal of the charge of desertion from the military record of Alexander Sleight, of Westhaven, Vt.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL: Paper to accompany House bill relating to the claim of Hannah E. Boardman—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition of the employees of the Quartermaster's Department at the Philadelphia depot, Schuylkill Arsenal, for pay for extra services during the Spanish-American war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McLAIN; Petition of the Protestant Orphan Asylum of Natchez, Miss., for allowance for use and occupation of asylum property by the United States Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Edward Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of ——— —to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Cornelius Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE: Papers to accompany House bill No. 3599, for the relief of Lewis M. Millard—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: Petition of the Milwaukee Chamber of Commerce, favoring amendments to the interstate-commerce act—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: Resolution of Hughes Post, No. 285, of Malta, Ohio, requesting the passage of the per diem pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WACHTER: Resolution of the Board of Trade of Baltimore, asking that the currency question be removed from politics—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, resolution of the national encampment, Grand Army of the Republic, relating to civil-service appointments—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, resolution of the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce, in favor of the single gold standard—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, paper to accompany House bill to place John and Laura V. Swearer in the pension rolls—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: Papers to accompany House bill No. 2892, granting an increase of pension to Franklin Chase—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 2889, to remove the charge of desertion against Cornelius O'Callaghan, alias William Blake—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE: Paper to accompany House joint resolution No. 15, to amend act of Congress making provision for sundry civil expenses of the Government—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Martin Harmer—to the Committee on War Claims.

Petitions, etc., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah were laid on the Clerk's desk and severally referred to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case, as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Resolutions of the Dubuque Ladies' Literary Association, First Methodist Episcopal Church, of Auburn, N. Y.; A. H. Ames and others, of Washington, D. C.; Mabel Tompkins and others, of Stanfordville, N. Y., and women's clubs, of Knoxville, Tenn.

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of Clurg McMillan and other citizens of McKeesport, Pa.

By Mr. BELL: Petitions of citizens of Salida Methodist Episcopal Church of Lamar, and letter of Mrs. Nora W. Frisbie, of Lamar, Colo.

By Mr. CLARKE of New Hampshire: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Meriden, N. H.

By Mr. DAHLE of Wisconsin: Petition of the Welsh Calvinistic Methodists of Wisconsin.

By Mr. FARIS: Petitions of A. W. Shields and others, of Paragon and Avon, Ind.

By Mr. GRAFF: Petition of 96 citizens of Farmington, Methodist Episcopal and Presbyterian churches of Dunlap, voters of Hopedale, Avon, Brimfield, and Peoria, Ill.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petitions of citizens of Edgeworth, Sewickley, Sharpsburg, and Christian Endeavorers of Bakerstown and Richland Township, Allegheny County, Pa.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania: Petition of a mass meeting of men at Reading, Pa.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Petition of citizens of Rykers Ridge, Jefferson County, Ind.

By Mr. GROUT: Petitions of residents of the Second Congressional district of Vermont.

By Mr. HARMER: Fifteen petitions of citizens of the Fifth Congressional district of Pennsylvania.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of 210 citizens of San Jose and vicinity, State of California.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petitions of Frank Stillwell and others, J. Ward Gamble, of Vineland, and G. E. Palen, of Ocean City, N. J.

By Mr. McDOWELL: Petitions of S. E. Sears and others, of Creston, and J. W. Martin and others, of Holmes County, Ohio.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Petition of Ed. E. Long, of Shoals, Ind., and vicinity.

By Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts: Petition of Helen A. Hanscom and others, of Haverhill, Mass.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petitions of H. E. Merrill and others, of San Jacinto, and 23 citizens of Villapark; D. C. Reed and others, of Redland, Cal.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Petition of F. E. Sanborn and others, of Melrose, Mass.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: Petition of F. W. Gookin and others, of Weston, Mich.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Petition of Frank F. Lewis and 13 others, of the State of Nebraska.

By Mr. WACHTER: Petition of Bishop John F. Hurst and others.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: Petition of George M. Bowker and 19 citizens of Concord Junction, Mass.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: Petition of J. E. R. Tracey and others, of Philadelphia, Pa.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *December 14, 1899.*

Prayer by Rev. LUCIEN CLARK, D. D., of the city of Washington.

Mr. WILLIAM J. DEBOE, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings; when, on motion of Mr. HALE, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand approved, if there be no objection.

Mr. HALE. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope the Senator from Maine will withhold that motion for a moment. I am in hopes that in the course of the day the standing and select committees of the Senate may be appointed. I understand that the Senators sitting on the other side of the Chamber have not quite completed their list, and if it should not be completed it may be necessary to have a session to-morrow simply for the purpose of appointing the committees, and for no other purpose.

Mr. HALE. Then I withhold the motion for the present.

THE GALAPAGOS ISLANDS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

In response to the resolution of the Senate of December 6, 1899, requesting the President "to inform the Senate, if not inconsistent with the public interests, whether this Government has any information as to the proposed sale of the Galapagos Islands by the Republic of Ecuador to Great Britain, or to any European power, and whether, if such report be well founded, what steps, if any, have been taken by the United States with reference to it," I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State.

WILLIAM McKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, December 13, 1899.

CONGRESSIONAL REFERENCE LIBRARY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Librarian of Congress relative to the establishment of a Congressional reference library at the Capitol; which was referred to the Committee on the Library, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. LORENZO DANFORD, late a Representative from the State of Ohio, and transmitted resolutions of the House thereon.

The message also announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution providing that when the two Houses adjourn on Wednesday, the 20th day of December, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Wednesday, January 3, 1900; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a petition of the legislature of Wisconsin, praying for the enactment of legislation increasing our American shipping; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

Memorial to Congress No. 1 A.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America assembled:

Whereas our American merchant marine during the past forty years has so declined that at the present time less than 10 per cent of our exports are carried abroad under our own flag instead of 90 per cent being so carried, as was the fact at the beginning of this period; and

Whereas our iron and steel industries have reached such a stage of development that we can now furnish the raw material for shipbuilding at as low a cost as any nation; and

Whereas the State of Wisconsin is dependent upon foreign markets for the disposition of its surplus grain, stock, and dairy products: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That, for the benefit of our farmers, miners, and manufacturers, and for the prosperity of our whole State, as well as the nation, we hereby petition Congress, now in Washington assembled, to speedily enact such laws as will give American shipbuilders and American steamship owners such encouragement as to cause them to build and maintain such a merchant marine as will successfully compete with all foreign nations for the carrying trade on the high seas and be an honor to our nation.

Resolved, That the governor is requested immediately to transmit a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives, and to our Wisconsin Senators and Representatives in Congress.

GEORGE H. RAY,
Speaker of the Assembly.
JESSE STONE,
President of the Senate.

Mr. HOAR presented sundry petitions of citizens of Massachusetts, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HANNA presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the reorganization of the consular service; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Hughes Post, No. 285, Department of Ohio, Grand Army of the Republic, of Malta, Ohio, praying for the passage of a per diem pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SEWELL presented the petitions of J. L. Ludlow and 18 other citizens of Gladstone, Frank P. Stone and 34 other citizens of Bloomfield, John M. Gear and 45 other citizens of East Orange, C. H. Dickenson and 20 other citizens of Newark, William Dellen, jr., and 88 other citizens of Elizabeth, J. H. Wolf and 27 other citizens of Newark, J. S. Friman and 30 other citizens of Califon, H. G. Stull and 25 other citizens of Milford, John H. Palmer and 45 other citizens of East Orange, and of A. W. Bingham and 44 other citizens of East Orange, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented the petitions of S. Burnham and sundry other citizens of Hamilton, C. N. Markle and 18 other citizens of Wilson, Fred Walthan and 18 other citizens of Coburton, C. A. Daniel and 9 other citizens of New York City, James M. Edsall and 126 other citizens, William A. Johnson and sundry other citizens of Brooklyn, Rev. T. R. Yates and 18 other citizens of Forestville, J. O. Davey and 17 other citizens of Syracuse, E. M. Andrews and 18 other citizens of Union Center, H. J. Rhodes and 18 other citizens of North Rush, E. P. Brigham and sundry other citizens of Conklin Center, Robert W. Ritchie and 18 other citizens of Lansingburg, C. A. Daniel and 17 other citizens of Rochester, Thomas Broxholm and 17 other citizens of Hunt, Cassius Marsh and 33 other citizens of Antwerp, William B. Walker and 17 other citizens of Greendale, Rev. William White Hanse and 17 other citizens of Palenville, Phœnix Barker and 13 other citizens of New York, Charles E. Cole and 70 other citizens of Manlius, Thomas R. Warnick and 17 other citizens of Condor, B. R. Bliss and 18 other citizens of Constantia, Edward G. Shiland and 26 other citizens of Coila, Charles H. Colegrove and 23 other citizens of Unadilla Forks, M. R. Lefever and 12 other citizens of Beaver Falls, Rev. J. P. Taylor and 8 other citizens of Pleasant Valley, C. E. Davenport and 25 other citizens of Brooklyn, W. P. West and 29 other citizens of Henvelton, Rev. J. W. Simpson and 16 other citizens of Utica, Albert L. Perry and 8 other citizens of Brooklyn, George Brown and 9 other citizens of New York City, and sundry petitions of citizens of Richmond, Brooklyn, Wallkill, Nyack, Lyons Falls, Brewster, Lockport, Middleport, Penn Yan, New York City, Dobbs Ferry, Buffalo, Riverhead, Burke, Claverack, Buskirk, Utica, Jamestown, Madrid, Kenmore, Mohawk, South Salem, Elbridge, Colton, Shushan, Fairport, Brookton, Far Rockaway, Rochester, Wilson, West Groton, Glens Falls, West Camden, College Point, and Bath, all in the State of New York, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. QUARLES presented the petitions of T. D. Haskins and 42 other citizens of Racine, William Moore and 95 other citizens of Clinton, Howland Hanson and 53 other citizens of Beloit, L. L. Plummer and 97 other citizens of Arkansaw, Matt Hollopeter and 23 other citizens of Oconto, A. P. Lea and 12 other citizens of Chippewa Falls, Andrew L. Frontz and 37 other citizens of Sandusky, F. W. Kingsley and 159 other citizens of Sun Prairie, W. B. Millard and 29 other citizens of New London, F. A. Nelson, of Fennimore, R. L. Cheney and 30 other citizens of Endeavor, J. C. Button and 52 other citizens of Trempealeau, George Leach and 31 other citizens of Walworth, Charles E. Butters and 21 other citizens of Tomale, and of J. A. Thomas and 139 other citizens of Pine River, all in the State of Wisconsin, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented the petitions of William P. Pearce and 9 other citizens of Goshen, C. H. Newton and 67 other citizens of Fort Wayne, and of Dr. E. Keith and 19 other citizens of Hagerstown, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SPOONER presented sundry petitions of citizens of Alderly, Kilbourn, Delton, Milwaukee, River Falls, Arkansaw, Eau Galle, Waterville, Beloit, Merrimac, Prairie du Chien, Almond, Roberts, Medford, and Antigo, all in the State of Wisconsin, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FORAKER presented petitions of 11,580 citizens of Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to define legal marriage and prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LINDSAY presented the petition of J. P. Mitchell and sundry other citizens of Harrodsburg, Ky., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE.

Mr. PRITCHARD, from the Committee on Pensions, submitted a report to accompany the joint resolution (S. R. 8) construing the act approved June 27, 1890, entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," reported by him without amendment on the 13th instant.

LIST OF PRIVATE CLAIMS.

Mr. WARREN (for Mr. TELLER), from the Committee on Claims, submitted the following report:

In compliance with the provisions of a resolution of the Senate of June 10, 1898, directing that the Senate Committee on Claims cause to be prepared an alphabetical list of all private claims which have been before the Senate, with the action of the Senate thereon, since the 4th day of March, 1891, and up to the 4th day of March, 1899, and that said list be communicated to the Senate, I have the honor to state that the work has been completed, and the manuscript is in the room of the Senate Committee on Claims, subject to the order of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report is accepted.

NATIONAL HOME FOR DISABLED VOLUNTEER SOLDIERS.

Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the following concurrent resolution from the House of Representatives, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed of the report of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, in addition to the usual number, 500 copies of the report proper, 500 copies of the report of the assistant inspector-general on the State homes, and 150 copies of the record of members, for the use of the Home.

BUREAU OF AMERICAN REPUBLICS.

Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following concurrent resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed, for the use of the Bureau of American Republics, 2,500 copies of the Annual Report of the Director of the Bureau of American Republics.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1570) to correct the military record of, and grant an honorable discharge to, Isaac H. Fitzmorris; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1571) granting an increase of pension to Pleasant Umfleet (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1572) granting a pension to Anderson Sherman;

A bill (S. 1573) granting a pension to John J. Logan;

A bill (S. 1574) granting a pension to Theodore Harris;
A bill (S. 1575) granting a pension to Nancy Hawkins;
A bill (S. 1576) granting a pension to Henry L. Flint;
A bill (S. 1577) granting a pension to Charles Bauermaster;
A bill (S. 1578) granting a pension to George W. Campbell; and
A bill (S. 1579) granting a pension to Mary Amanda Newton.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 1580) to provide for the punishment of violations of treaty rights of aliens; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 1581) to correct the military record of Christian Heinze; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1582) to correct the military record of John Sailer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affa rs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1583) for the relief of the heirs of A. Lawrence Foster; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1584) granting a pension to James A. Stine; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1585) making the proceedings of the Union Veteran Legion a part of the public records of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 1586) referring to the Court of Claims the claims of O. P. Cobb and others; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1587) granting a pension to John S. Dukate;
A bill (S. 1588) granting a pension to Eva Clark; and
A bill (S. 1589) granting a pension to Lovina Smucker.

Mr. ALDRICH introduced a bill (S. 1590) for the erection of a public building at Providence, R. I.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1591) granting a pension to Horace Brown;
A bill (S. 1592) granting a pension to Jane E. Augur; and
A bill (S. 1593) granting an increase of pension to Clara H. Inch.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 1594) for the relief of Robert Smalls; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 1595) to correct the relative rank of Edson A. Lewis, captain, Eighteenth United States Infantry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PETTUS introduced a bill (S. 1596) to equalize and regulate the duties of the judges of the district courts of the United States in the State of Alabama; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LINDSAY introduced a bill (S. 1597) granting increase of pension to soldiers of the Mexican war in certain cases, and providing for pensions to widows; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1598) for the relief of the estate of Joseph S. Hubbard, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SPOONER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1599) granting an increase of pension to Cornwell M. Brill (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1600) granting an increase of pension to John T. Hayes;
A bill (S. 1601) granting an increase of pension to John Thornton;
A bill (S. 1602) granting an increase of pension to Morris B. Kimball;
A bill (S. 1603) granting an increase of pension to John W. Kaump; and
A bill (S. 1604) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Graham.

Mr. VEST introduced a bill (S. 1605) for the purchase of a bronze portrait statue of George Washington; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. KENNEY introduced a bill (S. 1606) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John C. Carroll, alias John T. Johnson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 1607) for the relief of Agnes W. Hills and Sarah J. Hills; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1608) granting a pension to Eleanor R. Sullivan; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 1609) to provide for apprentices in the mints of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1610) to amend "An act to amend an act approved March 3, 1891, granting the right of way upon the public lands for reservoir and canal purposes," and to add thereto a new section, to be known as section 3, providing for the storage and use of water collected on the public and other lands and on park and timber reservations for irrigation, manufacturing purposes, for generating and distributing electric energy, and for other useful purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1611) in relation to certain fees to be allowed registers and receivers of United States land offices; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1612) providing for the purchase of metal and the coinage of minor coins, and the distribution and redemption of said coins; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1613) amending section 715 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, regulating the compensation and number of criers and bailiffs in the United States courts; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PRITCHARD introduced a bill (S. 1614) granting a pension to Alfred M. Hooper; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1615) for the relief of the Cape Fear and People's Steamboat Company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1616) for the relief of Thomas S. Lutterloh; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1617) to authorize the Southeastern Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Lumber River within the boundary lines of Robeson County, N. C.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HANNA introduced a bill (S. 1618) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and adjudicate the claim of the personal representatives of William Kiskadden, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1619) granting a pension to Ella Cotton Conrad; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 1620) for the relief of Hannah E. Boardman, administratrix of William Boardman, deceased, surviving partner of the firm of Boardman, Holbrook & Co., of the Neptune Works; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. McBRIDE introduced a bill (S. 1621) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 1622) for the relief of Jeronemus S. Underhill; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1623) for the relief of Charles Gallagher, of New York, and to refer his claim to the Court of Claims; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1624) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Dover, in the State of New Hampshire; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. BUTLER introduced a bill (S. 1625) to provide for telegraphic communication between the United States of America, the Hawaiian Islands, the Philippine Islands, and other countries; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. GEAR introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1626) granting a pension to Calvin Ellis;
A bill (S. 1627) granting a pension to George B. Hayden (with an accompanying paper); and
A bill (S. 1628) granting a pension to Adolph Schrei (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 1629) granting a pension to

Clara L. Harriman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HALE. I introduce by request a bill relating to the consolidation of certain bureaus in the Navy Department. I am not personally committed to the provisions of the bill, but I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs with the accompanying letters.

The bill (S. 1630) to consolidate the Bureaus of Construction and Repair, Steam Engineering, and Equipment, and to provide for the distribution of the duties thereof, was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 1631) to encourage enlistment in the United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1632) to amend "An act authorizing certain officers of the Navy and Marine Corps to administer oaths," approved January 25, 1895; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. MCENERY introduced a bill (S. 1633) to correct the military record of Ferdinand Pizarica; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CLAY introduced a bill (S. 1634) for the relief of the owners of the steamer *Leesburg;* which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1635) granting an increase of pension to Bedney F. McDonald; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ELKINS introduced a bill (S. 1636) authorizing the President of the United States to nominate Lieut. Commander R. M. G. Brown, now on the retired list, to be a commander on the retired list; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. CHILTON introduced a bill (S. 1637) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims in the case of Elizabeth A. Gill and others, legatees and heirs at law of W. H. Gill, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

EAST RIVER IMPROVEMENT, NEW YORK.

Mr. PLATT of New York submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to have a detailed examination made by the actual removal of the rock at the narrowest part of East River on the eastern side, at Ravenswood, Long Island, New York, at and near Rainey's cofferdam, for a distance of 1,200 to 1,500 feet, with a view to widening and deepening the channel at that part of the river to 600 feet of width and at least 15 feet of depth, with also an examination and estimate of cost for the whole work, including deepening the channel to 26 feet at mean low water. The expenses incurred in pursuance of this resolution shall be defrayed from the balances available from previous appropriations for the improvement of the East River.

KIOWA, COMANCHE, AND APACHE INDIANS.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I submit a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to inform the Senate as to the quantity, nature, and character of the lands in the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache reservation; what proportion, if any, of said lands are adapted to agriculture, and where the same, if any, are located; what proportion of said lands, if any, are adapted to grazing; whether said grazing lands are contiguous to agricultural lands; what proportion of such lands are mountainous or timber lands, and whether there are mineral lands in said reservation, and, if any, the character and extent of the same; also, how the reservation is at present occupied and the number of Indians thereon; what leases exist there, and what yearly rental is realized from the lands for the support of the Indians; whether said Indians have any trust funds; whether appropriations are annually made for their support, and, if so, the amount; also the character and habits of said Indians; whether they have made any progress in agriculture and stock raising, and if their knowledge of the same is sufficient to enable them to gain a livelihood thereby and be self-supporting, and to communicate to the Senate any reports or documents in said Department bearing upon the subject.

Mr. CHILTON. I should like to have the first part of the resolution read again.

The Secretary read as requested.

Mr. CHILTON. That is enough.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 15,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 164, third session Fifty-fifth Congress, being the report of the Daughters of the American Revolution, 1890-97, of which 5,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 10,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

REVISION OF CRIMINAL AND PENAL LAWS.

Mr. HOAR submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 15,000 copies of the report of the Commission for the Revision of the Criminal and Penal Laws of the United States, of which 5,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 10,000 for the use of the House of Representatives.

HOLIDAY RECESS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution from the House of Representatives; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Wednesday, the 20th day of December, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Wednesday, January 3, 1900.

Mr. ALLISON subsequently reported, from the Committee on Appropriations, the foregoing resolution, without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

AFFAIRS IN THE PHILIPPINES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a preceding day, which the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted on the 12th instant by Mr. PETTIGREW, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate whether the flag of the Philippine republic was carried by vessels in the bay of Manila, and whether the flag of the Philippine republic was ever saluted by Admiral Dewey or any of the vessels of his fleet at any time since May 1, 1898. Were Spanish prisoners delivered over to the Philippine forces at the time of the surrender of Subig Bay? Did a vessel commanded by the forces under Aguinaldo, flying the Philippine flag, accompany the vessels *Concord* and *Raleigh* back to Subig Bay in June, 1898, in order to compel the surrender of the Spanish forces?

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I move to lay the resolution on the table.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is not debatable without consent.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I do not desire to debate the resolution, but I do desire to make a brief statement of two or three minutes with regard to it. I hope, therefore, the Senator from New Hampshire will withdraw his motion for that purpose.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I may be allowed to say that I dislike to do so. Debate upon this resolution will do harm, in my judgment, to the interests of the country, and——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is not debatable without consent.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement of the reasons for introducing the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to submit some remarks on the resolution. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from South Dakota will proceed.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, this is a resolution simply of inquiry, and relates to facts which very many people are desirous of ascertaining.

Mr. SPOONER. Alleged facts.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Alleged facts, the Senator from Wisconsin says. The resolution relates to alleged facts with regard to which people are desirous of securing information. It has been asserted, and I have never seen it disputed, that vessels bearing the flag of the Philippine republic passed in and out of Manila Bay during the summer of 1898; that those vessels were saluted by the vessels of our fleet; that at one time the insurgents, the forces of Aguinaldo, the forces of the republic of the Philippines, attacked the Spanish forces at Subig Bay, about 50 miles from Manila; that one of the small vessels belonging to the Philippine republic returned to Manila for assistance; that this vessel came back, accompanied by two vessels of our fleet, flying the flag of the Philippine republic, and the surrender of the Spanish garrison was secured; and that the officers of our fleet turned the prisoners thus taken over to the Philippine insurgents.

Now, these are facts of great interest, if they are facts, to many of the people of this country. I have been requested by several very prominent people of the United States to ascertain by inquiry, if possible, the truth of those newspaper statements, and I therefore introduced the resolution.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, every word of the resolution and every word of the speech of the Senator will be telegraphed to Manila and do mischief to the Government.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire that the resolution shall lie on the table.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I call for the yeas and nays on that question.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. HANSBROUGH (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL]. I do not see that Senator in his seat, and I therefore withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. SPOONER (when Mr. QUARLES's name was called). My colleague [Mr. QUARLES] is absent from the Chamber for the moment. He has a standing pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. PROCTOR. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. BURROWS. I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY].

Mr. CULLOM. I have a general pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN]. I inquire if he has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. CULLOM. I therefore withhold my vote. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 20; as follows:

YEAS—41.

Aldrich,	Foster,	McCumber,	Sewell,
Allison,	Frye,	McEnery,	Shoup,
Beveridge,	Gallinger,	McLaurin,	Spooner,
Carter,	Gear,	McMillan,	Stewart,
Chandler,	Hanna,	Nelson,	Thurston,
Clark, Wyo.	Hawley,	Perkins,	Wellington,
Deboe,	Kean,	Platt, Conn.	Wetmore,
Depew,	Lindsay,	Platt, N. Y.	Wolcott.
Elkins,	Lodge,	Pritchard,	
Fairbanks,	McBride,	Ross,	
Foraker,	McComas,	Scott,	

NAYS—20.

Bacon,	Cockrell,	Kenney,	Sullivan,
Bate,	Harris,	Money,	Taliaferro,
Berry,	Heitfeld,	Pettigrew,	Tillman,
Butler,	Hoar,	Pettus,	Turley,
Clay,	Jones, Ark.	Rawlins,	Vest.

NOT VOTING—24.

Baker,	Cullom,	Kyle,	Proctor,
Burrows,	Daniel,	Mallory,	Quarles,
Caffery,	Davis,	Martin,	Simon,
Chilton,	Hale,	Mason,	Teller,
Clark, Mont.	Hansbrough,	Morgan,	Turner,
Culberson,	Jones, Nev.	Penrose,	Warren.

So Mr. PETTIGREW's resolution was laid on the table.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Let us have an executive session.

Mr. SEWELL. I suggest that we have an executive session.

Mr. GALLINGER. I withdraw my former motion, and move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After fifteen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

LABOR TROUBLES IN IDAHO.

Mr. KYLE. I should like to have a short paper of about 16 pages, relating to labor troubles in Idaho, printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as I see that committee have that subject under consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota asks that the paper sent to the desk by him may be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE DANFORD.

Mr. FORAKER. If there is no other legislative business to be transacted at this time, I ask that the message from the House of Representatives announcing the death of Representative DANFORD be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following resolutions from the House of Representatives; which were read:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *December 12, 1899.*

Resolved, That the House has heard with great sorrow of the death of Hon. LORENZO DANFORD, late a Representative from the State of Ohio.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House communicate these resolutions to the Senate, and that as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased this House do now adjourn.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, hereafter I shall ask that a day be fixed when proper tributes can be paid to the memory of the deceased. At present I ask for the consideration of the resolutions which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio submits resolutions, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. LORENZO DANFORD, late a Representative from the State of Ohio.

Resolved, That as an additional mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, December 15, 1899, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 14, 1899.

ENVOYS EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTERS PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Bellamy Storer, of Ohio, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Spain.

Lawrence Townsend, of Pennsylvania, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Belgium.

Arthur S. Hardy, of New Hampshire, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Greece, Roumania, and Servia.

William P. Lord, of Oregon, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to the Argentine Republic.

John N. Irwin, of Iowa, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Portugal.

MINISTER RESIDENT AND CONSUL-GENERAL.

Herbert W. Bowen, of New York, to be minister resident and consul-general of the United States to Persia.

CONSULS.

Horace L. Washington, of Texas, to be consul of the United States at Valencia, Spain.

Jesse H. Johnson, of Texas, to be consul of the United States at Coaticook, Canada.

SECRETARIES OF LEGATION.

Lloyd Carpenter Griscom, of Pennsylvania, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at Constantinople, Turkey.

James C. McNally, of Pennsylvania, to be secretary of the legation of the United States to Guatemala and Honduras and consul-general to Guatemala.

Spencer F. Eddy, of Illinois, to be second secretary of the embassy of the United States at Paris, France.

Joseph H. Choate, jr., of New York, to be third secretary of the embassy of the United States at London, England.

Arthur M. Beaupré, of Illinois, to be secretary of the legation and consul-general of the United States at Bogotá, Colombia.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

J. Barton Miller, of the District of Columbia, to be justice of the peace in the District of Columbia, assigned to the city of Tennallytown.

Terrence A. Duffy, of the District of Columbia, to be justice of the peace in the District of Columbia.

Albert L. Richardson, of the District of Columbia, to be justice of the peace in the District of Columbia, assigned to the city of Anacostia.

SUPERVISORS OF THE TWELFTH CENSUS.

D. Smith Talbot, of West Chester, Chester County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Pennsylvania.

George W. Youngson, of Parnassus, Westmoreland County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixteenth supervisor's district of Pennsylvania.

Charles A. Zerbe, of Lewistown, Mifflin County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Twelfth supervisor's district of Pennsylvania.

Harvey A. Kasson, of Akron, Summit County, Ohio, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixteenth supervisor's district.

Henry G. Seip, of Easton, Northampton County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Pennsylvania.

Milford H. Stebbins, of Wellsboro, Tioga County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eleventh supervisor's district of Pennsylvania.

William B. Sterrett, of Titusville, Crawford County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifteenth supervisor's district of Pennsylvania.

Howard G. Reitzel, of Mahanoy City, Schuylkill County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Pennsylvania.

Albert F. Shenck, of Lancaster, Lancaster County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of Pennsylvania.

George R. Scull, of Somerset, Somerset County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Thirteenth supervisor's district of Pennsylvania.

Frank M. Fuller, of Uniontown, Fayette County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventeenth supervisor's district of Pennsylvania.

James A. McMillin, of Harlansburg, Lawrence County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Nineteenth supervisor's district of Pennsylvania.

Henry A. Reed, of Sunbury, Northumberland County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Tenth supervisor's district of Pennsylvania.

Charles A. Durant, of Wilkesbarre, Luzerne County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Pennsylvania.

James M. Esler, of Tarentum, Allegheny County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighteenth supervisor's district of Pennsylvania.

John R. Edwards, of Scranton, Lackawanna County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Pennsylvania.

Charles H. Ainey, of Montrose, Susquehanna County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Pennsylvania.

Harry D. Beaston, of Philadelphia, Philadelphia County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Pennsylvania.

James M. Barnett, of New Bloomfield, Perry County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of Pennsylvania.

William T. S. Rollins, of Seat Pleasant, Prince George County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Maryland.

B. Gootee Stevens, of Williston, Caroline County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Maryland.

James L. Allison, of Punxsutawney, Jefferson County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourteenth supervisor's district of Pennsylvania.

Jonathan S. Willis, of Milford, Kent County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of Delaware.

Adolphus H. Harrington, of Frederick, Frederick County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Maryland.

Oscar L. Quinlan, of Baltimore, Baltimore County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Maryland.

POSTMASTERS.

Nannie H. Savage, to be postmaster at Monticello, in the county of Drew and State of Arkansas.

Edward S. Parnell, to be postmaster at Junction, in the county of Union and State of Arkansas.

Joseph P. Balmat, to be postmaster at Conway, in the county of Faulkner and State of Arkansas.

John M. Haggerty, to be postmaster at Houma, in the county of Terrebonne and State of Louisiana.

Louis Desmarais, to be postmaster at Opelousas, in the county of St. Landry and State of Louisiana.

Leon M. Carter, to be postmaster at Shreveport, in the county of Caddo and State of Louisiana.

Joseph Crow, to be postmaster at Omaha, in the county of Douglas and State of Nebraska.

John C. Burch, to be postmaster at Wymore, in the county of Gage and State of Nebraska.

George H. Woolman, to be postmaster at Lake Charles, in the county of Calcasieu and State of Louisiana.

John M. Jones, to be postmaster at Clay Center, in the county of Clay and State of Nebraska.

Leander H. Jewett, to be postmaster at Broken Bow (late Brokenbow), in the county of Custer and State of Nebraska.

Samuel B. Hall, to be postmaster at Ashland, in the county of Saunders and State of Nebraska.

Carl E. Ericson, to be postmaster at El Campo, in the county of Wharton and State of Texas.

David W. Barnhill, to be postmaster at Uvalde, in the county of Uvalde and State of Texas.

Henry C. Russell, to be postmaster at Schuyler, in the county of Colfax and State of Nebraska.

Frederick C. Grothaus, to be postmaster at Victoria, in the county of Victoria and State of Texas.

William H. King, to be postmaster at Whitewright, in the county of Grayson and State of Texas.

James Gipson, to be postmaster at Coleman, in the county of Coleman and State of Texas.

William C. Hurley, to be postmaster at Sulphur Springs, in the county of Hopkins and State of Texas.

Hermann C. Heilig, to be postmaster at Lagrange, in the county of Fayette and State of Texas.

Andrew J. Harrison, to be postmaster at Goldthwaite, in the county of Mills and State of Texas.

Paul Neubauer, to be postmaster at Floresville, in the county of Wilson and State of Texas.

William N. Merritt, to be postmaster at Nocona, in the county of Montague and State of Texas.

Julius Laux, to be postmaster at Flatonia, in the county of Fayette and State of Texas.

Isham Russell, to be postmaster at Winnsboro, in the county of Wood and State of Texas.

Frank H. Pierce, to be postmaster at Laredo, in the county of Webb and State of Texas.

Mary S. Parish, to be postmaster at Huntsville, in the county of Walker and State of Texas.

John S. Snook, to be postmaster at Caldwell, in the county of Burleson and State of Texas.

Joel B. Sharpe, to be postmaster at Brownsville, in the county of Cameron and State of Texas.

Philemon A. Schaefer, to be postmaster at Georgetown, in the county of Williamson and State of Texas.

Benjamin P. Gay, to be postmaster at Smithfield, in the county of Isle of Wight and State of Virginia.

William C. Ellett, to be postmaster at Blacksburg, in the county of Montgomery and State of Virginia.

George H. Sparenberg, to be postmaster at Big Spring, in the county of Howard and State of Texas.

George W. France, to be postmaster at Hoquiam, in the county of Chehalis and State of Washington.

John B. Cromwell, to be postmaster at Tacoma, in the county of Pierce and State of Washington.

Charles R. Bell, to be postmaster at Aberdeen, in the county of Chehalis and State of Washington.

William W. Clarke, to be postmaster at Milton, in the county of Rock and State of Wisconsin.

Ralph E. Arnold, to be postmaster at Fairchild, in the county of Eauclaire and State of Wisconsin.

John Stack, to be postmaster at Republic, in the county of Ferry and State of Washington.

Mary C. Darby, to be postmaster at Wilmington, in the county of New Hanover and State of North Carolina.

Frederic A. Meyer, to be postmaster at Boscobel, in the county of Grant and State of Wisconsin.

Emile C. Duval, to be postmaster at West De Pere, in the county of Brown and State of Wisconsin.

George A. Hibbard, to be postmaster at Boston, in the county of Suffolk and State of Massachusetts.

Philip H. Lybrook, to be postmaster at Winston-Salem (late Winston), in the county of Forsyth and State of North Carolina.

Emily W. Fagan, to be postmaster at Plymouth, in the county of Washington and State of North Carolina.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *December 14, 1899.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. MCALEER, a Representative-elect from the State of Pennsylvania, appeared at the bar of the House and was sworn in by the Speaker.

MONTHLY ACCOUNTS OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration and passage of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill for the information of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts by bureaus and offices of the War Department.

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for examination of monthly accounts by the bureaus and offices of the War Department after the date of actual receipt and before transmitting the same to the Auditor for the War Department, as limited by section 12 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved July 31, 1894, is hereby extended from twenty days to sixty days for the period of one year from the date of the passage of this act.

Mr. HULL. One word in explanation.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I hope the gentleman can show that there

is an immediate necessity for the passage of this bill. It modifies existing law, it has been to no committee, and has not been considered in the usual way, and unless there is a pressing emergency for the bill I do not think it ought to pass.

Mr. HULL. Unless there was a pressing emergency, there would be no excuse for offering it. I have copies of the letters from the Secretary of War and officers of bureaus asking for the immediate passage of the bill. The original letters were sent to the Speaker and from there were sent to the Committee on Military Affairs when appointed, and from that committee to the printer, so that the originals are not in my possession. The proposition is to reenact the law that was enacted on the 5th of last January, which extended the time for passing these accounts. The law expires on the 5th day of next January. We shall adjourn to meet on the 3d of January, and unless the act is passed the effect will be this: the accounts coming in from Manila, from Puerto Rico, and from Cuba and all parts of the Government where the Army is stationed will be tied up; and while it does not suspend the officer, it does prevent his transacting any further business until his accounts are passed.

So if we do not pass this bill the paymasters, the quartermasters, the commissaries, and all their bureaus will be held up until the accounts for the current month are passed. The Auditor for the War Department has notified the War Department that he will insist on a strict compliance with the twenty-day law. So unless we pass this bill it will be impossible for the paymaster to pay a regiment; it will be impossible for the commissary to furnish food; it will be impossible for the paymaster to furnish a tent or supplies of any kind until his accounts for that current month are passed. They could not even put on a large force of clerks to do it because they would be raw men.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I was about to ask if this bill made any increase in the amount that will be paid.

Mr. HULL. Not at all. By passing it it leaves the force just as it is. By not passing it, if they could utilize more clerks, it might be possible to get through in the twenty days.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I understood the gentleman from Iowa to say that he had conferred with the members of the minority of the Committee on Military Affairs in the last House, and that there was no objection on their part.

Mr. HULL. I did. I could not find the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COX], but I conferred with the gentlemen from New York, from Ohio, and from Illinois.

Mr. JETT. The gentleman from Iowa called my attention to it yesterday morning, and from my standpoint I can see no objection to the passage of the bill, because I deem it necessary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and accordingly it was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HULL, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Leave of absence was granted to Mr. CAMPBELL for three weeks, on account of important business.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with the special order the House will resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1, and the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. HEPBURN, will take the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill H. R. 1. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COX] is recognized for forty minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, under the arrangement which has been made I believe I have had ceded to me forty minutes of time?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

[Mr. COX addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I am sufficiently modest to say that in addressing this honorable House I do not expect to change the sentiment of the House upon the pending bill. In fact, I know I will not be discourteous to any member if I say that no speech that has been made or will be made on either side of the Chamber on this question will have that effect.

The opinions of the different political parties of the House are firmly fixed, but it is our duty to speak to the American people on the issues that so vitally affect them, and speak plainly so that they may understand, for it is not for this Congress to decide issues finally, but it is for the people themselves.

I am forcibly impressed with the fickleness of political parties. Had the Republican party framed in its platform of 1896, three years ago, the declarations contained in the currency bill now before the House, no such bill would be here for consideration, for the Republican minority would be so small in the House that it would be useless and ineffective, and instead of President McKinley occupying the high position that he now occupies, another gentleman would be in that place. I refer to the Hon. William Jennings Bryan, of Nebraska. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I am profoundly astonished at the Republican party, both for their fickleness, insincerity, and want of conviction and for their lack of statesmanship in failing to see and know what is good for the people and what is wanted by the country. Only a few years ago President McKinley and his entire party were shouting and clamoring for both silver and gold, domestic or otherwise; a little later on they stood for international bimetallism, and now they are as devotedly advocating the single gold standard. The Republican party has taken all the views on the currency question. They have boldly advocated every position. They have traveled all the routes. They have begun at one end of the financial road and landed at the other. Can the people of the country afford to confide in a party whose views are so unfixed and changing? Is the Republican party so shortsighted as to grope along in the darkness, hoping to touch the right and popular chord?

Mr. Chairman, I am glad the issue has at last been made. I am glad to know that the Republican party has made its last running retreat; that they have taken their true stand on the financial question, hoisted their flag, the colors of which can not now be changed, and that they must leave it to be upheld or hauled down by the American people in 1900. This all-important question should be settled for all time to come, and the people only can settle it. The constant agitation and the changes of political policies have done commerce and business relations generally great harm, and the sooner the issue can squarely and fairly be met and determined the better it will be for the country. I am glad that the issue is boiled down to its last analysis and that the question has been made whether this Government shall adopt the single gold standard, pure and simple, or not. I invite the issue and willingly submit it to the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the pending bill. I see no justification for it and no reason for its enactment except as a political measure. When the President now occupying his position in the White House came into power three years ago all of our currency was on a parity and every dollar was as good as any other dollar. The same is true to-day. Where is the difference? I ask gentlemen. Then the bill has no purpose save the one which has not been declared by gentlemen on the other side. The real purpose in the bill is to make the debts of the country, both governmental and private, payable in gold coin, and another purpose is to give to the national banks of the country greater and more far-reaching power.

Mr. Chairman, our gold is in no danger when domestic complications only afflict us. There is no danger that can arise from internal troubles with regard to it. We all know that our people do not care to handle gold for exchange or as pocket money. It is too heavy, too inconvenient. Gold is not wanted by the people. There is no better evidence of that fact than is to be found in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury himself, showing that it was necessary to issue gold certificates during the last year to meet the wants of the people and the wants of trade. There was not enough of paper money in circulation, and the Secretary of the Treasury acceded to the wishes and demands of the people throughout the country and issued gold certificates which were available for the purposes of trade.

Speaking, sir, for my own people, for the people of the State of Georgia, whom I have the honor, in part, to represent on this floor, I can say with absolute safety that they do not want to handle gold, because it is bulky, undesirable, and inconvenient in business transactions. Whenever currency has been shipped to the South to move our crops, it is not in gold, but it is in paper currency, available for use throughout the land, in all parts of it. Gold is not available; it does not pay to ship it; it is undesirable by the people and by the banks in Georgia, and undesirable to the sellers of our cotton crop. Therefore gold is not desired and is not used. What is the evidence that the people do not want gold as a money of circulation in the country? I think that fact is clearly shown by the condition of the Treasury at the present time, and the small quantity of gold in circulation amongst the people. When I tell you that we have in the Treasury millions upon millions of dollars of gold, more than we have ever had in years before, it is a conclusive proof that gold does not circulate amongst the people. It shows that they do not want it.

We talk of the "protection of the parity" of our metallic and other circulating money in this country. Mr. Chairman, that parity needs no protection from home disturbances and unsettled home forces. The only thing that can disturb that parity is an adverse balance of foreign trade to us.

Let us go back to 1893, when we had our great trouble with gold in this country, when gold was leaving the country, and there was serious apprehension in the minds of our financiers that we would have difficulty in meeting the obligations which

rested upon gold. What was the difficulty at that time? Why, then we had not only a home demand for gold, so to speak, but we found our reserve being rapidly destroyed by home overspeculation and the balance of trade throughout the world, which was against us in 1893 to the extent of many millions of dollars, thereby causing our gold to go abroad, while in 1892, the year previous, when the high-water mark of prosperity was reached, and the conditions were reversed and gold was in the Treasury, we find that the balance of trade in our favor that year was more than $202,000,000.

In the year 1893, this great balance being against us, more than $100,000,000 in gold flowed from this country. As I say, home panics and home troubles will not cause gold to leave us, and I dare say to-day—although I have no intention or desire to be considered an alarmist, but, on the other hand, would rather be always an upbuilder, because I always desire to see the country grow and go forward rather than go backward—I believe it to be true that we are upon the verge of a panic in the United States at this very day, and especially in the East. Go back and look at the clearing-house statements of the associated banks in New York City for the last ninety days.

The banks have been under a most tremendous strain. Money has loaned within the last sixty days, for one day, at as high a rate as 40 per cent per annum, and on many days it has reached a rate as high as 12 or 15 per cent per annum. What higher evidence could there be that those banks have been strained than the fact that within the last ninety days they have lost more than $100,000,000 of deposits, and consequently have had to call in their call loans to the amount of more than $100,000,000? They have loaned down to low-water mark. They have kept barely enough reserve balances to comply with the law. It appears that they have violated the law and gone below the legal reserve. What stronger evidence is needed that there is a great stringency among the associated banks of New York than that they have called upon the Secretary of the Treasury to come to their rescue, as he did come to their rescue by going to New York and purchasing $25,000,000 worth of bonds within the last two weeks?

I see from yesterday's paper that the moneyed institutions of New York have called upon him further to anticipate the January interest and pay it out now, in order further to relieve the great strain pressing upon them. What is the cause of that? It is the same as in 1893—overtrading, overspeculation; but it comes from a different source at this time than it did in 1893. Then it was by the country at large, but that is not the fact now. There is no overspeculation in the South and West, but it is confined to the East. It comes from the organization of these great trust combinations which are forming. For what purpose do they form? For two purposes. They are not associating themselves together for the simple purpose of building up prices of commodities to force the great masses of the people to pay higher prices, but they have another object in view. They form these great organizations of capital and water their stock, largely for the purpose of getting upon the market and putting immense speculative fortunes into their pockets by means of these combinations.

These securities, amounting to billions of dollars, are now afloat in all our moneyed centers. They are being carried largely by the banks, by the insurance companies, and, in fact, by all moneyed institutions. And I will say, to the credit of these associated banks, that were it not for their kindness toward these large wild-cat trust organizations I dare say that many of them to-day would be broken down and we should have a panic all over this country such as we have never had in the history of the nation. Why, the banks of New York to-day are loaned down to their last dollar, and I can truly say that the South has nearly all of its money in the city banks of New York. It has ten dollars on deposit with the associated banks of New York where it owes those banks one dollar. Supposing this situation had come in the summer, when the West and the South needed this money? But the South and the West do not need it now, because they have sent their commodities into the market and our money has gone East.

Therefore the great absorbing element at the present time consists of these wild-cat trust organizations, whose stocks are known as industrial stocks. Now, suppose that with this terrible strain upon us the trade balance of the world was against us, as it was in 1893, and we should have to send gold abroad to pay the balance, I reiterate, we should have one of the greatest panics known in the history of this country. But that situation does not exist. On the other hand, I am proud to say, and it proves my theory, that the trade of the world is in our favor. Let me state that there are only about $4,000,000,000 in gold in the entire world, and there is a great scramble among the nations of the world for this gold.

The money powers of the world, as soon as they see any indication of distress or weakness in a nation, begin to make inroads to acquire the gold of that nation. That was our situation in 1893. But as long as the trade balance is in our favor we are safe. In 1898 the trade balance in our favor amounted to the immense sum of $617,432,676, and in 1899 it amounted to $528,000,000. With these immense trade balances in our favor this country is safe, and we never can have any such trouble as we had in 1893 in the way of demands for our gold from the outside. And, by the way, I want to say that I am proud of the fact that the South and the West contribute largely to the exports which go to make up that magnificent trade balance in our favor.

The South sends her cotton, that is worth from two to three hundred millions per annum; the West sends its wheat, creating the great trade balance in our favor, and, I am proud to say also, our great manufacturing interests have sent more of their goods abroad than ever before in the history of the country. Therefore I maintain that the only time that we may anticipate any trouble with our gold is when the balance of trade is against us. Keep our foreign trade all right, and our money is right. We will never have any trouble with our local money in this country.

To show the wonderful changes in the trade balances, which mean so much to this Government, I beg to submit a table from 1887 to the present time, inclusive:

Year ending—	Total imports.	Total exports.	Balance.	
			In our favor.	Against us.
1887	$902,319,768	$716,183,211	$23,863,443	
1888	723,957,114	695,954,507		$28,002,607
1889	745,131,652	742,401,375		2,730,277
1890	789,310,409	857,828,684	68,518,275	
1891	844,916,196	884,480,810	39,564,614	
1892	827,402,462	1,030,278,148	202,875,686	
1893	866,400,922	847,665,194		18,735,728
1894	654,994,622	892,140,572	237,145,950	
1895	731,969,965	807,538,165	75,568,200	
1896	779,724,674	882,606,938	102,882,264	
1897	764,730,412	1,050,993,556	286,263,144	
1898	616,049,654	1,231,482,330	615,432,676	
1899	697,148,489	1,227,023,302	529,874,813	

The prime cause of the good condition of our country is our splendid trade abroad, sending so much more than we bring back from foreign lands.

There is a provision in the present bill for the establishment of a division of the Treasury Department, known as a division of issue and redemption, making two departments of the Treasury. I think it is claptrap. It reminds us of two doll houses. So long as the trade balance is in our favor we do not need any such division in the Treasury. Suppose the state of affairs were changed, and instead of $529,000,000 in our favor the balance of trade were against us, what would become of this little division scheme? I repeat, it would be looked upon as a mere doll house, to be swept away by the first financial storm.

This bill instead of protecting the Treasury is throwing dangers about it. The proposition to increase the powers of the national banks is un-American, unjust to the whole people, unsound, and inconsistent with the commercial independence and liberty of the people. It creates an alliance between the banks and the Treasury, the heretofore supposed peoples' Treasury, to the detriment of the Treasury. It makes the one dependent on the other, or rather makes the Treasury dependent on the national banks and gives the banks more power and independence. The Treasury has no power to hurt the banks, but the banks have ample power to damage the Treasury.

The bill strikes down nearly one-half of the standard money of this country when it strikes silver. I find that we have $876,000,000 of gold in the United States, but it is a fact that there are $1,400,000,000 of all other kinds of money that becomes dependent on the single gold standard. Therefore, in taking silver away, one of the standard moneys, we are throwing down some of the protection now afforded and thereby increasing the burden upon gold. Gold has to carry the burden of maintaining all this money. Your bill goes on to say that our money must be kept on a parity, every dollar with each other dollar, and it permits the Secretary of the Treasury, at his discretion, to redeem any of it in gold; consequently that makes every dollar of our money redeemable in gold.

Another drawback to the bill is that it will require more money in the Treasury at all times. It demands that an amount of gold and bullion, to constitute a reserve fund equal to 25 per cent of the amount, both of United States notes and Treasury notes issued under act of July 14, 1890, outstanding, shall be held in the division of issue and redemption. I will dare say that this reserve fund will amount upon an average to $110,000,000. Then the amount required to be kept in the general department of the Treasury is $50,000,000 in gold, making a total of $160,000,000 in gold that you must have at all times to answer the requirements of the bill.

I will not say more upon that line, as I want to call attention to another point. I look upon the most dangerous part of the bill to be the power given to a national bank to increase its circulation. Under the present law they are given the power of issuing

$240,000,000 to $250,000,000 of circulating notes. Under this bill where banks have a capital of $150,000 they are to carry 25 per cent of their capital in circulating notes. Banks above $150,000 capital are only required to issue $50,000 of circulation. Now a large bank, say of $2,000,000 capital, is only required to issue $50,000 in circulation. But the bill permits these banks to issue to the entire amount of their capital, of course provided the bonds are deposited as required by the bill. Upon investigation I find that we have in this country at the present moment 3,595 national banks, with a total capital, surplus, and accrued profits of $956,000,000. This bill permits these banks to issue to the extent of that capital.

Now you see how they can fluctuate the quantity of the money of this country. I do not mean to say that they are going to take advantage of the power that we give them, but are we willing to sit down and be helpless and say that they shall have that power? It is not American-like to do so. These banks under this bill are permitted to issue as a minimum amount of circulating notes $102,000,000; on the other hand, they are permitted to issue as a maximum amount $956,000,000. See how they can contract or inflate the currency of this country. There is the danger by which they can ebb and flow the amount of their own notes $852,000,000. The fluctuation that they can produce in the issue of the national-bank notes amounts to as much as there is gold in the United States. Now, why shall we confer this great power on the national banks? I believe it is wrong and unnecessary, and I do not believe the American people are willing to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is wrong to place this power in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury to buy and sell bonds. It looks to me as if it is humbling that great and honored Treasury Department of this country, and while we are adding two departments to the Treasury where heretofore we had only one, why not go further and add a third? Why not establish a brokerage department in the Treasury, and place a sign over the door and tell that "We buy and sell bonds here"? For that is what our Government is doing now. Last year the Secretary sold $200,000,000 worth of bonds, and what has he done in the last ten days or two weeks and is doing now? He is going into the markets and buying them back for the Treasury Department.

Then, truly, we are getting our Treasury at a low point, putting it into the jobbing business to compete with the bond speculators of this country.

Let me say something about the bonds. Who owns the bonds? Who controls them? I have tried to ascertain who owns the war bonds, what percentage the national banks own, but I have been unsuccessful in getting that information. I do, however, get a certain amount of information; and, based upon that, I dare say that the national banks in this country own three-quarters or seven-eighths of the war bonds. Upon investigation I find stored in the Treasury Department of our Government by the national banks $62,352,360 of those 1898 war bonds, stored by national banks to secure circulation. In addition to that I discover deposited in the Treasury $24,672,340 to secure deposits from the Government by the national banks, making a total of $77,030,200 stored by the national banks. They must at least own three-quarters or seven-eighths of that issue.

Let me take up the history of bonds issued by the Government since 1894 until the present time and see how the people have fared.

There were sold under the provisions of the war-revenue act approved June 13, 1898, $198,678,720 in bonds. These bonds were sold not in compliance with the law, but in direct opposition to it, as President McKinley conclusively demonstrates in his message to Congress. The law expressly requires that the bonds shall only be sold as the proceeds may be needed to defray the expenditures of the war. The books of the Treasury Department show that at the time these bonds were sold there was over $100,000,000 surplus over and above the one hundred millions required for the reserve fund.

The present cash balance in the Treasury above the $100,000,000 reserve fund being $186,636,998.95, demonstrates clearly that not one dollar of the proceeds of the bonds has ever been necessary, nor has it in fact ever been used. The President, in his message, shows that next year there will be a surplus in the actual receipts of the Government, and therefore the proceeds of the bonds never will be used. It would appear that the haste of the Secretary of the Treasury in disposing of these bonds was caused by a well-grounded fear that the occasion for selling them under the law would never arise, and that if he did not dispose of them then he would never have an opportunity of doing so. The bankers wanted to draw $6,000,000 a year interest out of the United States Treasury, and, submissive to their will, the Administration, openly defying the law, which authorized the issuance of bonds only in case of necessity, has paid the bankers the $6,000,000 a year demanded by them for money which has lain idle in the Treasury ever since it was placed there.

This loan was to be a "popular loan." This fact was heralded throughout the country and was made the subject of many speeches in Congress and on the hustings. It was reported after the loan was made that the bankers had not secured the bonds, but that they had gone to the people. Experience since that time has demonstrated that the banks had their depositors and friends largely to buy up the bonds, and it would be difficult now to find individual holders of these Government securities; but, as I have said, I believe the national banks hold three-fourths to seven-eighths of these bonds.

On December 8 these bonds were quoted in New York at 110¼. At this figure the income is 1⅛ per cent. At this price they find ready sale. The entire issue could be sold in New York at the present figure. This means that the United States Government can borrow all the money that it wants at 1⅛ per cent. This is what capitalists are willing to take and the price at which the banks can obtain the money with which to buy bonds, and they then secure from the United States Government a profit of more than 100 per cent per year.

In other words, the banks pay for interest on $200,000,000 loan $3,750,000, and the Government pays $6,000,000, leaving $2,250,000 a year clear profit to the banks. It is not necessary that the banks should invest a dollar of capital. They can borrow the money, buy the bonds, and draw $2,250,000 a year for their trouble in writing a letter making a bid.

This does not constitute all of the profits secured by the banks upon an issue of bonds. Two hundred million dollars in bonds sold at par are now worth $1.10 for each $1. This is a profit to the banks in the bonds themselves outside of any consideration of the amounts paid in interest of over $20,000,000.

Treasury Circular No. 123 contains the following information concerning the prior issues of bonds since 1894:

The presentation of United States notes for redemption prior to 1893 was not great enough to reduce the reserve fund below $100,000,000; in April of that year, however, the minimum was reached, and the fund became so low that in February, 1894, an issue of bonds became necessary to enable the Government to restore the gold reserve and redeem the obligations of the United States. Accordingly, popular subscriptions were invited for an issue of $50,000,000 of ten-year 5 per cent bonds, which were dated February 1, 1894, and realized to the Government $58,633,295 in gold. In November, 1894, another issue of $50,000,000 of the same class of bonds was necessary, the sum realized being $58,538,500. In February, 1895, the Government was again obliged to replenish the gold reserve, which it did by the purchase, under contract, of 3,500,000 ounces of gold coin, which were paid for with United States 4 per cent thirty-year bonds, amounting to $62,315,400. Another sale of $100,000,000 of 4 per cent thirty-year bonds was made through popular subscriptions, invited in January, 1896. The total amount of bonds thus issued since 1893 to protect the gold reserve was $262,315,400, and the total proceeds thereof, in gold coin, was $293,451,286.74.

The amount of United States bonds outstanding July 1, 1896, was as follows:

4½ per cent bonds continued at 2 per cent	$25,364,500
4 per cent bonds of 1907	559,636,850
5 per cent bonds of 1904	100,000,000
4 per cent bonds of 1925	162,315,400
Total	847,316,750

The same bonds which the Government sold for $293,454,286.74 would cost in the market to-day, according to the quotation of Fisk & Robinson, on December 8, $349,753,866, making a profit to the banks of $36,299,580.

During President Harrison's Administration the interest-bearing debt of the United States was $585,029,330. The noninterest-bearing debt was $1,000,648,939.37. In the Treasury statement of the public debt for the month of November, 1899, the interest-bearing debt has been increased to $1,037,049,690. The noninterest-bearing debt has been decreased to $398,048,760.16. The proposition in the currency bill is to wipe out this noninterest-bearing debt by replacing it with interest-bearing debt. The interest paid by the United States Government in 1892 was $22,893,883.25. The interest paid for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899, was $39,896,925.02. The debt of the United States has not been increased since 1892, while the interest charge has been nearly doubled and will be more than doubled by the time the purposes of this bill are carried out. The United States Government had no creditors who were clamorous for their money. Its creditors to whom no interest was paid were entirely satisfied. But under the new theory of statecraft it is urged most strenuously that unless we pay interest upon all the debts we owe we are ruined.

If a merchant in solvent condition should become imbued with the idea that his financial salvation depended upon his being allowed to pay interest to those creditors who did not want interest, an application for a writ of lunacy would be granted by any court in Christendom. This extra $20,000,000 a year, in round numbers, that we are now paying in interest above the amount we paid in 1892 is a subsidy to the banks pure and simple and is not based upon any sound principle of finance.

In December, 1892, President Harrison, in his annual message, called the attention of Congress to the great prosperity which the people of the United States were then enjoying. It is a fact that all of the leading commercial papers make comparisons of prosperity with the year 1892, that being considered universally the high-water mark of national prosperity.

Three months later $61,000,000 in gold was exported from the

United States. The banks presented certificates at the United States Treasury and withdrew the gold for exportation. This caused the reserve to fall very rapidly and alarmed the Administration and the business world. The reason for the withdrawal of the gold was the fact that the United States was the only nation, except Russia, which at that time had a surplus of gold. Germany had, a few years before, adopted a single gold standard, and at that time Austria-Hungary did the same. This created an unprecedented demand for gold in Europe, and the United States, being the only nation from which the gold could be procured, had it to furnish.

Seeing in prospective a large profit to be made, as it has been made, out of the issuance of national bonds, a committee of New York bankers called upon President Cleveland and Secretary Carlisle and convinced them that some drastic measure was absolutely necessary. They had themselves created the scarcity of gold and had shipped more than the conditions of business would warrant for the reason that there was an alluring profit to the banks in the shipment of the gold. The Government issued certificates similar in nature to clearing-house certificates, and practically made the United States Treasury a branch clearing house for the New York banks. This did not help matters, because it created an endless-chain arrangement, which continues to deplete the gold reserve in the National Treasury.

The trouble was that the banks in New York had sent away their gold until they had depleted their reserve, and there was no way except by depleting the United States Treasury to restore the gold in the banks that had been shipped to Europe. It had to come from some place, and the United States Treasury was the only place where there was any gold. A special session of Congress was called, the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act was repealed, and bonds were authorized. As soon as the bonds were authorized New York bankers again visited the President, who had been so frightened by what they had told him before that he easily believed them when they told him that the condition of the country was such that a popular bond issue could not be floated, but they would take the bonds, secure the money abroad, and thus replace the gold that had been withdrawn from the Treasury without calling upon any of the American banks to supply it.

To the astonishment of everyone, as soon as this reasonable-looking proposition was accepted, it was found that there was not only enough gold to pay for the bonds, but that this purchase netted the men who made it a little over $8,000,000 in twenty-four hours. The bonds were in active demand at a very considerable advance the day after their issuance. The problem was solved. All that banks required to keep up their gold reserves was to buy bonds from the United States Government, and all that the United States Government required to keep up its gold reserve was to sell bonds to the banks.

Mr. Chairman, I give this history of the bond issues within the past five years, including last year, to show the profits made from Government bond sales, which profits are enjoyed by the few and paid by the many.

Mr. Chairman, I will not discuss the bill further, but I trust soon to see the financial questions of this country settled finally and settled in accordance with the wishes of the great mass of the people of this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, that this bill will pass in this House seems to be a foregone conclusion; but before it shall be done I desire to record my profound and conscientious opposition to its provisions.

During all the years of my Congressional service I have stood firmly against what it contemplates, and nothing has occurred to change the deliberate convictions I have formed and uniformly sustained by vote and voice with all the earnestness of my nature.

I shall not essay elaborate argument, but will attempt to epitomize a few essential objections, which, however, have already been better stated than I can hope to do.

It is proposed to now do openly what it is charged and believed was covertly attempted to be done more than a quarter of a century ago and which, when discovered, quickened the resentment and aroused the righteous indignation of the whole country.

It is proposed by positive enactment to degrade, if not destroy, one of the great constitutional money metals of the centuries and to narrow and weaken the foundation upon which rests the superstructure of our paper currency.

One-half of the basis of redemption is to be removed and the work and doctrines and interpretations of the ablest statesmen and constitutional expositors of bygone years are to be swept away as with the besom of destruction. The ancient landmarks are to be obliterated. Old principles are to be repudiated. Reverence for the fathers is to be no more.

Oh, what a radical, cruel, and far-reaching iconoclasm is about to be perpetrated, and with what indecent haste is the rush to its accomplishment! The unit of value sanctioned by the best thought and research of our sires and the experience and "reason of strength" of fourscore years is to be cast out as vile and unworthy to occupy the place to which it was originally assigned in our monetary system.

There is to be no obscuration of its discredit and no incertitude as to its degradation. While it is insisted that it is already down and lying helpless before its enemies and its face drawn up in death, yet lethal missiles must be hurled in and upon its pallid corpse. It must be crucified afresh. Dead men tell no tales. Fear you a resurrection? Entomb it if you will, mount your guards, station your soldiers, but know ye that your custody of it will be temporary and that bimetallism, the vital principle it represents, will live again, and know further that for what you do now you shall yet be brought to judgment!

It is proposed to change the obligation of contracts, public and private, and, moved by the clamor of ex parte insistence, to insert through statutory force in such contracts words and stipulations never contemplated by the parties to them, and, in violation of solemn covenants and declarations, to destroy the equities of debtors without their consent. The amount "nominated in the bond" is insufficient; the "pound of flesh" is not enough; the severity must be intensified; the yoke must be made harder, the burden heavier. In all good conscience and by all the rules and proprieties of honest civilization and fair dealing among men, I deny the right of Government and the function of legislation to add a single grain to the weight of preexisting debt or to superimpose an additional burden to the back of toil.

It seems to me that the inevitable effect of the passage of this bill will be to contract the money supply and to reduce the circulation, to make the medium of exchange scarcer and thereby more difficult to obtain, and I assert, as a postulate of common and grievous experience and historic truth, that scarce money means hard times the world over. But it is contended that the genesis of the gold mines will meet any contraction that may ensue and that favorable balances of trade will continue to prevent the exportation of gold. Who knows when the mines will be exhausted or their yield diminished? Who knows when drought and disaster shall come upon us, when the crops shall fail, when the "rain of the land shall be powder and dust, and the heavens shall be as brass and the earth as iron," and the labor of the husbandman shall not avail? I beg the authors and supporters of this bill that they will not permit their optimism to turn their heads, and admonish them that it is neither safe nor wise to depend upon roseate views of the future. Good times and hard times have chased each other since the world began. It is the prudent thing to anticipate and provide against calamity.

It is proposed to confer upon the Secretary of the Treasury the authority to issue at his discretion bonds payable in gold. This is a dangerous power with which to invest any officer of the Government. Some of us have not forgotten how such discretionary power has been exercised in utter disregard of what we believed to be the true interests of the people and contrary to the spirit and intention of the law. The man does not live, Democrat or Republican, into whose hands I would be willing to confide such authority. Bond issues and the circumstances attending them will always constitute a dark chapter in our public annals.

It is proposed to increase the dominion of the national banks over the finances of the country. To this I am unalterably opposed.

Finally, it is proposed to overturn every contention for which the great majority of the Democratic party has stood in all the years in so far as the subject-matter of the bill relates to the same, and to fully establish the sway of money over man. I should do violence to my honest conclusions, contradict my past record and utterances, and, from my standpoint, aid in the infliction of unmeasured evils upon my country, if I were to do otherwise than to oppose and protest against the passage of this bill. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, that unparalleled activity prevails in all lines of commerce and production seems to be conceded by all members of this House. It is not necessary to go to statistical tables to discover the revival of business conditions throughout the country. The story may be read in the faces of the multitude. Let one who was familiar with the conditions, with the downcast expression of the people in the late business crisis, go through the country now and he will be impressed with a marked change. During that melancholy experience you could read the awful story of misfortune and distress on every brow, but to-day you can see the sign of buoyant hope beaming from every countenance. That remarkable transformation is a subject worthy of the time and attention of the psychologist as well as the statesman.

Our friends on the other side of the Chamber are willing to concede that a marvelous change came over the country in a very short period, but they will not admit that it was the result of Republican success even in a slight degree. They charge all the

misfortunes of the people to the Republican party and give the Lord credit for all the blessings that come. We have the argument of coincidence, and that ought to prevail over the general assertion that the country is prosperous in spite of, and not on account of, the present Administration, especially when we keep in mind the fact that times have always been good when Republican policies were being administered. No one was able to say that times were good during the late Democratic Administration in spite of the policy of the party then in power.

Under the first Administration of President Cleveland the country enjoyed a fair degree of prosperity, and the people were led to believe that Democratic success was not a menace to the business interests of the country as the Republican orators had so earnestly insisted, and in 1892, in an hour of thoughtlessness, they gave him another term. This time he was supported by a Democratic Congress in both branches, and for the first time for over thirty years that party was permitted to take charge of the vast interests of the country. We all know the result; and if the people gathered any wisdom from that melancholy experience, it will be more than thirty years before we have another Democratic Administration. It is easy to understand now why the first Cleveland Administration was a success. The Congress was Republican in one or both branches all the time, and the President was obliged to administer Republican laws and policies, so he could not do much injury. But when all departments of the Government were under Democratic control, the Lord departed from Israel and distress and destitution possessed the whole land. No Republican rose in his place on this floor then and said, "The land is blessed notwithstanding your party policies."

Many of us believe that the crisis of 1893 was either precipitated or aggravated by infirmities in the revenue and financial policies threatened at that time, and in my judgment it would be almost a criminal omission for this Administration, at this time of unequaled prosperity, to fail to correct those infirmities. We have already disposed of the revenue question with acknowledged success, and we now have before us a question of no less importance, looking to certain reforms in the currency system. The bill under consideration will correct some fundamental weaknesses in our system that were made conspicuous by their capacity for mischief a few short years ago. Our friends on the other side of the Chamber predict dire calamity to the country as the result of the legislation now proposed. They even go so far as to say that if the bill shall become a law it will result in another Democratic Administration. I confess, sir, that no greater misfortune than that could be conceived of. [Applause on the Republican side.]

If the bill can have any possible influence in promoting the candidacy of the idol of the Democratic heart, that great political necromancer from Nebraska, it could only be upon the theory that it would operate as a legislative strait-jacket and minimize his capacity for evil if he should become President. It might tend to assure the country against the danger of free silver even with a Democratic President, and there might seem less occasion to use that vigilance necessary to keep the Government in safe hands. I hope that after a few years we will have the affairs of the country on so firm a basis that it would not be wrecked by a Democratic President, though I have no thought that the people seriously contemplate such an eventuality. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The bill is simple in its provisions and it does not go beyond that which seems reasonably required by the situation. Deference must always be had to the customs and business habits of the people and only such changes made in legislation vitally affecting the important interests of the country as the conditions seem ripe for. There is no need now for any sweeping and radical reforms in banking and currency laws, and if adopted they would seriously disturb the healthy conditions that now prevail, for a time, at least. But since we have discovered elements of weakness in our currency system, we owe it to the country to correct those defects so far as it is in our power to do so, and wait for time to bring about other changes that may become necessary. They must come by natural growth, the slow and unerring process of evolution. Gentlemen decry the gold standard and expatiate upon the virtues of bimetallism. The gold standard seems still to be the nightmare of the Democratic party.

A superficial examination of the provisions of this bill will convince every fair mind that it will effect no change in the currency standard, but its purpose is simply to enact into law that which has been the administrative policy of the Government for the last quarter of a century. If it shall become a law a free-silver President could not put the currency of the country on a silver basis without the cooperation of both branches of Congress. Bimetallism is a fallacy, and every student of economic history must know it. We have had two bimetallic laws under which both gold and silver could be coined upon equal terms, and there has never been a day or an hour in the history of this Government when American gold and American silver traveled side by side in the channels of trade under a free-coinage law. It is an absolute and utter impossibility, and gentlemen who talk about bimetallism under a free-coinage policy at the arbitrary ratio of 16 to 1 mean a monometallic silver currency; that and nothing less. It can have no other possible operation.

The purpose of this bill is to put the country on a gold standard by legislation, so that a hostile Administration in future years can not disturb business conditions. We can not, by legislation, fix the standard of value. That is fixed by laws beyond the power of this body to repeal or change. But Congress has the power to impart to money its legal-tender quality, and in that lies the importance of this whole question. The fear that a free-silver Administration might discharge the obligations of the Government in a cheap currency is a constant menace to the commercial and industrial world. But this measure does not take away the legal-tender quality of greenbacks or silver. Those forms of money are still a full legal tender for the payment of all private debts and ordinary public demands in the same manner as under the present law, but they are to be more firmly anchored to gold, with the view of preserving their parity. Money has three prime functions, we are told by scientific economists. It is a medium of exchange, a denominator of value, and a means for the payment of debt.

It is in relation to the last function that the importance of this bill may be discovered. It provides that debts shall be paid in the same kind of money that was contemplated by the parties at the time the debts were made. It provides that Government bonds and Treasury notes shall be paid in gold, and this is said to be unfair because it discriminates in favor of the bondholders. There can be no discrimination as long as all forms of our currency are kept at a common parity. The bondholder has been paid in gold ever since resumption became a fact. This bill creates no change in the practice of the Government in that particular.

Gentlemen tell us that the Government creditor and the private creditor stand upon an equal footing, when a moment's reflection will demonstrate to any fair mind that that is a stupid fallacy. It must be kept in mind that the Government is sovereign and gives money its legal-tender power, and if it should insist upon the right to coin money at will and compel its creditors to accept whatever was so coined in satisfaction of their demands, the public credit would be infinitely lower than it is to-day. Imagine, if you can, the case of a private debtor having the power to issue money and make it a legal tender. His creditor would insist upon the right to stipulate in the contract the character of money in which the obligation should be discharged or there would be no contract. No government that does not pay its obligations in the best money of the world can maintain its credit. [Applause on the Republican side.] That is the vital principle in this bill.

Gentlemen tell us that the gold dollar has appreciated; that prices have gone down. I concede that the tendency for the last twenty-five years has been toward lower prices, but as a rule that has been a legitimate tendency. It has come about mainly from natural industrial development, the perfection of productive methods, and when the comforts and conveniences of life may be had more cheaply as the result of natural industrial growth it is the very highest evidence of prosperity. It brings to the homes and to the lives of our people more of the comforts and blessings that we all live to enjoy. In 1896, when the political soothsayers met at Chicago and fulminated the new Democratic creed, the dollar had taken on considerable unnecessary adipose. It was clumsy and disinclined to activity, for it had taken no kind of exercise for several years, and that was all it needed. [Applause on the Republican side.]

This bill, Mr. Chairman, contains a number of other features, of more or less importance, which I have not the time to discuss elaborately. One is that it creates a division in the Treasury Department of issue and redemption and provides for a segregated redemption fund. Under the present system the redemption fund consists simply of a general balance in the Treasury, and is liable for the payment of common obligations against the Government. A permanent redemption fund should be provided in order that our obligations and paper currency may be redeemed upon presentation without question or quibble.

The bill also confers power on the Secretary of the Treasury to sell bonds without limit when it shall be necessary to replenish the redemption fund. Gentlemen complain of this arbitrary power; and I confess, Mr. Chairman, that it is a power that it is possible to abuse; but no scheme of government has ever been wrought out by the genius of man that does not repose a large discretion respecting its most important functions in the wisdom and patriotism of its officials. If we are to presume that all men are dishonest, government must be regarded as a failure. If the power that this bill confers upon the Secretary of the Treasury had lodged there during the last Cleveland Administration I believe it would have saved the Government $100,000,000 at least. The vesting of the power is a guaranty that all the resources of the Government are not only pledged but are immediately available for the purposes of maintaining the public credit and is the

highest safeguard against the necessity for ever having to use the power at all.

The bill provides that when greenbacks and Sherman notes shall have been redeemed they shall not be reissued except in exchange for gold. Provision is made, however, for the transfer from the division of issue and redemption to the common fund of any redeemed paper at the discretion of the Secretary, and by this means redeemed paper may get into circulation again. The greenback is the most popular form of currency the country ever had. Every dollar is good the world over, and it is so sacredly associated with the days of our greatest calamity that it is canonized in the hearts of the people. But, notwithstanding all that, during the recent crisis the greenback was the greatest menace to public credit and proved to be a costly form of money. It was used to deplete the gold reserve, and it was a most effective agency in that work. When business conditions are normal the greenback will not be presented for redemption, because it is a more convenient form of money than gold or silver, and all that which finds its way into the Treasury in ordinary fiscal channels will be reissued. When conditions are disturbed and gold is in demand, greenbacks that have been redeemed will be held in the Treasury so they can not be used repeatedly to deplete the stock of gold. When conditions improve they may be transferred to the common fund and again go into circulation. This is one of the wisest and most judicious provisions of the bill. A moment's reflection will satisfy everyone of its value as a preserver of the public credit.

The talk about contraction is destitute of force. Provision is made for the exchange of gold for all other kinds of money whenever it shall be necessary to maintain the parity. This also is merely the enactment of the present policy into positive law.

The bill authorizes banks in small communities with a capital of $25,000. Under the present law no bank can be organized with less than $50,000 capital. The modification will enable many small towns to be supplied with banking facilities and loanable capital that are denied those advantages now. It will have a beneficial operation, because it will have a tendency to distribute money in all parts of the country. Then, it authorizes national banks to issue currency to the par value of the bonds they are required to deposit. This privilege will cost the country nothing, and it will impart to the currency an element of elasticity that will better meet the demands of exigencies as they arise.

The circulation of banks is relieved from the tax of 1 per cent that it now bears, and a tax of one-fifth of 1 per cent per annum is placed upon the capital stock, surplus, and undivided profits. The bank circulation now is $200,000,000, in round numbers, and the annual tax is $2,000,000. The capital, surplus, and undivided profits of national banks aggregate $1,000,000,000, in round numbers, and one-fifth of 1 per cent on this basis will yield $2,000,000 a year. The amount of taxes the Government will receive under this bill, if it becomes a law, will be the same as it receives upon circulation now, but it will be distributed more equitably. In large cities banks with large capital take out but little circulation and pay an inequitably small share of the circulation tax. Banks in the country towns take out the maximum amount of circulation as a rule and consequently pay a disproportionately large share of the taxes. This bill will equalize the burden by taking from the taxation of small banks in the country towns and adding to those of large capital in the large cities. Those large banks enjoy the prestige that the national banking system of organization and supervision gives, and they ought to pay for it.

The effect of the bill will be to increase the bank circulation, and an abundance of money for all purposes will be constantly maintained. It gives banks additional privileges without costing the Government a dollar. Banks are an indispensable factor in commerce and production, and I am in favor of all measures that will increase their legitimate functions. I would so limit and control their power that they can not become agencies of oppression, and yet so regulate them that they may subserve the business needs of the country in the highest degree. They should be servants and not masters. This bill will give them no dangerous power. We hear the criticism that the bill will enhance the value of Government bonds. It can not to any great extent, because they are now selling in the markets at a price that will yield less than 2 per cent per annum on the investment. But it is no objection to legislation that it will improve business and make property more valuable. It is better than if it would tear down, depreciate, and destroy. The bill is wise in all its provisions and amply meets every requirement of the times. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. LOVERING. Mr. Chairman, my interest in the subject of this discussion grows out of a lifelong connection with business affairs. My interest in the bill itself comes from my connection with the caucus committee which prepared it.

After the able presentation and explanation of all its provisions by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] in opening the debate, there is very little that any other member of the committee need or can say. I will therefore address myself only to a few general remarks pertinent to the subject.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before the committee deals with the fundamental principles of finance. In affirming and fixing the gold standard it puts down an anchor for a stable currency that no amount of political clamor nor change of party can drag from its moorings. In providing for the maintenance of the parity of all moneys it prescribes directions for a Secretary of the Treasury that must be observed; whoever comes after would be a bold man and deserving of impeachment should he disregard them. This bill should receive the commendation of our silver friends for what it does for silver. It not only carries the entire silver coinage on a parity with gold, but provides for the direct or representative use of it by making the silver certificates of denominations of $5 and under. This will insure the circulation of silver or small bills to the most remote parts of the country. If I mistake not, the business of the country will find use for every dollar so issued. I have heard free-silver advocates avow that this was all the recognition they asked for silver.

I have during the last few months traveled through nearly all the Southern States, and have taken occasion to talk with business and financial men, and almost without exception they have expressed themselves as not averse to the gold standard; but say they: "We are obliged to favor free silver because we are obliged to be Democrats." A singular illustration of cause and effect.

My friend from Tennessee [Mr. COX] has just said that we are here to obey the mandates of those who sent us here. No man ever uttered a truer word. We are here to obey the mandates of those who sent us here. Is he here in obedience to the mandate of his constituents in opposing this measure?

Mr. Chairman, every provision of this bill is a sound business proposition, and when adopted by Congress will afford the basis on which to form a good banking law. These, then, are the fundamentals or essentials of financial reform; all the exact propositions that need to be stated. Now, banking is not an exact science. It does not follow that one and only one banking law can be right. There are many methods of accomplishing the same end that may be good, perhaps equally good and operative, provided the basis be correctly established. For one, I do not think that a banking law need be very complex or abstruse. It seems to me that all the necessary provisions and safeguards can be stated in simple language, which all people of reasonable intelligence can understand.

Recognizing the principles of this bill, I believe that each and every member of the Banking and Currency Committee, be he from this side of the House or the other, could frame a banking bill that would not only be operative and satisfactory to the people, but several of such bills would probably be so nearly equal in merit as to make it hard to choose between them. Who knows but that if this bill had been a law before the last Congress the perpetual love feast held upstairs in the room of the Banking and Currency Committee might have been fruitful of a perfect banking bill under the leadership of that able, genial, and conciliating statesman, my late honored colleague from Massachusetts. Just here I think it only fair to say that great credit is due to the Banking and Currency Committee of the Fifty-fifth Congress, in that its work afforded the basis of this bill and greatly facilitated the labors of those who prepared it.

The last three sections of this bill contain all that relates to banking, and to my mind it is necessary that they should become law as soon as possible to meet the demand for circulation growing out of the deluge of prosperity that is sweeping over the country to-day.

I have listened very carefully to the speeches that have been made on the other side of the House, and I have listened in vain for any words in defense of the 16 to 1 standard. Our friends have fallen back upon the quantitative theory, and have not only appropriated the $385,000,000 of increased coinage, but now say that if that be a good thing then the unlimited coinage of silver would be so much the more desirable, forgetting that it is the increase of business that makes the increased demand and use for money.

We have to-day $2,000,000,000 of money in use in the United States, a larger amount than was ever known in the history of the country, and it is the purpose of this bill to make it world money, good as gold everywhere; and yet business has increased to the extent that more circulation is needed at once, and why? Let me show by illustration why. It is the custom in New England, and especially in Massachusetts, where it is in conformity with the law, to make weekly payments of wages, and all such wages are paid in cash. This has the effect of keeping money in the community.

With the increase of 10 per cent in wages which has recently taken place in most of our industries, and which I am glad to see has extended all over the country, even to the South and other

free-silver sections, it requires just that proportionate increase of money to meet the demand. Not only this, but the increased value of all products requires an increased volume of circulation.

It costs a cotton manufacturer in New England 33 per cent more to put in his cotton this year than it did last. Where he paid 6 cents for his cotton then, he has now to pay 8 cents, in round numbers. Although the cotton crop of this year bids fair to be one and one-half million bales less than last year, the farmer will receive $20,000,000 more for his crop.

The relief which this bill affords is much needed. The question was asked the other day as to what was the crop of last year. I will say that the cotton season ends on the 31st day of August. The crop of last year was, in round numbers, 11,216,000 bales. It was also asked what the crop would be this year. No one can tell with absolute certainty. It has been variously estimated at from under 9,000,000 bales up to about 11,000,000. The best authority I can find places the crop at something under 10,000,000 bales, or about 9,700,000 bales.

The necessity for it is the legitimate outgrowth of the return of normal conditions of prosperity incident to the wise policy of a business Administration.

As I listened to the eloquent gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND], and heard him alternately deny that there was prosperity and then explain why there was prosperity, my mind went back to the time when I left my State to come to the Fifty-fifth Congress, and I could but contrast the situation at home then with that which I left when I came to the Fifty-sixth Congress. Then the closed doors and smokeless chimneys of idle mills were seen on all sides, and the silence was only broken by the footsteps of the watchman who was left as caretaker of the property and to guard the large warehouses filled with goods for which there was no market.

On the streets were gathered the men and women, bemoaning their misfortune and enforced idleness, sadly husbanding their scanty resources, or turning in despair to the charitable societies or soup houses.

How different the scenes I have just left. Every furnace burning, chimneys smoking, every spindle humming, and every loom beating, making cloth to be sold even before it is finished. There are none who are willing or care to work but can find employment at good wages.

I found the same condition of prosperity in the South. Every wheel was turning, in many cases night and day, and there was a scarcity of labor everywhere. I have reason to know, from my own business interests in the South, that it is not easy to get sufficient labor, and wages have continually advanced.

In the eloquent argument of the gentleman from Missouri last Monday he undertook, in a part of his remarks, to apologize for the state of prosperity in which he found the country and to explain it away on the score of the increased volume of circulation. Then, in another part of his address, he devoted himself to a complaint of high prices of the staple products and manufactures of the country and fell to beating and belaboring trusts.

Now, Mr Chairman, I am not here to defend all the features or to deny all the evils that have been attributed to trusts, but I would like to ask my friend if it is a hardship and if it is due to a trust that the Southern planters will probably receive $20,000,000 more for their cotton than they did last year? Is it the fault of trusts that the iron mines of Pennsylvania and Alabama are receiving from 50 to 100 per cent more for their output than they did a year ago? Is it the fault of any trust that the uses for iron have within the last five years multiplied themselves three or four times? Is it due to trusts that the new uses for structural iron have so increased in all classes of buildings? Are trusts responsible for the development of electricity in all its departments, which has multiplied the uses for iron and copper?

The law of supply and demand is as potent and inexorable as the law of gravitation, and the moment the demand falls off or ceases the price must fall to meet it, and no trust in the world can for any length of time stand up against it.

Whatever form the opposition to trusts shall take it must not be in the direction of their suppression. It may regulate, it may exact publicity in their acts and accounts, but it must not seriously interfere with the free cooperation of capital. For just as sure as such cooperation is forbidden or crushed out by law a worse evil will arise to take its place. The individual Crœsus will grow and fasten himself, like the old man of the sea, upon the back of the public. He is not responsible to anyone, while the corporations are not only bound by their charters, but are responsible to thousands and tens of thousands of stockholders.

Combination and cooperation of capital are safeguards against great single capitalists whose power of monopoly is many times greater than that of any corporation. The only remedy of an oppressed people in such a case is to combine their capital to compete with and overcome the monopoly. If you deny them this power, you not only offer a premium to the plutocrat, but you secure him in his monopoly.

It seems to me that there is a great deal of senseless and unreasoning talk about trusts. I do not propose to champion them. In so far as they are honestly organized and administered on business principles, they can take care of themselves. In so far as they are dishonestly organized and conducted, there is law enough, if properly enforced, to keep them within bounds.

In so far as they defy correct business principles by piling up fictitious capital and inordinately capitalizing their expectations, they become top-heavy and contain within themselves the seeds of their own dissolution.

Wall street has a cold-blooded way of finding the vulnerable points in such concerns, and while it may help them up at the start, it is sure to kick them down at the first opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, as this country grows in population and develops its resources it must grow in its revenues and in its expenditures. Figures that once seemed enormous with a population of 40,000,000 now look small with a population of 75,000,000 and will dwindle more and more as we approach 100,000,000.

I mistake the temper of the American people if many of them can be much longer deceived by a mere array of figures. I mistake their temper also if they can be longer cajoled by the cheap silver dollar.

While our business at home and our trade abroad increases to almost fabulous proportions let us see to it that the quality of our money be not cheapened in the eyes of the world nor in the pockets of the people. [Applause.]

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] and others who have preceded me have so fully and clearly explained all the details of this bill that I shall confine the few remarks which I shall make to a discussion of its general principles. It might aptly be entitled "A bill to continue confidence and perpetuate prosperity." The amount of currency in circulation is not comparable in importance to the maintenance of confidence in the uniformity and stability of its standard and of what we term business confidence.

The useful purposes of money are three: First, to serve as the measure of values; second, as a medium of exchange—the go-between in the exchange of commodities from one man to another and in the adjustment of balances, and, third, as the basis of contracts to be performed in the future. Centuries ago money of some kind was necessary in every transaction. People did not trust each other. There was no credit. But with increasing civilization came increased trust and confidence, so that now 95 per cent of the business of this country is conducted without the actual use of money at all, but by operations involving confidence.

I may be pardoned a few illustrations from my own State. The president of the Pennsylvania Steel Company, one of the largest manufacturing institutions in the country, told me that of the millions of dollars received by that company for its products in a single year not one farthing was paid in currency or what we call money. It was all by check or draft or bill of exchange or other means involving confidence. For all the ores and coal and other material purchased by it that company did not pay out one cent in currency. Its employees were all paid by check, save where the amount was less than $20.

Out of some $12,000,000 received in a single year at the Pennsylvania State treasury only $2,000 was paid in money or currency. These are but samples of the way in which business is done everywhere.

While checks represent money, it is a mistake to suppose that money always changes hands in payment of them. They are usually settled by "clearings" between the banks upon which they are drawn. An officer in a prominent bank in my own city told me that recently in clearing with another bank, although there were many checks involved, the difference between those drawn upon his bank and presented by the other and those held by his bank against the other was only 3 cents; so that, although thousands of dollars were represented by the checks, they were all liquidated and paid by an actual exchange of only 3 cents in money.

The exchanges at the New York Clearing House from January 2, 1899, to November 30, 1899, aggregated $55,413,506,034.04, while the actual currency required to redeem that vast volume of what I may term credit money was only $2,888,214,065.64, or a trifle over 5 per cent. In some years it has been less than 5 per cent.

In addition to the enormous volume of business represented by checks there is the farther enormous volume represented by short-time notes, bills payable, etc., constantly given and received by every individual, firm, partnership, and corporation largely engaged in business. These are also matters involving confidence. When confidence is general, they, as well as checks, are used freely; but when either national or individual confidence is impaired or shaken, these great and necessary aids to business are less available. Those who would tamper with the currency or render its condition uncertain do not take into consideration the potent influence of credit. Whatever impairs the integrity of a nation, of a corporation, or of an individual impairs its credit;

whatever impairs credit and weakens confidence lessens commerce, and whatever lessens commerce results injuriously to all the people. There are many ways in which public confidence—business confidence—may be impaired. It has always been impaired to a greater or less degree by the election of a Democratic Administration and strengthened by Republican success, as a few modern instances will suffice to show. The election of a Democratic President in 1892 gave rise to the belief that under the free-trade theories which he and his party were likely to enact into law the manufacturing and mining industries of the country could not thrive.

Confidence in their ability to meet their obligations was impaired, their notes were thrown out by banks, their credit weakened, their ability to continue business ceased, and thousands of them went to the wall. As a necessary result the business of railroads decreased, and only the strongest of them were able to keep their properties out of the hands of the receiver. The enactment of the Wilson bill increased the distrust, and when to all this there was added the threat and serious danger of the free coinage of silver, rendering uncertain the unit of value and the obligation of contracts, the climax was reached.

With the impending triumph of Bryan and the free-coinage theory, no man possessing a good dollar was willing to invest it, uncertain of the character or value of the dollar which he might eventually receive in return. Consequently business enterprises were shut down and commerce was nearer at a standstill than it had been for many years before. Hundreds of thousands of men were out of employment. Capital was idle. Every day recorded additional business failures. The assignee and the receiver were in supreme control.

These conditions of distrust affected the amount of money in circulation, for while in 1892, the last year of Republican Administration, the amount in circulation for each man, woman, and child in the United States was $24.44, the highest up to that time known in the history of the country, the per capita had been reduced in 1896 to $21.10. And even that, although nominally in circulation—because in the country and not in the Treasury—did not actually circulate with the same activity and represent the same volume of business as in times of greater confidence. The great volume of check and credit transactions was immeasurably reduced.

The whole country was saved from bankruptcy only by the fortunate defeat of Bryan and the pernicious credit and commerce destroying theories advocated by him and his followers and embodied in the Chicago platform. With the election of McKinley there immediately began a restoration of confidence. This was aided by the repeal of the Wilson tariff bill and the enactment of the Dingley bill, thus assuring the country of reasonable protection to American industries and to American labor.

The election of a Republican President and of a Republican House of Representatives insured the public against any legislation debasing the currency; and finally the election of a Republican Senate inspired the people with confidence, born of the knowledge that the Republican party always keeps its pledges; that affirmative legislation would be enacted, making impossible, at least for a long time to come, the destruction of the existing gold standard. [Applause.]

The result of this confidence is seen on every hand. The products of our mines are greater than ever before; our factories are breaking all records; our railroads are absolutely congested with traffic. We have had in Pennsylvania recently the singular spectacle of a railroad company unable to move all its coal tonnage because it could not get cars, while the factory engaged in filling its order for cars was compelled to suspend operations because the overburdened railroads could not supply it with coal.

The armies that fought the battle of Gettysburg were smaller in number than the army of additional railway men employed since the defeat of Bryan. But the army of additional railway men is not comparable to the vast armies of men in other pursuits idle in 1896 who are now employed at living wages.

Mr. James Campbell, the efficient factory inspector of Pennsylvania, has favored me with advance sheets of his annual report for the year ending October 31, 1899, covering 11,355 factory establishments, concerning which he says:

> Three hundred and twenty-eight thousand and eight more persons were employed in 1899 than in 1896; 233,915 more persons were employed in 1899 than in 1897; 182,207 more persons were employed in 1899 than in 1898, and if the demand for skilled workers and laborers could be supplied the increase would be greater.

To refer to my own district, a single company employing 4,002 men in 1896 employs 6,315 to-day. This is only a sample—only an index to the conditions which exist throughout the length and breadth of the land. There is not an able-bodied man in this whole country who can not find employment at living wages, and every day we read of increases in wages.

I have just read in the North American, that in certain parts of Philadelphia there is great activity in real estate, caused by the fact that workingmen, who have heretofore been content to live in humble rented tenements are, as the result of improved conditions, beginning to purchase homes for themselves.

The amount of money in the United States has increased steadily since the defeat of Bryan, so that, while in 1896 we had $2,347,306,006, we had on the 1st day of July, 1899, $2,745,350,508—an increase of nearly $400,000,000, and the per capita of money in circulation had increased from $21.10 in 1896 to $25 now—the highest point ever known. And as the result of restored confidence and improved business conditions, this per capita of currency actually circulates and performs the functions for which it was intended. [Applause.]

My friend, the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], admits that universal prosperity has followed the defeat of Bryan and the election of a Republican Administration; but he does not give us any part of the credit. He attributes the result entirely to the forces of nature. The varying wheat crops in this and other countries, he says, are responsible. But that same gentleman and others told us in 1896 that wheat and silver marched hand in hand, that their fortunes were inseparably linked together.

When wheat is low they blame the Republican party and the gold basis; when prosperity everywhere abounds they give all the credit to nature. Of course, good crops help, and the forces of nature do sometimes seem to fight for the Republican cause. Nature is not wholly responsible for enabling the great Pennsylvania Steel Company, at my home, which went into bankruptcy under a Democratic Administration, to pay out $2,730,047.64 in wages to employees in 1898. Nature is not wholly responsible for the fact that at one time within the present year there were standing upon the sidings at the works of that company 43 cars loaded with structural iron bound for India, literally "on the road to Mandalay," to fill part of a $900,000 bridge contract. I do not think that nature is entitled to all the credit for putting at work the 328,008 additional factory hands in Pennsylvania. The restored confidence in proper protection to American labor and in the maintenance of the integrity of our currency and of public and private obligations has had even more to do with it.

Every taxpayer in the land has been benefited by this improved confidence in another way, to which I call your attention. Nearly every county, city, borough, and school district has, since the defeat of Bryan and the free-coinage theory, either refunded old loans or by borrowing created new ones at reduced rates of interest, so that whereas they formerly paid 5, 6, or 7 per cent, they now pay 4, 3½, and in many instances as low as 3 per cent in interest, the difference being saved to taxpayers.

This has largely come about because of the fact that the people who invest in bonds have confidence that the good money which they put into them will be eventually repaid in dollars equally good. The Federal Government borrowed money readily at 3 per cent in the midst of war with a foreign nation, while the preceding Democratic Administration paid 4 per cent in a time of profound peace. The American taxpayer may take comfort in contrasting his present condition with that prevailing in free-silver Mexico, whose people are taxed to enable the Government to pay $12 in silver as interest upon every $100 of loans held by nonresidents.

We are now and for many years past have been upon the gold standard, but the condition of the law is such that a Democratic President or Secretary of the Treasury alone, without any action by Congress, might instantly overthrow this condition and put us at once upon a different basis. We who are Republicans owe it to the people and to the country, now that we are in power, to enact such positive legislation as shall carry out the pledges made in our party platforms, both State and national, and continue the present favorable business conditions. This bill is intended to effectuate that purpose. It reaffirms the gold standard by declaring in its first section that the standard unit of value shall, as now, be the gold dollar of its present weight and fineness.

It positively enacts in its second section that the interest-bearing obligations of the United States now existing or hereafter to be entered into shall be deemed to be payable according to that standard, thus taking it out of the power of the President or the Secretary of the Treasury alone to affect their integrity or impair their value. It provides that all other obligations, public and private, for the payment of money shall be performed in conformity with the standard established in section 1. It expressly provides against affecting the present legal-tender quality of the silver dollar or of our paper currency. It provides that all our money shall be kept upon a parity with gold, and anchors us firmly to the gold basis, upon which the country is now enjoying such universal and unbounded prosperity. [Applause.]

Gentlemen upon the other side of the House claim that some gentlemen on this side must, in order to support this bill, make a change of front. Our platform of 1896 pledged the party to the maintenance of "the existing gold standard," and declared that "all our silver and paper currency must be maintained at parity

with gold." We all stand upon that platform to-day. You stood upon a platform which demanded the free and unlimited coinage of silver at 16 to 1 and were overwhelmingly defeated at the polls.

The Republicans of Pennsylvania, in their convention of 1896 and each year since, have demanded the maintenance of the existing gold standard of value as necessary "to restore and preserve the industrial prosperity of the Union," and there every Republican member from Pennsylvania stands to-day. If any Democratic member from Pennsylvania upon the floor of this House contemplates voting against this bill, I call his attention to the platform adopted by the Democrats of Pennsylvania in State convention assembled in 1896, about sixty days before the nomination of Bryan.

That Democratic State convention, which assembled at Allentown April 29, 1896, unanimously resolved that—

> Congress should enact such legislation as will give to the country a banking currency ample in volume for the needs of business, absolutely secure under every contingency, and at all times redeemable in gold. We are in favor of a firm, unvarying maintenance of the gold standard. * * * We believe that the interests of the people demand that the earnings of trade, agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, and especially the wages of labor, should be paid in money of the highest intrinsic value and of the highest standard adopted by the civilized nations of the world.

I bring that Democratic platform to the attention of every Democratic member from Pennsylvania, and, indeed, to every gentleman upon the other side of this House, and suggest to them that time has demonstrated its wisdom. Upon that point both parties in Pennsylvania agreed early in 1896, and the Republicans have not changed front.

I shall vote for this measure, Mr. Chairman, because it is honest; because it carries into effect the pledges of the Republican party made to the people in their hour of need; because it insures integrity on the part of the Government, of private individuals, and of corporations in keeping their obligations; because it insures to soldiers and sailors their pensions, to farmers the price of their products, to merchants the price of their wares, and to the vast army of laborers everywhere payment of their wages in the best money that the world affords. I shall vote for it because I firmly believe that its effect will be to continue the confidence and make more permanent the prosperity which under the present Republican administration of the Government everywhere abounds. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIBLEY] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. SIBLEY. Mr. Chairman, I had contemplated participating in the debate upon House bill No. 1, but an unfortunate or fortunate interview, whichever the case may be, that appeared in one of our Washington papers this week has seemed to cause some degree of alarm among my Democratic friends, and not wishing to embarrass the very genial gentleman who is the leader upon this side of the Chamber, who has been told by other Democrats that they thought the time should belong to those who were more thoroughly in accord respecting the substantial provisions of this measure, I thought to relieve him from all embarrassment by embalming my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where they may sleep in the crypt of this Capitol, in fellowship with the mighty thoughts of the great statesmen of the past who have given them to the world in the same manner. [Laughter.]

I do not know, Mr. Chairman, why my Democratic friends should have been afraid of me. I have been offered by the Republicans time in which to express my opinions, but I can not accept as a Republican courtesy that which I feel as a Democratic member I have a right to demand in my own proper person. [Applause.] I supported every candidate on the Democratic ticket nominated at Chicago, and upon the stump in twenty-seven different States in this Union I maintained the justice of the bimetallic contention. And yet it seems that views now as honestly entertained by me should not be given expression.

I am going to vote against this bill and was going to offer reasons with such power of logic, with such matchless charms of oratory, with such keen satire and invective that I expected to see every Republican abandon his untenable position upon this measure. [Laughter.] Why, over here upon this side of the Chamber, the great majority of us believe, I think, that you on that side are engaged in the task of driving nails in your own coffin, and my friends over here are so desirous that you shall be successful in the accomplishment of that task that I think they fear now—that is the charitable reason which I am giving to myself—they feared that if I gave expression to my opinions the hammer would fall from your nerveless grasp, Mr. Chairman. Therefore I shall avail myself of the privilege, under the rule, of letting my remarks go thundering down the ages in the precincts of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. I only want to take one minute at this point to say that there is no misunderstanding between my friend from Pennsylvania and myself.

Mr. SIBLEY. Not the slightest.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I offered the gentleman thirty-five minutes' time in which to give expression to his eloquent views. I offered this time in the utmost good faith.

Mr. SIBLEY. I do not desire to question that fact; but what had preceded it was the matter that caused me to determine, after the pressure that had been brought to bear upon my friend, to relieve him entirely from any embarrassment for any position which I am assuming upon this question.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Of course I was not aware of what had preceded our conversation between the gentleman and others.

Mr. SIBLEY. Certainly not.

Mr. Chairman, when a candidate for position in this honorable body, I stated to my constituents that upon measures pending in Congress affecting the welfare and happiness of the American people I should exercise, with such intelligence as I might possess, my conscientious sense of duty, regardless of whether the measure originated on one side of the Chamber or the other, honestly entertaining the opinion that on public questions this side of the Chamber can not be unequivocally right nor the other side wholly wrong; nor do I believe that upon questions affecting the prosperity and happiness of such a nation as ours partisan tests should be applied.

My belief is firm in the old adage that "The agitation of thought is the beginning of wisdom," and it is to be regretted that a measure so far-reaching in its consequences, so fraught with possibilities for weal or woe to the public, might not have been referred to the proper committee for such minor changes, at least, as would make it more acceptable to the country at large.

The expression of my opinions probably will not reflect the crystallized sentiment of either party in this controversy. Macaulay says: "The effect of violent animosities between parties has always been an indifference to the general welfare and honor of the state." Nevertheless, in the language of Tennyson:

> Let Whig and Tory stir their blood,
> There must be stormy weather;
> But for some true result of good
> All parties work together.

The first proposition enunciated in this measure is the permanent adoption of the gold standard. Recognizing as we do the power the majority possess to write their will upon the statute books of the nation, it may well be considered whether, even if the unit of value is to be 25.8 grains of gold nine-tenths fine, the hour is yet ripe for this nation to make such declaration.

We have seen the reputed statement of the Secretary of the Treasury that he hopes in the near future to be able to refund the interest-bearing obligations of the United States on a 2 per cent basis. This is a consummation eagerly to be desired, and no action taken by this body should so embarrass him as to render his task, if not impossible, at least more difficult of accomplishment.

In a message submitted to this body by President Cleveland during the Fifty-third Congress, in which he stated his determination to issue $62,400,000 of bonds, he said that if Congress would consent to write the word "gold" instead of "coin" in the bonds the bidders for the bonds would give $16,000,000 more for them. In other words, the international money magnates of the world placed their own estimate upon the difference in value between a bond payable in coin and one payable in gold. At that time, as I thought, the House wisely refused to change the terms of the bond. This difference in valuation was not a chance guess; it was not the theoretic deduction of some academician, but it was the calculating estimate of the best informed financiers of this round world.

We are now asked voluntarily to contribute to them not upon sixty-two millions of bonds alone, but upon $1,046,000,000, the difference in value between bonds reading payable in coin and bonds by their terms reading payable in gold. The estimate made by the world's financiers upon the difference in value of gold or coin bonds of the par value of $62,000,000 was sixteen millions, or about 25.92 per cent, which valuation, if extended to the total issue of interest-bearing bonds now outstanding, would mean an enhancement of value to the holders of such obligations of more than $260,000,000; while the lower rate of interest upon some bonds and short term of others would make this estimate too large, yet the indirect enhancement in values will probably exceed $100,000,000.

We may well inquire what necessity of such paramount importance impels our action in advance of negotiations entered into by the Secretary of the Treasury in attempting to refund these obligations at a rate of interest wherein the United States shall save in interest charges upward of $10,000,000 per annum. An offer made by responsible parties, and submitted to Congress by President Cleveland, affords each member of this body opportunity unerringly to estimate the value of the voluntary surrender which we are called upon to make. What present or prospective crisis dims the financial horizon demanding this change?

You tell us that we already have the gold standard. Under the interpretation of recent Secretaries of the Treasury this is unquestionably true, and has been for years; and I deliberately state my individual conviction that, for some years at least, it will remain the standard. Upon the floor of this House and upon the platform in many States of this Union I proclaimed my belief that the success of the adherents to the yellow metal in the Presidential contest of 1896 would leave in its train business paralysis, commercial stagnation, financial disaster, and all the horrors which accompany falling prices.

We accepted the doctrines of Aristotle, Locke, Adam Smith, Francis Wayland, John Stuart Mill, and every teacher upon financial economics from the dawn of history until this question became a burning issue in partisan politics, that a diminution in the volume of money meant a diminution in the value of products and all the attendant evil accompanying falling prices, and that an increase in the volume of money meant rising prices, with the stimulus to industry and enterprise which is the invariable accompaniment thereof. We championed the cause of silver, not because of any special affection for the white metal, but because we believed that the stock of gold was insufficient; that the foundations of a single metal were too narrow to afford industry and commercial genius to erect thereon grand temples commemorating successful achievement.

Standing here to-day, I affirm that the truth of the essential contention of the bimetallists has been vindicated and is justified in the industrial activity and the increasing range of prices as marked by the system of index numbers, finding its expression not alone in the United States but throughout the extent of the entire globe. Truly, my Republican friends, there have been but few showers in recent years finding you without umbrellas. That beneficent Providence which is said to be the especial protector of "children, drunkards, and the feeble-minded" has also been very kind indeed to our friends of that party represented upon the other side of the Chamber.

The discoveries of the Klondike, the development of Cripple Creek, the perfection of the cyanide process, which has enabled successful operations upon the gold reefs of Africa, have so augmented the production of gold that last year the world produced more than three hundred millions of that metal, more of gold alone added to the world's stock of money than had ever been added of both gold and silver in any one year since the history of man was first written. Responsive to the law laid down by Aristotle and accepted and advocated by the friends of bimetallism, following this great increase of the world's stock of money, prices have risen, hope has again been enkindled in the human heart, commerce sought new fields, and industry and energy find substantial recompense.

For more than a quarter of a century, from the very hour when the crime against humanity was enacted, destroying the money value of one of the precious metals, commercial disaster has trodden upon the heels of commercial disaster. The system of index numbers has shown steadily each year a diminution in the value of the products of labor, whether in factory or upon farm. But I believe that the depths of the valley of humiliation have been reached, that its ford has been crossed, and that now we are scaling the heights of the farther side and that for twenty-five years to come there will be an era of prosperity and development such as the world has never witnessed in the past.

Friends of mine who have visited the "Rand" inform me that those reefs, stretching unbrokenly from Johannesburg on the south, way up to Pretoria on the north, have unlimited possibilities of production, and that the settlement of the lamentable difficulties now existing between the English and the Boers (which can result, I believe, in but one way) will open to development that entire reef, which has been limited by President Kruger to the southern portion only. I am informed that one firm in Chicago has upon its books to-day, waiting alone the cessation of hostilities, orders amounting to more than $3,000,000 for mining machinery for South Africa.

Thousands of American miners are also waiting the close of hostilities to engage in the exploitation of this reef, which, with modern methods of treatment, renders it less hazardous than any mining enterprise heretofore known.

The opinion has been given me by those who are not optimistic in business matters that the product of gold from this reef is likely to reach from three to four hundred millions of dollars annually, and that the world's present stock of gold will be more than doubled within the next ten years.

From Peru, in the heart of the Andean range, come authentic reports of discoveries of gold of such tremendous magnitude and value as the world has never heretofore known, ore in strong veins running in value from four thousand into the hundreds of thousands of dollars per ton.

Following the automatic theory of money, gold will fall, or, as we may properly say, prices will rise relative thereto. Mr. Chairman, the outlook for production of gold is such that I would fain warn my friends on the other side to act with deliberation, prudence, and caution, for it would not be surprising, if the estimates of the possibilities of gold production in the future should be true, that the nations of the world will again be invited to a conference, as they were in 1854, following the discoveries in California and Australia, to consider the desirability of taking away the legal tender of gold, as did Holland and every state now comprising the present German Empire.

Within a few years, possibly, the battle of the standards will again rage, and we shall hear the white metal lauded as the money necessary to the common transactions of life and of such universal adaptation and free from so many objections to gold as currency that it will be called the poor man's money, and some gentleman may be found advocating the cause of silver, not because of its intrinsic value, but because of its scarceness relative to gold.

In 1896 bimetallism was the issue. From the platform my views were stated with all sincerity that we were then fighting one of the world's decisive battles; that we were submitting at the bar of public opinion the merits of the bimetallic cause, and that if then lost it was lost forever. Viewing the magnificent prosperity of the nation to-day, for one I can "rejoice with them that do rejoice," even if I can not obey the command to "weep with them that weep," if any such there be.

The future status of silver as money, in my opinion, will not be determined by the result of some great political campaign, but rather by the concurrent consent of the world's industrial and commercial enterprises.

While I believe that violent fluctuations in value are less liable with two metals than with one, nevertheless I am constrained to the opinion that silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 is not and can not again be an issue of overshadowing importance. Events which have followed, due to the wisdom of no political party, have so changed conditions that a cause that was sacred in 1896 may be ridiculous in some later year.

No man who advocated bimetallism complains of rising prices. It was with that end in view, it was for the farmers, the artisans, and the wage-earners of this nation that we made the contest. We advocated bimetallism and the cause of silver and assured the people that following its adoption prices would rise and the products of labor command higher recompense. We cared not what the color of the metal might be which should measure the products of toil. We demanded alone that in volume it should be sufficient to measure the entire capacity of industry engaged in useful production.

And whether this bill shall pass or fail, the enormous development of gold production has so set in motion and will so set in motion all the energies of production and development that capital may safely embark upon new enterprises, that investment will be augmented, and that a man will be justified in incurring indebtedness under an appreciating quantity of money and be entitled to expect substantial returns where, even with the highest degree of judgment under a diminishing volume of money, disaster was ever imminent.

For twenty-five years the farmers of our nation have traveled through the "slough of despond." I believe the burden is soon to fall from their backs, and that the producer of all the world's wealth will again be the king among men and an independent sovereign in his own homestead. The area of tillable land throughout the world to-day is substantially occupied. With increasing population and commercial expansion, agricultural production must stir itself to keep pace with increasing demand.

To some features of this bill I can yield my most cordial assent. I believe that the permission to issue bank notes to the par value of bonds deposited should be accorded. I believe the tax upon circulation should be removed, and that the banks' proportion of taxation for the protection which they should enjoy should be placed upon capital and surplus, and that nothing may hinder an outflow to the people of a volume of representative money equal to the demand of an ever increasing and expanding commerce. I also deem the provision for banks with $25,000 capital for small towns beneficent in its tendencies. My approval, however, can not be given to that feature which makes every dollar of both paper and silver a certificate of indebtedness against the United States Government.

I have introduced and at the proper time shall attempt to secure recognition for and approval of a bill the merits of which within my time I shall briefly outline, entitled "A bill to provide a safe and elastic currency, automatically expanding and contracting as the business needs of the nation may demand." In different form this bill has been before presented to Congress—in the Fifty-second Congress, I believe—by my learned friend from Tennessee [Mr. COX], and heretofore objection has been made that while there may be an outflowing currency from the Treasury in time of crisis, there would not be an inflowing currency when money might be so redundant as to provoke hazardous and perilous speculation. Permit me to read the text of the bill, which,

doubtless, in its phraseology and form may be much improved upon:

Be it enacted, etc., That any holder of United States bonds may deposit the same in the Treasury or any subtreasury of the United States, receiving therefor 80 per cent of the face of such bonds. The Treasury notes so issued shall be receivable for public and private dues under the provisions of law now applied to national currency issued by national banks of the United States. During the time of deposit of such bonds all interest thereupon shall cease, or be covered into the United States Treasury. Upon the presentation of the Treasury certificate of deposit, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe, together with payment of Treasury notes equal in amount to the sum advanced by the Treasury upon such bonds, the owner of the bonds may withdraw them and again convert the same to his own use.

Some four weeks since the Secretary of the Treasury advertised to purchase twenty-five millions of bonds. For this action he has in some quarters been sharply criticized. It is, however, the opinion of men well informed, and whose opinion I share, that by this action alone was a monetary panic averted in the city of New York. Panics are like conflagrations—they grow upon that on which they feed. It may occur in some future crisis that the Treasury will not be in condition to purchase bonds, or that the price which the Treasurer may fix may be below their market value. Under the provisions of such an act as I have outlined, additional value is given to every bond outstanding in the United States.

There are outstanding bonds of the United States amounting to more than $800,000,000 in excess of those pledged to secure the circulation of national banks. These are held throughout various portions of the United States by banks and private individuals. Whenever a monetary stringency occurs the holders of those bonds, upon depositing them, may draw out 80 per cent of their face value in Treasury notes. The relief to be afforded would not be confined alone to New York or the great money centers, but would be a relief extended to every portion of the United States where a local crisis or demand might arise.

The Government would be the gainer in the cessation of interest upon all deposited bonds, and the commercial world relieved from the threat of financial disaster, a foundation for the currency so broad and so secure that there will be required no introduction of the schemes similar to those originated by John Law to afford an abundant and elastic currency.

The owner of the bonds forfeits his interest upon his bonds and draws out his money only when the demand for money would make, and at the face value of the bonds would in industry yield, more than the interest upon the bonds at their par value. When the demand for money slackens the money flows back to the Treasury, and the regulation of the outgoing and incoming current follows the natural and legitimate demands of business alone.

This plan has been submitted by me to many men eminent in financial affairs, and while it has not commanded an expression of approval from all yet none have been able to state an objection of any character whatsoever or to give a reason or hazard an opinion that such a bill would fail to provide a currency solid at its base and elastic and automatic in its operations.

Mr. Chairman, many years ago Hume, the historian, wrote:

> A state is never greater than when all its superfluous hands are employed in the service of the public.

Viewing the magnificent prosperity which to-day abounds, seeing the commercial instinct and genius of America engaged in the peaceable conquest of the markets of the world; beholding every American furnace stack blazing, every forge glowing, with every loom clicking, and every spindle humming; urgent drafts upon the treasure stored in our mines of coal, iron, lead, copper, and all the precious metals to supply a constantly increasing demand; noting the marked increase in price received by the producers of petroleum, cotton, wool, and other products of the soil, which has lifted the burden of care and enkindled hope in tens of thousands of homes; witnessing the exports of the products of American factories and American workingmen progressing by leaps and bounds until they reached more than $339,000,000 last year; with our revenues, even in the presence of extraordinary expenditures for suppression of a revolt in our newly acquired possessions, promising to yield a substantial surplus; witnessing every locomotive and every car taxed to its limit, and every vessel laden to the Plimsoll mark to carry our products to market; a prosperity not bounded by parallels of latitude, by mountain range, or sea; reading only last week of voluntary advance of 10 per cent in the wages of 20,000 operatives in the woolen industry, and reading of these advances every week in all branches of industry for the last two years; viewing a condition where each man who has a day's work for sale finds within the reach of his arm a ready purchaser for that day's work at the highest price ever known in history; witnessing every man in the enjoyment of the God-given right to eat his own bread in the sweat of his own brow; retaining the most vivid recollections of the soup houses maintained to prevent the starvation of strong and willing American manhood, and for the support of which many of us were called upon to contribute. I, for one, have no pride of political opinion which I will place as a barrier to impede the triumphal march of the present order of affairs. With American homes bathed in the golden sunshine of prosperity my partisanship shrivels, as it ought, and my patriotism exults, as it should.

To my mind, every proposition in restraint of legitimate trade, every measure which in its tendencies may carry covert threat to our industries, every new scheme of dreamers and theorists, should be carefully weighed by members on both sides of this chamber who aim to be statesmen rather than mere politicians; not to make records for an impending Presidential contest, with which we may appeal to the prejudices or partiality of blind partisans, but with wise conservatism weighing, assaying, and analyzing all measures, and when in doubt let us rather stand still than rush headlong into untrodden paths.

Whatever our views political may be, love of country is not bounded by lines of party. The man or set of men who for political success would drag the car of progress which has emerged from the miasmatic lowlands back into the dismal swamp of despair is a worthy member of no party. I do not think there is such a one on this side of the Chamber. If there be such a one on either side of this body, may we all providentially escape from his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I have thus, in a desultory manner, stated some of my objections to the pending measure and have trespassed upon the time of this body with statements of my personal views, not because I have deemed an apology necessary for my views in the past or my position in the present. Each Representative in Congress must answer to his own constituency and to his own conscience as to his individual and representative duty.

If there be those who deem my position to-day inconsistent with views which I have heretofore expressed upon the floor of this House, I glory in that inconsistency which permits me to set aside the useful implement of yesterday because the development of the genius of the present affords me a better implement ready for my use to-day.

And so long as I may be honored with a seat in this body and during the term for which I am elected to serve in public life, and in my retirement, so long as life is spared, I shall believe with the poet that—

> New occasions teach new duties;
> Time makes ancient good uncouth;
> They must onward still, and upward,
> Who would keep abreast of Truth.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DALY] is recognized for ten minutes.

Mr. DALY of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time in four years that the party to which I belong has had a representation in this Chamber from my State. There are two of us here now; and if conditions continue as they are on the other side, there will be eight of us here at the next election. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Action such as that now pending upon a measure that has not received the sanction of a House committee, I assume, has never before been attempted except by the Republican party. It is a bad and vicious practice, and I do not wonder at the criticism of the minority when they arraign the Republican party for this unseemly haste in forcing this measure without that preparation so important a measure justly merits. Months of time have been given the Republican party for preparation, due to the appointment last February of a caucus monetary committee. On the opening of Congress this bill was framed, and every member of the majority was in possession of a prepared statement in explanation of its features.

The debate upon this measure has assumed many phases, but in reality the bill itself proposes absolutely to put in force a single gold standard. The doctrine of monometallism is modern; it is in direct conflict with our Constitution, and it is the first time in the history of our country that it has ever been suggested on the floor of Congress. No one has ever dared to stand for such a radical measure. The great minds of the country believed in the principles of the double standard. Many differed as to the principle to be applied in fixing the ratio, some believing that Congress had the arbitrary right, and others that Congress should regulate it by the laws of commerce and trade. The double standard was born of the minds of Jefferson and Hamilton, who paved the way for our country's greatness, and it is a part of our country's system that should forever remain.

This is evidenced by the fact that through every stage of our advancement and the many changes of party the Constitution has remained inviolate; gold and silver have been and are the money of the country. This is also evidenced by the protest made by the many distinguished statesmen who, when they discovered the demonetization of silver by the act of 1873, protested most strongly against it, and declared their ignorance of the passage of an act that caused that demonetization. Mr. Blaine declared on the 15th day of February, 1878, that he did not know anything that was in the bill at all, and Mr. ALLISON, of Iowa, declared the bill was doctored.

Mr. Burchard, of Illinois, declared that, "unaccompanied by a report, unknown to members of Congress, who, without opposition, allowed it to pass," and Mr. CANNON, of Illinois, "It was not discussed, as shown by the record." I might quote the expressions and sentiments of others in this same line, but enough has been said to impress the mind with the belief that the great leaders of the Republican party were opposed to the striking down of silver as a standard of value. Both political parties declared against a single standard when they solemnly pledged themselves to the use of gold and silver in their platforms. The Republican party in 1888 declared as follows:

The Republican party is in favor of the use of gold and silver as money, and condemns the policy of the Democratic Administration in its efforts to demonetize silver.

In 1892 it declared:

The American people, from tradition and interest, favor bimetallism, and the Republican party demands the use of gold and silver as money with such restrictions and with such provisions.

In 1896 it declared:

We are opposed to the free coinage of silver except by international agreement with the leading commercial nations of the world, which we pledge ourselves to promote, and until such an agreement can be made, etc.

In the Republican Campaign Book of 1896, issued by the national and Congressional committees, this proposition was declared:

Of the three measures, i. e., gold monometallism, silver monometallism, and bimetallism, the large majority of the people of the United States unquestionably favor bimetallism. It is the middle-ground between the ultra-faction element, as well as historical and constitutional ground.

Mr. GAINES. What book are you reading from?

Mr. DALY of New Jersey. From the Campaign Book of 1896, issued by the Congressional and Republican campaign committee of that year.

With declarations such as these, and upon which the Republican party has so frequently gone before the people, it will be wondered why this complete change of base. It is but a few years ago when some of the members on this floor declared with all their ability and eloquence against any proposal looking to the striking down of silver as a standard money, and none was more vehement, eloquent, and persuasive than the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. GROSVENOR. Let me read what he said. The House having under discussion, on the 14th day of February, 1895, joint resolution No. 275, authorizing the issue of $65,116,275 of gold 3 per cent bonds, the distinguished gentleman said:

Fellow-Republicans, let me read to you our platform, the declaration of our principles upon which we have marched to both victory and defeat. In 1888 we said: "The Republican party is in favor of gold and silver as money and condemns the policy of the Democratic Administration in its efforts to demonetize silver." In 1892 we said: "The Republican party from tradition and interest favors bimetallism, and the Republican party demands the use of gold and silver as standard money." These are the declarations of our party, and, Mr. Speaker, as one faithful to this platform declaration, I will not vote for this measure.

Again, in criticising the provisions of the bill the distinguished gentleman further said:

You said, "Give us a coin bond and we will let you have the money at 3½ per cent; give us a gold bond and we will charge you only 3 per cent. We make a difference of sixteen and a half millions of dollars in a period of thirty years." Why do you do it? We say you do it because in one case our bond would be payable in silver and in the other your bond would be payable in gold, and you get sixteen and one-half millions of dollars in our money for the purpose of compensating you for the difference between gold and silver.

The Republican party refused to sanction the issue of a gold bond and refused to have the policy of the Government changed from the issuing of coin bonds to that of gold. You were in line with the declarations of your party and refused to create a disparagement as against the coin bond. You looked upon it then as of equal merit with that of gold and would not permit the change to be made, as suggested by the banking syndicate of New York. This, too, was at a time when you might have afforded to be generous. Our country was passing through a financial panic such as it had never before experienced. Every industry was crying for help and our country's obligations were threatened with dishonor.

Mr. Cleveland was pleading for money and, in the hope of obtaining the sixty millions or more to meet the emergency, caused the resolution to be introduced for the issue of that amount in gold bonds. Your prostrate country appealed to your sympathies in vain. But you stood, you declared, for the Constitution; you stood for your party's declaration; and in your position you were sustained by your colleagues, Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois and Mr. HEPBURN, of Iowa, and others, aided by that peerless citizen of Nebraska, William Jennings Bryan. What a scene was that, my colleagues! The warrior from Ohio, Mr. GROSVENOR, and the statesman of Nebraska clasping hands in the common cause of preventing the destruction of bimetallism.

How things have changed since then! The Constitution must now be violated! The standard money of the country must be stricken down at the behest of the money changers to pay the obligations connected with Mr. McKinley's election. You know the fountains of wealth—the banks—never failed you during the campaign of 1896, and you ardently hope that they will perform the same duty for the coming campaign if this legislation asked for is placed upon the statute books. You say in answer to the arraignment of my party that we have virtually been on a gold basis for years and that the Republican party declared to the people that as soon as the opportunity offered, it would put the practice into the shape of positive law. This I challenge, and I have no hesitancy in saying that not a member on this floor ever made such a declaration. If he did, or his party ever assumed that position, the party would never have been in control of the Administration of this Government.

One of the reasons urged for the passage of this most unjust measure is that the conditions are favorable and the time opportune for the adoption of the gold standard, based upon the theory that the gold standard has been adopted in Austria-Hungary, Brazil, Great Britain, Chile, Portugal, Sweden, Turkey, Costa Rica, Japan, Peru, Russia, and other European and South American countries; therefore, forsooth, my country must bow to foreign policy. I say to you that I care not if the balance of the civilized world adopted it—the single gold standard. My country is greater, my country is more enlightened, its wants are greater, we are all freemen; therefore we need more money to maintain this glorious position than the unfortunate slaves and pauper labor of monarchical Europe.

If this single gold standard is such a magnificent institution abroad, why do the immigrants flock to our shore. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I will tell you. They pay labor on a gold standard, and that is the reason why these immigrants come to this country, glad to partake of the benefits of our institutions and leave behind them forever all remembrance of the poverty and misery they suffered from low wages and the single standard. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

American labor rightfully demands eight hours for a day's work; the American laborer justly asks for higher wages; the American laborer has that ambition and that personality required for good citizenship which makes him desire to surround his family with all the comforts of life and afford education for his children. These can not be obtained under a single gold standard or a contracted currency.

By one sweeping provision the entire bond obligations of this Government are turned into gold bonds, thereby increasing their market value. At no time was it ever legally insisted that the word "coin" carried with it the meaning of gold only. It has ever been contended by leading Republicans that notwithstanding the Government authorities construed them into gold obligations, yet the legal effect and true construction were that the same might be liquidated in silver.

I can not vote for any measure that by legislation will give increased value to the obligation. It was strictly contended by the Republicans that the Democrats by legislation intended to give a value to the silver dollar when we declared the power was in Congress to fix the ratio. It is this thing you are now doing that you charged upon the Democratic party when it declared for the proposition of 16 to 1, that it was proposed to fix value by legislation. Such legislation as you now contemplate places at a disadvantage he who earns his bread by his daily toil.

The redemption of the silver dollar and other circulating mediums, as this bill proposes, means contraction of the currency. Call it by what name you please, or you may designate it by the name of the "issue and redemption fund," yet it means that the money circulating in the channels of trade can be and will be retired by the redemption process and forever impounded and locked up, and thereby place us all at the mercy of the national banks. It means that the national banks will have every debtor at their mercy. It means that the national banks can raise the measure of discount to such an arbitrary standard that the struggling merchant must sooner or later go to the wall, and, on the other hand, the favored ones may keep on adding to their revenues. It is a bank trust, and it holds our business industries at their mercy.

Our Republican friends are boasting of prosperity, and boasting, too, that in a large measure it came through the policy pursued by the Republican party. This claim we deny. We say to you that if it is true, then it is dangerous to attempt to change or make innovation upon the existing laws relating to our monetary system which produced these results. Three hundred and thirty-seven million have been added to the circulation without the aid of legislation. This has in a great degree produced these prosperous times. Why should we now contract our currency? If this increased amount of money has increased the per capita circulation from $21 to $24, then why reduce to the old figures? If our industries are thriving and labor is well paid, why provide the means of destroying those conditions, which this bill will most assuredly do? Rather let our object be in time of plenty to prepare for famine.

The proposition to make every dollar of our currency redeemable

in gold has never before been advanced in this country, nor in any other. Why, then, coin silver at all? A Treasury note or gold certificate would perform the same service in the channels of business. If we are to strike down silver, as this bill proposes, we might as well make the destruction complete, for it will have no value as a circulating medium.

You will give the Secretary of the Treasury unlimited power to issue bonds, and at the same time give the national banks power to force bond issues. The Republican party condemned the Cleveland Administration for this same policy, as also did in reality the Democratic party. But if Mr. Cleveland's Administration was dictated by his banking friends, the same friends and the Cleveland allies combined to bring about the election of Mr. McKinley. This bill is their reward.

The unfairness of the pending measure is again apparent in the proposed method of taxing banks. They are to be taxed upon the basis of their capital and surplus. This is but an experiment against a tried policy which has prevailed since the inception of national banks; is a virtual reduction of their tax. Furthermore, why tax the surplus? That is a tax upon the people's money, as the surplus stands as the security of those who deposit.

While the absolute fixing of the ratio between gold and silver at 16 to 1 may not appear to me to be practicable, owing to the now changing conditions and to the power of the banks, there are few who will not agree with me that the money of the country could best stand upon a bimetallic basis.

But the Government is transferring the control of the money supply to the banks, notwithstanding the fact that the issuance of money is distinctly a Federal function, and the Government can not, in justice to the whole people, delegate that power to individuals.

The responsibility now rests upon the Republican party, and they must stand or fall upon the success or failure of this plan. I am opposed to this bill, not because of the question of ratio between the money metals, but because it leaves us at the mercy of unscrupulous financiers, strikes down bimetallism, and will not prevent contraction when a critical time arrives. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURKE] is recognized for fifteen minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, those of us who were here at the beginning of the extra session of the Fifty-fifth Congress, which convened on the 15th day of March, 1897, can see the similarity of the action of the majority of the present Congress and that one in forcing a party measure through the House over the protest of the minority and without regard to the time or manner in which it comes before the House. At the extra session of the last Congress the Dingley tariff bill was before the House, and at that time there sat in this Hall 153 new members, possibly not one of whom had ever read a clause of that bill, and yet the measure was forced through the House by the Republican majority without giving adequate time for its proper discussion.

But, Mr. Chairman, that bill was referred to the proper committee and duly reported to the House, while here at the beginning of the present session we have this measure presented to the House, affecting to a far greater extent the interests of the American people than did the Dingley tariff bill, and its passage demanded by the majority without its having been referred to any committee for deliberation and action, as the rules of the House require. I know, Mr. Chairman, that nothing that can be said on this side of the House will alter or change the determination of the majority on this floor to carry into effect their caucus edict and pass this bill. I recognize this fact fully, but duty to ourselves, as well as to those who sent us here, impels many of us to register our objection and not only vote against the measure, but give some of our reasons why such a departure from the financial system which has heretofore served the American people should not receive the sanction of the American Congress.

Mr. Chairman, during the discussion of this bill some strange things have been said on the floor of the House. I do not see the gentleman in his seat to-day, but I think it was the day before yesterday the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] made a statement that was absolutely astounding, at least to my ears. He declared in his dulcet tones—and we all love to listen to the gentleman, for he always speaks interestingly and charmingly on any subject he discusses—he declared that it was known to the people of the United States that we had been on the single gold standard since 1834.

Such a statement, Mr. Chairman, coming from such a source, I am unable to harmonize with the facts as they exist, for certainly no one knows better than does the distinguished gentleman that from the date of the first coinage laws of this country, in 1793, down to 1873, a period of about eighty years, this country enjoyed the blessings of bimetallism; gold and silver went concurrently to the mints, and were received and coined there at the ratio fixed and established by law, first at 15 and afterwards at 16 to 1; and, Mr. Chairman, I submit to the House to-day that from the dawn of civilization to this good moment the history of the world shows no people who ever prospered and grew as did the American people the first eighty years of our national life.

We have no way of judging the future except by looking to the past, and, judged by that standard, Mr. Chairman, I ask if bimetallism served the purposes of this Government and the people so well during the first eighty years of the nation's life, why would it not in the future continue to answer every demand? Only a few moments ago the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] stated that no great government, no enlightened country—I believe were his exact words—had ever yet adopted bimetallism. That was another strange assertion to make on the floor of the American Congress, in view of the facts of history, doubtless well known to the gentleman who made the assertion.

Considerable merriment was caused yesterday by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN]. He stated that the Democratic party had crossed itself so often on the money question if a Democrat should walk around the block and meet himself on the other side he would not know which one of the boys he was. [Laughter.] I thought then the gentleman was rather unfortunate in the illustration sought to be drawn. It occurred to me that if the distinguished member from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], entertaining the opinion they once held and that which they now hold on the money question, should meet themselves around a block, possibly there would be no nod of recognition [laughter], and I am quite sure, Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished occupant of the White House, President McKinley, should go around the block and meet that other gentleman with whom he used to be on terms of familiarity, Congressman McKinley, there would be no nod of recognition [loud laughter], for Congressman McKinley was a bimetallist and the friend of silver, while we all know President McKinley is a gold monometallist and is unfriendly to silver.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, the leaders of the Republican party, in Congress and out of it, have crossed themselves as often on the money question as any Democrat may have done, but I suppose they reconcile this change of opinion with the thought that "wise men often change their opinions and fools never do." Who are the wise and who are the foolish on this question I will not assume to say. Mr. Chairman, this bill, in my judgment, is vicious from start to finish. The very first declaration it contains fixes irrevocably and for all time to come the single gold standard on the American people. The Republican party in their national platform adopted at St. Louis in 1896 declared in favor of international bimetallism, and, Mr. Chairman, I submit to the House if that declaration was honestly made, then the majority on the floor of this House to-day are not sincere in their determination to pass this bill and the converse of this is equally true.

If the majority of this House are sincere and honestly believe the provisions of this bill are best for the interests of the American people, then the Republican party was not sincere and deceived and misled the people when they declared for bimetallism in any way, international or otherwise. Supplemented to this, Mr. Chairman, is the further fact, well known to all, that the gentlemen sent to Europe by the President in 1897 in the interests of international bimetallism were hampered and possibly defeated in their purposes by the actions and outspoken declarations of the Secretary of the Treasury in favor of the single gold standard and his advocacy of a measure similar to the one now under discussion. It was impossible to make the people of Europe believe that those in authority honestly wanted bimetallism while the Secretary of the Treasury, voicing no doubt the policy of the Administration, was publicly declaring his hostility to everything except the single gold standard.

The second section of this bill, Mr. Chairman, to my mind, is possibly worse than any other section in it. It provides for the payment of all interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the payment of money, now existing or hereafter to be entered into, and all United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the law of July 14, 1890, shall be deemed and held to be payable in gold coin, and all other obligations, public and private, for the payment of money shall be paid in gold. Every bond now outstanding against this Government and every other obligation to pay money is payable in coin; that is, in either gold or silver, at the option of the Government. The bondholders in this country and in Europe have been at work since the close of the civil war to have these obligations paid in gold, and at last they have found a Republican House, Senate, and President ready and willing to grant their inequitable and illegal demands.

The gentleman in charge of this bill [Mr. OVERSTREET] stated that this change from coin to gold in the payment of Government obligations would not benefit the holders of such obligations. If this be true, why have these holders for years and years been demanding this change? No one is here who will say that the great producing and laboring masses of the American people have ever advocated or desired that gold should be substituted for coin in these

obligations. Why, Mr. Chairman, during the Administration of Mr. Cleveland, while there was pending a proposition to sell Government bonds—$62,000,000, I think—a strong effort was made to have them made payable in gold, and the reason was urged that these bonds would sell for $16,000,000 more if the word "gold" were substituted for "coin."

Congress refused to sanction the change, and, sir, in the face of these facts, we have members here who voted against this change and are now favoring it, and who declare with apparent frankness and candor that the bondholders will derive no benefits from the proposed change. The total interest-bearing debt of the United States is $1,046,048,750. If the gain suggested in the sale of these bonds while Cleveland was President be correct, then it will be readily seen that the bondholders pocket the snug sum of about $261,000,000 by way of enhanced value of the interest-bearing debt of the Government, caused by changing the word "coin" for "gold;" and, Mr. Chairman, who pays this $261,000,000 into the pockets of the bondholders? We all know that Government bonds are exempt from all taxation, national, State, and municipal; therefore they contribute nothing. It falls on the shoulders of that class whose voice is rarely heard pressing their claims for Government favor—the producing and laboring millions of American citizens. These are they who furnish support and sustenance for the Government in times of peace and who rally in defense of her flag in time of war.

I wish I had the time, Mr. Chairman, to discuss each of the eleven sections of this bill, but I have not. I will, however, call the attention of the House to section 4. This, in my judgment, is dangerous in that it confers on the Secretary of the Treasury the right and authority to issue and sell bonds at his discretion for the purpose of maintaining the redemption fund provided for in section 3 of the bill. I wish, sir, to emphasize my distinct opposition to this feature of the bill. I object to the grant of such authority to anyone, and Congress should never give to any one man, I care not who he may be, the power and authority to saddle untold millions of indebtedness on the people of the United States. These bonds, if issued, are payable in gold at the end of twenty years, and will draw interest at 3 per cent per annum; and, as before said, the limit to the amount to be issued is absolutely discretionary with the Secretary.

Much has been said, Mr. Chairman, by gentlemen about the operation of what is termed the "endless chain" in the Treasury Department. We have heard much about it and read much about it, but I say to the membership of this House to-day that if this bill becomes a law (and I believe it will) this "endless chain" will be transferred from the windows of the paying and receiving clerks in the Treasury to the bond-issuing department, and there the "endless chain" will work, as occasion demands, until there will be riveted around the necks of the American people a bonded debt such as has been seldom borne by any nation.

The eighth section gives unheard-of privileges to national banks and enlarges their powers so that they may be able to either contract or expand the currency at their own will and pleasure, as it may be profitable for them to do.

It is suggested by gentlemen that under the provisions of this bill national banks could issue their notes to the full extent of the bonds deposited and that this would result in a much larger circulating medium. Experience shows that when times are easy bank circulation expands and when money is stringent the reverse is the case.

The truth is, Mr. Chairman, the issuance of money, whether of gold, silver, or paper, is the special function of the Government, and the authority to give to the people a safe, sound, and stable currency should never be delegated to any bank, national, State, or private.

A careful reading of this bill by anyone who is disposed to consider it on its merits will convince him that the effect of its enactment will be to reduce the circulating medium of the country, thereby contracting the circulation now outstanding.

Mr. Chairman, with one exception, no political party has ever yet declared in favor of the single gold standard, and the Gold Democrats who did so declare in 1896 only carried one small precinct in the United States.

I may be mistaken, sir, but I believe a large majority of the people of this country are opposed to the financial system sought to be established by this bill. Some may indulge the hope that the passage of this bill will sound the political death knell of the party responsible for its enactment; but whether these hopes be realized or not, the passage of this measure signalizes the fact that the Republican party has surrendered unconditionally to the money power in this country. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, you fellows on the other side have been talking like you thought that we Democrats were fools, and occasionally one of you, with more brass than brains, says he knows we are. My answer to such a fellow is that he thinks he knows it, but he thinks what Patterson dreamt. Patterson dreamt a lie. [Applause and laughter.]

It is sometimes a case of Hobson's choice as between a fool and a knave, but, whatever else you may be, there is a big gang of your fellows that are not fools, but you think that you can fool the American people. In your speeches you are trying to mix up and muddy the money question and thereby hide the real nature of your acts. I propose to call attention to the hornbook principles and the bed-rock fundamentals upon which the issue really turns—the standard of value. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In order to clearly understand that issue we must first understand what is meant by a standard of value.

There will be other issues, and very vital ones, involved in the campaign of 1900, but the battle royal that will be waged in every State of this Union will be the same that it was in 1895—the battle of the standards. You fellows seem to flatter yourselves that that issue was settled forever in your favor in the election of 1896, but you forget that no question submitted to the ballot is ever settled among the American people until it is settled right. The so-called decision in your favor was not fairly won, and so sure as there is a God of justice who reigns in heaven and rules in the affairs of men on earth, that decision will one day be reversed by an overwhelming majority of the American people.

> Truth crushed to earth shall rise again,—
> The eternal years of God are hers;
> But Error, smitten, writhes in pain,
> And dies amid her worshipers.

In the limited time allotted to me I will discuss the real issue involved in the banker bill now before the House, and that is, the *standard of value* it proposes to fasten upon the American people.

In order to understand that, we must first understand what is the real meaning and function of the *standard of value*. Much error has been engendered in financial discussions by confusing the different functions of money and using arguments applicable to money in one function, but utterly without any logical force as applied to it in an entirely separate and distinct function. According to all recognized authorities on political economy money has at least three separate functions: First, as a medium of exchange; second, as a measure of value; third, as a *standard of value*.

Now let us examine these different functions of money.

What is its function as a medium of exchange?

Simply this: Suppose there was no such thing as money for a medium of exchange and a farmer went to town with chickens, butter, and eggs to trade for sugar, coffee, and calico; what would he have to do to make a trade? He would have to find not only a man who had sugar, coffee, and calico to trade off, but a man who was willing to trade them off for chickens, butter, and eggs, and that might be hard to do; but with money as a medium of exchange the farmer sells his truck for that, and when once he gets that in his hands, he has no trouble in finding a man who will be willing to trade him sugar, coffee, and calico for that.

Now, what is meant by money in its function as a measure of value? Simply this: Suppose there were no money as a measure of values and a farmer wants to trade off a mule. If he meets a man with wheat and he asks him, "What is the value of your mule; what will you take for him?" he would have to figure out his value in wheat, and then he might say, "This is a 60 bushels of wheat mule." He meets another man with corn, and he says, "What will you take for your mule?" It would do no good to tell that fellow it was a 60 bushels of wheat mule, and so he would have to figure out his worth in corn, and so on with every other commodity he might be willing to trade him for; but with money as a measure of value he simply estimates his value in money, and as the owner of the wheat and corn has already done the same thing with reference to his product, each has a common measure of value and understands the other at once.

This brings us to its third and, in this discussion, its most important function—that of a *standard of value*. This requires a more extended consideration.

The standard of value of any obligation, whether public or private, is that substance or thing which will not only legally discharge the obligation, but the right to demand which, will determine the value of the obligation itself, as compared with other things. Suppose, for instance, an obligation calls for the delivery of so many bushels of wheat; wheat is the standard of value of that contract. Wheat will discharge it, and the worth or value of wheat at any particular time will determine the worth or value of the contract at that time. Now, suppose a whole lot of shrewd fellows with thousands and millions of wheat contracts in their pockets want Government aid to enhance the value of their holdings; how could they do it?

Wheat is a standard article of human food, and when it is unduly scarce or high, poor people can use corn meal for bread. So the shrewd holders of wheat contracts get up an agitation against the use of corn bread as human food. They get a report from a

medical commission that the use of corn bread is unwholesome, and that the Government, in the interests of public health, ought to pass a law to forbid its use, and a subservient Congress should be found to pass a law closing the mills against corn as they did closing the mints against the free coinage of silver. Would not such a law enhance the value of every wheat contract in the world and depreciate the value of corn? Such was the precise effect of the Sherman Act of 1873 in closing the mints against silver. You now propose to consummate that base conspiracy against the rights of the plain people of America.

You propose in this bill to say, whatever may have been the law before this time, that hereafter no silver dollar shall be any part of the standard of value, but that gold alone shall be the standard of value of all obligations of the people of these United States. And yet gentlemen stand up here and say that such a law is not in the interest of the bondholders, bankers, and other large holders of Government obligations! You propose to say that these large holders of such obligations shall be absolutely entitled to receive 25.8 grains of standard gold, coined at the Government mints, for each and every dollar called for in the obligations.

The number of such obligations will foot up to many hundred millions of dollars, and the passage of this law will necessarily enormously increase the demand for gold and thereby enormously increase its value, and as an increase in the value of any substance or thing, which is the standard of value of an obligation, necessarily increases the value of such obligation, the passage of this bill will naturally tend to increase the purchasing power of every dollar of paper or representative money based upon the single gold standard, just as surely as an increase in the demand for wheat would naturally tend to increase the value of all contracts based on wheat. Of course, a large increase in the mining output of gold would hold such tendency in check, and if such increase in the gold output is followed by an increase in the volume of circulation, it would naturally tend to raise the general level in the prices of commodities that would have to be exchanged for a currency based on gold.

The great increase in the world's output of gold (amounting now to about $300,000,000, as against about $200,000,000 a few years ago) and the large amount of money put into circulation by the war with Spain and the Philippines explain nearly all the rise in prices not brought about by a diminished supply of certain products or the manipulations of certain trusts and combines to unduly increase the prices of products controlled by them. In other words, the purchasing power or value of money is controlled by the same great law of supply and demand that applies to everything else. The scarcer anything is the harder it is to get, and the harder anything is to get, the more you have to pay in order to obtain it. The most eminent writers on political economy tell us that money is bought and sold the same as other things. You may not call it a sale, but, in substance, that is what it is. A boy brings potatoes to sell. There is a merchant willing to exchange money for potatoes. If potatoes are scarce and money reasonably plentiful, the boy gets more money for his potatoes and the merchant gets less potatoes for his money. If potatoes are reasonably plentiful or money scarce, the boy who sells potatoes and buys money gets less money and the merchant who sells money and buys potatoes gets more potatoes.

These are merely plain and simple principles, Mr. Chairman; but these plain principles constitute the lunacy of the silver lunatics. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You are fond of telling the people that the great law of supply and demand, and not the volume of currency, determines prices. In telling that you tell a half truth, and a half truth is always a lie. Our Gold-Bug friends are always talking about the law of supply and demand as applied to the product of the farmer, but they fail to tell us that that same law applies to money also. It takes four elements to determine prices: First and second, the supply and demand of the particular products; third and fourth, the supply and demand for money that such products have to be exchanged for.

Now, in regard to "silver lunatics," Thomas Jefferson tells us that he was denounced as a madman or a lunatic by the bankers and money sharks in his day. It is curious how history repeats itself. In 1796 Thomas Jefferson was defeated for the Presidency by John Adams, but four years later he ran against the same man, and in the year 1800 Thomas Jefferson was elected President of these United States. History may repeat itself in the year 1900, and then William J. Bryan will be the President of these United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The fundamental difference between the Democratic and Republican policies on the standard of value is that the Democrats want to allow debtors in all obligations, public or private, their old common-law right of paying their obligations in either gold, silver, or paper money, based upon the bimetallic standard established by our forefathers in 1792, and which was the supreme law of the land from 1792 to the passage of the Sherman Act of 1873.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TERRY. I understood that I was to have five minutes more.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. TERRY. If an annual mining output of three hundred millions of gold will advance prosperity in a country on the single gold standard, how much greater would be that prosperity from an output of five hundred millions of gold and silver combined in a country using both gold and silver as its standard value?

The Republican policy is to narrow the base of primary money and the Democratic policy is to broaden it. The Republican policy is in the interest of the money classes. The Democratic policy is in the interest of the toiling masses, who produce the wealth and constitute the bone and sinew of the country, who pay its taxes and uphold the honor of its flag. No man can safely predict how long the present large output in gold will continue, and whenever it begins to fall off, all of your much boasted jackdaw McKinley prosperity will pass away, and, like an "insubstantial pageant faded, leave not a wrack behind."

The introduction and passage of this bill will mark the final and absolute surrender of the Republican party leaders to the gold syndicate and money power that poured out its millions of corruption fund to make McKinley President in 1896. You propose to abdicate national functions in favor of national banks, to surrender to private corporations the power to control the volume of the money supply of all this land.

With this power of the national banks to control the volume of the country's currency, they can expand or contract it at will. When they want to inflate the values of properties or securities owned or controlled by them or their friends, they can expand it and dispose of what they want to sell at the top of a boom, and then contract it and gather in what they want to buy at the bottom of a collapse. They can thus, by alternate expansions and contractions, absolutely control and dominate the property interests of the entire people of the United States and make themselves their masters.

This was clearly pointed out by John C. Calhoun in a speech delivered by him in the United States Senate in 1833. To confer such powers upon national banks is a base surrender of the rights of the people, and should forever damn any set of men or political party responsible for it.

In this bill you are giving away the very birthright of national government for the mess of pottage you got from the election of 1896; and a miserable mess it was, if we may judge from the way in which your Administration has been truckling to the spirit of English toadyism—yielding to un-American influences and turning its back upon many of the most cherished principles and traditions of the great American people.

What has England, the head center of the gold syndicate, been engaged in? She tried to grab the gold fields from Venezuela, and finally, through the decision of a high joint commission, got the lion's share of what she coveted. She has now cast her covetous eyes on the gold fields of Alaska, and even while her colonial secretary is prating about the beauties of an Anglo-American alliance, she is strengthening her military posts on this continent, and has her guns all trained toward us from Vancouver to Quebec.

She is also grabbing for the gold fields of Africa, and, to exploit her gold syndicate, is waging against the gallant Boers the most unjust and un-Christian war ever waged by one Christian people against another—against the gallant Boers battling for liberty in the Transvaal. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In fighting the passage of this bill we stand where Jefferson stood, when he warned his countrymen against the money sharks in the dawn of the present century. We stand where Jackson stood, when he fought the United States Bank in his day. We stand where Lincoln stood when he uttered his solemn warning to the American people to beware of the insidious and rapid growth of the corporation and banking power and the bondholder trust, whose vast influence now overshadows all the land. We stand where the true, the brave, and earnest-hearted of this land have always stood in every crisis of its history, and, God helping us, we intend to stand there [applause] and to continue and keep up that fight until the janizaries of corporate greed and monopolistic power are driven from the field and the plain people of the land shall plant the glorious symbol of their triumph upon the Dome of this Capitol, with every star radiant in the light of national victory! [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BALL] is recognized.

Mr. BALL. For how much time?

Mr. RICHARDSON. How much time remains of this hour?

The CHAIRMAN. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. BALL. Mr. Chairman, the fact that so many members of this House on the Republican side of the Chamber find it necessary, in order to give their support to this bill, to recant the professions, if not of a lifetime, at least for the term of their public

service, neither commends the bill to my support nor prompts me to oppose it. Three years ago every Republican upon the stump declared it was not their purpose either to abandon silver as money of ultimate redemption, to retire the greenbacks from circulation, or permanently fasten the gold standard on our country.

They then proposed to hold on to the gold standard until foreign governments would help them to turn it loose. Upon a declaration in 1896 for international bimetallism they carried the country and won this House by more than 50 majority. Suspicion as to their good faith, although they refrained from passing a measure like this through the Fifty-fifth Congress, caused by the experience of the bimetallic commission and the utterances of the Secretary of the Treasury, reduced the Republican majority in this Congress to 13, notwithstanding a war was in progress when the elections were held, a condition which always redounds to the good of the party in power.

Why the necessity of now pressing this extreme measure? The Senate is safely against the free coinage of silver, and no bill to change existing conditions in the interest of silver can become a law; and if such a bill could be passed, it would not meet the approval of the President unless he should again change his mind upon the money question. The truth is, the Republican party having never declared in favor of either the retirement of the greenbacks or the permanent adoption of the gold standard, that the great agencies organized to plunder the people and which now own and control the policies of the Republican party are not willing to trust you to go back to your people for instructions, but now demand the pound of flesh, and, unlike Shylock, they are willing to take it even though it draws the blood of the people.

It appears to-day that the Republican party, which brought in this bill, has made an ignominious surrender to the money power by reporting a measure which no political party ever declared for, unless you dignify as such the sliver from the Democratic party in 1896, which polled 135,000 votes in the United States.

I am not surprised at the change of front within three years by the Republican party upon the money question. Less than a year ago not one of you, from the President down, could or would tell how he stood on the question of the forcible annexation of the Philippine Archipelago without the consent of its people. On the contrary, to-day hardly a dissent exists upon that side of the aisle from a policy which the President declared at the outset "could not be tolerated and as contrary to our code of morals." Nay, more, you are seeking only a convenient pretext to take Cuba, in the face of our plighted faith to that unhappy isle and the nations of the earth.

Mr. Chairman, I take no special pleasure in the embarrassment of so great a number of gentlemen upon the other side, caused by former positions and utterances in antagonism to the one which they now occupy. The fact that the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. CANNON, once found it necessary to embrace the cause of silver in order to secure his election and, as he says, defeat the Greenbackers; that the eloquent gentleman from Iowa, Mr. DOLLIVER, has had his "whirl" at silver and, it is said, was so alarmed at the last Republican national convention that he was afraid a declaration for gold would remove all the able Republican Representatives from Iowa from the public service; that the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. HILL, found himself at the last session of this Congress, when he denied the agency of one Joe Leiter in advancing the price of wheat, attributing his paper profits to shrewdness in foreseeing the application of the law of supply and demand, forced to come down with a dull and sickening thud with his theories when, before his remarks could be revised for the RECORD, Leiter had failed and wheat gone down in one day 60 cents per bushel; that they and others are now convinced that this bill is "a good thing and they ought to push it along," does not weaken the force of my objections to the measure or abate my fears as to its harmful results to the people of our country.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, the only doubt that has arisen in my mind for twenty years as to the advisability of the free coinage of silver has been because so many gentlemen, high up in the councils of the Republican party, have professed at all times a friendliness for silver.

The differences upon great fundamental questions between Democracy and Republicanism is so marked that when I find myself agreed with any considerable number of Republicans, I am at once in doubt as to whether or not the measure about which we are agreed is in the interest of the masses of the people.

The issues upon the money question are now sharply defined, and the Republican majority in this House have not added to the weight of their former arguments, reenforced by an occasional false note upon this side of the Chamber, the sounder of which vainly imagines that he can promote Democratic success and advance Democratic theories of government by supporting Republican measures.

This bill comes here, as I have said, without the indorsement of any great political party, and has never been incorporated into the platform of any party save that of the bolters from the Democratic party who met at Indianapolis in 1896, and whose ticket carried only one precinct in these United States. It is not framed at the instance of any considerable number of the unselfish voters of the land, but is demanded by the selfish interest which put up the money to elect the Republican ticket in 1896 and who now demand that the bread cast by them upon the waters shall be returned an hundredfold and in the "shape of cake." This bill is to be passed in the face of the fact that those Republicans who live near the home of the founder of their party, Mr. Lincoln, and west of there, and who yet retain some longings for the Republicanism of Lincoln, do not in their hearts approve of its provisions, and who know that it is a sacrifice of the money which saved the Union and a complete surrender to that class of gold holders who denied their country upon either side the sacrifice of blood or treasure. Unlike General Grant, who in a memorable campaign cut loose from his base of supplies, the Republican party takes no chances, but stands by its campaign contributors.

The Republican party is to go before the country and urge as an excuse for the surrender of the people's last citadel to the money power that the necessity of this bill has been proven by the prosperity now enjoyed by the country. Upon this frail bark they venture to ship their political fortunes and in this castle of cards they would intrench themselves against the assaults of an outraged and plundered public—upon a fictitious prosperity, which is the outgrowth of exploitations of great combinations of capital made possible under the Dingley law; upon the sale of bonds pretendedly made to carry on war after peace was proclaimed; upon an abnormal balance of trade in our favor and the stimulation of many industries now caused by the necessity of providing for our armies in the field and in forts, but which must be dearly paid for in the end.

Why, sirs, if that be the test, what became of the prosperity and the speculative spirit which laid off every hilltop in historic old Virginia and every prairie in "bleeding Kansas" into future great cities in 1889, 1890, and 1891, and that, too, under the Bland-Allison Act and the Sherman law, which are now denounced as the source of all our financial woes?

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that many articles controlled by trusts have been phenomenally advanced; that pig iron, for instance, which a year ago was worth $7.15 per ton, has more than doubled in value; but, Mr. Chairman, while the exploiters of these great combinations have thus doubled the price, the wages of labor has advanced not over 10 per cent, an advance barely sufficient to compensate for the increase in the cost of living. It is true, labor is more generally employed, but it is also true that it is only given a livlihood as long as employment lasts, with no opportunity to accumulate. It is also true, I believe, that these great combinations of capital known as trusts, if permitted to run their course, will destroy themselves when their inflated values have been wrecked; but it is also true, Mr. Chairman, that the promoters of these gigantic combinations will arise, phœnix-like from their ashes, with ill-gotten gains, fleeced from the small fry taken in for the purpose of plunder. They will add to their already enormous wealth by extravagant salaries and reorganized properties bought in through the agencies of receivers.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the shallowness of the money lenders' argument, which has been taken up by their agents and representatives throughout the country, that the world's increased production of gold has solved the money question and exploded the argument of the friends of silver can be easily refuted. Why, Mr. Chairman, these same gentlemen three years ago were contending that our demand for more money was a senseless clamor; that we had money in plenty, what we needed was confidence; that civilization had passed beyond the use of metal money to any great extent, the business of the country being transacted by the agencies which commercial necessities had provided. Hardly had they recovered from the fright which the splendid campaign of our honored leader, the world's greatest champion of popular rights, Mr. Bryan, had given them, when they were thrown into ecstasies by the discoveries of gold in the Klondike and elsewhere.

Why should they have taken so much joy in new discoveries of gold, and why are we constantly confronted with their arguments now of the wonderful productiveness of African gold fields and the great addition to be made to the world's stock of gold by new processes for mining it, unless they know that their arguments in 1896 that we had money enough were false and our arguments that we needed more primary money true? Do not these same gentlemen know that with all the increase in the world's production of gold and in the midst of the prosperity of which they prate that we were a short time ago upon the verge of a great panic, and that, too, in spite of the fact that millions upon millions of Government money were in the coffers of national banks, which were drawing interest upon Government bonds, interest upon currency issued upon Government bonds, and interest upon Government deposits at the same time? You all know to this gross favoritism was added the payment of unearned interest to the

banks upon their bonds by the Secretary of the Treasury and the buying in of Government bonds at $1.11 with only four more years to run at an interest of 5 per cent, which is hardly more than half the interest rates paid by the people who will have to pay the bonds.

Mr. Chairman, I propose to prove that the arguments advanced upon the other side of this House that there has been added to the money in circulation in this country more than $300,000,000 in the past three years is not due to an increased production of gold in the world. The greatest quantity of gold ever produced of which we have any statistics was in the year 1898, being $287,428,600. On January 1, 1898, the world's stock of gold available for coinage was $4,594,900,000. On January 1, 1899, the world's stock of gold available for coinage was $4,631,700,000. Thus we see that while the world produced, in round numbers, $287,000,000 in 1898 that not quite $37,000,000 was added to the world's stock of gold money during that year, and, Mr. Chairman, it is true for a long series of years that by far the larger volume of gold produced has not become available for money. It is also true that as men become more and more fabulously rich, as under unjust laws they are now doing, that more and more will it be demonstrated that gold is the rich man's money, and more and more will it be diverted to the purposes of ornament and other uses than that of money.

From whence, then, did our increased volume of money come within the past three years? The answer is easy. From the sale of bonds and the abnormal balance of trade in our favor, caused principally by disasters to agriculture across the waters. In round numbers, for the past three years the balance of trade in our favor has been $1,400,000,000. Thus, from the proceeds of war bonds, signed with the blood of our gallant soldiers and sailors, and the value of our farm products, enhanced by famine in foreign lands, we have added in three years $300,000,000 to our circulation, but it has required the sale of $200,000,000 in bonds and the selling of $1,400,000,000 more of our products than we bought to obtain it. Reverse these conditions; impound the greenbacks, as this bill proposes; destroy the legal-tender value of all forms of money except gold, as this bill does; make our obligations, public and private, payable in gold, as does this monstrosity, then let a shortage occur in our agricultural products and the industrial interests be tied up by a great protest from organized labor denied its share of prosperity! Let Europe demand our gold, and see then how this mushroom prosperity will vanish!

The presence of this bill here, advocated by a majority of the misrepresentatives of the American people, has convinced me more than ever of the necessity of an American money policy for America. It has convinced me more than ever that the national banking interests, which are behind this bill, are a menace to good government. Those of us who declared in the campaign of 1896 and prior thereto that there was no middle ground between "independent unlimited coinage of gold and silver and the issue of all paper money by the Government" and the "adoption of the single gold standard, the abandonment of silver as money, and the surrender of the exclusive power of issuing paper money to the banking corporations" were hooted at. To-day our prophecies have come to pass, and we are not left as "one crying in the wilderness," as is the gentleman from Iowa, who says that every prophecy he has ever uttered in regard to silver has come to nought, and who was comforted because that distinguished apostle of the gold standard, Mr. Sherman, of Ohio, was in the same boat. We have this advantage, that the advocates of free coinage of silver prophesied at the time that their prophecies would fail.

When the Bland-Allison law was passed it was a compromise made with pretended friendliness to silver, as a substitute for a free-coinage bill presented by that great exponent of the silver cause, whose vision was never obscured by selfish interests, who looked alone to the good of the people, whose memory is reverenced by all true Americans, Richard P. Bland. The Sherman bullion-purchase law was passed as a makeshift and a substitute for a free-coinage bill without the support of a single real friend of silver or a Democratic vote. The trouble with those measures was that by law we discriminated in favor of gold as against silver and pronounced the one metal as more worthy of trust than the other; that we allowed the silversmiths to fix the value of a money metal instead of fixing by law its value.

Had we then said to the world, "Ninety-five per cent of our business is domestic as against 5 per cent foreign; we will not sacrifice the convenience and interest of 95 per cent to 5 per cent; we have sufficient gold and silver planted in our own soil by the 'Giver of every good and perfect gift' to provide us with an independent and ample supply of primary money to keep pace with our business and population, and we will not sacrifice that advantage that foreign consumers may loan us more money, draw from us greater rates of interest, and buy our products at a far less value"—had we given both metals equality before the law; had we said then, aye should we say now; that if all the gold and silver in the world was coined into money and their use abandoned for every other purpose they would not supply the legitimate demand for money, but that paper money and evidences of debt would still be resorted to as is recognized by this bill, and that this great Government of ours, growing nearly one-third of all the products grown by man, manufacturing about one-third of all the articles made by man, and possessed of about one-third the banking capital of the world, with a balance of trade of $600,000,000 in our favor per annum, could and can compel the nations of the earth to pay us in the money we demand, and to take 16 pounds of silver as the equal of 1 pound of gold, or go out of business with those nations now using more than $3,000,000,000 in silver as full legal-tender money.

Only a day or two ago the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH] exhorted us to stand by gold because we did $1,500,000,000 in business with gold-standard countries, as against $400,000,000 with silver-standard countries, and yet the party to which that gentleman belongs is to-day afraid to send a message of sympathy across the seas to the brave Boers who are struggling against the oppression of England as we once did, a party which is about to subvert the Declaration of Independence and is now sacrificing the money of the people and the blood of its manhood in an effort to force a government upon the Filipinos without their consent, for the sole purpose of seeking a market in silver-using countries for British and American gold-standard goods.

Mr. Chairman, I am an optimist, not a pessimist. While I believe that this financial measure, the present tariff policy, subserviency to trusts and the money power, the policy of "criminal aggression" in extending our dominion over distant islands in defiance of organic law and the advice of the fathers of the Republic, will bring great disaster to the American people and render the problems of free government more difficult, yet I do not despair. I have great confidence in the ultimate action of the American people. Although slow to move at times, they will not surrender the form of government which our forefathers, by superb self-sacrifice and inspired wisdom, established. [Applause.]

The lines are now sharply drawn.

In my judgment, "the people will come into their own again" in the only possible way outside of revolution—that is, by and through that political organization whose birthplace was lighted by the fire of liberty, whose author transcribed in the Declaration of Independence the principles for which it stands; the party of Jefferson, of Madison, of Monroe, of Jackson, and of Bryan; the hope of the people, the friend of mankind—the Democratic party. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

[Mr. McCLEARY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in listening to the golden gems of wisdom and the silvery sparkles of eloquence that have irradiated and illumined this discussion, I have been so strongly reminded of the thrilling days and nights of the campaigns of 1896 and 1898, that, in addressing the House after so many days of debate, I feel compelled to narrate one incident that occurred in my own campaign in the latter year. I remember being met just outside the hall on the evening of one of our meetings by an old and feeble constituent of mine, and as I stopped to congratulate him on his ability to be out, he said: "Congressman, I made up my mind that I would hear your speech to-night if it killed me." [Laughter.]

Now, let me hasten to assure my friends who may have any apprehension as to the result of my remarks this afternoon that my old friend not only survived that speech, but he has been getting better ever since [laughter]; and the chances are 16 to 1 that the reason of his improvement is that on that evening he heard good Republican doctrine, for I had just been nominated on a platform declaring for the establishment by law of the single gold standard, and the meeting was held to ratify that platform.

Considering the way in which our friends on the other side of the Chamber were carried off their feet by the precipitancy with which they were plunged into the discussion of this question, the eloquence, brilliancy, acumen, and inaccuracy of their arguments demonstrate anew their ability to meet any emergency.

The inaccuracy of their statements of historical facts was only paralleled by their ignorance of the Scriptures. I want to suggest to my learned friend from Kentucky that in his version of the parable of the man who went down from Jerusalem to Jericho he does great injustice to the thieves. Let me remind him that it was not the Levite that fell among the thieves. The thieves had too much discretion to tackle such a cold-blooded proposition; and as the gentleman from Kentucky does injustice to the thieves in his version of the parable, he does injustice to his own intelligence and that of his colleagues in his sweeping and comprehensive denunciation of those who support this measure.

Now if I thought that it was at all necessary to say anything in support of the acknowledged reputation of the Republican side of the House for thorough familiarity with the Scriptures, I should begin my remarks with a text from the book of Ecclesiastes:

He that loveth silver shall not be satisfied with silver; nor he that loveth abundance with increase: this is also vanity.

In the remarks on the adoption of the rule under which this

debate has been held the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] said that it would take more time than we could get on our side of the House to apologize for the opinions of those of our party who had paid the debt to time and mortality. But he said nothing of the indefinite extension of time that would be necessary to permit the gentlemen on that side of the House to apologize for the position on the financial question of the distinguished living and the more distinguished dead of the Democratic party. [Laughter on the Republican side.] The only illustrious Democrat for whom an apology has been made by them is Grover Cleveland, and the tone in which this apology was given leaves some doubt in our minds as to whether our Democratic friends were apologizing for themselves for having made Mr. Cleveland President or apologizing for the Almighty for having made Mr. Cleveland. In my opinion the Lord never made a better Democrat than Grover Cleveland, and the Democrats never made a better man President. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] poured out the vials of his wrath upon the Republican party with a fervor that reminded me of one of the old Hebrew prophets hurling his denunciations from the summit of Ebal or Gerizim upon the chosen people. As he spoke in lonely grandeur from the midst of a disintegrating party his words had a solemn pathos like the voice of one crying in the wilderness.

Now, let the prophet from Missouri derive what comfort he can from the delusion that his denunciations are just, but let him not forget to temper the warmth of his enthusiasm with the reflection that we on this side of the House are still the chosen people—chosen by our fellow-citizens to protect the honor and credit of the nation.

Since the triumph of the Republican party in 1896 this country has enjoyed, under the wise and statesmanlike Administration of President McKinley, a period of widespread commercial activity and extraordinary prosperity. Our Democratic friends are unwilling to attribute any of our national blessings to the triumph of Republican principles, and explain them as the direct gift of Divine Providence. Perhaps we ought only to claim that the Almighty has made use of the Republican party in working out his scheme of beneficence. But who ever heard of the Almighty making any use of the Democratic party for beneficent purposes?

This bill, so far as it relates to the currency, simply places upon the statute books the will of the people registered at the polls in 1896. The gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber who have the courage to vote for this bill need not fear that they are departing from the principles of their party, for in supporting this measure they are simply returning to the principles of Jefferson and Jackson. And in their independence they are following the example of the founder of their party. It was Jefferson who said:

> I never submitted the whole system of my opinions to the creed of any party whatever in religion, philosophy, politics, or any other matter where I was capable of thinking for myself. Such an addiction would be the last degradation of a free and moral agent. If I could not go to heaven but with a party, I would not go there at all.

We may be sure that if Jefferson was unwilling to make his chance of reaching heaven depend upon his allegiance to the Democratic party, he would not, if alive to-day, risk plunging his country into the opposite abyss by advocating the modern, Bryanesque doctrines of that party. But with characteristic disregard of the truth, Bryan and his followers lose no opportunity of asserting that in their advocacy of the principles of the Chicago platform they are following faithfully in all the footsteps of Jefferson and Jackson. To one, however, who is at all familiar with the political views of Jefferson and Jackson it is clear that there is not an important principle contained in the Chicago platform or advocated by Mr. Bryan to which these distinguished Democrats were not opposed.

When Mr. Bryan told us in one of his oracular utterances that the Democratic party did not care about ancestry and had no use for pedigrees I was reminded of one of Jefferson's letters to a friend who was about starting for England. The letter closes with this request:

> One further favor and I am done—to search the Heralds' Office for the arms of my family. I have what I have been told were the family arms, but on what authority I know not. It is possible there may be none. If so, I would, with your assistance, become a purchaser, having Sterne's word for it that a coat of arms may be purchased as cheap as any other coat.

Will some gentleman on the other side, who with Mr. Bryan is following in all the footsteps of the immortal Jefferson, tell us Mr. Bryan's views of this method of proclaiming one's democracy? Will Mr. Bryan, following the example of the illustrious founder of his party, go to London and buy a coat of arms for the purpose of making more apparent the gulf that separates him from the great mass of his countrymen whom he daily insults by calling them the "common people?" Thanks to the Republican party there are now in this country no common people of any race, color, or religion!

This Jeffersonian method of securing a coat of arms has its advantages, because one can select a motto and devices in keeping with one's personal characteristics. Considering the obstinate pertinacity with which Mr. Bryan has reiterated the untruths of history and finance, the Earl Marshal might for an adequate honorarium issue to the irrepressible vocalist of the Platte these arms and motto:

> HE BEARETH ARGENT, ON A FIELD SABLE, A DEMI-DONKEY RAMPANT, FROM ITS MOUTH ISSUANT IN FLAMES, 16 TO 1, GULES, AND UNDERNEATH THE WORDS VERBA NON VERA.

The author of the Declaration of Independence had strange views on the benefits to be derived from a connection with Great Britain. As late as the fall of 1775 he wrote to a friend:

> I am sincerely one of those who would rather be in dependence on Great Britain, properly limited, than on any other nation on earth, or than on no nation.

And a few days later he wrote:

> Believe me, dear sir, there is not in the British Empire a man who more cordially loves a union with Great Britain than I do.

And even after the battle of Bunker Hill, in another letter, he expressed his wish that the conflict might be settled without going any further, and after the surrender of Cornwallis he put himself on record as in favor of an offensive and defensive alliance with Great Britain. How many of you, gentlemen, are following in Jefferson's footsteps in this matter? Do you favor an alliance with Great Britain to-day?

But Mr. Bryan has often said, "Like Thomas Jefferson, we trust the common people." In what way did Thomas Jefferson trust the common people? In his commentaries on the Constitution, written from Paris, he said:

> I like the power given the legislature to levy taxes, and for that reason solely approve of the greater House being chosen by the people directly. For I think a House chosen by them will be very illy qualified to legislate for the Union and for foreign nations.

In his draft of the constitution of his own State of Virginia he makes, as the foundation of suffrage, property holding or service in the State militia. How many of you, gentlemen, are following in Jefferson's footsteps in this limitation of the right of suffrage?

But we also hear a great deal from the Chicago platform and from Mr. Bryan in reference to the life tenure of the judiciary. Jefferson expressed himself firmly and decidedly on this point, as he did on every other point of public interest in his day. He said:

> The dignity and stability of government in all its branches, the morals of the people, and every blessing of society depend so much upon an upright and skillful administration of justice that the judicial power ought to be distinct from both the legislature and executive and independent of both, so that it may be a check upon both, as both should be checks upon that. The judges, therefore, should always be men of learning and experience in the laws, of exemplary morals, great patience, calmness, and attention; their minds should not be distracted with jarring interests; they should not be dependent upon any man or body of men. To these ends they should hold estates for life in their offices, or, in other words, their commissions should be during good behavior.

How many of you, in supporting the Chicago platform, are following in Jefferson's footsteps in this matter? In his draft of a constitution for Virginia he provides that the higher judges shall be elected for life by the assembly and that all the lower judges, even down to justices of the peace, shall be appointed by the executive for life.

We have also heard from the leader of the Democratic party a great deal of denunciation of the use of the ancient writ of injunction by our courts, and a clause in the Chicago platform is aimed against it. But let us look for a moment at what Jefferson conceived the province of the judiciary under our Federal and State constitutions. He said, in a letter to Madison from Paris:

> I like the negative given to the Executive with a third of either House, though I should have liked it better had the judiciary been associated for that purpose or invested with a similar or separate power.

Gentlemen, when you inveigh against the use of the writ of injunction by our courts, how close do you keep to the footsteps of Thomas Jefferson, who went so much further, and believed not only, as you say, in government by injunction, but government by judicial veto?

Again, let us see what the great statesman and founder of the Democratic party had to say about the matter of imposts and direct taxation. In another letter, in commenting upon the Constitution, he says:

> There is a great mass of good in it in a very desirable form, but there is also to me a bitter pill or two. Would it not have been better to have assigned to Congress exclusively the article of imposts for Federal purposes and to have left direct taxation exclusively to the States.

Now, if this was such a bitter pill to Thomas Jefferson, what sort of a bolus would he have thought was being forced down his throat in your income-tax law that has been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court?

No, my Democratic friends, you do not believe to-day in any of Jefferson's political views. Many of his ideas were crude, childish, and preposterous and quite in harmony with some of the absurd principles of Bryan and his followers. But his views on maintaining the high character and independence of the judiciary and on coinage and finance commend themselves to all thinking, patriotic men to-day; and if you followed them, as you claim to do, you would vote for this bill. Judged by the ancient creed of the

Democratic party you Bryan Democrats have left undone those things which you ought to have done, and you have done those things which you ought not to have done.

Jefferson, at the time of the establishment of our National Government, made a careful and exhaustive study of the questions relating to coinage and currency. In his elaborate notes on coinage he says:

The proportion between the values of gold and silver is a mercantile problem altogether. * * * Just principles will lead us to disregard legal proportions altogether; to inquire into the market price of gold in the several countries with which we shall be principally connected in commerce, and to take an average from them.

And again he says:

Perhaps, we might with safety lean to a proportion somewhat above par for gold, considering our neighborhood and commerce with the sources of the coins, and the tendency which the high price of gold in Spain has, to draw thither all that of their mines, leaving silver principally for our and other markets.

In a note to his outline of the coinage system are these words:

I would still incline to give a little more than the market price for gold because of its superior convenience in transportation.

In his famous letter to Hamilton in reference to this matter he said:

With respect to the dollar, it must be admitted by all the world that there is great incertainty in the meaning of the term, and therefore all the world will have justified Congress for their first act for removing the incertainty by declaring what they understand by the term, but the incertainty once removed exists no longer and I very much doubt a right now to change the value and especially to lessen it. It would lead to so easy a mode of paying off their debts. Besides, the party injured by this reduction of the value would have so much to urge in support of the first point of fixation. Should it be thought, however, that Congress may reduce the value of the dollar, I should be for adopting for our unit, instead of the dollar, either 1 ounce of pure silver or 1 ounce of standard silver.

The average ratio of the coinage of gold and silver in the commercial nations of Europe at the time of the establishment of our Mint was 14¼ to 1. In accordance with Jefferson's views, in our first coinage we slightly undervalued silver, and the metals were coined at the ratio of 15 to 1. This was done for the purpose of bringing gold to this country and keeping it here. But in the course of a few years the bullion value of the metals had changed to about 15½ to 1. And now we come to Jackson's attitude on the money question. In the early thirties gold was discovered in the southern Alleghanies. Through Jackson's influence the ratio of our coinage was changed in 1834 to 16 to 1, and in 1835 branch mints were established in Charlotte, N. C., and Dahlonega, Ga., restricted by law to "the coinage of gold only."

This undervaluation of silver and the establishment of these mints for the coinage of gold only would be called by Bryan, I suppose, owing to his reverence for the memory of Jackson, the misdemeanor of 1834.

The sound views of Jefferson and Jackson on the money question and the wise legislation with reference to coinage recommended by them were based upon a clear conception of the truth of these two principles: First, that the adaptability of metals for use as money lies in the mercantile value of the metals and that coinage neither adds to nor detracts from that value; second, that two or more metals can only circulate freely as money at the same time when they are coined according to their mercantile ratio of exchange.

The experience of mankind, however, has shown that the ratio of exchange of two substances does not remain the same for any length of time and that when two metals are used concurrently as money the metal that is undervalued in the ratio of coinage will disappear from circulation. If a gold dollar has, as a coin, only the purchasing power of a silver dollar when as a piece of metal it has the power to purchase enough silver to make two dollars, it will not long remain a coin.

If, for example, we should enter upon the free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the ratio of 16 to 1 while the mercantile ratio of exchange is 35 to 1, all the gold in the country would at once disappear, the purchasing power of the silver dollar would be reduced one-half, all prices would consequently be doubled, while all creditors, annuitants, savings-bank despositors, pensioners, beneficiaries of life-insurance companies, and building associations would find that the money received by them had lost one-half of its purchasing power.

The people of this country in the elections of 1896 and 1898 declared their unbelief in this silver heresy, and this bill simply embodies into law the will of the people.

The most serious feature of this money question is that there is such a great diversity of opinion in regard to the fundamental truths in relation to money. Bryan and his school of political philosophers arrive at certain conclusions by a process of reasoning based upon a system of theorizing which ignores the facts of history. But the money question is preeminently a practical question and should be considered from the standpoint of human experience. Ignoring theories and basing our conclusions on the facts of history, I take these to be the fundamental truths in relation to money:

First. Money is that commodity for which by universal consent the people agree to exchange all other commodities.

Second. The people, not the Government, select the commodity which they wish to use as money.

Third. The functions of Government in relation to money, like the functions of Government in relation to food, begin when the people have selected the commodities which they wish to use as money or food.

Fourth. Government can not give to any commodity a value that has not been given to it by the laws of nature and exchange any more than it can give to food nutritive properties that have not been given to it by the laws of nature.

Fifth. When the people have selected metals for money, the coinage of metals is an attribute but not an obligation of sovereignty.

Sixth. Government can not by coinage or legislation add to any metal a value that has not been given to it by the laws of nature and exchange.

Seventh. Exchanges of commodities for money are always expressly or by implication for a given weight of a given metal.

Eighth. The Government can not compel me to part with the work of my hands or the production of my brain.

Ninth. When I have parted with the work of my hands or the production of my brain and have been promised therefor a given weight of a given metal, and he who has made the promise seeks to pay me in a less weight of the stipulated metal, he is guilty of a crime, and the Government will punish him accordingly.

Tenth. When the Government steps in and compels me to receive a less weight of the stipulated metal, or a different metal, it is guilty of a fraud which requires its sovereignty to carry out.

These, according to my understanding, are the ten fundamental verities in relation to money, and they are as unassailable as the Ten Commandments.

I understand that the Democratic party is endeavoring to accomplish that which, if done by an individual, would be a private crime; if done by the Government, a national fraud.

The fundamental truths in relation to currency are equally simple:

First. All metal tokens, such as the silver, nickel, and copper coins of the United States, and all receipts for money issued or authorized to be issued by the Government for use as money, are currency.

Second. Currency is simply a substitute for money used for convenience in making exchanges.

Third. When a community has different kinds of money and different kinds of currency, it is the duty of the Government to so regulate the character and issue of currency as to make all forms of currency redeemable in the best kind of money.

Fourth. The United States has the good fortune to have but one money—gold—and the misfortune to have nine different kinds of currency.

Fifth. It is the duty of our Government at once to simplify and reform our currency and register in the law of the land the will of the people that all our currency shall be redeemable in the money selected by the people.

In view of these fundamental truths concerning money and currency, I hope to see the time when there will be a uniform system of money in operation throughout the civilized world. This money system should be based upon the unrestricted free coinage of such metals as the people may choose, coined by weight according to the metric system. Such a system can be adopted at any time by any nation without waiting for the cooperation of other countries, for existing contracts and foreign exchanges could be adjusted to such a system more readily than our forefathers adjusted their outstanding contracts under our present system when it was adopted a century ago.

Under this system we would have a universal coinage, the coins of our country being substantially the same as the coins of every other country. Each coin would express on one side its national character and on the other side its universal character. On the obverse of the coin would appear the arms, insignia, and legend of the nation that issued it, and on the reverse would appear the simple story of its weight, told in the universal language of the metric system.

Under such a system there would be no silver question, and Bryan's occupation would be gone. All the jargon about 16 to 1, keeping up the ratio, and maintaining the parity would disappear. All the superstition and embarrassment that have surrounded the use of arbitrary and symbolic names, such as guinea, dollar, etc., for describing the given weight of a certain metal, and all uncertainty as to the meaning of these symbolic names would also disappear and our money system would be founded, as it should be, upon eternal truth and mathematical accuracy. With such a money system our currency system would take care of itself.

Until we are ready to reform our system of money and currency along some such lines it is the duty of our National Government, by pledging its credit and by all other honorable means, to give to all forms of money and currency the same ratio of exchange and purchasing power. This bill tends to accomplish this end. It is a step in the right direction. It conforms to the views of

Jefferson, Hamilton, Morris, Jackson, and all our practical statesmen, economists, and financiers. The strongest argument in its favor is that it is utterly opposed to the theories of Bryan and his school of repudiationists.

I trust that there are many gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber who will support this measure. Let me strengthen their resolutions with the noble words of the great founder of their party:

The honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith form the bright constellation which has gone before us and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reform; the wisdom of our sages and the blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment; they should be the creed of our political faith, the text of our civic instruction, the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust, and should we wander from them in moments of error or alarm, let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety.

Will you follow the bright constellation that guided the steps of the immortal Jefferson or will you stagger after the ignis fatuus that rose from the marshes of the Platte and for over three years has been deluding the credulous portion of the American people?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for ten minutes.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I am in the habit of practicing law for a living at home. In our Kentucky practice we plead to an issue. I have sat here for two or three days trying to ascertain the legal effect and what would be the consequences of the enactment of this proposed bill into law. I have heard a great number of learned discussions in opposition to the Chicago platform, and I have listened carefully to the arguments upon the other side, without having ascertained any definite light as to what would be the effect of the enactment of this bill, so I sent up yesterday to the Comptroller of the Currency and asked him this question:

If all national banks now doing business with a paid-up capital stock of $150,000 or less should be permitted to issue currency to an amount equal to 25 per cent of the capital stock paid in, and all such banks having a paid-up capital stock of over $150,000 should limit their issues of currency to $50,000 to each bank, would the amount of national-bank currency be increased over or decreased under the amount as at present; and if so, how much?

To that question the Comptroller of the Currency sent me this answer yesterday (and that is precisely what this bill proposes to do):

In reply to your inquiry of the 12th instant, you are respectfully advised that if the national banks with a capital stock of $150,000 or less were permitted to issue a circulation to the amount of 25 per cent of their capital, and those with a capital stock exceeding $150,000 were permitted to issue circulation to the amount of $50,000 each, the total issuable circulation would be $97,388,809. The outstanding circulation of the national banks on September 7, 1899, was $200,345,567. Under the plan suggested the circulation of the banks would be reduced to the extent of $102,956,758.

It has been repeatedly announced upon the other side that one of the purposes of this bill is to enlarge the circulation of the national banks. This is ostensibly one of the purposes, because this bill provides that the currency may be increased to par instead of only 90 per cent, as now. But that ostensible purpose is more than counterbalanced by the fact that by this bill the circulation is confined to the par value of the bonds, and the decreased amount of the bonds by the terms of this bill will necessarily curtail the circulation of the national-bank currency $102,000,000.

I propounded yesterday to the Comptroller of the Currency this further question:

Suppose that all national banks having a paid-up capital stock of $150,000 or less should limit their currency to a sum equal to one-fourth of the amount of the capital stock paid in, and that all banks having a paid-up capital stock of more than $150,000 should limit the currency to $50,000 to each bank; and suppose all the present laws relating to the taxation of national banks should be repealed excepting the act of July 13, 1898, entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," and that in lieu of all the statutes so repealed there should be substituted a tax of one-tenth of 1 per cent per annum upon the value of the franchises of all these banks as measured by the aggregate amount of their capital surplus and undivided profits, would the total amount of taxes to be collected by the Government from these institutions be increased over or decreased under the amount now collected; and if so, to what amount?

And that, too, is another provision of this bill.

To that question the Comptroller sends me this answer:

For the year ended July 1, 1898, the national banks paid an internal-revenue tax on their capital and surplus of $1,752,802. During the year ended June 30, 1899, the tax collected on national-bank circulation by the Treasurer of the United States was $1,991,753, making the total taxes paid to the Government on capital, surplus, and circulation $3,744,545. With the repeal of the tax on circulation, continuing the tax imposed by the war-revenue act of 1898, and placing an additional tax of one-tenth of 1 per cent on the capital, surplus, and undivided profits of the national banks, the Government would derive from this combined tax on the franchise of the banks $2,709,090, a reduction of $1,035,455 from the amount paid under existing laws, as shown by the latest returns.

So that, Mr. Chairman, this bill proposes necessarily to reduce the circulation of the national banks more than $100,000,000 and proposes to decrease the amount of taxes collectible from these institutions more than a million dollars per annum, and yet what I would like to hear would be an address from the other side contradicting these figures. I want somebody to say to this committee whether the enactment of the bill into a law will bring these results. We contend that the issue of the Chicago platform is not before this committee. For my part, whenever that question comes up, I shall have no hesitancy in standing up and advocating every principle in it.

There is no issue before the committee as to the single gold standard or the wisdom of the Chicago platform. And yet day after day we have had addresses devoted exhaustively to those questions. The question before the committee is, Shall the Federal statutes remain as they are—shall the law continue in force as it is—or shall we introduce this new statute, this new proposition, that has never been advocated upon this floor by any statesman from the foundation of the Government? No man that ever occupied the White House, from Washington to William McKinley, ever advocated such a measure as this. I undertake to say that the gentlemen on the other side are shouting into the wrong tree. We are not here upon this side now to advocate 16 to 1. They say that we are upon the single gold standard. They say that every dollar is equal to a gold dollar, and these propositions are not denied. The truth is that this Government never saw a dollar that was worth less than 100 cents to a dollar unless its legal-tender function was curtailed. The Spanish milled dollars, the Mexican dollars, the paper dollars, the silver dollars—all kinds of dollars—have been worth 100 cents in all our national history for more than one hundred years unless they have been deprived of their legal-tender function.

This bill finds no excuse and can not be justified, whether you favor the free coinage of silver or stand for the gold standard.

If you favor the single gold standard, you say that you are already on that standard, and have been since 1873, and that all the obligations of the Government are being paid in that metal when demanded. Then how will the passage of this bill change either the law or the practice? No; this bill does continue the gold standard, but it is not introduced here for that reason.

It does more than that; it reduces the circulation of the banks in their interest more than $100,000,000, as I have shown from the figures furnished by the Comptroller of the Currency. It reduces the amount of annual taxes more than a million dollars to be paid by these banks. It jeopardizes the security of depositors by reducing to $50,000 the maximum amount of bonds required to be deposited by any of these institutions. It is unfair to the smaller national banks, by requiring them to keep on deposit a larger proportionate amount of bonds than is required of the larger and stronger banks.

If you argue that you want the bill because you want the single gold standard, then you have already answered that argument by stating that we are already on the gold standard and that all of the obligations of the Government are being paid in gold. If you argue that you want the bill because you want an elastic currency, the answer is that private corporations, organized for private gain, should not be intrusted with this enormous power any more than the railroad corporations should be given the power of making elastic freight rates. Private greed would tempt both classes of these corporations to contract when the masses of our people would want them to expand and to expand always at the wrong time for them. But an elastic currency is the very thing this bill is careful to prevent. In section 8 elasticity is carefully guarded against in this language:

Provided, That the amounts of such circulating notes issued to any national banking association having on deposit United States bonds to secure circulation at the passage of this act, or which may hereafter deposit such bonds to secure circulation, shall not exceed in any case the par value of the bonds deposited as herein provided.

Now, it is "herein provided" that the bonds to be kept on deposit even by the largest and strongest bank need not exceed $50,000; and it is "herein provided" that the currency issued shall not exceed the par value of the bonds. We see by the Comptroller's figures that although currency may be issued up to the par value of the bonds to be deposited by the terms of this bill, still the amount of currency will be reduced more than a million dollars below the amount now in circulation, caused by the still smaller amount of bonds required to be kept on deposit in the Treasury. In other words, currency now required to be issued up to 90 per cent of the par value of the bonds is more than $100,000,000 in excess of the currency allowed by this bill, although to be issued up to the par value of the bonds.

It is well known that these national banks will issue no more currency than the law requires them to. Their profits are made from the deposits and not from the currency issued. So that the national bank with a paid-up capital of $1,000,000 is not required—indeed, it is not permitted—by this bill to issue currency in excess of the amount of $50,000, while the smaller banks are required to issue currency to the amount of 25 per cent of the capital paid in. The bank, therefore, with $150,000 is required to issue notes to the amount of $37,500 and the million-dollar bank to issue money only to the amount of $50,000.

It is, therefore, a truckling to the larger banks and an unwise and unjust discrimination in their favor.

But, again, this bill seeks to exonerate the larger banks from the payment of their just share of taxes. These taxes are now imposed upon the circulation and in proportion to the circulation.

The larger banks under this bill will pay a smaller amount of taxes proportionately than the smaller ones.

For my part, if I believed in the single gold standard and was

willing to make silver merely a token money, redeemable in gold, still I would oppose this bill, because we have about $500,000,000 of outstanding silver dollars, and it is a foolish piece of extravagance to keep these silver dollars at all, to be used as token money. If we must have the single gold standard, then sell these silver dollars at 50 cents to the dollar and let the Government realize $250,000,000 for them, to be turned into the Treasury. No man can give any good reason why the Government could not and should not use paper money in lieu of these silver dollars, if the silver dollars are to be used only as promises to pay in gold. This new paper money would be as good token money, redeemable in gold, as you propose to make the silver. This new paper money would have behind it the same pledge, just as you say silver has, and why hoard this silver as a mere sentiment? So, I say, the logical conclusion from your major premise is to sell the silver dollars as bullion and substitute paper money. Take out of circulation everything but gold and the paper redeemable in gold, and the Government would make $250,000,000 by this transaction, and have precisely the same amount and character of money you are proposing to establish.

You Republicans should not claim any credit for the present prosperous condition of the country. The large productions of gold in the Klondike and in South Africa have, it is true, appeased in some measure the demand for more basic money. The war with Spain and in the Philippines, together with that in Africa, have increased the demand for mules, cotton, manufactured articles, and farm produce, and we are having comparatively prosperous times. But these are not of your doing, and unless past experience fails these mines will soon be exhausted. The present good condition proves our contention. We have argued all along for more basic money and for higher prices. We said that with more money would come higher prices, and with higher prices would come better times. Both of these propositions you denied. Now our predictions have been fulfilled, and yet you claim the credit. The truth is that all of the legislation enacted upon the subject of silver was Republican legislation and passed by your party, so that if you are to have credit by the present prosperity of the country, you are to be charged up with the panics of 1873 and of 1893 and the distressing conditions of those periods.

There is a peculiar thing about our bondholders and our money standards. The bondholders had no objection to a fiat money standard at the outset when they were buying the bonds cheap on that account. It was only after the bonds had been sold by the Government that these gentlemen clamored to be paid in coin "in order to strengthen the credit of the Government." Then these bondholders had no objection to the double standard when Mr. Cleveland had bonds for sale. They took coin bonds without objection, and only remarked they would give $16,000,000 more for them if "gold" instead of "coin" was put in them. But the double standard was all right for buying purposes.

Now this bill comes and writes "gold" in these same coin bonds, donates that $16,000,000 to these bondholders, and it is a great outrage to talk about double standards and fiat money now. The Government is on one standard when bonds are to be sold, and always on another standard when bonds are to be paid. Yes, gentlemen, and let me remind you that the same people who were for fiat money and then for the double standard in buying bonds from the Government are the same people who fostered and organized that Indianapolis convention. They are the same people and influences that are thrusting this bill forward and crying "repudiator" at every man who opposes the single gold standard.

But again, this bill greatly increases the amount of gold to be kept locked up in the Treasury in addition to the $100,000,000 of gold reserve now kept. It requires an additional $50,000,000 to be kept on deposit in the fiscal department. Then comes this new feature:

> There shall be transferred from the general fund in the Treasury of the United States and taken up on the books of said division, as a redemption fund, the amount of gold coin and bullion held against outstanding gold certificates, the amount of United States notes held against outstanding currency certificates, the amount of silver dollars held against outstanding silver certificates, the amount of silver dollars and silver bullion held against outstanding Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890, and an amount of gold coin and bullion to constitute a reserve fund equal to 25 per cent of the amount both of United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890, outstanding.

Thus we see that by contracting the national-bank circulation and by this new redemption department substantially all the money of the country may be impounded in the Treasury by this bill except gold and the subsidiary silver coins. The silver dollars may again be paid out, it is true, but only as token money redeemable in gold, and this silver will take the place of paper which is to be permanently retired, and as such token money will operate as the same endless chain to drive out the gold that is admittedly the worst feature of the present system.

No, gentlemen, this bill does provide for the perpetuation of the single gold standard, but it does more. It is a bankers' bill which conflicts with the declarations of both the great political parties. It originated at a popular watering place on the Atlantic, without consulting the common people, and they do not want it.

All of the talk which I have heard for years on this floor and elsewhere about the commercial value of gold and silver, independent of the prices fixed by the demands for purpose of coinage, is to my mind little short of nonsense. The law of supply and demand applies to silver as well as to anything else; and when you destroy the chief demand for silver and expect the price to remain unchanged, you are talking very unwisely. There can be no commercial or commodity value ascertained for either metal until all the countries of the world cease using both of them for coinage into money or until all the world begins the coinage of both of them at the same ratio. All of the troubles we have had in our past history in keeping the two metals together was not caused by differences in the prices of the metals as commodities, but because of the different prices offered by different countries at the same time for these metals for coinage purposes.

At one time France paid a larger price for our silver than we were paying, and the silver went there and left us nothing but gold. At another time France paid a larger price for our gold than we were paying, and the gold went there and left us nothing but silver. So with other countries. The metal that left us always went to be coined into money and not as an article of commerce. The demand for the metals for the purpose of being coined into money has (coupled with the supply) in all the ages and countries of the world regulated their value. By money I mean money and not mere tokens or promises to pay money. You certainly have not forgotten the trade dollar, which had more silver in it than the standard silver dollar and yet, not being a legal tender, was worth only its bullion value.

You certainly can go up to the other end of the Avenue and find a Mexican dollar with more silver in it than there is in one of our standard silver dollars and find it passing for much less.

No; it is not because of the pledge of the Government behind the silver dollar to keep it up. No such pledge was ever made until 1890, by the Sherman law, and silver had remained at par for seventeen years after the gold standard was established in 1873. No; it was not because of the small number of silver dollars in circulation prior to the Sherman law. France keeps to-day $800,000,000 of silver on a par with gold simply by paying all of her obligations in either metal at the option of the Government and by making both of them full legal tender.

This country, with twice the population and business, could keep half that amount of silver at par too, and in the same way.

But the national banks do not want us to do it, and hence this bill is introduced. Thus step by step the work has been done.

First. The sale of the bonds at low prices and payable in any lawful money.

Second. A change in the contract making the interest payable in coin.

Third. The destruction of the silver dollar, and leaving no coin but gold.

Fourth. The sale of other bonds as coin bonds and for $16,000,000 less than could be had for gold bonds. Now we are asked to not only write gold instead of coin in all the bonds, but we are asked to allow the national banks to contract the currency more than a hundred millions and to relieve them from the payment of more than a million dollars annually in taxes. Every one of these steps was an outrage upon the people. Have not these national banks been favored enough? They are already enjoying privileges not enjoyed by State banks, and this bill still further extends and enlarges these privileges so that the State banks will hardly be able to compete with them for business. From whatever standpoint this bill is looked at it is wholly useless and wholly pernicious.

The natural tendency of the nations anyhow is to concentrate wealth and power into the hands of the few and to leave the millions poor and dependent. Legislation ought to be directed so as to counteract this natural tendency as far as practicable. Instead of doing that you have, by protective-tariff duties and special legislation, fostered many a trust and made many a millionaire at the expense of the people. This bill will make the national banks the greatest trust of them all. You are shutting your eyes to all the warnings of history. The banks of Europe control the movements of the armies and navies of the Old World. And if this bill fulfills the promises made by its promoters, if it brings an elastic currency and gives these banks full power to contract and expand the currency as they choose, if this bill gives the Secretary of the Treasury full power to issue gold bonds whenever and in such amounts as he pleases, then indeed we will have come to the very gates of a monarchy. So let the martial music strike up and the bugle call to glory and to empire be sounded.

With the empire shall be needed this favored money class and a gilded aristocracy. But with the empire will come also a larger standing army, larger tax rates, and the people must furnish the soldiers and pay the taxes. I stand here to enter my protest against this bill and warn you that its enactment will serve to

hasten that evil day that sooner or later has always come to every country in every age; that evil day when the masses of the people have become paupers and slaves, crouching at the feet of a throne. It is the same old story, written upon the tombs and attested by the moldering monuments of antiquity. All of the freedom that mankind has ever known has been surrendered and lost by yielding to the same temptation. The glitter of the empire soon disappears when the citizen has lost his liberty. The owl soon comes to hoot in the banquet hall when the king and his guests have departed, and the lizard comes and crawls over the broken columns and crumbled art that for a time ornamented the royal pageant. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, in the time allotted me for the discussion of this matter I shall first endeavor to give a clear and concise explanation of the most important provisions in the measure.

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL.

By section 1 the gold dollar, consisting of 25.8 grains standard gold, is made the unit of value. By sections 2 and 4 all interest-bearing obligations of the Government, the United States notes, the Sherman Treasury notes, all obligations, public and private, for the payment of money, and at the option of the Secretary of the Treasury any other kind of money, are made payable and redeemable in gold. In brief, by the terms of this bill gold is made the only money of final redemption and the sole measurement of values.

The motive that induced its authors to provide, in the fourth section, "and all silver certificates presented for redemption shall be redeemed in accordance with existing laws," is known to themselves only. It would be a reflection upon their intelligence to assume that they were unfamiliar with the facts that the Secretary of the Treasury had time and again said that it was his duty under the law to redeem every silver dollar with gold if demanded by the holder, and yet, giving these gentlemen the benefit of the presumption that they were aware of this, it makes the conclusion irresistible that this language is placed in the bill to mislead and deceive the people.

Section 2 contains this language:

> All obligations, public and private, for the payment of money shall be performed in conformity with the standard established in said section.

That is, in section 1.

By this provision an obligation for the payment of a hundred dollars can only be discharged by the payment of that number of dollars, each of which contains the required quantity of gold. And yet by a subsequent provision in the same section it is said:

> Nothing herein contained shall be construed or held to affect the present legal tender quality of the silver dollar or of the subsidiary or minor coins or of the paper currency of the United States, or the laws making national-bank notes receivable and payable for certain public debts and dues and obligations between national banks.

By this clause it is made sufficient for an obligor to tender silver dollars or United States notes in the payment of such debts. There is a conflict between these provisions which must inevitably produce great confusion and many hardships to both creditors and debtors.

The bill establishes in the Treasury Department a division of issues and redemption, which is charged with the issues, redemptions, and exchange of the various kinds of United States money permitted or authorized by law. It is made mandatory upon the Treasurer to transfer from the general fund in his Department, first, all gold coin and gold bullion held against gold certificates; second, all United States notes held against currency certificates; third, all silver dollars held against silver certificates; and, fourth, all silver dollars and silver bullion held against Sherman Treasury notes; and these sums, aggregating on the 9th day of December, 1899, $683,454,903, constitute the redemption fund. In addition to this, and to be used for redemption purposes, the Treasurer is required to also transfer to this division gold coin and gold bullion equal in amount to 25 per cent of the United States and Sherman notes, which is to constitute the reserve fund, and will amount at present to $108,865,824.

The redemption fund proper and reserve fund will aggregate, as matters now stand, $792,320,727, not a dollar of which can get into circulation where it can do active service in the commerce of the country except by the withdrawal of a like sum theretofore so engaged.

It is officially stated that the gold coin and bullion in the United States on the 1st day of July, 1899, amounted to $963,498,384. By the terms of the pending bill $289,328,943 of that sum will be imprisoned in the vaults of the Treasury as redemption and reserve funds, leaving $674,169,441 in gold to be used in the payment of Government expenses and in the commerce of the country.

The silver dollars and bullion will be held in the redemption fund; or if not, their paper representative, in silver certificates or Treasury notes, will be impounded in their stead. Under the power vested in him by section 3, to maintain the parity and value of money by the use of gold for the redemption of any other kind of money, the Secretary of the Treasury will, no doubt, retire from circulation every dollar of silver and Government issues of paper money. Taking the latest published reports, there will be, at its organization, placed in this division about five hundred millions of silver dollars and bullion, which includes practically all our silver money exclusive of subsidiary coin. There will likewise be placed in it about $290,000,000 in gold coin and bullion with which to begin the retirement of greenbacks, silver certificates, Sherman notes, and currency certificates.

The Secretary is authorized from time to time to transfer to this division from the general fund any money not otherwise appropriated, or he may exchange funds in this for those in the general division, or he may sell gold bonds of the Government to maintain the reserve fund; but he is forbidden to make a transfer from the general fund which would reduce it below $50,000,000. With this restriction, it may be safely said, in view of our increasing expenditures, that there will seldom be transfers and exchanges will be unheard of; but the issue of gold bonds will be the rule, and the climax of stupidity and folly will have been reached when a great Government like ours shall be found issuing gold bonds for the purpose of reducing the volume of money in circulation.

The bill authorizes the organization of national banks as follows, namely: In cities of the population of 2,000 or less, with a capital of $25,000, by permission of the Secretary of the Treasury; in cities of 6,000 population or less, $50,000 capital; in cities of 50,000 or less, $100,000 capital, and in cities of more than 50,000 population, with a capital not less than $200,000. To secure their circulating notes such banks are required, where the capital does not exceed $150,000, to deposit with the Treasurer of the United States interest-bearing, registered United States bonds to an amount not less than one-fourth the capital, and $50,000 where the capital exceeds $150,000.

Upon the delivery of these bonds such banks are entitled to receive from the Treasurer circulating notes in blank, registered and countersigned as required by law, to the par value of the bonds; but in no event shall such notes be issued to such an association in an amount in excess of the capital stock actually paid in. The limitations placed upon the circulating notes is that they can not exceed the capital stock paid in, and the condition precedent is that the character of bonds must have been deposited for them. It must be entirely plain to every man, even those of puny comprehension, that it is the deliberate purpose of the dominant party in this House to fasten as permanently as can be done by statutory enactment upon the people of the United States the single gold standard, to retire all forms of Government money other than gold, and delegate to the national banks the power to issue and control the volume of paper money hereafter to circulate among our people. To each and every one of these three unsound, unwise, unpatriotic, and vicious propositions I am now and always expect to be opposed. I protest against this scheme to plunder and oppress the plain people of this country in order to make profit for the favored few. This measure ought to be entitled "A bill to aid national banks and enrich the gold trust and bond syndicate by the impoverishment of the people."

OPPOSED TO NATIONAL BANKS.

But the national banks must be cared for by the Republican party, nor must the Grand Old Party forget the bond sharks.

The chief purpose of this bill is to delegate to the national banks the power to issue and privilege to control the entire volume of paper currency in the United States. In the accomplishment of this cruel and wicked design interest-bearing gold bonds to an amount satisfactory to the bond hunters will no doubt be the most active instrumentality. Issue bonds to replenish the gold reserve and then deplete it by the purchase for retirement of greenbacks and other Government paper currency with the gold until the national banks are left without a solitary check upon their merciless manipulations of the circulating medium. It is a conservative estimate that fixes the possible volume of national-bank notes at one-third of the circulation, and it is believed will be nearer one-half when this measure shall have been in operation for one or two years. Armed with this high function of government, those in charge of the banks will see that it is so exercised as to bring profit to them, though it plunder the people and dishonor the Government.

The circulation will be contracted or expanded whenever there is a promise of reward to themselves, though it should, "like a thief in the night," steal away the fortunes and happiness of men by the millions. The power to control the volume of circulation carries with it the possibility of striking down fortunes and wrecking homes and can not be safely reposed where avarice will tempt or revenge will inspire its unfaithful execution.

Banks of deposit and discount are a benefaction, but those of issue are a curse to any citizenship. Such institutions are condemned alike by past experience and the teachings of statesmen.

In 1803 Mr. Jefferson wrote Mr. Gallatin:

This institution (The United States Bank) is one of the most deadly hostilities existing against the principles and form of our Government. * * * Ought we, then, to give further growth to an institution so powerful, so hostile? * * * Now, while we are strong, it is the greatest duty we owe to the safety of our Constitution to bring this powerful enemy to a perfect subordination under its authorities. The first measure would be to reduce them to an equal footing with other banks as to the favors of the Government.

On September 11, 1813, he wrote Mr. Eppes:

Bank paper must be suppressed and the circulating medium must be restored to the nation, to which it belongs.

Andrew Jackson said:

If Congress has the right under the Constitution to issue paper money, it was given them to be used by themselves and not to be delegated to individuals or corporations.

In his Thirty Years in the United States Senate Thomas H. Benton says:

Experience had shown such an institution (United States Bank) to be a political machine adverse to free government, mingling in the elections and legislation of the country, corrupting the press and exercising its influence in the only way known to the money power—by corruption. General Jackson's objections reached both heads of the case—the unconstitutionality of the bank and its inexpediency.

General Jackson, by his indomitable courage and heroic efforts, drove from existence the United States Bank at the termination of its second charter, and from that time to the civil war the Democratic party lost no opportunity to denounce the system. In the national banking act the Republican party substantially revived it, and in the lifetime of these the history of the old bank has at least in some respects been repeated.

By some hidden influence the Secretary of the Treasury was induced upon the close of the war to enter upon the work of retiring the paper circulating as currency, and would have continued this disastrous policy had not the act of January, 1868, prohibited its further enforcement.

Again, subsequent to 1875, under the guise of resumption, this same scheme to aid the national banks was inaugurated, but the act of May 31, 1878, denying the Secretary the right to further retire greenbacks, was passed.

The intents of men are not discernible except as they mature into action; but, tracing these policies to the motives that induced them, as you would the stream to the fountain, you must arrive at the conclusion that they were intended to benefit the national banks of the country. Could the taxpayers of America be made more happy or wealthy by the conversion of a noninterest-bearing currency into interest-bearing bonds? No, gentlemen; the purpose then as now was to endow the national banks with the valuable prerogative conferred by this bill.

But these are not the only instances in which they are reputed to have attempted to bring about favorable action on the part of the Government. Emanating from some one, there was scattered throughout this country in the early spring of 1893, to bankers and capitalists, the following circular letter, viz:

DEAR SIR: The interests of national bankers require immediate financial legislation by Congress. Silver, silver certificates, and Treasury notes must be retired and the national-bank notes upon a gold basis made the only money. This will require the authorization of from $500,000,000 to $1,000,000,000 of new bonds as a basis of circulation. You will at once retire one-third of your circulation and call in one-half of your loans. Be careful to make a money stringency felt among your patrons, especially among influential business men. Advocate an extra session of Congress for the repeal of the purchase clause of the Sherman law, and act with the other banks of your city in securing a petition to Congress for its unconditional repeal per accompanying form. Use personal influence with Congressmen, and particularly let your wishes be known to your Senators. The future life of national banks as fixed and safe investments depends upon immediate action, as there is an increasing sentiment in favor of Government legal-tender notes and silver coinage.

Following this, Congress was convened in extraordinary session; a "money stringency" was felt from shore to shore; the "purchase clause" was repealed and Congress requested to authorize the issue of "gold bonds," which it refused. How much these institutions had to do with the origin, prevalence, and atrocity of the panic of 1893 will perhaps never be fully known, but that they contributed in some measure is manifested by the reduction of their circulating notes from 1887 to 1892 in the sum of $96,075,508. They are largely responsible for the endless chain whose first link was wrought by Secretary Foster, as appears from the following telegram:

OCTOBER 1, 1891.

PHINEAS PIERCE,
32 Sumner Street, Boston, Mass.:

Assistant Treasurer Kennard has been instructed to redeem Treasury notes in gold.

CHAS. FOSTER, *Secretary.*

And whose circuit was practically completed before the Harrison Administration passed, as appears from the following order, viz:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 20, 1893.

SIR: You are hereby authorized and directed to prepare designs for the 3 per cent bonds provided in a Senate amendment to sundry civil bill now pending. The denominations which should first receive attention are 100's and 1,000's of the coupon bonds, and 100's, 1,000's, and 10,000's of the registered bonds. This authority is given in advance of the enactment, in view of pressing contingencies, and you are directed to hasten the preparation of the designs and plates in every possible manner. I inclose a memorandum for your guidance in preparing the script for the body of the bonds.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES FOSTER, *Secretary.*

THE CHIEF OF THE BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING.

How great an influence they may have exerted in securing a reversal of the rulings of Secretary Foster in reference to silver certificates and silver dollars through the following utterances of Carlisle and Gage it is not possible to tell, but that there was a reversal of Foster's position is shown by a letter written by Secretary Gage on November 4, 1897, to Mr. C. F. Taylor, of Philadelphia, Pa., from which I quote as follows:

It may be added that it was officially declared by the late Secretary of the Treasury that "although silver dollars and silver certificates have not up to the present time been received in exchange for gold, yet if the time should ever come when the parity can not otherwise be maintained, such exchange will be made." This would no doubt be the rule of action now if required to maintain the parity. Such a contingency, however, has not yet arisen, and so far as can now be seen is not likely to arise.

Respectfully, yours, L. J. GAGE, *Secretary.*

For these reasons the national-bank features of this bill are seriously objectionable, and in the name of the splendid constituency I represent I not only protest against the extension of the Government's favors to these institutions but appeal for the withdrawal of those they now enjoy.

AGAINST GOLD STANDARD—REPUBLICAN MISCONCEPTION OF VALUE.

To those who have listened to or read the argument of gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber it is glaringly apparent that they are either ignorant or purposely conceal their knowledge of the conditions that give origin to value. They constantly refer to it as an intrinsic quality of the material used for money purposes. For instance, in the course of his remarks the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] said:

The legal-tender quality adds no value to money, but merely makes provision whereby debts may be discharged by the tender of specific kinds of money, which, being good, the creditor is bound to accept.

In a certain sense this is true, and yet there has not been made upon this floor within recent times a statement more artfully misleading than the one quoted. The Congress alone can make or designate a legal-tender money for this country; and while that does not directly add value, it does, as admitted by him, "make provision whereby debts may be discharged," etc., and this power conferred by law to discharge debts causes people who owe debts, must pay taxes, and effect exchanges to want this money for these purposes. The entire population enters the competitive struggle to obtain every such dollar, and its value rises and falls as the supply and demand for them fluctuate. It creates a demand for such money, and this demand, the supply being limited, creates value in it.

Again, the gentleman, referring to the efforts of the Government to supply the deficiency in money and to cause it to circulate by making it legal tender, says:

The universal and absolute failure of all such efforts is sufficient evidence that this quality is not a quality of value. There is not a single instance in the history of finance where the legal-tender quality added to the money has enabled it to circulate at a greater value than its intrinsic value where it does not possess equally the pledge and faith of the Government for its full redemption.

The gentleman's memory has grown treacherous and untrustworthy, for I am sure he knows that the so-called trade dollar, containing 420 grains of silver, but not possessing full legal-tender power, fell in value to 80 cents, while the standard silver dollar, containing but 412½ grains of silver, possessing full legal-tender power, kept at a parity with the gold dollar, and that without any pledge on the part of the Government to redeem it in gold.

This occurrence within recent years ought to satisfy the gentlemen on the other side that there is a marked difference between a dollar possessing full legal-tender power and one that does not. It will not be possible for the gentlemen to escape the dilemma by the contention that the Government was pledged to maintain the parity and equal value of the one and not the other, because it has never been hinted that there was any such duty resting upon the Government until the passage of the Sherman law in 1890, and this disparity occurred before that date. Indeed, Secretary Foster, as late as February and December, 1892, held that silver coin and silver certificates were not redeemable in gold, as appears by the following correspondence:

TREASURY OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., February 13, 1892.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your favor of the 12th instant, in which you ask whether silver certificates have been redeemed in gold coin: in what amount and on what authority. I have to state in reply thereto that, so far as this office is concerned, it has never been done, nor have any of the subtreasury offices been authorized to do so, and no departmental instructions have been received to that effect.

Respectfully yours,

E. H. NEBEKER,
Treasurer United States.

Hon. H. M. TELLER, *United States Senate.*

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *Washington, December 7, 1892.*

MY DEAR SIR: I have your favor of December 7. I beg to inform you that silver dollars are not, in law or in practice, exchanged for gold or for paper that calls for gold.

Very respectfully,

CHARLES FOSTER.

Hon. H. M. TELLER, *United States Senate.*

Nothing could more conclusively demonstrate to the thoughtful students of the question a total lack of knowledge of the origin of value than do such expressions as those quoted upon the part of the gentlemen who give utterance to them. The intrinsic qualities of matter can not be destroyed or impaired by the failure to use it; and if value were one of the intrinsic qualities of gold and silver, it could no more be destroyed or changed by ceasing to convert these metals into money or use them as commercial commodity than could their hardness, malleability, and other inherent qualities.

In the commerce of the world there are requisitions for both gold and silver; and if not one ounce of either were employed for monetary use, these metals would still be valuable as articles of commerce, though no one is so stupid as to believe their value would be so great when so restricted in use. Nor does any man entertain the opinion that these metals would have value if there were no use to which they could be applied, for, in such an event, no one would want them and, not wanting them, would give nothing of value in exchange for them. This view, sound in logic, is sanctioned by a long and unbroken line of authorities that have often been cited in and out of this Chamber in the discussion of this question, and to a few of which I now call attention.

Jevons, in the Value of Gold, says:

Value, like utility, is no intrinsic quality of a thing; it is an extrinsic accident or relation.

Again he says:

Value is not a property of anything. It arises wholly out of relations which exist between things.

Francis A. Walker, in his Money and its Relations to Trade and Industry, states as follows:

Money no doubt is the produce of labor, but, as Adam Smith observes, if it would exchange for nothing, it would have no value; so M. Say says that the value of gold and silver consists only in what they will buy.

McLeod says:

There is no such thing as intrinsic value.

If, then, value is not inherent or an intrinsic quality of matter, it follows irrefutably that it must have its origin in extraneous circumstances and conditions, and to deal with a question of such vital importance legislators ought, if they have not heretofore done so, advise themselves most fully as to what these are.

Senator JOHN P. JONES has defined value to be:

Human estimation placed upon desirable objects whose quantity is limited.

And, speaking for myself, I have been unable to detect any error or lack of completeness in this definition. It is sound in reason, supported by the best thought of the ages, and no man has since its utterance appeared upon the arena of public life in this or any other country who has been able to point out any fallacy in it.

It seems to me to be axiomatic, for if there is no desire on the part of anyone for a given thing, it can not be exchanged for another thing of value; while, on the other hand, if the quantity is unlimited, it can not be exchanged for a thing of value, because it can be had without the surrender of such other things. The conclusion is irresistible and unavoidable that the value of money, or anything else whose quantity is limited, depends upon the demand and supply. In logic the truth of this proposition has never been and it is safe to say can never be overthrown. In the history of monetary affairs and commerce it has been established by the occurrences of every day since the world began, and the sooner the lawmakers recognize and accept this fundamental principle the earlier will come the possibility and unfailing hope of the correction of our unsound and unsafe system.

MONEY DEFINED.

Nothing is actual money that does not possess the legal-tender power or needs itself to be redeemed. Hence I define money to be an irredeemable thing, a solvent of debts and medium of exchange. The dollar is the unit in this country of its denominations and this unit is subdivided into fractional parts. All contracts for the payment of money specify the number of units and parts of units to be paid, and must be discharged without reference to the value of the unit at the time of the fulfillment of the obligation. For if a man to-day agrees to pay another $1,000 twenty years hence, there is no judicial tribunal to be found that would not hold the obligor bound when it became due to pay that number of dollars, though it required twice as much of the products of his labor and articles of commerce generally to secure them as he would now have to give in exchange therefor.

The terms of the agreement and the law preclude the consideration of the change in value of the dollar, notwithstanding the resultant effect may have been extremely disastrous to the debtor and profitable to the creditor, or vice versa. Gentlemen upon this floor have seen within their own times friend after friend fall in the struggle with the appreciating dollar and sink beneath its cumulative burdens into hopeless insolvency and utter despair.

As a medium of exchange people look not merely to the dollar, but to the exchangeable or purchasing power of the dollar, and whatever this may at the time happen to be is its value.

There may be those who have never considered it, but it is not conceivable that any human intelligence has ever studied the question and concluded that the value of the dollar, whether of paper, silver, or gold, is fixed and unchanging. Indeed, the fool who will learn in no other way than by "the hard school of experience" knows that it does change as the conditions upon which it is dependent vary. The principal factors in controlling it are the supply and demand, first, of and for dollars, and, secondly, of and for articles of commerce.

Demand for money arises from the natural and artificial wants of mankind, and the functions assigned it by law, and the necessities of trade, and in the aggregate exclusive of that pressing upon it for service in the payment of debts is at any given time equivalent to a very large per cent of human desires for all other things. For, if one want a hoe or a hat, a dress or a diamond, the preliminary wish is for dollars with which it may be had.

The supply of money is fixed by law, either directly, as in cases where the power and discretion to control the quantity to be issued are given to some department of government, or indirectly in the selection of the money material by naming it in the law.

The demand for money is always urgent and, except in times of business depression, increasing, so that it is a matter of the most serious importance that the supply by direction or indirection resting with the law should be maintained at such relations with the demand for it as will insure a fairly remunerative price for the commodities for which it is exchanged. That the purchasing power of the dollar is not always the same may be shown not only by the infallible rules of logic, but by the declarations of the most learned authors who have written upon this interesting topic.

Aristotle said:

Money by itself * * * has value only by law and not by nature; so that a change of convention between those who use it is sufficient to deprive it of all its value and power to satisfy all our wants.

John Locke, in Considerations, etc., Regarding Money, says:

Mankind having covenanted to put an imaginary value upon gold and silver by reason of their durableness, scarcity, and not being very liable to be counterfeited, have made them, by general consent, the common pledges whereby men are assured in exchange for them to receive equally valuable things to those they parted with for any quantity of those metals; by which means it comes to pass that the intrinsic value regard in those metals made the common barter is nothing but the quantity which men give or receive of them, they having as money no other value but as pledges to procure what one wants or desires.

Again, he says:

But if you increase or lessen the quantity of money current in traffic in any place, then the alteration in value is in the money.

David Hume says:

It is not difficult to perceive that it is the total quantity of the money in circulation in any country which determines what portion of that quantity shall exchange for a certain portion of the goods or commodities of that country.

James Mill says:

In whatever degree the quantity of money is increased or diminished, other things maintaining the same, in that same proportion the value of the whole and of every part is reciprocally diminished or increased.

John Stuart Mill says:

The value of money, other things being the same, varies inversely as its quantity, every increase of quantity lowering the value and every diminution raising it in a ratio exactly equivalent.

Ricardo says:

The value of money in any country is determined by the amount existing. * * * That commodities would rise or fall in price in proportion to the increase or diminution of money I assume as a fact incontrovertible.

Says Cernuschi:

The purchasing power of money is in direct proportion to the volume of money existing.

Francis A. Walker states:

The value of money in any country is determined by the amount existing.

Human reason sometimes errs, and it is barely possible, though not probable, that these great scholars, one and all, may have been mistaken either in premise or conclusion. There is yet another evidence, not merely persuasive, but, in my opinion, conclusive, touching this matter, and it is to be found in the history of prices of staple products. If, then, money, whether gold or silver, varies in value, we have not the choice between a unit that does and one that does not vary, but rather a selection between standards, all of which change with the varying conditions that dominate every one of them.

WHY I AM FOR THE BIMETALLIC STANDARD.

If the standard shall be of gold or of silver alone, its measuring capacity will vacillate with every movement of the demand for or

supply of it, while if it be made of both I conceive that the supply will be less liable to fluctuate, because when there may be a diminution in the one it may be overcome by an increase in the other metal available for coinage. If this should occur only at rare intervals, it would serve to avert the disturbances, wrecks, and ruins that otherwise would crush thousands of our countrymen.

The prosperity and happiness of our people demand a system that will guarantee a sufficient quantity of basic money, and if in an effort to secure it we should adopt a plan that would, as some appear to apprehend, produce too much, it would be infinitely more easy to cure that defect and protect the country against its evil consequences, if any, than it will be if we establish one that will give too little; in which case irreparable losses, baffling human ingenuity to escape, would be visited upon our fellow-citizens. [Applause.]

I am for the bimetallic standard, not only for these prudential reasons, but because it is neither a new nor unsuccessful experiment in the United States, the opinion of the clamorous recent converts on the other side to the contrary notwithstanding. It was given to our constitutional Government upon the counsel and advice of Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton, the ablest and most profound exponents of their respective schools of political economy in their age and time, if, indeed, not since the foundation of the Republic. It came to us when the love of country and people was at its high tide and before the besom of selfishness had infected our free institutions. It received the sanction of the wisdom and patriotism of all citizens, native and adopted, for more than eighty years of our national life, during which the marvelous and matchless progress of an honest, intelligent, energetic, and unselfish population in material, moral, and mental development challenged the admiration of the civilized world and caused the most advanced nations to shudder for the safety of their laurels. [Applause.]

I know it has been said that because of the changes made by the acts of 1834 and 1837 we have been upon the gold basis since then, and even the act of 1853, which related to the quantity of silver thereafter to be used in the coinage of the subsidiary coin, has been invoked to aid the rudderless arguments of our opponents.

These changes, as everyone in the least familiar with the subject is aware, were made to prevent speculators from shipping our coin to countries which were coining the particular metal at a higher ratio than it was coined by the United States, and, instead of detracting from, fortifies and strengthens our contention that when a government confers the legal-tender power upon money made of any given metal, it produces a desire for it that enhances its value.

The relative value of gold and silver in 1873 has been cited as evidence of the fact that it can not be affected by legislation. This is a most unfortunate citation for our adversaries when the full story is told. At that time France was coining silver at the ratio of 15½ to 1, so that under her law 359.9 grains of that metal could be converted into a coin equal in value to a gold dollar, while in this country we were putting 371¼ grains into the silver dollar. Hence ours was by the effect of the French law driven to a premium. Differently stated, it was as follows, viz:

	Ratio.	Value in gold.
371¼ grains of silver	16 to 1	$1.00
Do	15½ to 1	1.0315
1 ounce of silver	16 to 1	1.2929
Do	15½ to 1	1.3337
United States unit, 371¼ grains of silver		1.00
French unit, 359.9 grains of silver		1.00

But if we had not this satisfactory and convincing experience that attended our course under that standard to guide us now into the pathway of safety and good fortune, there is eminent authority that should be of more than passing influence on the Republican side to support the view that the Constitution—to whose mandates we should ever render a cheerful obedience—forbids the destruction of this ancient system. I may add at this point, and with much pride, that I am in my political affiliation one of that class that holds and teaches that the Constitution should be strictly but fairly construed and, when so construed, observed with an unflinching fidelity. [Applause.]

Hon. Daniel Webster said:

I am clearly of the opinion that gold and silver at ratios fixed by Congress constitute the legal standard of value in this country, and that neither Congress nor any State has authority to establish any other standard or to displace this standard.

Hon. James G. Blaine said:

I believe gold and silver coin to be the money of the Constitution. No power was conferred on Congress to declare either metal should not be money. Congress has, in my judgment, no power to demonetize silver any more than to demonetize gold.

But Republicans tell us that this constitutional standard, if adhered to, will flood the country with money. This, if true, would be a cogent reason for a change, but no justification for a violation of the fundamental law. But is it true?

By the official statement issued from the Treasury Department December 1, 1899, it is shown that there has been coined but 482,622,376 standard silver dollars in our entire history, and in the same document the paper currency in the United States on the same date is certified at $1,268,783,987, or nearly three times the sum of silver dollars.

If, in addition to our silver and gold coin, more money to the extent of this enormous amount is required, no sufficient reason has been or can be given, in my opinion, why it should not be supplied in both silver and gold, if possible.

If, then, the Government should undertake, with mints wide open to the free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold, to supplant this volume of paper currency, can any man number the years in which that work shall have been fully completed?

It is no answer to this to say that a paper circulation is more convenient than a metallic one, for wisely enough has it been provided that the holder of gold or silver coin may deposit it in the Treasury and receive gold or silver certificates, according to the coin deposited, in lieu thereof. This is the ancient and abiding doctrine of the Democratic party, the tried and approved principle of a sound finance. [Applause.]

According to the report of the Director of the Mint for 1898, there was then on hand in the principal countries of the world $4,594,900,000 in gold, $3,977,500,000 in silver, and $2,322,800,000 in uncovered paper.

This gold and silver money was the net results of the accumulations of all the countries since the use of these metals for money began, and yet the figures show that they were not sufficient to meet the wants for money by $2,322,800,000. If, beginning its use as money as early as the human race did, there is now but $3,977,500,000 of it, then tell me how far down the line of the centuries to come it will be before this vast fund of uncovered paper money used for the lack of the metals can be substituted by the new acquisitions of silver, and then how much longer till the flood? [Applause.]

The supporters of this measure insist with apparent earnestness that the course of affairs since 1896 has destroyed what they term "the free-silver heresy" and point to advanced prices as indisputable proof. We have in the past and do now contend that not only gold and silver is the money of the Constitution, but that if limited to gold the essential amount of basic money can not be had. The facts are that by importations and productions the gold coin and bullion in the United States were increased from July 1, 1896, to July 1, 1899, in the sum of $363,267,541, if the official reports can be relied upon. This was an increase of 60 per cent in the money of final redemption, and the effect upon prices exemplifies our invincible argument. Of this sum $200,954,193 was secured by net imports of gold coin and bullion, and while it increased our stock it impaired that of other nations, and can not be said to have been an accretion to the common store.

By fiscal years it was as follows, viz:

Year ending June 30—	
1897	$44,653,200
1898	104,868,476
1899	51,432,517
Total	200,954,193

The balance of $162,313,348 must represent the productions for that time of the mines in the United States, which would be an average annual production of $54,004,449. It is hardly within the scope of well-founded expectations that this high yield should continue through any considerable number of years. The gold product of the United States mines averaged $49,050,000 for the calendar years 1877 and 1878, but for the twenty-four years beginning with 1873 and ending with 1896 the average was only $36,822,833. Still, should our mines maintain this generous flow when proper reductions are made for the part used in the arts and sciences and that necessary to replace the worn, lost, and destroyed coin, it is difficult to see how the necessities that arise from the growth of our population at the rate of nearly three million per annum and expanding commerce are to be met by this product.

My gold-standard friends, if you are anticipating with confidence that this precious metal will continue to rush in upon us from foreign shores, let me admonish you that it is a venture full of danger to chain this country to such a standard upon the assumption—for it can be no more than such—that there will be at least equal additions in the years to come. Confident myself that they do not have the element of certainty to that degree that intelligent men ought to make them the basis of legislation like this, I appeal to the history of the importations of this metal for the years that lie behind us to convince you of the hazard in doing so. The records of your Government—and you ought not to ignore them—show that such acquisitions of gold, like the tides, ebb and flow. The net exports of gold from the United States from June

30, 1864, to June 30, 1877, amounted to $561,639,427; the net imports from June 30, 1877, to June 30, 1888, were $224,192,846; and the net exports from June 30, 1888, to June 30, 1896, reached the sum of $323,628,544.

The net exportations, as stated for the period from 1888 to 1896, almost equals one-third of the gold said to be in the United States now, and assuming that the history of that time may repeat itself, it is apparent that it would be criminal on our part to ignore it and base our actions solely upon the occurrences of the past three years.

REPUBLICANS HAVE CHANGED POSITION.

But, Mr. Chairman, I can not conclude my remarks upon this interesting subject without calling attention to the conduct of your party touching it. The time has been within recent years when your most conspicuous leaders, as well as thousands of the rank and file of your party, were not unmindful of the wisdom and justice of the cause for which we now contend, nor did it discredit their party standing to declare for the system that your party now endeavors to destroy. More than that can be said. The Republican party more than once in national convention plighted its faith and avowed its devotion to the bimetallic standard.

In 1888 the Republican platform said:

The Republican party is in favor of the use of both gold and silver as money, and condemns the policy of the Democratic Administration in its efforts to demonetize silver.

Watever apologetic explanations may be attempted, this was intended to and did give the American voters to understand that you were then for the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver.

In 1892 the Republican platform, touching this question, read:

The American people, from tradition and interest, favor bimetallism, and the Republican party demands the use of both gold and silver as standard money, with such restrictions and under such provisions to be determined by legislation as will secure the maintenance of the parity of the two metals, so that the purchasing and debt-paying power of the dollar, whether of silver, gold, or paper, shall be at all times equal, etc.

I omit the part merely commending the efforts to bring about an international conference. If there had been any doubt as to the kind of money referred to in the 1888 resolution, this utterance removed it by announcing that the party was for "both gold and silver as standard money."

Your platform in 1896, so far as the money question is concerned, is fairly and accurately stated in this clause, to wit:

We are therefore opposed to the free coinage of silver, except by international agreement with the leading commercial nations of the world, which we pledge ourselves to promote, and until such an agreement is obtained the existing gold standard must be preserved.

In 1888 your party was so enthusiastically for free silver that it was not content with the enunciation of its position, but it even arraigned in vigorous terms an alleged Democratic Administration for its animosity toward the white metal.

In the next national council of the party (1892) you thought you were still for the two as "standard money," but having some misgivings, due, no doubt, to the lack of instructions from the masters, you left as an avenue of escape the provision that there should be some safeguards thrown around it by legislation so as to insure the same purchasing power for the dollars of each.

In 1896 the party proclaimed that it was steadfast in the faith, provided other nations could be induced to embrace it; otherwise you were against it. But you pledged your Administration to an honest, faithful missionary service in its behalf. You sent your commissioners to foreign courts, and when objections were being dissipated and the prospects of success were brightening your chief financial officer, a member of the President's official family, began writing letters and giving out interviews to the resident correspondents of the foreign press which made and were intended to make the impression upon the minds of those with whom the commission were treating that the American people were not earnestly for the bimetallic standard. Of this course on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury the President was fully apprised by Senator CHANDLER. Strange indeed it was that the Secretary thus attempted to thwart the execution of an honorable obligation resting upon his party, and especially upon the President, but stranger even than this is the fact that the President, having been thus informed, did not seek to counteract the effects of the Secretary's efforts. He was bound not only by the platform upon which he was elected, but in his letter of acceptance he gave his pledge to enforce it, as follows:

The Republican party has declared in favor of an international agreement, and if elected President it will be my duty to employ all proper means to promote it.

In making his report orally to the Senate of the United States on January 17, 1898, Senator WOLCOTT, who was chairman of the Bimetallic Commission, referred to these matters as follows:

We were also somewhat embarrassed by the statements of representatives of the New York bankers in England, who sought access to English officials and assured them that any sentiment which had formerly existed in the United States in favor of bimetallism was dead: that the commission was sent solely as a sop to a few far Western Republicans; that the country generally favored the gold standard, and that the President of the United States shared this view.

The statements were untrue, of course, but in support of them these people assumed to present interviews and statements of the Director of the Mint, a hold-over from the last Administration, the late Comptroller of the Currency, an equally precious legacy, now out of the public service and translated to a Chicago bank, and pretended statements in letters and interviews from the Secretary of the Treasury to the effect that there was no chance for international or other bimetallism and favoring the permanent adoption of the gold standard. Nobody in Europe cared a rap what the two minor prophets thought or said, as nobody in this country cares, but the alleged statements of the Secretary were a different matter. * * * In my opinion the great majority of the members of the Republican party are bimetallists, and the fact that they are misrepresented by a Cabinet officer is not pleasing but endurable.

The President and his party had evidently concluded to make an open avowal for the gold standard, for within two hours of the time fixed for the final adjournment of the extra session of the Fifty-fifth Congress he sent a special message to that body, transmitting with it a report from the Indianapolis gold convention committee, and said:

I commend this report to the consideration of Congress. * * * This subject should receive the attention of Congress at this special session. It ought not to be postponed until the regular session.

After this, on the 28th of January, 1898, at a reception at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York, in a speech delivered, the President said:

It will not suffice for citizens nowadays to say simply that they are in favor of sound money. That is not enough. The people's purpose must be given the validity of public law.

He now is more bold than then, and in his annual message sent to the present Congress, he says:

While there is now no commercial fright which withdraws gold from the Government, but, on the contrary, such widespread confidence that gold seeks the Treasury demanding paper money in exchange, yet the very situation points to the present as the most fitting time to make adequate provision to insure the continuance of the gold standard and public confidence in the ability and purpose of the Government to meet all its obligations in the money which the civilized world recognizes as the best.

The President has not always entertained this view of the money question. On November 5, 1877, he voted for the Bland free-coinage bill. On February 28, 1878, he voted for the Bland-Allison Act and aided in the passage of that law notwithstanding the President's veto. He was chairman of the committee on platform in the national convention of his party of 1888 and reported the resolution in favor of the use of both gold and silver as money. On June 14, 1890, in this House, he said:

I am for the biggest use of silver in the currency of the country. I would not dishonor it; I would give it credit and honor with gold. I would make no discrimination. I would utilize both metals as money and discredit neither. I want the double standard.

And he is the same William McKinley who, in a speech at Akron, Ohio, in 1891, said of Grover Cleveland:

During all his years at the head of the Government he was dishonoring one of our precious metals, one of our own great products—discrediting silver and enhancing the price of gold. He endeavored, even before his inauguration to office, to stop the coinage of silver dollars, and afterwards and to the end of his Administration persistently used his power to that end. He was determined to contract the circulating medium and demonetize one of the coins of commerce, limit the volume of money among the people, make money scarce, and therefore dear.

He would have increased the value of money and diminished the value of everything else—money the master and everything else the servant. He was not thinking of the poor then. He had left their side. He was not standing forth in their defense. Cheap coats, cheap labor, and dear money; the sponsor and promoter of these professing to stand guard over the poor and lowly. Was there ever more glaring inconsistency or reckless assumption? He believes that poverty is a blessing, to be promoted and encouraged, and that a shrinkage in value of everything but money is a national benediction.

There is in the immediate front of your party in this country a national contest, in which you will have to explain to the American people why your party has undergone such transformation of sentiments since the election of 1896. You may be able to meet the expectations of the people in this direction, but at present I do not see how it will be possible.

CONCLUSION.

But, without further comment upon this phase of the question, I desire to say, in conclusion, that from the hour it became manifest that this country was to be chained to the single gold standard the clouds of distress became darker and thicker about our pathway and the shocks of disaster grew more numerous, terrific, and far-reaching, until the very foundations of our financial institutions seemed as if they were about to crumble into hopeless ruin. Special causes, easily traceable by the student of public affairs and not of enduring character, have temporarily checked the ravages of this vicious system; but when these causes, like the conditions that gave birth to them, have ceased to exist and be operative, as in the vicissitudes of a brief span they will, it is not improbable that the storm of financial disaster will again bear down upon us in all its horrible fury and relentless devastation.

The righteous appeal that we have so lately heard from every section of our common country finds no response in this measure.

Under it the dollar, now too exalted, can never be dethroned, and its purchasing power over the products of farm and mine will certainly not grow less and may reach limits hitherto unknown. Staggering under its blighting effects, from those who delve in mines, those who cultivate and cajole the fields into yielding bountiful harvests, and all the toiling millions will come the mighty cry, until its echoes and reechoes will be heard in every section, even in this capital city, and heeded by a Congress willing to serve the plain people rather than do the bidding of the money trust, the bond syndicates, and the national banks. With a vivid recollection of the sufferings and sacrifices of our fellow-citizens in the past under your gold standard, I again denounce this bill, which can not fail to bring power and fortune to the few, nor likewise miscarry in its mission of peril and desolation to the many. [Applause.]

[Mr. BERRY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for eight minutes.

Mr. LACEY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has no time. The gentleman from North Carolina has the floor.

Mr. ATWATER. Mr. Chairman, the limited time allotted to me in this debate will not permit me to make an extended argument upon this great financial question. However, it is not necessary that I should do so, as the question has heretofore been very fully discussed and the great American people have studied this question of bimetallism or monometallism and have already made up their verdict. My own position among the people of my district is too well known to need any affirmance at this time. With the intelligence which always characterizes them in their study of public questions, they have concluded that the success of bimetallism is necessary to the prosperity of the great body of our people. I do not think I am exaggerating the truth when I say that a large majority of the citizens of the United States have reached a similar conclusion. The Republican party have never declared against bimetallism, and when their leaders and speakers have been charged heretofore with favoring the single gold standard as the money of ultimate redemption they have always repudiated the suggestion and claimed that they were bimetallists, provided that this condition could be effected by international agreement.

They have claimed that the United States could not alone put into operation the double standard of gold and silver without the aid and cooperation of the other great powers in the world. The present Administration among its first official acts after it came into power was to appoint a junketing commission to visit the continental powers with the professed purpose of obtaining their consent for the restoration of silver to an equality with gold.

It has transpired in this debate that there is scarcely a prominent Republican member of this House, long in public life, who has not heretofore in the discussions of this question in this Hall unqualifiedly committed himself against the single gold standard; and it is said that there are few more exhaustive or logical arguments in favor of bimetallism than contained in a speech delivered in this House some years ago by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Mr. CANNON.

This position of the Republican party and of its distinguished members was either a result of sincere conviction, or was, perhaps, part of a deliberately preconceived plan to deceive the people of this country. Great truths are not intended to be bandied about from year to year, or to be changed, chameleon-like, to suit the whims or fancies of individuals or parties or decades. There are some axioms of finance which appear to have established themselves as firmly as any well-known principle of political economy, and one of these is the theory of bimetallism.

During the fluctuations which have occurred from time to time in the production of the precious metals, during the recurring stages of depression and prosperous times—considering the selfish ambitions of large owners of wealth of the country and the wants and demands of the great mass of the people, considering the conditions of producers and consumers, of the capitalist and of the laborer, of the agriculturists and the manufacturers—the great principle of bimetallism had embodied itself into the financial economics of the world as the best system which could be devised to serve the interest of all classes and to preserve the great principle of equality between the breadwinner and the employer of labor.

The Republican party until to-day has never dared to favor legislation which declared openly and unequivocally against bimetallism. Were it not for this deception which the other side has practiced before the people there would have been an unmistakable majority in this House to-day opposed to this bill. They have practiced a deception upon the people, and they are now proposing to reap the result of this long period of duplicity and double dealing. I am glad that they have thrown off the garb which they have worn so long and that they now appear in their true position upon this question. The gauntlet has been thrown down, and it is for the American people to decide in that great battle which will be waged in 1900 whether this Government shall be administered in the interest of the creditor class who hold our bonds and other evidences of indebtedness or in favor of the interests of the great body of the people who claim that their Government should stand for "equal privileges to all and special privileges to none."

The Republican party in North Carolina has even gone further in its declaration for bimetallism than the national Republican party. They have in their State platform often declared for bimetallism and the restoration of silver, and the few Republicans in this State who have aligned themselves with the national Republican party have invariably been retired to private life, and not one of this class to-day occupies a seat in either branch of the Fifth-sixth Congress nor any prominent position within the State of North Carolina. That party within the past few years has had the effrontery in my State to approach the Populist party and ask for their cooperation and to claim that there was no distinction between the Populist party and the Republican party upon this great financial question. Can it be that the leaders of the party in my State have no fixed political convictions and that they are guided simply by their desire for the spoils of office? The Republican member of this House from my State, the distinguished gentleman from the Eighth district, Mr. LINNEY, has frequently made speeches in his district and boldly claimed that he was a bimetallist and that he would omit no opportunity to favor any legislation which recognized the use of both gold and silver as basic metals.

The distinguished senior Senator from my State, Mr. PRITCHARD, has pledged himself openly and before the people to vote for the restoration of silver to its ancient rights as a money metal whenever such a proposition should come before the Senate as a separate bill.

My colleagues in this House know that when it was charged against the Republican party in our State that they were in favor of the gold standard that in every instance they stood before the people and with unabashed effrontery said, "We are as much in favor of bimetallism as you are, the only difference between us being that we wish it through international agreement."

Yet, in the face of this record of the Republican party in my State, the distinguished gentleman, Mr. LINNEY, made a speech this week upon this floor in which he claimed that he had undergone a contrite repentance and experienced a glorious conversion by which he had abandoned his beautiful theories of bimetallism and was now in favor of this bill. What has caused this change of front? At the feet of what Gamaliel has he studied this question and imbibed so much new wisdom? Has he been worshiping at the altar of Mammon? Has he been listening to the siren voices of the prosperous bondholders or was the whip of the party lash applied in the Republican caucus which brought about this repentance and his bright conversion? He will in all probability have an opportunity of explaining to the people of North Carolina the details of this remarkable conversion and of telling them how the scales of ignorance fell from his eyes, and it is to be hoped that he will accompany his explanation with stereopticon views of the beautiful process.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] said that of all the promises that the bimetallists had made in 1896 not a single one has come true. The error of this statement has been most ably controverted by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY]. No one rejoices at the prosperity which certain sections and industries of our country are enjoying more than myself. We said in 1896 that a greater volume of money, sufficient to meet the necessities not only of the financial centers but of the great agricultural sections of our country, was necessary in order to enhance prices, and we said, further, that enhanced prices indicated prosperity and that low prices indicated hard times. To-day we have a greater volume of money than we had in 1896 and to this fact is most largely attributable the present degree of prosperity.

How has the volume of money been increased? Not by legislation, but because the world's supply of gold has been increased. The wealth of the Klondike has been coined at our mints; the gold fields of South Africa have yielded the golden metal in unexampled quantities, and from various other sources the production of gold has largely increased, and, having the rights of free mintage at all the mints of the world, the increase of gold has entered into the channels of commerce and trade and industrial business, so that this partial prosperity offers affirmative proof of the correctness of our position which we maintained in 1896. What will you do when the world's production of gold is curtailed or when it fails to keep pace with the increase of population and commerce and industry of the business world? Then will it be that the falsity of your position and the soundness of our faith will be amply illustrated, and the blow which you are aiming to-day at the vital part of the American body politic will take its full effect, and the people will indignantly remove from power and place the party which inflicted so vital a wound.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana, I believe it was,

said that there was not a section in all these United States which was not prosperous. If he will go into the great tobacco belts of my State and of other States he will observe a condition very far removed from prosperity. In that golden belt of my State which produces the finest bright tobacco there was prosperity fifteen years ago. Tobacco sold at remunerative prices and yielded a fair profit upon the investment. Farm lands were in demand and sold at high prices, and yet the condition is reversed to-day. Tobacco sells at barely the cost of production, if so much, and lands that were formerly not upon the market may now be purchased at a ruinous sacrifice. This result has been largely effected by the tyrannical and ruinous methods of the great tobacco trust. Just as gold has been made the standard of value throughout the world and is controlled by the few, so has the great tobacco industry been absorbed by one gigantic corporation, which is to-day controlling the prices of the leaf tobacco of the farmers and of the manufactured product of the country. No government can be said to be "A government of the people, for the people, and by the people" so long as such a condition is possible under the forms of law.

There are many trusts, with a capital of millions of dollars, which control many of the staple products of the fields and of the mines and of the factories, but there is one other trust which overshadows all the others, as the great mountain overtops the valley below, and this is the great gold trust of the world.

It would be interesting to know the exact number of financial institutions and individuals in the United States which control the gold bullion and coin in this country, and, however few that number may be, it is still true that their number, in comparison to the population, is still less in the great powers of continental Europe, yet this metal, which is the only basic money and the money of ultimate redemption, is controlled by the few.

He who controls the money of a country controls prices, and he who controls prices with the power to enhance and diminish the prices of products has his hand upon the heart of the industrial and business world and can produce panics at his will, and who will deny that the holders of the gold of the world are closely allied together? And yet the Republican party is willing to go upon record in favor of fastening still more certainly these shackles upon the industrial world and of surrendering the great body of the people into the hands of this financial trust.

The bill under consideration is entitled "A bill to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes." The title of the bill is erroneous. It should be entitled "A bill to take from the Treasury millions of dollars and pay over to the holders of the bonds of the United States and to the holders of other bonds and evidences of indebtedness through the country." It is a bill dictated by the selfish and all-prevailing power of capital and greed. There is not one line in the bill in the interest of the wage-earners or the producers of the country.

As the representative of a people who are entitled to be heard upon this floor, I protest against its passage and shall cast my vote against it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to engage in a general discussion of the financial question. Debate may be regarded as futile when a decision has been reached (by the majority party in caucus) before it begins, as is true in reference to the bill under discussion. I shall therefore give but a brief expression of my objections to the pending measure.

This bill is not demanded in the platform of any political party. It protects no popular right or interest. It comes alone at the bidding of those upon whom it confers special powers and benefits. Its theory has no recognition in any school of political economy.

It makes the gold dollar the unit of value, thus erecting the gold standard. If any benefit could possibly arise from this provision to the public, it is destroyed by the subsequent provisions of the bill.

While gold is made the unit of value, all other moneys of the United States are made mere credit moneys as contradistinguished from gold and forced to rest on the gold for support or redemption, which is totally inadequate for this purpose, even in view of its increased production, and this inadequacy is confessed on the face of the bill by the provision authorizing the sale of gold bonds to purchase gold to maintain the "reserve of gold" in the Treasury, that the credit moneys may thereby be held at parity with the standard adopted.

Thus, under this system the maintenance of the parity of our moneys does not depend alone on the standard fixed, but partly on the indebtedness (by issuing bonds) that we may incur to obtain the standard money. It then follows that the parity of the moneys must at last be maintained by the credit of the Government. This credit, under another system, might be used without the intervention of a gold purchase and give the same stability to the currency that the bond issue in purchasing gold can give—the credit would be as effectual under one system as the other. It must, then be clear that under the bill that the gold standard can not be maintained while other moneys may depend upon it for support without the aid of a bond issue to in turn support it. If this could have been done, good faith to the people on the part of the Republicans would have caused a provision for it in this bill, and the bond feature of the bill could have been omitted.

Bimetallism alone can accomplish this result. The Chicago platform affords a scientific solution of the question in the interest of the people.

The bill erects the gold standard, but it carefully provides for the destruction of gold as a circulating medium by making all other moneys the instruments of its withdrawal by forced redemption from the Treasury, thus absorbing the gold, contracting the currency, destroying the values of property, and again imposing the burdens of debt on the people by a bond issue in unlimited amounts to give stability to the currency so often as the gold reserve falls below $50,000,000.

The bill repudiates the existing contract between the United States and its bondholders in the interest of the bondholders and legislates additional value in bonds already issued and sold by making them payable in gold instead of coin, as provided in the bond—either gold or silver, at the Government's option. This provision is intended to enhance the value of the bonds in the market and will do so ultimately, since the purchasing power of the money they are now to be paid in will be increased as it is contracted, and the means of its contraction are ample in this bill, and the people must do the paying.

The power to issue bonds, or rather to determine the necessity for an issue and order the same, belongs to Congress and should be seldom exercised. The grant of this discretionary legislative power by the bill to the Secretary of the Treasury is unwise; its grant to issue such bonds in unlimited amounts is reckless.

The bill surrenders the power of Congress over money to national banks to a degree that is unsafe and dangerous. It is unwise to expect one who has power to bestow blessings on himself to practice self-denial for the public good.

Can it be possible, Mr. Chairman, that we must be forever forced to issue bonds and incur indebtedness to maintain the stability of the currency of this Government? This bill offers this and nothing more. What is the meaning of all the platforms that have been enacted in this country and the declarations in which we pledged ourselves to a sound and stable currency and financial system? Let me ask the gentlemen on the other side, what do you mean when you say that you want a sound financial system?

If I understand you correctly, if I understand the intent and meaning of your platform declarations and that of the Democratic party, it is that we want a system of finance in which gold, silver, and paper money of all characters shall circulate on a basis of parity and equality throughout the Government, every dollar being equal to every other dollar; a complete, self-supporting, and fixed system, to exist without imposing the burdens of a bonded indebtedness on the people to maintain it. If this be true, the bill fails to accomplish the purpose. It weakens the present erroneous financial system so far as the public interest is concerned. It brings the Republic as an humble suppliant at the feet of its bondholders and its national banks. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GRAFF. Mr. Chairman, I was greatly interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BERRY]. He was exceedingly liberal in the discussion of the monetary question and especially in his opinions regarding the ratio. I was particularly interested in watching him tear the halo off the ratio of 16 to 1 and to hear his declaration that he was not wedded by any means to the Chicago platform of 1896. I confess that I might have been more surprised had he not been one of many of the gentlemen from the other side of the Chamber who have in this debate showed their want of respect for the ratio fixed by the Chicago convention.

Indeed, it has been the exception in the course of one week's debate for the members upon the opposite side of this House to reassert their fealty to the ratio of 16 to 1. For the most part they have been silent upon that subject, when the very first section of this bill makes the question of the standard, and hence the ratio, to be adopted the most important subject before the House in the discussion of this bill. The gentleman from Kentucky asserts that he is not only not wedded to the Chicago platform of 1896, but proposes to wait for the declaration of the Democratic party in the next national convention of 1900, and proposes to stand on that, whatever it may be.

But, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say to the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber that the American people are not to be trifled with in the consideration of the fundamental question that is before us, by the shifting attitude which they propose to occupy themselves in these matters. I am here this afternoon not for the purpose of adding to the information which has already been given as to the provisions of the bill so much as I am here to emphasize my distinct approval of every one of these features. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I come from a district which prior to 1894 and for twenty years previous to that had given Democratic pluralities ranging from 1,500 to 2,500, before the time when there was any fusion existing between the Republicans and Democrats and when the Populist vote in the district was in the neighborhood of 1,500. The campaign of 1894 was won in my district because the people demanded another change from existing conditions prevailing at that time. The campaigns of 1896 and 1898 were made chiefly on the money question, and it is principally for that reason that the great body of the intelligent people of my district drifted away from their associations with the Democratic party and into the Republican party, because of their desire for sound money and better business conditions than existed at that time.

It becomes me, therefore, M . Chairman, not to be silent upon this question when we are called upon to make permanent the prosperous conditions that are now prevailing in the country by ingrafting into the law the provisions which are drafted in the impending bill. From the foundation of our Government changes in our coinage and currency laws have been made with the utmost caution and only from time to time as the immediate exigencies of business demanded, and our system has been the evolution of the logic of events in our history rather than the plan of any man or body of men in any era of our development, and sometimes misled by temporary depression to resort to some degree of fiatism.

Still every change made has been hedged by some cautionary limitations, showing the disposition upon the part of statesmen of all times to disturb existing conditions as little as possible by this class of legislation. Conservatism has left its mark on our financial legislation far more deeply than our public utterances on the subject. Financial legislation can not be the direct means of creating wealth. Its legitimate function is to facilitate the transaction of business demanding to be consummated. Bad financial laws may, however, prevent a prosperity otherwise assured.

A good financial system, if involving a too radical change, may cause a serious disturbance to existing conditions that would work disastrous results. Such a vital and delicate relation to our business does our financial legislation bear to our business world. We have learned a truth—that the Government can not make a profit for itself out of the coinage of dollars or the printing of notes. As long as the Government undertakes to bear the burden of maintaining the standard of our money it must be the source of some expense.

The issue of money does not create wealth or of itself make business. We have sometimes imagined it did both at times when business was temporarily and artificially stimulated by the issue of cheap money in large quantities, but ultimately we have had to pay the penalty in the reaction and return to normal conditions. These are no longer merely expert opinions found only in works on political economy, but are vital truths popularly understood by the masses of the American people and learned by them in the hard school of experience. An anomalous situation, indeed, has presented itself in this debate.

Both sides of this Chamber are congratulating the country on the improved industrial conditions since 1896; it is sometimes grudgingly admitted by our Democratic friends on the other side of the Chamber, but local pride and facts combined have prompted each Democratic member to claim that a more than proportionate share of prosperity has been awarded to his district, presumably because of his piety, as, according to his claims in this debate, such prosperity was produced by the combined efforts of "Providence, natural causes, and the increased production of gold." Would we have had this influx of gold, upon which they join us in congratulations, if we had the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1? Ah, no! What proportion of credit is to be awarded each I do not know. From which conclusion, however, it logically follows that the Chicago platform is to be amended at least in one respect, and that is to give at least some slight recognition of Providence.

Some new scientific and political truths are to be promulgated by our friends of the other side: The way to add is to subtract; the way to multiply is to divide, and the way to continue a desirable business prosperity is to alter the political conditions and change the governmental policies under which that prosperity came and continued—to turn out the party which performs and put in the party which promises. If the people recognized the truth that the standard of our money should be based upon the bullion value of the metal constituting it and that there could not be concurrent circulation of two kinds of ultimate redemption money, excepting so long as the legal ratio was the same as the ratio of the bullion value of the respective coins, in the trying times of 1896, when the great end desired by all was to change the business conditions, how can it be expected in the next political battle of 1900 that they shall ignore these truths when the universal demand is that the present improved and improving conditions shall be preserved?

I never made a campaign in my life in which I did not give credit to the masses of the Democratic party for honesty and integrity of purpose. I believe if there ever was a campaign in all our history where both sides were equally honest and sincere it was in the campaign of 1896, where they started with little whirlpools of discussion on street corners, composed of two men in the morning and wound up with five hundred or six hundred in the evening.

The American people gave their best thoughts, as a whole, involving general study upon the subject of the monetary question in 1896, and I believe that their judgment at that time, carefully and honestly made, was final and final for many years. What excuse will be given for the failure of the prophecies of Mr. Bryan, upon the faith in which was ho nestly rested by his friends the gospel of disaster which the advent of McKinley and the gold standard was to produce? These prophecies were that we were to have, first, a constantly rising value of the dollar and a constantly downward tendency of the commodities which it purchased; second, a contraction of the volume of the currency, and third, a still more emphasized business depression and general idleness.

The challenge has repeatedly been made on the floor of this House by the Republican members for a denial from the other side of the failure of these prophecies. Yes, it has been demanded of the other side of the Chamber that the fulfillment of a single one of the prophecies be shown at this time. The only reply has been an admission of the failure in the general return of prosperity due, as claimed by them, to "Providence, natural causes, and the increased production and discovery of gold."

We Republicans do not object to being members of such an alliance and can, at least, say that no alibi can be established against us as a successful defense of the proposition that the Republican party is responsible for the present desirable conditions. We were there when the wondrous change took place. No candid man will claim that the direct cause of returning prosperity can be demonstrated like a problem in Euclid. Economic causes and effects are not so simple in their relations. Complex and various are, no doubt, the causes of the present splendid demand for the products of labor. Labor is employed. The conflict is not over employment, but wages. Agricultural products have an upward tendency. New manufacturing enterprises are being projected. Extension of loans is easily obtained. The volume of profitable American enterprises has burst the bounds of our own Republic and gone out upon the seas. We read in the Good Book that there was a man who had been blind from his birth who went to the Master, and He touched the man's eyes and restored his sight. The man who had been restored returned to his friends, and his friends got into a discussion among themselves as to whether the Master who had performed the cure was divine or not, and they turned to the man, and he said: "Whether He be a divine or no I know not; one thing I know, that, whereas I was blind, now I see."

The people of this country will not disassociate and can not separate the administration of the Republican party from the present condition; and these conditions are not peculiar to any avenue of life, but are gradually spreading into every field of effort. I do not believe that the primary cause for this condition is the inauguration of the war and the victories and prestige which came to us as a result of it. The war has undoubtedly contributed to our commercial prestige by reason of the brilliant achievements on land and sea of our Army and Navy; but we have gone out with a sound public credit and have sought to do business with foreign nations upon the basis that we propose to demand the best money in the world and propose to obligate ourselves to pay the best money in the world.

There never was a time in the history of this country when there were as many thousands of people as there are now who do not classify themselves with any one political party. The campaign of 1896 was decided, not by partisans, but by patriots, and the result turned largely upon the vote of the independents, or men who had formerly not affiliated with the Republican party. There was a time when we could rally the people around a partisan standard for the sake of the name and traditions of the party; but even the Republican party, with its splendid achievements of the past, can not hope to win in the coming campaign of 1900 upon any other assurance than that we are able to preserve the existing conditions.

The statement of the gentleman from Kentucky that he proposes to abide by the next national Democratic platform, no matter what that may be, has excited the admiration of his colleagues, but it is not the present spirit in which the voters of this country propose to act, I apprehend, in the coming campaign. His position reminds me of a little story about a couple of gentlemen who were rival aspirants to the legislature in a backwoods county. They were of the same political faith and were upon the same platform, advocating their particular claims, and the question came up as to whether they would submit their differences to the party caucus. One of them, while making a speech advocating his own cause, was asked if he was willing to abide by the decision of the caucus and whether he was in favor of a caucus. He did not seem to comprehend what was meant by a caucus, but he was quite clear as to his position, for he said: "If the caucus is for me and my

friends, then me and my friends are for the caucus; but if the caucus is agen me and my friends, then me and my friends are agen the caucus." [Laughter.]

The issues of 1900, which are before us in this debate very largely, can not be dealt with thus flippantly. They involve all the best interests of the country. We owe the people of the United States something more than a safe administration founded on correct financial principles. We owe them the duty of ingrafting these principles in the law. We owe it as a matter of party faith. We owe it to fulfill the promise of the St. Louis platform that the existing standard shall be preserved. We owe it by the State platforms of the Republican party promulgated since that campaign, and by the public papers and utterances of the President of the United States. But we owe it by a greater obligation to the people of the United States that an assurance may be given that there shall be no disturbances of existing conditions by another prolonged uncertainty as to our currency and the standard.

We propose to give to the men who intend to project new enterprises the assurance that they may rest secure in the stipulated value of the currency until the Senate shall again become Democratic, which can not be for a space of eight years. That is a practical assurance which is of appreciable value to men who propose to have confidence enough to go out into the domain of the unknown and untried and invest their savings and earnings in new and novel enterprises, and so, I say, at the same time that it is the part of honor, the part of expediency, the part of party faith, and the part of business sagacity for us to pass this law just as it is.

I am glad that it is not sought to go into the domain of creating a new currency scheme and placing our currency upon a different basis; not that a better scheme might not be created, but because of the uncertainty of its operation, of the desire to have no serious disturbance to a condition which now meets every reasonable demand. It was much safer for the committee charged with that duty to give us a bill incorporating every essential promise and guaranty which the party had made, incorporated every essential which was necessary to give the people of the country who employed labor and launched new enterprises a feeling of security in the stability and the safety of the future. It is a most auspicious time for us to place our currency upon a sound basis by law, as it is now in fact. As shown by the report of the committee which formulated this bill, the following facts appear:

The net gold in the Treasury on the 2d day of October, 1899, was $254,328,830. There is more gold in the United States now than ever before. The world's product of gold in 1898 was the greatest in history, and exceeded the product of 1897 by $48,616,600, and of 1896 by $85,177,600. The product of gold from the mines in the United States in 1898 was the greatest in the history of the country, exceeding the product of 1897 by $7,100,000, and of 1896 by $11,375,000. The output of gold, both of the world's product and the product from American mines, has increased annually since 1890. The output of silver for the same period has varied in different years, but its value per ounce has had a uniform tendency downward, declining to 59 cents per ounce in 1898, its lowest register.

The present conditions are most favorable and the time most opportune for the clear and unequivocal adoption of the gold standard. Prior to the year 1896 the gold standard had been legally adopted by the following countries, viz: Austria-Hungary, Brazil, British Honduras, Chile, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, Germany, Great Britain, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, and Turkey, and since 1896 the gold standard has been adopted by Costa Rica, Japan, Peru, and Russia. The coinage of silver on private account was suspended (prior to 1896) by the United States, Belgium, France, Holland, Italy, Spain, India, Switzerland, Greece, and Venezuela, thus effectually, although not absolutely fixing their status as gold-standard countries.

While we have been for many years, and are now, upon the gold standard, yet the bill first provides that "the standard unit of value shall, as now, be the dollar, and shall consist of 25.8 grains of gold nine-tenths fine, or 23.22 grains of pure gold, being the one-tenth part of the eagle." Thus we have the matter placed beyond cavil. The bill, then, does not disturb the legal-tender qualities provided by existing law of the silver dollar, or of the subsidiary or minor coins, or of the paper currency of the United States, or the laws making national-bank notes receivable and payable for certain public debts and dues and obligations between the national banks.

The bill provides for a separate division of issue and redemption, to which is assigned all records and accounts relating to the issue, redemption, and exchange of the several kinds of United States money. There is now no provision, except most indirectly, for the minimum amount of reserved fund by existing law. The pending bill provides that the minimum amount of gold coin and bullion to constitute a reserve fund shall be equal to 25 per cent of the amounts, both of United States notes and Treasury notes, issued under the act of July 14, 1890, outstanding. There is a provision authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds payable in gold coin, at a rate not exceeding 3 per cent per annum, payable in gold coin at the end of twenty years, but redeemable in gold coin, at the option of the United States, after one year, for the purpose of maintaining the gold reserve when necessary.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to use the reserve fund in maintaining at all times the parity and equal value of every dollar issued or coined by the United States, and authorizes the Secretary, at any time that he may deem necessary to maintain the parity and equal value of all the money of the United States, at his discretion to exchange gold coin for any other money issued or coined by the United States, meaning by this to include the silver dollar and silver certificates. This provision, however, as at present in the bill, authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to do so in his discretion and only when necessary.

The bill directs that all the United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890, presented for redemption shall be redeemed in gold coin at the will of the holder, but that silver certificates presented for redemption shall be redeemed in accordance with the existing law. It also provides that the notes and certificates so redeemed or exchanged shall be held and constitute a part of said redemption fund, and shall not be withdrawn therefrom or disbursed except in exchange for an equivalent amount of the coin in which said notes or certificates were exchanged or redeemed, except as otherwise provided in the bill; and it is further provided in the bill in that connection that a transfer may be made, or exchange of currency from the redemption fund to the general fund, and in that way under the provisions of the bill, but in no other way, can the provision concerning the paying out of notes or certificates once redeemed for other than the same coin be accomplished.

The bill repeals the limit heretofore existing of $50,000,000 as the maximum of subsidiary coin and fractional currency. So great has been the demand for additional subsidiary coin and fractional currency that the issue has been increased regardless of the law, and on September 30, 1899, the amount of this species of money exceeded the lawful limit by $16,523,333. The United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890, hereafter issued or reissued, shall be of such denominations, not less than $1, as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, and silver certificates hereafter issued are to be only in denominations of $1, $2, and $5.

These provisions of the bill are to meet the demands of the so-called "pocket trade" of the country and to render more difficult the collection of these bills, for the purpose of seeking to embarrass the Treasury of the United States by their presentation for redemption in large quantities. Existing law with regard to national-bank notes provides for the allowance of issue of only 90 per cent of the par value of the bonds deposited for their security. This bill permits the national banks to issue their notes to the full par value of the bonds so deposited, and removes the tax upon the circulation of national banks, and seeks to equalize it by placing a tax of 1 per cent upon the value of their franchises as measured by the aggregate amount of the capital, surplus, and undivided profits.

This, it is hoped, will induce a large number of national banks, who have not thought it profitable to take advantage of their authority to issue notes, to take advantage of the provisions of the bill and give to the people an increase of the volume of the currency without any deterioration in its safety. The bill also permits national banks with $25,000 capital to organize in towns of 2,000 population, thus extending banking facilities to small towns. Armed with this record and with the practical results of our legislation before the people of the United States, we may safely approach the next great political conflict in 1900. [Applause.]

Mr. THAYER. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly my inability to be in accord with what appears to be the prevailing opinion of my associates on this side of the House, sentiments which have been voiced by so many of the distinguished and learned gentlemen who upon this floor represent Democratic constituencies. But if I read aright the history of my party and the history of my country, my associates this day on the currency question do not express or reflect the true and patriotic sentiment of that party which has been written in indelible letters upon every page of its glorious history, through all these decades of its long, honorable, and patriotic career, namely, that the best currency, recognized as such the world over, was none too good for it. In this assertion I accept and reserve only the single instance of the great mistake of 1896, made, I confess, in the name and by a portion of that Democratic party which Jefferson founded, Jackson defended, and the illustrious Russell, of Massachusetts, sought to protect, even at the sacrifice of life itself.

Mr. Chairman, I believe if the single question of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 could be submitted to the Democratic voters of this country unconnected with any illustrious name or personality and free from all other political questions or suggestions, they would declare against it by an overwhelming majority. Further, Mr. Chairman, I believe the time has come—yes, and is long past—when the financial interests, the industrial interests, and the general business interests of this country should be relieved from this continuous and ever-present agitation of the silver question, which, at least for the past eight years, has been a greater menace and a greater injury to financial enterprises than all other things combined, hanging like a funeral pall over the general business prosperity of this country. These

interests are looking to us this hour for a final adjustment and settlement of this question, that they may not be forever disturbed by this "endless chain" of currency talk and currency agitation. The country knows that if this bill becomes the law of the land now, in all human probability it will remain the law for at least six years to come: and if for six years, I have such confidence in the practical workings of the gold standard for the good of the country that it will thereafter stand for all time. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But, Mr. Chairman, it ill becomes our friends across the aisle to take to themselves too much credit for the establishment of the gold standard at this time. The Republican party would never have dared to present this bill had not that little band of Democrats at Indianapolis in 1896 exhibiting a spirit of self-sacrifice never before witnessed in this Republic in times of peace, boldly and patriotically declared in convention assembled for the single gold standard, to the end that the glory and honor of the true and honest dollar of the fathers should not perish in our midst, but should be upheld and defended by the humble followers of the great founders of our political party, and this stand was taken at a time when the Republican party was consorting and coquetting with the pale-faced goddess of the silver mines, who, with her sweet voice and silver tongue, was entrancing many a doubting Thomas on the other side of this House, those being most susceptible to the winning ways of this charmer who came from districts which had been inoculated with the silver virus. If an avenging God should place the mark of Cain upon the forehead of every Republican who has openly espoused the silver cause, or, what is, in my opinion, worse still, secretly given aid and comfort to the silver goddess, many a gentleman on the other side of this House who this day seems so much at ease among his newly acquired friends on the monetary question would not dare at this moment to raise his hat above his brow.

And, sir, I am proud to know and to realize that the seed which a portion of the Democratic party sowed in 1896 took root, grew, and fructified for a glorious harvest, and that the party this day in power thereby has learned something, and, seeing the error of its ways, has become emboldened to cut from the cover and appear in the open, influenced in large measure thereto by the declaration for the single gold standard so boldly announced in 1896 by the little band of Democratic patriots whose influence has permeated the whole body politic on this question to such an extent that it is now deemed safe by the Republican party to accept and announce this Democratic doctrine, and with monumental assumption, so far as history will permit, to appropriate to itself exclusively the honor of establishing the gold standard.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to no man my allegiance to the principles and traditions of the Democratic party. I have been a Democrat all my life and my progenitors for three generations kept the faith, and I have been a Democrat in a State and in a county where it costs something and means something to be a consistent Democrat. We, through evil and good report, have kept the faith, and with each returning election have set the beacon light on the watchtowers of the old party, and it seems that some of the stragglers and skedaddlers from the honest-money fold have been attracted by their lights and now that the shot and shell are heard no more, or, if heard at all, in the dim distance, out of range, are returning from their wandering to join those who have held the fort and borne the burden in the heat of the day. Of course I understand that they come at the eleventh hour, but they shall have their reward.

Again, I can not consider it a part of my duty to oppose a measure which is in direct line with my own views of all that is just and right, and is destined to confer a lasting benefit upon the country, simply because it is introduced and supported by gentlemen representing the Republican party.

These are some of the considerations, briefly and imperfectly stated, which control my actions; and entertaining these views, I should be false to myself, false to the traditions of my party, and false to the best interests of my country did I fail to support this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, if there is no other gentleman who desires to address the committee, I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HEPBURN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 1 and had come to no resolution thereon.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. FARIS, will act as Speaker during the evening session.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following resolution:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Wednesday, the 20th day of December, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Wednesday, January 3, 1900.

Also:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed of the report of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, in addition to the usual number, 500 copies of the report proper, 500 copies of the report of the assistant inspector general on the State homes, and 150 copies of the record of members for the use of the Home.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to have a detailed examination made by the actual removal of the rock at the narrowest part of East River on the eastern side, at Ravenswood, Long Island, New York, at and near Ramey's cofferdam, for a distance of 1,200 to 1,500 feet, with a view to widening and deepening the channel at that part of the river to 600 feet of width and at least 15 feet of depth, with also an examination and estimate of cost for the whole work, including deepening the channel to 24 feet at mean low water. The expenses incurred in pursuance of this resolution shall be defrayed from the balances available from previous appropriations for the improvement of the East River.

Also:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Bureau of American Republics 2,500 copies of the Annual Report of the Director of the Bureau of American Republics.

Also:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to print, in excess of 1,000 copies authorized by the act of January 12, 1895, 5,000 copies of the annual report of Maj. Gen. E. S. Otis, United States Volunteers, commanding the Department of the Pacific and Eighth Army Corps, and military governor in the Philippines, dated August 31, 1899, 1,000 copies for the use of the Senate, 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 2,000 copies for the use of the War Department.

SALARIES OF CONGRESSIONAL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES FOR DECEMBER.

Mr. BULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the following joint resolution.

Mr. DALZELL. Will the gentleman suspend a moment? Mr. Speaker, the Senate has just sent over a concurrent resolution——

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will suspend, the gentleman from Rhode Island offers a resolution, which will be reported to the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 80) to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1899, on the 19th day of said month.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and they are hereby, authorized and instructed to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives, including the Capitol police, their respective salaries for the month of December, 1899, on the 19th day of said month.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Rhode Island asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution just reported. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken; and the resolution was agreed to.

ANNUAL REPORT OF MAJ. GEN. E. S. OTIS.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has just sent over a concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the report of General Otis. I ask that the resolution be read from the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the Clerk will report the resolution.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, authorized to print in excess of the 1,000 copies authorized by the act of January 12, 1895, 5,000 copies of the annual report of Maj. Gen. E. S. Otis, United States Volunteers, commanding the Department of the Pacific and Eighth Army Corps, and military governor of the Philippines, dated August 31, 1899, 1,000 copies for the use of the Senate, 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 2,000 copies for the use of the War Department.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we may consider that resolution at the present time.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would like to ask the gentleman as to the necessity for any haste about printing this before the committees are appointed.

Mr. DALZELL. The necessity for haste, as I am informed from the Printing Office, or through the Senate from the Printing Office, arises from the fact that the type is now set and that these additional copies may be printed now at very little additional expense, whereas if we do not print them now the type will have to be reset and it will cost considerable money. It is in the interest of economy, as I understand it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken: and the resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The hour of 5 o'clock having arrived, as fixed by the special order, the House will be in recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

The recess having expired, the House at 8 o'clock p. m. was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. FARIS].

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the order of the House for the session this evening, the House will now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] will please take the chair.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. HEPBURN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1, the financial bill.

Mr. JETT. Mr. Chairman, the short time allotted to me in this discussion will not enable me to express myself fully upon the provisions of the bill now under consideration. This measure was introduced upon the first day of this session, and a special order has been made for its consideration which provides for a sufficient time only for a brief discussion of its provisions.

This bill enacted into a law will be a law placed upon the Federal statutes that is a departure from the old established policy that has been in vogue in this country since the adoption of the Federal Constitution. It is a material departure from that financial policy that was mapped out by the fathers and by those who laid the foundation for this great American Republic.

I desire to confine myself simply to the bill under consideration, and will therefore read the first and second sections. The first section is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the standard unit of value shall, as now, be the dollar, and shall consist of 25.8 grains of gold, nine-tenths fine, or 23.22 grains of pure gold, being the one-tenth part of the eagle.

That part of section 2 to which I desire to call the attention of this House is as follows:

That all interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the payment of money, now existing or hereafter to be entered into, and all United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the law of July 14, 1890, shall be deemed and held to be payable in the gold coin of the United States as defined in section 1 of this act; and all other obligations, public and private, for the payment of money shall be performed in conformity with the standard established in said section.

Mr. Chairman, it will be seen that by section 1 the gold dollar is made the standard for unity value, and by section 2 all the interest-bearing obligations of the United States, now existing or hereafter to be entered into, and all the United States notes, commonly called "greenbacks," and the Treasury notes shall be deemed and held to be payable in gold coin of the United States, and that all other obligations, both public and private, for the payment of money are to be performed in conformity with said second section, which means that they are to be paid in gold. These two sections of the bill show conclusively not only that it is a departure from the established and well-known policy of this Government, but it is antagonistic to the position that any great party has ever taken since the existence of this Republic. In and by this measure you are attempting to put the country absolutely on a gold basis in fact as well as in theory. You stand now committed to the policy of gold monometallism. In that memorable contest of 1896 you proclaimed that you were in favor of bimetallism to be brought about by international agreement. You as a party have now abandoned that position and declare yourselves as opposed to bimetallism in any form whatever.

When the present Administration came into power you were pledged to secure an international agreement for the coinage of silver, and a commission was appointed that traveled abroad to consult with the European nations concerning that subject; and it is charged that that was only a pretense upon the part of the Administration to carry out that pledge so adopted in the St. Louis platform. And as an evidence that the Administration was not sincere in this matter, it has been openly stated that while the commissioners so appointed were trying to secure such international agreement, the Secretary of the Treasury of this country was in a measure convincing foreign nations that were being consulted that it was only a pretense upon the part of the United States and not to be considered seriously by them.

Whilst you were pledged as a party to bring about legislation friendly to silver, you have, in fact, from the very day of the inauguration of the present Chief Executive, been flirting and courting with the money power and money interests of this country and gradually advancing to the position which you are now assuming.

You now claim that the country is demanding this character of legislation. From what source does it come? Does the demand come from the great mass of people who are engaged in agricultural pursuits? Does it come from that heroic and patriotic class of our citizens who are engaged in daily toil for the support of themselves and their families? Does it come from the citizenship of this country who are in moderate circumstances financially? My answer and my response is that it does not. If you have had a call from any source whatever, that call has been from that class who have amassed great fortunes to the detriment of others, and who are dictating the affairs of government and have been doing so for the last few years, and from all outward appearances are controlling the present Federal Administration. Ah, gentlemen, in my humble judgment you are simply carrying out the pledges heretofore made; you have changed your position so abruptly on this great financial question not at the request or demand of the great body of the people, but at the solicitation of the moneyed interests and those who reap fortunes through the labor and toil of others. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

By this bill you change the existing terms of the contract; you provide that all obligations, both public and private, for the payment of money shall be performed in accordance with the provisions of this bill, which means that they shall be paid in gold and nothing but gold. You say to the people that all the contracts heretofore entered into shall now be paid in gold, whether that contract is a public obligation or private. You say that all contracts for the payment of money hereafter entered into shall be paid in gold, yet you know, and I know, that only a small part of the money with which the people do their business in this country is gold. If this is to be the law, you double the burden of the debtor class; instead of giving the debtor relief, you increase his burdens. By this legislation you are legislating in favor of the creditor class and in opposition to the debtor class, and when you proclaim upon the floor of this House that this legislation is demanded by the people of the United States you deceive yourselves, and I believe that you are deceiving your constituents, for your constituents are not demanding that the obligations into which they have heretofore entered shall be performed in any other manner other than by the terms of the obligation itself as entered into.

Mr. Chairman, these are not the only bad features of this bill. Its enactment into law, and its enforcement, means the withdrawal of the greenbacks, and that necessarily means a contraction of the currency. I find that the President in his recent message delivered to this House uses this language:

I repeat my former recommendations that a portion of the gold holdings shall be placed in a trust fund from which greenbacks shall be redeemed upon presentation, but when once redeemed shall not thereafter be paid out except for gold.

This is one way that the Republican party has for retiring the greenbacks, and the provisions of this bill are such that when the greenback is once redeemed it can not be paid out thereafter except for gold; and we all know what necessarily must follow, and that is, that it means an impounding of the greenbacks which are now circulating among the people to the amount of over $340,000,000. Nor does it stop there; but it also means an impounding of the Treasury certificates and the silver dollars that are now in circulation, with the power and privilege given to the national banks to take the place of the people's money.

You make the United States notes and the Treasury notes and, in fact, the silver dollars all redeemable in gold. You provide further by this bill such legislation that places the power in the hands of the national banks to control the volume of money. This is legislation that is unjust to the people. This is legislation that is not demanded by the great mass of the people; it is legislation in favor of a class and against the interests of the masses, and the enactment of this bill will, and should, defeat you before the people. You misjudge that patriotic and industrious class of citizens who are engaged in the various avocations of life to gain a livelihood, and who are the real wealth producers of the land, when you think that you can force this character of legislation upon them without their resenting it. They will resent it, and I will resent it for them. [Great applause.]

In section 4 I find this provision:

That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to maintain the gold reserve fund taken upon the books of the division of issue and redemption, as herein provided, and for this purpose he may from time to time transfer to such fund any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, or may exchange any of the funds in the division of issue and redemption for other funds which may be in the general fund of the Treasury, and in addition thereto he is hereby authorized to issue and sell, whenever in his judgment it is necessary to the maintenance of said reserve fund, bonds of the United States.

Here is unlimited power to issue bonds of the United States given to the Secretary of the Treasury. If this bill should become a law, it is so favorable to the great financial interests of this country that they could at any time within twenty-four hours force a bond issue; and by this section you are placing, without any restrictions whatever, upon the Secretary of the Treasury the right and authority at his discretion to issue bonds, and the Secretary of the Treasury is usually a man that is connected with the great banking institutions. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to placing this power in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury, giving him the right, without any limitations whatever, to place an indebtedness over the heads of the people of this nation. It is unjust. It is class legislation, because it is legislation in the interest of the favored few and against the rights of the common people.

You provide in this measure for the payment of the interest as

well as the principal in gold of all the outstanding obligations and all those hereafter to be issued. At this time, according to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, the interest-bearing bonded indebtedness of the United States is $1,046,000,000, all payable in coin, as that is now the terms of the obligation as the law exists to-day, but if this bill passes all these bonds will be payable in gold only, together with the interest thereon. And now, have you gentlemen occupying seats on that side of this Chamber stopped to think how much money by this legislation you are putting in the pockets of the bondholders?

When President Cleveland sold $62,000,000 in bonds, before doing so, in a special message to Congress, he said that if authority was given to sell gold bonds instead of coin bonds on the sale of the $62,000,000 of bonds there would be a gain of $16,000,000. And on the same basis the making of the interest-bearing bonded indebtedness of the United States payable in gold, as provided in this proposed legislation, will mean a gain to the bondholders of over $261,000,000, which follows that this great sum of money of over $261,000,000 is to be taken from the pockets of the people by this proposed legislation and presented to the bondholders. You gentlemen on the Republican side of this House who profess and proclaim your friendship for the rights and interest of the people are here proposing to vote away more than $261,000,000 of the people's money and gratuitously present it to the syndicate of bondholders and men who are only patriotic and have the interests and welfare of these United States at heart when they can plunder and bleed the nation.

How you can face your constituents and advocate a measure of this kind I am unable to understand. How you can vote and by so doing place upon the Federal statutes a law that not only takes from the people this vast sum of money heretofore mentioned but makes every obligation into which they may hereafter enter more burdensome and harder for them to meet and at the same time expect their support and respect I can not understand. You appear to be of the opinion that because you have the moneyed owners upon your side it is all you need. But I warn you, and warn you now, that I believe that the people of this country will rise up in their righteous indignation and sweep your party out of power for favoring this class of legislation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that the influences that are instrumental in securing this legislation are the same forces and same influences that begun a raid on the United States during the time of the war between the States. To be convinced of this fact it is only necessary to follow the history of the financial legislation from 1862 up to the present time. In February, 1862, the present greenback currency was created, and in this House at that time the bill passed making greenbacks a full legal tender. When this bill was presented to the Senate, a most formidable lobby, composed of the same class of people who are now clamoring for "national honor and public faith and public credit," were found knocking at the doors of the Senate, demanding an amendment to the bill as it passed the House. They wanted to insert this clause: "Except duties on imports and the interest on the public debt."

The bill was so amended in the Senate. By reason of this amendment the duties on imports and interest on the public debt necessarily had to be paid in gold. We were a great importing nation; money must be had to pay such imports; money must be had to pay the interest on the public debt. It could not be paid with the greenbacks by this amendment, and demand for gold was created. Speculators had cornered the gold, and in order to get the money with which to pay the interest on the public debt and the duties on imports we were compelled to apply to these men who had cornered gold for it. We all know the result. These men who held the gold demanded all the way from $2 to $2.85 in greenbacks for $1 in gold; these same men taking the greenbacks purchased with gold at less than 40 cents on the dollar, and with the same greenbacks so purchased bought Government bonds at the full face value of the greenback, so that the bonds cost the gold gamblers less than 40 cents on the dollar in gold. I think the exact cost was 35 cents on the dollar in gold. These speculators and plunderers of the General Government now held that the bonds of the United States were "payable in lawful money." They desired to score another point, since they held the bonds of the United States that had cost them not to exceed 35 cents on the dollar. They then went to Congress, which was controlled by the Republican party, and demanded further legislation by which they could be again benefited.

In 1869, after the war was over and they had thoroughly gotten control of the Republican party, they clamored for the passage of what was called the "public credit strengthening act." In that way that act was passed and became a law, by which act all of these bonds payable in lawful money were declared to be payable in coin, which meant either gold or silver. These plunderers were not yet satisfied; they were still seeking legislation. They now had a law that provided that the obligations should be paid in coin. However, that, they thought, might be repealed, and they were not willing to stop until they had the contract itself so read that the obligations of the Government were payable in coin.

In 1870, being afraid that the law of 1869 might be repealed, the same bondholders came and procured the passage of the "funding bill," which authorized them to have written in the face of the bond that it was payable in coin.

This, Mr. Chairman, is a part of the history of the financial legislation of this country; and when I say that the influences that are instrumental in securing this legislation are the same influences that began a raid upon the Treasury of the United States during the war between the States, I can refer to the history of the legislation upon this great question as abundance of evidence in proof of my assertion. Their appetites for greed sharpened with their success. Their schemes for spoliation were as yet incomplete, and three years after the refunding bill was adopted they procured the demonetization of silver, thus greatly enhancing the value of the holdings. These are the ghouls who feast and fatten off of the toils and burdens of others while they cry for "honesty and public faith and the sustaining of the national credit." This is the class who denounce the common people as anarchists and as villains, while they themselves are seeking to enact legislation that will enable them to violate the sacred contracts into which they have heretofore entered.

Now, a word to my Republican friends. If it was good to have the double standard heretofore—for you have placed yourselves upon record favoring it—what reason do you give upon the floor of this House or to the country that it is not good to have and sustain the money of the Constitution, gold and silver, at this time? There is not a man of you who has been in Congress for any considerable length of time but what has placed himself upon record in favor of both gold and silver as the basic money of this country. You have always maintained convictions to that effect until the assembling of your last national convention, in St. Louis, when that convention was controlled and dominated by the bondholders and bankers of the country.

In 1888 in your national convention you declared that—

> The Republican party is in favor of the use of both gold and silver as money, and condemns the policy of the Democratic Administration in its efforts to demonetize silver.

This declaration of your party platform was written by the gentleman who is to-day the President of the United States. You were striking at the Cleveland Administration—and I am not here to defend the Cleveland Administration upon that question—and the truth is that the McKinley Administration is following in the footsteps so closely of the Cleveland Administration that no one can discern the difference.

Again, in the national Republican platform of 1892 you said:

> The American people from tradition and interest favor bimetallism, and the Republican party demands the use of gold and silver as money.

What a change in the convictions of the leaders of this great party! Were you honest and sincere when you made these declarations to the people? If you were, what reason are you giving to the people of this country for your sudden change of heart?

Again, in 1890, in a speech in this House of Representatives, the present Chief Executive on this subject said:

> I am for the largest use of silver in the currency of the country. I would not dishonor it; I would give it equal credit and honor with gold. I would make no discrimination. I would utilize both metals as money and discredit neither. I want the double standard.

These are only a few of the declarations that men high up in the affairs of the Republican party have made favorable to the use of gold and silver as the standard money of the land.

Yea, you have changed your convictions, gentlemen, because of the fact that your party has been taken charge of, body and soul, and is controlled by the wealth of the country. Before I would surrender my convictions to the money power, before I would misrepresent that proud and patriotic people who commissioned me as their Representative in Congress, I would resign my seat as a member of this House.

You may pass this bill through this House—and I suppose you will on Monday next, because you have brought in the party lash and have driven into line those members whose judgment dictated to them that they ought to stand by the principles and declarations enunciated by their party heretofore—but, as sure as you do, I want to say to you as an humble member of this House that when you go before the people of this country and this question is fairly presented to them that, notwithstanding all of the coercing of the corporations and the money changers, you will be swept out of power, and instead of you maintaining a majority upon the floor of this House you will be in the minority. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, permit me to say that the Republican party is taking on British practices and British ideas.

The Republican party is standing for colonial colonization, for colonial possessions, and for that character of expansion that threatens the very foundations of the Republic itself, and takes on the appearances of an empire.

The Republican party is following in the footsteps of the British Empire on the financial question; you are in favor of adopting their monetary standard; you are following them in the suppression of human liberty, for now one of the most unrighteous and unholy wars is being waged by that Empire against a good and inoffensive people in the South African Republic.

You fail to sympathize with the Boers in the struggle for liberty in which they are now engaged. If you keep up at the rate you have been going, in a short time you will be in favor of an empire instead of a government with the power lodged in the hands of the people.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is going to be another hearing before the people. The line is now drawn, the gold monometallists upon the one side and all those who favor the money of the Constitution and of the fathers and the right of the people to rule upon the other.

In that contest at the head of the column will be the friend and champion of the rights of the people. He will be placed upon the declaration of principles enunciated at Chicago in 1896, with the declarations declaring against trusts, imperialism, and militarism, and in that contest we expect to elect that fearless and patriotic citizen, William Jennings Bryan, President of these United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ALLEN of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, it is with a considerable degree of embarrassment that I stand before you this evening for the purpose of addressing this body for the ten minutes allotted to me with reference to the bill which is now pending for consideration.

I have heard, sir, the question of monopoly discussed in its various forms and phases during this discussion on the floor. I have heard monopoly condemned; I have heard monopoly censured and abused; and it seems to me that if there is anybody or any man who can take pride in monopoly at the present time it is a speaker on the floor of this House on this question, for a more perfect monopoly I have never seen in all of my experience. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I believe it to be my duty to the constituency whom I have the honor to represent on this floor to raise my voice, in common with the Democrats on this side of the Chamber, in opposition to the pending bill and to assert some reasons why I shall oppose it and why I shall cast my vote against it. And yet, sir, it is due to the country that there should be a fair, honest, and full discussion of the measure.

Why, then, do I oppose the bill? Because, Mr. Chairman, in my judgment it is a vicious measure and one which has no necessity back of it to authorize or warrant its enactment. I take as evidence of that fact the announcements and declarations made by gentlemen on the other side of the House themselves and the condition of the country which they say prevails to-day. We are told that there is a condition of universal prosperity. Why, then, seek to hamper it? I assume as evidence of the fact of that prosperity the declaration of the distinguished President of the United States who now occupies the White House, and will let him, in one of his public utterances, declare what is the condition of affairs now prevailing.

Let me read, sir, to you an extract from a speech made by Mr. McKinley at Vincennes, Ind., on the 11th day of October, 1899. He said then in part:

> Our financial condition was never better than now. We have good money and plenty of it circulating as a medium of exchange. Banks may fail, fluctuations in prices come and go, but the money of the country remains always good, and when you have a dollar of it you know that dollar is worth 100 cents, because back of it is the Government of the States.

Not gold, as provided for in the pending bill; not the dollars taken from the hard earnings of the people, but because there is back of each dollar "the Government of the States," using the language of the President himself.

Further he says:

> Not only have we prosperity, but we have patriotism, and what more do we want?

You have prosperity, you have patriotism, you have money circulating, every dollar of which is as good as any other dollar, and, Mr. Chairman, I ask gentlemen on the other side, What more do you want? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

You say that the gold standard has been in force since 1834. If not since that time, then some of you claim that it has been in force since 1853. If it was not, then some of you say it has been since 1873, when, by legislative enactment, you were determined to make it so. And yet you come here with an anomalous proposition—a paradoxical proposition, one which can not be justified under the conditions which you say exist—and ask the House of Representatives and the Congress of the United States to reenact a law which you claim is already in force and is now upon the statute books and of which the country can avail itself if it so desires. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I ask you, sir, what is the necessity for that? There must be something behind all this, and, in my opinion, it is in part to make provision for a depletion of the Treasury that must of necessity follow in the policy and practices of the Administration. It is not my purpose now, Mr. Chairman, to discuss the silver question, for I have not the time. I am not here to abuse men upon that side of the House for their views, but I am here, sir, in response to what I conscientiously and honestly believe to be right, and I am here to say that I believe this bill is opposed to the best interests of the whole people of this country. Why, sir, it absolutely retires from circulation a large part of the money of this country, every dollar of which is as good as gold, and substitutes for it a national banking currency, bought and purchased by the people and paid for in taxes imposed upon them. That money is to be retired, bound up in the vaults of the Treasury, or destroyed, as some gentlemen would have it, as suggested upon the other side, and its place taken by a currency issued upon taxation of the people for the purpose of maintaining the national banking system of this country. Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but I am especially opposed to that provision of the bill which is in these words—section 4, referring to the reserve fund, says:

> SEC. 4. That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to maintain the gold reserve fund taken up on the books of the division of issue and redemption, as herein provided, and for this purpose he may from time to time transfer to such fund any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, or may exchange any of the funds in the division of issue and redemption for other funds which may be in the general fund of the Treasury, and in addition thereto he is hereby authorized to issue and sell, whenever in his judgment it is necessary to the maintenance of said reserve fund, bonds of the United States bearing interest at a rate not exceeding 3 per centum per annum, payable in gold coin at the end of twenty years, but redeemable in gold coin at the option of the United States after one year.

I am opposed, sir, to this Congress vesting the power in one man to say what the legislation of this country shall be with reference to the further issue of bonds. The power of taxation is an extraordinary power. It is necessary in all governments, but it is a power that should never be delegated by the sovereign people to any one man to exercise for them. This Congress has upon several occasions refused to grant that power upon the request of the President of the United States, and I say now, sir, to vest that power of Congress in one man, to give him the authority in his discretion to say whether or not bonds shall be issued, to say whether or not a further burden shall be placed upon the people, to say whether or not additional interest shall be paid by them, is something that should not be surrendered by this representative body to any individual.

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen upon the other side talk of prosperity. I am glad to meet them along that line. I say to you that the Democratic party, and I, as a member of that party, representing one of the proudest constituencies in this Union, representing, sir, I believe, the greatest agricultural district in the whole United States—I say to you that no people would welcome prosperity more than the Democratic party, or more than I as a representative of that party would welcome it. But, Mr. Chairman, if it be true that prosperity has come, if the farmers are thrifty, the manufacturers are prosperous, if the mining industries of this country are profitable, if every dollar of our currency is as good as every other dollar, if we are patriotic and if we have, in the language of the President, all that we want, I ask, why the necessity of this further legislation that places this great indebtedness upon the people of this country?

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to you that the farming interests of this country are the foundation of almost all its wealth. I want to say to you that prosperity has not come to them, according to the statistical report, as it has come to the manufacturing interests of this country. I want to say to you that the reports show that the exports of farm products of this country amount to 67 per cent of the total exports, and that there was a decrease of those exports in 1899 from those of 1898, and a relative decrease in the price per bushel of wheat grown by the farmers of this country in 1899 from that of 1898.

The prices of our great agricultural products are fixed by the price in the foreign market, and in that market there comes competition with the products of all the cheap labor of the world. Our home consumption of wheat and other products is drawn from a supply greatly in excess of the demand made by that consumption, so that we are compelled to find a foreign market in which to dispose of that surplus. The almost universal use of gold as the standard money throughout the world makes for it a demand by which its purchasing power is increased, and with the constantly increasing production that must necessarily follow from the opening up of the yet undeveloped great agricultural areas of the South and West there will inevitably come a decrease in the value of our products. If we are to adopt gold as the sole basis upon which the business of the country is to be conducted, we must procure a great portion of it from Europe, where we find a market for our surplus products, and by decreasing the volume of money, the value of our exported products would in the same ratio be decreased.

Mr. Chairman, this state of affairs is intensified by reason of the fact that by the tariff laws of this country we are precluded from exchanging our products for the manufactured products of those

countries in which we are compelled to sell, where we could purchase much cheaper than here, and are compelled to purchase a large portion of the necessities of life with from 50 to 100 per cent or more added thereto in the way of protection to those industries, and thereby the interests of the agricultural classes, the great farming interests of the country, are taxed to pay tribute to the protected manufacturing interests.

Mr. Chairman, I see that my time is about expired. I know that this bill will pass, but, sir, from the action of this House we will appeal to the people, confidently believing that in their verdict we will find vindication of the justice of our opposition. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. JETT. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] is recognized for ten minutes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration, from a logical analysis of it, means not only a purpose to fix the gold standard as the unit of value, but it means to turn over to the national banks of this country the volume of the money to be used by the people.

I have listened very carefully to the speeches that have been made, both pro and con, upon this subject, and especially the speech made by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] who introduced the bill, and I must say that from his standpoint he made a masterly speech. I refer to his speech because under existing circumstances he had ample opportunity to present not only the bill in its entirety, but the reasons that actuated the committee in their preparation and presentation of it.

It may be, Mr. Chairman, that I am unnecessarily, I will not say alarmed, but appalled. I can not support this measure. It provides:

That the standard unit of value shall, as now, be the dollar, and shall consist of 25.8 grains of gold, nine-tenths fine, or 23.22 grains of pure gold, being the one tenth part of the eagle.

Section 2 of this bill provides:

That all interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the payment of money, now existing or hereafter to be entered into, and all United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the law of July 14, 1890, shall be deemed and held to be payable in the gold coin of the United States as defined in section 1 of this act; and all other obligations, public and private, for the payment of money shall be performed in conformity with the standard established in said section.

This section changes all contracts now payable in coin, both public and private, and makes them payable in gold. This is a violation of every sense of right and justice.

Section 3 provides:

That there be established in the Treasury Department, as a part of the office of the Treasurer of the United States, a division to be designated and known as the division of issue and redemption, to which shall be assigned, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may approve, all records and accounts relating to the issue, redemption, and exchange, as hereinafter provided, of the several kinds of United States money.

I quote so much of said section as shows the true purpose of this bill, which has for its object the surrender of the issuance of the currency into the hands of the corporation herein created, composed of the Secretary of the Treasury and the national bankers.

Is there no confidence to be placed in the pledges of political platforms? This inquiry is pertinent when we remember that in 1892 the Democratic party nominated Mr. Cleveland for President and the people were led to believe from that platform that the reform of the tariff was the great panacea for all ills; and after the people had heard the discussion upon that proposition, the result was that Mr. Cleveland was elected President of these United States. As soon as he was elected he swapped thumbs and called a special session of Congress, not for the purpose of giving to the country a reform tariff bill, but for the purpose of repealing what was known as the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act. During Mr. Cleveland's Administration, because of want of fidelity to the platform pledge that was made to the people, he succeeded in dividing the Democratic party into factions, and when he had served out his term we found the Democratic party throughout this country prostrate, bleeding from every pore from wounds inflicted by Mr. Cleveland and his associates.

In 1896 the Republican party made its platform, in which it declared for bimetallism through international agreement. The people listened to the arguments both pro and con, the Democratic party claiming that it would establish bimetallism alone without the aid of any country on the face of the earth. Mr. McKinley was elected. I will not undertake to discuss or to use any harsh language as to how he was elected, but he was elected on that question. What did he do? He swapped thumbs just as Mr. Cleveland did, and called a special session of Congress for the purpose of enacting a new tariff law, when that political monstrosity known as the Dingley tariff bill was born. May we not expect that history will again repeat itself next November?

Mr. Chairman, that was a bill that levied illegal and unjust tribute upon the people in the interest of the dominant class. It was an act of political piracy. It was an act that was wrong in principle and pernicious in practice. The gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber, who are now the spokesmen of the Republican party, are not satisfied in deceiving the people by party platform pledges, but they dare to come here at the seat of their Government and boldly undertake to deceive them again by covering the true intent and purpose of this bill by calling it "A bill to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes," when in truth and in fact the object and purpose of it is to turn over to the national banks the control of the currency. Why do not they say what they mean and mean what they say?

Born in the light of liberty and the love of law, consecrated by the blood of patriots and christened by the fires of battles, this Government ought to be the proudest, the grandest, and the purest on the face of this earth. And it would be but for greed and avarice and partisan politics.

The introduction of this bill, which was framed amid the glittering seductions of Atlantic City, begins the last act in the tragedy of a nation's shame. It is the most remarkable and humiliating scene every witnessed upon the stage of history. The actors have thrown off the mask and robes of international bimetallism. They have fallen like whining cowards before the colossus of gold. The proposed bill is but another step in the iniquitous system by which the Republicans are stripping from the American people their most essential right, a system which will establish a new feudalism, without chivalry and without sentiment.

Again the lords of the realm will assume the powers of Government, the most sacred and fundamental of which is the issuance of the country's currency. It is an idea as old as Aristotle, yet true as the latest demonstrations of Edison, that a nation's money is a nation's blood, for money is the universal means by which a nation's labor is distributed in the various forms of bread and raiment and all the other necessities of human existence. Now, it is an unquestioned principle that the quantity of currency is an elemental factor in the regulation of all values. Hence the function of coining money and issuing currency is the most delicate and the most fundamental prerogative of popular sovereignty. Have the Republicans forgotten that all the powers of sovereignty emanate from the people? Do they deny that the coinage of money and the issuance of currency are among the essential and universal elements of sovereignty? Do they not understand that the Government at Washington is the only tangible expression of American sovereignty? Then why do they attempt to transfer the most basic element of Government from the mints to the millionaires? Why is it that they desire to change the seat of government from the buildings of the people to the banks of individuals? They would farm out the currency and place the money of the people under the control of individuals. As long as national banks retain the function of issuing money the dearest right and the most essential liberty of the American people will be desecrated and disgraced. The present bill extends the powers of national banks; it divorces entirely the functions of issuing currency from the Government and completes the scheme for the spoliation of the people.

This bill proposes under the cover to establish the gold standard, to perpetuate national banks as banks of issue, to surrender to the national banks and the Secretary of the Treasury complete control of the issuance of our currency, thereby creating by law a partnership between the Secretary of the Treasury and the wealthy few of our people. Not only this, but this bill, so far as it applies to national banks, is more objectionable than the present national banking law. I hope that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] and the other gentlemen who control this bill will place such restrictions upon the issue of national banks to the end that a bank once organized could not increase or diminish its notes. We are powerless under the rules to amend this bill or to offer a substitute.

As the law stands now those that are engaged in the national banking business can not withdraw all their notes from circulation. There are some restrictions which prevent them in a measure from contracting and inflating their notes at will. When this bill becomes a law, as it surely will, because the Republican party has the power to enact in into a law and its representatives are here for that purpose, the national banks will be clothed with so much power over the currency of this country that they will be enabled to create a financial panic within twenty-four hours should it suit their pleasure so to do. Knowing and believing this as I do, I can readily understand why it was that Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic party, said that national banks as banks of issue were more dangerous to the liberties of the people than large standing armies. I am not opposed to national bankers as individuals, because I know that there are many great and good men engaged in that business, but it is the power of issuing any kind of money, be it called credit money or whatever it may, that I oppose. It is a special privilege, a special power, given to them by law, which they ought not to exercise.

Section 4 of this bill reads as follows:

That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to maintain the gold reserve fund taken up on the books of the division of issue and redemption, as herein provided, and for this purpose he may from time to time transfer to such fund any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, or may exchange any of the funds in the division of issue and redemption for other funds which may be in the general fund of the Treasury, and in addition thereto he is hereby authorized to issue and sell, whenever in his judgment it is necessary to the maintenance of said reserve fund, bonds of the United States bearing interest at a rate not exceeding 3 per cent per annum, payable in gold coin at the end of twenty years, but redeemable in gold coin at the option of the United States after one year.

This is too much power to confide in any one man. Under the provisions of this bill the Secretary of the Treasury can issue one million or ten billions of bonds payable in gold, whenever in his judgment it is necessary to the maintenance of the reserve fund as provided by this act. This is unwise and unjust and dangerous legislation.

I want to say in conclusion that the gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber seem to forget that bonds are chains; and chains are onerous and galling, notwithstanding they be chains of gold. I can hear the clanking of these gold chains as they are now being forged by the national banks in the East with which to bind us hand and foot, and you gentlemen are their henchmen to rivet them on both hands and feet of the American people. I stand up in my place and defy you to do your worst. There will come a time when the people will be able to rise up as one man and break these shackles from their limbs and set themselves free. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WILLIAM E. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would not attempt to discuss this question in the brief time allotted to me if I did not feel that it was a matter of great importance to my constituents as well as to the public at large. I do not say this complainingly, for I know that new members are not entitled to the privileges accorded to those of long service and that in the discussion of all questions those members long in service in this House have a decided advantage over those of less experience. I fully appreciate the recognition shown me and will avail of my time to the best advantage.

I feel that this bill is fraught with more of weal or woe for mankind than any legislation that has been proposed in a third of a century. It has already been suggested in this debate many times that no party has ever previous to this time declared in favor of the gold standard. In 1896 the Democratic party declared in favor of independent bimetallism; the Republican party declared in favor of international bimetallism; the Populist party and the Silver party for independent bimetallism. The only party which ever declared openly for a gold standard was that little handful of so-called Democrats that met at Indianapolis, the home of the progenitor of this bill, and nominated that ancient and acrobatic statesman of Illinois, John M. Palmer, for the Presidency. [Laughter and applause.] Not only has no party declared for it, but at no time in the history of this country or of the world has any people been called upon to approve or indorse or to graft upon themselves a gold standard.

The purpose of this bill is to fasten and rivet the gold standard upon us without the sanction of the people, and then, next year, before its evil effects fully manifest themselves and are realized in all their dire consequences, ask an approval and ratification by the people at the polls. It was attempted in 1875 to adopt the gold standard without discussion, when, in pursuance of an European conspiracy, a bill was smuggled through Congress and the approval of the President secured without his knowledge of the contents of the bill, and now, in line with the same reprehensible conduct, and characteristic of the same party that enacted that law, we find this bill attempted in almost the same way. There was no demand arising from the people, no platform declarations in the Congressional election of any party last year, no warning and no notice to the public, and yet a self-constituted committee met at Atlantic City, where they held conference with the presidents of banks and banking syndicates and drafted this bill in accordance with the exactions of the men who furnished the Republican campaign fund three years ago.

It then went into a secret vault and never saw the light of day until last week, when it was presented to the consideration of this House without having been published to the country for the consideration, approval, or criticism of the people. They not only introduced it in an informal manner, not referring it to any committee, as is the usual and customary and proper procedure, but they undertook by the operation of the Committee on Rules to deprive the representatives of the people from adequate preparation and the proper discussion of the question at any length on the floor of the House. They now ask to impose the law upon the people without opportunity for amendment here and without awaiting popular expression of resentment or approval, and before public sentiment can become aroused to the danger that is threatened and the weak-kneed, who have been corralled like so many cattle, can be influenced by the muttering of the coming storm to vote against it. [Applause.]

In the discussion of this question, Mr. Chairman, I do not feel called upon to defend the Chicago platform, if any defense is necessary. I stand upon that platform and the party is committed to it, but this bill does not present the issues presented in the campaign of that year. Any patriotic American citizen, no matter whether he then favored independent or international bimetallism, no matter whether he voted for McKinley or Bryan, can consistently and ought to vote against this bill. When they say the question was discussed then, and that we ought to be prepared to meet it now, I reply to the gentlemen that the issues presented by this bill were not presented by the platforms adopted in 1896. We discussed bimetallism then, which was the creed of the Democratic party and the slogan of the Republican party. The Democratic party said, "We want independent bimetallism," and the Republican party said, "We want international bimetallism and pledge ourselves to promote it." We then warned the people from every stump that the pretensions of the Republican party in favor of bimetallism were not sincere, that they were hiding behind a mask, and that if McKinley should be elected the gold standard would be adopted and no good-faith effort made to promote international bimetallism, and we now point to this gratuitous and audacious attempt as proof of our predictions and a fulfillment of our prophecy. [Applause.]

One other point, Mr. Chairman, before presenting some of the objections which I wish to urge to this bill is the concession made by gentlemen upon the other side that the quantity of money in circulation has much to do with regulating prices. Why, it has been boasted by these gentlemen that since the election of 1896 and the inauguration of McKinley $385,000,000 has been added to the circulation, and they claim that prosperity is due in a measure to that increase of money, and that by reason of the increased production of gold the free coinage of silver becomes unnecessary. So much, then, for the quantitive theory of money, which I have not time to discuss within the limit assigned me. It is in effect conceded and eliminates much controversy and contention. [Applause.]

If prosperity has come, as is contended, it came under the same system and under the same financial policy that precipitated the panic of 1893. But let me say that whatever may be the improved condition of the times, they are traceable to other causes. The increased demand for the product of the farm and factory to equip and sustain large armies for the Spanish and Philippine wars, the conversion of 100,000 men from producers to consumers in the field, has produced a legitimate increase in the price of product and labor. Then, again, prices, in many instances, of the products of factories have been marked up by the great trusts and combinations formed and encouraged under the McKinley-Hanna Administration. I have not the time to discuss trusts here, but while passing wish to say they are the creatures of Republican class legislation. I fear that there is no real and abiding prosperity; that times have improved from temporary causes only.

I have no time to discuss that question now; but, Mr. Chairman, for the purposes of this argument I am willing to concede that there is a period of unusual prosperity prevailing, particularly in the moneyed and commercial centers and in other portions of the country which have been blessed by abundant harvests. If so, there is less reason for disturbing these conditions by a change in our financial policy. The motto "Let well enough alone" can be invoked with profit here. [Applause.]

Briefly stated, my reasons for opposing the bill are these:

First. It makes no provision for the coinage of the silver dollar, and, as I understand the law, since the repeal of the Sherman Act there is no provision for the coinage of the silver dollar in any existing law, and no provision in the proposed law for its coinage except for the coinage of fractional or subsidiary coin, as already embodied in the existing law. [Applause.]

Silver by this bill becomes directly redeemable in gold and ceases to be basic money. Heretofore it has not been redeemable by law, and has constituted a part of the actual money of the country. We have had since 1878 an anomalous financial system—a kind of quasi bimetallism—and silver has never heretofore been wholly discarded as actual money or reduced to the rank of credit or token money until now, when it is contemplated by the provision of this bill to make it redeemable—even worse than that, it is proposed, and little or no attempt is made to disguise it, to redeem, retire, and drive out of existence the "dollar of our daddies." [Applause.] We rejoice with our friends across the aisle in the new discovery and increased production of gold—we are not hostile to the yellow metal—and if there should be an adequate production of gold for the use of the civilized world for the purposes of basic money there would be no demand for the use of silver as money, and we would yield our contention.

The mere fact that this bill authorizes increased issue of bank currency is of itself an admission that there is not gold enough to answer the demand for money. But with the whole world engaged in a mighty struggle for gold and issuing gold bonds to maintain a supply; with a war barely averted between England and Venezuela only recently by reason of a British attempt to shift her boundary line to encompass and steal a gold mine from a

country helpless without the intervention of a friendly nation; with a disputed Alaskan boundary line between our own country and the same avaricious nation by reason of the rich gold finds along the border; with a deplorable war now raging in the Transvaal between Boer and Britain, for which England can give but one excuse, and that a wicked design to seize and hold the reef of gold in that far-away country—rich beyond the dreams of avarice—for which she would blot out civilization forever and turn back the hands of time a hundred years; with such greed and such desperation, why should we strike down our own fair product and enter into the arena of conflict, into an unseemly and mercenary gold-grabbing scramble, with the other nations of the earth?

And, by the way, Mr. Chairman, I desire to express my disapprobation of England's attempt to subjugate that sturdy yeomanry. I rejoice in the Dutch victories, and, commingling my prayers with those of the dying martyrs and living heroes of that sunny land, I invoke the spirit of freedom, of devotion, and self-sacrifice, the love of country and home and fireside, the courage, the conviction, and the patriotism that inspired the fathers of our own Revolution, who struggled, endured, and died, with the same gold-fevered, merciless, and mercenary foe, for the freedom of our beloved, our native land. [Applause.]

Second. I object to the bill because it provides for the retirement of the greenbacks as well as the silver dollar and will operate to contract the currency to that extent. This is, no doubt, the object and purpose of the bill, but it was proclaimed the other day by some gentlemen on the floor, in the course of this discussion, that it will not have that effect, for the reason assigned that when the silver or greenback dollar is retired the gold dollar given out in exchange will go out to take the place of the retired dollar.

But, Mr. Chairman, gentlemen forget that that gold dollar in the first place was taken out of circulation; let me say, was extorted from the people; and the gold dollar which is paid out of the Treasury to redeem the silver or greenback dollar, as the case may be, may find its way, during the course of a day, back into the Treasury, ready to redeem another greenback or silver dollar, and so on from day to day, so that one dollar in the course of a year may redeem many hundreds of dollars, and in the course of time a small amount of gold can redeem every greenback and silver dollar outstanding and thus contract the volume of the currency to that extent. It is claimed that the silver and greenback may be paid out again for gold and in that way find their way back into circulation. But such is not the purpose of the bill, and I apprehend that the banks and financial sharks who horde and corner the gold and are, as we all know, unfriendly and inimical to silver and paper money will never give up a dollar in gold to redeem or to take out of hock a single greenback or silver dollar. Hence I say that when once redeemed the people's money will be consigned to its long home, to its final resting place, never again to come forth to cheer the hope, to gladden the heart, or to replenish the purse of the people. [Applause.]

Third. I object to the bill because it impairs the obligation of existing contracts in favor of the creditor and against the debtor, and makes a new obligation which has not heretofore been embodied in the contracts of the Government. It makes the bonds of the Government payable in gold coin, contrary to the express declaration which they bear upon their face. [Applause.] Congress refused to make the bonds when issued payable in gold coin, and they were placed upon the market with the full knowledge that they were payable in coin, gold or silver, at the option of the Government. It was represented by the bond speculators that the bonds could be floated at a much greater premium if made payable in gold, but Congress refused. They were sold on the basis of coin bonds, payable either in silver or gold, and at a profit to the holder, who now comes to the front to exact his pound of flesh in return for his campaign contribution and demands legislation for the payment of his bonds in gold, contrary to the letter, the spirit, and the intent of his contract. Mr. Chairman, such a demand is monstrous, and if enacted into law, if an indignant people do not rise up and visit retribution upon the offenders a just and righteous God will. [Applause.]

Fourth. It places a dangerous power in the hand of the Treasurer of the United States. That question has been already ably and logically discussed upon this floor. Mr. Chairman, it places more power in the hands of an individual than has ever been given a public officer since the Government of the United States began. The exclusive and absolute right to issue bonds at will is a dangerous power. It is a power that should never be intrusted to one person. It is a power that should be lodged solely in the Congress of the United States; in the hands of the people's representatives. [Applause.] Why this extraordinary delegation of power? Is it because Congress can not always—when Democratic—be relied upon to truckle to the demands of the money changers, the gilded magnates, and the bank trusts? Or is it because the Republican party, which was never known to betray a "trust," is faithfully keeping its pledges made to the money barons three years ago when such tremendous contributions were made to the Hanna corruption campaign fund? When this power is conferred the national banks, which can corner the gold at their own sweet will, and with full power to contract or expand the bank currency at the bidding of the bank trust, can drain the Treasury of gold, exhaust the reserve fund, and force an issue of bonds whenever it is desired to increase and multiply the national banks and extend their influence until their omnipotence is supreme and the people, bound hand and foot, become abject slaves, without remedy save that of revolution. [Applause.]

The fifth and last reason which I have time to specifically assign in opposition to this bill is that it creates a bank trust and places the issue and redemption and volume of our money helplessly in the hands and subject to the absolute control of the national banks. The power to issue money is a constitutional function of government and ought not and can not safely be delegated. Experience has taught us that banking institutions and financial concerns worship a mercenary god and are prompted in all their dealings by greed and avarice. Such a surrender of the people's birthright is a sad spectacle; it is pitiable indeed. The dire prophecy so often made is about to be fulfilled and the political fortunes of our country given over in abject and helpless submission to a band of conspirators—a lot of remorseless cormorants who have fed and fattened on the public and contributed of their ill-gotten gain to the corruption of public morals, to the seduction of the citizen voter, and to the destruction of those bulwarks of human liberty which vouchsafe free institutions, American manhood, American freedom, and American progress [applause], and now come with the audacity of his satanic majesty and exact merciless and extortionate compliance with the letter of their bond. The future alone can disclose the awful consequences of this iniquitous bill, for the responsibility of which I trust no Democrat will have to answer to his people or to his God. [Great applause.]

Gentlemen upon the other side of the Chamber have expressed great solicitude for the future of the Democratic party, and have deluged us with prophetic warnings as to the consequences of our action here. Let me say to our friends across the isle that they can better afford to concern themselves about their own political future. I warn them now if they pass this bill, if they fasten upon these people a gold standard without their authority and without their sanction, when the battle is fought and the victory won next November the news will go beyond hill and dale, across the prairies and the great father of waters, over the plains and the mountain peaks, around the world, announcing the glad tidings that the cause of Democracy has triumphed; that the will of the people is supreme. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. McLAIN. Mr. Chairman, in the very beginning of my remarks I wish to say that the extraordinary methods adopted by the party in power in forcing this bill upon the House, without even referring it to a committee, has thereby debarred me from giving that care and time upon the preparation of my remarks that this occasion demands. But I have not allowed considerations of this character to prevent me from giving public expressions on the floor of this House to my opposition to the pending bill. When one contemplates fairly and impartially this great question for us to decide, he is reminded that a great responsibility rests with him. I have the past few days listened with much pleasure to this great debate. I feel sure I can not throw any additional light upon it. But I owe it to myself and to my constituents to thus raise my voice against its passage.

Again and again this question under consideration has been discussed in this House on former occasions. From every stump in this land the best orators of our day have crossed swords upon this issue. It has been an issue in one of our Presidential campaigns, in which we as a party went down in defeat. But with all that, Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who have not lost heart. Trusting in the supreme justice of our cause, I firmly believe that in the grand sweep of things a great success will be our reward. It is true the greatest test of courage is to bear defeat without losing heart. Our cause is just. Our hearts are full of cheer. For the right of the people we will faithfully contend, believing that right, honestly and persistently pressed, has a passport to victory sooner or later.

Mr. Chairman, the question under consideration is a great and momentous one. It is overtopped by none other, not even by trusts, nor by expansion and imperialism. It is a radical departure, pregnant with evil, which some day will prove a curse to this country. Unmindful of party creed, the American people all over this land are watching this Congress. They feel and know that no graver problems ever confronted an American Congress for solution than meet this one at its very threshold. Among these problems for solution is this one. It is hoped by them, when we have acted on this one, along with the other great and new problems, that it may be so executed that they may gather fresh inspiration in the stability of our Government and in the cause of human freedom. Our duty can well be performed if we are simply honest, intelligent, and patriotic. If we earnestly desire to

hand over to our country an increased legacy of power and glory, we must so act. In so doing, intelligence, justice, and prosperity will continue with increased force to dwell in our land.

Mr. Chairman, the position, aim, and design of the Republican party as voiced in this bill is absolutely startling; it is bold; it is defiant. I think it can be truthfully denominated as a bill in the interest of bondholders. It is practically turning the financial system of the Government into the hands of the money power of the country. This bill has not only their hearty cooperation, but they are the power behind the throne. To fasten the gold standard upon the country is their aim. This bill, if passed, will accomplish that for them. They are clamoring for it. Solemnly do they echo in tones of commanding confidence, one to another, the cry of "sound money," "honest money." They cry out aloud to those who are under obligations to them, We must have it now, right now. In response to this demand all other business is laid aside by this House. Yea, all precedents are violated to railroad this pet measure of theirs through this House. If the bondholders of this country had prepared this bill, could it have been made stronger in their interest? Right here let me read a part of the bill. Sections 2 and 4 read as follows:

SEC. 2. That all interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the payment of money, now existing or hereafter to be entered into, and all United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the law of July 14, 1890, shall be deemed and held to be payable in the gold coin of the United States as defined in section 1 of this act; and all other obligations, public and private, for the payment of money shall be performed in conformity with the standard established in said section. Nothing herein contained shall be construed or held to affect the present legal-tender quality of the silver dollar, or of the subsidiary or minor coins, or of the paper currency of the United States, or the laws making national-bank notes receivable and payable for certain public debts and dues and obligations between national banks.

SEC. 4. That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to maintain the gold reserve fund taken up on the books of the division of issue and redemption as herein provided, and for this purpose he may from time to time transfer to such fund any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, or may exchange any of the funds in the division of issue and redemption for other funds which may be in the general fund of the Treasury, and in addition thereto he is hereby authorized to issue and sell, whenever in his judgment it is necessary to the maintenance of said reserve fund, bonds of the United States bearing interest at a rate not exceeding 3 per cent per annum, payable in gold coin at the end of twenty years, but redeemable in gold coin at the option of the United States after one year. But no transfer shall at any time be made from the general fund of the Treasury to the division of issue and redemption which will reduce the general fund below $50,000,000. That all United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890, presented for redemption shall be redeemed in gold coin at the will of the holder, and all silver certificates presented for redemption shall be redeemed in accordance with existing law.

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and required to use said reserve fund in maintaining at all times the parity and equal value of every dollar issued or coined by the Government, and if at any time the Secretary of the Treasury deems it necessary in order to maintain the parity and equal value of all the money of the United States he may, at his discretion, exchange gold coin for any other money issued or coined by the United States. The notes and certificates so redeemed or exchanged shall be held in and constitute a part of said redemption fund and shall not be withdrawn therefrom nor disbursed except in exchange for an equivalent amount of the coin in which said notes or certificates were redeemed or exchanged, except as hereinbefore in this section provided. Nothing in this act shall be construed as repealing that provision of the act approved July 14, 1890, which provides that "no greater or less amount of such notes shall be outstanding at any time than the cost of the silver bullion and the standard silver dollars coined therefrom then held in the Treasury purchased by such notes."

Mr. Chairman, I have not the time to discuss these sections of the bill in all of their bearings. See what extraordinary power it gives to the Secretary of the Treasury! It makes all bonds payable in gold! In all of its provisions it thirsts for gold! It writes gold into all interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the payment of money, now existing or hereafter to be entered into, and all United States Treasury notes are payable in gold; and all obligations, public and private, for the payment of money are to be paid in gold. It places in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury full and complete authority to issue and sell, whenever in his judgment it is necessary to the maintenance of the reserve fund, the bonds, and interest and principal are payable in gold. He is especially charged to use the reserve fund in maintaining at all times the parity and equal value of every dollar issued or coined by the Government.

It further provides that if at any time the Secretary of the Treasury deems it necessary in order to maintain the parity and equal value of all the money of the United States he may, at his discretion, exchange gold coin for any other money issued by the Government. It is permissible to national banks to issue notes to the full amount of their bond deposit without any additional security. Such are some of the sweeping and drastic measures in this bill, the ultimate object of which is to bind the country to the gold standard, thereby inflicting a cruel wrong on it, seeking to enslave the people.

This law is not needed. The people have not demanded it. When its unjust and I might say cruel provisions are thoroughly understood by the people, they will repudiate it and hurl from power the party that enacted it. From the signs I see around me, this bill will be passed; but that will not quiet the discussion on this great question. The more it is discussed, the plainer it will appear to the people that it has the appearance of legalized robbery.

Mr. Chairman, in support of this measure much has been said about the prosperity in our land. I admit that times are better. I will admit that labor finds ready employment, and I pray to God that it may not only remain with us, but go on and on, growing brighter and better as the months and years roll round. It is loudly heralded abroad that this is an evidence, an object lesson, that bimetallism is wrong and the gold standard is right. We are taunted with this. Who brought around better times? Was it the Republican party? Was it the gold standard? No. One reason is that within the last few years the money volume has been increased to an unprecedented extent, and in a manner and way that no one saw or reasonably expected. It came not by the bidding or through the instrumentality of any party or statutory law.

Nature has responded copiously to the toiler of the mines. In 1898 the production of gold was the greatest in the history of the world by many millions. That we may get a clear conception of what I am trying to impress, let me briefly surround myself with all the facts, or rather data, in reference to the production of gold and silver within the last hundred years in the world. At the risk of being tedious I herewith submit the following table, which speaks for itself. This table was incorporated in the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET]. I find it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 12, from which I take this:

Product of gold and silver in the world since 1799.

[The annual production of 1800 to 1872 is obtained from five-year period estimates, compiled by Dr. Adolph Soetbeer. Since 1872 the estimates are those of the Bureau of the Mint.]

Calendar year.	Gold.		Silver.		
	Fine ounces.	Value.	Fine ounces.	Commercial value.	Coining value.
1800	6,486,922	$134,093,000	29,005,428	$30,337,000	$37,618,000
1861	5,949,582	122,989,000	35,401,972	46,191,000	45,772,000
1862	5,949,582	122,989,000	35,401,972	47,651,000	45,772,000
1863	5,949,582	122,989,000	35,401,972	47,616,000	45,772,000
1864	5,949,582	122,989,000	35,401,972	47,616,000	45,772,000
1865	5,949,582	122,989,000	35,401,972	47,368,000	45,772,000
1866	6,270,086	129,614,000	43,051,583	57,646,000	55,663,000
1867	6,270,086	129,614,000	43,051,583	57,173,000	55,663,000
1868	6,270,086	129,614,000	43,051,583	57,086,000	55,663,000
1869	6,270,086	129,614,000	43,051,583	57,043,000	55,663,000
1870	6,270,086	129,614,000	43,051,583	57,173,000	55,663,000
1871	5,591,014	115,577,000	63,317,014	83,938,000	81,804,000
1872	5,591,014	115,577,000	63,317,014	83,765,000	81,804,000
Total	78,709,630	1,628,252,000	547,997,231	729,563,000	708,521,000
1873	4,658,675	96,290,000	63,267,187	82,120,800	81,800,000
1874	4,990,031	90,750,000	55,300,781	70,674,400	71,500,000
1875	4,716,563	97,500,000	62,201,719	77,578,100	80,500,000
1876	5,016,488	103,700,000	67,753,125	78,322,000	87,000,000
1877	5,512,196	113,947,200	62,679,916	75,278,000	81,000,740
1878	5,761,114	119,092,800	73,385,451	84,540,000	94,882,240
1879	5,282,174	108,778,800	74,383,495	83,532,700	91,172,000
1880	5,148,880	106,436,800	74,795,273	85,640,000	90,706,000
1881	4,983,742	103,023,100	79,020,872	89,925,700	102,168,000
1882	4,934,086	101,996,600	86,472,091	98,242,300	111,802,200
1883	4,614,588	95,392,000	80,175,023	93,084,300	115,226,000
1884	4,921,109	101,729,600	81,567,801	94,785,000	105,401,000
1885	5,245,572	108,435,600	91,609,959	97,518,800	118,445,200
1886	5,135,679	106,163,900	93,297,290	92,783,500	120,628,800
1887	5,116,861	105,774,900	96,123,586	94,031,000	124,281,000
1888	5,350,775	110,596,900	106,827,606	102,185,900	140,706,000
1889	5,973,790	123,489,200	120,213,611	112,414,100	155,427,700
1890	5,749,306	118,848,700	126,095,062	131,937,000	163,062,000
1891	6,330,194	130,850,000	137,170,919	135,500,200	177,352,300
1892	7,094,286	146,651,500	153,151,762	133,404,400	198,014,400
1893	7,618,811	157,494,800	165,472,621	129,119,900	213,844,600
1894	8,704,302	181,175,600	164,610,304	104,493,000	212,829,600
1895	9,615,190	198,763,600	167,500,900	100,545,600	216,566,900
1896	9,783,914	202,251,600	157,061,370	105,850,300	203,039,200
1897	11,552,532	238,812,000	164,073,172	98,443,800	212,134,800
1898	13,904,363	287,428,600	165,295,572	97,524,500	213,715,400
Total	167,120,321	3,454,633,800	2,780,586,618	2,590,386,100	3,595,075,700
Grand total	245,886,951	5,082,935,800	3,328,583,849	3,289,949,100	4,303,596,700

In addition to this table I will say that from another authority I find that the world's production of gold and silver from 1800 to 1860, and including the present time, is given in round numbers as follows below, which for the period from 1860 to 1898 practically agrees with the above table. That statement is as follows:

The average annual production of gold in the world for the first forty years of the present century, as given by Soetbeer, was $10,588,000. The average annual production of silver for the same period was $25,895,000, making a little over $36,000,000 annually of both gold and silver for the world. From 1800 to 1850 the production of gold averaged $36,392,000; that of silver, $32,440,000 annually, or $68,832,000 of both. From 1850 to 1860 the production of gold rose to $133,291,000, while that of silver increased to $37,266,000, giving for both metals an average of $170,557,000, nearly three times that of the previous decade. From 1860 to 1870 the annual production of gold fell to an average of $120,968,000 and silver rose to $50,717,000, making for both $177,667,000.

From 1870 to 1880 the annual production of gold fell to $115,000,000 and silver rose to $91,850,000, coining value, making for both for this decade $206,850,000, the first time in the history of the precious metals when their production rose above $200,000,000 in a single year. From 1880 to 1890 the annual production of gold still declined, falling for this decade to $100,000,000, while that of silver continued to rise until it reached $172,000,000, coining value, making for both

metals for this decade $278,000,000. But as silver had been partially demonetized since 1873, the monetary effect was less than the coining value here given.

From 1890 to 1893, when the mints of India were closed and the silver law in the United States was repealed, the annual production of gold rose to $132,000,000 and silver to $176,000,000. Since 1893 the production of gold has continued to increase, rising for the fiscal year 1894 to $181,000,000; $198,000,000 in 1895, $202,000,000 in 1896, $237,000,000 in 1897, and $290,000,000 in 1898—the highest in the world's history, and larger, as we see, than the production of both metals at any time prior to 1891, and eight times the average production of both metals during the first forty years of the century and one and a half times the average annual production of both from 1860 to 1880, and more than the average annual production of both from 1880 to 1891.

Mr. Chairman, again there is another potent factor in making times apparently good. I say apparently good, for to the toiling masses they are not as good and prosperous to them in proportion as to the money power. Never within the history of this country had the money power such supreme command and control. They are driving with a free rein. It is the trust of trusts. It has created a kind of false prosperity. It has cornered nearly every manufactured article and thereby run the prices up. In doing so, I admit it has put in motion all kinds of factories, giving employment to all. While it has done this, yet it has also raised the prices of nearly all manufactured goods and articles to an abnormal point, thereby compelling all consumers, and especially the toiling masses, to pay unnecessary, yet exacting, tribute to them. The passage of this bill increases its power, and decreases the liberties and the rights of the people.

To place the power in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury and that of the national banks to issue and control the currency of this Union is a bold and dangerous step. Under the provision of the law it virtually gives them the power to issue and control the currency at will or as their interest may dictate. Unquestionably this creates, fosters, and maintains the most dangerous trust of them all—a money trust, which, I fear, will finally control the Government. I do not think I speak extravagantly when I say this. These trusts are a cruel and wicked conspiracy against the prosperity and liberties of the people. In most cases they are a vast horde of legalized plunderers. It is true these trusts are condemned in the President's message, though fostered, I fear, by some of the measures of his party—notably, this financial bill.

Right here I will remark, by the way of parenthesis, that some of the advocates of this measure assert that as some of the eminent financiers indorse this bill and urge its passage, therefore that should be a weighty argument in its favor. I will not stop here to discuss this proposition at length, but will modestly suggest to our self-confident opponents that we have as able financiers on our side of the question as the country can show and who will not suffer by comparison with any. I am sorry, truly sorry, to say we have in the last few years lost a few of our supporters in a rather hurried way. If I mistake not, among some of the distinguished lights and financiers who were once with us is the present Chief Executive and a late Secretary of the Treasury, to say nothing of numerous members who are now on this floor of the House who were once with us, but are now advocating this bill. This defection may prove something or nothing. Just why all this change of front, whether in the line of progress or not, might present a question for debate.

But I must return back to the subject of the increase of gold. An eminent authority on this line says:

> What bearing, then, has the recent increase in the production of gold, which has reached, as we have seen, unprecedented and unexpected dimensions, on the money question as viewed from the standpoint of bimetallists? The effect on prices and business is, of course, the same as it would be if, instead of the present supply being all gold, it were part silver, with free coinage for both metals, as before 1873. In other words, it is the increased supply and not the particular kind of metal that tells. That is the quantity theory of money upon which bimetallists base their contentions, and to admit that the increased supply of gold keeps up prices and helps business is to admit the quantity theory of money.
>
> Admitting the good effects of the present large production of gold, would it be safe to rest the monetary system of the world for all time upon the accidental production of one metal for a year or for a dozen years? Not years, but centuries—ages—must be taken into view when considering a question like that of a standard of value which extends indefinitely into the future.
>
> The periods in the world's history when the supply of the precious metals has been sufficient to sustain and vitalize industry and commerce have been short and infrequent, while the periods when the blight of an insufficient supply of money has deadened the energies of mankind and stayed the progress of the world have been long and frequent.
>
> What has been will be again. No geologist believes that the present rate of production of gold can last very long, much less be permanent, while the world's activities, if not again checked by another dearth of money, will continue to increase as civilization increases and spreads over the world.

This increase in the gold supply, Mr. Chairman, instead of proving that the gold standard is correct and the bimetallist is wrong, demonstrates what we have been contending for all the time—more basic money—is correct. The increase in the production of gold for 1898 is more than the combined production of gold and silver for any year prior to 1891. That is to say, if at that period and prior thereto gold and silver had been freely coined at the ratio of 16 to 1, it would not have been as great as the production of gold to-day; that is, for the year 1898. Again, I repeat for emphasis, that the production of gold for 1898 is greater "than the production of both metals at any time prior to 1891, and eight times the average production of both metals during the first forty years of the century, and one and a half times the average annual production of both from 1860 to 1880, and more than the average annual production of both from 1880 to 1890."

From this statement, which I presume no one will deny, one clearly sees that it is the volume of money in circulation that the country needs and "not the particular kind of metal." I presume all will admit that the increased production of gold has had something to do with the prosperous times. Then, to admit that is to admit the quantity theory of money. I am told it is confidently expected for the year 1899 the production of gold for the world will reach the fabulous sum of $400,000,000. Think of it. This is nearly twice as great as the production of both metals for any one year prior to 1891. One of the chief arguments of the gold-standard men prior to and since 1891 to the "free coinage of silver" was that it would "flood" the country with too much money.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the combined production of both at that time is less than the production of gold for the year 1898 and is far less, by over $100,000,000, for the year 1899. This, in my judgment, clearly demonstrates the falsity of the position of those who urged that the free coinage of silver would place too much money in circulation. If that argument was good then, it is good now. But, in the name of justice, do you hear anyone crying out that the country is now "flooded" with gold? Do you hear anyone warning us against a still greater "flood" of gold for this year, that is pouring itself into the lap of the world? No; it is welcomed by all. It does seem to me, Mr. Chairman, if any fair and contemplative mind will analyze these facts, he must inevitably conclude that the bimetallist theory is correct. Well, it may be said as gold in such quantities has been discovered and put into circulation, that we do not need any more money; that is to say, "free silver." My answer to that is, "Would it be safe to rest the monetary system of the world for all time upon the accidental production of one metal for a year or for a dozen years?" I say, no. But I contend, further, that with the increased population and business over this country, if the production of gold should continue indefinitely at the present annual output, then it would not swell the volume of money too great to have the free coinage of siver along with it, but, on the contrary, it would be beneficial to business and the country at large. By reference to the above table of the annual production of gold and silver we see the production of the two metals for the year 1898, which is the greatest by millions in the history of the world for any one year, amounts to the sum of $501,146,000. The business of the world could easily utilize this sum at an annual yield for all years to come. The unprecedented increase in the world's business and activities, progress, and population, calls for more and more money every year to sustain them, and that desired end can not be reached without the free coinage of silver.

Mr. Chairman, within my limited time this is about as far as I can pursue this line of argument.

Mr. Chairman, this clamor for the gold standard and for this willful degradation of silver by adverse legislation is in the interests of schemers and bondholders who add nothing to the wealth of the country by either industry or invention. To any fair and impartial mind, without argument, one can see that the gold standard could be easily and quickly reduced to a pitiable condition by the use of similar methods. Gold and silver walked side by side at a certain ratio for years, and that happy situation remained until, by a stealthy process of arbitrary legislation, the settled order was overthrown, to the ruin of business and to the misery of countless multitudes of our people. Who is asking for this legislation? The bondholders. The Republican party promised earnest efforts to aid in securing international remonetization. Their efforts in earnest to do so have only been excelled by their earnestness to the contrary.

This cry that we are in danger, or ever have been in danger from an overflow of money, is absolutely without foundation. The output of the mines have been somewhat varied in different years, but the general average of uniformity has been very remarkable always. But what happened in 1873? It is well known that the blow, the murderous blow silver received then by the act of that year was not demanded by the people or any party of this country Situations of affairs afforded no excuse, in any point of view, for the radical change then wrought out in any such a manner. So secretly, and I might say stealthily, was it done that even the President was not aware of the intent of the drastic movement.

Mr. Chairman, may I not be justified in saying that the ultimate effect of this bill is to enrich the wealthy and impoverish the poor? It contracts the circulating medium, making money scarce, while it opens the door wide for additional bond issues without limit; gives the national banks absolute control of all the money in the United States; renders even the Government subject to the greed of the millionaire and national banks; it decreases the circulating medium and increases the number of national banks. It

does seem, Mr. Chairman, that the concentration of the power in the hands of the few and the concentration of the wealth in the great money centers has gone so far that they have become bold and "want the earth and the fullness thereof."

When you pass this bill no measure that will pass this Congress, or has ever passed the American Congress, will be more withering and crushing in the long run to the business interests of this country. Barring our future action on the Philippine question and kindred ones, other legislation we do here may come and go, wither and perish, but the evil and bitter fruit that will necessarily flow from the passage of this bill, will, in my judgment, live and abide long after we are asleep in the bosom of mother earth. In the name of the people whom I represent I do most solemnly protest against the passage of this bill. [Applause on Democratic side.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, some of my colleagues on this side have expressed surprise at the extraordinary methods resorted to by the majority to pass this bill. And it is remarkable that a measure of such vast importance should be rushed through in such hot haste. However, there is no room for surprise. The gold power never deals fairly with any question in which its interests are involved. In 1873 it slipped the demonetization of silver through both Houses of Congress and across the President's desk without discovery, very much as a burglar slips through a house at midnight and robs sleeping victims of their jewelry and coin. In 1892 it inserted in the Democratic platform a declaration in favor of admitting both metals to coinage without discrimination against either, but in language of such straddling duplicity that it was construed as a condemnation of the coinage ratio. Mr. Cleveland was there nominated for President. He accepted the nomination and thus gave the country to understand that he would uphold the platform, yet within a few months after his election he called Congress together for the sole purpose of striking down silver coinage altogether.

In 1896 the gold power wrote into the Republican platform a declaration favoring international bimetallism and nominated for the Presidency that gifted orator, Mr. McKinley, whose resonant voice had so lately been reverberating throughout the land in favor of silver coinage and in denunciation of Mr. Cleveland for his hostility to the white metal. From the very day of his election he used all of the influence of his high office to obstruct the international bimetallism for which his platform had declared. Now comes this bill, fresh from the hands of the gold power, to be galloped through, under its whip, in violation of all legislative precedent, to the end that the monopoly conferred by it may be put into the stocking of the national banking trust as a Christmas gift.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to every feature of this remarkable bill. No measure ever came before Congress fraught with more danger to the people than this.

I am opposed to it because it establishes a single gold standard. I do not believe that there is enough gold to transact the business of the world and maintain stability of prices.

Gentlemen on the other side tell us that parity between the two metals could not be maintained. The Government has never tried to maintain a parity, but, on the contrary, has used every means to destroy it, at the instance of the gold power. Let there be no discrimination against either metal. Let the debtor, whether it be the Government or an individual, make payment in the metal most easily obtained and there will never be any trouble about parity.

We are told that the depreciation in silver bullion renders it inexpedient to attempt to maintain silver coinage. Depreciation of silver bullion has resulted from denying it access to the mints. Admit it to coinage on an equality with gold, and silver bullion will be worth as much as silver coin and either will be worth as much as gold. No man having silver bullion would sell it for less than he could get for it at the United States Mint.

You say that you are not willing to coin 50 cents' worth of bullion into a dollar in money. Oh, no; you are too honest for that, but you are willing to coin $2 worth of the farmer's wheat, $2 worth of the farmer's hogs into a single dollar in gold, and you have done it.

My Republican friends, why is it that the gold power requires you to demonetize silver? We can not accept your statement that it is because of the depreciation in silver bullion. You were as determined in your efforts to demonetize it in 1873, when the bullion in a silver dollar was worth $1.02 in gold coin, as you are now. The object of demonetization then was and now is to enhance the value of gold at the expense of the people.

I am opposed to the bill because it provides for an unlimited increase in our bonded debt. I am one of those who believe that we should be paying off our debt, not increasing it. This measure gives to the Secretary of the Treasury power to issue bonds whenever in his discretion he may deem it necessary, and he will deem it necessary whenever the national banking trust shall demand it. So it is that to confer these special bounties upon the national banking trust you not only burden the people now living with all the hardships they can carry, but you lay a heavy debt on the country to be paid out of the toil of generations yet unborn. You sell our very children into slavery to the gold power.

I oppose this bill because it will retire our greenbacks from circulation. The people are satisfied with that form of currency. Let the Government issue directly whatever paper money is needed, and not turn that function over to be exercised by the national banking trust. Republicans say that they want the Government to go out of the banking business. Without stopping to discuss the soundness of that proposition, I assert that it is more important that the banks should go out of the governing business. It is not necessary, however, for the Government to go into the banking business in order to keep the greenbacks in circulation. Gentlemen tell us that the greenbacks serve as an endless chain to deplete the gold reserve. This could never have been had the Secretary of the Treasury obeyed the law instead of yielding to the dictates of the gold power. When greenbacks were presented for redemption, had they been redeemed in that metal which it was most easy and convenient to obtain, not a greenback would have been presented for redemption. That is what the plain letter of the law required.

I am opposed to this bill because it creates a trust and confers upon it privileges and immunities not conferred upon the rest of the people. It grants a monopoly. The bank currency provided for in this bill is made secure, not by the solvency of the bank, but by the bonds deposited with the Secretary of the Treasury. Then why should not any bank, or any person having bonds, have the right to deposit them and take currency? There are many banks, thousands of them in the country, which are not national banks, that are abundantly solvent. The purpose of the bill is to limit the special privileges granted to a few hundred national banks which compose the trust.

This bill confers upon the national banking trust the power to issue and regulate the volume of currency. It can make money plentiful or make it scarce as best suits its purpose. It can make money plentiful in one part of the country and scarce in another, as it may choose. It can hurt the whole country. It can hurt one part of the country and help another. The national banking trust under this law can issue currency up to the full amount of bonds it can control, or it can decline to issue any at all. Having issued money, it may call in any or all of it, as may best suit its stock-jobbing purposes. By these processes it can control prices and keep markets continually fluctuating and disturbed. Some very good object lessons as to how this may be done have been given within the last few days. A week ago there was a slump in the stock market. A review of it in a financial paper contained the following:

> Having accomplished the object desired in bringing about a general slump in the stock market through the manipulation of money and sterling-exchange rates, the Rockefellers, through the National City Bank, helped along an easier tendency in to day's call loans.

Here we have the Rockefellers, through their bank, making money tight and prices low on one day while they buy what they want, and on the next day, through the same bank, they make money easy and prices high while they sell what they bought so cheap the day before in a panic of their own making. A week later another slump in prices occurred, and here is a statement of it contained in a paper which I hold:

> The Standard Oil crowd have done what they wanted—they have forced the Boston and Montana interests to sell out their property to them by all but breaking a big bank. When the Montana people surrendered, the Standard Oil withdrew the pressure and skipped $3,500,000 from New York to Boston to help the bank out. But in the meantime a lot of people were hurt in the smash.

What tremendous power to be in the hands of a Rockefeller; and yet this is the influence to which the Republican party is giving the power to issue the people's money and regulate the volume of it, to expand or contract the currency, to raise or lower prices at will and in its own interest instead of the people's.

I am opposed to this bill because it will make the national banking trust a factor to be reckoned with in our political contests. It will desire to guard the special privileges granted and obtain others from time to time, and will endeavor to see that a friendly President and Congress is selected.

The gentleman from Ohio, as well as others upon that side, have had the hardihood to cite Andrew Jackson and Thomas Benton as supporters of the policies of this bill. The greatest achievement of those two great statesmen was the overthrow of just such a financial trust as is being created here. It took them seven years to accomplish that result. We could not do better now than to listen to the words of Mr. Benton. In a speech in the United States Senate he said:

> This mass of power, thus ramified and thus directed, must necessarily become, under prolonged existence, the absolute monopolist of American money, the sole manufacturer of paper currency, and the sole authority to which the Federal Government, the State governments, the great cities, corporate bodies, merchants, traders, and every private citizen must, of necessity, apply, for every loan which the exigencies may demand. "The rich

ruleth the poor, and the borrower is the servant of the lender." Such are the words of Holy Writ; and if the authority of the Bible admitted of corroboration, the history of the world is at hand to give it. But I will not cite the history of the world, but one example only, and that of a nature so high and commanding as to include all others, and so near and recent as to be directly applicable to our own situation. I speak of what happened in Great Britain in the year of 1795, when the Bank of England, by a brief and unceremonious letter to Mr. Pitt, such as a miser would write to a prodigal in a pinch, gave the proof of what a great moneyed power could do, and would do, to promote its own interests in a crisis of national alarm and difficulty. I will read the letter. It is exceedingly short; for after the compliments are omitted there are but three lines of it. It runs thus:

"It is the wish of the court of directors that the chancellor of the exchequer would settle his arrangement of finances for the present year in such manner as not to depend upon any further assistance from them beyond what is already agreed for."

Such were the words of this memorable note, sufficiently explicit and intelligible; but to appreciate it fully we must know what was the condition of Great Britain at that time. It was the year 1795, and the beginning of that year, than which a more portentous one never opened on the British Empire. The war with the French Republic had been raging two years, Spain had just declared war against Great Britain, Ireland was bursting into rebellion, the fleet in the More was in open mutiny, and the cry for the reform of abuses and the reduction of taxes resounded through the land. It was a season of alarm and consternation, and of imminent actual danger to Great Britain; and this was the moment which the bank selected to notify the minister that no more loans were to be expected. What was the effect of the notification? It was to paralyze the Government and subdue the minister to the purposes of the bank.

From that day forth Mr. Pitt became the minister of the bank, and before two years were out he had succeeded in bringing all the departments of Government to his own slavish condition. He stopped the specie payments of the bank, and made its notes the lawful currency of the land. For twenty years the bank was the dominant power in England; and during that disastrous period the public debt was increased $2,000,000,000, and that by a bank which, according to its own declarations, had not a shilling to lend at the beginning of the period. I omit the rest. I say nothing of the general subjugation of the country banks, the rise in the price of food, the decline in wages, the increase of crime and taxes, the multiplication of lords and beggars, and the frightful demoralization of society. I only seize the central figure in the picture, that of a government arrested in the midst of war and danger by the veto of a moneyed corporation, and only permitted to go upon condition of assuming the odium of stopping specie payments and sustaining the promissory notes of an insolvent bank as the lawful currency of the land.

This single feature suffices to fix the character of the times, for when the Government becomes the servant of the lender the people themselves become its slaves. Can not the Bank of the United States act in the same way? It certainly can, and just as certainly will when time and opportunity serve and interest may prompt. * * * What grounds for alarm and terrible apprehension when, with so many independent States, so many rival commercial cities, so much sectional jealousy, such violent political parties, such fierce contests for power, there should be but one moneyed tribunal before which all the rival and contending elements must appear—but one single dispenser of money, to which every citizen, every trader, every merchant, every planter, every manufacturer, every corporation, every city, every State, and the Federal Government itself must apply in every emergency for the indispensable loan, and this in the face of the fact that in every contest for human rights the great moneyed institutions have uniformly been found on the side of kings and nobles and against the lives and liberties of the people.

This was the language of the great Benton, and it does not sound much like he favored a national banking trust, such as the Republicans are calling into existence by this measure. Not less pronounced was the opposition of General Jackson. When the decrepitude of advancing years called him to private life, he wrote a farewell address to the American people, in which he dwelt upon the evils of a banking trust and bank currency; and as a rebuke to the audacity of those who have cited him in support of this measure it may be proper to quote some of his language. He said:

In reviewing the conflicts which have taken place between different interests in the United States and the policy pursued since the adoption of our present form of government, we find nothing that has produced such deep-seated evil as the course of legislation in relation to the currency. The Constitution of the United States unquestionably intended to secure to the people a circulating medium of gold and silver; but the establishment of a national bank by Congress, with the privilege of issuing paper money, receivable in the payment of the public dues, and the unfortunate course of legislation in the several States upon the same subject, drove from general circulation the constitutional currency and substituted one of paper in its place.

Certainly there is nothing in this language to give comfort to the advocates of this bill, for he declares gold and silver both to be the money of the Constitution and condemns national-bank paper in the strongest terms. He says again, further along:

The corporations which create the paper money can not be relied upon to keep the circulating medium uniform in amount. In times of prosperity, when confidence is high, they are tempted by the prospect of gain, or by the influence of those who hope to profit by it, to extend their issues of paper beyond the bounds of discretion and the reasonable demands of business, and when these issues have been pushed on from day to day until public confidence is at length shaken, then a reaction takes place and they immediately withdraw the credits they have given, suddenly curtail their issues, and produce an unexpected and ruinous contraction of the circulating medium which is felt by the whole community. The banks by this means save themselves, and the mischievous consequences of their imprudence or cupidity are visited on the public.

This grand statesman has given us warning against what the Republican majority of this House is about to do, and if we were wise and patriotic we would heed his warning. But the difficulty here is that not the representatives of the people but the representatives of the banking trust are in the majority.

Mr. Chairman, the moving hands of the clock warn me that my time has almost expired and that I must hurry along. Gentlemen of the Republican side had much to say about the higher range of prices of certain commodities prevailing and the era of prosperity now said to exist. They claim that this has been brought about by the gold standard and the present Administration. My Republican friends, on this as on all other questions you have shown yourselves to be insincere opportunists. Do you say now that higher prices are beneficial to the people? In 1896 you said that you wanted the best dollar in the world—the dollar with the largest purchasing power. You said that you not only wanted low prices, but constantly decreasing prices, and that the election of McKinley and the assurance of the gold standard would insure these. Standing on this floor in 1896, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] said:

I know of no man whose wail is heard because of the fall in prices of wheat grains, food, cloth, clothing and the implements of husbandry and trade, and all that go to administer to the comfort, the health, and the needs of every man, rich or poor, in his own home, except the advocate of the free and unlimited coinage of silver.

This was the Republican view then. On the other hand, Democrats and Populists said that they wanted better prices and that an increase in volume of money would increase prices. The great increase in the output of the gold mines of the world has greatly increased the volume of money in circulation, and this has resulted in better prices, just as we said it would. The result has vindicated the correctness of the principle we contended for. If the increase in the volume of money in circulation caused by the increase in the gold supply has brought a slight improvement, then how much greater would have been the increase if the money volume had been swelled by silver coinage? Other things besides the increase in the volume of money have helped prices. Bad crops abroad and a good crop at home have set the balance of trade in our favor. Surely, with all their gall, Republicans will not claim that either the famine abroad or the good crops at home were caused by the election of McKinley or the establishment of the gold standard.

But, after all, the increase in prices to the producer has been very slight. There is no such era of prosperity as we have heard talked about by the other side. Wherever there has been any marked increase in prices it has been of those things sold by trusts, where prices have been arbitrarily raised and not from the natural course of trade. The farmer is selling his wheat for less than he did a year ago and is paying two and one-half times as much for his barbed wire; is selling his hogs at the same old price and paying $3.50 for the nails he bought a year ago for $1.50. This is the character of most of the prosperity now afflicting the country. This is the kind of prosperity that robs the poor to add to the wealth of the rich. That is the purpose of the bill now under consideration. Can you pass it? Will you do it? Yes; you must do it. The trusts demand it. But in after years, when another generation groans under the weight of the debt you are now putting upon the country, your children will rise up to curse you. This abomination will pass into a stain in our statutes, but it will not remain. A long-suffering people will blot it out. The Republican party will be driven from power, and, in the fear of God, William J. Bryan will act as the Chief Magistrate of this Republic. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I know that as a rule it is better for new members to listen to those who are their seniors in point of public service and to talk but little themselves. But were I to remain silent while the iniquities of this bill are being fastened upon the American people I would be untrue to the platform on which I was nominated, recreant to the trust reposed in me, and false to the principles and doctrines that I myself have always taught. I come, Mr. Chairman, fresh from the hands of the mountaineers of north Alabama, among whom I first saw God's sunlight, among whom I first breathed the pure mountain air, and with it inhaled the very inspirations of liberty itself. Among these people I first learned to hate tyranny and to despise the tyrant, whether it came in the form of some despot himself or that of despotic influences and interests which step by step sap the life-blood of freedom and bind her votaries hand and foot.

When these people met in convention, without my seeking, and, indeed, against my most solemn protest, they placed in my hands the banner of Democracy, and upon every hilltop and in every valley I spread its ample folds to reflect the sunlight of liberty and to catch the afflatus of freedom.

When I asked that convention to recall its nomination and place the standard in the hands of some one better able and more desirous of bearing it, and this was refused, I then asked them to write upon it the Chicago platform, without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t," and that I would lead them to victory, because the people and the people's God would then be upon our side.

When this was done I went forth to battle, and from that day till the polls closed I never doubted the result. Then, Mr. Chairman, with these recollections crowding thick and fast upon me, may I not well say that I would be recreant to my people were I not to raise my voice against what I believe to be the crowning infamy of the Republican party since the days of the "force bill" and carpetbag rule? The Republican party has boasted itself as being the party of freedom and of liberty. It points with pride to the fact that at one stroke of the pen it struck the

shackles of slavery from 5,000,000 human beings. For this work I give it credit, and from a honest heart thank God that slavery in the South is forever gone.

But, Mr. Chairman, when this bill passes and begins to show its hideous fangs, I fear that around the limbs of millions of toiling Americans will be riveted chains of poverty and despair harder and more binding than those which you struck from the black man's arms. And in after years, when from the mountain tops of north Alabama and from all over the South and the West the gaunt, hungry fingers of an impoverished people are pointed at you, I can say to those who are now gloating over their brief power, "Shake not your gory locks at me," for "thou didst it." A gentleman in this discussion has said that he wished that the Republican party could give this bill as a Christmas gift to the country. Such thoughts are sacrilege and worthy only of the followers of those who upon the natal day of the Christ child were the money gamblers in the temple, on whom in after years the righteous indignation of the same Christ child was destined to fall. What does that Christmas celebrate? The birth of Him of whom angels from heaven, beneath Judean stars, upon Judean hills, to Judean shepherds, heralded "Peace on earth, good will to men."

But, Mr. Chairman, if I read this bill aright, it carries not one breath of "peace on earth" or "good will to men," but in almost every word it carries the elements of oppression and want. No chord of love or good will can be evoked from its bosom, but the harsh strains of avarice and greed come from its every touch. A few years ago that party which is now bartering its very soul to the money fiend professed to be the friend of silver as well as gold. In its platform of 1888 it denounced the Democratic party in the following terms: "The Republican party is in favor of the use of both gold and silver as money and condemns the policy of the Democratic Administration in its efforts to demonetize silver." Was it sincere then? Who can contrast its utterances then with those heard to-day and recognize even the shadow of its former self? On the committee which reported this platform we find the distinguished gentleman who to-day sits at the helm and guides the ship of state. But, oh, how changed!

Coming on down but four brief years to 1892, we again find the Grand Old Party declaring its friendship for silver, but in more restricted terms. Slowly, yet surely, it was seeking to be struck by the aspen sting of gold, and in the following terms does it deliver itself along this line:

> The American people, from tradition and interest, favor bimetallism, and the Republican party demand the use of both gold and silver as a standard money, with such restrictions and under such provisions, to be determined by legislation, as will secure the maintenance of the parity of values of the two metals so that the purchasing and debt-paying power of the dollar, whether silver, gold, or paper, shall be at all times equal. We commend the wise and patriotic steps taken by our Government to secure an international conference and adopt such measures as will insure a parity between gold and silver for use as money throughout the world.

Four more years roll by, and we find it in open flirtation with this gilded, painted maid, and in its self-sought sleep it lays its head in this Delilah's lap, seeking to be shorn. This is its utterance:

> The Republican party is unreservedly for sound money. It caused the enactment of the law providing for the resumption of specie payments in 1879. Since then every dollar has been as good as gold. We are unalterably opposed to any measure calculated to debase our currency or impair the credit of our country. We are, therefore, opposed to the free coinage of silver except by international agreement with the leading commercial nations of the world, which we pledge ourselves to promote, and until such an agreement can be obtained the existing gold standard must be preserved. All our silver and paper currency must be maintained at parity with gold, and we favor all measures designed to maintain inviolably the obligations of the United States, and all our money, whether coin or paper, at the present standard, the standard of the most enlightened nations of the earth.

Who could be deceived by such utterances as these? Many there were so credulous as to believe that beneath this tempting bait there lurked no cruel hook. Still her speakers went forth, wearing this transparent mask, and, like the ostrich, thought if but the head was hid no part was exposed to view. Many were deceived by the words of their oily politicians, who were—

> By smooth dissimulation skilled to grace;
> A devil's nature with an angel's face.

And when the polls were closed Nebraska's noble son had fallen with his face still to the foe. Then it was that the money power laughed and said, "We've gotten all we want." Our coffers were invaded and we were made to bleed, but soon it will all come back. Slowly the stealthy tread of the assassin of silver and the enemy of the people has marched for years along the corridors and within these halls with hidden blade, but now beneath this Dome, in broad daylight, it is drawn to deal the fatal blow.

The mask of dissimulation is now thrown off, and those who eight years ago acknowledged the people as their only lords and feared to disobey their will now boldly bow before the golden calf. Scarcely a decade has passed since it denounced the Democratic party for trying to do what it is about to do. But—

> Vice is a monster of so frightful mien,
> As to be hated needs but to be seen;
> Yet seen too oft, familiar with her face,
> We first endure, then pity, then embrace.

Mr. Chairman, do you suppose, or is there one of the distinguished gentlemen who has spoken on the pending measure who does suppose, that if to the thousands of American pilgrims who visited the mecca of Republicanism in 1896, and from the vine-bowered cottage heard words of inspiration from their chief—that if that chief had proclaimed that the success of the Republican party meant the passage of this bill, he to-day would have been the nation's head? No, Mr. Chairman, no; but instead of going forth with thousands shouting at his triumphal car he would have been buried beneath an avalanche of American ballots so deep that no blast from HANNA'S bugle horn could ever have disturbed his sleeping clay.

Mr. Chairman, there is no man who has a higher respect for the distinguished Chief Executive of this nation than I. There is no man who has a higher respect for the distinguished leaders of the Republican party than I. But I believe that when they fix this bill upon the American people they turn loose a Pandora's box of ills that no antidote of time can ever heal. They tell us that the bill is a mere declaration of what the law is now. If so, why waste thousands of dollars of the people's money in a work of supererogation? I believe that many of you would now in your heart of hearts pray that this cup might pass from you. But you have promised it, and with lash held high above your heads your master now demands the pay. 'Twas not thus nominated in the bond, but he tells you 'twas written thus between the lines.

Another national election is coming on. Another bond must soon be made to the same old usurer, and before your draft is honored he says in words that can not be misunderstood, "First pay what thou owest to the uttermost farthing." That, Mr. Chairman, explains your unseemly and indecent haste. Your national committee meets here to-morrow, and with it comes the money changer, and he presents your note. Gladly would you renew, but he tells you no. Pay what you owe and then borrow again. And then with folded hands you say, "'Tis thine to command, and mine to obey."

Recognizing their impotency to go before the people on the cold facts of their record, they know they must dicker with the money power for the sinews of war. It is a bitter pill for you to swallow, gentlemen of the Republican side, but your doctor says you must take it, and like little men you will gulp it down. You sugar-coated it for years, but now, with all its bitterness, you shut your eyes and swallow it down. Did I need argument to prove that bimetallism is right and a single gold standard is wrong, I could stand here till Christmas and quote from the speeches of your ablest men arguments stronger and more conclusive than I could make. The distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], understood to be the able mouthpiece of the Administration on this floor, by his frequent previous utterances furnishes many strong arguments for this side.

But against the heresies of the pending measure we need no appeal to Republican argument. It carries within its own bosom the seeds of its own condemnation. The second section of the bill is in violation of at least two principles of the Federal Constitution. It is obnoxious to that principle which makes both gold and silver the basic money of the Government and is violative of that principle which lends the emphasis of organic law to the inviolability of a contract.

When young liberty was an infant in its swaddling clothes, and the American people had first emerged from the sway of the tyrant, the fathers wrote into the fundamental law the doctrine that gold and silver both should be the money of the land. In that same instrument was ingrafted the principle that has always been the rule of good morals, that the law should never lend its sanction to the violation of contracts.

When in the contract of the bond monger was written the statement that it should be made payable in "coin," the purchaser took it with the knowledge of the fact, expressed in the instrument itself, that they could be paid either in silver or gold at the option of the Government. This agreement you now break for them by permitting them to demand payment in gold alone. The effect of such action is to enhance the value of their bonds, and the people are made to pay them an amount greatly in excess of what they agreed to take. Is this fair? Is it just? Is it honest? Let the American people answer. But you reply that it is equally unjust to pay these bonds in a debased money. If they agreed to take payment in a money liable to be debased, this was their contract, and they should abide by its terms.

But, Mr. Chairman, if silver has been debased, it was their hand which struck it down, and they are parties to the crime. Then shall they with bold assumption take advantage of their own wrong? No forum of conscience would permit it, and in no forum of the law should such monstrous views be ever known. Silver for a hundred years held companionship with gold, oftener being before than behind, and never did it become unsound till stricken by the heavy hand of law. The laws of trade could not dethrone it; the law of supply and demand could not do it, but it took the Congress to strike it down. Before you talk of unsound money, restore it to its legal place beside the yellow coin. Place it there

upon the same plane by law as you place gold, and see if side by side they will not move with even tread. We who favor its restoration under the law, we who favor the legalized free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, are indeed the honest-money men, and not you who have dragged it from its pedestal beside the gold.

Another result, Mr. Chairman, of this second section will be to establish a gold monopoly, whose effects we are sure to feel. The President, in his recent message, argues against baneful trusts, and yet, when he puts the Executive signature to this bill, he gives the positive sanction of the law to the most gigantic trust ever turned loose upon the land. It requires all debts, both public and private, to be paid in gold. These are said to be over $50,000,000,000, greatly more than all the gold in circulation in all the world. Then suppose the devotees of gold should begin to demand payment in that coin of all these debts as they become due, where will the gold come from to pay them, and how soon will gold rise and sweat fall?

Then comes contraction and with it misery and squalid want not dreamed of in the philosophy of the most veritable calamity howler in all the land. There is another feature of contraction in this bill that is dangerous in the extreme. It is that which permits the withdrawal of hundreds of millions of dollars of greenbacks from circulation. It is no answer to this proposition to say that such confidence will be inaugurated by the passage of the bill as that no such contraction will take place. It is the history of all money sharks that whenever it is to their interest thus to do they will always play the card. The annals of all countries show that undue contraction of the currency always results in misery and suffering among God's poor. Those to whom the law should ever hold out its helping hand are those who soonest feel the evils of a money strain. Sir Archibald Allison, the great English historian, in his magnificent history of Europe, speaking of the evils of contraction, says:

Serious as these evils were, they did not excite any general attention as long as they were partial or confined chiefly to particular localities. But during the last fifteen years another cause of general influence has come into operation, which had rendered the evils complained of universal and engendered a general feeling of the necessity of its removal. This was the contraction of the currency, the prolific parent of all the social and political changes which have taken place in Great Britain during the last thirty years and the effects of which are far from being yet exhausted.

Thus prosperity under a system of currency mainly dependent on the retention of gold leads to alternations of prosperity and suffering as inevitably as night succeeds day and day night, and that altogether irrespective of drains of gold from extraneous causes such as war loans, extensive importations of grain owing to bad harvests, or the like—which necessarily and still more immediately lead to a ruinous contraction of the currency, and consequent stoppage of credit and general suffering.

The way, and the only way, to avoid this is perfectly simple, although such is the combined influence of the clear appreciation of the subject by a few interested parties on the one hand and the benighted ignorance of it by the vast majority of the sufferers under it on the other that an entire generation required to be rendered bankrupt, or go to their graves, before the subject was generally understood. This is to have two currencies in every commercial community—the one convertible on demand into the precious metals, for conducting its foreign transactions; the other not so convertible, to sustain its domestic industry.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I oppose this bill because in its third and fourth paragraphs, and in fact throughout the bill, it makes the Secretary of the Treasury a veritable autocrat of American finance. True to the traditions of the Republican party, it is a long stride toward their pet theory of centralized power. No more dangerous function of Government could be conferred on any man than is conferred on the Secretary by this bill. It gives him the right to insert the lance of autocratic power and draw from the arteries of Government every drop of life blood flowing through the same. In it you have a species of centralism more dangerous to liberty than all your standing armies. For when you bring the wolf to the poor man's door, and he sees his pale-faced wife and hungry children threatened by its fangs, you bind him hand and foot and crush the breath of liberty from his soul more nearly than in any other way.

The monopoly given to the national banks, Mr. Chairman, is an evil lurking in the bill that is but little less than those I have pointed out. Such powers are subversive of the doctrine of "equal rights to all and special privileges to none," and should meet a just rebuke from every Democratic voter. But I have not time to further elaborate the iniquities with which this bill bristles from beginning to end.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in the free and unlimited coinage of silver at a ratio of 16 to 1 without awaiting the concurrence of any nation on God's green earth. I believe we are big enough and old enough to take care of ourselves. In this I differ from many of my warmest Democratic friends at home—men who are honest in their views and whose opinions I respect. I believe that William J. Bryan is to-day the ablest living exponent of the principles I have discussed, and I believe he will be its standard bearer for the second great battle.

I revere the traditions of my party as handed down by the fathers. I believe in its doctrines as taught by its sages and as exemplified in the lives of its statesmen. As such, and as I view conditions, I would be a traitor to my people and unworthy their commission were I not to lift my voice and record my vote against the pending measure. In the cabins and in the cottages upon the mountain tops and in the valleys of my native heath lives the yeoman, surrounded by his toil-worn wife and his little flock. God grant that no act or vote of mine may ever add to the burdens which they now bear, and that in every word I utter and every vote I cast while I stand as their representative upon this floor I may have no higher motive and no loftier aim than to promote their best interest and alleviate their conditions.

Then when I return to my home I can look them in the face and say of a truth, "Thy people are my people; thy country is my country; thy God is my God." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. RIDGELY. Mr. Chairman, this bill is here under orders from the Bankers' Association and the world's great money trust. Its title should read:

A bill to lock up and finally destroy all our silver dollars, greenbacks, and other issues of Government currency.

To give national banks a complete monopoly of the nation's credit and power of issuing all paper money, permitting them to expand or contract its volume at will.

To compel the people to pay the banks double interest on their capital—first, on their bonds (which are also free of all tax); second, on their bank notes.

To create and put in perpetual motion an endless chain to draw both gold and gold bonds from the Treasury at the will of the money trust.

To repudiate all existing money contracts, public and private, giving the creditor twice his legal right by compelling all debtors to pay in money of double value.

To create and support, at the expense of our people, the most powerful money trust of the world, giving it power to reduce wages and prices of all property at will.

Mr. Chairman, the iniquity of this legislation is partially but truly exposed by this revised title, yet some of its provisions are so villainous as to demand special mention in connection with the recent record of the Republican party and its leaders here and elsewhere.

REPUBLICAN TREACHERY TO SILVER.

During all these years of conflict between silver and gold (which is, in fact, the struggle of the great common people against the money trust) the Republican party has, until this act, professed to desire the full restoration of silver as "standard money." In 1890 President McKinley declared on the floor of this House:

I would give it (silver) equal credit and honor with gold; I would make no discrimination; I would utilize both metals as money and discredit neither; I want the double standard.

In 1888 the Republican national platform contained this declaration:

The Republican party is in favor of the use of both gold and silver money.

In 1892 the Republican national platform declared as follows:

The Republican party demands the use of both gold and silver as standard money.

Standard money, Mr. Chairman. I call special attention to the importance of this fact, as it defines the attitude of the Republican party. In that year a question had arisen in the public mind as to what the Republican party meant in 1888, when it declared in favor of silver money. Did it mean token money, to be redeemed with gold, as this bill provides, or standard money, having all the powers that Congress could give to gold or any other money? To this question the party emphatically answered with the demand for "silver as standard money."

HOW THE MIGHTY HAVE FALLEN!

To-day we have before us in this bill proof that the Republican party has not only surrendered to the gold trust, but that it is ready to use its present absolute power to bind the people with this gold bond by all the powers that human law contains, and by this act prove itself a traitor and repudiator of its oft-repeated pledges to its members and the country. Of this act thousands of honest Republicans are making a note to-day and doubtless forming resolutions to quit the party for its treason to the people and its cowardly surrender to the demands of the money kings.

If any further proof of this cowardly surrender is necessary, I will quote from leading Republican members speaking officially on the floor of this House at still later dates. On February 14, 1895, the House having under discussion a resolution authorizing the issue of gold bonds, one of the very things which this bill now provides, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], in opposition to gold bonds, said:

Fellow-Republicans, let me read to you our platform, the declaration of our principles upon which we have marched to both victory and defeat. In 1888 we said: "The Republican party is in favor of gold and silver as money and condemns the policy of the Democratic Administration in its efforts to demonetize silver." In 1892 we said: "The Republican party from tradition and interest favors bimetallism, and the Republican party demands the use of gold and silver as standard money." These are the declarations of our party, and, Mr. Speaker, as one faithful to this platform declaration, I will not vote for this measure.

At still later dates, even after the election of 1896, we find prominent Republicans on this floor declaring that their party is not a single gold-standard party and that its last national platform does not declare for the single gold standard. And now we have this single gold-standard bill before us, under "hurry-up" orders, being the first bill introduced on the first day of this the first Congress, since the conflict began, in which the gold party have held absolute control over this money question; here, too, not from any committee of this House, but direct from a Republican caucus, without a dissenting vote, acting on the demand of the great banking and money trust.

These facts, Mr. Chairman, are enough to bring the blush of shame to the face of every honest Republican, to hide which gentlemen on the other side cry "prosperity" and boast of the great increase of the volume of gold and bank notes, while in still louder tones they boast of increased debts, which they call "confidence."

ANSWER TO CLAIMS OF PROSPERITY.

Mr. Chairman, our answer to all this is that the present activities are not due to any acts of the Republican party. They are mainly the result of the war, accidents of the seasons, and multiplied debts. The war forced a debt (destined under this bill to grow) on the nation of two hundred millions, drawing that amount of money out of hiding and paid it into circulation. It has forced temporary employment of large numbers of our people.

The accidents of the seasons forced a temporary influx of gold, and the national banks have increased their debts by issuing more notes.

A still greater cause of present conditions is to be found in the resulting wild speculations in all classes of industrial properties and their multiplied debts under the manipulation of powerful trust syndicates.

When we analyze these causes we find fully 90 per cent of them are new forms of debts, which this bill declares shall be paid out of the people's products in such amounts as will buy 25.8 grains of gold for each dollar of all these vast debts.

Ah, my Republican gold-standard friends, do you realize what all this means? The best authenticated statistics we have place the aggregate of all debts in the United States at $40,000,000,000 and of the world at $150,000,000,000. This vast debt is steadily increasing, the annual interest being more than the world can pay, while we go on legislating to force our people still deeper into debt, deceiving ourselves by assuming that by statute laws we can make the impossible possible.

TO IMPROVE THE BILL.

Mr. Chairman, if the majority here would permit amendments to this bill, we would offer a number. One would be to permit any citizen to deposit United States bonds and draw currency thereon, stopping interest on all bonds so deposited by banks or others while on deposit. This would prevent the bank monopoly of the volume of our money and also save the people from paying double interest.

THE REAL ISSUE.

Mr. Chairman, the real issue involved in this whole money question is not between gold and silver alone; it is, in fact, a question of who shall issue and control our money supply. Shall we by this legislation make a gift of this great power and profit to the bank syndicate? They can not get it except by legislation. Or shall we retain this sovereign power in and for the people?

All money is the creation of law. In a republic all laws emanate from the people; hence the power to create and issue money is inherent and belongs to all the people.

The question of what substance we shall use to evidence our money power, whether paper, silver, or gold, like the questions of quantity, legal power, and method of issue, are matters of detail only.

This bill gives to a few bankers the sovereign money power of all the people, guaranteeing double interest to the banks on their entire capital—first, the interest on their Government bonds, which are free of all tax; second, bank interest on their notes. Every cent thus donated the people must pay.

This bill also gives the banks full power to increase their notes at will, but does not compel them to keep up any definite supply, thus leaving the control of the volume and value of money absolutely with the banks.

DESTRUCTION OF ALL GOVERNMENT MONEY.

To make room for these bank notes this bill is clearly intended to finally destroy as money all of our silver dollars and greenbacks as well as all Government currency, of which there is now in existence and use over nine hundred million dollars. Another reason why the silver dollar must be eventually destroyed is to prevent the States from legislating (as under the Constitution they have a right to do) to make them legal tender in payment of all debts.

The question will soon properly arise, when this law goes into effect, Why use fifty cents' worth of silver upon which to print a promise to pay a dollar in gold; why not sell the silver as bullion and print these promises on paper?

The intention of the bill is clearly to destroy all forms of Government money, including all silver dollars. It also forces the people to keep the value of all bank notes equal at all times to gold by making them receivable and interchangeable by the Government. To do this, new issues of Government gold bonds are to be kept on sale without limit.

This bill will cost the producers of our country not less than $200,000,000 annually, making them donate this amount to the banks. All of this great burden could be saved by proper legislation.

THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD ISSUE ALL MONEY.

To all this I would offer a substitute for the entire bill, providing for the issue of all money by the Government, giving to every dollar—whether paper, silver, or gold—full, absolute, and equal money power, receivable for all taxes and debts, paying the same into circulation on the Government expense account, thus reducing taxes and abolishing all issues of bonds forever, regulating the volume and value of such money by keeping it in a fixed ratio to the total quantity of all property in the nation, eliminating the debt system by making the money volume large enough to transact all business on a cash basis, neither authorizing nor enforcing debt contracts.

As material on which to evidence this money I would provide Government coinage of all silver and gold metals offered at the mints at the present ratio of 16 to 1, adding paper to regulate the total volume of money. I would provide, as now, a close watch over all exports and imports of money, supplementing the metal money in domestic use with such volume of paper money as would from time to time be necessary to regulate the value of the dollar in its average purchase or exchange relation to property. This can always be done by giving all money full legal-tender power, maintaining its total volume in a fixed ratio to the total quantity of all property, and eliminating the debt system.

MORE THAN THE GOLD STANDARD.

Mr. Chairman, I would warn members here and the country that this bill does much more than rivet the single gold standard upon our people; it ties them hand and foot, and delivers them as helpless victims into the hands of the world's most powerful money trust, a trust, too, whose strength, great as it is now, will be multiplied tenfold by the advantages it gives. As an index to what is coming upon the people I will present here an editorial from the pen of Alfred Henry Lewis, published in the Verdict, August 7, 1899, a paper, too, owned and controlled exclusively by O. H. P. Belmont, one of the moneyed kings of America:

HERE BE TRUE NEWS.

This is a grave story. It is one of even, near concern to small and great. Let it come unshod of simile, unbusked of imagery or rhetoric, unclouded of any mists of metaphor. In Wall street, as this is read, the giant trust of all is forming. It is to collect within itself the banks of New York City. Its core is to be Standard Oil. Its moving spirits are John Rockefeller and Pierpont Morgan. With them in full and close association are the Rothschilds and their American agents. It was to link the Rothschilds to the scheme that of late took Morgan Europeward and brought him back again. This trust at its consummation, which is close, will pull the reins of guidance and crack the whip of domination over $2,000,000,000. It will, as stated, be a muster of the New York City banks. They are to be made into one force, unified and brought under one word and one command. Thereafter they are to say "No" together, or "Yes" together, or together stand motionless and mute. This trust of the banks is to be the dictator trust; to overlord all other trusts. The greatest among these latter will be dwarfed as they stand beside it. We, the people, are to become the subjects of bank conquest and suffer the feudalism of money. This bank trust is to be our William of Normandy. New York City is to be its Hastings without a blow. It will have, as it were, a Doomsday book, and the country is to be parceled among its followers.

This is a true tale. There is neither guess nor fancy in its telling. Naught but the bald facts are set forth. This trust expects to hold the nation in the hollow of its hand. Their plan is to be the grand bank of the United States; issue at the last its money and have custody of its credit. In a cruder day Jackson defeated a parallel conspiracy; crushed beneath his stern heel the head of a similar serpent. With this difference: That was a python of seven and one-half millions, a baby and plaything to the one in hand. Now are we to confront a serpent of two billions, or one two hundred and fifty times as large. At a time, too, when the Jacksons seem gone from our midst. For a century and a quarter there has been liberty in this land. For a century and a quarter Europe, pointing to America, whether in hate or love, was driven to say with Job: "There the wicked cease from troubling; there the weary be at rest! There the prisoners rest together; they hear not the voice of the oppressor! The small and the great are there, and the servant is free from his master!" Once this trust of the banks, and Europe will say this no more. There will none to give tongue to it. The fact of freedom will have departed, the song would be a lie. In that day of gilded, narrow fetters the spirit of true Americanism will be crippled, bent, and broken. A sightless Samson, it will grind in the mills of the Philistines. It will long for destruction and dig for death as for treasures that lie hid.

Standard Oil is to be the heart of this bank trust. There is one known thing of Standard Oil. Its minimum profits are at least forty millions yearly. How much more they be is the jealous secret of Standard Oil, and none may pierce it. As stated, as captain-constructors of this bank trust are Rockefeller, Morgan, and the Rothschilds. They will go to New Jersey for organization. That State has grown the Morocco of America. Its statutes are the merest shipyards to build and launch and outfit these trust pirates of commerce. New Jersey, to be consistent, should adopt the black flag as its banner. It should float the Jolly Roger with skull and crossbones from the dome staff of its capitol. Once this trust of the banks is afloat, it will have beneath its pennant every bank in New York. They must join or be destroyed. The old killing Standard Oil method will suffice for this. Then it will extend itself. Every bank in the country will become its gillie. There will be no limit to its sway. Its powers will find their last extension in the frontiers of the possible. It will loose and unloose credit. It will fix the

price of money and censor the markets to the last item of value. It will pick up the national debt and hold the country between its thumb and finger. It will demand bonds and get them. Or it will force payment for them. It will stand at the spigot of loans. It will flow money on or off at its selfish interest or caprice.

All other businesses will set like beggars at its gates. It will be the Dives of trade, and commerce will become its Lazarus. If it likes you, you may have money; if it hates you, your ruin is within its reach. In short, controlling as it will the tides of credit in their ebb or flow, this bank trust will rule the mart. An autocrat, it will respond to nothing but itself. There will be none greater, none stronger. Congresses will exist by its consent, and Presidents wait hat in hand for its orders. It will have power of life and death in business; to lift up or strike down, to plant or uproot. Between the upper and nether millstones of its operations all men are to be ground; and all will be grist to its hopper. Elections will be at its mercy. It will produce in office its own paid, sworn follower. It will draw within the train of its control every element of government. You may change your White House every four years, your Congress every two; yet, once this trust of the banks be rooted, you'll never change your ruler. You will bow eternally before this never-dying, changeless dynasty of money.

SOCIALISM IS COMING.

And now, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I deem it my duty to take a broader view of the problems involved in this legislation. We are approaching the rapid culmination of the most tyrannical forms of capitalism. The owners of wealth as far back as we have history of human government have ever insisted that capital should have the legal right to draw to itself increase out of labor's productions. These wealth owners are ever present when laws are to be enacted and see to it that every power of government, legislative, executive, and judicial, shall be made to recognize and enforce this power of capital. Armies are instituted and directed in their operations to support and extend the rights and interests of capital, even in the present wars waged under its orders against the Filipinos and the Boers; we hear the bold demand of capital claiming its right to conquer those people in order that it may appropriate nature's rich resources, using our armies to hold the people there in subjection, while capital works them at a few pennies per day, throwing their product of rice, tobacco, sugar, cotton, etc., on the market to force down wages of our home people.

The hand of capitalism is even plainly visible in the treaty so recently made with Spain. By its terms we are bound to recognize and enforce all land and property titles that may have obtained in any and all the territory acquired, up to the very hour of its ratification, regardless of fraudulent methods or the plundering processes that had long since driven the people into open revolt. Ah! Mr. Chairman, there is much more at stake than the gold standard, and I warn its friends here and elsewhere that by their very greed and by this very bill their idol is doomed to its final death—killed in the house of its friends in their servile effort to serve a tyrannical and relentless master.

All laws enforcing tribute to capital are bound to go. Civilization can not carry this mighty load of capitalism much longer and survive. The people will find a way out. Already the cry against every trust is universal in the land. Legislation is being urged by the people providing a graduated tax upon all forms of wealth as the best way to return at least a part of the illgotten gains of the rich to the people from whom it is being unjustly taken.

MILLIONS OF SOCIALISTS.

Socialists are multiplying by hundreds of thousands throughout the nation. This bill will recruit their ranks by millions. Their power will soon be felt upon the floor of Congress and in every department of government. They have the true solution of this mighty and growing trust problem. They lay down as their foundation rock the broad principle that all capital for the successful production and distribution of all things necessary to the highest human comfort, mental and social development, which of necessity must be used collectively, shall be owned collectively, and that such property as can best be used individually shall be owned individually. Their cry is, "Public ownership of public utilities." By this simple policy they propose and will forever abolish the bondage of capital and make it serve man, instead of, as now, demand service from man. We are by this very bill unwittingly hastening and making the establishment of socialism an absolute certainty. As one who believes in the fundamental principles of socialism I take a degree of satisfaction in seeing this bill enacted into law, knowing that it will hasten the overthrow of the present system of capitalism it is designed to serve. As it goes down the people will establish in its place a government restored to and used by and for the people. That government will be true socialism. Under this new order, soon to be universally established, every toiler will get more than double pay over present rates, while all interest and tribute to capital will be forever abolished. Our Government railroads will render better service at one-fourth present charges, paying double wages for eight hours' labor. The people everywhere will find ready employment in healthy, well-ventilated factories and mines, each one receiving the full value of his product; our women will enjoy happy homes, while free to choose their occupation, owning and controlling all they produce, while no child will be compelled to work to the sacrifice of its education and health. May God speed the day when all these happy conditions shall be realities. They are all possible and already in sight. To the millions of overburdened and heavy-hearted people I extend congratulations, not because of this legislation, but in spite of it, for its burdens will arouse again the slumbering spirit of liberty and the tyranny of capitalism will be overthrown, while in its stead industrial and social freedom will be established.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I think that this is the only place on this earth where a man is permitted to talk about silver. Up in my State of Michigan the man who would attempt to discuss the money question would empty the hall as quickly as it would be emptied if a smallpox sign were hung over the stage. [Laughter.] With us it is a dead issue.

Gunton instructs us that in the Anaconda mine silver can be produced ready for coinage without expense. The by-products found with it are of sufficient value to pay the cost of mining. In the mines of New South Wales the silver in a dollar may be produced at an expense of 25 cents. The output of these mines is sufficient to meet the world's demand for silver. Under such circumstances it is not possible that gold and silver may be kept together at the ratio of 16 to 1. This being true, it seems to me that no harm can come from a declaration of the real facts. No harm can come from putting into enduring form in our statutes the statement that gold to-day is the real and the only true measure and unit of value.

The Republican party has always stood for advancement. It has always met with courage the duty of the hour. The trouble with our friends on the other side is not that they are sometimes right and sometimes wrong, for I admit that the real Democrats have many times been right. The trouble is, they are never right at the right time. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] They are like a man who sits in a street car with his back in the direction the car is going, with his back turned toward progress. They never see a good thing until they have got by it. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

They are like the boy who for the first time saw an elephant. He said, "Oh, mother, he is going in the wrong direction." [Laughter.] Up in our State the real Democrats, the Democrats who are so oftentimes right, have absolutely perished. They have an alliance up there between Silver Republicans, Silver Democrats, Prohibitionists, and the remnants of the Salvation Army [laughter], all out not for principle but for victory.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that any party will ever succeed on wind money. Real money is what we want, and I believe that the real money is gold money. Because it matters not, Mr. Chairman, what nation may stamp the gold coin. It may bear the impress of the weakest or the strongest nation of the world, it is of equal value. We may gather the gold coin from the wreck of the ages, we may take it from the ruins of a nation two thousand years dead, and it is just as true and just as valuable as it was the day it fell shining from the mint that stamped it. That is real money, good money, gold money; and all we ask of men on either side is that they will vote their convictions; vote for the real and the good money. Have the courage of your convictions. Courage is the best word that ever blossomed upon the lips of man. Ernest Renan brushed the dust from a sunken Syrian tomb, laid two thousand years before the Christian era, and he found inscribed thereon one word, and that word told the history of a progressive and a prosperous people. That one word was "Courage!"

If our great party shall ever perish from the earth, and the time shall ever come when her record shall fail to be written among the annals of men, let there be inscribed upon her tomb two words, and let those words be "Courage" and "Integrity." There can be no harm in declaring in this law that an honest people shall pay her honest debts in the best money of its nation.

Our party was ever honest, ever true. I come from the district where this party was born. Under the oaks at Jackson, in nature's cathedral, mid the fragrance of flowers and the songs of birds, our party was born. It was a birth of purity, and pure it will continue, and it will ever stand for the payment of the nation's honest debts in the nation's honest money. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But our friends say that the gold standard breeds trusts. The tariff was the father of trusts, they also say. In a sense our party has led to the trusts. Under the rule of your friend and leader, Mr. Cleveland, who you say should have been put off at Buffalo—— [Laughter.]

A MEMBER. And kept off.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. And kept off. There was no claim about trusts. There was no argument that money was too aggressive. Your claim then was that money was cowardly; that it never fought battles; that it went into hiding. The times and the circumstances are such now that money is getting aggressive, it is in the fight, and you claim that it must be restrained. Under our rule you say it goes into trusts, and under your rule it goes into stockings and other hiding places.

Sam Jones tells a story of a man he met the other day, an old free-silver mollusk, as he called him. He said, "Jones, where is all that prosperity you were going to give us?" "Why," said Jones, "it is everywhere. Labor is employed, capital is active, the railroads are overburdened. There is prosperity everywhere." And he said, "It has not struck me yet." Jones said, "It is pretty hard to hit nothing." [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not care so much to discuss this bill in detail as to talk of the general political situation. I am not at all terrified by the awful Democratic denunciations hurled with such deafening vehemence at this bill and its authors, aiders, and abettors. I have heard Democratic denunciations before, and have long ago learned that whatever the politicians of the Democratic party oppose it is fairly safe for a Republican to favor, for they have opposed every political bill passed by the people and the Republican party in the last forty years. The result is that when I hear the Democrats denouncing any political measure I feel very safe in favoring that measure.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY AN ANTI PARTY.

The Democratic party may be called the "anti" party. They are "anti" this and "anti" that. They are "anti" everything—anti-gold standard, anti-protection, anti-imperialism, anti-trust, anti-expansion, anti-militarism, and even anti-prosperity unless it comes their way.

Years ago it was anti-consolidation, anti-Grantism, anti-resumption, anti-civil rights, anti-centralization, anti-greenbacks, and anti everything the Republican party favored.

As a result the various planks in the Democratic platforms soon get out of fashion and are cast aside like old clothes. The old anti-Grant plank is now down in the Democratic cellar, being used for kindling wood. The anti-resumption plank is now offered at 5 cents on the dollar of its original cost. The anti-greenback plank can not be found at all, and they deny ever having had one. The anti-civil-rights plank is so covered with dust and cobwebs you can not read it. The anti-protection plank is not put to the front any more, and is marked, "Once 100 cents, but now 75 cents," like goods in a store window. The old anti-centralization plank is the only one that they have taken out of their rubbish heap and rubbed up for future use, if needed. Even the 16 to 1 plank, that was above par last year, is now put a little behind the anti-trust and anti-imperialism planks, and is marked, "Only 90 cents—was 105."

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY A DO-NOTHING PARTY.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, the Democratic party is strictly an anti-party. I defy any of them to name a law now on the statute book put there by the Democratic party in the last fifty years that is to-day of any benefit to the American people, and especially to the laboring man. And yet they always in election times and in their speeches pretend that they are the friends of the laboring man.

The Republican party is the great affirmative, progressive party of the country. It has led the way in every forward step our country has taken in the last forty years. It has put on the statute book every law there that benefits the poor man, that builds up commerce, that helps the farmer, that multiplies manufactures, and guards the rights, liberties, and privileges of the American people. The Republican party for forty years has marched at the head of the great American procession, the flag of our country in its right hand, and the band playing "Hail, Columbia" and "Yankee Doodle." The dogs barked and the donkeys brayed, but the procession moved grandly on. [Applause.] It has been well said that the Republican party proposes, the Almighty disposes, and the Democratic party opposes. [Laughter.]

DEMOCRATIC POLITICAL BUGABOOS.

The priests of some religions, doubting their ability to rule their people by appealing to their reason and consciences, resort to methods of terror, and manufacture awful idols and monstrous graven images, and perform various incantations and grotesque dances, attired in robes of terror, with horns on their heads and visages painted in imitation of imaginary monsters.

So the high priests of the Democratic party have for the last forty years been trying to terrify the people with imaginary political bugaboos.

When Lincoln was first a candidate the Democratic high priests got up an awful bugaboo they called "abolitionism," and deceived multiplied thousands of the people.

When Grant was our candidate for the Presidency they manufactured twin bugaboos, called "centralization" and "military despotism," and scared many timid persons into believing that if Grant was elected our liberties would all be taken away from us.

When Hayes was our candidate they paraded before the public the caricature denominated a "bloated bondholder," and tried to make us believe that it was the Republican party in disguise, and that if Hayes was elected the bondholders would take all of our property from us and feed us on husks.

When Garfield was our candidate these high priests of Democracy invented a most fearful bugaboo devil called the "force bill," and terrified the Southern people within an inch of their lives by swearing that if Garfield was elected a vast army would be sent South to hold the elections, and that none but Republicans and negroes would be allowed to vote, and as a consequence the South would be destroyed and life for a Democrat would not be worth living.

When Harrison was last a candidate these same Democratic high priests got together and invented a brand-new lot of frightful bugaboos, whom they denominated "robber barons," and rushed them all over the country to the terror and dismay of millions of innocent and unsuspecting Democrats, and created such an epidemic of apprehension and fear that Cleveland was actually elected President; and now we are told by these same Democratic high priests that Cleveland was a worse devil than all of the awful "robber barons" combined! [Laughter.]

THE GOLDBUG BUGABOO.

When McKinley was our candidate for President three years ago the Democratic bugaboo makers brought out a stupendous crawling monster of antediluvian proportions and branded it a "Goldbug," and swore that it was the Republican party and that if McKinley was chosen President this Paleozoic monster would devour the substance of us Americans as the caterpillar and the palmerworm devoured the crops of the children of Israel in the days of old. These Democratic bugaboo makers actually got up a circus, with William Jennings Bryan as the chief ringmaster and about 10,000 Democratic politicians for clowns and monkeys, and traveled all over the United States, exhibiting this horrible and awe-inspiring "Goldbug," hoping to terrorize the ignorant, to intimidate the cowardly, to demoralize the imaginative, and to create apprehension, if not conviction, in the minds of the thoughtful and the patriotic. Awful were the prophecies indulged in by Bryan and his army of clowns as they exhibited this appalling "Goldbug." Fearful were their contortions of body, face, and gestures as they portrayed the evils that would result from putting the country in possession of this all-devouring "Goldbug."

And although millions were deceived and some of the very elect were led astray, there nevertheless remained enough men, true, patriotic, wise, and brave, to overthrow the army of false prophets, with Bryan at their head, and elect to the Presidency William McKinley, the great advance agent of prosperity, the apostle of sound money, the opener of the mills, the friend of the farmer, and the champion of the American laboring man. And now that awful "Goldbug" manufactured for that great Democratic circus of three years ago is in the back yard of the Democratic junk shop, and on examination it will be found to be composed of nothing but a thin shell of Democratic brass, inflated with Populistic wind. [Laughter.]

A NEW BUGABOO BEING MADE.

And now our Democratic-Populistic adversaries are scratching their heads in an effort to invent a new bugaboo wherewith to scare the people next year. They can be seen almost any day in the Democratic junk yard looking over their old bugaboos to see if they can repair or refit any of them and use them in the next campaign. Some of them are casting lingering looks on the bugaboos of "centralization" and "military despotism," that were used by them to try to scare the people into voting against General Grant; and it is believed that out of these two bugaboos a new one will be made, to be called "imperialism," and it will be ready for use in a short time, with horns upon its head, the claws of a tiger for hands, teeth larger than a lion's, eyes red as blood and as big as saucers, cloven hoofs for feet, and a tail like the very devil's; and with this bugaboo of "imperialism" Bryan will start a new circus, and has already reengaged most of his old clowns and monkey boys. Look out for the show when you see the posters on the trees. [Laughter and applause.] Their next bugaboo will be more terrifying than Barnum's monstrous picture of the great American gyascutus. Next after Barnum, Bryan is the greatest humbug showman the world has ever produced.

The average Democratic politician always carries about him a prodigious variety of misinformation on political subjects. He is almost sure to possess a host of magnificent disqualifications for patriotic statesmanship. Among numerous other equipments he is generally armed with many brilliant intellectual deficiencies for financial discussions. His voice is almost always clothed with what he believes to be thunder, and he shakes his fist as though he thought he could hurl the lightnings of Jove. The result is that when he rushes into the arena of debate he is a most formidable adversary in appearance, and nothing delights him so much as a chance to hurl stupendous predictions of evil and bombard his opponents with terrific denunciations and anathemas, clothed in awful adjectives of the superlative degree; but, fortunately for his opponents, his predictions never hit, and his bombs of denunciation, being filled with nothing but wind, do no harm.

BRYAN'S FALSE PROPHECIES.

Every financial doctrine preached by Bryan and his free-silver apostles three years ago has been proved totally false by the inexorable and irrefutable logic of existing facts. His two great doctrines were that silver and farm products traveled hand in hand, and that if the gold standard was maintained money would become scarcer and prices and wages lower. On these two doctrines hung all of his law and all of his prophecies; but events have repealed his law and falsified his prophecies.

Silver absolutely refused to do what Bryan wanted, and wheat refused to do what silver did. Bryan and his apostles had sworn with a mighty oath that silver and wheat had been wedded in holy wedlock from the foundation of the world, and that they both traveled the same road arm in arm, in lovely and loving companionship, and that when silver fell down wheat fell with it, and that when silver rose up wheat rose also, with a smile upon its face. [Laughter.]

But lo! since Bryan's defeat wheat and silver have had a fearful quarrel, and wheat has taken one end of the road, while silver has taken the other, and now they are far apart and divorced from bed and board, if not absolutely. They seem to have turned their backs upon each other forever. How sad! Wheat seems to have said to silver:

Go, false one, go; I'd rather make
My bower upon some icy lake,
When thawing suns begin to shine,
Than trust to love so false as thine.

[Laughter.]

And silver seems to have said to wheat:

Had we never loved so kindly;
Had we never loved so blindly—
Never met or never parted,
We had ne'er been broken hearted.

[Laughter.]

SILVER DIVORCED FROM ITS SPOUSES.

Bryan, indeed, insisted that silver was a sort of polygamist and had several wives. Iron was alleged to be one of its wives and cotton another. Whatever road silver traveled, iron and cotton were charged with keeping it company, and Bryan and his free-silver apostles quoted facts and figures and introduced big books and quoted great men to prove that silver was always to be found in company not only with wheat but with iron and cotton, besides several other "old things" too numerous to mention.

But, alas! the course of true love never did run smooth; and now silver has been deserted by not only wheat, that seems to have been its favorite spouse, but by iron, and, what is worse and the most unkindest cut of all, actually deserted by cotton. Iron and cotton have gone up in price, conquering and to conquer, whereas silver has gone down in defeat and disgrace, with none of its sweethearts and mistresses to bear it company, nobody but Bryan and the Democratic party to sit up with it of nights and comfort it on its bed of affliction. [Laughter.] The silver in the American silver dollar is to-day worth only 46 cents, and is only kept at par by the gold in the Treasury and the confidence the business world has in the honesty and statesmanship of the Republican party.

WHAT THE REPUBLICANS HAVE DONE FOR SILVER.

We Republicans have done our best for silver. We passed laws to buy all that was mined in our country; we set our mints to work and coined 500,000,000 silver dollars; we sent commissioners to foreign lands to entreat other nations to join us in keeping silver on its legs; we propped up silver by crutches of gold to keep it going; but in spite of our laws to buy bullion, in spite of our enormous coinage of silver dollars, in spite of our efforts to get other nations to rally to our aid, in spite of our policy to sustain silver with gold, silver has been growing weaker and weaker in the markets of the world; it has been going down, down, down in the scale of price, the demand for it has continued to decrease and grow less until the day has now come when no enlightened nation on God's earth holds up silver as its standard of value, and we, unaided and alone, can not fight its battle against the whole world and hope to win. International bimetallism seems to be forever doomed. It is a beautiful idea, but, like the rainbow, can be seen only in the distance, and moves away from you as fast as you pursue. It is the "iridescent dream" of a financial visionary, and will never be realized in our day. The world is moving on, and we must move with it or get left.

Gold, as a matter of fact and as a matter of business, has been our standard of value for over fifty years. "As good as gold" was the saying of our people whenever the value of any other good money was called in question. And this bill only puts into law what the American people long, long ago put into actual everyday practice. This bill only puts into law what the American people ordered to be put into law when they elected William McKinley President of the United States three years ago, and we would have passed it before had there not been an opposition majority in the Senate.

BRYAN'S FALSE PROPHECIES.

Every prediction made by Bryan and the Democratic party three years ago has been falsified by the inexorable logic of indisputable events. Bryan and his fellow free-silver Democrats predicted that if the gold standard was adhered to the prices of all agricultural products would be so low no farmer could live by farming; that the price of labor would be so low that no laboring man could live by his labor; that money would be so high that no man in debt would be able to borrow it, and as a consequence financial ruin would be his inevitable fate. Bryan predicted that nobody would prosper but bankers; that all manufacturing establishments would either be compelled to close or to give pauper wages to their employees; that our ships would rot at our wharves for want of freights to carry; that many of our railroads would become mere streaks of rusty iron; that universal and irreparable bankruptcy would seize upon the business men of our land, and widespread and unmitigated poverty would be the doom of our people, while starvation and pestilence would stalk abroad through the land like destroying angels, bent on our utter extermination.

Prophet of evil, never hadst thou yet
A cheerful word for me. To mark the signs
Of coming mischief is thy great delight;
Good dost thou ne'er foretell nor bring to pass.

We were told that the Republican party could not be trusted, that all the usurers, all the money sharks, all the bloated bondholders, all the robber barons, all the goldbugs, all the corruptionists, all the enemies of the laboring man, and all the foes of the farmer were in the Republican party, and that if that party elected McKinley as President awful and manifold would be the calamities that would inevitably fall upon the American people, and the salt of liberty would so lose its savor that our very freedom would be like the blazonry of silks and jewels in the gloom of the grave.

PROSPERITY IN SPITE OF PROPHECY.

But out of these nettles of predicted danger have sprung the beautiful blossoms of safety and prosperity. Instead of money becoming scarcer, it has become more plentiful; instead of agricultural products going down to nothing, they have greatly increased in price; instead of laborers' wages being cut down to pauper rates, they have been greatly raised; instead of railroads having nothing to do, they have not enough cars to carry their passengers and freights; instead of our business men being ground to powder in the bankruptcy courts, they have never been happier or more prosperous; instead of our manufacturing establishments closing their doors, all of the old ones are in full blast and new ones are springing up on every hand; instead of poverty and wretchedness stalking through the land like destroying angels—instead, in short, of the vials of Heaven's wrath being poured out upon a God-cursed land, instead of this awful picture of desolation and doom painted by Bryan and the free-silver Democrats as the sure fate of our country if McKinley was elected, what do we behold? A prosperity as fair as a new Jerusalem descended from the skies, a universal acclaim of rejoicing, an era of happiness and good times seldom before experienced by our people, a spirit of progress and enterprise that is carrying our name and our products to markets never visited by us before, and a feeling of grateful contentment as high as the sky, as wide as the earth, and as deep as the sea. [Applause.]

THE GOLD STANDARD A BLESSING.

Bryan, the false prophet of free silver, told us three years ago that under a gold standard the price of all the products of the farm and the factory would go down and the wages of the laboring man would grow less and less and that the man in debt would never be able to pay out, and what Bryan said became the gospel for tens of thousands of Democratic cross-roads orators. But what are the facts? Under the gold standard nothing has gone down in price but silver and the Democratic party. Everything the farmer and manufacturer have to sell has increased in price, and labor is more generally employed and better paid than at any time under Cleveland's Democratic free-trade Administration. And more, the value of the products of the farm have increased over $600,000,000 and the value of the products of our factories, furnaces, and rolling mills have increased from nine thousand millions in 1890 to twenty thousand millions in 1899, a rate of progress never before made in any country on earth in any period of man's history since the foundation of the world. [Applause.]

Bryan and his apostles of free silver and free trade preached three years ago that if McKinley was elected and the gold standard maintained there would be an awful dearth of money; that greenbacks, national-bank notes, silver certificates, and silver dollars would all disappear, and that no money would be left but gold, gold, gold, and that nobody would have any of that but the bankers, the millionaires, the "goldbugs," the "robber barons," and the "bloated bondholders;" that the poor man would never see a gold piece, not even if his eyes were sore, and that a few gold men would be the kings of the land and all the balance of the people no better than serfs and not as good as slaves.

MONEY MORE PLENTIFUL.

And yet what do we find as the fact? Instead of the predictions of Bryan and his free silver apostles proving true, they have proved to be totally false. Instead of money becoming scarce it has become far more plentiful, so that the amount now in circulation is about two thousand million dollars, one-half of which is gold, and the other half paper money and silver, thus giving us more money to the man than we have ever had since Columbus discovered America.

Four years ago the gold money in the United States amounted to five hundred and ninety-seven millions, whereas to-day the amount is over one thousand millions, and the larger proportion of it is in actual circulation, whereas four years ago most of our gold was locked up in the banks or hoarded secretly by the few lucky holders.

In the last four years the money in the hands of the people has increased $620,000,000, and the amount is increasing every day and will continue to increase as long as honest money and honest men are in the land.

Notwithstanding all of Bryan's predictions have proved untrue and all of his doctrines unsound, yet the Democratic party still worship at his shrine. It is a most interesting spectacle to behold the Democratic politician's devotion to Mr. Bryan. He has become a sort of god with many of them, and when you ask them what makes them think so and so, they at once answer, "Bryan says so." In the Old Testament we read, "Thus saith the Lord." But in the new Democratic testament it is, "Thus saith Bryan." The abject devotion of the Democratic party to Bryan reminds me of the implicit faith of the little girl in her mother, when she answered a playmate's denial by saying, "It is so, because my mother says it is so; and what my mother says is so is so, even if it ain't so!" [Laughter.]

REPUBLICAN PROSPERITY IN SPITE OF DEMOCRATIC PREDICTIONS.

In spite of all the prophecies of disaster and starvation made by Bryan and his apostles three years ago, not only are the North, East, and West wonderfully prosperous, and that prosperity increasing every day, but the South is prosperous and is becoming more prosperous all the time.

To hear some of these Southern Democrats talk you would think that the South was a very land of sorrow and poverty; that its people were sitting in darkness robed in sackcloth and ashes, and that no ray of light awoke smiles upon the face of beauty or kindled a gleam in the eye of love. They seem to say to the South—

Affliction is enamored of thy parts,
And thou art wedded to calamity.

Mr. Chairman, I repudiate this picture of the South. It is monstrously false and atrociously unjust. The South to-day is more prosperous, better contented, and more hopeful than at any time since Lee's surrender. Our people are at work and at profitable work, and are happy in their work. Never have we gotten out so many thousand carloads of coal, never have so many hundreds of thousands of tons of pig iron been made, never so many millions of yards of cotton and woolen goods manufactured, never such a demand for our lumber and our marble, never so many men engaged in factory work, never so many people happy over the business outlook. Our farmers are getting good prices for all they have to sell, and our cotton planters, instead of being devoured by imaginary "goldbugs," are secretly thanking God that McKinley was elected and praying that he may be reelected. Like King Agrippa, they are almost persuaded to become Republicans! [Laughter.]

COTTON PLANTERS PROSPEROUS.

Yes, cotton is 7 cents a pound and may go up to 10. It used to be "5-cent cotton." And do you know what 7-cent cotton means? I read from the Chattanooga Times of October 9, 1899, a leading Democratic paper of the central South:

From reports received here it appears that the one thing which has been lacking during the past year to make a well-rounded and general prosperity for the Southern States has come.

Do you hear that, Mr. Chairman? "A well-rounded and general prosperity for the Southern States has come." The South is not being devoured by "goldbugs!" Here is the voice of a leading Democratic paper of the South. Note the headlines: "South's prosperity—The advance in iron had a wonderful effect—But the increase in the price of cotton will make the good times more widespread."

But I read on:

Last year the iron and other industries of the South experienced an unprecedented degree of prosperity, with the exception of the cotton trade. * * * But now the price of cotton is advancing in a remarkable way. The staple is now selling at a higher price than at any time this year or last. * * * If the present high rate continues, it will mean millions of dollars to the Southern farmers and dealers and, through them, a fine prosperity to all interests in the South. * * * To state the same fact in figures, the advance in cotton, if the price ruling last week holds, as it probably will, means that Southern planters will receive at least $75,000,000, possibly $100,000,000, more for this year's crop than for that of last year.

THE SOUTH HAS PROSPERITY.

And cotton has not only gone to 7 cents, but is fast crawling up to 8, and this will mean largely over $100,000,000 added to the wealth of the South in a single year from one item alone. Considering that, according to the Times, "the iron and other industries of the South experienced an unprecedented degree of prosperity," it is no wonder that newspaper, Democratic though it be, was forced by an honest outburst of enthusiasm to exclaim—

The one thing [7-cent cotton] which has been lacking during the past year to make a well-rounded and general prosperity for the Southern States has come!

Yes, Mr. Chairman, "a well-rounded and general prosperity for the Southern States has come."

I could read from other Southern Democratic papers to the same effect, but will content myself by reading an extract from a South Carolina paper, the Columbia State. It says:

Never before in this country has there been a time of such push and enterprise in the towns as we have now, and as a natural consequence never before has there been such rapid growth as the towns in our State are making to-day. * * * This is going to be a great year for Columbia.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, not only "a great year" for Columbia, S. C., but a great year for that greater Columbia which is our whole country. [Applause.] Everywhere throughout the South the bells of joy are ringing in the hearts of the masses of the people. Only the Democratic politicians are unhappy. There are certain weeds that seem to grow only on the refuse heaps in our back yards and in low places, and so Democratic politicians in the South sometimes flourish best where there is most rubbish and most ruins and under cloudy skies, whereas the sun of prosperity causes them to wither and to fade.

PROSPERITY IN TENNESSEE.

We are wonderfully prosperous all through the South. In my district the output of the coal mines is only limited by the capacity of the railroads to haul it away. Our furnaces and rolling mills are all in full blast, our marble quarries are shipping enormous quantities of our beautiful marbles all over the land, our lumber mills are all at work, our cotton and woolen mills are doing better than ever before, all of our other factories are running to their full capacities, our merchants are doing a most gratifying business, new enterprises are being constantly started or projected, our railroads have not sufficient rolling stock to move our freights, money is more plentiful than for years, the farmers are getting good prices for all they have to sell, and the laboring classes are all employed. Not even our Democrats, few and far between as they are and possessed of magnifying eyes to a marvelous degree as they seem to be, can find any fault, and if it were not for the offices it is safe to say that nine out of every ten of them would renounce the Democratic party and all its works and join the Republican hosts amid glad hosannas of praise and thanksgiving. [Laughter and applause.]

And I say here boldly that a very large proportion of the business men of the South—Democratic business men, I mean—are in favor of this bill. In their private and business talks they utter Republican sentiments, they favor a protective tariff and a gold standard—yes, and are for national expansion also, and tens of thousands of them would vote the Republican ticket if that awful bugaboo of "negro supremacy" did not stand between them and the ballot box.

THE SOUTH FULL OF HOPE AND NOT DESPAIR.

The South is no region of despair, overhung by a starless sky. Its gateway is no battle-scarred, prisonlike iron door, with a rusty lock and a clanking chain, surrounded by tottering walls and thunder-blasted trees, bearing on its archway the inscription Dante saw over the gate of hell—

All hope abandon, ye who enter here.

On the contrary, Mr. Chairman, the gateway to the South is as fair as the entrance to Eden; its pillars of grand proportions, wreathed about with flowering vines; its surroundings suggestive of beauty, happiness, and enterprise, where "every prospect pleases" and nothing vile can be found, and on its gorgeous archway, in letters of shining gold and artistic form, these words:

The Southland, earth's new Eden,
Blessed are they who enter here.

And when you enter, hope will be your guide, fortune will be your opportunity and success your crown of reward.

Nowhere are there such grand inducements for the intelligent investment of capital; nowhere such a splendid future for enterprise and industry; nowhere such magnificent business prospects as in this superb region of the South, the garden of the world.

THE ENORMOUS GROWTH OF BUSINESS.

To show the stupendous increase in the business of the United States I call attention to the clearing-house reports, which show that their business for 1896 aggregated thirty-seven thousand million dollars, while their business for 1899 aggregates sixty-nine thousand million dollars; so that for every $100 paid in 1896 $186 were paid in 1899, thus showing that the business of our country

to-day is nearly twice as great as it was when McKinley was elected President.

Another unerring evidence of the enormous increase of business is the fact that money orders issued by the post-offices of the United States have increased more than $20,000,000 a year.

The Agricultural Department estimates that the value of farm animals in the United States has increased in the last two years $342,000,000, which is just that much more in the hands of our farmers.

And, wonder of wonders, we are now shipping to foreign lands more than $1,000,000 worth of manufactured goods every day in the year, our total exports of all kinds, breadstuffs and meats included, amounting to over one thousand million dollars for this good year of 1899.

And all this marvelous growth has been accomplished while William Jennings Bryan and his horde of Democratic politicians have been going to and fro in the earth and up and down in it, preaching 16 to 1 and filling the land with predictions about the tremendous and appalling calamities sure to come upon the country because of the gold standard and the protective tariff of the Republican party. The Democratic politicians howl and bark, but the procession moves on all the same with the Republican party at its head and McKinley as its great captain. [Applause.]

DEMOCRATS ADMIT WE ARE PROSPEROUS.

Many Democratic politicians admit the country is prosperous; they admit it because they are obliged to admit it; they admit it with awfully wry faces; but they admit it nevertheless. They hold the admission in their mouths as long as possible, but all you have to do is to fish for it with a direct question and you will hook it on the point of your interrogation and draw it forth.

The fact that our country is prosperous has been admitted by the great Democratic newspapers all over the country. It has been admitted by the great Democratic leaders on the floor of this House. It is the one great, indisputable, magnificent fact of the year 1899. It is grandly apparent all over the land. It shines in the towns and cities. It is apparent on every well-managed farm. It gleams in the eyes of the laboring man. It roars in every factory. It bursts forth in smoke and flame from every smokestack. It thunders along every railroad with its loaded trains and laboring locomotives. It cuts the waters of lake, river, and ocean in front of every steamboat and steamship. It inspires happy songs in all the cotton and corn fields of the South, and all the hives of human industry in the North. It lifts the mortgage from the humble home and makes glad its inmates. It fills our schools with merry children and crowds our colleges with studious youths. It fills the whole land with blessedness as the waters fill the great deeps of the ocean, and inspires hope in many a heart that had long harbored the black vulture of despair. [Applause.]

DEMOCRATIC EXPLANATIONS OF OUR PROSPERITY.

And the great business now of Democratic politicians is trying to show that this prosperity is not the result of Republican policies and Republican administration. Some of them say that our present great prosperity is the result of an accident! I am sorry that this sort of accident did not happen under the last Democratic Administration. Some say that our prosperity is due to the Spanish and Philippine wars. But our prosperity had sprouted and was growing rapidly before either of these wars began.

Some say that our present extraordinary prosperity is caused by the enormous amount of gold mined in the world. But if that be so, it is only a fulfillment of the predictions of the Republican party that there would be enough gold mined and minted to do the business of the world. And, finally, we have heard a prominent Democratic member on this floor rise in his place and ask the question whether the Republican party or the Almighty is the author of our great prosperity. Uncle Mose, an old negro preacher, was once asked by a Democratic orator in Virginia if the Almighty and not the Republicans did not free the negro. "Yes," replied Uncle Mose, scratching his gray head, "I s'pose the Almighty did do it, but these Republicans helped Him a heap, I tell you." [Laughter.]

The Almighty always blesses those who work in accordance with His eternal laws of reason and righteousness, and the reason the country is more prosperous under Republican rule than under Democratic rule is that the Republicans conform their policies and legislation to the eternal verities of the Almighty, instead of pandering to the passions and prejudices of sections and special interests. We have been told from our boyhood that honesty is the best policy. The Republican party has builded its financial house on this rock, and the gates of hell and the Democratic party will never prevail against it. [Applause.]

DEMOCRATS EXPERTS IN EXPLANATION.

The Democratic politicians are great explainers. Indeed, they are the very best explainers in the world. They are experts in explanation. They have had more experience in explaining than any other people in the world, personal, political, or professional. It is true that they generally—

Puzzle by their explanations
And darken by their elucidations.

Nevertheless, the strong point with the average Democratic politician is his capacity for explanation and elucidation.

And now they are trying to explain the high price of agricultural products, especially cotton and stock; they are trying to explain the advance in wages and the increase in price of iron and steel; they are trying to explain the enormous increase in the bulk of business; they are doing their best to elucidate how it is that the ratio in value between gold and silver has gone down from 16 to 1 to 34 to 1, notwithstanding their assertion four years ago that the Almighty had made the ratio 16 to 1 and it was not in the power of man to change it!

I heard of a Democrat who was throwing up to a Republican that McKinley's election had not kept wheat up to a dollar. "I know that," said the Republican, "but you Democrats don't understand things. McKinley don't work in the same line all the time. He first worked in wheat, then he worked in iron, and now he is working in cattle, horses, and cotton." [Laughter.] So McKinleyism helps everybody. [Applause.]

M'KINLEY'S ADMINISTRATION COMPARED WITH CLEVELAND'S.

I do not wish to close my remarks, Mr. Chairman, without drawing some contrasts between the Administration of President Cleveland and the Administration of President McKinley. Cleveland, you know, was supposed to be a sort of Democratic god. He was believed to be perfect, and could do no wrong. He set himself up as the champion of free trade, and under his Administration free trade was given a fair trial, and you know, and the American people know, with what result.

Under Cleveland's Democratic free-trade Administration we had to sell bonds to get money to run the Government, while under McKinley's Republican protection and gold-standard Administration we have such a surplus of money in the Treasury that we are using it to pay off our bonds and thus decrease the national debt.

Under Cleveland's Democratic free-trade Administration we bought millions of pounds of steel and iron from foreign lands, while under McKinley's Republican protection and gold-standard Administration we are selling millions of pounds of steel and iron in foreign lands, and are building steel bridges in Europe, Asia, Africa, and South America, to the astonishment of the balance of the world.

Under the last year of Cleveland's Democratic free-trade Administration the total imports and exports of the United States were thirteen hundred million dollars, while under the last year of McKinley's Republican protection and gold-standard Administration the total imports and exports have reached the enormous aggregate of two thousand million dollars.

Under Cleveland's Democratic free-trade Administration the farmers of the United States managed to live only by mortgaging their farms and sacrificing their stock, while under McKinley's Republican protection and gold-standard Administration the farmer's have got such good prices for their products and stock that many have been able not only to live comfortably but to pay themselves out of debt.

FREE TRADE VS. PROTECTION AND THE GOLD STANDARD.

Under Cleveland's Democratic free-trade Administration it became necessary to borrow $262,000,000 to obtain gold wherewith to maintain the gold reserve and pay the current expenses of the Government, and that, too, while we were at peace with all the world, while under McKinley's Republican protection and gold-standard Administration we have millions of gold in the Treasury and have paid many millions of our indebtedness besides, and that, too, while carrying on two great wars, one requiring over 200,000 additional troops and the other requiring 75,000 more, besides immense enlargements in our naval forces and twenty millions paid for the Philippines and three millions paid the Cuban soldiers. [Applause.]

Under Cleveland's Democratic free-trade Administration there were such multitudes of laboring men thrown out of employment by the Democratic free-trade hard times that it was necessary to open houses where they and their children could get soup and bread to save them from starvation, while under McKinley's Republican protection and gold-standard Administration laboring men get plenty of work at good wages, and many of them are not only supporting their families and schooling their children, but are saving up money for the future. [Applause.]

THE DEMOCRATIC WAR ON SHEEP AND AMERICAN TIN.

Under Cleveland's Democratic free-trade Administration war was declared against the American sheep, and the price of American wool became so low that hundreds of thousands of our sheep were slaughtered because it was unprofitable to keep them, while under McKinley's Republican protection gold-standard Administration the American sheep has been befriended, American wool has doubled in price, and the sheep have immensely increased in number and value.

The free-trade Democrats swore by Grover Cleveland and all their other gods that we could not make tin plate in this country, and if we did the price would be so high that a poor man would not be able to buy a coffeepot or tin cup, and that the price of all

canned goods would be enormously increased, whereas under Republican protection tariffs over three thousand million pounds of tin have been manufactured in the United States and the price is one-fourth less than it was when the McKinley bill was passed. [Applause.]

DEMOCRATIC POLITICIANS AND RICH MEN.

The Democratic politicians seem to be anxious to destroy all the rich men in the land who are Republicans. They would inaugurate a general and indiscriminate massacre of them all. It seems to be no crime for a man to be rich if he is a Democrat; but if he is a Republican he should be tried by drumhead court-martial and shot at once.

Where there is great prosperity there are apt to be some rich men who will profit by it; but while trying to prevent anybody becoming rich you may prevent the country from becoming prosperous.

I once heard of a half-witted negro boy whose duty it was to keep the flies off his master while he slept. The boy grew tired of his task, and, seeing a great many flies on his master's face, got a big rock and, creeping up softly, threw it with great violence against his master's face. He killed a great many of the flies, but he killed his master also. So these Democrats pass laws to kill off the rich, but in so doing they kill prosperity also. We had a sample of this when Cleveland was President. [Applause.] Where the carcass is there will the eagles be also, and where there is blood there will be bloodsuckers; but is it not better to have blood and some bloodsuckers than to have no blood and no bloodsuckers?

PROSPERITY IN SPITE OF DEMOCRATIC DENUNCIATIONS.

And thus it will be seen, Mr. Chairman, that all of the predictions of the Democratic party for the last forty years have proved untrue and all of their denunciations have proved undeserved. This being so, their predictions and denunciations now fail to have any effect on me, and I do not believe they will have any effect on the country. They are the same predictions and denunciations the Democrats make in every campaign. In their sight we Republicans are always very bad men, always belong to the wicked and corrupt money sharks, and are always in a conspiracy to ruin the American people. In their own sight the Democratic politicians are always patriots without guile, always honest and wise, and always trying to rescue the people from the remorseless grasp of the money power.

But we will find one year from now, after this bill has become a law, that all of these Democratic predictions of evil are just as false as all of their former predictions have proved to be. We will find one year from now that our country will still be prosperous, that the people still have confidence in us, and that with McKinley chosen President for a second term, and a strong Republican majority in both Houses of Congress, Bryanism and free silver will be forever things of the past, and the verdict of impartial history will be that the United States of America, as the foremost nation of all the world, will owe its exalted position to the wisdom, the patriotism, the honesty, the courage, and the enterprise of the Republican party. [Applause.]

Mr. BREAZEALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to record in the name of Louisiana her protest against the passage of this most iniquitous measure. I use that word advisedly. It is iniquitous not only in its provisions, but it is iniquitous in its treachery to the American people. Scarcely three years ago some 13,000,000 people, almost the entire voting strength of the American people, registered their ballots in favor of bimetallism. The Democratic party in its national platform spoke out strong and sharp for silver; in unmistakable terms it demanded that the money of this country should be gold and silver in the ratio of 16 to 1. Some 6,000,000 people voted for the inauguration of that system. They adopted the true American doctrine, the true American principle, that this country was grand enough and great enough to inaugurate that system without the assistance of any other country or nation on the face of God's green earth.

The Republican platform announced the doctrine that they favored bimetallism, but upon the pitiful, puny plea that we were not great and strong and powerful enough to inaugurate that system unless we had the help of the European nations; and it remained for a poor little handful of so-called Democrats—some 180,000—to vote squarely and plainly for the gold system.

Now, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that out of the entire vote cast three years ago only this pitiful 180,000 or 200,000 favored the gold system as the monetary system of this great Republic. The remaining 13,000,000 favored bimetallism. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, you have no warrant from the American people for the passage of this measure. On the contrary, you have the absolute statement by the people themselves that they favored bimetallism; and to-day you propose to carry through this measure and choke it down the throats of the American people, because you have seen the handwriting on the wall and know that unless you do it to-day this is your last chance and you will never have the opportunity again to do it.

You take advantage of this wave of prosperity now, believing that you can pass this measure and that there will be nothing said about it at the approaching election by the American people. But I say, Mr. Chairman, that you are counting without your host. Lay not the flattering unction to your soul that you can commit this crime with impunity. The American people have never forgiven treachery; and if this be not treache ry of the most damnable kind, I do not know what it is.

Now, passing from the general aspect of the bill to its provisions, show me, I ask you, where you will find any such unwarranted power was ever given or was ever proposed to be given in this House as is given by this bill to the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury is vested with such absolute power that it appalls any thoughtful, any patriotic, man to contemplate. Think for a second what power section 4 of the bill confers upon the Secretary of the Treasury of this great country. It invests him with authority to maintain the gold reserve, which I understand will be about $120,000,000, by the issuance of bonds at his sweet will and at the dictates of his judgment.

Without restriction, without safeguard, the unlimited power is vested in the Secretary of the Treasury to pile up the bonded debt of the nation as his judgment, good, bad, or indifferent, may dictate. The fathers who framed the organic law contemplated no such violation of this spirit. They intended no such power to be vested in any one man, and this most extraordinary grant of authority to the Secretary of the Treasury will receive the unanimous condemnation of the people in 1900.

Mr. Chairman, no less objectionable is that section of the bill which increases the power of the national banks. The existing laws on this subject are bad enough in all conscience, but under the terms of this act the Government surrenders her rights to control the monetary system of the nation to the tender mercies of the national banks, which, under the extraordinary power granted by this act, can inflate and contract the currency of the nation at will. In my humble judgment this is a crime of the worst character and unequalled in the history of this Republic.

Mr. Chairman, the passage of this measure is a complete surrender by the Government to the money power of the nation and furnishes the completed evidence of the charge that the Republican party owed its success in 1896 to the money power and to-day is paying the debt contracted in that election.

I thank God, Mr. Chairman, that it is not the Democratic party that is guilty of this crime, of this treachery. I thank God, sir, that it is not the Democratic party that seeks to chain this nation, like Prometheus to the rock, that the money power may plunge its golden talons into its quivering vitals and gorge itself on the sufferings of the people. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I will plant my feet in the footprints of the fathers, where there is no danger of stumbling or going astray. The purposes of the present bill are apparent. The first section declares and establishes the single gold standard. The second section makes all obligations, public and private, payable in gold only. The third section establishes in the Treasury Department a division to be known as the division of "issue and redemption." The fourth section is a command upon the Secretary of the Treasury to maintain the gold reserve, or redemption fund, and gives him unlimited and unconditional power for that purpose to issue and sell bonds of the United States, bearing interest at a rate not to exceed 3 per cent, payable in gold coin, at the end of twenty years, but reserving the right in the Government to redeem them after one year. Also, that all greenbacks and notes issued under the act of 1890, and known as Sherman notes, when received into the Treasury, shall not be reissued except for gold, and that silver certificates shall not be reissued in denominations above $5.

The remainder of the bill extends the power of national banks and authorizes them to receive from the Government the par value of the bonds deposited in currency notes, and greatly reduces the tax against the banks. These are but the general features of the bill, but the bill in its entire scope and meaning is revolutionary, and means a complete change in our monetary affairs. The second section of the bill uses the following language:

That all interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the payment of money, now existing or hereafter to be entered into, and all United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the law of July 14, 1890, shall be deemed and held payable in the gold coin of the United States as defined in section 1 of this act; and all other obligations, public and private, for the payment of money shall be performed in conformity with the standard established in said section [gold].

The interest-bearing bonded indebtedness of the United States is $1,046,000,000, all payable in coin (gold or silver). If this bill passes, all these bonds will thereafter be payable in gold only. Now, if Mr. Cleveland's statement holds good, and he spoke by authority, this will increase the value of these outstanding bonds in the sum of $261,500,000, which means that that vast sum of money is to be taken out of the pockets of the people by legislation and presented to the bondholders as a gift from the honest

and industrious people of the country. And yet gentlemen on the other side boast of Republican integrity and friendship for the masses of the people. May Heaven spare my people from such friendship.

This section of the bill is a fraud on the taxpayers of this country. Every bond of the United States is payable in coin, either gold or silver, and this section of the bill changes the contract and requires the Government to pay them in gold only. It is a dishonest concession to the bondholder, one they do not deserve and one they should not have. It is an iniquity upon the people that should not be perpetrated.

When Cleveland sold $62,000,000 in bonds, before doing so, in a special message to Congress, he stated that if Congress would authorize gold bonds to be sold instead of the coin bonds then authorized by law that the Government would gain by so doing $16,000,000. In other words, the $62,000,000 of bonds payable in gold would be worth $16,000,000 more than if payable in coin.

And, Mr. Chairman, this same principle will affect the entire mortgage indebtedness of the country, corporate, municipal, and private, and will cost the debtors of the country countless millions more than they contracted to pay. For them to pay less than they owe would be dishonest and to compel them to pay more is extortion.

In a speech which I had the honor to deliver in this House in March, 1898, upon this subject, in giving a history of the conduct of the creditors of the Government I made the following statement, which I repeat here:

"Mr. Speaker, a history of the concessions already made by this Government to its creditors is enough to bleach with shame the cheeks of every man who loves fair dealings and approves of common honesty. First, the depreciated currency at the close of the war was bought up by speculators at a discount ranging from 40 to 60 per cent and exchanged for the bonds of the Government at full face value. These bonds were payable in the lawful money of the United States.

"On March 16, 1869, a law was passed making these bonds payable in coin, without any additional consideration being paid to the Government. The greenbacks at that time were good enough for the citizen, the merchant, and the soldier, but the debts due the bondholders were made payable in coin. Ever restless, ever grasping, these creditors secured the passage of the act of 1870, and after its provisions were put in force they were securely intrenched with all their holdings. At this time the bonded debt of the Government was largely owned in foreign countries.

"Not satisfied with this liberal treatment on the part of the Government, not satisfied with doubling their investments, but inspired by their greed and encouraged by their successful plundering of the people, they and their allies set on foot the conspiracy which resulted in the demonetization of silver in 1873. And, Mr. Chairman, no conspiracy to overthrow a kingdom or plunder its people was ever pursued to consummation with more secrecy and less regard for human rights. And yet these people and their mouthpieces upon this floor declare with apparent candor that it would be 'repudiation and dishonor' to pay these bonds in the money of the contract.

"To me, Mr. Chairman, the failure of the Government to enforce the terms of this contract would be treason against the Government and a repudiation of the rights of the sovereign people. This, Mr. Chairman, is my opinion now and will be as long as I believe in the integrity of contracts and the right of the debtor to discharge his contract as he agreed to do."

Mr. Chairman, I feel that I could not be just either to myself or the patriotic and industrious people I have the honor to represent should I fail to oppose by all honorable means the passage of this bill. I know in advance that any arguments that may be advanced on this side of the House, it matters not how sound and conclusive they may be, will not be heeded by those on the other side, who have surrendered in advance the birthright of the people to the money changers and bondholders of the country.

The very first section of the bill declaring and establishing the single gold standard in the United States bodes greater evil to the agricultural and laboring classes of this country—indeed, to the nation itself—than any legislation that has heretofore been boldly proposed by a great political party.

Those of us who have continuously and persistently urged upon Congress the justice and right of the equal coinage of gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 have been met at every point by the argument that the agitation of the money question disturbed the business interests of the country, and that it ought not to be done; that if we would only let the money question rest prosperity and happiness stood ready to bless every home in the land. And now these very men who have pressed with such earnestness these arguments are no sooner in control of Congress and the Executive than they begin the agitation of the money question in the most radical manner.

You propose by this bill in the most defiant way to establish in this country gold monometallism as completely as legislation can do it.

In the beginning of this conspiracy (I can not call it by any other name) against the industrial and producing classes of this country nothing was done openly. The people were deceived and misled at every step. The act demonetizing silver passed in 1873 came like a thief at night, and was not understood by the people for years after its passage. And after it was known and understood by the people, and as late as 1888, the Republicans in their national platform declared "that the Republican party is in favor of the use of both gold and silver as money."

And in 1892 you declared in your national platform "that the American people from tradition and interest favored bimetallism, and the Republican party demands the use of both gold and silver as standard money." Such were the declarations of the Republican party. When it was charged by a deceived and injured people that it was in favor of the gold standard, it was denied on stump and in platform. Now you step out into the open and propose to establish by law the gold standard and to make all obligations, both public and private, payable in gold only.

Mr. Chairman, since the beginning of the discussion of the silver question in recent years, every man almost who opposed the free coinage of silver at the present legal ratio of 16 to 1 did so protesting that he was a bimetallist and a greater friend of silver than those who favored free coinage. I remember very well in my first race for Congress that when I would charge my Republican opponent and his party with being "gold bugs" and in favor of the single gold standard, they would grow indignant in their denials and protest their friendship for silver. They were then either deceived themselves or attempting to deceive the people. Where will they stand now that the issue is unmasked? My predictions then are now demonstrated. I stand to-day where I stood then, opposed to banks of issue, opposed to the single gold standard, and in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at the present legal ratio. And if this bill passes it will bear the prints of sorrow. It may not come to-day nor to-morrow, but come it will as certain as the years roll on.

This means that all the debts and commercial transactions of the country must rest upon gold for their final payment. Gold being the standard will in fact, as well as law, should this bill pass, be the only money of final payment.

I think, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that we might profit by a comparison of the amount of gold we will have with the amount of debts we must pay. The following estimate of our debts will be found to be substantially correct:

Present interest-bearing bond indebtedness.

Bonded debt of the United States	$1,300,000,000
Bonded debt of railroads	5,665,000,000
Mortgage debt, secured on real estate (census of 1890)	6,019,000,000
Bonds issued by organized industrial trusts, not less than	4,000,000,000
State, municipal, and other corporate bonded debt, more than	1,000,000,000

Giving a total of $18,000,000,000 in round numbers. Interest on this vast sum at 5 per cent will amount to $900,000,000 per year; which must be paid annually or at shorter periods.

In addition to this taxes were collected last year as follows:

Customs	$206,000,000
Internal revenue	273,000,000
Total	479,000,000

Making a grand total of corporate and national debts and taxes to be paid annually of $1,376,000,000. The amount of gold and gold certificates now in circulation, as shown by the Treasurer's report, is $762,244,252, about one-half as much as the national taxes and interest on the national and corporate indebtedness for one year, and only one twenty-fifth of the debt as shown above.

In addition to this our commercial transactions in the United States in one year will amount to more than $70,000,000,000, so that this vast annual charge, as well as our vast commercial transactions, must rest upon the narrow basis of about $700,000,000 in money of final payment.

Much of this debt is held abroad, and the money for its payment may have to be drawn from our small supply of gold and shipped to foreign countries to meet these demands.

The $90,000,000 of bullion certificates can no longer be used for this purpose, not even in the payment of private contracts. The $346,000,000 of greenbacks can not be used in the payment of these; they must be paid in gold. But, Mr. Chairman, this is not all. The bill does not stop here, but it establishes a bureau of "issue and redemption." This bureau, Mr. Chairman, is a jail in which to confine the bullion certificates, issued under the Sherman law, and the greenbacks, from which they will never be released. It is only an indirect way of permanently retiring the greenbacks, amounting to $346,000,000, and Treasury notes of 1890, amounting to $90,000,000, and converting the $400,000,000 of silver certificates into denominations of $5 and less.

This money of the people, representing the credit and sovereignty of the Government, is to be retired from circulation and the volume of our currency contracted more than $400,000,000. This greenback, which was a stay to the nation in time of war and that has contributed so much to the convenience and happiness of

the people, is not only to meet its death, but must die from perpetual imprisonment in the division of "issue and redemption."

Not only that, but the Secretary of the Treasury will have the power under this bill to redeem the silver dollars in gold, thus completely destroying the legal-tender quality of all money except gold, and instead of having legal-tender silver dollars as money, they will constitute a charge against the gold redemption fund. So we will have greenbacks, silver, Treasury notes of 1890, and currency certificates, amounting in all to about $950,000,000, all redeemable in gold, that may be, at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, redeemed, and gold bonds issued, if necessary, for every dollar with which to redeem them. Such a proposition, to my mind, Mr. Chairman, is not only monstrous but criminal. [Applause on Democratic side.]

But let us go a step further. We have seen, as stated before, that the total amount of gold belonging to the people is $762,244,252. Under this bill a reserve fund of at least one hundred and fifty millions must be maintained by the Government. Under the present law national banks are required also to keep a reserve fund, which on the 7th day of September, 1899, amounted to $630,789,147, which is $18,544,925 more than all the gold in the United States belonging to the people. So with the silver money and certificates and the greenbacks out of the way, the national banks will have an absolute monopoly of the currency of the country.

Mr. Chairman, we hear much of trusts and monopolies these days. The people are being robbed and plundered in every direction—the Standard Oil trust and the sugar trust laying tribute upon every home in the land; the beef trust raising the price of meat until it will take a bushel of wheat or 2 bushels of corn to pay for a respectable beefsteak.

The Federal Steel Company, with a capital of $200,000,000; the American Steel and Wire Company, which have in the last few months arbitrarily advanced the price of their products from 50 to 150 per cent. And this is only a few of the unlawful combinations that are ruthlessly plundering the people. These corporations and trusts that have amassed these great fortunes, not by labor and toil, but by favoritism and protection under the law, now filch from the people their hard-earned dollars, and defy them, and ignore and override the laws made for their control.

They have destroyed many villages and towns by buying up and otherwise closing independent factories. They have turned the laborer back from their closed doors and smokeless furnaces. Already they have discharged more than a hundred thousand commercial travelers, and are fast reducing the remaining number. They not only control the price of many articles of commerce, but dictate to the retail merchant what price he shall make to his customers. Large department houses are fast taking the place of the smaller retail merchants. In fact, they are becoming the masters; all others, the servants.

And yet, Mr. Chairman, in the face of this situation, blind to the teachings of the past, and unmindful of the oppressions of the people, the present Administration proposes to put this bill through Congress under the gag rule, with limited debate, to charter the greatest trust known to the world—the banking trust—and give to it unlimited power over the currency of the country; power to expand or contract the currency at will; power not only over the business of the country, but power to destroy the country.

The great banking houses in New York will be the headquarters for this trust, and the smaller banks throughout the country will be but the satellites and lieutenants of this great institution to carry out its orders. And the division of "issue and redemption" established by this bill will be the signal station for this trust and for the gamblers and stockbrokers throughout the country.

And, Mr. Chairman, if this signal station should sound the alarm, then banks under the operation of this bill could in a few days paralyze the business of this country. Who is it that does not remember the panic of 1893? The banks called in all their loans, and no man could borrow a dollar. The country was without means to carry on its business. Labor was unemployed, and commerce was at a standstill, and how much more severe may be the stroke under this bill.

THE NATIONAL BANKS THE POWER BEHIND THE THRONE.

On October 31, 1899, there were 3,601 national banks in the United States, with an authorized capital stock of $608,528,045. And these banks had on deposit with the Treasurer $232,463,160 in bonds and $5,562,170 lawful money as a security for their circulation. Under the law as it now stands, the national banks may deposit with the Treasurer of the United States United States bonds and receive in bank currency 90 per cent of their par value.

Under the present bill, if it should become a law, they can receive a dollar in bank currency for every dollar in bonds so deposited. When the bonds are so deposited the bank not only receives the full par value of the bonds in bank currency, but the Government pays to the banks all interest accruing on the bonds so deposited. So if a bank should deposit in the Treasury $100,000 in bonds bearing 3 per cent interest, the Government would pay the bank $3,000 a year interest on its bonds, and turn over to the bank, in addition thereto, $100,000 in bank currency, to be loaned to the people at whatever rate of interest they could secure.

These bonds and this currency are free from the burdens of taxation that often bears so heavily upon other property. Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted, I will indulge for a few minutes in a brief review of the history of banks of issue. The history of the old United States Bank, which was chartered in the early days of the Republic, was so conspicuous for its evil effects upon the country that it ought to suffice to render the name national bank forever odious to the American people. Its record for criminal conduct against the people and the Government was and still remains without a parallel. Its evil effects upon the finances of the country were most disastrous.

Jackson, seeing its baleful effects, determined to save the Government by destroying the bank. And in one of the most memorable political contests in history he destroyed the bank and saved the Government. The next banking act was passed by Congress in 1864, in the midst of the civil war; but even then the effort was made to conceal the name and real purposes of the act. So the bill was passed with this significant title: "To provide a national currency secured by a pledge of United States bonds, and to provide for the circulation thereof."

The acts of 1791 and 1816, chartering the United States Bank, plainly stated in the title the purpose of the act, but neither the title nor the act of 1864 disclosed the name "bank;" on the contrary, the companies chartered by it were called "associations." This was done for the evident purpose of concealing from the people the fact that national banks had been established. And no sooner had they been established than they began a war against the greenbacks which has been kept up until this good day. In 1874 this charter act was amended, and was entitled "The national-bank act," which act the bill under consideration seeks to amend.

There is, Mr. Chairman, and ever will be a ceaseless conflict between banks of issue and money coined or issued by the Government, for the reason that every dollar of money that can be destroyed or withdrawn from circulation makes room for as many dollars of bank money. Or, to state the proposition in another way, if there were sufficient money in circulation to meet all the demands of trade, bank money would have no place in our financial system; but if all or a part of the money necessary to meet the demands of trade be wanting, then bank money comes into use.

This conflict, Mr. Chairman, has ever been the disturbing element in our financial system and will continue to be until the banks are destroyed or until they become the supreme masters of the Government and the people.

It was the banks that determined upon the destruction of the greenbacks. It was the banks that forced the contests against silver. And if this bill shall become a law they will be complete victors over the Constitution and the people. The free coinage of gold and silver in this country never would have been interrupted but for the influence upon our finances of the banks and their allies, the bondholders.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is no new contest. It is but the same contest that has been waged since the foundation of the Government, in one form or the other, by special and privileged classes seeking to seize the powers and functions of the Government and then appropriate them to their own use. This same power has levied taxes upon our people for the benefit of the favored ones.

It has secured in the past to favorites of the Government land grants of more than 200,000,000 acres of the public domain. This same power wrung from the hands of the Supreme Court of the United States a decision declaring the income-tax law unconstitutional, overturning the decisions of that court for a century, thus relieving the wealth of the country from the burdens of taxation.

And, Mr. Chairman, the effort to pass this bill is but the same old conflict waged against the money of the country by private banking corporations and the bondholding element of the country, seeking to deprive the Government of its highest sovereignty—that of its power to issue and coin money for the benefit of the people—and appropriate that power for their own gain.

These banks, Mr. Chairman, have a most cunning way of transacting their business. To illustrate: On September 7, 1899, the liabilities of the national banks on account of deposits were $3,031,463,016—five times as much as their paid-up capital; and on the same day they had loans and overdrafts outstanding amounting to $2,500,000,000—more than four times as much as their capital stock and one and one-half times more money than all the money in the United States. So it may be seen that they were loaning at interest, at one time, all the money they had and all that everybody else had and a thousand million dollars more than all the money in all the country.

If, Mr. Chairman, these corporations under existing law can, by the use of certificates of deposit and checks, or by some sort of necromancy in bookkeeping, manage to collect interest on all the money in the country, what may they not do if given the extended

privileges contained in this bill? How long will it be until these grasping and insatiate corporations will not only control but own the country?

How apt are the words of Jackson at this point. In speaking of the old United States Bank he said:

> The bold effort the present bank has made to control the Government, the distress it has wantonly produced, are but premonitions of the fate that awaits the American people should they be deluded into a perpetuation of this institution or the establishment of another like it.

And what impelled the immortal Jefferson to most solemnly declare that "I sincerely believe that banking institutions are more dangerous than standing armies"? These solemn statements, made by these, the two greatest statesmen and patriots known to American history, ought to be a sufficient warning to cause this Congress to hesitate long before taking the fatal step.

This is not all, Mr. Chairman. The passage of this bill means the indefinite postponement of the payment of our national bonded debt, as well as its enlargement. The banks must have the bonds, and their influence will be sufficient to extend their payment indefinitely. And as they may need more bonds the finances will be so manipulated by them as to compel their issue. And from year to year we will go on paying millions of dollars in interest without any promise of relief.

But this is not all. We have promise of much more legislation by this Congress not in the interest of the people. The Payne-Hanna ship-subsidy bill is to be brought before Congress for consideration, and we have been informed that orders have been issued that it must pass. By its terms the people are to be taxed from $75,000,000 to $150,000,000 annually, to be given as a bonus to the shipowners of the country. The standing Army is to be largely increased, to see, I suppose, that the trusts and combines are not molested while plundering the people.

I had some hope, Mr. Chairman, when I came to this Congress that the Republican majority would consent to some legislation in the interest of the great army of honest, industrious people upon the farm and in the shop and following other lines of labor; but day by day I learn that no laws upon that line are to be passed. There is to be no modification of the exacting tariff laws that stand like a stone wall around the trusts.

The war-revenue tax is to remain to burden and harass the people. The farmer and laborer are to be forgotten in the mad rush toward commercial and military imperialism. The trusts and combines, with a king—the bank trust—to command their cohorts, are to be unbridled and turned loose upon the people, while the people themselves have no day in the legislative halls of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I entertain no hostility to legitimate capital. I would encourage its use and investment in developing not only the great resources of my own State, but of all the country. It is the friend of labor and of the people, and I would not only encourage it, but protect it. But it is the enormous aggregations of capital that seek not to build up, but to tear down—that seek by means of its great power to oppress the people—that I would crush. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I would put iron bits in the mouth of relentless greed. I would chain the green-eyed monster, Avarice, and free the people from their oppression and wrong.

I would encourage and favor legitimate capital and its investment in the industries and business of the country in such a way as to be profitable to its owner and at the same time bless mankind.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that my sympathies and my heart are with the man who by honest effort and honest labor, in an open and fair contest, wins his way in life. My father was one of the common people. By his strong arm and honest heart he helped to build up my native State. I grew to manhood under his care and tutelage; I stood by him when he was called to his reward, and after he was gone, inspired by his life and sacred memory, and in honor of his independent and stalwart manhood, I resolved that I, myself, would be one of the common people, that their cause should be my cause, that all who sought to oppress them should be my enemies; not that I hated them, but because of their injustice; and by this resolution I have lived. And faithful to its obligations I shall continue to be as long as the struggle for right, justice, and liberty shall last and I shall live.

I will plant my feet in the footprints of the fathers, where there is no danger of stumbling or going astray. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I shall not consume any of the short time allotted me in the discussion of the economic principles underlying this bill and its probable operation. On a former occasion I discussed those principles with more or less thoroughness upon this floor, and so, assuming them as premises generally agreed upon, I shall proceed at once to the consideration of the provisions of the particular bill under discussion. But it is futile to try to consider this bill, even, with any degree of completeness, within the time set apart for its discussion. If every minute should be utilized as contemplated in the rule enforced here by the majority, there would be less than five minutes available for each member of the House as his proportionate share.

It will be impossible to do more in so limited a time than to attack a salient here and there, and then transfer the whole debate to that broader forum where the previous question does not operate and where no committee on rules is tolerated.

I am persuaded, Mr. Chairman, that this is the first time in the history of legislative procedure that a far-reaching financial measure, involving radical changes in the financial system of a people, has been thrust so suddenly upon a legislative body and forced to a passage within the brief space of one week.

And why this haste? Is there some great crisis impending in the financial world? Are our trade relations depressed because the gold standard has never been written in the statute books? Are our securities depreciating in the markets of the world because the word "gold" has not been written in the bond? Assuredly not. Neither the one nor any of these conditions prevail; there is absolutely nothing impending that is considered competent to justify legislative interference with the financial system of a country. On the contrary, there never was a moment in the history of our country, or in the history of any other country, when general monetary conditions and business relations were more satisfactory—if one accept as true one-half the boasts of enthusiastic gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber.

It is true that conditions are largely improved, and I congratulate the country that this is true. But it is equally true, Mr. Chairman, that the prosperity we enjoy is to a considerable extent fortuitous in origin and factitious in character. Misfortune and disaster in other parts of the world have opened those markets to the overflowing granaries of the West at good prices. The military operations of the United States for eighteen months past against Spain and the Philippines, together with the war in South Africa, have combined to create an enormous demand for material of all sorts that has kept our farms and factories alike busy at remunerative prices. Coincident with all this there comes a shortage in the cotton production unprecedented in the history of its culture; and while the bulk of the crop, as usual, had passed out of the hands of the farmers before the full scope of the shortage had been realized, still they have gotten a larger share of the advance than in former years.

So that, Mr. Chairman, there is a degree of general prosperity that is very gratifying to every American; but, as stated, it is of a fortuitous nature, and its origin lies wholly outside the agencies of the Republican party.

There is no pretense by the apologists for this measure that any immediate need of change exists. Why, then, is this bill here under such unusual circumstances?

Is the Republican party driven to it by its platform pledges?

Is it impelled by stress of its campaign pledges to bring this bill here at this time and in this way? Nay, verily. The platform pledges of that great organization in 1896 stood stoutly for bimetallism by international agreement; and the spokesmen for the party have again and again repudiated the insinuation that the party ever stood for the single gold standard.

Not only so, six and a half million American freemen went to the ballot box in 1896 and voted for Bryan and bimetallism without the agreement or consent of anybody; so that ninety-nine hundredths of American voters, in their latest expression upon the question, registered their voices for bimetallism of one sort or the other.

Whence, then, I repeat, comes the demand for this bill? According to the claims of the advocates of the measure there never was a time when the people at large were thinking or demanding less in respect to financial legislation. They are too busy reaping the results of prevailing prosperity, we are told, and that there is a certain factitious prosperity of the spotted variety, due to fortuitous circumstances utterly independent of parties or platforms, no one will deny. Who, then, is demanding this legislation?

Why demand it so insistently and force it with such precipitancy just at this time, when admittedly the attention of the people is momentarily diverted in other channels? Is there a method in this madness? The approaches of the gold standard proper to the goal of their desire have rarely ever been won by direct assault.

Their first great vantage was won in 1873 by methods that merit a harsher term than indirection. Under the guise of a codification of the coinage laws that year they dropped out the silver dollar, which had up to that time been specifically designated as the standard of value.

Their next great vantage was in the early days of the Fifty-fourth Congress, while the attention of the people was centered upon the tariff issue. We may not be able to locate, Mr. Chairman, the demand for such a measure as this, but we can all see at a glance to whose benefit it inures. The merest tyro in finance need not read far into its provisions to see in whose interest it is drawn.

Without entering upon a detailed analysis of its provisions—

there is no time for that—I proceed to state briefly my objections to the measure; and a casual glance will fully justify my contention, I think.

1. In the first place, I oppose it because it proposes to change the money of payment of our bonds without the consent of the people, who are a party to the contract. As they now read, the bonds of this Government are payable, both principal and interest, in coin, and coin under the terms of the Constitution includes both silver and gold. Here, then, is a proposition to strike out the money of payment, agreed upon beforehand by both parties, and substitute therefor a scarcer and supposedly more valuable money.

And the proposition is to do this unjust thing without any demand from the people—nay, more; it is proposed to do it without consulting the people or so much as saying "by your leave." Was there ever a more high-handed, a more impudent, assumption on the part of any political party intrusted for the time being with representative powers? Was there ever a more servile surrender of a people's rights at the hands of those who had sought and secured the confidence of that people upon pledges of a different tenor?

Think of it. The party whose proud boast in the past has been that it stood invariably for "great moral ideas;" that party deliberately changing the contract of the people who trusted them, to the enormous disadvantage of their confiding constituency! Changing the contract to the disadvantage of the people without the consent of the people, did I say? It is worse than that, Mr. Chairman. They are here proposing to change it in this bill in the face of distinct instructions to the contrary. Time and again have the representatives of the bond syndicates met the representatives of the American people and sought by open and by insidious means to get this precise thing done, and each time they have met decided and deserved rebuff.

Not even in the hour of national danger, not in the hour of national disaster, not in the throes of threatened national chaos did these shylocks relent or cease to press their demands. But not even in those dire extremities could a Congress be found so servile or so craven as to surrender the people's rights. Why, Mr. Chairman, the American people only a few years ago paid, or agreed to pay, in the aggregate, $16,000,000 for the poor privilege of retaining the word coin in sixty-two and a half million bonds.

It was a distinct proposition, arising from the bond syndicate then enjoying the exclusive privilege of handling American securities. The representatives of the American people refused the proposition in the most emphatic terms, preferring to pay the difference in dollars rather than betray the trust of a confiding people and lay an ever-increasing burden upon future generations without the consent of the people themselves.

If the difference charged by the bond syndicate for the privilege of writing "coin" instead of "gold" in the bonds represents the real difference in their value, it is fair to assume that the same difference was exacted with reference to the other outstanding coin bonds of the Government; and upon the same basis that difference would be in the neighborhood of $240,000,000.

If this bill becomes law it will be tantamount to giving this enormous difference to the bondholders as a bonus and at the same time give them all they demanded in the first instance—they will get the difference and the thing for which the difference was paid.

It means more than this, however. It means fastening upon the present generation and upon posterity an additional burden that will grow with a steadily accelerating velocity as the days go by, and as the production of gold fails to keep pace with steadily increasing demands laid upon it—a burden, Mr. Chairman, that must be paid ultimately by productive industry in farm and forge and factory. Mr. Chairman it is inconceivable that a great party which has been trusted by the people of this country could be found willing to impose that burden under any circumstances, least of all to impose it without the consent expressly granted of the people.

2. In the second place, I oppose this bill because it is essentially a measure of contraction. Its ultimate and inevitable effect will be to contract the volume of currency by just so much as the amount of the greenbacks outstanding. That is to say, that there will be a speedy and inevitable substraction of $346,000,000 from the volume of currency now outstanding.

It is bound to be so. There is no escape. Under the terms of the bill gold dollars must be paid out whenever these greenbacks are presented at the Treasury. And under the terms of the bill, also, these greenbacks must stay in the Treasury until an equal number of gold dollars are locked up in their place. Under existing conditions both gold and greenbacks are in circulation simultaneously. Under the terms of this bill when the gold is out the greenbacks must be in; when the greenbacks are out the gold must be in. And yet gentlemen on the other side deny that this means contraction; and, be it observed, contraction means distress, low prices for farm products—it means stagnation of business, paralysis of trade. Not only so, but if, as may easily happen, the gold so paid out for greenbacks is shipped abroad, there will be a contraction of the volume of the circulation equal to double the greenbacks so redeemed. Conditions favorable to the export of gold may occur at any time; they are most liable to occur when the demands for money in this country are most urgent. But this is not all. Under subsequent sections of the bill it is easy to see that those conditions may be produced artificially at any time by cooperation of the banks of this country and through them the banks of the world.

Mr. Chairman, there has never been a time in the history of the world when, in my judgment, there was too much money in circulation. On the other hand, the field of history is strewed from end to end with wreck and ruin and starvation and desperation by the inordinate stringency of money. Hence, I am disposed to resist with all the energy and ability I possess any measure that even makes possible a contraction of our circulating medium.

This much of contraction is, in my judgment, as certain and fixed as the all-pervading law of cause and effect—contraction to the amount of the greenbacks outstanding, at the least. There is good reason to believe, however, that the silver currency and silver certificates might be used to the same purpose should the shifting values of international exchange make it worth while for the speculative cliques of the country to collect the subsidiary coin and silver certificates and take them to the Treasury for redemption.

But pass this; there remains the unquestioned and necessary contraction by the amount of the greenbacks; and this in its ultimate result means $346,000,000 less money, at the very least estimate, available for purposes of trade and for the handling of the great staple crops of our country.

3. And not only so, but under the terms of the bill a further contraction is made possible by the surrender of bonds held for circulation of national banks. These banks may, by concert of action, in a day withdraw these bonds down to the minimum limit, lock up these notes, and thus contract the volume of currency to an alarming degree. Suppose such contraction should take place at the time when the cotton crop was to be marketed, or the wheat crop. Does anyone doubt what the effect would be upon the price of those commodities? And this dangerous power is intrusted, under this bill, in the hands of the banks, the very class of people whose interest is supposed to lie in the direction of tight money, which means dear money; which in turn means cheap labor, cheap products of labor.

4. Only one other feature of this extraordinary bill will I call attention to at this time. That is the extraordinary power vested by its terms in the Secretary of the Treasury. Do gentlemen on the other side realize what the issue of bonds means? It means a mortgage upon posterity; a mortgage means interest to pay; interest to pay means taxes to pay. And so it comes to pass that under this bill the power to tax is vested, in the last analysis, in one man—a power hitherto religiously guarded and reserved by an unbroken line of precedents and traditions in the people themselves alone. Mr. Chairman, we can not afford, in my judgment, to surrender that power into the keeping of any man, be he never so wise and honest and true to the traditions of our past.

Too much patriotic blood has been poured out in wresting that power of taxation from the hand of despotism and safeguarding it as the exclusive and inalienable prerogative of the people.

Mr. Chairman, there is one redeeming feature about these proceedings—only one. When the roll shall be called next Monday it will be essentially a vote of lack of confidence in the reelection of William McKinley. It can have no other significance in the light of the declarations of the Republican leaders on this floor. They claim that the country is on the gold basis to-day and has been for the past three years, by the grace of God and of William McKinley.

If this be true, is it not equally true that the gold standard is safe so long as William McKinley remains in the Presidential chair? If you are confident in the reelection of Mr. McKinley, why safeguard the gold standard by legislation on the eve of the election? This extraordinary precaution on your part can have but one meaning, and that is a lack of confidence in the result of the election next year. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

[Mr. TALBERT addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

On motion of Mr. OVERSTREET, the committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FARIS) having resumed the chair, Mr. HEPBURN, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House bill No. 1, and had come to no resolution thereon.

On motion of Mr. OVERSTREET (at 10 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Librarian of Congress, in relation to a library

of reference at the Capitol—to the Committee on Rules, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, recommending an additional appropriation for the Light-House Service—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, in relation to establishing depositories of public money in islands under administration of the United States—to the Committee on Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 4152) to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts by bureaus and offices of the War Department—passed the House.

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 4153) to provide for extra pay to officers and enlisted men belonging to companies and regiments of United States Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEVILLE: A bill (H. R. 4154) to provide for the purchase of a site for a public building in the city of Kearney, in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 4155) to amend section 3296 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF: A bill (H. R. 4156) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4157) fixing times when, regulating the manner in which, and declaring the character of the accounts between the United States and the several public-land States, relative to the net proceeds of the sales and other disposition of the public lands made and to be made therein by the United States, which shall hereafter be stated and certified to the Treasury Department for payment—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 4158) to refer the treaty rights of Mississippi Choctaws for adjudication—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 4159) to enable the people of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. TALBERT: A bill (H. R. 4160) to amend an act entitled "An act to credit and pay to the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia all moneys collected under the direct tax levied by act of Congress approved August 5, 1861," approved March 2, 1891—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 4161) providing for an addition to the public building at Springfield, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 4162) to appropriate the sum of $100,000 to erect a public building at Emporia, Kans.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 4163) providing for the employment of letter carriers at every post-office which produced a gross revenue for the preceding fiscal year of not less than $1,900—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. KITCHIN: A bill (H. R. 4164) to amend the war-revenue act reducing the tax on tobacco, and requiring telegraph companies to pay the stamp tax on messages and dispatches—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPALDING: A bill (H. R. 4165) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Grand Forks, N. Dak.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4166) providing for the selection of the lands within Fort Pembina Military Reservation, N. Dak., by the State of North Dakota—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4167) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Red River of the North at Drayton, N. Dak.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARNEY: A bill (H. R. 4168) for the erection of a public building at Waukesha, Wis.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 4169) to provide for the time and place of holding the terms of the United States circuit and district courts in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 4170) for the erection of a post-office building at Athens, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TALBERT: A bill (H. R. 4305) to provide for the erection of a monument to the memory of Travis, Bonham, Bowie, and Butler for gallantry and heroism during the Mexican war—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 4337) extending the homestead laws to soldiers of the Spanish war and in the Philippines—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 77) to provide for pay to certain retired officers of the Marine Corps—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 78) to amend the Constitution of the United States in relation to income and succession taxes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 79) to declare our policy in the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: A resolution (H. Res. 42) authorizing the Committee on Naval Affairs to appoint an assistant clerk during the Fifty-sixth Congress—to the Committee on Accounts.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 43) authorizing the Committee on Naval Affairs to have printed and bound such papers and documents as are necessary during the Fifty-sixth Congress—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: A resolution (H. Res. 44) concerning our relations with the Philippine Islands, and especially with Sulu and its so-called Sultan—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GLYNN: A resolution (H. Res. 45) paying tribute to the memory of Prof. Joseph Henry, deceased, in honor of the centennial of his birth, on account of his discoveries leading to the invention of the telegraph, his services as the first secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and his work for twenty years as Chairman of the United States Government Light-House Board—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona: A memorial of the legislature of the Territory of Arizona, relating to the feasibility of building a dam across the Gila River at Buttes, in Arizona—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the Territory of Arizona, praying that Arizona Territory be speedily admitted to statehood—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the Territory of Arizona, favoring an increase in the salary provided and paid to members of the legislative assembly—to the Committee on the Territories.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 4171) granting a pension to Mrs. Kate J. Krepps, of West Brownsville, Washington County, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4172) to correct the military record of Allen Hyatt, of Connellsville, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 4173) referring the claim of William H. Diamond, of Chester, Pa., for damages for personal injuries sustained, to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 4174) for the relief of Thomas J. Powell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARBER: A bill (H. R. 4175) granting a pension to Catharine Bowden—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BAKER: A bill (H. R. 4176) for relief of James H. Andrews—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARNEY: A bill (H. R. 4177) to correct the military record of William Elkert—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 4178) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Brady, of Yates Center, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRENNER: A bill (H. R. 4179) granting a pension to Henry B. Lambe—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COONEY: A bill (H. R. 4180) granting an increase of pension to A. J. Pickett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4181) to grant William Fitch a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4182) to pension Daniel L. Mallicoat—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4183) to remove charge of desertion from service record of John B. Ackerson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4184) to correct the service record of Joseph Baier—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CROWLEY: A bill (H. R. 4185) granting increase of pension to Russian Blair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4186) granting a pension to Melvina Buckler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4187) granting pension to the heirs of James F. Cassatt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4188) granting a pension to Mary A. Dickson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4189) granting a pension to Emma M. Elliott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4190) to increase Elizabeth A. Swan's pension to $17 per month, as widow of Thomas C. Swan, second lieutenant Company K, One hundred and twenty-ninth Indiana Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4191) to pension Sarah E. Haynes, widow of William Haynes, Company G, Seventy-third Ohio, of East Prairie, Mo., formerly Paris, Ill.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4192) to pension James Foltz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4193) to pension Levi C. Mann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4194) granting a pension to John W. Spiers, an army nurse, and so forth, at $12 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4195) to increase the pension of Harrison Kilburn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4196) granting increase of pension to Pleasant Umfleet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4197) to remove charge of desertion of William Martin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4198) to grant a pension to Susan Jane Brewer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4199) granting increase of pension to Gabriel M. Funk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 4200) to increase the pension of Shelton Flaningam—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4201) for the relief of Ira C. McClenthen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHICKERING: A bill (H. R. 4202) to correct the relative rank of Edson A. Lewis, captain, Eighteenth Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 4203) to increase the pension of Alexander G. Hunt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4204) to correct the military record of George A. Winslow—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 4205) granting a pension to Daniel W. Boutwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4206) granting pension to Mary A. Wampler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4207) for the relief of George W. Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4208) granting a pension to Joseph Fipps—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4209) granting a pension to Thomas B. Roark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4210) for the relief of Charles H. Wilson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4211) granting a pension to Rosa L. Couch, of Leavenworth, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4212) granting a pension to J. W. Phillips—to the Committee on Pensions..

Also, a bill (H. R. 4213) granting pension to Josiah C. Ury—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4214) for the relief of Peter D. Staats—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4215) for the relief of James Gillice—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4216) for the relief of John W. Stevens—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4217) granting an increase of pension to Michael Diguon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4218) granting a pension to Anna King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4219) for the relief of Horace L. Dunlap—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4220) for the relief of Norman C. Webster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4221) for the relief of W. H. Fisher—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4222) granting a pension of $50 per month to Hester A. Hanback—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4223) for the relief of Thomas F. Cook—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4224) granting a pension to Betty Elmore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4225) for the relief of Rosa L. Couch—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FREER: A bill (H. R. 4226) for the relief of James Crosson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4227) for the relief of John Parsons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4228) for the relief of John Francis, Point Pleasant, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4229) to grant an honorable discharge to Lewis Goodrich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 4230) to grant a pension to Charles Farmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4231) to grant a pension to Maechel Ryan, alias Kennedy, Company F, One hundred and eighty-seventh New York Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4232) to increase the pension of Phillip Volkner, Company C, Twenty-ninth Michigan Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4233) for the relief of Emma M. Deal—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4234) to amend the record of Ludwig C. Huebner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4235) for the relief of William Dumond—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4236) for the relief of Sarah J. Winas—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4237) for the relief of Erasmus O. Loukes, Company I, Sixteenth New York Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILL: A bill (H. R. 4238) to correct the military record of Clinton C. Harris—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4239) for the relief of Jonathan Milburn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4240) for the relief of Mary E. V. Jones, widow of Col. James A. Jones, Twenty-fifth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4241) granting a pension to Alverdie Rush—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4242) granting a pension to William W. Mansfield, late Company B, Thirteenth Ohio Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 4243) for the relief of Martha Strickland, widow of William Strickland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 4244) for the relief of John T. Heffernan—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4245) for the relief of J. J. L. Peel—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KLUTTZ (by request): A bill (H. R. 4246) for relief of John W. Gray—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 4247) granting a pension to Francis S. Wolfe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LYBRAND: A bill (H. R. 4248) granting a pension to Benjamin Meredith, Company B, One hundred and thirty-second Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4249) granting increase of pension to Richard Milliner, Company F, Fifty-fourth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4250) granting increase of pension to Show Hinebaugh, Company G, Eighty-second Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4251) granting a pension to William R. Hughes, late captain Company E, Twenty-third Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 4252) granting a pension to Rosabelle McAuthur—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4253) granting a pension to Mary F. Wollard—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4254) for the relief of Jane Womack—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4255) for the relief of the trustees of Enon Baptist Church, Chesterfield County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4256) for the relief of the estate of William B. Todd, deceased—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4257) for the relief of Mary S. Graves—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. METCALF: A bill (H. R. 4258) referring the claim of Robert W. Dunbar to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4259) for the relief of William R. Wheaton and Charles H. Chamberlain, of California—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4260) for the relief of Arthur L. Fish, of California—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4261) for the relief of J. W. Leigh, of California—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4262) granting a pension to Catherine E. Lane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4263) granting an increase of pension to Cook Burk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4264) granting an increase of pension to Richard Hembree—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4265) granting an increase of pension to James Gowan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4266) for the relief of Jacob McMillen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEVILLE: A bill (H. R. 4267) granting an increase of pension to Ezra A. Bennett, of Basin, in the State of Nebraska—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4268) granting a pension to William C. Couch, of Sidney, in the State of Nebraska—to the Committe on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 4269) for the relief of Louis I. Seymour—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4270) granting a pension to Martin V. B. Cartwright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4271) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Sperry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 4272) for the relief of Mrs. L. E. Adams, heir at law of R. J. Edelin, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4273) for the relief of W. L. B. Wheeler, of Prince William County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4274) for relief of W. W. Derry, of Loudoun County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 4275) for the relief of the Atlantic Works, of Boston, Mass.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 4276) granting a pension to John R. Eggeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4277) granting a pension to George W. Mower—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4278) granting an increase of pension to William W. Minturn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4279) granting a pension to Sarah A. Morrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4280) granting an increase of pension to Henry O. Briggs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4281) granting an increase of pension to Stephen P. Choate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4282) granting a pension to Freddie Gassmeier, dependent son of Martin Gassmeier, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4283) granting a pension to Huldah A. Bowen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4284) granting a pension to Persis Barnard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4285) granting a pension to Hila Ann Connor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4286) granting an increase of pension to Andrew F. Dinsmore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4287) to correct the military record of Henry Berry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4288) to correct the military record of John Bishop—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4289) to correct the military record of Harrison Ferguson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4290) to correct the military record of Wesley B. Coon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4291) to correct the military record of Richard H. Marsh—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4292) for the relief of Clark G. Russell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4293) to correct the military record of Lewis F. Morgan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4294) to amend the military record of Capt. A. M. Dobbelacre—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4295) for the relief of Abraham D. Cudney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4296) to correct the military record of William Cooper—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 4297) for the relief of Cynthia A. Wood, as executrix, and Charles S. Wood, as executor, of the last will and testament of Charles Squire Wood, deceased, late of the city of New York—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 4298) granting an increase of pension to John M. McCord—to the Committee on Invalid pensions.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 4299) to correct the military record of Reese P. Peoples—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4300) granting a pension to Jerusha Sturgis, widow of Brig. Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4301) for the rellef of Jeremiah Sullivan from the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4302) for the relief of Lieut. Col. Edward Simonton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPALDING: A bill (H. R. 4303) for the relief of the heirs of Aaron Van Camp and Virginius P. Chapin—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOMPKINS: A bill (H. R. 4304) to reimburse John Waller, postmaster at Monticello, N. Y., for moneys expended in carrying the mail—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 4306) for the relief of Leroy B. Wilkins, of Scott County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4307) for the relief of John F. Byars, of Newton County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4308) for the relief of Margaret Champion, of Scott County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4309) for the relief of David K. Patterson, of Scott County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4310) for relief of estate of Samuel Heard, of Scott County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4311) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Phœnix, Yazoo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4312) for the relief of Franklin Sessions—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4313) for the relief of Mrs. Susan Davis, of Mississippi—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4314) for the relief of estate of P. M. M. Alexander, of Holmes County, Miss.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4315) for the relief of the estate of J. J. Galtney, deceased, late of Yazoo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4316) for the relief of Caroline V. English—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4317) for the relief of H. J. Thornton, of Scott County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also a bill (H. R. 4318) for relief of Daniel S. Miller, of Jasper County, Miss.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4319) for the relief of John D. Ryan, of Meridian, Miss.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4320) for relief of Samuel Whitman, sr., of Enterprise, Clarke County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4321) for relief of estate of John Dear, deceased, of Attala County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4322) for relief of John L. McClendon—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 4323) for the relief of Eugenia A. Stone—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4324) for the relief of George W. Croft and others—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WATERS: A bill (H. R. 4325) granting a pension to Mary A. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4326) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Dodge—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4327) for the relief of David R. Watson, alias John R. Williams, alias Francis Williams—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4328) to grant a pension to Alfred Stokes, late a guide for General Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4329) to grant a pension to Mrs. Jemima Mills, widow of Richard Mills, a soldier in the Indian wars of 1836—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4330) to grant a pension to Demple Thurman, the blind and afflicted daughter of John Thurman, deceased, a pensioner and veteran of the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4331) to grant a pension to Isaac Gibson, late a major, Sixth Illinois Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 4332) to remove charge of desertion against Theodore F. Looker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BABCOCK (by request): A bill (H. R. 4333) for the relief of William C. Dodge—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4334) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Snyder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4335) granting a pension to Sarah Robinson, guardian of William H. Edmonds, helpless and idiotic minor of Joseph C. Edmonds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 4336) for the relief of Sarah E. McCaleb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4338) for the relief of Hyland C. Kirk and others, assignees of Addison C. Fletcher—to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BELLAMY: Petition of the heirs of Jacob Watkins, of Richmond County, N. C., praying for reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the heirs of Henry Clarke, of Richmond County, N. C., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the heirs of James McPherson, of Richmond County, N. C., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the heirs of George W. Cole, of Richmond County, N. C., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CROWLEY: Papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Pleasant Umfleet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for an increase of pension to Gabriel M. Funk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers in support of House bill for the relief of Susan Jane Brewer—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS: Petitions of William Wallis and others, Hunter Neill and others, J. D. Cawthon and others, and R. C. Miller and others, of the State of Kansas, favoring a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBLE: Petition of the State Dairymen and Butter Makers' Association of South Dakota, favoring the passage of a law taxing colored oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Letter of Jos. L. Friedman, secretary of the Cigar Leaf Tobacco Board of Trade of the United States, urging the passage of a bill in the interest of the leaf-tobacco industry—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HITT: Papers to accompany House bill No. 440, for the relief of Moses M. Longley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 4067, to correct the military record of Patrick Cassidy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Sarah E. McCaleb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Jeremiah Lockwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill to increase the pension of James Gowan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to William Burch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Richard Hembree—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Papers to accompany House bill No. 2204, for the relief of William O. Eagle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIXEY: Paper to accompany House bill relating to the claim of W. W. Derry—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Mrs. Eugenia A. Stone—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of G. W. Croft—to the Committee on War Claims.

Petitions, etc., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah were laid on the Clerk's desk and severally referred to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case, as follows:

By Mr. BAKER: Petitions of the Wilmington Methodist Episcopal Conference and numerous citizens of the Second Congressional district of Maryland.

By Mr. BROSIUS: Petition of citizens of Columbia, Lancaster County, Pa.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petitions of the Christian Endeavor societies of New London and of Chester County Methodist Episcopal Church, of Spring City, and others.

By Mr. CURTIS: Petitions of S. A. Johnson, W. H. Doole, C. H. Wareham, Mrs. J. D. Hewitt, and many other citizens of Kansas.

By Mr. CRAWFORD: Petition of James Wild and other citizens of the Ninth Congressional district of North Carolina.

By Mr. DOVENER: Petition of J. P. Berry and 198 citizens of Braxton County, W. Va.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania: Petition of Olivet Presbyterian Church, of Reading, Pa.

By Mr. HALL: Petitions of M. M. George, C. S. Smith, J. B. Kast, J. C. Young, William Laurie, G. A. Smith, R. M. Foster, H. F. Means, Mrs. R. C. Wright, and others, and resolution of the Presbytery of Northumberland, all in the State of Pennsylvania.

By Mr. HULL: Petition of L. H. Pammel, Fred Stevens, and others of the Seventh Congressional district of Iowa.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: Petition of the Christian Church of Pomeroy, Wash.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of Rev. W. H. Keyer and numerous other citizens of Fremont, Ind.

By Mr. SMALL: Petitions of A. G. Cox and 50 citizens of Pitt County; George T. Simmons and 23 citizens of Beaufort County, N. C.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *December 15, 1899.*

Prayer by Rev. LUCIEN CLARK, D. D., of the city of Washington.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings; when, on motion of Mr. GALLINGER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal, without objection, will stand approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution of the Senate authorizing the Secretary of War to print, in excess of 1,000 copies authorized by the act of January 12, 1895, 5,000 copies of the annual report of Maj. Gen. E. S. Otis, United States Volunteers, commanding the Department of the Pacific and Eighth Army Corps and military governor in the Philippines, dated August 31, 1899.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4152) to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts by bureaus and offices of the War Department; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 80) to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1899, on the 19th day of said month; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. HALE. There evidently would be no quorum of the Senate present to-morrow, and I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PERKINS presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal., remonstrating against any reduction of the tariff on citrus fruits; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Fresno, Cal., remonstrating against any reduction in the tariff by proposed treaties or otherwise on California products; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Sierra Club, of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the adoption of a system for the leasing of portions of the public domain in the interests of water conservation and supply; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. MCMILLAN presented the petition of John B. Penfield and sundry other citizens of Vicksburg, Mich., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BAKER presented the petition of S. R. Shepherd and sundry other citizens of Leavenworth, Kans., praying that Mary Irene Rosenthal, of that city, be granted an increase of pension of $20 per month; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GEAR presented a petition of sundry letter carriers of Burlington, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation regulating the salaries of letter carriers; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. FRYE presented the petition of M. F. Sturtevant and 27 other citizens of Maine, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RETURN OF CANNON, BANNERS, ETC., TO MEXICO.

Mr. TELLER presented a petition of the legislature of Colorado, praying for the return to the Republic of Mexico of cannon, banners, and other trophies captured by the United States forces during the war between the United States and Mexico; which

was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint memorial No. 1.—By Senator Basela.

The general assembly of the State of Colorado to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled; to the honorable the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the general assembly of the State of Colorado, respectfully represent that, by reason of their geographical proximity, their topographical similarity, and their historical origin in common with the Republic of Mexico, the attention of your memorialists has been especially called to the extent and character of our sister Republic and the relation of the United States toward her people and their sentiments.

That interesting people occupy a region having a common border line with the United States extending over 2,000 miles, a region replete with history that seems to fill all the epochs since the cradle ages, with a marked and wonderful variety of vegetable products, the most extensive mineral output, and a vast commerce in domestic animals. These, with a government quite similar to our own, with a development on lines of higher civilization parallel with our own, can not but excite in our breasts a lively, honorable, and sympathetic interest.

Late statistics show that the Republic of Mexico received during her last fiscal year imports to the value of $42,294,095, of which more than one-half, or $22,365,830, came from the United States. They exported during the same year a total value of $111,346,494, of which $86,742,951 came to the United States, most of which, outside the precious metals, being of a character not infringing on our manufactured productions.

Citizens of the United States have investments in Mexico divided among railroads, smelting, herding, rubber and coffee plantations, and other fixed values, a sum approximating $300,000,000.

For more than three hundred years Mexico was under the dominion of Spain. In 1821, following the line of most colonies on this hemisphere, she declared her independence and shed her blood that liberty might approach the minimum degrees of latitude and settle its benign influences over her vast dominion. Under liberty and free government since Juarez, Mexico has not attempted the portals of the future with the blood-rusted key of the past, but with her educational, religious, and internal improvement systems abreast with the present, she is unlocking her future, under the administration of President Diaz, by engendering a policy in harmony with the most advanced lines of civilization. No doubt that the example set by our forefathers in resisting the tyranny of Great Britain was the spark that inspired the Mexican patriots to throw off the yoke of Spain, and, later, that spark still burning on her altars, caused her to resist the attempt to erect an alien and hostile dynasty within her borders. And who will deny that the sentiment of patriotism was the potency of her arms in resisting the aggression of the United States in our war with that sister Republic?

Time has smoothed the ruffles of that strife, and forgetfulness has settled forever its amenities. But time never grows old to the patriotic sentiments of a people.

In our war with our sister Republic we captured many cannon, guns, banners, and other trophies of war, many of which were captured from Spain by Mexico during her struggle for independence. They are to Mexico mementoes of the blood purchase of her liberty. To us they are mere superannuated guns and mouldering banners, in no wise needed to preserve in the hearts of our people the memory of the valor of her soldiery. Some of these mementoes are at West Point and other places, particularly the Vera Cruz, the Contreras, the Chapultepec, the Molino del Rey, and the City of Mexico. Some of these again spoke for liberty, as in the case at Greensburg, Ky., during the war for the preservation of the Union.

The late achievements of our country, our efforts in the cause of humanity, the prowess of our arms, the brilliant victories of our Navy, have lifted us to a conspicuous position, where we command at once the wonder and admiration of the world. We can afford to be magnanimous. Your memorialists believe that the return of these cannon, guns, banners, and other trophies to our sister Republic would show that generous spirit of high-planed fraternity that would excite in the people of that Republic a confidence in our friendly and peaceful intentions, kindle a lively interest in our welfare, and invoke a love for us as a people that would find root in the most arid acre of her possessions.

Your memorialists, in view of these considerations and in harmony with the sentiments they enjoin, pray your honorable bodies to provide by law, or joint resolution, that the cannon, banners, and other trophies which were captured by the United States in the conflict between this Republic and the Republic of Mexico be returned to the Mexican administration with such expression as a half century of peace may suggest.

And your memorialists will ever pray, etc.

That this memorial be enrolled and one copy be sent to the President of the United States, and one copy to each of our members in the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled.

FRANCIS CARNEY,
President of the Senate.
WILLIAM G. SMITH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
CHARLES S. THOMAS,
Governor of the State of Colorado.

HISTORY OF THE CAPITOL BUILDING.

Mr. McMILLAN. I submit a paper giving a history of the construction of the Capitol building, which is of much value at this time, when the people of the District are about to celebrate the centennial of the removal of the seat of Government to the District of Columbia. I move that the paper be printed as a document and that 200 copies, bound in cloth, be printed for the use of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Has the Senator from Michigan any idea as to what expense will be involved? Is it required that the motion shall go to the Committee on Printing?

Mr. HALE. It must be referred if the cost of printing exceeds $500.

Mr. McMILLAN. No; it does not have to go to the Committee on Printing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without any objection, the order will be made to print the paper as a document, as requested.

LIST OF PRIVATE CLAIMS.

Mr. WARREN. Yesterday I made a report on behalf of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] from the Committee on Claims. I ask that an order be made to refer the report to the Committee on Printing. The report was merely accepted yesterday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PLATT of New York introduced a bill (S. 1638) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to adjust and settle the account of James M. Willbur with the United States, and to pay said Willbur such sum of money as he may be justly and equitably entitled to; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1639) making appropriation to pay the judgment of the Court of Claims in favor of the New York Indians, and providing for distribution of same; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 1640) for the relief of John F. Barney; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1641) granting an honorable discharge to Isaac Dulhagen; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ELKINS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1642) granting a pension to N. A. Mann;
A bill (S. 1643) granting a pension to E. G. Welch;
A bill (S. 1644) granting a pension to Annie E. Eads;
A bill (S. 1645) granting a pension to David O. Carpenter;
A bill (S. 1646) granting a pension to Morgan Grimes;
A bill (S. 1647) granting a pension to John Canty;
A bill (S. 1648) granting an increase of pension to I. H. Duval;
A bill (S. 1649) granting a pension to Edgar Travis;
A bill (S. 1650) granting a pension to Charles H. Dollman; and
A bill (S. 1651) granting a pension to Bejamin F. Hall.

Mr. ELKINS introduced a bill (S. 1652) to correct the military record of William H. Neal; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1653) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Point Pleasant, W. Va.;
A bill (S. 1654) for the relief of the county court of Upshur County, W. Va.;
A bill (S. 1655) for the relief of Nathaniel Bush;
A bill (S. 1656) for the relief of Jacob W. Hudson;
A bill (S. 1657) for the relief of W. D. Catlett;
A bill (S. 1658) for the relief of Elizabeth Muhleman, widow, and the heirs at law of Samuel A. Muhleman, deceased;
A bill (S. 1659) for the relief of the executor of William Dillon, deceased;
A bill (S. 1660) for the relief of the board of education of Bolivar district, of Jefferson County, W. Va.;
A bill (S. 1661) for the relief of George W. Graham (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 1662) for the relief of G. W. Ratleff.

Mr. ELKINS introduced a bill (S. 1663) making appropriation to aid in the purchase of land and the erection of a monument in commemoration of the battle of Point Pleasant, W. Va., fought in the year 1774; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1664) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Bluefield, in the State of West Virginia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1665) authorizing the President of the United States to nominate Lieut. Commander R. M. G. Brown, now on the retired list, to be a commander on the retired list; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1666) to remove charge of desertion from John Lyons; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1667) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Hall; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CAFFERY introduced a bill (S. 1668) for the relief of Mitchell F. Jamar; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1669) granting a pension to Jane M. Anderson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 1670) granting a pension to Ellen S. Witter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1671) for the relief of Mrs. Louisa Mitchell Smith; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 1672) granting a pension to Susie Gilbert; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 1673) to grant an honorable discharge from the military service to Charles H. Hawley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SPOONER introduced a bill (S. 1674) removing the bar of the statute of limitations from actions and claims by any of the States of the Union for reimbursement under the act of July 27, 1861, and the joint resolution of March 8, 1862, and any acts supplementary thereto; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SULLIVAN introduced a bill (S. 1675) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Sarah T. Jarratt, or her legal representatives; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1676) for the payment of certain claims; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. TELLER. This is a bill which contains the report of the Committee on Claims in the last Congress. The bill was not passed at the last session owing to the disagreement in conference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Chair understand the Senator from Colorado to report the bill or is it the introduction of a bill?

Mr. TELLER. It is the introduction of a bill which is a part of the omnibus claims bill. It contains the bill the Senate passed and which the House conferees would not consent to. There are no new claims embodied in it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1677) to declare the jurisdiction of circuit courts of the United States in certain cases; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1678) to define judicial circuits; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1679) to provide for the allotment of lands to Indians without changing their tribal relations, and to authorize the leasing of Indian lands in certain cases; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1680) to regulate the shipment of wild game from one State to another; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

A bill (S. 1681) for the relief of Thomas Rosbrugh;

A bill (S. 1682) to grant a tract of land in the district of Alaska to the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church; and

A bill (S. 1683) to aid the State of Colorado to support a school of mines.

Mr. TELLER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1684) to increase the pension of Graham McClossen;

A bill (S. 1685) granting an increase of pension to Antoinette A. Strong;

A bill (S. 1686) granting a pension to Daniel L. Tracy;

A bill (S. 1687) granting a pension to Henry Wagner;

A bill (S. 1688) granting a pension to Maria L. Meserve;

A bill (S. 1689) granting a pension to Elliott H. Benton;

A bill (S. 1690) granting a pension to Robert N. Pollock;

A bill (S. 1691) granting a pension to T. R. Le Tellier;

A bill (S. 1692) granting a pension to A. S. Elwood;

A bill (S. 1693) granting an increase of pension to Richard A. Cornell;

A bill (S. 1694) granting an increase of pension to George W. Blake;

A bill (S. 1695) granting an increase of pension to Edward L. Berthoud;

A bill (S. 1696) directing the Secretary of the Interior to pay to Andrew Bevins Read, administrator of the estate of Phineas W. Read, deceased, the accrued pension on certificate No. 183178;

A bill (S. 1697) granting a pension to John F. Kline; and

A bill (S. 1698) for the relief of Henry Hegwer.

Mr. TELLER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 1699) for the relief of Elias Gilbert;

A bill (S. 1700) for the relief of James Broiles;

A bill (S. 1701) to correct the military record of Capt. Jesse W. Peabody;

A bill (S. 1702) for the relief of Charles F. Leimer;

A bill (S. 1703) to establish a council of ordnance; and

A bill (S. 1704) for the relief of James C. Howard.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1705) for the relief of Samuel Tomlinson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1706) for the reference of certain claims against the Government of the United States to the Court of Claims; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 1707) for the relief of George W. McCray; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. McMILLAN (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1708) to confirm title to lot 1, in square 1113, in Washington, D. C.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. FOSTER introduced a bill (S. 1709) extending homestead laws to soldiers of the Spanish war and in the Philippines; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 1710) for the relief of Alphonso M. Potvin; which was read twice by its title, and, with an accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1711) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Green (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1712) granting a pension to Arminda D. Davis (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1713) granting an increase of pension to Alice S. Jordan.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1714) for the relief of Peter Mariann from the charge of desertion; which was read twice by its title, and, with an accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1715) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Maria N. Flint; which was read twice by its title, and, with an accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 1716) to amend section 1225 of Revised Statutes so as to provide for detail of active or retired officers of the Army and Navy to assist in military instructions in public schools; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1717) for the relief of George H. White; which was read twice by its title, and, with an accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1718) for the relief of William and James Crooks, of Canada; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GEAR introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1719) granting a pension to Michael W. Mitchel;

A bill (S. 1720) granting a pension to Elvina F. Hayes;

A bill (S. 1721) granting an increase of pension to Amos H. Goodnow; and

A bill (S. 1722) granting a pension to Bertha Leavey.

Mr. GEAR introduced a bill (S. 1723) to remove the charge of desertion against William F. Barrett, alias Frank Barrett; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1724) to reimburse the legal heirs of the late John George Bauer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a bill (S. 1725) to reopen and readjust the accounts of certain registers and receivers of the United States land offices, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. BAKER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1726) granting an increase of pension to E. Bierer;

A bill (S. 1727) granting a pension to Jane Dykes;

A bill (S. 1728) granting an increase of pension to E. P. Stearns (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1729) granting an increase of pension to Oliver J. Lyon;

A bill (S. 1730) granting an increase of pension to Oliver S. Coffin;

A bill (S. 1731) granting an increase of pension to William A. Williford (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1732) granting a pension to George W. Perry (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1733) granting a pension to Louisiana H. Delahay;

A bill (S. 1734) granting a pension to Mary S. Belding;

A bill (S. 1735) granting a pension to Oscar Reed; and

A bill (S. 1736) granting an increase of pension to Mary Irene Rosenthal.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 1737) for the relief of William A. Grogan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1738) for the relief of Stalnaker Marteney; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McCOMAS introduced a bill (S. 1739) to authorize the President to retire the chief instructor of swordsmanship at the Naval Academy at the age of 62 years, on the pay of a lieutenant of the junior class; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 1740) to authorize C. E. Marr and E. H. Pierce to accept silver watches awarded to them by the government of the Dominion of Canada in recognition of their services in rescuing British sailors; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1741) granting a pension to Clara L. Harriman; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

MOBILE MARINE DOCK COMPANY.

Mr. PETTUS submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the claim of the Mobile Marine Dock Company against the United States for compensation for property taken or damaged and for use of property during the war of the rebellion, referred to in Senate bill No. 285, be, and is hereby, under the provisions of section 14 of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1887, entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," referred to the Court of Claims for ascertainment and report to the Senate of the facts on the following points, with any other facts pertinent and material to said claim:

1. Nature and extent of control exercised and use made of property of the Mobile Marine Dock Company, at Mobile, Ala., by the Quartermaster's Department of the United States Army during the war of the rebellion and the period during which the same was done or had.

2. At the rates in effect at the dock of the Mobile Marine Dock Company at the time when control of the same was first taken by said Quartermaster's Department, charged by said company for like services to vessels of private owners, the amount of compensation due for (1) docking at said dock, done during the period of the control of the same by said Quartermaster's Department and under orders of the same, of vessels, including vessels belonging to the Navy of the United States, vessels permanently or temporarily in the military service of the United States, and any and all other vessels; (2) use of said dock had for and in the repairing of such vessels during such period by or under orders of such department, and (3) use had by or under orders of said department during said period, in and about the repairing of vessels not docked at said dock, of machinery, tools, and other appliances appertaining to said dock.

3. The value at that time of all lumber and other materials and supplies furnished by the Mobile Marine Dock Company during said period to said Quartermaster's Department for use in and about repairs to vessels; the amount of compensation due at rates then current at Mobile, Ala., for dressing and other preparation of lumber or other materials done at the sawmill and shops and yard of the Mobile Marine Dock Company for or under orders of said Quartermaster's Department not embraced in the estimated value of lumber and other materials and supplies furnished; and the amount of the value of tools and other appliances of the Mobile Marine Dock Company taken during said period by or under orders of said Quartermaster's Department and applied to uses of the United States Army and never returned to the Mobile Marine Dock Company.

4. The value of the use during said period had by said Quartermaster's Department of the work shed, smithy, warehouse, and office and ship yard of the Mobile Marine Dock Company, as distinct from the compensation due for the dockage and use of dock and appliances referred to in the second item above.

5. Cost, including value of materials, of repairs made by the Mobile Marine Dock Company, upon the abandonment of control of its said property by said Quartermaster's Department, of injuries done to said dock by the use of the same made under orders of said Quartermaster's Department during said period.

COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth rules may be suspended, and that the order I send to the desk in regard to the standing and select committees of the Senate may be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island asks unanimous consent that Rules XXIV and XXV may be suspended and that the order introduced by him may receive present consideration. The Chair hears no objection, and the Secretary will read the order.

The order was read, and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That the following, commencing with December 16, 1899, shall constitute the standing and select committees of the Senate for the Fifty-sixth Congress:

STANDING COMMITTEES.

On Agriculture and Forestry.—Mr. Proctor (chairman), Mr. Hansbrough, Mr. Warren, Mr. Gear, Mr. Foster, Mr. Bate, Mr. Money, Mr. Heitfeld, Mr. Harris.

On Appropriations.—Mr. Allison (chairman), Mr. Hale, Mr. Cullom, Mr. Perkins, Mr. Sewell, Mr. Warren, Mr. Wetmore, Mr. Carter, Mr. Cockrell, Mr. Teller, Mr. Pettigrew, Mr. Berry, Mr. Tillman.

On Coast and Insular Survey.—Mr. Foster (chairman), Mr. Hawley, Mr. McMillan, Mr. Perkins, Mr. Wellington, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Berry, Mr. Clay, Mr. Culberson.

To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.—Mr. Jones of Nevada (chairman), Mr. Jones of Arkansas, Mr. Gallinger, Mr. Kean, Mr. Scott.

On the Census.—Mr. Carter (chairman), Mr. Hale, Mr. Platt of New York, Mr. Quarles, Mr. McCumber, Mr. McEnery, Mr. Lindsay, Mr. Kenney (one vacancy).

On Civil Service and Retrenchment.—Mr. Baker (chairman), Mr. Pritchard, Mr. Lodge, Mr. Elkins, Mr. Wolcott, Mr. Chilton, Mr. Kenney, Mr. Harris, Mr. Sullivan.

On Claims.—Mr. Warren (chairman), Mr. Mason, Mr. Stewart, Mr. McComas, Mr. Depew, Mr. McCumber, Mr. Kean, Mr. Teller, Mr. Martin, Mr. Rawlins, Mr. McLaurin, Mr. Taliaferro (one vacancy).

On Coast Defenses.—Mr. McBride (chairman), Mr. Hawley, Mr. Proctor, Mr. Burrows, Mr. Wellington, Mr. Penrose, Mr. Butler, Mr. Turner, Mr. McLaurin, Mr. Culberson, Mr. Taliaferro.

On Commerce.—Mr. Frye (chairman), Mr. McMillan, Mr. Elkins, Mr. Nelson, Mr. McBride, Mr. Gallinger, Mr. Penrose, Mr. Hanna, Mr. Mason, Mr. Depew, Mr. Vest, Mr. Jones of Nevada, Mr. Berry, Mr. Caffery, Mr. Turner, Mr. Martin, Mr. Clay.

On Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia.—Mr. Caffery (chairman), Mr. McLaurin, Mr. Aldrich, Mr. McMillan, Mr. Wellington.

On the District of Columbia.—Mr. McMillan (chairman), Mr. Gallinger, Mr. Hansbrough, Mr. Proctor, Mr. Pritchard, Mr. Baker, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Wellington, Mr. Martin, Mr. Kenney, Mr. Mallory, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Clark of Montana.

On Education and Labor.—Mr. Kyle (chairman), Mr. Perkins, Mr. Gear, Mr. Penrose, Mr. McComas, Mr. Caffery, Mr. Lindsay, Mr. Turley (one vacancy).

On Engrossed Bills.—Mr. Cockrell (chairman), Mr. Hoar, Mr. Ross.

On Enrolled Bills.—Mr. Sewell (chairman), Mr. Hanna, Mr. Caffery.

To Establish the University of the United States.—Mr. Wellington (chairman), Mr. Frye, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Foraker, Mr. Deboe, Mr. Jones of Arkansas, Mr. Clay, Mr. Caffery, Mr. Chilton.

To Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service.—Mr. Ross (chairman), Mr. Foraker, Mr. Hoar, Mr. Deboe (three vacancies).

On Finance.—Mr. Aldrich (chairman), Mr. Allison, Mr. Platt of Connecticut, Mr. Wolcott, Mr. Burrows, Mr. Platt of New York, Mr. Hansbrough, Mr. Spooner, Mr. Jones of Nevada, Mr. Vest, Mr. Jones of Arkansas, Mr. Daniel, Mr. Chilton.

On Fisheries.—Mr. Perkins (chairman), Mr. Proctor, Mr. Frye, Mr. Mason, Mr. Foster, Mr. Butler, Mr. Turner, Mr. Mallory (one vacancy).

On Foreign Relations.—Mr. Davis (chairman), Mr. Frye, Mr. Cullom, Mr. Lodge, Mr. Clark of Wyoming, Mr. Foraker, Mr. Wolcott, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Daniel, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Money.

On Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.—Mr. Beveridge (chairman), Mr. Kyle, Mr. Carter, Mr. McBride, Mr. Depew, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Teller, Mr. Tillman (one vacancy).

On the Geological Survey.—Mr. Elkins (chairman), Mr. Allison, Mr. Fairbanks, Mr. Kean, Mr. Money, Mr. Rawlins, Mr. Clark of Montana.

On Immigration.—Mr. Penrose (chairman), Mr. Fairbanks, Mr. Lodge, Mr. Chandler, Mr. Mason, Mr. Sewell, Mr. Rawlins, Mr. Turner, Mr. Clay, Mr. McLaurin, Mr. Sullivan.

On Improvement of the Mississippi River and its Tributaries.—Mr. Nelson (chairman), Mr. Gear, Mr. Baker, Mr. Deboe, Mr. Bate, Mr. McEnery, Mr. Sullivan.

On Indian Affairs.—Mr. Thurston (chairman), Mr. Platt of Connecticut, Mr. Shoup, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Baker, Mr. Quarles, Mr. McCumber, Mr. Kyle, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Jones of Arkansas, Mr. Pettigrew, Mr. Rawlins, Mr. McLaurin, Mr. Clark of Montana.

On Indian Depredations.—Mr. Deboe (chairman), Mr. Kyle, Mr. Shoup, Mr. McBride, Mr. Ross, Mr. Beveridge, Mr. Lindsay, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Martin, Mr. Berry, Mr. Pettus.

On Interoceanic Canals.—Mr. Morgan (chairman), Mr. Harris, Mr. Turner, Mr. Culberson, Mr. Hawley, Mr. Sewell, Mr. Platt of New York, Mr. McBride, Mr. Hanna.

On Interstate Commerce.—Mr. Cullom (chairman), Mr. Chandler, Mr. Wolcott, Mr. Aldrich, Mr. Gear, Mr. Elkins, Mr. Kean, Mr. Lindsay, Mr. Chilton, Mr. Tillman (one vacancy).

On Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.—Mr. Simon (chairman), Mr. Warren, Mr. Kyle, Mr. Thurston, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Quarles, Mr. Harris, Mr. Heitfeld, Mr. Jones of Nevada (two vacancies).

On the Judiciary.—Mr. Hoar (chairman), Mr. Platt of Connecticut, Mr. Davis, Mr. Clark of Wyoming, Mr. Thurston, Mr. Spooner, Mr. Fairbanks, Mr. Simon, Mr. Teller, Mr. Lindsay, Mr. Chilton, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Pettus.

On the Library.—Mr. Wetmore (chairman), Mr. Hansbrough, Mr. Cockrell.

On Manufactures.—Mr. Mason (chairman), Mr. Wetmore, Mr. Scott, Mr. Foster, Mr. Harris, Mr. Clay, Mr. McLaurin.

On Military Affairs.—Mr. Hawley (chairman), Mr. Proctor, Mr. Shoup, Mr. Sewell, Mr. Warren, Mr. Carter, Mr. Burrows, Mr. Bate, Mr. Cockrell, Mr. Pettus, Mr. Harris.

On Mines and Mining.—Mr. Stewart (chairman), Mr. Hanna, Mr. Simon, Mr. Clark of Wyoming, Mr. Scott, Mr. Tillman, Mr. Heitfeld, Mr. Clark of Montana (one vacancy).

On Naval Affairs.—Mr. Hale (chairman), Mr. Perkins, Mr. McMillan, Mr. Chandler, Mr. Platt of New York, Mr. Hanna, Mr. Penrose, Mr. Tillman, Mr. Martin, Mr. Butler, Mr. McEnery.

On Organization, Conduct, and Expenditures of the Executive Departments.—Mr. McComas (chairman), Mr. Wetmore, Mr. Mason, Mr. Penrose, Mr. Beveridge, Mr. Butler, Mr. Caffery, Mr. Kenney, Mr. Taliaferro.

On Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico.—Mr. Foraker (chairman), Mr. Gallinger, Mr. Perkins, Mr. Fairbanks, Mr. Nelson, Mr. McComas, Mr. Depew, Mr. Cockrell, Mr. Pettigrew, Mr. Mallory, Mr. Clark of Montana.

On Pacific Railroads.—Mr. Gear (chairman), Mr. Davis, Mr. Frye, Mr. Foraker, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Harris, Mr. Rawlins, Mr. Taliaferro.

On Patents.—Mr. Pritchard (chairman), Mr. Platt of Connecticut, Mr. Thurston, Mr. McComas, Mr. Mallory, Mr. Turley (one vacancy).

On Pensions.—Mr. Gallinger (chairman), Mr. Shoup, Mr. Baker, Mr. Pritchard, Mr. Kyle, Mr. Deboe, Mr. Quarles, Mr. McCumber, Mr. Lindsay, Mr. Kenney, Mr. Turner, Mr. Taliaferro (one vacancy).

On the Philippines.—Mr. Lodge (chairman), Mr. Allison, Mr. Hale, Mr. Davis, Mr. Proctor, Mr. McBride, Mr. Beveridge, Mr. Rawlins, Mr. Turley, Mr Culberson (one vacancy).

On Post-Offices and Post-Roads.—Mr. Wolcott (chairman), Mr. Chandler, Mr. Carter, Mr. Gear, Mr. Mason, Mr. Penrose, Mr. Elkins, Mr. Butler, Mr. Kenney, Mr. Clay, Mr. Culberson.

On Printing.—Mr. Platt of New York (chairman), Mr. Elkins, Mr. Jones of Arkansas.

On Private Land Claims.—Mr. Teller (chairman), Mr. Turley, Mr. McEnery, Mr. Hale, Mr. Platt of Connecticut, Mr. Baker, Mr. Beveridge.

On Privileges and Elections.—Mr. Chandler (chairman), Mr. Hoar, Mr. Burrows, Mr. Pritchard, Mr. McComas, Mr. Caffery, Mr. Pettus, Mr. Turley, Mr Harris.

On Public Buildings and Grounds.—Mr. Fairbanks (chairman), Mr. Warren, Mr. Wellington, Mr. Simon, Mr. Scott, Mr. Quarles, Mr. Vest, Mr. Rawlins, Mr. Money, Mr. Turner, Mr. Culberson.

On Public Health and National Quarantine.—Mr. Vest (chairman), Mr. Jones of Nevada, Mr. McEnery, Mr. Mallory (one vacancy), Mr. Gallinger, Mr. Spooner, Mr. Deboe, Mr. Depew.

On Public Lands.—Mr. Hansbrough (chairman), Mr. Carter, Mr. McBride, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Clark of Wyoming, Mr. Kean, Mr. Berry, Mr. Pettigrew, Mr. McEnery, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Heitfeld.

On Railroads.—Mr. Clark of Wyoming (chairman), Mr. Nelson, Mr. Thurston, Mr. Lodge, Mr. Hawley, Mr. Wetmore, Mr. Scott, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Pettus, Mr. Money, Mr. Clark of Montana.

On Relations with Canada.—Mr. Hanna (chairman), Mr. Hoar, Mr. Hale, Mr. Fairbanks, Mr. Cullom, Mr. Pettigrew, Mr. Tillman, Mr. Jones of Nevada, Mr. Jones of Arkansas.

On Relations with Cuba.—Mr. Platt of Connecticut (chairman), Mr. Aldrich, Mr. Cullom, Mr. Davis, Mr. McMillan, Mr. Chandler, Mr. Spooner, Mr. Teller, Mr. Money, Mr. Butler, Mr. Taliaferro.

On the Revision of the Laws of the United States.—Mr. Burrows (chairman), Mr. Pritchard, Mr. Thurston, Mr. Daniel, Mr. Mallory.

On Revolutionary Claims.—Mr. Lindsay (chairman), Mr. Bate, Mr. Deboe, Mr. Simon, Mr. Foster.

On Rules.—Mr. Spooner (chairman), Mr. Aldrich, Mr. Hoar, Mr. Elkins, Mr. Teller, Mr. Cockrell, Mr. Bacon.

On Territories.—Mr. Shoup (chairman), Mr. Sewell, Mr. Carter, Mr. Thurston, Mr. Kyle, Mr. Ross, Mr. Beveridge, Mr. Bate, Mr. Heitfeld, Mr. Mallory, Mr. Clark of Montana.

On Transportation Routes to the Seaboard.—Mr. Quarles (chairman), Mr. Clark of Wyoming, Mr. Foraker, Mr. Ross, Mr. Shoup, Mr. Turner, Mr. Pettus, Mr. Turley (one vacancy).

SELECT COMMITTEES.

To Investigate the Condition of the Potomac River Front at Washington.—Mr. Scott (chairman), Mr. Frye, Mr. Simon, Mr. Beveridge, Mr. Martin, Mr. Sullivan (one vacancy).

On Woman Suffrage.—Mr. Daniel (chairman), Mr. Berry, Mr. Hoar, Mr. Wetmore, Mr. Foster.

On Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress.—Mr. Berry (chairman), Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Cullom, Mr. Allison, Mr. Ross.

On the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians.—Mr. Bate (chairman), Mr. Teller, Mr. Platt of Connecticut, Mr. Davis, Mr. Baker.

On Transportation and Sale of Meat Products.—Mr. Pettigrew (chairman), Mr. Vest, Mr. Wolcott, Mr. McCumber, Mr. McComas.

On Industrial Expositions.—Mr. Depew (chairman), Mr. Hawley, Mr. Warren, Mr. Wellington, Mr. Proctor, Mr. Hansbrough, Mr. Lodge, Mr. Vest, Mr. Daniel, Mr. Pettigrew, Mr. Lindsay, Mr. Heitfeld, Mr. McLaurin.

On National Banks.—Mr. Kean (chairman), Mr. Burrows, Mr. Penrose, Mr. Chilton, Mr. McEnery.

To Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands.—Mr. McCumber (chairman), Mr. Simon (one vacancy).

Mr. COCKRELL. I wish to state that there are a number of vacancies left in the minority representation on these committees, some of which will be filled by a new Senator, who is expected to take his seat at no distant day, and others will be filled by those who are already here, the assignments for which the committee did not have the time to make.

Mr. ALDRICH submitted the following resolutions; which were referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committees on Interoceanic Canals, Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico, the Philippines, and the Relations with Cuba be, and they are hereby, authorized to employ clerks to be paid at the rate of $2,220 each per annum; that the Committee on Coast and Insular Survey be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ a clerk to be paid at the rate of $1,800 per annum; the above clerks to be paid from miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate until provided for by law.

Resolved, That the Committee on Industrial Expositions be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ a clerk at the rate of $1,800 per annum.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas subsequently reported, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, the foregoing resolutions without amendment; and they were considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

AFFAIRS IN SAMOA.

Mr. DAVIS submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State is requested, if not inconsistent with the public interests, to send to the Senate the report made by Hon. Bartlett Tripp, the member of the Samoan Commission on behalf of the United States of America.

GREAT PEDEE RIVER IMPROVEMENT IN SOUTH CAROLINA.

Mr. TILLMAN submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to submit a report of survey and estimate for the improvement of the Great Pedee River, South Carolina, between Cheraw and the Wilmington, Columbia and Augusta Railroad bridge.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 4152) to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts by bureaus and offices of the War Department was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PAY OF EMPLOYEES.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 80) to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1899, on the 19th day of said month was read the first time by its title.

Mr. ALLISON. That is the usual joint resolution which is passed before the holidays. I do not see any necessity to have it referred.

Mr. HALE. No; let it be passed.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be placed on its passage.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was read the second time at length and considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. HALE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After thirty-five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, December 18, 1899, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 15, 1899.

SECRETARY OF LEGATION.

Edwin V. Morgan, of New York, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at Seoul, Korea, vice William F. Sands, resigned.

GENERAL APPRAISER.

Israel F. Fischer, of New York, to be general appraiser of merchandise, to succeed F. N. Shurtleff, removed. Mr. Fischer is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

AUDITOR FOR WAR DEPARTMENT.

Frank H. Morris, of Ohio, to be Auditor for the War Department, to succeed William W. Brown, resigned. Mr. Morris is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

AUDITOR FOR NAVY DEPARTMENT.

William W. Brown, of Pennsylvania, to be Auditor for the Navy Department, to succeed Frank H. Morris, resigned. Mr. Brown is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

ASSISTANT TREASURER.

Bernard G. Farrar, of Missouri, to be assistant treasurer of the United States at St. Louis, Mo., to succeed G. H. Small, whose term of office has expired by limitation. Mr. Farrar is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

ASSAYER.

Roswell K. Colcord, of Nevada, to be assayer in charge of the mint of the United States at Carson, Nev. Designation changed from superintendent of the mint at Carson. Mr. Colcord is now serving under a temporary commission issued daring the recess of the Senate.

MEMBER OF INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION.

Albert Clarke, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Industrial Commission authorized by act of Congress approved June 18, 1898, to succeed S. N. D. North, resigned. Mr. Clarke is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

INSPECTOR OF STEAM VESSELS.

John D. Sloane, of Iowa, to be supervising inspector of steam vessels for the Fifth district, to succeed W. R. Tibbals, removed. Mr. Sloane is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

SURGEONS IN MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

P. A. Surg. Joseph J. Kinyoun, of Missouri, to be a surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Kinyoun is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

P. A. Surg. William P. McIntosh, of Maryland, to be a surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. McIntosh is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

P. A. Surg. George M. Magruder, of New York, to be a surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Magruder is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

P. A. Surg. William J. Pettus, of Virginia, to be a surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Pettus is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

P. A. Surg. Louis L. Williams, of South Carolina, to be a surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Williams is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS IN MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Asst. Surg. Hugh S. Cumming, of Virginia, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Cumming is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Asst. Surg. Joseph B. Greene, of Alabama, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Greene is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Asst. Surg. Arthur R. Thomas, of Illinois, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Thomas is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Asst. Surg. Henry W. Wicks, of Missouri, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Wicks is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

ASSISTANT SURGEONS IN MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

John W. Amesse, of Michigan, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Amesse is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Donald H. Currie, of Missouri, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Currie is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Elmer R. Edson, of Indiana, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Edson is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Carroll Fox, of Pennsylvania, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Fox is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Joseph Goldberger, of Pennsylvania, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Goldberger is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Walter W. King, of Michigan, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. King is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William A. Korn, of New Jersey, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Korn is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John M. Holt, of New York, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Holt is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Charles E. D. Lord, of Maine, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Lord is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Thomas B. McClintic, of New York, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. McClintic is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Dunlop Moore, of Pennsylvania, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Moore is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Carl Ramus, of Illinois, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Ramus is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Thomas F. Richardson, of Louisiana, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Richardson is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Joseph W. Schereschewsky, of New York, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Schereschewsky is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Halstead A. Stansfield, of California, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Stansfield is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Frank J. Thornbury, of New York, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Thornbury is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Frederick E. Trotter, of New York, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Trotter is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Charles W. Vogel, of Maryland, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Vogel is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Robert L. Wilson, of Texas, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Wilson is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Clarence W. Wille, of Pennsylvania, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Wille is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

CAPTAINS IN REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

First Lieut. George E. McConnell, of the District of Columbia, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, in place of George W. Moore, deceased. Mr. McConnell is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

First Lieut. John W. Howison, of the District of Columbia, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, in place of Morton L. Phillips, deceased. Mr. Howison is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

First Lieut. Owen S. Willey, of Louisiana, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States. Mr. Willey is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

FIRST LIEUTENANTS IN REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Second Lieut. William V. E. Jacobs, of Maryland, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States. Mr. Jacobs is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Second Lieut. James M. Moore, of Maryland, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Owen S. Willey, promoted. Mr. Moore is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Second Lieut. John E. Reinburg, of Illinois, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed John W. Howison, promoted. Mr. Reinburg is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

SECOND LIEUTENANTS IN REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Third Lieut. William E. AtLee, of New York, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed William V. E. Jacobs, promoted. Mr. AtLee is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Third Lieut. Leonard T. Cutter, of New Hampshire, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed John E. Reinburg, promoted. Mr. Cutter is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Third Lieut. James C. Hooker, of Mississippi, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed James M. Moore, promoted. Mr. Hooker is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Third Lieut. Charles Satterlee, of Connecticut, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States. Mr. Satterlee is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

THIRD LIEUTENANTS IN REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Benjamin L. Brockway, of Alabama, to be a third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed B. M. Chiswell, promoted. Mr. Brockway is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Joseph H. Crozier, of Pennsylvania, to be a third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed John Mel, promoted. Mr. Crozier is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Harold L. Hinckley, of Massachusetts, to be a third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed B. H. Camden, promoted. Mr. Hinckley is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Thomas M. Molloy, of Massachusetts, to be a third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed H. G. Hamlet, promoted. Mr. Molloy is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Henry W. Pope, of Massachusetts, to be a third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed F. C. Billard, promoted. Mr. Pope is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

CHIEF ENGINEER IN REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

First Asst. Engineer Denis F. Bowen, of New York, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States. Mr. Bowen is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

FIRST ASSISTANT ENGINEER IN REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Second Asst. Engineer Henry K. Spencer, of Wisconsin, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Denis F. Bowen, promoted. Mr. Spencer is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

SECOND ASSISTANT ENGINEER IN REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Byron A. Minor, of Wisconsin, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Henry K. Spencer, promoted. Mr. Minor is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

NAVAL OFFICER OF CUSTOMS.

John Webre, of Louisiana, to be naval officer of customs for the port of New Orleans, in the State of Louisiana, in place of Henry Demas, whose nomination was rejected by the Senate. Mr. Webre is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Charles J. Robb, of Indiana, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Michigan City, in the State of Indiana, to succeed William A. Gray, removed. Mr. Robb is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Edward Banks, of Maine, to be collector of customs for the district of York, in the State of Maine, to succeed Edward W. Baker, whose term of office has expired by limitation. Mr. Banks is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Roland Billingham, of New Jersey, to be collector of customs for the district of Burlington, in the State of New Jersey, in place of George R. Whittaker, deceased. Mr. Billingham is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John Bourne, of New York, to be collector of customs for the district of Dunkirk, in the State of New York, to succeed P. R. Bradley, removed. Mr. Bourne is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Albert R. Day, of Maine, to be collector of customs for the district of Bangor, in the State of Maine, to succeed A. L. Simpson, removed. Mr. Day is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Henry Harrison, of New York, to be collector of customs for the district of Genesee, in the State of New York, in place of M. J. Callihan, deceased. Mr. Harrison is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John A. Thornton, of Louisiana, to be collector of customs for the district of Teche, in the State of Louisiana, to succeed John H. P. Wise, removed. Mr. Thornton is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Walter C. Witherbee, of New York, to be collector of customs for the district of Champlain, in the State of New York, to succeed George S. Weed, resigned. Mr. Witherbee is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Fred W. Wight, of Maine, to be collector of customs for the district of Waldoboro, in the State of Maine, to succeed Joseph E. Moore, whose term of office has expired by limitation. Mr. Wight is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

APPRAISERS OF MERCHANDISE.

Alexander Bruce, of Ohio, to be appraiser of merchandise in the district of Cuyahoga, in the State of Ohio, to succeed Maurice Rohrheim, removed. Mr. Bruce is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Henry S. Hill, of New York, to be appraiser of merchandise in the district of Buffalo Creek, in the State of New York, to succeed Louis D. Voltz, removed. Mr. Hill is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Owen Summers, of Oregon, to be appraiser of merchandise in the district of Willamette, in the State of Oregon, to succeed R. J. Hancock, resigned. Mr. Summers is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

SPECIAL EXAMINER OF DRUGS, ETC.

Benjamin P. Ashmead, of Pennsylvania, to be special examiner of drugs, medicines, and chemicals in the district of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania, to succeed Louis A. Kelly, removed. Mr. Ashmead is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 15, 1899.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Charles M. Moses, of Maine, to be collector of customs for the district of Portland and Falmouth, in the State of Maine.

INDIAN AGENT.

Clinton T. Stranahan, of Lewiston, Idaho, to be agent for the Indians of the Nez Perces Agency, in Idaho.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

BY TRANSFER.

Second Lieut. Charles P. Faulkner, from the artillery arm to the infantry arm, March 9, 1899, with rank from July 9, 1898.

Second Lieut. Earle W. Tanner, from the artillery arm to the infantry arm, April 4, 1899, with rank from March 23, 1899.

Second Lieut. Harold P. Goodnow, from the artillery arm to the infantry arm, September 23, 1899, with rank from September 10, 1899.

Second Lieut. Percy W. Arnold, from the artillery arm to the cavalry arm, March 29, 1899, with rank from June 23, 1898.

Second Lieut. Rush S. Wells, from the artillery arm to the cavalry arm, March 29, 1899, with rank from July 9, 1898.

Second Lieut. Herbert J. Brees, from the artillery arm to the cavalry arm, March 29, 1899, with rank from July 9, 1898.

Second Lieut. Ward B. Pershing, from the artillery arm to the cavalry arm, April 3, 1899, with rank from July 9, 1898.

Second Lieut. Robert R. Wallach, from the artillery arm to the cavalry arm, March 29, 1899, with rank from July 9, 1898.

Second Lieut. George Williams, from the artillery arm to the cavalry arm, March 29, 1899, with rank from July 9, 1898.

Second Lieut. Charles S. Haight, from the artillery arm to the cavalry arm, March 29, 1899, with rank from July 9, 1898.

Second Lieut. Ben H. Dorcy, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, May 10, 1899, with rank from April 5, 1899.

Second Lieut. Clark D. Dudley, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, May 10, 1899, with rank from April 5, 1899.

Second Lieut. Hamilton Foley, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, May 10, 1899, with rank from April 10, 1899.

Second Lieut. Edwin A. Hickman, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, May 10, 1899, with rank from April 10, 1899.

Second Lieut. Warren W. Whitside, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, May 10, 1899, with rank from April 10, 1899.

Second Lieut. Godwin Ordway, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, May 10, 1899, with rank from April 10, 1899.

Second Lieut. Samuel A. Purviance, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, May 10, 1899, with rank from April 10, 1899.

Second Lieut. Guy Cushman, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, May 10, 1899, with rank from April 10, 1899.

Second Lieut. James D. Tilford, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, May 10, 1899, with rank from April 10, 1899.

Second Lieut. Guy S. Norvell, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, May 10, 1899, with rank from April 10, 1899.

Second Lieut. John McClintock, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, May 15, 1899, with rank from April 11, 1899.

INFANTRY ARM.

To be second lieutenants.

John McClintock, of New York, March 22, 1899.
John W. Wright, of District of Columbia, April 10, 1899.
Ralph McCoy, of Michigan, April 10, 1899.
Edwin A. Hickman, of Missouri, April 10, 1899.
James Dean Tilford, of New York, April 10, 1899.
Guy Cushman, of Missouri, April 10, 1899.
Godwin Ordway, of District of Columbia, April 10, 1899.
Samuel A. Purviance, of Pennsylvania, April 10, 1899.
Hamilton Foley, of New York, April 10, 1899.
Guy S. Norvell, of District of Columbia, April 10, 1899.
Warren W. Whitside, of District of Columbia, April 10, 1899.
Frederick R. De Funiak, jr., of Kentucky, April 10, 1899.
Grosvenor L. Townsend, of New York, April 10, 1899.
George Rutledge Armstrong, of Tennessee, April 10, 1899.
George S. Richards, jr., of New York, April 10, 1899.
James K. Parsons, of Alabama, April 10, 1899.
Nathaniel R. Chambliss, of Alabama, April 10, 1899.
Walter G. Penfield, of Connecticut, April 10, 1899.
Thomas Leverett Brewer, of Maryland, April 10, 1899.
John Fred James, of Virginia, April 10, 1899.
Reuben Smith, of Minnesota, April 10, 1899.
George E. Ball, of Michigan, April 10, 1899.
Dan Tyler Moore, of New York, April 10, 1899.
Clarence B. Smith, of South Carolina, April 10, 1899.
Russell P. Reeder, of Ohio, April 10, 1899.
Eldred Dudley Warfield, of Maryland, April 10, 1899.
Howard Campbell Price, of Pennsylvania, April 10, 1899.
Chase Doster, of Kansas, April 10, 1899.
Oliver H. Dockery, jr., of North Carolina, April 10, 1899.

John R. Thomas, jr., of Illinois, April 10, 1899.
Walter Bogardus McCaskey, of Pennsylvania, April 10, 1899.
Frank R. Lang, of Maine, April 10, 1899.
Milton Artello Elliott, jr., of Arkansas, April 10, 1899.
Robert F. McMillan, of New York, April 10, 1899.
George D. Freeman, jr., of Ohio, April 10, 1899.
William E. Hunt, of New Hampshire, April 10, 1899.
Ernest Eddy Haskell, of Massachusetts, April 10, 1899.
William Shubrick Bradford, of Delaware, April 10, 1899.
Jack Hayes, at large, April 10, 1899.
William H. Waldron, of West Virginia, April 10, 1899.
Joseph K. Partello, of Georgia, April 10, 1899.
Leon L. Roach, of Ohio, April 10, 1899.
Horace Potts Hobbs, of Pennsylvania, April 10, 1899.
Louis J. Van Schaick, of New York, April 10, 1899.
George Stanton Tiffany, of District of Columbia, April 10, 1899.
Edgar A. Myer, of New York, April 10, 1899.
Arthur Morson Shipp, of Virginia, April 10, 1899.
Joseph W. Beacham, jr., of New York, April 10, 1899.
Francis J. McConnell, of Delaware, April 10, 1899.
Rhinelander Waldo, of New York, April 10, 1899.
Richard P. Rifenberick, jr., of Ohio, April 10, 1899.
Wallace Macdonald Craigie, of Pennsylvania, April 10, 1899.
Graham Ligon Johnson, of Georgia, April 10, 1899.
Charles E. Hay, jr., of Illinois, April 10, 1899.
Walter E. Stewart, jr., of New Jersey, April 10, 1899.
Robert H. Wescott, of Wisconsin, April 10, 1899.
George W. Wallace, of Colorado, April 10, 1899.
Harry Adsit Woodruff, of New York, April 10, 1899.
Paul Hurst, of District of Columbia, April 10, 1899.
Kurtz Eppley, of New Jersey, April 10, 1899.
Edward W. Robinson, of Washington, April 10, 1899.
Israel Putnam, of New York, April 10, 1899.
Allen Parker, of Indiana, April 10, 1899.
Charles B. Stone, jr., of California, April 10, 1899.
Allen Smith, jr., of Washington, April 10, 1899.
Fred W. Hershler, of District of Columbia, April 10, 1899.
Howard Stanberry Avery, of California, April 10, 1899.
Charles Smith Foster, of North Dakota, April 10, 1899.
Neil A. Campbell, of Rhode Island, April 10, 1899.
John B. Sanford, of Vermont, April 10, 1899.
Frank B. Hawkins, of Pennsylvania, May 1, 1899.
Joseph B. Morse, of California (since deceased), May 1, 1899.
Howard Gilman Young, of Pennsylvania, May 1, 1899.
G. Arthur Hadsell, of Connecticut, May 1, 1899.
George I. Feeter, of New York, May 1, 1899.
Wait C. Johnson, of Vermont, May 1, 1899.
J. Millard Little, of Georgia, May 1, 1899.
John L. Bond, of Ohio, May 1, 1899.
Joseph S. Cecil, of Tennessee, May 1, 1899.
Edward R. Stone, of Massachusetts, May 1, 1899.
Albert R. Dillingham, of Pennsylvania, May 1, 1899.
William Richie Gibson, of Iowa, June 1, 1899.
Henry M. Bankhead, of Alabama, June 1, 1899.
Henry A. Ripley, of Michigan, June 1, 1899.
William A. Kent, of District of Columbia, June 1, 1899.
Raymond W. Hardenbergh, of Pennsylvania, June 1, 1899.
Maxwell Keyes, of Texas (since killed in action), June 1, 1899.
Walter C. Sweeney, of West Virginia, June 1, 1899.
Alfred McCalmont Wilson, of Pennsylvania, June 1, 1899.
Charles McClure, jr., of Minnesota, June 1, 1899.
Samuel Wheelan Noyes, of California, June 1, 1899.
Frederick Wilson Benteen, of Georgia, June 1, 1899.
Charles W. Weeks, of Nebraska, June 1, 1899.
Knud Knudson, of Wisconsin, June 1, 1899.
James Thornton Watson, at large, June 1, 1899.
George B. Sharon, of Nevada, June 1, 1899.
William Wallace McCammon, jr., at large, June 1, 1899.
Henry Watterson, jr., of Kentucky, June 1, 1899.
Cyrus A. Dolph, of Oregon, June 1, 1899.
Francis W. Healey, of Idaho, June 1, 1899.
Willis P. Coleman, of Louisiana, July 1, 1899.
William D. Pasco, of Florida, July 1, 1899.
Dupont B. Lyon, of Texas, July 1, 1899.
William Stanley Sinclair, of Texas, July 1, 1899.
Richmond Smith, of Wisconsin, July 1, 1899.
Charles Maurice Smith, of District of Columbia (since died of wounds received in action), July 1, 1899.
Arthur P. Watts, of Texas, July 1, 1899.
Eli Lewis Admire, of Oklahoma Territory, July 1, 1899.
Augustus Hall Bishop, of Delaware, July 1, 1899.
Austin Allen Parker, of Indiana, July 22, 1899.
William E. Mould, of Michigan, July 24, 1899.
Rhees Jackson, of Oregon, August 1, 1899.
Charles E. Kilbourne, jr., of Oregon, August 1, 1899.
Charles M. Gordon, jr., of Missouri, August 1, 1899.
Fred Van S. Chamberlain, of Illinois, August 1, 1899.
William N. Hughes, jr., of Pennsylvania, August 1, 1899.
Sylvester Bonnaffon, 3d, of Pennsylvania, August 1, 1899.
Robert C. Humber, of Georgia, August 1, 1899.
Hunter Kinzie, of California, August 1, 1899.
Paul Devereux Stockley, of New York, August 22, 1899.
George A. Cooper, of Louisiana, September 1, 1899.
Joseph C. Brady, of Missouri, September 1, 1899.
William K. Armstrong, of Alabama, September 1, 1899.
Robert S. Clark, of New York, September 1, 1899.
William O. Smith, of Missouri, September 1, 1899.
John Henry Page, jr., at large, September 1, 1899.
Parker Hitt, of Indiana, September 1, 1899.
Palmer G. Wood, jr., of California, September 1, 1899.
Paul Ward Beck, of Colorado, September 1, 1899.
John W. Norwood, of North Carolina, September 1, 1899.
Harold Dever Coburn, of Wyoming, October 5, 1899.
Robert Whitfield, of Georgia, October 5, 1899.
Allen J. Greer, of Tennessee, October 5, 1899.
Edwin E. Carroll, of Kansas, October 5, 1899.
Louis McLane Hamilton, of New York, October 5, 1899.
Harry Craig Williams, of Mississippi, October 5, 1899.
Albert B. Donworth, of Maine (late first lieutenant, Seventeenth United States Infantry), November 2, 1899.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

INFANTRY ARM.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. John W. French, Twenty-third Infantry, March 26, 1899.
Lieut. Col. Aaron S. Daggett, Twenty-fifth Infantry, March 31, 1899.
Lieut. Col. Chambers McKibbin, Twenty-first Infantry, April 1, 1899.
Lieut. Col. Emerson H. Liscum, Twenty-fourth Infantry, April 25, 1899.
Lieut. Col. Charles C. Hood, Nineteenth Infantry, May 5, 1899.
Lieut. Col. Ezra P. Ewers, Ninth Infantry, May 16, 1899.
Lieut. Col. William H. Bisbee, First Infantry, June 16, 1899.
Lieut. Col. Gilbert S. Carpenter, Seventh Infantry, June 20, 1899.
Lieut. Col. Abram A. Harbach, Third Infantry, July 19, 1899.
Lieut. Col. Daniel W. Burke (since appointed brigadier-general, United States Army), Eleventh Infantry, September 8, 1899.
Lieut. Col. George W. Davis, Fourteenth Infantry, October 19, 1899.
Lieut. Col. Jacob H. Smith, Twelfth Infantry, October 20, 1899.

To be lieutenant-colonels.

Maj. Richard I. Eskridge, Tenth Infantry, March 26, 1899.
Maj. Stephen P. Jocelyn, Nineteenth Infantry, March 31, 1899.
Maj. William H. Clapp, Eleventh Infantry, April 1, 1899.
Maj. Charles Keller, Eighteenth Infantry, April 25, 1899.
Maj. William F. Spurgin, Twenty-third Infantry, May 4, 1899.
Maj. William H. Boyle, Twenty-first Infantry, May 5, 1899.
Maj. Egbert B. Savage (since transferred to the Thirteenth Infantry and retired from active service), Eighth Infantry, May 14, 1899.
Maj. Charles A. Coolidge, Seventh Infantry, May 16, 1899.
Maj. Wilson T. Hartz, Fifteenth Infantry, May 25, 1899.
Maj. Charles A. Dempsey, Second Infantry, June 16, 1899.
Maj. William E. Dougherty, First Infantry, June 20, 1899.
Maj. Sumner H. Lincoln, Tenth Infantry, July 12, 1899.
Maj. Greenleaf A. Goodale, Twenty-third Infantry, July 19, 1899.
Maj. Cyrus S. Roberts, Seventeenth Infantry, August 14, 1899.
Maj. Henry R. Brinkerhoff, Third Infantry, September 8, 1899.
Maj. J. Milton Thompson, Twenty-fourth Infantry, October 19, 1899.
Maj. John W. Bubb, Fourth Infantry, October 20, 1899.

To be majors.

Capt. David B. Wilson, Twenty-fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Capt. Walter T. Duggan, Tenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Capt. Leon A. Matile, Fourteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Capt. Butler D. Price, Fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Capt. John G. Leefe, Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Capt. Henry H. Adams, Eighteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Capt. Owen J. Sweet, Twenty-fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Capt. Albert L. Myer, Eleventh Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Capt. Charles A. Vernon (since retired from active service), Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Capt. John W. Hannay, Third Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Capt. John J. O'Connell, First Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Capt. Samuel R. Whitall, Sixteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Capt. James Regan, Ninth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Capt. John B. Rodman, Twentieth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Capt. Harry L. Haskell, Twelfth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Capt. Daniel Cornman, Twenty-first Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Capt. Charles B. Hall, Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Capt. Joseph W. Duncan, Twenty-first Infantry, March 2, 1899.

Capt. Henry Wygant, Twenty-fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Capt. George O. Webster (since retired from active service), Fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Capt. Robert F. Bates (since retired from active service), Eighteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Capt. Frank H. Edmunds, First Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Capt. Francis W. Mansfield, Eleventh Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Capt. Frederick M. H. Kendrick, Seventh Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Capt. P. Henry Ray, Eighth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Capt. Benjamin C. Lockwood, Twenty-second Infantry, March 13, 1899.
Capt. Charles M. Rockefeller, Ninth Infantry, March 16, 1899.
Capt. Charles B. Hinton (since retired from active service), Eighteenth Infantry, March 26, 1899.
Capt. Philip Reade, Third Infantry, March 31, 1899.
Capt. John T. Van Orsdale, Seventh Infantry, April 1, 1899.
Capt. William Gerlach (since retired from active service), Third Infantry, April 25, 1899.
Capt. James A. Buchanan, Eleventh Infantry, May 4, 1899.
Capt. Joseph F. Huston, Twentieth Infantry, May 5, 1899.
Capt. Willis Wittich, Twenty-first Infantry, May 14, 1899.
Capt. William H. W. James, Twenty-fourth Infantry, May 16, 1899.
Capt. Ralph W. Hoyt, Eleventh Infantry, May 16, 1899.
Capt. George A. Cornish, Fifteenth Infantry, May 25, 1899.
Capt. John A. Baldwin, Ninth Infantry, June 2, 1899.
Capt. Charles A. Williams, Twenty-first Infantry, June 8, 1899.
Capt. Marion P. Maus, First Infantry, June 16, 1899.
Capt. Frederick A. Smith, Twelfth Infantry, June 20, 1899.
Capt. Thomas C. Woodbury, Sixteenth Infantry, July 8, 1899.
Capt. George Le R. Brown, Eleventh Infantry, July 12, 1899.
Capt. Edward B. Pratt, Twenty-third Infantry, July 19, 1899.
Capt. Calvin D. Cowles, Twenty-third Infantry, August 14, 1899.
Capt. George P. Borden, Fifth Infantry, September 8, 1899.
Capt. William B. Wheeler, Eighteenth Infantry, September 8, 1899.
Capt. Walter S. Scott, Twenty-fifth Infantry, September 8, 1899.
Capt. Cornelius Gardener, Nineteenth Infantry, September 16, 1899.
Capt. Alfred Reynolds, Twentieth Infantry, September 20, 1899.
Capt. Leven C. Allen, Sixteenth Infantry, October 10, 1899.
Capt. James E. Macklin, Eleventh Infantry, October 19, 1899.
Capt. William L. Pitcher, Eighth Infantry, October 20, 1899.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Frederick V. Krüg, Twentieth Infantry, February 27.
First Lieut. William N. Blow, jr., Fifteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Everett E. Benjamin, First Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. William J. Pardee, Twenty-fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. William M. Wright, Second Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. André W. Brewster, Ninth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Charles H. Muir, Second Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Austin H. Brown, Fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Almon L. Parmerter, Twenty-first Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Frank De W. Ramsey, Ninth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Henry P. McCain, Fourteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. William S. Biddle, jr., Fourteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. George S. Cartwright, Twenty-fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Samuel E. Smiley, Fifteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Daniel B. Devore, Twenty-third Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Beaumont B. Buck, Sixteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. William F. Martin, Fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Edward P. Lawton, Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Evan M. Johnson, jr., Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Frank McIntyre, Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Harry Freeland, Third Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. David J. Baker, jr., Twelfth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Benjamin A. Poore, Sixth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Edward W. McCaskey, Twenty-first Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Chauncey B. Baker, Seventh Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. James H. McRae, Third Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Amos B. Shattuck, Twenty-fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. William M. Swaine, Twenty-second Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Walter H. Gordon, Eighteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Armand I. Lasseigne, Fourteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. James H. Frier, Seventeenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. George J. Godfrey, Twenty-second Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Henry C. Keene, jr., Twenty-fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Frank L. Winn, Twelfth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Charles C. Ballou, Twelfth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Erneste V. Smith, Fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. George B. Duncan, Fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Lucius L. Durfee, Seventeenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Charles D. Dwyer, Third Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Julius A. Penn, Second Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Edward M. Lewis, Twentieth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Richard C. Croxton, First Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Edward N. Jones, jr., Eighth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Dwight E. Holley, Fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Arthur Johnson, Seventeenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Odon Gurovits, Eleventh Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Stephen M. Hackney, Fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. George E. French, Fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. George W. Martin, Eighteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Harry D. Humphrey, Twentieth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Harry E. Wilkins, Second Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Charles H. Martin, Fourteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. William Weigel, Eleventh Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. John C. Gregg (since killed in action), Fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Thomas G. Hanson, Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Herman Hall, Twenty-second Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Arthur B. Foster, Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Marcus D. Cronin, Twenty-fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Charles S. Farnsworth, Seventh Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Charles Gerhardt, Eighth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Samuel Seay, jr., Fourteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. James T. Dean, Fourteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Ulysses G. McAlexander, Thirteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Edson A. Lewis, Eighteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. William K. Jones, Sixth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Edmund Wittenmyer, Fifteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Michael J. Lenihan, Second Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Mark L. Hersey, Twelfth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Samuel A. Smoke, Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Frank H. Albright, Twenty-fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Frederic D. Evans, Eighteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. James Baylies, Tenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. George A. Detchmendy, First Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Earl C. Carnahan, Fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Archibald A. Cabaniss, Twenty-fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Thomas M. Moody, Twentieth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Charles E. Tayman, Twenty-fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. James W. McAndrew, Third Infantry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. John S. Grisard, Seventh Infantry, March 13, 1899.

First Lieut. Edward R. Chrisman, Sixth Infantry, March 16, 1899.
First Lieut. Peter C. Harris, Thirteenth Infantry, March 16, 1899.
First Lieut. Munroe McFarland, Thirteenth Infantry, March 26, 1899.
First Lieut. William T. Wilder, Twenty-fifth Infantry, March 31, 1899.
First Lieut. William H. Wilhelm, Fourteenth Infantry, March 31, 1899.
First Lieut. William R. Sample, Thirteenth Infantry, April 1, 1899.
First Lieut. William R. Dashiell, Twenty-fourth Infantry, April 25, 1899.
First Lieut. Eli A. Helmick, Tenth Infantry, May 4, 1899.
First Lieut. Charles G. French, Fifteenth Infantry, May 5, 1899.
First Lieut. Robert W. Rose, Seventeenth Infantry, May 14, 1899.
First Lieut. William C. Bennett, Sixth Infantry, May 16, 1899.
First Lieut. William A. Campbell, Twenty-second Infantry, May 16, 1899.
First Lieut. Frederic H. Sargent, Eighth Infantry, May 19, 1899.
First Lieut. Harold L. Jackson, Twenty-second Infantry, May 25, 1899.
First Lieut. John M. Sigworth, Ninth Infantry, June 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Percival G. Lowe, Eighteenth Infantry, June 8, 1899.
First Lieut. Wilson Chase, Twenty-second Infantry, June 8, 1899.
First Lieut. Charles B. Hagadorn, Twenty-third Infantry, June 16, 1899.
First Lieut. Harry R. Lee, Eleventh Infantry, June 20, 1899.
First Lieut. Edwin V. Bookmiller, Ninth Infantry, July 8, 1899.
First Lieut. Edward T. Winston, Nineteenth Infantry, July 11, 1899.
First Lieut. Edwin T. Cole, Fourth Infantry, July 12, 1899.
First Lieut. William A. Phillips, Second Infantry, July 15, 1899.
First Lieut. John R. M. Taylor, Twenty-third Infantry, July 17, 1899.
First Lieut. George W. Kirkman, Eighth Infantry, July 19, 1899.
First Lieut. Francis E. Lacey, jr., First Infantry, August 14, 1899.
First Lieut. Sydney A. Cloman, Fifteenth Infantry, September 7, 1899.
First Lieut. Charles Crawford, Twenty-first Infantry, September 8, 1899.
First Lieut. William S. Graves, Seventh Infantry, September 8, 1899.
First Lieut. Frank D. Webster, Twentieth Infantry, September 8, 1899.
First Lieut. Joseph D. Leitch, Twenty-fourth Infantry, September 8, 1899.
First Lieut. Samuel Burkhardt, jr., Tenth Infantry, September 16, 1899.
First Lieut. James E. Normoyle, Fifth Infantry, September 20, 1899.
First Lieut. Robert Alexander, Eleventh Infantry, October 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Frederick S. Wild, Twelfth Infantry, October 8, 1899.
First Lieut. William O. Johnson, Second Infantry, October 10, 1899.
First Lieut. James R. Lindsay, Eighth Infantry, October 11, 1899.
First Lieut. Hiram McL. Powell, First Infantry, October 19, 1899.
First Lieut. Fred W. Sladen, Fourth Infantry, October 20, 1899.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Preston Brown, Second Infantry, February 27, 1899.
Second Lieut. William D. Conrad, Twenty-third Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Thomas Franklin, Twenty-third Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. George H. Steel (since resigned), Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Paul Giddings, Third Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. George L. Byroade, Third Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Ira L. Reeves, Seventeenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Edward S. Walton, Eighteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Alfred T. Smith, Twelfth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Bert H. Merchant, Eighth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Fred L. Munson, Ninth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Thomas M. Anderson, jr., Thirteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. John E. Hunt, Twenty-fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Charles D. Roberts, Seventeenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. John K. Moore, Fifteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Claude H. Miller, Twenty-fourth Infantry, March 22, 1899.
Second Lieut. Harold B. Fiske, Eighteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. John H. Hughes, Fourth Infantry, March 3, 1899.
Second Lieut. George W. Helms, Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Rufus E. Longan, Eleventh Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Frank M. Savage, Fifteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Thomas T. Frissell, Third Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Edward A. Roche, Fifteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. William M. Fassett, Twenty-first Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Henry M. Dichmann, Seventh Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Halstead Dorey, Fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. George F. Baltzell, Fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Edgar T. Conley, Twenty-first Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Edgar T. Collins, Eighth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Seaborn G. Chiles, Eleventh Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Lyman M. Welch, Twentieth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Warren S. Barlow, Fifteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. John G. Workizer, Second Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Charles H. Bridges, Twenty-second Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. John Robertson, Sixth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. James V. Heidt, Sixth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Charles S. Lincoln, Twenty-fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Patrick H. Mullay, Fourteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Robert McCleave, Second Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Monroe C. Kerth, Twenty-third Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Charles H. Munton, Twenty-third Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Curtis W. Otwell, Seventh Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Francis K. Meade, Twenty-first Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Lambert W. Jordan, jr., First Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. William F. Nesbitt, Sixth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. James B. Gowan, Sixteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Harvey W. Miller, Thirteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Edwin D. Bricker, Seventeenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Thomas F. Maginnis, Eleventh Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. William W. Fiscus, jr., Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Daniel G. Berry, First Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Harold Hammond, Ninth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Ralph E. Ingram, Fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Robert C. Davis, Seventh Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Joseph F. Janda, Eighth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Alvan C. Read, Thirteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Ira C. Welborn, Ninth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. David E. W. Lyle, Eighteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Alexander E. Williams, Second Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Romulus F. Walton, Tenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Charles W. Exton, Twentieth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. David P. Wheeler, Twenty-third Infantry, March 2, 1899.

Second Lieut. Edgar Ridenour, Sixteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Chauncey B. Humphrey, Third Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Berkeley Enochs, Twenty-fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. William L. Murphy, Twenty-fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Robert J. Maxey, Sixth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. G. Maury Crallé, Twentieth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Joseph F. Gohn, Fourteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. James H. Bradford, jr., Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. David L. Stone, Twenty-second Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Patrick A. Connolly, Twenty-first Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Ralph A. Clay (since deceased), Thirteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. John B. Schoeffel, Ninth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Walter T. Bates, Seventeenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Englebert B. Ovenshine, Sixteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Percy M. Cochran, Seventh Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. George N. Bomford, Fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Benjamin P. Nicklin, Ninth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. John W. French, Eleventh Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Cromwell Stacey, Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. William A. Cavenaugh, Twentieth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. George M. Grimes, Twentieth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. William C. Geiger, Fourteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Thomas R. Harker, Fifteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. John F. Wilkinson, Fifteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Frank D. Wickham, Sixteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. William B. Folwell, First Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. William K. Naylor, Ninth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Bryan Conrad, Eighteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. William H. Oury, Twenty-third Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Harry A. Eaton, Eighth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Campbell King, First Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Tenney Ross, Third Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. George C. Martin, Twenty-first Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Edward E. Downes, First Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Robert O. Van Horn, Seventeenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Ezekiel J. Williams, Fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Moor N. Falls, Eighteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Edgar A. Macklin, Eleventh Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Joseph W. Glidden, Fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. John R. R. Hannay, Third Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Henry S. Wygant, Third Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. James M. Graham, Eleventh Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Joseph L. Gilbreth, Fourteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Charles F. Humphrey, jr., Seventeenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Willey Howell, Fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Benjamin J. Tillman, Seventh Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. George J. Holden, Tenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. William R. Webb (since deceased), Sixteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Harry E. Whitney (since deceased), First Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Arthur Cranston, Seventeenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Charles F. Bates, Twenty-fifth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Charles C. Todd, Third Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. John J. Toffey, jr., Sixteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Carl A. Martin, Twenty-first Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. George D. Arrowsmith, Thirteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Mark Wheeler, Fourth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. G. Soulard Turner, Eighth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. William H. Williams (since deceased), Twelfth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Watts C. Valentine, Nineteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Ivers W. Leonard, Twenty-second Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Philip E. M. Walker, Sixteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Robert W. Barnett, Twelfth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. David B. Mulliken, Sixteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Pearl M. Shaffer, Thirteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Laurence A. Curtis, Twelfth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Peyton G. Clark, Thirteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. William H. Jordan, jr., Eighteenth Infantry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Courtland Nixon, First Infantry, March 9, 1899.
Second Lieut. Augustus C. Ledyard, Second Infantry, March 13, 1899.
Second Lieut. Irving J. Carr, Seventeenth Infantry, March 16, 1899.
Second Lieut. Easton R. Gibson, Ninth Infantry, March 16, 1899.
Second Lieut. Henry C. Bonnycastle, Twentieth Infantry, March 26, 1899.
Second Lieut. Edward Croft, Nineteenth Infantry, March 31, 1899.
Second Lieut. Adolphe H. Huguet, Twenty-first Infantry, March 31, 1899.
Second Lieut. Raymond Sheldon, Seventeenth Infantry, April 1, 1899.
Second Lieut. James D. Taylor, jr., Twentieth Infantry, April 25, 1899.
Second Lieut. Frank Halstead, Fourth Infantry, May 4, 1899.
Second Lieut. Harry E. Knight, First Infantry, May 5, 1899.
Second Lieut. Campbell E. Babcock, Twelfth Infantry, May 13, 1899.
Second Lieut. Harry R. Campbell, Twenty-second Infantry, May 14, 1899.
Second Lieut. Daniel F. Keller, Twenty-fourth Infantry, May 16, 1899.
Second Lieut. Archie J. Harris, Second Infantry, May 16, 1899.
Second Lieut. Alexander J. Macnab, Twenty-third Infantry, May 19, 1899.
Second Lieut. Frank S. Burr, Third Infantry, May 25, 1899.
Second Lieut. Ward Cheney, Fourth Infantry, June 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Stanley Howland, Twenty-fourth Infantry, June 8, 1899.
Second Lieut. Ralph B. Parrott, Twenty-second Infantry, June 8, 1899.
Second Lieut. Stanley H. Ford, Sixteenth Infantry, June 16, 1899.
Second Lieut. James McD. Comer, Sixteenth Infantry, June 30, 1899.
Second Lieut. Benjamin H. Watkins, Second Infantry, June 30, 1899.
Second Lieut. Robert M. Brambila, Twenty-third Infantry, June 30, 1899.
Second Lieut. Edward A. Bumpus, Twenty-first Infantry, July 8, 1899.
Second Lieut. Louis E. Hill, Fourth Infantry, July 11, 1899.
Second Lieut. Harry F. Dalton, Ninth Infantry, July 11, 1899.
Second Lieut. John N. Straat, jr., Twenty-fifth Infantry, July 12, 1899.
Second Lieut. George De G. Catlin, Tenth Infantry, July 15, 1899.
Second Lieut. Donald McNulta, Fourteenth Infantry, July 17, 1899.
Second Lieut. Charles P. Faulkner, Fourteenth Infantry, July 19, 1899.

Second Lieut. Edward W. Perkins, Eighth Infantry, August 14, 1899.
Second Lieut. Marshall Childs, Sixth Infantry, August 19, 1899.
Second Lieut. Henry S. Wagner, Eighth Infantry, August 30, 1899.
Second Lieut. Frederick G. Knabenshue, Fourth Infantry, September 7, 1899.
Second Lieut. Archibald I. Harrison, Twenty-fifth Infantry, September 8, 1899.
Second Lieut. George H. Knox, Twentieth Infantry, September 8, 1899.
Second Lieut. Thomas J. Powers, jr., Twenty-fifth Infantry, September 8, 1899.
Second Lieut. William A. Lieber, Twenty-third Infantry, September 8, 1899.
Second Lieut. James E. Bell, Second Infantry, September 9, 1899.
Second Lieut. Charles R. Ramsay, Twenty-first Infantry, September 16, 1899.

CAVALRY ARM.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. Henry Carroll (since retired from active service), Sixth Cavalry, March 29, 1899.
Lieut. Col. Theodore A. Baldwin, Tenth Cavalry, May 6, 1899.
Lieut. Col. Adna R. Chaffee, Third Cavalry, May 8, 1899.
Lieut. Col. Michael Cooney (since retired from active service), Seventh Cavalry, June 9, 1899.
Lieut. Col. Charles D. Viele, First Cavalry, September 14, 1899.
Lieut. Col. William A. Rafferty, Second Cavalry, October 18, 1899.

To be lieutenant-colonels.

Maj. Charles S. Ilsley (since retired from active service), Ninth Cavalry, March 29, 1899.
Maj. Theodore J. Wint, Tenth Cavalry, April 8, 1899.
Maj. Francis Moore, Fifth Cavalry, May 6, 1899.
Maj. Henry W. Wessells, jr., Third Cavalry, May 8, 1899.
Maj. James N. Wheelan, Eighth Cavalry, June 9, 1899.
Maj. Edward M. Hayes, Seventh Cavalry, July 1, 1899.
Maj. Thomas C. Lebo, Sixth Cavalry, September 14, 1899.
Maj. William M. Wallace, Second Cavalry, October 18, 1899.

To be majors.

Capt. Martin B. Hughes, Ninth Cavalry, March 29, 1899.
Capt. Clarence A. Stedman, Ninth Cavalry, April 8, 1899.
Capt. Henry W. Sprole, Eighth Cavalry, May 6, 1899.
Capt. Edgar Z. Steever, Third Cavalry, May 8, 1899.
Capt. William Stanton, Sixth Cavalry, June 9, 1899.
Capt. Edward A. Godwin, Eighth Cavalry, July 1, 1899.
Capt. Frederick K. Ward, First Cavalry, July 11, 1899.
Capt. Alexander Rodgers, Eighth Cavalry, September 14, 1899.
Capt. Walter S. Schuyler, Fifth Cavalry, October 18, 1899.

To be captains.

First Lieut. John W. Heard, Third Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Stephen L'H. Slocum, Eighth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Eugene F. Ladd, Ninth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. William W. Forsyth, Sixth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. William F. Flynn, Eighth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Francis G. Irwin, jr., Second Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. John M. Neall (since dismissed), Fourth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Carter P. Johnson, Tenth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Herbert H. Sargent, Second Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Roger B. Bryan, Second Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. J. Franklin Bell, Seventh Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. William S. Scott, First Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Daniel L. Tate, Third Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. George W. Goode, First Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. John C. Waterman, Eighth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Robert J. Duff, Eighth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Godfrey H. Macdonald, First Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Matthew F. Steele, Eighth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. George H. Cameron, Fourth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Robert. D. Walsh, Fourth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. George W. Read, Fifth Cavalry, March 29, 1899.
First Lieut. James A. Cole, Sixth Cavalry, April 8, 1899.
First Lieut. De Rosey C. Cabell, Eighth Cavalry, April 23, 1899.
First Lieut. Farrand Sayre, Eighth Cavalry, May 6, 1899.
First Lieut. Hugh J. Gallagher, Sixth Cavalry, May 8, 1899.
First Lieut. Grote Hutcheson, Ninth Cavalry, June 9, 1899.
First Lieut. George O. Cress, Fourth Cavalry, July 1, 1899.
First Lieut. James B. Hughes, Tenth Cavalry, July 11, 1899.
First Lieut. Richard B. Paddock, Sixth Cavalry, July 15, 1899.
First Lieut. Robert A. Brown, Fourth Cavalry, September 14, 1899.
First Lieut. Willard A. Holbrook, Seventh Cavalry, October 18, 1899.
First Lieut. Lewis M. Koehler, Ninth Cavalry, November 7, 1899.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Edmund M. Leary, Second Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Julius T. Conrad, Third Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Howard R. Hickok, Ninth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Samuel B. Arnold, First Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Samuel McP. Rutherford, Fourth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. George W. Kirkpatrick, Eighth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Cornelius C. Smith, Second Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Joseph E. Cusack, Fifth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Walter M. Whitman, First Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Lincoln C. Andrews, Third Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. William R. Smedberg, jr., Fourth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. John M. Morgan, Eighth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Andrew E. Williams, Third Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Walter C. Babcock, Eighth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. William Yates, First Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Herbert B. Crosby, Eighth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Benjamin B. Hyer, Sixth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Mathew C. Smith, Second Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Edward B. Cassatt, Fourth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Kenzie W. Walker, Ninth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Harry H. Pattison, Third Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Edward E. Hartwick (since resigned), Ninth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Charles G. Sawtelle, jr., Second Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Francis Le J. Parker, Fifth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. George F. Hamilton, Ninth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. William H. Paine, Second Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. John W. Craig, Fifth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Hugh D. Berkeley, First Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Albert E. Saxton, Eighth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Hamilton S. Hawkins, Fourth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Frank Parker, Fifth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Thomas G. Carson, Fourth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. George Vidmer, Tenth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Casper H. Conrad, jr., Fifth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Herbert A. White, Sixth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Nathan K. Averill, Seventh Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Harry La T. Cavenaugh, Ninth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Mortimer O. Bigelow, Eighth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. William G. Sills, Second Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. August C. Nissen, Sixth Cavalry, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Clyde E. Hawkins, Third Cavalry, March 29, 1899.
Second Lieut. James S. Parker, Fourth Cavalry, April 8, 1899.
Second Lieut. Joseph S. Herron, First Cavalry, April 23, 1899.
Second Lieut. Henry B. Dixon, Tenth Cavalry, May 6, 1899.
Second Lieut. George B. Pritchard, jr., Ninth Cavalry, May 8, 1899.
Second Lieut. Alvord Van P. Anderson, Sixth Cavalry, June 9, 1899.
Second Lieut. Herman A. Sievert, Ninth Cavalry, July 1, 1899.
Second Lieut. Eugene P. Jervey, jr., Fifth Cavalry, July 11, 1899.
Second Lieut. LeRoy Eltinge, Fourth Cavalry, July 15, 1899.
Second Lieut. John B. Christian, Second Cavalry, August 31, 1899.
Second Lieut. George W. Moses, Third Cavalry, September 14, 1899.
Second Lieut. Charles E. Stodter, Ninth Cavalry, October 18, 1899.
Second Lieut. Alexander M. Miller, jr., Tenth Cavalry, November 7, 1899.

ARTILLERY ARM.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. Jacob B. Rawles, First Artillery, February 23, 1899.
Lieut. Col. William L. Haskin, Second Artillery, October 16, 1899.

Lieut. Col. Wallace F. Randolph, Third Artillery, October 17, 1899.

To be lieutenant-colonels.

Maj. David H. Kinzie, Third Artillery, February 23, 1899.
Maj. John R. Myrick, Fifth Artillery, October 16, 1899.
Maj. Edward Field, Second Artillery, October 17, 1899.

To be majors.

Capt. Abner H. Merrill, First Artillery, February 23, 1899.
Capt. William Ennis, Fourth Artillery, March 18, 1899.
Capt. George S. Grimes, Second Artillery, March 31, 1899.
Capt. John M. K. Davis, First Artillery, October 16, 1899.
Capt. Benjamin K. Roberts, Fifth Artillery, October 17, 1899.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Hamilton Rowan, Second Artillery, February 23, 1899.
First Lieut. David Price, First Artillery, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Frank S. Harlow, First Artillery, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Samuel E. Allen, Fifth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Edward H. Catlin, Second Artillery, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Walter S. Alexander, Fourth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Edward St. J. Greble, Second Artillery, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Frederick S. Strong, Fourth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Albert C. Blunt, Fifth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. William C. Rafferty, First Artillery, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. John L. Chamberlain, First Artillery, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Warren P. Newcomb, Fifth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Charles L. Phillips, Fourth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Charles J. Bailey, First Artillery, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Clarence P. Townsley, Fourth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Harvey C. Carbaugh, Fifth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. George F. Barney, Second Artillery, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. David J. Rumbough, Third Artillery, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Millard F. Harmon, First Artillery, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Adelbert Cronkhite, Fourth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Charles H. Hunter, First Artillery, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Charles G. Treat, Fifth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Stephen M. Foote, Fourth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. George W. Van Deusen, First Artillery, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. John C. W. Brooks, Fourth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. William F. Hancock, Sixth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. George T. Bartlett, Third Artillery, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Charles A. Bennett, Third Artillery, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Edward A. Millar, Sixth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Henry C. Davis, Seventh Artillery, March 15, 1899.
First Lieut. Thomas Ridgway, Fifth Artillery, March 18, 1899.
First Lieut. John W. Ruckman, Seventh Artillery, March 31, 1899.
First Lieut. William P. Stone, Seventh Artillery, April 20, 1899.
First Lieut. Ira A. Haynes, Fourth Artillery, July 10, 1899.
First Lieut. Willoughby Walke, Seventh Artillery, August 28, 1899.
First Lieut. Louis Ostheim, Sixth Artillery, October 16, 1899.
First Lieut. John Conklin, jr., Second Artillery, October 17, 1899.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Arthur W. Chase, Second Artillery, February 23, 1899.
Second Lieut. Frank W. Coe, First Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. William R. Smith, First Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Henry H. Whitney, Fourth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Samuel A. Kephart, Fourth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Louis R. Burgess, Fifth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. James A. Shipton, First Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. William Chamberlaine, First Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Charles P. Summerall, Fifth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. William M. Cruikshank, First Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Gordon G. Heiner, Fourth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. George H. McManus, Third Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Edward J. Timberlake, jr., Second Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Samuel C. Hazzard, First Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Otho W. B. Farr, Second Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. William P. Pence, Fifth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. James M. Williams, Seventh Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Edward P. O'Hern (since appointed first lieutenant in the Ordnance Department), Third Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Dwight E. Aultman, Second Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Alston Hamilton, First Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. John C. Gilmore, jr., Fourth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Rogers F. Gardner, Third Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Harry E. Smith, First Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Joseph L. Knowlton, Second Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Conway H. Arnold, jr., Fifth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Joseph Wheeler, jr., Fourth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Adrian S. Fleming, Sixth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Brooke Payne, Fifth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Harry F. Jackson, Second Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Robert E. Callan, Fifth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. William S. Guignard, Fourth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Edwin Landon, Second Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Clarence H. McNeil, Fifth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Joseph P. Tracy, Fifth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Lloyd England, Third Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. James W. Hinkley, jr., Fifth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Percy M. Kessler, Third Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Johnson Hagood, First Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. George T. Patterson, Third Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Frank K. Fergusson, First Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Robert S. Abernethy, Third Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Edwin O. Sarratt, Third Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Albert J. Bowley, Fourth Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Bertram C. Gilbert, Second Artillery, March 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Lawrence S. Miller, Fourth Artillery, March 14, 1899.
Second Lieut. Winfield S. Overton, Third Artillery, March 15, 1899.
Second Lieut. Mervyn C. Buckey, Fifth Artillery, March 18, 1899.
Second Lieut. Frederick E. Johnson, Seventh Artillery, March 26, 1899.
Second Lieut. Earle D'A. Pearce, Sixth Artillery, March 31, 1899.
Second Lieut. Arthur S. Conklin, Seventh Artillery, April 20, 1899.
Second Lieut. Benjamin F. Koehler, Sixth Artillery, July 10, 1899.
Second Lieut. James F. Brady, Seventh Artillery, August 28, 1899.
Second Lieut. Hugh La F. Applewhite, Seventh Artillery, September 19, 1899.
Second Lieut. Roderick L. Carmichael, Seventh Artillery, October 16, 1899.
Second Lieut. Harry G. Bishop, Sixth Artillery, October 17, 1899.
Second Lieut. Andrew Moses, Seventh Artillery, November 9, 1899.

QUARTERMASTER'S DEPARTMENT.

To be deputy quartermaster-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel.

Maj. Charles A. H. McCauley, quartermaster, July 13, 1899.

To be quartermaster with the rank of major.

Capt John McE. Hyde, assistant quartermaster, July 13, 1899.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

To be surgeons with the rank of major.

Capt. Marlborough C. Wyeth, assistant surgeon, June 8, 1899.
Capt. Richard W. Johnson, assistant surgeon, November 6, 1899.

PAY DEPARTMENT.

To be assistant paymasters-general with the rank of colonel.

Lieut. Col. Alfred E. Bates (since appointed Paymaster-General), deputy paymaster-general, March 31, 1899.
Lieut. Col. Charles I. Wilson, deputy paymaster-general, July 12, 1899.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

To be captain.

First Lieut. Robert McGregor, Corps of Engineers, September 29, 1899.

To be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Frederick W. Altstaetter, Corps of Engineers, September 29, 1899.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

To be colonel.

Lieut. Col. Lawrence S. Babbitt, Ordnance Department, April 7, 1899.

To be lieutenant-colonel.

Maj. James W. Reilly, Ordnance Department, April 7, 1899.

To be major.

Capt. David A. Lyle, Ordnance Department, April 7, 1899.

To be captains.

First Lieut. George W. Burr, Ordnance Department, April 7, 1899.

First Lieut. Colden L'H. Ruggles, Ordnance Department, April 29, 1899.

POSTMASTERS.

Thomas Boggess, jr., to be postmaster at Ashland, in the county of Boyd and State of Kentucky.

Colmore L. Barnes, to be postmaster at Elizabethtown, in the county of Hardin and State of Kentucky.

Coleman C. Wallace, to be postmaster at Richmond, in the county of Madison and State of Kentucky.

Ethel E. Johnson, to be postmaster at Vanceburg, in the county of Lewis and State of Kentucky.

George W. Hutcheson, to be postmaster at Lawrenceburg, in the county of Anderson and State of Kentucky.

Charles L. Gray, to be postmaster at Carterville, in the county of Jasper and State of Missouri.

Columbia Drew, to be postmaster at Appleton City, in the county of St. Clair and State of Missouri.

August Bierwirth, to be postmaster at Cape Girardeau, in the county of Cape Girardeau and State of Missouri.

James C. Robertson, to be postmaster at Mountain Grove, in the county of Wright and State of Missouri.

Charles L. Mowder, to be postmaster at Braymer, in the county of Caldwell and State of Missouri.

Benjamin C. Klusmeier, to be postmaster at La Grange, in the county of Lewis and State of Missouri.

Alfred R. N. Folger, to be postmaster at Gaffney, in the county of Cherokee and State of South Carolina.

Benjamin P. Chatfield, to be postmaster at Aiken, in the county of Aiken and State of South Carolina.

Charles L. Broy, to be postmaster at Eureka, in the county of Eureka and State of Nevada.

William M. Bray, to be postmaster at Henderson, in the county of Chester and State of Tennessee.

Joshua E. Wilson, to be postmaster at Florence, in the county of Florence and State of South Carolina.

Leonard R. Owens, to be postmaster at Marion, in the county of Marion and State of South Carolina.

David Herriott, to be postmaster at Morgan Park, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois.

Charles Meighan, to be postmaster at Ogden, in the county of Weber and State of Utah.

William O. Douglas, to be postmaster at Jellico, in the county of Campbell and State of Tennessee.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *December 15, 1899.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

FINANCIAL BILL.

The SPEAKER. In pursuance of the order, the House will resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill No. 1, and the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. HEPBURN, will please take the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill No. 1, the financial bill, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] is recognized.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the banking and bondholding interests of this country, those mighty and potential influences which have for so many years dominated the Congress of the United States and dictated the financial policy of this Government, have decreed that the bill now under consideration shall pass this House without amendment and without change. This bill, Mr. Chairman, is not dissimilar in its main and essential features to that which was reported to this House in the Fifty-fifth Congress from the Committee on Banking and Currency. That bill, like this, was intended to provide by statutory enactment for a single gold standard of value; to make every interest-bearing obligation payable in gold; to retire from circulation and impound in the Treasury every dollar of the United States notes, commonly called "greenbacks," and to confer upon the national banks enormous privileges and powers hitherto not enjoyed by them; in effect, to give to the national banks absolute and supreme control of the paper currency of the United States.

In other words, if this bill becomes a law, it will establish by legal enactment the single gold standard, make the gold dollar the unit of value, retire from the channels of trade and commerce $346,000,000 of United States notes, which President Garfield declared, in his letter accepting the Republican Presidential nomination, to be as "national as the flag" and "equal to coin," and which from that day to this have been universally regarded as the best paper money the world has ever seen. It carries out the Republican policy of taking the Government out of the banking business and puts the national banks into the Government business with a vengeance. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

It may be worth while to recall some of the legislation of the Republican party leading up to this measure, by which it is intended that the financial and industrial servitude of the people of this great Republic shall be made complete. It is not an attractive story nor is it one to which the American people can point with any degree of pride.

It is a story of scheming, of treachery, of insatiate greed, and even of crime. The public debt which grew out of the war between the States had reached the gigantic sum of $2,844,649,000 in the summer of 1865, and of this debt $2,381,530,000 bore interest. The principal of the original bonds was payable in lawful money, which was understood to be United States notes, and that of the refunding bonds in coin. The interest was payable in coin. Up to the present moment no bonds or other Government obligations have ever specifically been made payable in gold, although in recent years they have been treated by our Treasury officials as if they were so payable. Upon this enormous indebtedness the American people have paid in the past third of a century nearly, if not quite, three thousand million. This bare statement will of itself convey some idea of the gigantic power which has resided and still resides in the hands of the bondholding plutocracy of this country. Although nominally the principal of our public debt has been greatly reduced in these years, yet, if measured in the wheat of the farmer, it is as large as it was thirty-four years ago.

Observe, Mr. Chairman, that these bonds, payable in lawful money, were purchased with greenbacks, then greatly depreciated in value. In March, 1869, Congress passed an act entitled "An act to strengthen the public credit." That act provided that bonds payable in lawful money should be made payable in coin. This was the first step in carrying out the scheme which we see to-day about to eventuate in the payment in gold of every interest-bearing obligation of the Government. The next step was the passage of the act of July 14, 1870, entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt." By virtue of this act the public debt of the Government was refunded into bonds payable specifically, principal and interest, in coin. It is true that the interest rate was lowered, but the life of the bonds was materially lengthened, and, being payable in coin instead of greenbacks, the holders thereof, who had procured the passage of the act, were most eager to avail themselves of its provisions. By this refunding process the value of their holdings was greatly enhanced. The bonds were made payable in gold or silver, and gold and silver were then at a considerable premium.

I scarcely need mention the next act in this bondholder's conspiracy. It was to secure, at the hands of a complaisant Republican Congress, the passage of an act which has been denounced the world over as a diabolical crime against the American people. By the act of February 12, 1873, the Republican party struck down and demonetized the silver dollar, which for a period of eighty-one years had been the legal unit of money. I shall not dwell upon this hideous page of Republican financial legislation. No words of mine could fitly portray the enormity of this act of political and financial perfidy. Of all the sins committed against the people of this Republic at the instance of the bondholding power, this is by common consent the most heinous. It was soon to be followed by another act of far-reaching importance. Having made the public indebtedness payable in either gold or silver, and having stricken down and demonetized silver, it only remained to provide for the resumption of specie payments. This was done by an act passed January 14, 1875, which provided that specie payments should be resumed on January 1, 1879.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not stop to point out just how the resumption of specie payments was accomplished. Had not the act of 1878, passed over the veto of President Hayes and known as the Bland-Allison law, been enacted, it is safe to affirm that the task imposed by the act of 1875 would have been far more difficult, if not impossible, of accomplishment. Under the Bland-Allison

Act there was added to the volume of our currency more than 400,000,000 silver dollars, for which the people of this country are indebted to the Democratic party.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I have the right to conclude that the bill which we are now considering is but the culmination of a carefully considered and well-planned scheme, contrived thirty long years ago, for the purpose of enhancing the value of the interest-bearing indebtedness of the Government and thus adding to the already enormous wealth of the individuals and corporations into whose hands the great bulk of it has long since been collected.

I fully realize, Mr. Chairman, that the Democrats of this House are powerless to prevent the consummation of this great crime proposed to be committed against the American people. We can only hope that this bill may find its grave in the Senate.

For the first time in the history of the Republican party it has thrown off all disguise and come out squarely and avowedly for the single gold standard.

The platform upon which President Harrison was nominated and elected in 1888 declared in these words:

> The Republican party is in favor of the use of both gold and silver and condemns the policy of the Democratic Administration in its efforts to demonetize silver.

The Republican platform of 1892 employs this scarcely less emphatic indorsement of bimetallism:

> The American people from tradition and interest favor bimetallism, and the Republican party demands the use of both gold and silver as money.

When the Republican party again assembles in national convention, it will be entirely fitting for it to amend its platform of 1892 so as to make it read as follows:

> The American people from tradition and interest favor bimetallism, but the bondholding power demands the use of both gold and national-bank notes as money.

The attitude which the Republican party has now openly assumed toward silver furnishes ample proof, if other proof were necessary, that its past professions of friendship for that metal were both insincere and false and were only made for the purpose of catching votes. In the future, it is to be presumed, you will place your reliance solely upon the money power, by and through which it is your hope and your purpose to influence the individual voter. Do not be too sanguine. Unless I am mistaken, the popular upheaval will be greater than you now imagine if you pass this measure of perfidy and financial iniquity. The American people have not yet reached that stage of moral decadence and political servitude which alone can justify your faith in a gospel according to Shylock.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY], whom I do not now see in his seat, has asked if any Representative upon this floor would say there had been no increase of prosperity in his district. It may be true, Mr. Chairman, that in the district which the gentleman so ably represents there has been an increase of prosperity. I have no knowledge of the industrial and financial conditions existing in any district in Iowa. I do know, however, that in many sections of our country there has been marked improvement in trade and business. But wherever such has been the case there are reasons not far to seek which will account for that improvement, and they are in no wise the result of any economic or financial legislation for which the Republican party is responsible. On the contrary, it is due entirely to other causes and has come in spite of bad Republican legislation. Moreover, this improvement in business is confined to spots and is, in most instances, lacking in every element of permanency.

For nearly two years the Government has been expending enormous sums in the fortification of our seaports and in the maintenance of our armies and navies. The prosecution of our war with Spain and the Filipinos has turned into the channels of trade and commerce millions upon millions of money. The ordinary revenues of our Government have been immensely augmented by those derived under the war-revenue law, and we are informed that the President has exercised the authority conferred upon him to borrow money on the credit of the United States and under that authority has actually borrowed $198,678,720.

The expenditure of these vast sums has unquestionably stimulated and improved business in certain sections. The increase thus produced in the volume of our circulating medium has enhanced prices and given an impetus to trade. There has, for instance, been wonderful improvement in the iron and steel industries.

To maintain an army of 50,000 men on the other side of the globe alone necessitates collossal expenditures in the way of supplies and transportation. The great transcontinental railway systems are all doubtless increasing their gains. But, after all this has been said, the fact remains, and time will demonstrate, that much of this vaunted prosperity is purely speculative and illusory.

In the strictly agricultural sections of our country there has been, I venture to affirm, no improvement in either financial or industrial conditions. Certainly there has been no appreciable improvement in the trade and business conditions of the district which I have the honor to represent on this floor. On the contrary, while the prices of almost everything we buy have been advanced, our wheat, and corn, and oats, and our fish and oysters bring less to-day than they brought a year ago. There has been, it is true, some advance in the price of cotton, but that our Southern friends attribute to a decreased production. You Republicans laugh at this. But when we tell you that wheat is selling for 70 cents to-day, while it brought over a dollar a year ago, you reply at once, "Overproduction." You can not say that there has been any increase or overproduction in the supply of oysters. Moreover, Mr. Chairman, the lack of prosperity in many of the agricultural communities is due to and is directly traceable to the legislation of the Republican party. In many sections of my State there have sprung into existence within the past few years quite a number of fruit and vegetable canneries. This once promising industry has been almost destroyed as the result of Republican legislation.

THE TRUSTS.

Before the enactment of the McKinley tariff act the duty on imported tin plates was 1 cent a pound. That act more than doubled the duty. It was reduced under the Wilson bill to 1⅛ cents per pound, but the rate as fixed in the Dingley or present law is 1⅛ cents. The Republican party has boasted that its tariff legislation was the mother of the tin-plate industry. How, then, can it escape responsibility for the tin-plate trust? At the beginning of the canning season of 1898 3-pound tin cans could be purchased at $1.45 per hundred. The season of 1899 saw them advanced to $2.90 per hundred, despite the fact that canned goods were cheaper than they were the year previous. As a result, most of the canneries were shut down and hundreds and thousands of men and women thrown out of employment. The vegetables, chiefly tomatoes, perished in the fields of the farmers, and many of those who had purchased fertilizers upon the faith of their crops were forced to sacrifice their cattle and horses in order to pay the debts thus incurred. Those canners who were able to purchase cans, and who kept their contract with the farmers, did so at a dead loss.

In my own immediate community I know personally of many cases of actual distress, caused by the arbitrary and unwarranted advance in the price of tin plate by the American Tin Plate Company. This company was organized under the laws of New Jersey just one year ago. To-day, as I learn, it embraces some 40 plants and 280 mills—practically every mill in the United States which manufactures tin plate for the general trade. It is capitalized at $50,000,000. In order to restrict production and enhance its profits, this gigantic so-called "industrial" combination had closed up during the first ten months of its operations 9 plants and 40 mills, 2 of which plants and 4 of which mills were located in Baltimore, Md. These Baltimore City mills were not only shut down and their employees turned out of doors, but they have been actually dismantled. Within a few months after the formation of this colossal trust the price of tin plate advanced 100 per cent. I hold in my hand a press dispatch from Indianapolis, Ind., dated two days ago, in which it is stated that tin plate worth $2.25 per box two years ago is now selling at $5.30 per box, and that another advance of 10 per cent will be made within the next two weeks.

Mr. Chairman, the American tin-plate trust is the child of the Republican party. It could not exist for a single hour but for the protection given to it by the Dingley tariff law. Trusts, we are told, tend to lessen the cost of production. That may be, and doubtless is, true; but that they crush out and destroy honest competition and enormously increase the prices paid by the consumer must be manifest to everybody.

Unless some means can be devised by which this trust evil can be extirpated, or at least abated, general prosperity is impossible in this country. We are told in the public press that we may soon expect an upheaval among the manufacturers of tin plate; that the American Tin Plate Company is soon to be overthrown.

Heaven grant that this may be true! For myself, I do not believe it. The American Tin Plate Company not only has a practical monopoly of the production of tin plate, but it also controls the raw materials out of which tin plate is manufactured. This it does through the National Steel Company, an associated trust which monopolizes the production of tin-plate bars. More than this, Mr. Chairman, it is reputed to have a contract covering a term of years with the half dozen or more manufacturers of tin-plate machinery, thus preventing outsiders from equipping competing plants. Is it surprising then that under such conditions as I have described the farmers of my district should be somewhat skeptical when told in the gold-standard Republican press that they are enjoying a great flood of prosperity?

There are, perhaps, more ways than one to account for that prosperity which the gentleman from Iowa would have us to understand exists in his district. One of them has occurred to me. His constituents are more fortunate than mine in that there

is paid annually into his district a vast sum for pensions. During the last fiscal year there was paid into the State of Iowa the sum of $5,156,942. There are eleven Congressional districts in that State, and if we assume that an equal amount was distributed in each the gentleman's district received last year, in the way of pensions, $468,813. There are seven counties in his district, and a similar assumption would give to each of them $66,973. Such a sum distributed annually throughout the district which I have the honor to represent would at least serve to alleviate the distress which the tin-plate and other trusts, protected and fostered by Republican legislation, have inflicted upon that people.

But, Mr. Chairman, if one trust can compass so much evil, what may not the hundreds of mammoth combinations now operating in the United States be capable of working? There are the sugar trust, the tobacco trust, the rubber trust, the oil trust, the window-glass trust, the leather trust, the paper trust, the linseed and cotton-seed oil trust, the American malting trust, the American steel and wire trust, and hundreds upon hundreds of kindred concerns, all representing vast aggregations of capital, and all organized for the purpose of controlling the production and distribution of the common necessaries of life and of plundering the people. I charge that the Republican party is responsible for this deplorable condition of affairs. These trusts and combinations are all dependent, to a more or less extent, for their very existence upon the Republican protective tariff.

But, Mr. Chairman, the most gigantic as well as the most dangerous, the most all-pervading as well as the most cruel, the most tyrannical as well as the most deadly of all trusts is the hideous money trust. It is that parent trust which controls the Republican party, which, as I have shown, has dictated its financial policy for so many years, and which has driven it, in the face of its many platform declarations to the contrary, and in spite of the professions and protestations of its greatest leaders, living and dead, to come out at last squarely and unequivocally in favor of a single gold standard.

Verily, it would seem that unless these monster trusts shall work their own destruction, the evils which flow from them must be endured by the American people so long as their destinies are controlled by the Republican party. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. RHEA of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the presentation and settlement of the pending measure does not demand or call for acrimonious discussion. The country does not believe and will not believe that the Republicans are wholly bad, or that the Democrats, Populists, or Free Silver Republicans are wholly ignorant.

The bill is not properly described by its title. Its purposes are wider, farther reaching than indicated.

The bill seeks to and will, if enacted into law, fix gold as the only standard of value of all property by making all other coin and forms of currency directly redeemable in gold—this to include the now standard silver dollar. It is an unconditional surrender to the national banks of the sovereign function of government "to coin and issue money," with an enlargement of the rights and powers of these banks now enjoyed by law. It creates a monster trust that, in my judgment, will fully and remorselessly control the volume of our money, not in the interest of the business or labor of the country, but in the interest of the money mongers and selfish greed. It changes every existing contract for the payment of money.

Its discussion does not involve the issues raised by the 1896 Chicago platform or the St. Louis Republican platform of that year, except so far as its provisions antagonize the one and violate the pledges of the other. I shall not now, Mr. Chairman, discuss the reasons or beliefs that brought the 1896 platform into existence, but will merely content myself for the present by declaring that my political hopes and fortunes are tied hard and fast to the Chicago platform and William Jennings Bryan.

It was agreed by both parties in 1896 that the "single gold standard" was not desirable for and not beneficial to the people of the United States. The Republican party and platform of that year declared it hurtful and vicious, but not so bad as to warrant us in discarding it alone, and pledged the party to use all effort to secure international agreement for its overthrow, while the Democratic party believed and declared it so utterly vicious and hurtful as to justify us in independent action. The country—at least the Democratic portion—did not believe the platform utterances of the Republican party—its leaders—were sincere or made in good faith. The promise there made was accepted by the rank and file of the Republican party. These men, as some critical and perhaps observant folks have declared, aided by an exceedingly liberal distribution of "all forms of currency," succeeded in securing a prima facie majority in favor of the Republican ticket in November, 1896.

Was the promise to do your level best to bring about and secure "international agreement" made in good faith? What intelligent effort has the Republican party made to keep this pledge made the people? A commission, it is true, was appointed and sent abroad to confer with the principal countries of Europe, pretendedly in the interest of bimetallism. But this country and the world soon saw the hypocrisy of the whole business. While this commission was junketing about the capitals of the Old World to ascertain the will and pleasure of the banking house of My Lord Rothschilds, the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States had outlined a "currency plan" and sent it, with his report, to the Congress, declaring the object and purpose of this Government was to "permanently establish the single gold standard in the United States," and the President, Mr. McKinley, declared he fully agreed with and indorsed the plan of the Secretary. And now the Republican party, as if to furnish the incontestible proof of its entire good faith, comes with this bill, the most drastic, radical measure ever proposed, and supports it without the loss of a man in this House.

What interests demand the enactment of this law, Mr. Chairman? No body of men ever assembled outside the countingroom of some great banking house, except the Indianapolis junta, has ever declared for or demanded such a law, and this junta, as everyone knows, was composed of special attorneys, representatives of selfish greed, and a few ancient relics that somehow survive the mutations of time. The industrial classes do not ask it. No commercial interest demands it. Manufacture does not seek it. Agriculture has felt its baleful effects. None but the dealers in money have any interest in its passage. What reason can you give the country? What excuse do you offer? What necessity do you pretend exists for this law?

You answer, "A sound and stable currency demands it; that the ceaseless drain upon the Treasury for gold to redeem the greenbacks demands it; that the 'endless chain' must be broken." You propose to retire the greenbacks, Treasury notes, and, indeed, every form of paper currency, permanently, except the national-bank note, by redeeming them in gold. But you do not stop here. You declare by this bill that the standard silver dollar shall be directly redeemable in gold, but, by a provision covertly intended to put the Treasury and its gold reserve at the mercy of the bond sharks, the silver dollar may be issued again when "deemed necessary," only that they may be returned again and gold demanded for them, and bonds issued to get the gold, thus welding the links of the "endless chain" you have heretofore declared must be broken.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the House and the country to another feature of this bill and the attitude of the Republican party toward it. When the Democratic party and other bimetallic forces have demanded the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, the Republican party has appealed to the history of silver coinage in the United States and proudly boasted that in the life of the Government, prior to 1873, there had been less than 9,000,000 standard silver dollars coined, and that since that time, under Republican Administrations and limited silver coinage, more than 400,000,000 standard silver dollars have been coined and put in circulation, every dollar of which has been proclaimed to be the equal of a gold dollar anywhere in the world, because the policy and practice of the Republican party pledged the honor and faith of this Government to keep at par with the gold dollar the silver dollar, and this could only be done by limiting the coinage of the silver dollar. If this is the work of the Republican party, Mr. Chairman—and it has proudly and boastfully proclaimed it as such, always and everywhere declaring the Republican party a better friend to silver than the Democratic party—strange to say this party now comes and by this bill boldly and shamelessly proposes to bastardize its own children and discredit them before the world as base and spurious. By instinct, if by no other feeling or faculty, the beasts of the forest protect and fly to the rescue of their own, and it is left to the inhumanity of this party of "God and morality" and "national honor" to stigmatize and desert its own.

The crowning feature of the injustice and wrong this bill visits upon the country and its people, the taxpayers, is that section—No. 2—affecting present and future obligations and contracts for the payment of money, public and private. For the full understanding and effect of this section it must be read in connection with the first section of the bill, the two together being as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the standard unit of value shall, as now, be the dollar, and shall consist of 25.8 grains of gold, nine-tenths fine, or 23.22 grains of pure gold, being the one-tenth part of the eagle.

SEC. 2. That all interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the payment of money, now existing or hereafter to be entered into, and all United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the law of July 14, 1890, shall be deemed and held to be payable in the gold coin of the United States as defined in section 1 of this act; and all other obligations, public and private, for the payment of money shall be performed in conformity with the standard established in said section.

This changes every obligation of the Government, every bond heretofore issued and sold, and every contract or obligation calling for the payment of money made in the course of the daily business transactions of the people. It is opposed to every notion or principle of justice, law, or equity. The attempt to carry into effect its principles or purposes in the affairs of daily life between

man and man would not be tolerated by any court in the land. It violates every principle of common honesty and fair dealing. It retroacts and gives to the holder of money obligations the right to demand and exact of his debtor payment in a kind or form of money not specifically called for, and which perhaps he would not at the time the contract was made have obligated himself to pay in. It leaves the debtor no choice or alternative as to what kind of money he shall or may pay in, though by the very terms of his contract he had the choice and right to pay in any lawful money at the time he made his contract.

It declares that in the opinion of the Government of the United States, as delivered by the Republican party in Congress, but one party is necessary to the validity and binding effect of a contract. The rule of law throughout the civilized world and the commonly accepted belief of mankind everywhere that two or more parties were essential to the making of a valid and binding contract; that the parties must reach an agreement, and that this agreement must be the voluntary action of all parties to the contract; that no restraint, no duress, no fear or hope unduly excited must be practiced or exercised by the one over the other to give standing or character to a contract, is exploded by this bill. The law writers have never known the true principles governing contracts. The judges have never expounded a safe and sound principle to guide men in their business affairs. But one man is necessary to the establishment and validity of a contract to pay money, and that man is the creditor. So declares this bill.

Who demands this change, Mr. Chairman? Certainly not the man who must pay the money called for by the contract. Will anyone be so foolish as to believe that when a debtor has the option of paying in gold, silver, or legal-tender paper currency he will not only relinquish this option and right, but absolutely demand that the lawmakers shall compel him by statute to pay in one kind of money alone—gold—and that the scarcest and, by your admission, the best and highest-priced money? You admit that gold is the highest-priced dollar, because your chief excuse for fastening more certainly the gold standard upon the people by this bill is to put the United States upon a footing with the other great commercial countries of the world by making our obligations payable in the best dollar in the world. One dollar can not be better than any other dollar unless the one is higher than some other dollar, buys more labor or products of labor, more property, than some other dollar will buy.

This being true, if you change a contract for the payment of money by making the contract payable in a higher-priced dollar, a dollar that the debtor must give more of his labor or property to get, you do him a positive hurt, you materially injure him, and this should never be done, except upon compulsion of the clearest necessity for the public good or in obedience to the absolute right of the creditor to demand such payment. If this change has not the purpose or effect of enhancing the value of present money contracts, why make it? It could certainly be of no benefit in this case to a creditor, and he would not ask it, and surely the debtor would not want the change made; because if he did not have to pay in a higher-priced dollar than he first agreed to pay in, it might be more convenient for him to secure one of three or more forms of money on pay day than to be confined to the production and payment of one kind, gold, alone.

In the closing days of the Administration of the late G. Cleveland he wanted authority to issue bonds payable in gold alone. He urged that such an issue could be sold in the markets for more money and at a lower rate of interest than coin bonds and that a saving could be made the Government in the item of interest alone of about $16,000,000. The supposed patriotism and financial wisdom of the Republicans in Congress at that time refused to give the President this power, on the ground that gold was high priced and constantly rising in price and that the "United States and the Republican party, by interest and tradition," were in favor of bimetallism—the use of both gold and silver as basic money.

Every consideration of public policy, Mr. Chairman, every notion of common honesty, every rule of law or justice is against this measure. If a State in this Union should enact such a law, there is not a court in Christendom that would not declare it obnoxious to every sense of right and equity and contrary to the Constitution because it impaired the obligation of contracts. If a State legislature—aye, Mr. Chairman, if the Federal Congress—should declare by law that contracts heretofore made payable in gold coin alone should be payable, at the option of the payor, in gold, silver, or paper currency, the Supreme Court of the United States would denounce such a law as subversive of every known principle of right or justice, and you gentlemen on the Republican side of this House, in your own hearts and minds, must denounce this bill as the climax of injustice and wrong, but you feel impelled to submit to the sway of influences you can no more resist than the shallow-rooted tree can resist the fury of the storm. What the judgment of the courts may be on this bill I will not venture to assert. Strange and subtle influences overcome the courts at times. but in my humble opinion the judgment of the American people will condemn it and you as its authors at the ballot box when the full effect of it is felt throughout the country.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, under the limitations of this debate it is impossible to discuss the various provisions of this bill and their probable effect upon the people with that care and intelligence which its importance to the country demands. Containing, as it does, provisions which have never been discussed in Congress or before the people, and coming to this House from a Republican caucus without the consideration or report of any committee, the members on this side of the Chamber had a right to expect that the gentleman in charge of this bill [Mr. OVERSTREET] would in the beginning of this discussion give a fair and clear statement of its provisions.

But notwithstanding that gentleman who opened the debate and participated in the formation of this bill had unlimited time, by the courtesy of this House, he was satisfied to close his remarks with his carefully written defense in favor of the gold standard; and I insist that up to this hour here on the closing day of this debate some of the most important provisions of this bill have not even been referred to by gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber. It seems to be part of the Republican policy in this discussion to make the people believe that beyond the first section of this bill, which is to establish the gold standard, it is a most innocent measure and of but little consequence to the country.

Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the assertions made on the other side that the time has come when the Government should be clear and explicit upon this subject, this bill does contain ambiguities and uncertainties in some of its provisions, but I want to assure the members of this House that those uncertainties will not be found in that part of the bill written for the benefit of the bondholders. The few lines in section 2 of this bill, which transfer from the pockets of the people to the vaults of the bondholders millions and millions of dollars without any consideration whatever, are as clear and explicit as the English language can make them.

Mr. Chairman, the first part of section 2 provides that all existing obligations of the Government, as well as those hereafter issued, shall be paid in gold coin. All these Government bonds were issued under laws which authorized them to be paid in coin—silver as well as gold. All the Government bonds referred to in this bill were issued, sold, and purchased with the distinct understanding that they were payable not in gold alone, but in coin, which meant silver as well as gold, and, as I now remember, it is so written in the face of the bond itself; and, I remember very distinctly that in the Fifty-third Congress, when the President of the United States, then engaged in negotiating a loan for the Government, sent his appeal to that Congress, urging its members to give the Secretary of the Treasury the power to issue bonds payable in gold coin, claiming that such bonds could be sold for several million dollars more to the syndicate with which he was then about to deal than bonds issued under the law as it then existed, it was well known to the members of that Congress that the syndicate itself stated that they were willing to pay several million dollars more if Congress would authorize a gold bond. But that Congress refused to authorize the issue of gold bonds. I voted against the proposition myself. The statement of the gentleman from Ohio, given as a reason why he and others voted against issuing gold bonds, is no answer to the contention which I am about to make. It is well known that that syndicate purchased those bonds not as gold bonds, but as coin bonds, and bought them for several million dollars less because they were payable in coin—silver as well as gold.

So have the other obligations referred to been issued, sold, and purchased with the understanding that they were coin obligations, payable in silver as well as gold. This bill, Mr. Chairman, converts all these coin obligations into gold obligations, thereby adding millions and millions of dollars to the value of these bonds. And every million that you add to the value of these Government obligations is taken away from the pockets of the people, thereby requiring that much more of their property and their labor to discharge this indebtedness. An unsuspecting people before their own eyes to-day are being robbed of millions and millions of money by the acts of their representatives upon this floor. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This alone, Mr. Chairman, ought to be sufficient, even in the eyes of the Republicans and certainly in the eyes of a Gold Democrat, who has always claimed to be fair between debtor and creditor, to defeat this bill. But, Mr. Chairman, that part of section 2 which follows is not so certain, and I call the attention of the gentleman in charge of this bill to that portion which I am about to read, and trust he may yet find time to give this House the benefit of his construction. I read from section 2, at the bottom of the page:

> And all other obligations, public and private, for the payment of money shall be performed in conformity with the standard established in said section.

Which is the gold standard.

What do gentlemen mean by "in conformity with the standard established in said section" unless they mean that these private obligations are payable in gold coin, or in its equivalent, which is almost as burdensome, if not quite so? All these obligations—State, county, railroad-aid bonds, notes, and mortgages—to-day are payable in silver as well as gold. I do not overlook that which follows. There is a provision afterwards which seems to have been suggested by some Western Republican, whose eloquent words in behalf of free silver were still ringing in his ears, and they had to put in the following:

> Nothing herein shall be construed or held to affect the legal-tender quality of the silver dollar or of the subsidiary or minor coins.

What is a fair construction of these provisions? It is this: That all these private debts now payable in silver at 100 cents on the dollar shall, after the passage of this bill, be paid in gold coin or its equivalent, and if silver is to be a legal tender under this bill it must be a legal tender at its gold value and not its coinage value.

Now, Mr. Chairman, no man can tell what the effect of this bill will be upon the two dollars. If a great and sudden exportation of gold, or a change in the condition of our monetary system from the passage of this bill, or any other cause should send gold to a premium and silver to a discount, the debtor to-day who has a right to pay his obligations in silver at 100 cents on the dollar must pay it in gold or the equivalent of gold, though it should take $125 or $150 in silver to pay $100 of his indebtedness.

I regret that I have not more time to dwell upon this section; but there are so many mean things in this bill outside of this section that I must pass it by.

Mr. Chairman, while it is impossible even for a Republican to tell what will take place under this bill, we can see after reading its provisions what may take place. This bill transfers into this division of issue and redemption every silver dollar in the Treasury, the greenbacks, the silver certificates, the Treasury notes, and all the silver dollars, including the dollars coined under the act of 1890, which after the passage of this bill will have no duty to perform in the monetary system of our Government, for the notes issued on account of them will be redeemed in gold coin. [Loud applause.]

Under this bill the Secretary of the Treasury will have power to withdraw from the circulation of the country every dollar of greenbacks, amounting to $346,000,000; every dollar of Treasury notes under the law of 1890, amounting in round numbers to $100,000,000; every silver certificate now issued, amounting to about $400,000,000, and over $800,000,000 of the currency of the country can be locked up out of the circulation under this bill without another dollar more of gold in the country than you had in the beginning, and you know it. It is no answer to say that for every paper dollar that goes in a gold dollar will be paid out.

When the gold dollar is received to redeem the paper dollar it is taken out of circulation. You must get your gold to redeem this paper currency from increased revenues or the sale of bonds, and it comes out of our money in circulation in either case. So you will have no more gold than you had in the beginning. If you can not see contraction in this, you may be able to see contraction in the Republican party after the passage of this measure. It is too clear for any dispute that our present volume of currency may be contracted over $800,000,000 under this bill, and we ought to know from the experience of past panics what such a contraction means.

Such an unfortunate condition will make money scarce and higher and property and wages lower; it will bring such misery and distress upon the people that they will again rise in their majesty and power to condemn the party that brought upon them these great afflictions. But, Mr. Chairman, this is not all under this bill; it is possible for the Secretary of the Treasury to lock up in his vaults every silver dollar by exchanging gold for it. And as you may buy the same gold a dozen times to accomplish this redemption or exchange, it does not follow that you will have any more gold coin in the country than you had in the beginning.

But if the Secretary should choose the other course and decide to again pay out silver dollars received in exchange for gold coin, then the silver dollar, under this bill, may be used to accomplish the wicked purpose of stealing gold from the Treasury and forcing a new issue of bonds, just as the greenback has done for years under the policy of the gold standard; and I call the attention of all Gold Democrats to the fact that we still have this endless chain, only of silver instead of paper. And the statement of the gentleman from Indiana that when the holder of silver had the right to exchange it for gold he would lose his desire to do so is no answer to the contention I make. When they had the right to exchange greenbacks for gold, they were not satisfied with the mere right, but took their greenbacks to the Treasury to get out gold, not because they liked gold better than greenbacks, but because they liked bonds better than either; and the same mischief may be practiced in this bill by using silver dollars instead of greenbacks.

I want to say to the Gold Democrats on this floor, if you want to vote against your party and with the Republicans on this measure, then look only at its first section. But if you desire to vote with the Democratic party in this House, and are hunting for good causes to do that, then, sirs, whatever may be your opinion on silver, you can find many strong and valid reasons as Democrats for voting against this bill if you will only look beyond its first section.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR]—and I hope he will not consider me out of order for attempting to talk on the bill itself—the distinguished gentleman from Ohio criticizes members on this side of the Chamber for endeavoring to discuss the free-coinage question and not confining themselves to the bill before the House. Yet I submit that from the beginning to the end of his remarks he nowhere comes within cannon shot of this measure. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Of course we on this side of the House did not expect the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, who is always burdened with the weighty affairs of the Administration, to go into a detailed discussion like other gentlemen whose burdens are less onerous on this floor. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Ohio criticises us for discussing free coinage and the Chicago platform, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCREARY] criticises the members on this side of the House for not indorsing the Chicago platform every time they get an opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, there is just this difference between a Democrat and a Republican: A Republican is subject to such frequent changes on the money question it is important that he should express his opinion, not only at every session of Congress, but between times as often as possible, in order that his people may know where he stands [laughter on the Democratic side], while a Democrat has honest convictions and is not turned from them by every change of the wind.

It was only in February, 1891, at Toledo, Ohio, that President McKinley, in criticising ex-President Cleveland's opposition to silver, said:

> During all these years at the head of the Government he was dishonoring one of our precious metals, one of our own great products, discrediting silver and enhancing the price of gold. He endeavored, even before his inauguration to office, to stop the coinage of silver dollars, and afterwards, and to the end of his Administration, persistently used his power to that end. He was determined to contract the circulating medium and demonetize one of the terms of commerce, limit the volume of money among the people, make money scarce, and therefore dear.
>
> He would have increased the value of money and decreased the value of everything else—money the master, and everything else the servant. He was not thinking of the "poor" then. He had left their side. He was not standing forth in their defense. Cheap coats, cheap labor, and dear money; the sponsor and promoter of these, professing to stand guard over the poor and lowly. Was there ever more glaring inconsistency or reckless assumption? He believes that poverty is a blessing to be promoted and encouraged, and that a shrinkage in the value of everything but money is a national benediction.

Behold this great Republican champion of the silver dollar, as then parading in sheep's clothing; but see him now in the true livery of the wolf, following as closely as a child ever followed its mother, in what he now considers the golden footsteps of Mr. Cleveland.

Let this Benedict Arnold in finance forever stand convicted by his own eloquent and forcible words.

Mr. Chairman, in order that this severe indictment presented by Mr. McKinley against Mr. Cleveland for trying to demonetize silver may be adapted to present men and present conditions, let it be amended by striking out the name of the old defendant, Grover Cleveland, and inserting the name of the new defendant, William McKinley, and by striking out the name of the old prosecutor, William McKinley, and inserting the name of the new prosecutor, William J. Bryan. Then, "Your Honor," we are ready for trial.

Mr. Chairman, if I had time, I would be glad to express my convictions in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, and emphasize the fact, if possible, that I am stronger for that proposition to-day than ever before. But, sir, you can not deceive the country; this is not a contest against the free coinage of silver. It is a contest in favor of national banks against the greenbacks, the Treasury notes, all the paper currency of the Government, and every silver dollar now in circulation, over 500,000,000 silver dollars already coined, defended by McKinley the First and destroyed by McKinley the Second. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, why this reckless assault upon all our money of the country except the gold and bank notes? Does it not show that one of the main purposes of this bill is to take away from the people's Government the right and power to coin money and issue currency and turn it over to the national banks? Sir, as a Representative of the people upon this floor, I am unwilling to assist in turning this high function of Government over to these money changers. I am unwilling to make the people of this country dependent upon the sweet will and selfish interests of these banking corporations for a sufficient volume of money with which to transact their business.

It is un-Democratic, it is un-Republican, it is un-American in principle. Once this great power is completely in the hands of these corporations, and it will be much harder for the people to regain it then than to retain it now. You give to these selfish corporations the great and dangerous power to make the people's money, and, by uniting with other great trusts and combinations to carry out their own purposes, they will soon be making Congressmen, Senators, and Presidents, and I am not sure they could do much worse in making Presidents than the people have for the last few years. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the Republicans are encouraged to retire the greenbacks and destroy all our silver dollars at this time by the increased volume of gold coin now in the United States. What has brought about this increase of gold and with it an increase of prices? It is due in part to the large increase in the annual output of gold for the last few years and to the large importation of gold caused by a large balance of trade in favor of the United States. But what assurance have we that such conditions will continue? Who can look into the secret chambers of the earth and say that this large production of gold will continue? Our experience with new gold discoveries in the past proves just to the contrary. And what assurance have we that the large balance of trade in favor of the United States will continue? This is due more to short crops in other countries and abundant crops in our own than any other cause. What right have we to expect that the Almighty will continue to send his famines upon other nations and his blessings of bounty upon ours?

Mr. Chairman, the Republicans in this discussion have had much to say about our large volume of gold and the present prosperity of the country. No one rejoices more than myself to see the people prosperous under any and every Administration. But whatever of prosperity we do enjoy at this time is due largely to conditions over which the Republican party had no control. They will hardly claim credit for the world's large increase in the annual production of gold or for our abundant crops, which have done so much to increase our balance of trade and our importations of gold from other countries. It is true that the Republican tariff laws have created trusts all over the country, and by their selfish combinations they have greatly advanced the prices of many manufactured articles. But if the country enjoys any genuine prosperity, it has come not on account of the legislation or Administration of the Republican party, but in spite of them. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Conditions caused by the present and recent wars have also had their effect upon prices; but, Mr. Chairman, the fact that we have an increase in our volume of gold, and with it an increase of prices, only proves that which the advocates of free coinage have always claimed—that an increase in the volume of money would give us better prices and better times, and whether that increase comes from gold or silver coin makes no difference. But our present prices do not depend upon our gold alone, but all our silver dollars and government currency are assisting gold in the various channels of trade. Now, if under the provisions of this bill all our silver dollars, our greenbacks, and other currency should be withdrawn from circulation, will this not at once so increase the demand for gold as to greatly increase its value and reduce the value of everything else, even if our present supply of gold should remain with us?

But, Mr. Chairman, we have no right to assume that our present supply of gold will continue for any great length of time. The production of gold at the mines is always uncertain. Our large balance of trade may, under a wise Providence and in spite of President McKinley, be turned against us, and, whether this should occur or not, we must remember other great countries are scrambling for gold to maintain the gold standard. And conditions are liable to arise at any time in some of these gold-standard nations to suddenly increase the demand for gold and cause much of our own supply to disappear. In fact, we are threatened with such conditions now. Gold is no respecter of persons or nations, and will go in the future, as it has in the past, to the highest bidder.

Our gold does not belong to the Government, but to its private holders, and they will permit it to leave us whenever it is to their interest, though it should produce a panic in our own country. So we may have plenty of gold to-day, and to-morrow it may take the wings of the wind and fly to the uttermost parts of the world; and if conditions should arise that would take from us our gold and leave us with the standard only [laughter on the Democratic side], how much better to have silver dollars than no dollars at all. It is this uncertainty which makes it unsafe to depend upon gold alone as our primary money and calls for both metals in our coinage system. And our currency, of whatever kind or volume, is certainly safer and sounder when based upon both metals for its redemption than it is based on one alone, which is liable to be diminished at any time by causes over which we have no control.

Again, Mr. Chairman, the passage of this bill certainly destroys all hope of bimetallism by international agreement, and international bimetallism must be entombed in that great cemetery already filled with the broken promises of the Republican party. But, Mr. Chairman, there will be at least one virtue in the passage of this measure. It will prove to the country what hypocrites the Republican leaders were in 1896, when they pretended to favor bimetallism—silver coin as well as gold—in order to secure the votes of thousands and thousands of good Silver Republicans in the West and South, who really believed that their party was acting in good faith and trying to bring about bimetallism. This bill will certainly be a disappointment to many of the men who have helped to place you in power.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that such an odious measure was ever prepared for the consideration of Congress, but if it had to be prepared, how becoming in its authors to go just as far east as possible for its creation; how becoming it was that this Republican committee should assemble just as near the feet of the British Crown as the eastern coast of our Republic would permit, in order that they might receive not only the advice of the bondholders of New England but of the agents of the money lords of Old England as well.

Mr. Chairman, some of the provisions of this bill exhibit all that selfish greed that characterizes the vital force in Republican politics to day; it is full of burdens to the debtor classes of this country and ought to be defeated. But, sir, there is this consolation to this side of the House and to the country: If this bill is not beaten it will beat the Republican party and make William J. Bryan President in 1900. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS] has yielded to me only one minute. Can I take four minutes of the time of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Have we that much left in this hour?

The CHAIRMAN. No; there is but one minute remaining.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will yield to the gentleman three minutes out of the next hour, so as to give him four minutes.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. BERRY], in the course of his remarks, used this language:

> Do you know that this man Taylor who is elected governor of Kentucky would not have come within 40,000 votes of it if it had not been for the men that were for honest and fair politics in the State of Kentucky and did not want corrupt methods ingrafted upon the State?

I take that from the report of the Official Reporter. I regret the necessity of airing the differences of the Democrats of Kentucky upon this floor, but since the gentleman has begun it, I meet the issue fairly, and I desire to congratulate my friend on his boldness in declaring his position during the last campaign in Kentucky, although he waits until nearly sixty days after the election and comes 800 miles from the scene of action to do so. Frank avowal of a conviction is not characteristic of the gentleman, and it is a matter of satisfaction to learn that he has not only made up his mind as to who ought to be governor of Kentucky, but is willing to depart from his usual course sufficiently to avow that conviction.

There were 191,000 votes cast for Mr. Goebel in Kentucky. According to the gentleman, these are the men and this the number of voters opposed to honest and fair politics in the State. Less than 15,000 votes were cast for Brown, the bolting Democrat. I leave the House to judge not only who voted for honesty and fairness in politics in that race, but also to judge of the quality of the gentleman's gratitude to the people who have four times honored him with a seat on this floor.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman represents the sentiment neither of Kentucky nor of his district in the remarks I have quoted from his speech, and I assure him his constituents will testify their estimate of his course at the earliest possible moment. Sir, the bolting in Kentucky was largely a matter of dollars and cents, bought and paid for by the most gigantic, as it was the most oppressive and most infamous, corporation that ever found lodgment south of Mason and Dixon's line. Its paid attorneys for a stipulated fee made speeches in which they traduced, slandered, and maligned from one end of the State to the other a man whose shoes they were unworthy to loosen. And yet Mr. Goebel received 30,000 more votes than any Democrat who ever aspired to a public place in that Commonwealth. I challenge the gentleman to point out one dishonorable act in either the public or private life of William Goebel. If the gentleman means to say that those who voted the Democratic ticket in Kentucky last fall stood for dishonesty and corruption in politics, his statement is gratuitously and wholly untrue.

Just a moment, Mr. Chairman, as to this man Goebel who is so much maligned and slandered. He comes from the humblest parentage, with the heritage of no great name or fortune to speed him on his way. He is yet in the meridian of his manhood and stands the first citizen of his Commonwealth and the governor of that great old State. I use the word advisedly, because before

the buds burst on a tree in Kentucky he will be the chief executive, and we will have routed that nefarious gang who won their certificate of election by corruption, fraud, and rascality. Mr. Goebel has honored his people as they have honored him. Clean-limbed as a racer, young, brave, and determined, he has never hesitated to break a lance upon the shield of corruption or wrong wherever he has found it. So soon as he had attained the requisite age he was sent to the upper chamber of the general assembly of Kentucky, and no sooner had his feet touched the carpet of that historic chamber than he placed himself close in touch with the people of the State, and has been true to them upon every great issue.

From the lusty loins of that Commonwealth have sprung many of the nation's good and great, but she never sent forth a nobler champion of the right, a greater tribune of the people, a more gallant and incorruptible gentleman than William Goebel. His fight in Kentucky was not against Republicanism. It did not represent a square, fair battle between the two parties. It was a contest between the Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company upon one side and the plain people of the Commonwealth upon the other. They sent their hirelings from the mouth of Sandy to Mill's Point, and for a stipulated fee they traduced, slandered, and maligned a man whose public and whose private career was above reproach in the esteem of all decent people. If he had been a bad man, if he had represented anything but the best sentiments of the people of the Commonwealth, why, I ask my colleague, should he have received 30,000 more votes than were ever before given any Democratic aspirant for public place in Kentucky?

I regret the necessity, Mr. Chairman, of washing our linen in Kentucky on the floor of this House, but I do not intend that the party which has honored me with a commission on this floor shall be slandered, traduced, or misrepresented, though it be by a man I esteem, holding a commission from the same people that I hold one from.

The gentleman does not speak the sentiment of his district. Mr. Taylor has not been elected governor of Kentucky. An incorruptible board of canvassers, obeying the law, a thing which Republicans seldom ever do when party advantage has weight in the scale, has given him his certificate, but when the case comes before a judicial tribunal, as it will in a few days, and the calcium light is turned on, the citizens of every party will know that Mr. Goebel was fairly elected as he will be fairly inaugurated governor of the State. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

These are the facts. I court no controversy on this subject, yet I fear none. Armed with right I will maintain the position of the Democratic party of my State here, as I tried to do there. I shall say nothing of the unfortunate attitude of my friend; he has the right to take any position he sees proper in this House, as he had in Kentucky, but he has no right to question the attitude of gentlemen that differ with him upon that question. This man Goebel is the most maligned, misrepresented, and slandered man I ever knew in my life. He was vituperated time and again, slandered, and misrepresented by mercenary penny-a-liners and hired attorneys.

Mr. SULZER. They are afraid of him.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Yes; they are afraid of him.

Mr. BERRY. What has New York got to do with it?

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. He has been slandered.

Mr. SULZER. He is a good fighter.

Mr. BERRY. They had to get outside people——

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. We had no outside people, we needed none, except those Democrats, those tribunes of the people, who always go to the rescue when there is a fight against corporate greed. No man will deny Goebel's ability. No man will question his integrity; and if my colleague will state to this House one single act that would impair his official or private character or is reprehensible or unbecoming a brave Kentuckian, I will withdraw what I have said and remain in my place stultified. No sort of question was made against the man except that he was of iron nerve, one who scorned his foes and loved his friends, and that has made him dear to the people of Kentucky. I have said this, Mr. Chairman, to vindicate not only the position of myself and colleagues on this floor, but of 191,000 Democrats of Kentucky who will approve every statement I have uttered from my place. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BROSIUS. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BERRY. May I have a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

[Mr. BERRY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. BROSIUS. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I think the gentleman——

Mr. BROSIUS. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHEELER] may have further time.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I want to thank the generous spirit which prompts the gentleman on the other side of the Chamber. I will try to say something that will be grateful to them. I wish to say in reply to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BERRY] that there was not a policeman in the Louisville convention that debarred any honest, decent Democrat going on the floor who had the credentials from his party and from his county. Any man could go there. A few thugs and toughs were excluded. There were a few Republicans who wore upon their sleeves so-called Democracy, but in their minds were prepared to knife the party, and they were properly excluded from the convention.

I do not like everything that transpired there; I do not like everything that transpires here, but I am not going to bolt my seat in the American Congress because I find oppression and wrong and tyranny on the other side of the Chamber. I stood in my place and tried to serve my people in that convention, as I stand in my place and serve them here. The gentleman says I am as corrupt as Goebel. Indeed I am; but weighed in that scale with Goebel and myself on one side and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BERRY] on the other, and the people of Kentucky to judge, we know full well what the verdict would be.

Mr. BERRY. We will let that be determined in the future.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. It will be determined in the future.

Mr. BERRY. You will have to abide by it.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I shall abide by it. The probability of my remaining in Congress rests with the people, but if my people ever say that I must remain at home, I will stay there—a Democrat that never scratched his ticket and never betrayed a trust. They have honored me far beyond my deserts, but if the gentleman comes to Congress again from the Sixth district, he will never be indorsed by the 6,000 majority of that Congressional district.

Mr. BERRY. Do not become a prophet.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I am a prophet to that extent. I want to say to the Republicans of this House that the conditions in Kentucky are not as bad as stated. Lay not the flattering unction to your soul that you will reap any benefit from what took place there.

Kentucky Democrats may sometimes do things they ought not to do, but they will never go over to the Republican party, and in 1900 Kentucky will go Democratic by the greatest majority ever given in the history of the State.

I regret that I felt compelled to make this defense in the presence of our enemy in this House.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COX. In the discussion of a currency bill I do not think gentlemen on this side ought to air their differences for the enjoyment of the Republicans. [Laughter.] I do not know much about the Kentucky campaign, but I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is one that the Chair does not care to decide. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BROSIUS] is recognized.

Mr. BROSIUS. Mr. Chairman, I bespeak the indulgence of the members of the House to the extent of permitting me to continue my remarks to-day without interruption. I do not think there will be any occasion for interruption, as I do not purpose discussing politics. I do not believe by any means that our Democratic friends are absolutely good, but I have no disposition to-day to set their sins before them. I would not like to say it myself on account of my habitual guarded discretion, but another has said that the Almighty has put his hand on the Democratic party, and the episode just witnessed in this House affords some evidence of its truth. And if it be true, I have no disposition to interfere. [Laughter.] I believe with Senator Benton, of old bullion fame. He did not entertain a morbid affection for John C. Calhoun, and after the death of the latter a friend said to him, "Senator, what have you to say now of Mr. Calhoun?" The Senator replied, "Not anything; not a solitary thing. When the Almighty puts his hand on a man I take mine off." [Laughter.]

It seems to me a happy providence in our national affairs that has brought us upon such auspicious conditions for those repairs in our financial and banking laws which have pressed with extreme urgency upon public attention for some years. Unfortunate indeed has been the situation of those who have been endeavoring for some years to make suitable reforms in our monetary system. They seem to have incurred the disfavor of Providence and invited a confusion of tongues whose only prototype is the lingual curse of Babel. At last we have escaped from this curse, we have recovered a common language, can discourse and agree together like rational creatures. This makes action possible.

With business and industries at high-water mark, with all our people employed, with wages advancing, with prosperity and content singing with every craft and confidence smiling in every face, with a thousand millions of gold in the country, four hundred millions, almost, in the Treasury, and probably three hundred

and fifty millions in the banks, was there ever in all our history so auspicious a moment for the correction of those defects in our financial system that time and experience have revealed?

The hour solicits us, a sense of need invites us, and patriotism commands us. Let us not falter.

HYPERCRITICISM.

Earnestly seeking an opportunity to correct the errors our predecessors have committed is no concession to that hypercriticism which in recent years has sought to cover our financial system with ridicule and bring it into popular contempt. A few carpers and cavilers have indulged in criticisms as severe as they are senseless. They rival the famous strictures of Tooke, one of the most noted economists of his time, on the Bank of England. In his great work on the history of prices he said:

The Bank of England is one of the most wanton, ill-advised, pedantic, and rash pieces of legislation that has ever come within my observation.

Of course nobody took him seriously, and a half a century has not prevailed against the Bank of England. Criticisms of that character carry about as much weight as Sidney Smith's complaint of the solar system, when he said to his friend Jeffrey—

D——n the solar system. Bad light, planets too distant, pestered with comets, feeble contrivance. Could make a better with ease.

I do not mean to make any concession to this babble against our banking system in the efforts I make to improve it. Salmon P. Chase made an accurate forecast when he said to an eminent gentleman after completing the national-bank act:

I have completed to-day a very great thing. I have finished the national banking act. It will be a blessing to the country long after I am dead.

I believe with the late Justice Miller, of the Supreme Court of the United States, when he said:

The present national banking system, in my judgment, and in that of many thinking men, statesmen, and financiers, is the best that the world has ever seen.

But while I believe it is the best the wit of man has ever heretofore devised for our country, I think it can be made better and we ought not to be content with any system that is worse than the best possible.

BOGY OF CONSISTENCY.

Unlike some honorable members, I give my adhesion to this measure without a string to it. My devotion is not discounted by mental reservations. I do not have to reorganize my conceptions of the subject or reconsider former views to support this bill, for its substantial propositions are in the line of my thought and my effort for years. But what on earth is more commendable than a change of mind in the light of a new day. It is pitiful to witness the efforts of some men to be consistent. I have listened in this debate to animadversion upon the inconsistency of men in not always holding the same views. If we did, we would soon be a nation of fools. Consistency is the bogy of little minds, to which infant statesmen and feeble philosophers pay homage. What has a great soul to do with consistency more than with his shadow on the wall? It is the rule of wisdom to speak to-day what we think and to-morrow speak again what we think, though it contradict every utterance of yesterday. Every great question must come to the touchstone of the present. To-day, and not last year, is the judgment day for this financial measure.

BUSINESS MEASURE.

The bill before us is a great business measure calculated to keep upon the present solid foundation the welfare and prosperity of the whole country. It has a twofold purpose: First, the money standard; second, the better adaptation of our currency system to the requirements of trade and industry; and all of its provisions are subsidiary to one or the other aim. Its first and most important object is to affirm the existing standard of value and provide for its maintenance.

WHY AFFIRM THE EXISTING STANDARD?

It has been pertinently asked, "Why affirm an existing standard?"

The answer is not far to seek. And in answering I forbear making any argument in support of the wisdom of that standard, for I cordially indorse what has been so ably said on that subject by those who have preceded me, notably my friend from Connecticut [Mr. HILL].

In the first place, it is desirable, for the sake of unity, clearness, and convenience, to have the declaration of the standard reproduced in connection with the provisions for its maintenance. This is the commonest occurrence in our legislation. A single instance out of a great number may serve as an illustration. Section 8 of the act of March 3, 1843, declares what shall constitute the standard for gold and silver coins, requiring both to be nine-tenths fine. The same identical section is reproduced as section 13 of the act of February 12, 1873, so that it would be found in connection with the provisions which immediately follow in section 14 relating to the unit of value and the various coins authorized.

But there is another reason. Our monetary legislation for half a century has been an evolution developed by accretions at long intervals, as amendments were suggested by time and experience. The system has grown in a fashion not greatly distinguished for unity or logical coherence. It has therefore lent itself to varying constructions under the bias of party feeling or the exigencies of politics. The result has been that diverse views and purposes have led to diverse interpretations of law, and out of the vicissitudes of our financial affairs, our trials, dangers, and catastrophies narrowly escaped has come a degree of uncertainty as to what might occur in possible contingencies in the practical administration of the system. This is disquieting to the public mind. We know, as has recently been said, in matters monetary the state of mind is as important as the state of fact. In such a juncture it is obviously the dictate of wisdom to remove the doubt, clarify the situation, and put the public mind at ease.

We agree, no doubt, that it is requisite to the general tranquillity and prosperity that we should not only be able to maintain the gold standard but that the people have faith that we will do so, and nothing can be so assuring to the public mind as to see the purpose of the people clothed in the vitality and majesty of public law. The distinct and unequivocal declaration of the "standard" in this measure in connection with the well-conceived and clearly expressed means of maintaining it therein contained constitute that complete and final assurance which produces absolute quietude and composes the mind to a state of tranquillity.

MONEY UNIT.

The bill declares that the standard unit of value shall be the dollar and shall consist of $25\frac{8}{10}$ grains of gold nine-tenths fine. I have been asked, "What is a unit of value, the standard money unit?" On a former occasion I submitted some reflections on the subject of the "money unit," and I take the liberty of reproducing them at this point for the consideration of those interested in such reflections:

A numerical unit is a pure abstraction. It is expressed by a figure. We manipulate figures without respect to commodities of any kind. We can say three times three are nine without considering the concrete denotement of the numbers. It may be one or more of anything you choose, as one dollar or one apple. A numerical unit is not a creature of the law, but of the mind. A single thing is one by nature and not by legal enactment. So we can not reach the legal contents of the expression "money unit" from the merely numerical side.

When we advance a step toward the reality and add to the numerical abstraction the word "dollar," we have a concrete unit. Every unit of measure or weight or value must be a concrete unit; a unit expressed by a determinate amount or quantity or weight of the thing to be measured or weighed or estimated, to be taken as a standard of comparison for other determinate amounts, quantities, or weight of like kind, and without which no kind of exchange but primitive barter could take place.

A money unit, then, contains this group of ideas, namely:

First. A numerical abstraction—a symbol for purposes of notation.

Second. A determinate weight of precious metal or metals, as the case may be, which is fixed by law.

Third. The denomination "dollar," also a creature of the law, which expresses the value of the predetermined weight of precious metal which constitutes the unit.

The value inheres in the metal and not in the form of it. A certain number of grains of gold or silver in the form of a cube are just as effectually a unit of value as if in the form of a disk, for value resides in substance and not in form.

The struck coin is a thing apart. It is not the "money unit," but a thing of convenience in exchange, a certificate of weight and fineness. If it coincides with the unit in value, that is an incident which gives it no character different from other coins excepting in denomination. The unit, as a mere symbol, is only the money of the mind. The struck coin is the piece for payment, and contains the value which its name expresses. The former is in view when a contract of sale is made; the latter only comes into requisition when it is executed. One is for the arithmetic of exchange, to afford terms in which values can be expressed; the other is to effect exchanges of commodities whose value has been reduced to expression in the terms of the unit.

We have thus arrived at our definition of "money unit," namely, a given number of grains of precious metal possessing a determinate value, named "dollar" or "unit," by comparison with which the denominations of money are regulated, and in the terms of which, or the fractions or multiples thereof, general values are expressed.

GOVERNMENT OBLIGATIONS.

We find in this bill a distinct declaration that the interest-bearing obligations of the Government and the United States notes and Treasury notes are payable in gold. The importance of this declaration may not be appreciated by those at home and abroad who have implicit faith in the honor and integrity of the American people, and there are millions of such.

Mr. Rothschild, the great London banker and financier, once paid the United States a handsome compliment. When he was asked which he would prefer, American obligations payable in coin or in gold, he said:

I would rather have them payable in coin, for, at the rate gold is being produced now, and in anticipation of the enlarged production in the near future, it is not impossible that silver may be the better money when the bonds mature. At any rate, I know that the United States, as long as it enjoys the option, will always pay its obligations in the best money in the world.

On the other hand, there are those who are haunted by the ghost that troubled Sydney Smith. They live in the twilight of distrust and suspicion. It is not pleasant to refer to anything as mean and low down as the calumny of Sydney Smith, but he illustrated a class of people who must be reckoned with in the general treatment. In his letter on American debts, Mr. Smith observed that

It was sad to see us rejected by every state in Europe as a nation with whom no contract could be made because none would be kept; that we were deficient in the elements of good faith, a people who preferred any load of infamy, however great, to any pressure of taxation, however small.

It is doubtful if a man lives to-day who entertains any such opinion of us as Mr. Smith, expressed in the spasms of a convulsion. But upon the faint-hearted, feeble-minded, suspicion-haunted, ghost-seeing mortals this declaration will have a salutary influence, for it is calculated to produce quietude and composure in times of agitation and alarm, and is by no means the least important provision in the bill.

LEGAL TENDERS.

It is, moreover, one of the excellencies of the bill that this is accomplished without disturbing the legal-tender quality of our silver coins and paper currency. It is desirable, on grounds of the most obvious reasoning, that some portion of the paper currency with which exchanges are effected should possess the legal-tender quality. In the transaction of commercial business it not infrequently happens that tenders of payment are to be made. Such tenders, to be legally effective, must be made in legal-tender money. Without a form of currency easily obtainable and conveniently portable for such use, the people would be subjected to extreme inconvenience.

This was fully realized by a gentleman in New York who was required to make a tender of $20,000. He was unable for a time to obtain that amount of greenbacks and was confronted by the necessity of carrying to the place of tender $20,000 in gold. He succeeded at length in obtaining the currency, but the incident emphasized the necessity in a commercial nation of having legal-tender money other than coin for the convenience of the people. Our legal-tender notes occupy the same position in our currency as the Bank of England notes do in the currency of Great Britain. The latter are legal-tenders in all commercial dealings between individuals, but redeemable in gold at the counter of the bank as our legal tenders are at the counter of the Treasury.

SEGREGATION OF THE RESERVE.

The proposal to segregate the gold redemption fund and to keep it separate and apart from the current funds of the Treasury is a practical and sensible means of protecting the reserve which, with lapse of time, has grown more and more acceptable to the public.

Chief among the difficulties we have encountered in the maintenance of the Treasury gold reserve has been the use of it to supplement a depleted revenue. It is obvious enough under that practice that a diminishing revenue must lead to a depleted reserve, and that to an impairment of public confidence in the ability of the Government to redeem its pledges by maintaining the gold standard.

It is not anticipated that the conditions from which our difficulties a few years ago sprang, as naturally as fruit from the blossom, will recur; not, at least, as long as we are able to guard the administration of the Government against those delinquencies which produced the distresses of the country. Yet it is wise to provide against possible contingencies by making it easy to encounter any stress of weather that may overtake us in the future.

Any deficiency in revenue under this bill will be supplied by taxation or by the use of the credit of the nation in borrowing to meet the contingency. The gold reserve can not be trenched upon and is not likely to be reduced to that apprehensive limit which disturbs the public mind and excites alarm. It is the business of the current revenues to meet the current expenditures, and the barrier between the general fund in the Treasury and the gold redemption fund should be impassable except for an exchange of forms of money for the convenience of the latter.

RETENTION OF GREENBACKS.

Nothing could be more excellent or more consonant with common sense and right reason than the provision authorizing the retention in the Treasury of United States notes redeemed in gold until exchanged for gold. The practical utility of this provision is only exceeded by its absolute justice to Government and people. If any untoward conditions should overtake us in the future, this provision will prevent the recurrence of the "endless chain" which worked such disaster in the years of unhappy memory. To continue exposing ourselves to the possibility of being compelled to suspend gold payment or continue borrowing gold to meet an endless drainage is scarcely consistent with sound statesmanship. We have had the experience of that wasting process, and we do not invite its recurrence. We have realized how vain and futile the task—as vain as that of the daughters of Danaus, doomed to draw water from a well and pour it eternally into a perforated cask. The absurdity of the process, as well as its danger, admonishes us to take arms against its possible recurrence by killing with all possible dispatch what was called the auriferous tapeworm that wriggled back and forth between Wall street and the Treasury.

Nor is there any danger of the volume of our legal-tender paper being seriously diminished under this provision. The operation of the provisions of this bill when it shall have become law will be so salutary, so reassuring to the public mind, will so far allay fears and dispel doubts of the purpose and ability of the United States to redeem all its obligations in the best money and to keep all its currency equally good, that a preference for paper will so widely prevail that an inconsiderable amount will ever be presented for redemption.

UNWARRANTED ASSUMPTION.

A singular assumption has been advanced that this is a comprehensive scheme for getting our national currency out of the way and issuing bonds to keep up the gold reserve while the legal tender remains in the reserve fund, being replaced by bank notes. Some penetrating mind has suggested an operation like this: Fifty million of notes will be taken to the reserve and that amount of gold taken out. That reduces the gold reserve by $50,000,000. To replenish the gold $50,000,000 of bonds must be sold, and then $50,000,000 goes back into the redemption fund without anything being paid out, and then we have contraction. Repeat the operation a few times and all the legal tender notes are in the Treasury and the gold out, and the paper money of the country is supplied by the banks. Now, it takes a genius to conceive a scheme like that, but no man in a lucid interval would believe that anybody would have a motive for working such a scheme if it was possible. I do not say that there is not credulity enough in some quarters to believe it despite the dead weight of argument against it, for some minds are like the pupil of the eye, the more light you throw upon them the more they contract.

I think in one of George Eliot's works there are some comments on the mental characteristics of the donkey. She says the distinguishing characteristic of the donkey's mind is its aptness to arrive at conclusions inversely to the strength of the evidence. And I think she adds that it argues a higher intellectual acumen on the part of the donkey than the direct sequence. I mean no reflection upon anyone, but desire to emphasize the fact that we can not make an argument or a financial system that will satisfy any mind that is superior to reason.

It may be said in reply to this wonderful scheme that, on the hypothesis that legal-tender notes would go in in large amounts for gold, the latter would become very abundant in the channels of trade and would be paid into the Treasury in large amounts in taxes and revenue—90 per cent of the customs duties are now paid in gold—and the Secretary, under section 4, would at once exchange his legal tender for that gold and the legal tenders would go out into circulation again, and if they came back they would go out again in the same manner, thus keeping up the gold reserve without the necessity for issuing bonds. The assumption carries the idea that the Secretary of the Treasury would issue bonds to replenish the gold reserve when there was an abundance of the yellow metal in the general fund of the Treasury transferable for that purpose, an assumption which is wholly inadmissible and without warrant in the terms of the bill. But the fact is, no such scheme would ever be set in operation. It is not consonant with reason and common sense. Neither the people nor the banks wish to handle gold unnecessarily. It is inconvenient, subject to loss by abrasion, and altogether undesirable.

BUT ONE CONSTRUCTION POSSIBLE.

This provision of the bill will admit of but one construction. The Secretary is required to maintain the gold reserve. How? First, by transferring to such fund any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. That means the transfer of gold, for any other kind of money would not replenish the gold reserve. Second, he may exchange any of the funds in the division of issue and redemption for other funds which may be in the general fund of the Treasury. That means an exchange for gold funds, for no other would maintain the gold reserve.

Then he is required to use the reserve to maintain the parity and equal value of every dollar issued or coined by the Government, and when necessary to this end he may exchange gold coin for any other money issued or coined by the United States. The money so redeemed or exchanged shall be retained in said redemption fund until exchanged for an equivalent amount of the coin in which it was redeemed, except as heretofore in this section provided. Now, what was "heretofore" provided? Why, clearly, the exchange of any funds in the division of issue and redemption for any other funds in the general fund of the Treasury. And all these means of maintaining the gold reserve and the parity of all our money are to be exhausted before recourse is had to the issue of bonds.

Now, under these provisions, whatever kind of money may be redeemed in gold, it is not possible for the gold reserve to require the issue of bonds for its maintenance as long as there is a dollar of gold in the general fund of the Treasury that can be transferred to the reserve.

The assumption upon which the argument proceeds, that large amounts of legal-tender notes would be presented for redemption, is contradicted by every day's history from the 1st of January, 1879, down to the hour when demagogues put out the lights and the American people stumbled in the dark. Under normal conditions in the past greenbacks have remained in the hands of the

banks and the people. Over $300,000,000 of them are now in the their hands. On the first day the resumption act went into operation the current of gold, not paper, set toward the Treasury. At the close of business on Monday, the 2d day of January, 1879, this message came to the Secretary from the office of the subtreasurer in New York:

One hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars of notes presented for coin, and $400,000 of gold for notes.

For many years our Treasury was richer in gold than any other in the world. A depleted reserve was a thing undreamed of for fourteen years; and now, after the lapse of but thirty-four months from the Republican restoration, from the people's recovery of the dominion of reason and patriotism, we have more gold in the Treasury than we know what to do with, and might have much more if we had the paper to exchange for it. Last year it is estimated that $25,000,000 of gold was tendered the Treasury for paper which could not be supplied, and the appearance of greenbacks at the counter of the Treasury demanding gold is as rare as bluebirds in winter.

SILVER DOLLARS SHOULD BE EXCHANGEABLE FOR GOLD.

In the maintenance of the gold reserve the Secretary is authorized, as I have already suggested, to exchange one form of money for another. This provision is not as ample as I would have it. I would require the Secretary to exchange gold for silver dollars when demanded by the holder. I agree on this point with my friend from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], and this is no new birth in the family of my financial ideas. Six years ago on this floor, in the debate on the bill to coin the seigniorage, I said:

This Government ought not to issue a single dollar of less value than a gold dollar that is not redeemable at the option of the holder in something of the value of 100 cents. We take 49 cents' worth of silver and stamp it with the image and superscription of the United States. We declare it worth 100 cents. We sanctify it with the holy legend, "In God we trust," and send it forth armed with full legal-tender power and without provision for redemption, to pay 100 cents' worth of debt. One act of legislation is pressing upon us with extreme urgency now—that we either provide for putting a dollar's worth of silver in the coined dollar or make it redeemable in a gold dollar.

These were my views six years ago, and I am of the same opinion still. Every form of money in use in the United States is redeemable, directly or indirectly, in gold, except the standard silver dollar. Down to 1878 the only coin ever minted in the United States of less intrinsic value than its face was deprived of its full legal-tender power and denied the free privilege of the mint and made redeemable in lawful money.

So in this legislation, for the sake of unity in its provisions, of the principle involved, and of fidelity to our pledges to maintain sound money and to clothe our purpose with the vitality of public law, I would make the gold and silver dollars interchangeable.

SOUND MONEY.

What is sound money? Money is sound when its intrinsic or commercial value corresponds with its coinage value and is equal in purchasing power to that used by the leading commercial nations with which we deal, or is convertible at the option of the holder into such standard-value money. Every dollar in use in this country meets the requirements of that definition except the silver dollar. While we are reforming the errors of the past I would remove that blemish. No harm can come from such a provision. But this I need not elaborate. I find in the North American Review for December an able article from the pen of my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] in support of this proposition, in which he shows clearly it would be no menace to the Treasury. He says:

Our stock of silver is scattered among 75,000,000 people throughout the whole vast area of our country. It constitutes the current money of exchange. It has to do with all the myriad transactions of business life. It would be almost impossible to withdraw it from circulation in any substantial amount. That could only be done at all by paying a premium for it. It is beyond reasonable conception that any contingency can arise which would make its exchangeability with gold a serious menace to be provided against.

Mr. NEVILLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BROSIUS. I can not. I said in the beginning that I preferred not to be interrupted. I am compelled to talk upon a schedule that really does not admit of local accommodations. [Laughter.]

CIRCULATION TO THE PAR OF BONDS.

But passing to the banking and currency sections of the bill, it is to be observed that there is a general consensus of opinion that additional facilities should be afforded the banks to enable them to provide increased accommodations to the people and to give greater elasticity to their issues. This need becomes obvious in view of the fact that many national banks have deposited bonds to the full amount of their capital stock and exhausted their right to issue circulation. Five hundred and thirty-one banks, with a capital stock of $72,217,500, are thus at the limit of their power without the possibility of adding one dollar to their circulation, however urgent the need.

The right to issue circulation to the par of the bonds deposited would be a relief to such banks as well as to others, especially in the South and West in times of stringency, if not at other times. This would open the way to an immediate increase in the bank circulation of some $25,000,000, while the operation of the provision relieving the banks from the tax on circulation would enable them profitably to increase their issue still more. These provisions operating together would give a certain degree of elasticity to the bank currency by diminishing the cost to the banks of their present issues and providing them with an additional issue of 10 per cent without cost.

If it is true that under existing law banks receive one-half of 1 per cent on their circulation more than they would on an investment of an equivalent amount of capital at 6 per cent, it is obvious that if they were relieved of the 1 per cent tax they would receive 1½ per cent more than on a 6 per cent investment. Then, if to that they add an additional issue of 10 per cent without cost, which, loaned at 6 per cent, would yield the equivalent of two-thirds of 1 per cent on the 90 per cent already out, the aggregate would be 1½ plus two-thirds of 1 per cent or 2⅛ per cent, making the total return on capital 8⅛ per cent. At that profit banks would put out all the circulation the people need. With this encouragement they might, if necessary, convert a portion of the miscellaneous securities they carry, amounting last year to some $240,000,000, on which they can not realize more than 4 or 5 per cent, into Government bonds to increase their circulation.

With this relief afforded it is manifest that they would be able if they chose to avail themselves of their privileges to supply all the bank currency required.

ELASTIC BOND-SECURED CURRENCY.

But the inquiry remains whether there is not a better way to provide an elastic currency, adapted to relief in times of stringency and panic, than to give the banks the additional 10 per cent of currency in a lump without cost.

It is not desirable to make currency too plenty or credit too easy in normal times. When money is unduly abundant, bankers strive to increase their loans, causing interest to fall and the price of securities to rise. This causes speculative buying, and the buyers become the bank's borrowing customers on call on the security of stocks. The movement is sometimes short-lived and the crisis speedily reached. The longer it lasts the more disastrous the collapse. In all cases, sooner or later, a cessation of the rise in prices must come and then panic.

A little check on the elasticity of currency while the rise in stocks is in rapid progress would have a wholesome effect. A little tightness of the money market, causing interest to rise gradually, not abruptly, leading to a slight shrinkage in prices, might prevent a panic or at least mitigate its intensity. Some one has compared it to letting off steam from a boiler through an escape pipe instead of bottling it up until the boiler explodes. But some give in the currency is needed at times and ought to be available, but it ought not to be unrestricted. Business and prosperity keep money in active circulation because more people are employed and their business is done almost exclusively with cash. Then, again, wages are advancing and prices are rising—conditions which require more currency. Furthermore, the country, the West and South especially, does not supply so many deposits to the reserve centers.

Western banks have recently offered 2½ per cent for deposits. The new rule of the clearing-house banks making a charge for the collection of out-of-town checks has diverted large amounts of money to other cities. For this and other reasons, perhaps, there is at times a legitimate need for some increase in the currency. To meet this need banks have recourse now to means of which they do not avail themselves. The national banks of the United States could issue in the aggregate $345,000,000 more circulation than they do. New York has not exhausted its limit by $29,000,000, nor Chicago by $16,000,000, nor the West by $18,000,000. It may be that there would be no profit in issuing that amount. If there was it would doubtless be issued, for men do not go into the banking business exclusively for their health or amusement. The likelier reason is that they do not need it in view of the enormous deposits they have.

On September 7 the national banks of New York City had individual deposits amounting to over $450,000,000, besides carrying the money of other banks all over the country to the amount of nearly $253,000,000. These amounts are fabulous and the uninitiated can hardly understand how it can all be disposed of; but on the date named the loans and discounts of these banks amounted to about $542,000,000. Little wonder they had at that time an outstanding circulation of but $15,000,000, while their total investment in permanent securities was over $104,000,000. So that whatever indulgence we extend to national banks, it will be availed of to a limited extent only in central reserve cities; but the country outside the great cities needs this relief and ought to have it.

But with the tax on circulation removed I think a profitable increase of the issues would take place sufficient to meet the requirements of business under normal conditions. The Comptroller suggests that the banks will immediately take out the additional circulation for the purpose of profit; that business

credits will be extended and adjusted to correspond with such increase of the currency, and practically the same inelasticity will characterize our bank-note issues then as now. With the advent of a panic we would have no additional means of lessening the necessity for a curtailment of loans. In view of this he strongly recommends that the additional issues of 10 per cent be subjected to a tax of 2 or 3 per cent while in circulation, which will tend to prevent its unrestricted use under normal conditions and to save it for use at those periods of the year when the moving of the crops or the existence of panic most urgently calls for additional currency to assist the general liquidation of debts.

If the Comptroller's assumption is warranted, that an increase of $100,000,000 of bank notes may be reasonably expected as the result of the proposed modification in the mode of taxation of national-bank notes—and I think there is strong reason for the assumption—then it is obvious enough that the true method of supplying an elastic, bond-secured emergency circulation is to subject the additional 10 per cent issue to such a tax as would restrict its use to such emergencies as demand it in the interest of the banks and the public need. As this provision is not in the bill, I do not care to elaborate the subject at this time, and I advert to it only to bring it to the attention of the House for their consideration.

The provision in the bill authorizing the institution of banks in small towns with a capital of $25,000 meets a long-experienced need in many sections of the Union, notably in the South and West. The call for smaller banks from these sections has been incessant for years.

BRANCH BANKS.

It is the only relief practicable for small communities. Branch banks advocated by some are out of the question in this country. They are incompatible with our system and, if permitted, would overthrow it. The large, strong banks of the cities, with their branches, would eat up the small independent banks of the country, and then by their competition would continue the struggle between each other until the strongest only survived. Where branch banking prevails it is held that the fewer and the stronger the banks the greater the safety. The main cause of the recent bank troubles in Montreal was that some of the weaker banks found the competition too severe for them. A learned writer says:

> Under the branch banking system all the weaker institutions are compelled eventually to succumb, and there remain only such a number of strong banks as, with their branches, can find a reasonable profit within the field occupied.

These independent banks under our popular free banking system have been conspicuous factors in building up the localities in which they are established. A bank owned and managed by the people of the locality where it does business has a more direct interest in the advancement of that locality than the branch of a large city bank could have. Under our system of local independent banks this country has enjoyed a development, growth, progress, and prosperity unrivaled by any country having a system of monopolistic banks. I am sure the man is out of tune with the sentiment of the people of this country who advocates such a modification of our system as would turn over the banking business of this country to a limited number of large city banks.

SMALL BANKS.

Smaller banks, then, being the only feasible relief for the rural communities, they should be authorized.

In the report of the Banking and Currency Committee of the Fifty-fifth Congress on a bill containing this provision it is said:

> Under the existing law the minimum capital stock required for the organization of a national bank is $50,000. In some sections of the country there has been a growing need for bank issues, as well as for other banking accommodations, in small towns in which the amount of $50,000 can not readily be raised for banking purposes. The inequality in the distribution of national banks is one of the marked features of our national banking system. In the Eastern and Middle States banks are abundant, and this alteration in the law would not be availed of to any considerable extent. But in the Western and Southern States there is a dearth of banks in many sections, due, no doubt, to the lack of capital in those sections.
>
> The following statement illustrates the situation:

Statement of banks, bank stock, and bank circulation in the States named.

States.	Number of banks.	Bank stock.	Bank circulation.
Massachusetts	268	$97,017,500	$31,511,706
Pennsylvania	412	74,233,129	27,600,870
New York	334	87,130,000	35,023,522
Ohio	248	45,645,338	15,714,986
Illinois	220	38,696,000	7,322,015
Indiana	114	14,372,000	5,521,060
New Jersey	102	14,385,000	4,966,527
Iowa	168	13,510,000	3,865,309
North Carolina	27	2,716,000	830,067
South Carolina	16	1,918,000	540,473
Georgia	29	3,066,000	1,143,504
Florida	18	1,485,000	368,668
Alabama	26	3,585,000	1,206,823
Mississippi	18	755,000	249,532
Louisiana	21	3,735,000	1,349,892
Arkansas	9	1,220,000	279,916

It thus appears that a marked discrepancy exists in the bank circulation and accommodations in the different sections of the country. This inequality may be remedied, in part, at least, and the existing need met to some extent in the sections where there is a dearth of bank issues and banks are so remote from each other as to afford grossly inadequate accommodations. Relief of this character has been recommended by those best qualified to judge, and meets the approval of the Comptroller of the Currency, who is most familiar with the banking needs of the country.

In the report of the Comptroller of the Currency two years ago it is said:

> The minimum capital stock required at present for the organization of a national bank is $50,000, with a deposit with the Treasurer of the United States of United States bonds of $12,500. The proposed reduction of capital stock to $25,000, with a proportionate reduction in the amount of bonds to be deposited with the Treasurer, in places of less than 2,000 inhabitants, would give independent banks of issue to communities in the South and West which, owing to the conditions surrounding them, can not take from their daily business needs a greater sum and invest in banking. The result is that they are deprived both of the use of foreign and local capital and the utilizing of their own credits. The safety of banking upon a reduced capital stock in such localities would be not less than that which attaches at present in larger cities and towns upon a greater capital stock. State banks are, under proper regulations and safeguards, conducted upon the basis of a small capital and, with the methods of examinations employed and the requirements exacted, there is no reason to believe that banks in the national system would be less safe. It would be far better for depositors in all towns and villages of limited population if officers and directors of national banks had dividends to pay upon but half of fifty thousand of capital instead of upon the whole amount. It would lessen the hazarding of loans upon uncertainties in order to make a profit which can not be legitimately earned, and therefore diminish the number of resultant failures.

SOME STRIKING COMPARISONS.

This argument is convincing enough, but it may be reenforced by some further considerations highly important to any adequate treatment of the banking question. That we may have before our minds conditions with which we are compelled to reckon in devising means of relief for sections suffering from lack of banking facilities, I reproduce the results in brief of an investigation I made some two years ago of the conditions existing in different sections of the Union, which, I believe, create an insuperable difficulty in the way of making any uniform system of banking equally efficacious in all parts of the Union. These conditions embrace area, population, personal and real property, farm lands, farm products, mortgages, average rate of interest, manufactured products, wages of employees in manufacturing, silver product, savings-bank depositors, number of national banks, capital stock, bonds to secure circulation, bank-note circulation, individual deposits, loans and discounts, money due by national banks, State banks, and reserve agents, and stocks and securities held by the national banks in each State.

For the purpose of the comparison I have adopted a classification of States as McKinley States and Bryan States, embracing, of course, in the former class all that gave their vote in the election of 1896 for McKinley and in the latter all that voted for Mr. Bryan. This mode of classification is adopted for convenience only and not for the purpose of appealing to political feeling, for on the money question there can be no politics. There is, however, a coincidence worthy of notice, that the States which voted for Bryan are those in which the greatest need for additional banking facilities is supposed to exist. This fact suggested the mode of classification adopted.

For the sake of brevity I will omit the tabulated statements, but will give the results of the comparison, which you will find interesting and instructive.

It shows that the McKinley States have in round numbers 35 and the Bryan States 65 per cent of the total area, while in population the ratio is substantially reversed, the McKinley States having 64 and the Bryan States 36 per cent of the total.

In school expenditures the McKinley States rise to 78 and the Bryan States fall to 22 per cent of the total. In the former the per capita expenditure for education is $2.71 and in the latter $1.37.

Of personal property the McKinley States possess 68 and the Bryan States 32 per cent of the total. Of real property the former hold 76 and the latter 24 per cent of the total. Of farm lands the McKinley States have 71 and the Bryan States 29 per cent of the total in value.

Of farm products the McKinley States produce 60 and the Bryan States 40 per cent of the total product. Of real-estate mortgages the McKinley States are burdened with 81 and the Bryan States with 19 per cent of the total incumbrance. Of manufactured products the McKinley States produce 87 and the Bryan States 13 per cent of the total product. Of the wages paid labor in manufacturing the McKinley States pay 88 and the Bryan States 12 per cent of the total wage paid. In silver product the Bryan States are far in the lead, producing 98 and the McKinley States but 2 per cent of the total product. In number of savings-bank depositors the McKinley States show over 98 and the Bryan States less than 2 per cent of the whole number, reversing the ratio in the case of silver.

It must be admitted that these are most pregnant facts and are of the profoundest significance in the consideration of the banking and currency question and its bearing upon those sections of the Union which exhibit such marked inferiority in all the elements which constitute the basis of modern economy in the mechanism of commercial exchange.

It is not my purpose at this time to submit any reasoning from the conditions I have brought into view. Every member of this House will be sensible enough of the influence they must exert upon the problem of supplying currency and credit to communities so deficient in the very breath of life to fiscal institutions. It is not to be expected that communities comparatively weak in the material resources which must precede banking facilities can maintain a banking system suitable to stronger, more developed, wealthy, and populous sections any more than we can expect the feebleness of childhood or the decrepitude of age to admit of the regimen suitable to the vigor of mature manhood. Banks can not be maintained where there is no banking to do; credit money is unavailable where credit does not exist; but these will grow up in every community just as fast as material development, capital, wealth, and business require them.

The comparisons I have given, as you have observed, relate to those conditions which constitute the foundations of a prosperous community. I now give you the results of a comparison in another class of conditions relating to the banking situation in the several sections of the Union. From this you will perceive how the latter conditions correspond with the former, showing from the comparison of facts the exact situation we would expect from an a priori view.

This exhibit shows that the McKinley States contain 75 and the Bryan States but 25 per cent of the total number of national banks. Of the capital stock the McKinley States have 83 and the Bryan States 17 per cent of the total. Of bonds deposited to secure circulation the McKinley States have 89 and the Bryan States 11 per cent of the total. Of bank-note circulation the McKinley States have 88 and the Bryan States 12 per cent of the total. Of individual deposits the McKinley States have 85 and the Bryan States 15 per cent of the total. Of loans and discounts the McKinley States have 91 and the Bryan States 9 per cent of the total. Of the money due from national and State banks and from reserve agents the McKinley States have between 80 and 85 and the Bryan States an average of about 20 per cent of the total. Of the stocks and securities held by the banks the McKinley States have 87 and the Bryan States 13 per cent of the total.

But a glance at these percentages will show how completely they conform to those in the former comparison, demonstrating that banks will exist where they are most needed and will multiply in proportion to the means of creating them and the need for their use.

LANCASTER COUNTY.

Now, let me, in the way of an object lesson, submit an illustration of the disparity of banking benefits enjoyed in different sections on account of differences in the conditions under which banking operations are carried on.

Lancaster County, Pa., which constitutes the Tenth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, contains an area of less than 1,000 square miles and has a population of about 150,000. It is an agricultural county, containing 500,000 acres of cultivated land divided into 9,000 farms which are assessed at nearly $90,000,000. Its agricultural product in 1890 was $7,657,790, exceeding by at least 25 per cent that of any other county in the Union. Its people have $21,500,000 invested in judgments and mortgages. It has 26 national banks, with a capital stock of $3,650,000 and a note circulation of $1,087,430. No citizen in the county need travel from his residence more than 12 miles at most to a national bank, where he can obtain all the accommodations he needs if he possesses the necessary collaterals.

The following table exhibits the banking situation in that county on October 6, 1896, and the situation has not materially changed since that time:

Bank statement for Lancaster County, Pa.

Number of banks.	Capital stock.	Bonds to secure circulation.	Notes in circulation.	Individual deposits.	Loans and discounts.
26	$3,650,000	$1,344,500	$1,203,929	$5,508,909.60	$7,985,301.78

I now present, in order to bring the contrast fully into view, a corresponding statement of the banking situation in the seven Southern States named.

Banking statement for seven Southern States named.

State.	Number of banks.	Capital stock.	Bonds to secure circulation.	Note circulation.	Individual deposits.	Loans and discounts.
North Carolina	28	$2,766,000	$806,000	$705,385	$4,869,968	$6,432,705
South Carolina	15	1,848,000	499,750	446,785	3,744,481	5,856,344
Georgia	28	4,016,000	507,000	1,109,457	6,634,493	8,925,609
Florida	17	1,350,000	405,000	382,930	3,911,651	3,567,624
Alabama	27	3,405,000	1,215,500	1,063,660	5,727,797	6,417,525
Mississippi	10	855,000	242,650	216,790	2,032,424	2,034,329
Arkansas	9	1,220,000	248,500	208,190	1,661,422	2,355,437
Total	134	15,460,000	3,924,400	4,173,197	28,582,236	35,589,573
Average	19	2,208,571	560,628	596,171	4,083,176	5,084,224

In the foregoing comparison we see side by side two agricultural sections of our country—one a single county, with an area of 973 square miles, with a population of 150,000 and one Representative in Congress; the other, seven sovereign States, with an average area of 48,985 square miles, an average population of 1,225,524, and an average representation in Congress of seven members. The result of the comparison shows that the former area, limited in extent and population as it is, has 37 per cent more banks, 65 per cent more capital stock, 140 per cent more bonds deposited for circulation, 100 per cent more circulating notes, 36 per cent more individual deposits, and 57 per cent more loans and discounts than the average number and amounts in the States embraced in the latter extended area.

The conditions which account for such disparity in banking facilities as are revealed in the foregoing comparison are conspicuous factors in the problem of national banking. They render impossible of attainment the proposal of some enthusiastic currency reformers, viz, a banking system which will furnish equal facilities to and make credit equally available in all portions of the country and distribute the loanable capital of the country so as to meet the needs of all sections. This might be possible in a country of more homogeneous conditions than ours, but here and now it is one of the "iridescent dreams" of financial Utopia, for dissimilar conditions will never yield similar or equal results in banking any more than in other realms. The best we can do will be an approximation to this ideal; to so amend our system as to secure the least of the worst and the most of the best results of a uniform national banking system. The bill before the House is an important step in that direction, and its passage will afford no inconsiderable relief in the sections of the country where the need is greatest.

FINANCIAL EMPIRE COMING TO AMERICA.

In a large sense the benefits of this measure will not be sectional, but coextensive with the Union, for it is a distinct legislative declaration of that purpose which the people of the United States steadfastly insist upon, that they shall be on a sound financial basis. Its provisions promote the maintenance of the five points of currency "Calvanism"—uniformity, safety, convertibility, elasticity, and sufficiency. These tenets constitute the standard of our faith and practice, and give assurance to the world that in banking and currency, at least, the United States is orthodox. Of this our history has given abundant demonstration.

This country has had a singularly interesting financial experience. Without summoning the ghost of our continental currency, we have seen hundreds of millions of dollars, the circulation of a portion of our country, engaged in an unfortunate attempt to break up our family housekeeping, like the apples of Sodom turn to ashes in the hands of the people, sweeping away great blocks of the wealth of its holders.

We have seen other millions of bank notes issued by State institutions depreciate in value, lose their currency, and become worthless in the hands of their unhappy holders. On the other hand, we have witnessed a currency exchanged for the wealth of the country to carry on a war for the preservation of the Union appreciate from 36 cents on the dollar to par in gold. From the ragged edge of worthlessness it rose in a few fleeting years to the value of specie the world over, commanding its face in gold in every commercial city on the globe. This achievement of unrivaled splendor in finance was due to wise legislation and invincible integrity.

One of the first steps we took after the war in our splendid march to the imperial place we now hold among the nations was to make our paper currency the equivalent of the world's money and equally good everywhere the flag floated. By our steadfast adhesion to the principle of national currency we have maintained our national honor and kept our money sound. Indeed, the wisdom of American statesmanship has evolved out of weakness a stupendous marvel of strength. The financial solidity of the United States will soon be the eighth wonder of the world. Our financial independence is practically achieved. Great and surprising things have come to pass in the last twenty months. We paid a debt of $20,000,000 to Spain without a wrinkle on the placid face of our finances and without shipping a dollar of gold.

The raising of the Bank of England's rate of discount produces no impression here. Even Congress convenes without exciting apprehension of financial disturbance. Financial empire is coming our way. We are advancing with leaps and bounds to the position of a creditor nation. Power and dominion in the financial world follow the course of commerce and manufactures. The scepter is passing from the Old to the New World, and New York will supplant London in the near future. American credits in Europe are putting a different face on the great questions of finance the world over. We are loaning money abroad by the millions, and we are very near the point where we can hold the reins of financial power on two continents.

Mr. Chairman, I hail the alluring prospect. I indulge the hope that the representatives of the American people will rise to the level of the new occasion which teaches new duties. This measure

is a part of the forward movement which leads upward through the gateway of our great opportunity. The gates of the East and South are open, and the immeasurable possibilities of world commerce invite us. A merchant marine commensurate with our resources, power, and empire will soon be among our achievements. A naval armament worthy a nation capable of achievements of such unrivaled splendor on the sea as shed undying luster on our naval heroes in the late war will soon be among our possessions. This Republic is rising into prominence as a coequal with the great world powers and will be a conspicuous factor in the world problems which loom in the twilight future.

This measure will be an effective agency in our equipment for the opportunities which Providence has laid at our feet. It is a necessary part of our qualification for the preeminence we are achieving in the commercial and financial world. A world power must have its finances based upon a world standard and must keep its money the best the world knows.

Among the inscriptions on the monument which perpetuates the memory, records the achievements, and recites the glories of England's Virgin Queen there is not one that shines with so fadeless a luster as that which tells how she restored the money of the Kingdom.

It is a happiness to know that among the recitals on the pages of American history that shall record the achievements and transmit to endless generations the imperishable glory of this Republic there will be none that will shine down the centuries with a more supernal splendor than that which tells how this nation preserved its honor, maintained its credit, and kept its money good. [Applause.]

APPENDIX.

[Extracts from the Report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899.]

Section 333 of the Revised Statutes of the United States provides that the Comptroller of the Currency, in his annual report to Congress, shall suggest amendments to the banking laws by which the system may be improved.

There is one reform needed in the bank-note currency of the United States concerning the general principles of which there seems little room for honest controversy. This is a provision for an emergency circulation which can be used in those seasons of the year in which the moving of crops requires an increase in the circulating medium, and to lessen the disastrous effects of the immense liquidation of credits incident to a financial panic. The widespread ruin and misery, affecting all classes of citizens and all kinds of business, which results from an industrial and financial panic is such that any measure designed to forestall or to lessen its destructive power should properly demand the highest degree of consideration. A time of active commerce and normal financial conditions, such as we are enjoying at present, is most opportune for the deliberate and careful discussion of measures which, if adopted now, may in a measure relieve the embarrassments above indicated and the keenness of the distress of commercial and industrial interests incident to such panics as those of 1873 and 1893.

It is true that the enactment of legislation by which the credit of our governmental currency may be protected from the effects of deficient revenues and from the influences of commercial panic is important as a measure of governmental policy at this time. The panic of 1893 and an ensuing period of deficiency in governmental revenue demonstrated that fact; but they likewise demonstrated the necessity of circulation of some nature by the banks which could be used to supply the demands during such an extreme emergency for a liquidating medium whose existence would tend to protect solvent institutions of all kinds from forced bankruptcy resulting from a money panic. The object of such a circulation is neither to provide profits to the banks nor to serve as a basis for the expansion of commercial credits under normal conditions. It would be to the country at large what the clearing-house certificates have proved to be in times of panic in some of our larger cities.

The necessity for such circulation, designed for the mutual protection of banks and the public in times of panic and money stringency, and so heavily taxed as to compel its retirement after the period of acute demand for money is passed, is made clearer by a reference to conditions prevailing in 1893.

The deposits of the national banks of the country between May 4 and October 4, 1893, were reduced in the sum of $378,767,691; the contraction in balances on deposit with other banks was $51,198,856; the contraction in stocks and securities was $2,177,912. The banks took out $31,265,616 of new circulation and borrowed $36,615,092 in their efforts to meet the general demands upon them. As a matter of fact, the necessary delay incident to printing national-bank notes by the Government after receiving the order for circulation by the banks, amounting on the average to twenty-five days, prevented the issuance of a larger circulation at this time, the acute crisis having passed by the time the notes were ready for delivery, and the order for the notes canceled by the banks in consequence.

The amount of orders canceled for this cause during the period above named is estimated at $11,000,000. Even with the aid of this additional circulation and borrowing, the national banks of the country, to meet this drain in deposits, were compelled to contract their loans during this period in the sum of $318,767,691, taking this immense amount from the productive industries of the country and carrying disaster, not only to employer and employee, but to every class of our citizens.

The records of this office show that with our banking system as a whole the money stringency incident to a financial panic is soon over. At most it is a matter of but a few months. The crisis of a panic once passed, the arrested wheels of general business start moving very slowly, and the unproductive and unloaned capital of the country stagnates in the banks.

In May, 1893, during the panic, the average reserve of the banks of the United States was 20.4 per cent, and in December, 1893, 35.7 per cent. In May, 1893, the banks of New York City held reserves of only 23.5 per cent, and in December, 1893, they held 41.2 per cent, or $66,653,000 above the required legal reserve of 25 per cent.

These facts prove that emergency circulation which could be used to lessen the disastrous effects of the liquidation incident to an industrial and bank panic would be needed for but a few months, and would not remain as a disturbing and unusual factor in business long after its time of maximum influence.

In connection with the recommendations which he embodies hereafter, the Comptroller repeats the recommendation made by him in his last report to Congress, to wit:

"For the purpose of allowing elasticity to bank-note issues to protect the banks and the community in times of panic, a small amount of uncovered notes, in addition to the secured notes, should be authorized by law, under the following limitations: They should be subjected to so heavy a tax that they could not be issued in normal times for the purpose of profit, but would be available in times of emergency. The tax should be so large upon the solvent issuing banks as to provide a fund which, in connection with the pro rata share of the assets of an insolvent bank, would be sufficient to redeem the notes in full, without necessitating any preference of note holders over depositors of any insolvent issuing bank. The tax should be so large as to force this currency into retirement as soon as the emergency passes. Such a currency could be used only to lessen the evil effects of the too rapid liquidation of credits which are collapsing under a financial panic, but could not be profitably used as a basis of business speculation and inflation. It should be to the business community what the clearing-house certificates are to our cities in times of panic—a remedy for an emergency, not an instrument of current business."

In view of the fact that our national banking system is composed of over 3,600 separate institutions scattered throughout our great country and surrounded by diversified business conditions, the problem of the enactment of such a law, involving as it does a departure to some extent from the principle of a bond-secured circulation, presents grave difficulties, arising partly out of the natural conservatism of our people and from the fact that the plan will be somewhat experimental. That such a law providing for the protection of the business community shall be ultimately passed is of great importance. A marked degree of elasticity, however, is possible of attainment in connection with our present system of bond-secured national-bank notes.

The Comptroller believes that, in accordance with the President's recommendation, national banks should be allowed to issue circulation to the par of the United States bonds deposited by them for circulation, and that, in connection with the law authorizing this, provision can be made for a secured emergency circulation.

The object of allowing banks to take out circulation to the par of the bonds is to induce them to furnish for the use of the public a larger amount of circulation than is in existence at present. The present rate of profit to be derived by the banks from their circulation is not sufficient to justify them in offering a larger amount, but any method of increasing the profits on circulation will result in an increase.

It is true that the authorization of an issue of currency to the par of the deposited bonds, subject to the present rate of tax, is one method of inducing a larger circulation, but it is not the only method. By a modification of the present rate of taxation on bank notes, coupled with the authorization of issues to the par of the bonds, the same inducements can be offered for a larger circulation and yet provision be made for a secured emergency circulation.

The Comptroller, therefore, would recommend legislation authorizing the issuance of national-bank note circulation to the par of the deposited United States bonds, and that the additional 10 per cent circulation thus allowed the banks be subjected to a tax at the rate of 2 or 3 per cent per annum for the time used, which will tend to prevent its unrestricted use under normal conditions and to save it for use at those periods of the year when crops are to be moved and in those periods of panic when it is most valuable both to the banks and the business public as a means of assisting the general liquidation of credits. With the object of securing an increase in the present bank-note circulation, he would recommend the reduction or abolishment of the present tax of 1 per cent per year on the circulation to 90 per cent of the deposited bonds—the amount of the reduction in the tax on currency to be collected from the necessary per cent of tax on the capital and surplus of national banks if requisite to the public revenues.

To allow the banks to issue up to the par of the bonds, unsubjected to additional tax on the 10 per cent extra circulation, will result in their immediately taking out their additional circulation for the purpose of profit. Business credits will be extended and adjusted to correspond with such increase of the currency, and practically the same inelasticity will characterize our bank-note issues then as now. With the advent of a panic we would have no additional means of lessening the necessity of a call upon the business community to furnish, by the repayment of loans, practically the bulk of the deposits drawn by frightened depositors.

It will be seen from an examination of the calculations given hereinafter that exactly the same rate of profit could be realized by the banks upon circulation to 90 per cent of the bonds deposited, taxed at four-ninths of 1 per cent per annum, as they could realize upon circulation to the par of the bonds at the present tax of 1 per cent.

It will also be seen that if the tax on the 90 per cent of circulation should be entirely abolished, or shifted to the franchise of banks, the profit on circulation would be much larger than could be realized upon circulation issued to the par of the bonds subjected to the present tax.

This rate of profit to be realized upon untaxed circulation issued to 90 per cent of the bonds would be so large that upon circulation issued to the par of the bonds it would be necessary to reduce the tax down to three-fifths of 1 per cent before an equal profit upon par circulation could be made.

It will also be noted that exactly the same rates of profit could be made upon 90 per cent circulation taxed one-sixth of 1 per cent as could be made upon par circulation taxed three-fourths of 1 per cent.

In the judgment of the Comptroller these tables show conclusively that by modification in forms of taxation the same relative increase in general bank-note circulation, with an emergency circulation in addition, can be obtained, while only an increase without any elasticity could be obtained under any system of uniform taxation upon par circulation.

For the purpose of indicating that within the range of the possible modification of taxation on a circulation to 90 per cent of the bonds, provision can be made for an emergency circulation of 10 per cent to the par of the bonds, while amply encouraging the increase in general note circulation desired, the Comptroller summarizes the result of calculations given more in detail hereafter.

Profit in dollars upon circulation issued against a deposit of $100,000, Government 4 per cent bonds maturing in 1907, at present price, being the possible amount to be realized under different rates of taxation, in addition to 6 per cent on the capital invested in bonds, with money worth 6 per cent.

On $90,000 circulation, being 90 per cent of $100,000 bonds, 1 per cent tax on circulation under present laws	$279.88
On $100,000 circulation to par of bonds, uniform 1 per cent tax	779.88
On $90,000 circulation to 90 per cent of bonds, taxed four-ninths of 1 per cent, making possible an issue of $10,000 emergency circulation, to be taxed at the rate of 2 or 3 per cent for the time issued	779.88
On $100,000 circulation to par of bonds, uniform tax of three-fourths of 1 per cent	1,029.88
On $90,000 circulation to 90 per cent of par of bonds, taxed one-sixth of 1 per cent, making possible an issue of $10,000 emergency circulation, to be taxed at the rate of 2 or 3 per cent for the time issued	1,029.88
On $100,000 circulation to par of bonds, uniform tax of three-fifths of 1 per cent	1,179.88
On $90,000 circulation to 90 per cent of par of bonds without taxation, making possible an issue of $10,000 emergency circulation, to be taxed at the rate of 2 or 3 per cent for the time issued	1,179.88

In the foregoing figures no profit is calculated as accruing upon the emergency circulation.

The Comptroller believes that the levying of a tax of one-sixth of 1 per cent upon circulation to 90 per cent of the par of the bonds, and allowing the banks to issue currency to the par of the bonds by paying a tax at the rate of 2 or 3 per cent per annum on the excess up to the par when outstanding, will result in the desired increase in our general bank-note issues, and provide a marked degree of elasticity in our circulation.

In this connection the Comptroller can not properly discuss the question of taxation of banks as related to the public revenues further than to say that the imposition of a tax upon the capital and surplus of the banks to offset any reduction in the tax on currency will remove any objection to his recommendation, on the grounds that it lessens the share of the public burden which the banks should properly bear.

In considering the probable effect on the amount of bank circulation outstanding which will result from a change in rates of taxation it must be remembered that the calculation would properly include, if it could be safely made, an estimate of the increased price of Government bonds, which will probably be incident to a greater demand for these bonds from the banks seeking profit on circulation under the modified rate of taxation.

This increased price of bonds may be such as to negative to some degree the desired effect of an increased bank-note circulation, since it will tend to lessen the profits on circulation. It must be remembered, however, that this objection can be made to any method of increasing the apparent profits on bank-note circulation, including the method of authorizing issues to par, subject to a uniform tax.

The Comptroller believes that from the passage of laws altering, as suggested, the rate and method of taxation of national-bank notes, an increase of at least $100,000,000 may be reasonably expected.

Based upon our present bond-secured bank-note circulation, which amounts to about $207,000,000, and this added amount, we would have, under such laws, an available bond-secured emergency circulation of at least $30,000,000.

As a summary of his views on this subject, the Comptroller would call attention to the following propositions:

First. Whether or not legislation be passed providing for an uncovered emergency circulation for needed protection from the disastrous effects of panics, a very much larger degree of elasticity can be imparted to our present bond-secured bank-note currency, thus making it of greater use in seasons of the year in which the demand for currency is above the normal, and of invaluable assistance in times of panic.

Second. This result can be obtained by the enactment into law of the President's recommendation that national banks be allowed to issue to the par of the Government bonds deposited by them as security, and by the modification of the present tax upon national banks as follows:

After determining approximately the lowest rate of profit which will call into circulation the additional amount of national-bank notes deemed necessary for public convenience, this rate of profit should be reached by lessening or shifting to the franchise of banks the present 1 per cent tax on circulation to 90 per cent of the par of the Government bonds securing it. A tax of 2 or 3 per cent should then be levied on the excess of circulation over 90 per cent of the bonds, which will make of such excess circulation a secured emergency circulation, only to be used when it becomes a public necessity, and not as a means of profit by the banks under normal conditions.

The general increase in bank circulation desired being possible of attainment through the lowering of the tax on the 90 per cent circulation, this additional tax on the 10 per cent excess circulation to the par of the bonds will not materially interfere with such general increase and will only operate to create an emergency circulation of great value.

Third. As the use of rediscounts and bills payable on the part of the Western and Southern banks at certain seasons of the year is regarded as evidencing the need of an elastic circulation, and as bearing upon the question of the measure of relief which may be expected from the bond-secured emergency circulation here recommended, the Comptroller will state that without any general increase in bank-note circulation as a result of new legislation, the possible emergency circulation of $20,000,000 immediately available, based on bonds securing the present circulation, amounts to more than the combined bills payable and rediscounts of all the national banks of the United States outstanding at any time within the last three years.

If the Comptroller's estimate of a possible bond-secured emergency circulation of $30,000,000 be correct, this amount is about double the average combined bills payable and rediscounts of the entire national system outstanding within that period.

As the elastic and uncovered issues of the joint-stock banks of England, Scotland, and Ireland, comprising all the uncovered bank notes there issued, may be cited as illustrating the advantages of an elastic circulation, the Comptroller would also call attention to the fact that these entire issues are but a small amount more than the $20,000,000 bond-secured emergency circulation which would be immediately available on existing bond deposits in the United States under the legislation recommended. And with an increase in general bank-note circulation, resulting from modified laws, we would probably have a bond-secured emergency circulation in this country larger than the emergency circulation of the joint-stock banks of England, Scotland, and Ireland, which is secured only by the general assets of the banks, without preference over other creditors.

Fourth. Even if a special uncovered emergency circulation be provided, to be used only in case of panics, the plan here suggested of changing the taxation and issues of secured bank notes will afford an elastic circulation of value in times of money stringency not approaching the severity of a panic.

With or without the legislation for the special uncovered emergency circulation, the bond-secured emergency circulation will be of great public use.

Fifth. If provision be made for an uncovered emergency circulation for use in times of panic, subject to a tax so large as to be repressive at all other times, the 10 per cent bond-secured emergency circulation herein recommended might be taxed at the rate of 2 per cent per annum for the time issued instead of at the rate of 3 per cent, thus allowing its freer use under more normal conditions. But if no uncovered circulation for panics be provided, the more repressive tax of 3 per cent seems desirable upon the bond-secured emergency circulation.

Sixth. There is no need, under normal conditions, of a large amount of emergency circulation or a high degree of elasticity in bank-note circulation. The immense volume of checks, drafts, and bills of exchange, based upon the assets of banks and often called bank-credit currency, expands and contracts in accordance with the demand of trade and business, and is the medium through which the great bulk of the business of our country is transacted. It is extremely elastic, and varies in amounts at different seasons of the same year. It is generally amply adequate to the business needs of the country, except in times of disturbed confidence and financial panic.

Seventh. The issuance of bank-asset notes under normal conditions and in the present development of our banking system can not be justified by the plea that without them the needed elasticity of bank-note currency can not be obtained. Nothing except the avoidance of panic can at present justify any experiments with bank-asset currency. When authorized for use in times of panic the notes should be so heavily taxed that they can circulate only while a panic lasts and, like clearing-house certificates, should be a remedy simply for a rare emergency

In seeking the theoretical advantages of fluidity in bank circulation we should take no risks with its solidity.

The following table, to which reference has already been made, shows the calculation in detail of profits on bond-secured national bank-note circulation under the present and different methods of taxation and issue:

Profit on national-bank circulation, secured by $100,000 United States 4 per cent bonds of 1907, at $113,125, money being worth 6 per cent: First, with circulation 90 per cent of bonds, tax 1 per cent; second, circulatian par of bonds, tax 1 per cent; third, circulation 90 per cent of bonds, tax four-ninths of 1 per cent; fourth, circulation par of bonds, tax three-fourths of 1 per cent; fifth, circulation 90 per cent of bonds, tax one sixth of 1 per cent; sixth, circulation par of bonds, tax three-fifths of 1 per cent, and seventh, circulation 90 per cent of bonds, with no tax.

Capital invested.	Bonds purchased.	Amount of circulation on bonds.	Receipts.		
			Interest on circulation at 6 per cent.	Interest on bonds.	Gross receipts.
$113,125	$100,000	90 per cent. $90,000	$5,400	$4,000	$9,400
$113,125	100,000	Par. $100,000	6,000	4,000	10,000
$113,125	100,000	90 per cent. $90,000	5,400	4,000	9,400
$113,125	100,000	Par. $100,000	6,000	4,000	10,000
$113,125	100,000	90 per cent. $90,000	5,400	4,000	9,400
$113,125	100,000	Par. $100,000	6,000	4,000	10,000
$113,125	100,000	90 per cent. $90,000	5,400	4,000	9,400

Capital invested.	Deductions.				Net receipts.	Interest on capital invested.	Yearly profit on circulation in excess of interest on the investment.
	Tax.	Expenses.	Sinking fund to retire premium on bonds.	Total deductions.			
$113,125	1 per cent. $900	$62.50	$1,370.12	$2,332.62	$7,067.38	$6,787.50	$279.88
$113,125	1 per cent. $1,000	62.50	1,370.12	2,432.62	7,567.38	6,787.50	779.88
$113,125	⅑ of 1 per cent. $400	62.50	1,370.12	1,832.62	7,567.38	6,787.50	779.88
$113,125	⅑ of 1 per cent. $750	62.50	1,370.12	2,182.62	7,817.38	6,787.50	1,029.88
$113,125	⅑ of 1 per cent. $150	62.50	1,370.12	1,582.62	7,817.38	6,787.50	1,029.88
$113,125	⅑ of 1 per cent. $600	62.50	1,370.12	2,032.62	7,967.38	6,787.50	1,179.88
$113,125	No tax.	62.50	1,370.12	1,432.62	7,967.38	6,787.50	1,179.88

Mr. COOPER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, an analysis of this bill discloses its purpose, meaning, and intent to be, (1) unequivocally to fix the gold standard on this country; (2) to make all the interest-bearing obligations of the United States, all the greenbacks, Treasury notes, silver certificates, silver dollars, and other forms of currency redeemable and payable in gold coin, and all obligations, public and private, past, present, and future, for the payment of money payable in gold coin; (3) to impound and destroy the $346,000,000 of paper currency commonly known as greenbacks; (4) to make permanent a gold reserve; (5) to give greater power to the national banks over the currency of the United States, and to further delegate to them the power of sovereignty.

I insist that not one of the provisions of the bill should be enacted into law. The mover of this bill, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET], has made a painstaking and elaborate argument in its support, and it is to be presumed that he has exhausted all the argument that will or can be made in its behalf. He is reasonably fair, but the fault of his argument mainly is the fallacy of his premises. He assumes that gold and silver have an intrinsic value. This is not true. They have a relative value and are measured by each other, by the lawful functions they may perform, and by the commodities they acquire or interchange for. Without a demand to perform any duties for mankind they would be valueless; and they increase in value in proportion to the service and functions they perform. He also premised by the assertion that the legal-tender quality of money does not add to its value.

He next assumed that money is only a medium of exchange, and, lastly, that the value of silver was, prior to 1873, the equal in value to gold, because but a small quantity of silver had then been coined and in circulation. The controversy here necessarily brings up for consideration, incidentally, if not directly, the coinage question or "silver issues." And the pertinent issue involved is the contention that the Democratic party has always made, that the quantity of money in circulation among the people regulated its value and brought prosperity or distress. I concede that for the past eighteen months the country has increased in prosperity, that the products of labor are bringing a higher price,

and that employment of labor has increased. But these results are attributed mainly, if not only, to the increased volume of money put in circulation among the people; that it is not in consequence of the single gold standard as practiced or proposed, but has come in spite of it.

The volume of money has not only been increased in this country, but the quantity put in circulation among the people has been enormously increased. Our exports have exceeded our imports for the past two years to the amount of $1,145,307,489. This money, paid by foreign nations for the products of labor in this country, has been added to our circulating medium. It is believed by many that during the past eighteen months we have sold more American stocks and securities abroad than during any other period of our history. If true, the money arising from these sales has been added to our currency. The gold productions of the world for the past two years have been greater than ever before, and the United States have been the beneficiary of the lion's share of this product.

A great war has been waged, in which the Government has had to expend about $350,000,000, and this vast sum of money directly and immediately delivered to the people, though later it will have to be returned by the people to the Government. In the war now being waged in the Philippine Archipelago we are expending about $600,000 per day. A bond issue has been made by the present Administration and $200,000,000 worth of bonds were sold to the bankers of this country, and the money derived from the sale of these bonds has been distributed among the people for labor and the products of labor.

More than 100,000 men during the past twelve months have been employed by the Government as soldiers, sailors, seamen, etc., and thereby were removed from competition with American labor, and consequently increased the demand for labor.

Mr. Chairman, these are the things that have brought about the apparent prosperity, and these are the results promised by the Democratic party if the volume of money should be increased by the free coinage of silver.

To insist that the legal-tender quality of money does not add to its value is to dispute a law of business as well as a law of nature. I concede that law can not directly confer value on any metal or material, but law can create a demand which will confer value on a money metal or anything else, and this demand will be created by giving to money a legal-tender quality. As a medium of exchange legal-tender money is not absolutely essential; but money is not only a medium of exchange; it is a standard and measure of value, and I will add the further definition that it is the representative of human energy deposited for future use. Then, if you increase the functions that this medium of exchange, measure of value, and representative of labor may perform, you necessarily add to its value. It is true there are a great many matters of detail connected with money or the financial question.

Mr. Chairman, the effects of the various financial policies that have been proposed permeate every nook and corner of business life and leave their impress upon all commercial, manufacturing, mining, and agricultural activity, yet the gist of the matter I believe to be very simple. All business is governed by the same principle; all nature is governed by the same laws. The force that draws down the meteor to disastrous collision with the earth is the same force that causes the leaf to float silently down to the ground. The same laws that govern the interpretation of a contract to build a nation's capitol or to string an electric cable beneath the sea also govern the construction of a contract to deliver a bale of cotton or a bunch of cattle, and so the principles that underlie this question of free coinage of silver and the single gold standard underlie the simplest and commonest transactions of everyday life.

The question here presented is simply a question of money monopoly. All know that there is a law known as the law of demand and supply. According to this law, if there is a great demand for an article, or if the amount demanded is greater than the amount that can be supplied, the price of the article will rise, and if the supply of the article is greater than the demand, the price of the article will fall. If the amount of money which can be used to transact the business of this country is large, much larger than there is a demand for, then money will be cheap. If, on the other hand, the supply of money is not large enough to meet the demand, if two dollars are needed where only one dollar can be found, then money will do just what everything else would do under the same circumstances—it will rise in value and purchasing power.

The law of demand and supply is a natural law, and there are no exceptions to the laws of nature. They are general; they are universal. In all countries, in all ages past, men have attempted at times to get control of the stock or supply of one article or another in order to be able to put up the prices and thus enrich themselves off the necessities of their fellow-men. They are all about us to-day, and we call them trusts. They go hand in hand with the power that is attempting to force this bill as a law upon the American people, and they are both moved by the same purpose, hoping and expecting the same result.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is bad because it is retroactive in its effect, and makes all the obligations of the Government and the private obligations of the citizen payable in one kind of money only—gold. When the public and private debts now existing were contracted and incurred they were payable in the lawful money of the United States, and that money was gold, silver, and paper. By the destruction of the greenbacks, as proposed in this bill, and by making all the silver and paper currency a charge upon gold, leaving gold the only legal-tender money, the money of the country will not only be contracted, thereby adding to the value of the remaining money, but the gold will be additionally increased in value, because it will be authorized by law to perform a function that no other circulating medium or money can perform. This purposed legislation will change the contracts to the injury of the debtor class of this country.

All laws affect all persons some and many persons seriously. The effect of this law would be to materially and seriously affect the weaker class of our people, the debtor class. Should it follow that under this law we would have a redundant currency or an increased volume of money, then it would injuriously affect the creditor class of our people. If favors to one of these classes must be given by law, where in justice and equity ought it to fall? Most men become debtors from necessity. Food and raiment must be obtained for themselves and those dependent upon them, and in order to obtain it they must pledge their future labor to obtain credit. Most men become creditors from choice and for profit. It is the expected interest and profit that buy the use of the money of the creditor. Then, if one must suffer by law it is but equitable and humane that he who is weakest and enforced by the necessities of himself or family to incur obligations should receive the favor of the law.

Mr. Chairman, I predict that if this bill becomes a law it will result in an appreciating currency. Were the operation of an appreciating currency equal upon all men, little damage might be done, but he perishes first who is weakest, and by his ruin drags down the stronger. The farmer is the weakest of capitalists, and therefore has the least power of resistance, because he can not suspend production. In like manner farm labor is weaker than industrial labor, because it can not combine. The farmers of the country per capita may be the smallest debtors, but in the aggregate owe the largest sum of money of any class of its citizens.

This bill purposes to impound and furnishes the means and opportunity to destroy $346,000,000 of the lawful money (greenbacks) of the United States, and yet we have the anomalous statements made by the friends of the bill that its effect will be to increase the volume of money.

Mr. Chairman, the last and possibly the most dangerous provision of the bill is that section which purposes to delegate further sovereignty and greater power to the national banks. I am not opposed to banks when they operate within their proper sphere and do not exercise the functions of government. In fact, I would aid them in all manner of ways that they may facilitate the business transactions of the country. But their history has been one of constant danger to the Republic. Almost since the beginning of our history, between the people and the banks there has been an irrepressible conflict, and this conflict will never be over so long as governments are so constructed and legislation so enacted as to give scope and opportunity for the free operation of the principles of greed, ambition, selfishness, and love of power.

Scarcely had our Government been installed when some men from the Eastern States came to Congress and asked this body to delegate to them the power to issue paper money, and thus control the money supply of the country. This request, so hostile to the spirit of democracy, was the first test of the new system. It was the first deviation from the idea of equality to all and special privileges to none. Had our forefathers withstood this attack boldly much of subsequent American history might never have been written; but they yielded and a charter was granted for twenty years to an institution to be known as the United States Bank. The next great trial of strength between the people and the classes occurred when the first charter of the United States Bank expired by limitation and a second charter was asked for. The friends of the people fought the measure with all the energy they possessed and clearly pointed out its unconstitutionality and its hostility to the fundamental idea of popular government. In vain did Mr. Jefferson say:

> Bank paper must be suppressed and the circulation be restored to the nation, to whom it belongs.

In vain did he say:

> I have ever been the enemy of banks—not of those discounting for cash, but of those foisting their own paper into circulation and thus banishing our cash.

The bank triumphed by using in its struggle against popular rights the very power which the people had granted to it. When

the second charter expired its advocates again came before Congress and demanded a renewal of the charter. Fortunately for Democracy, Andrew Jackson, a man who knew no fear of the harm which corporate influence could do him, fought the measure with all the energy of his intense nature; but it was again in vain.

In vain did Secretary of the Treasury Gallatin say:

> The right of issuing paper money as currency, like that of gold and silver coins, belongs exclusively to the nation, and can not be claimed by any individual or individuals.

In vain did Secretary of the Treasury Crawford say:

> Coinage and the regulation of money have, in all nations, been considered the highest acts of sovereignty. As a paper currency is issued upon the national credit, the whole property of the nation is pledged for its redemption. It is, therefore, manifest that it should not issue upon the credit of any individual or association of individuals.

In vain did the New York State convention say:

> We declare unqualified hostility to bank notes and paper money as a circulating medium, because gold and silver is the only constitutional currency.

Just as the national Democratic convention, four years later, declared:

> We believe such an institution (a national bank) one of deadly hostility to the best interest of the country, dangerous to our republican institutions and to the liberties of the people, and calculated to place the business of the country within the control of a concentrated money power and above the laws and will of the people.

In spite of all these utterances and influences the bank triumphed. Congress passed the charter, but President Jackson vetoed the bill, and the bank expired, and for twenty-five years the country got along without a national bank, and these were among the most prosperous in our commercial history.

Mr. Chairman, when the civil war broke out the spirit of greed and lust for power again asserted itself. When the plain, common people were hurrying to the front to offer their services and their lives to their country, these friends of a national bank hurried to Washington and offered their services, not to fight their country's battle, but to have themselves made the beneficiaries of a system of national banks by virtue of which the banker would have his property exempted from taxation and would have the privilege of drawing interest on his untaxed property and also on his debts. The country was then in the throes of war, and money was urgently needed. Were it not for this I would say, shame on the Congress that would grant such privileges.

The money power has been insidious and sleepless, and has constantly wrenched from the Government, to the injury of the people, an unfair and an unjust power. The holders of the obligations of the Government that were originally payable in the lawful currency of the United States and that could have then been paid with money worth 40 to 50 cents on the dollar in coin came before Congress in 1869 and demanded that the contract be changed and that these obligations be made payable in coin, and they got what they asked for. The excuse for the act was that the law would strengthen the credit of the country. The paper currency of the Government had been good enough to pay off the common soldier and the common sailor and the farmer who had furnished supplies for the aid of the Government, but it was not good enough to pay the banker and the bondholder who had speculated on the necessities of the country. Not satisfied with this advantage, these same people came to Congress again in 1873 and demanded that silver be demonetized, thereby again changing the obligations from coin obligations to gold obligations. Again they got what they asked.

Encouraged by their previous successes, they now come to Congress asking that the word "gold" shall not only be written in the obligations of the Government, but that it shall be written in all the contracts and obligations of the people. Cheered by the power that has heretofore been granted them, they come demanding that the Government shall parcel out its sovereignty and surrender to them the manipulation and control of the fiscal and financial affairs of the Government. And it is evident that this branch of Congress "will crook the pregnant hinges of the knee" and yield to this hurtful and unreasonable demand.

Mr. Chairman, true Democracy is sympathy for the poor and unfortunate. It rejoices with those who rejoice in the success of honest effort and weeps with those who feel the pitiless hand of misfortune and oppression. True Democracy is to-day looking with sympathetic glances toward the courageous Boers, who are struggling for liberty and self-government. Wherever on this earth are the poor, the unfortunate, the oppressed; wherever is heard the hiss of the oppressor's lash; wherever is seen the triumph of selfish greed over human right; wherever is found a brave, honest, frugal, self-denying, toiling people, striving to obtain a just reward for their labor and avail themselves of the protection which a just government ought to confer on its citizens, there the spirit of Democracy broods over them with loving tenderness. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I shall not, of course, undertake to make a speech upon the theories underlying what I believe to be the sound financial principle of bimetallism. I have made that speech not once already, but three times in this House, considering every possible phase of it as far as I was intellectually able to consider it. I rise here to-day for the purpose of noticing a few things which have arisen in this debate.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCLEARY], who was heard yesterday, notices "a strange inconsistency" upon the part of gentlemen upon this side. He says that they do not come "rushing down the aisles now holding free-silver bills in their hands to offer as substitutes." The remark, in its quibbling and in its lack of intellectual integrity, was worthy of all other arguments which the gentleman used during the same debate. When giving some facts of history, with other and explanatory facts of the same history lying embedded in his own mind, he tried to create a false impression. This he attempted to do by using the words "silver dollar" in a double sense—using it himself to mean the specific coin, but expecting the people who heard him to understand it to mean silver money. You will all recall that.

Now, why do I say that the gentleman has quibbled when he says we do not come down the aisles with free-silver bills in our hands as substitutes? I say it because he knows as well as I know that this rule has been constructed for the express purpose of preventing amendments, substitutes, or anything else upon which record votes can be obtained in the House of Representatives.

Mr. MCCLEARY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MCCLEARY. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Would you, if you could, introduce a free-silver amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, answering for myself, I stand here to say that I have never yet made a public utterance by which I would not abide, because that utterance has always been not only the conviction of my constituents, but my own. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And had I the power now, standing here as I do, if I were the Czar of America and had unlimited power, I would to-morrow open the mints to the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, with but one doubt in my mind, and that doubt would be as to whether it were not better to go to the world's legislative ratio of 15½ to 1. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MCCLEARY. I am glad to have the gentleman express himself. Will he pardon one other question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I, Mr. Chairman, at any rate, am not one of those who profess opinions that they would not dare carry into execution.

Mr. MCCLEARY. May I ask another question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield always.

Mr. MCCLEARY. In view of the statement of my friend a moment ago as to quibbling, I desire to ask his attention to the fact that we have always had the coinage of subsidiary silver. The act of 1873 did not prevent that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I understand the gentleman's question, and I want to save as much time as possible.

Mr. MCCLEARY. Pardon me just for a moment. I will see that you get more time. The only thing men have ever talked about in regard to the act of 1873 was the silver dollar piece. The crime of 1873 was that that specific coin was cut off. My point was to show that that specific coin had never been coined as money.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I can not yield further, because my time is so short and I understand the gentleman's question. I say that the gentleman is quibbling again. When the act of 1873 was passed the only legal-tender full-rate silver money was the silver dollar, and therefore we complain that when they then struck down the silver dollar they struck down all silver as standard, self-redeeming money.

But prior to 1873, and prior to 1834, when the mints of the country were opened to the unlimited coinage of silver in halves and in quarters that were full weight, containing exactly one-half or one-fourth of the amount of silver in a silver dollar, and being full legal tender, the gentleman knows that the complaint would not have been then that the "silver dollar" was stricken down, but would have been that "silver" was stricken down; nor would it have been solely that in 1873, when the silver dollar was struck down, had there then been in existence halves and quarters that were of full weight, full legal-tender, self-redeeming money; and the gentleman was possessed of all these facts in his mind. I know of my own knowledge that there is not a man in this House better acquainted with the facts of American financial history than the gentleman from Minnesota.

Now, the gentleman knows as well as I know that when we complain that in 1873 the cessation of the coinage of the silver dollar struck down silver it was because at that time, although it had not been the case at prior times, the silver dollar was the only self-redeeming silver coin.

Mr. McCLEARY. If the gentleman will pardon me——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman has taken advantage of that fact, and of the fact that all this argument had preceded along that line, to go back to Jefferson's order in order to make the impression on the minds of the people that Jefferson had stricken down silver when he ordered the cessation of the coinage of the specific coin, one dollar. He does this because in 1873 the silver dollar was regarded by the public as the only form of silver money—that is, standard silver money.

Mr. McCLEARY. If the gentleman will pardon me, I will ask him one more question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I will yield to the gentleman; and right here I will not only yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, but to any other gentleman upon that side who has a single proposition to make, which, drawn from the present conditions, makes in his opinion the argument which we made in 1896 either discredited, impeached, or false.

Mr. McCLEARY. The gentleman admits, as I understand, that the coin known as the silver dollar has not been coined as money on private account in this century. That was my allegation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I never disputed the letter of that assertion. My entire statement was that you made a misleading allegation based on that. Based upon one sense in which you used the word, literally, perhaps your statement was true, but in doing it you used the words "silver dollar" in such a manner as that the country might understand something which was not true and which you knew was not true.

Mr. McCLEARY. The gentleman had no such purpose. It was absolutely his intention to state exactly what he meant and mean exactly what he said.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Let us see. I will leave that to the House. We were engaged in discussing the question of bimetallism, in discussing that; and when the gentleman introduced that argument he must have introduced it as a relevancy, and if it was relevant at all it was relevant upon the ground that it proved that history established the fact that bimetallism did not exist from the time of Jefferson's order and that monometallism did. And if it was not intended by him to be accepted as relevant for that purpose, then I have too much respect for the gentleman's intelligence to believe that he would have used it in the argument at all.

Mr. McCLEARY. Now, one further question, and I will try not to embarrass my friend again or take up his time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman does not embarrass me, but he does take up my time.

Mr. McCLEARY. Is it or is it not true that the silver coins less than a dollar disappeared from the country for the same reason that the dollar disappeared about 1853?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Not at all. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the gentleman has come to that, because there is one of the things that I want to explode, if I can explode anything.

Mr. McCLEARY. I would like to hear you explode it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman's whole question is based upon the assumption that there exists a so-called commercial ratio between two metals, and that when we undertook to tie them together, in the early part of our Government, by a ratio of 15½ to 1, gold fled the country, and when we undertook to tie them together, later on in the history of the country, by a ratio of 16 to 1, silver fled the country. Now, that is the basis of presumption in your question, is it not?

Mr. McCLEARY. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Now, Mr. Chairman, there is the presumption, and they say that it is thereby demonstrated to be a fact that you can not tie the two metals together by a legislative ratio, and that you must attempt to find the commercial ratio. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, a man who has thought the matter out to a result, if he possesses the capacity of a 14-year-old boy, would never afterwards, as long as he lived, make an assertion that there ever had been a commercial ratio between the two metals.

Now, why? Because, unless he uses the phrase "commercial ratio" in a double sense, he means a ratio independent of the use of the metals as money. If he means anything he means that. If he means nothing, why, then, of course, he ought to quit talking. Now, then, how will you find out what the commercial ratio was, or is, or can be, unless one of two things happen—unless both metals were equally and everywhere all over the world not money, or unless both of them were equally and everywhere all over the world money. Neither state of affairs has ever existed in the world. Possibly neither ever will exist.

Now, then, the nearest you can come to what would be a commercial ratio, neither of these state of affairs existing, is to take the ratio of production. Take the ratio of production. We had a ratio of 15½ to 1 prior to the change in 1834 and one of 16 to 1 after that time. And yet the ratio of production between the two metals varied vastly over 100 per cent from 1830, prior to the law, down to 1852, after the law.

By the way, it is not the commercial ratio that made the gold leave us prior to 1834. It was not the commercial ratio that made the silver leave us subsequent to 1834. It was a conflict of legislative ratios, and the mistake that was made by that great man, Hamilton, was that he was foolish enough to attempt to seek an imaginary thing, an ignis fatuus, something that did not exist, never did exist, and can not exist until the conditions are legislated into being. Had he pursued what would seem now to be an obvious, plain, and palpable course, he would have looked abroad, not for a practically not existent, an imaginary and unascertainable thing, but to find what the chief controlling, existing legislative ratio was, and he would have found it to be 15½ to 1. What did he do?

Mr. McCLEARY. Will the gentleman yield right there for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Wait until I get through with this thought and I will answer all questions. I believe I could stand here twenty-four hours, if physical strength would hold out, and answer these questions. What was the consequence, Mr. Chairman? We found the French mints offering a higher price for gold at one period and for silver at a later period, their ratio remaining constant at 15½ to 1 and not varying one-half on either side. Gentlemen say the coins parted company.

They did no such thing. There never was a time except when there were temporary agios (as there was a temporary agio in 1893, when a premium was paid in New York for silver dollars). With the exception of the temporary agios there never was, I say, a time when one American coined dollar was not the exact equivalent in interchangeability and exchangeability with every American coined dollar. The metals parted company. The bullions were not maintained at a parity.

It was not after we coined them that a difference or "parting" came. But because the French mint paid more for gold at one period the gold went there. Later on, when we adopted 16 to 1, the French mint paid 3 cents per ounce more for silver, and silver went there. The very fact that you people have been going all over the country and repeating, viz, that only a certain number of silver dollars were coined prior to the war, proves that the silver did not go to the mint.

In other words, the fact you quote is the proof that your contention as to disparity of coins or moneys is false. In other words, the thing you quote does not prove that you can not tie the two metals together by legislative ratios. It merely proves that as between two conflicting legislative ratios the stronger will prevail. Remember at that time France overtopped us in her influence on the commerce and exchanges of the world, as much as we do her to-day—aye, more. Our legislative ratio met a stronger legislative ratio and went down.

Mr. Chairman, I have said that I was willing to stand here all day and answer any questions or objections the object of which was to show any imagined discrepancy between lessons drawn from actual conditions and the propositions laid down by us in the campaign of 1896, the object of which was to contradict or impeach the theory which we then advanced or to show that that theory is not applicable to present conditions.

Conditions change, and the effect of the application of true theories to them varies in intensity of manifestation, but the principle never varies in itself and is always applicable. I was much struck by an observation made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] in a speech made by him, not because there was anything new in the remark, but because it is eminently applicable to present times. That remark was that "no right conduct, public or private, can be predicated upon anything except a true theory." He was eminently correct. All scientific results begin with a working hypothesis and end in accord with some fundamental law. I care not whether you call it a theory, a law, or a fixed principle.

In politics it is perhaps better to call it a principle. Without fundamental principles a man in his private conduct, a nation in its public conduct, is a derelict at sea, and all those who would physic the body politic without squaring themselves with the fundamental and underlying principle of political science are, after all, but empyrics. It has been said in this debate that our nominee for the Presidency in 1896, W. J. Bryan, said, "You might just as well expect to see the law of gravitation violated and an apple fall upward instead of downward as to see prosperity under a gold standard," and it has been argued that the fact that we now have a measure of comparative prosperity not only falsifies his prediction but the theory upon which it was founded.

Mr. Chairman, men in the heat of debate frequently express themselves inadequately. Mr. Bryan is of course no exception to the rule. Men are seeking strong expressions. The excitement of the moment urges them to it, and they have not time to condition every proposition in all of its bearings and in view of all possible contingencies. The gentlemen who have made this objection to what Mr. Bryan said, though they may have literally quoted his

words in some extemporaneous speech, know that they are not giving a fair presentation of what he meant nor of the theory which he represents.

What Mr. Bryan meant and what he said, not once, but a hundred times, must be taken as having reference to the then condition of gold production, and if he had had time to condition the remark he would of course have said that with the amount now coming from the mines each year there can not be an increase of prices nor any prosperity under a gold standard. When I use the word "prices" I mean a general level of prices.

What Mr. Bryan did say, not once but a hundred times, clearly expressed, and what in fair intendment he meant when he invoked the analogy of the law of gravitation, was that a stationary or decreasing volume of self-redeeming money must carry with it lessening wages and falling prices; that a decreasing volume of basic money and increasing wages and prices are contemporaneously impossible. Why, you yourself confess the converse in this debate when each and every one of you boast that there has been an increase of over $200,000,000 in the money in circulation among the people of the United States within the last year. And then you say to us, "You promised the people an increased circulation through the instrumentality of the free and unlimited coinage of silver, and we have given them an increased circulation by an immense addition of gold money."

God save the mark! You and Mr. McKinley have given us this increased volume of gold money. Mr. McKinley is responsible and should have the credit for the discovery and the exploitation of the gold mines in South Africa and of those in the Klondike. Mr. McKinley and the Republican party should be kept in power because the cyanide process of treating gold ores has decreased the cost of production of gold and increased its volume to what extent exactly we do not know.

But, although your claim is ridiculous, it contains three admissions: First, that times as a whole have improved—that we are upon a more prosperous basis than we were in 1895; and secondly, that the cause of this improvement consists in a condition of higher prices—prices increasing and therefore encouraging production and industry, instead of the former condition of prices constantly falling and therefore discouraging production and disheartening producers; and third, that the cause of the rise in prices has been an increase in the volume of basic money in the shape of gold.

We admit these conditions and all they tend to show, all except the assumption involved in the last one, that the increased volume of gold has been owing to any act of yours. It has been due to an act of God, and God is in special partnership neither with your party nor with my own. You have the cart before the horse, just as you have when your orators say that the election of Mr. McKinley caused wheat to go up. They might with greater propriety say that the fact of the rise in the price of wheat elected Mr. McKinley. They can say with no measure of truth that the election of Mr. McKinley caused the rise in the price of wheat.

The fact is, as you well know, that wheat was higher for some time prior to the election of Mr. McKinley than it is to-day. I say that when Mr. Bryan uttered the words which are attributed to him, if he did utter them, he had in his mind the then condition of gold production. Conditions change; principles never. Unfortunately it is true that there are men in this world who can not see a principle under certain conditions. There are men who can not understand that the law of gravitation works when a balloon goes upward, or that the law of gravitation is not violated when a rocket is shot aloft in the air.

To show how conditions have changed to some extent, not in impeachment of our theory but in fulfillment of it, I will call your attention to an experience in my own career in this Hall. I stood upon the floor of this House in 1893 when gentlemen upon the other side of the Hall were objecting to the free and unlimited coinage of silver upon the ground that the annual production of the silver mines was so immense that the business of the world could not absorb it. The annual production of silver at that time was $210,000,000.

I made a labored argument in support of the proposition that after subtracting from this sum the amount of silver which must necessarily go into the arts and further subtracting the amount which would be taken by the Orient for money and by the limited-coinage countries for fractional and subsidiary currency, the United States alone could absorb in its business the balance left, and that if it could absorb it and use it, if there was a demand sufficient to use every dollar of it as money in the United States, free-coinage legislation here could hold the coins, gold and silver, at a parity.

I went further, and some of my colleagues thought went to an extreme, when I said that if not a dollar was used in the arts nor taken by the Orient nor went to the mints of Europe for subsidiary coinage, we could still absorb and use the entire $210,000,000. Gentlemen not only met that argument with doubt, but with denial, and some of them, I am afraid, with mental derision. The product of all the silver mines of the world at that time, as I have said, was $210,000,000 per annum.

I have forgotten the exact figures of the annual production of gold and can not now refer to them, but it was about $109,000,000, making a total of $319,000,000, of both gold and silver, to be added to the world's volume of money each year if every dollar of each metal were coined. What do we see now? I said then that the increase of the volume of the world's money by $210,000,000 could not only be absorbed, but absorbed with benefit to the industries and employments of the sons and daughters of men to their benefit, because the infiltration of the amount into the blood of commerce would stimulate industry, quicken prices, encourage producers, and lift debts. What do we see now, I repeat, with an annual production of gold alone of a little bit more or a little bit less than $300,000,000?

The world has absorbed it with benefit to everybody everywhere, with a quickening of prices upon the general level or average of staple commodities to the extent, however, of only 6 or 8 per cent. What was then denounced as repudiative inflation has since occurred by the accidents of discovery and by the incidents of invention and has inflated the general average of prices only 6 or 8 per cent! The Democratic party has never been the friend of either metal above or against the other. It is just as glad to see an increase of the basic money of the world through the instrumentality of gold as through that of silver.

The effect of its increase through the agency of gold has been to furnish an object lesson of the truth of our theory. That theory is the old and time-honored "quantitative" theory of money—the theory not announced but reiterated by John Stuart Mill when he said that, other things being equal, prices vary in proportion to the quantity of money.

Why, Mr. Chairman, if gentlemen would stop to think but a moment, they would know that there must be a law which governs everything, and that there must be a law of exchangeable value: a law by means of which the price or exchangeable value of everything in this world, which is furnished in limited quantities and is, therefore, desired in exchange, is determined; a law which governs the value of Carmen's voice, of the agility of a ballet girl, of the services of an attorney, of the labor of the workingmen, of the products of the soil, of the mines, and of the factory. That law you all know. It is the law of supply and demand, and in connection with every article of the world, except the go'd and silver that are used for money, you admit that it is the determining law of value.

While gentlemen are talking about what Mr. Bryan said when he expressed himself hastily, let me call attention to what Mr. Carlisle, in a laboriously prepared and premeditated speech, said—and Mr. Carlisle is the greater intellect by long odds among the gold-standard men. He said that the quantity of money had nothing to do with its "purchasing power;" with its exchangeable value, as you may call it; with its price, as you might say, varying the phrase. Yet every one of you is standing here to-day arguing that we have prosperity because of increased prices, and that we have increased prices because of the increased volume of money. It is true you make the false claim that your party has caused the increased volume of money, and that last claim is false.

Why, Mr. Chairman, if anybody wanted to determine how much wheat should be given or taken for a given quantity of cotton, he would want first to know what the estimated supply of wheat was and what its estimated possible consumption was, and then he would want to know what the estimated supply of cotton was and what the estimated demand of the mills for cotton would be. When he got answers to both queries, then he would know, and not until then would he know, what the price of cotton ought to be, measured in terms of wheat, or what the price of wheat ought to be, measured in terms of cotton. So when a man wants to know how much money should be given or taken for a given quantity of wheat or cotton, he wants to be informed as to the supply and demand in regard to the commodity in the first place, and of the supply and demand in regard to the money to be exchanged against it in the second place, and when he has collocated the two things he has the price of wheat or cotton, measured in terms of money.

The sort of predestination which I believe in is this: That God predestined that all things should obey and be determined in their relations to other things by certain fixed, determined, and immutable laws. The law of the operation of a thing's existence and fixing its relation to other things once discovered is what is called a "theory" in contradistinction to a hypothesis. Now, to state that it is true that the law which determines exchangeable values for all other things is a law from which money can escape—to state that it is true that God made one law of exchangeable value for everything in this world except money, and then made another law to determine the exchangeable value of money, would be to utter the rankest blasphemy.

What has become, my friends, of your old and time-honored argument of the overproduction of silver? Why, a gentleman

from Iowa himself has told you in this debate that within twenty-five years the production of gold has increased 280 per cent and the production of silver 276 per cent. Now, my Republican colleague's figures may not be exactly right, but the lesson remains that there has been no overproduction of silver as compared with gold. But some one says, "You may overreach yourself by that argument, because when you use both metals as money the immense increase in their production will give you too much money."

I believe with Mr. Carlisle, I believe it was, who said in effect that "the world will be happy, indeed, if it should ever have a sufficient quantity of both metals for the uses of commerce and industry." In this very bill you are solicitously providing for a new form of paper money, or rather paper promises to pay money, to act as substitutes for money and to do the work of money in exchange. The whole world is to-day forced to do a great deal of its business with paper substitutes for money.

The volume of these paper substitutes in the world now is so immense that it is beyond the dream of man that there could be a sufficient production of silver to take the place of all of it, or a half of it, and yet as long as a single paper promise to pay, a single piece of so-called paper money—which is not merely a certificate of deposit of metal or coin—is used in the commerce of the world, just so long has the world before its eyes an object-lesson demonstration of the insufficiency of the precious metals. One of our Republican confreres in this debate said that "when the mills were opened that caused an increased circulation of money;" that "opening the mills made business profitable;" that then "money came out of its hoarding places into the active business of the world."

The gentleman has the cart before the horse again. It was the increased circulation that enabled the mills to open their doors, and not the opening of the mills which produced the increase in the volume of money. Think a moment. There must be somebody with money to buy goods before mills can sell them. The mills opened because they thought they saw a chance for profit in production. Now, Mr. Chairman, our increased circulation has been due to two facts—one applicable to us particularly and the other applicable to the world. Coincident with, or rather just prior to, the election of Mr. McKinley an unprecedented famine occurred in India.

Contemporaneously with it there was a decreased production of wheat in Russia and in the Argentine Republic, both our competitors in the exportation of wheat. At the same time, and for the first time in history, the Australian colonies imported instead of exporting wheat. At the same time, and most luckily for us, we produced an almost unprecedented crop. There was, therefore, an unusual supply on our hands to sell and a most unusual demand of the world for it. The wheat farmer obtained splendid prices.

He drew from all the rest of the world for payment of his crop an immense amount of gold, thus increasing our share of the world's gold. As he was paid he bought from the shoemaker, from the clothier, from the furniture dealer, from the manufacturer, from the miner, all that was necessary to supply his necessities. This quickened domestic trade. Even if there had been no permanent increase of the world's volume of metallic money, there would have been, because of these conditions, a temporary increase of the money in the United States, and therefore a local and a temporary rise in prices of most things.

The second factor in our increased circulation I have incidentally called attention to already, namely, the immense addition to the volume of the world's money by the immensely increased production of the world's gold, first by discovery and secondly by new processes, cheapening and therefore extending production. My friend from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] says that "people have found that things have changed." In view of these facts, I should imagine so. But the quiet and absurd assumption in his remark was that the Republican party had changed them.

The argument has also been used in this debate, in a quibbling way, which shows lack of intellectual integrity, that neither the first section of this bill nor the act of 1873 made gold the standard of value in this country; that the act of 1834, passed under the Democratic Administration of Andrew Jackson, worked this result. The simple answer to all that is this: That the law of coinage to which reference is made, which was passed under the Administration of that great Democrat in 1834, kept the mints of the United States open to both gold and silver in unlimited quantities, free of charge for mintage, at the ratio of 16 to 1. If, then, that be gold monometallism, as I have said upon the floor of this House once before, we will not quarrel about words.

Give us the law of Andrew Jackson to which you refer. We will call it bimetallism, and you may call it gold monometallism. We will have what we want whatever you call it, namely, the free coinage of every ounce of gold or silver which may be brought to the mints at the ratio of 16 to 1. It is true in the debates in Congress when that bill was passed some gentlemen, and among them Democrats, said that they wanted the "gold standard."

But gentlemen who are at once informed and candid will admit that they used the word in the sense of a gold circulation—a law to produce a gold circulation. For reasons which I have indicated in another part of these remarks, it did give a gold circulation, but it did not give us a gold standard. I am informed by my friend Mr. Towne, of Minnesota, and my recollection accords with his, that Dana Horton counted up some eight or nine senses in which the word standard was used by loose thinkers, loose talkers, and loose writers.

Let us not quarrel about words; ideas, things, ought to cause the base of difference between us, or else there ought to be none. But it is rather humorous to hear a gentleman say that we had the gold standard as early as 1834, and then to hear him say that "If there were any doubts about it, they were removed in 1853;" and that "If there were any doubts about it then, they were removed in 1873;" and that "If there were any doubts about it then, they were removed in 1893;" and that "If there is any doubt about it now, it will be removed by this bill."

A thing which seems to be such dead certainty that very nearly all the balance of a life of a nation must be spent in "removing doubts" as to whether it was done at all or not must constitute a very exceedingly uncertain certainty, or a very marvelously certain uncertainty.

One more remark. If it be true, as both sides seem to be now agreed that it is true, that we have to-day a state of affairs prosperous by comparison with what they were three or four years ago, and that this comparative prosperity is owing to higher prices, and that these higher prices are owing to an increased circulation of money, which has taken place under this Administration, then it is worthy of your reflection, carrying the argument backward, to consider why it is not true that this increase of circulation would have been still greater if we had had not only the annual crop of gold, but, in addition to that, the annual crop of silver coined into self-redeeming money, and, further, why it is not true that if we had had an increase of circulation that much greater than our present increase, prices would not have been that much higher and prosperity that much greater.

But, Mr. Chairman, while there has been a comparative increase of prices on the average of 6 to 8 per cent, and while this increase has been healthful and beneficent, because natural and because it was due to the decreased purchasing power of money—that decreased purchasing power being, in its turn, due to the increased volume of money—there has been in some lines of production an abnormal, unnatural, unhealthful, and malevolent increase of prices. I say this because an increase of prices which comes about by strangling competition, by extinguishing individualism, and by dispensing with the labor and services of workingmen and traveling men is necessarily unhealthful and dangerous. The abnormal increase to which I refer has been in the prices of such articles as are controlled by trusts—barbed wire, for instance—which has advanced, I am informed, about 100 per cent—steel nails, tin and tin wares, and various other things entirely too numerous to recount. The increased price, which does not go in due proportion to the laborer and to the producer of the raw material, but which represents only an increased and undue profit to the capitalist, is not such an increase as can lead to the betterment of the conditions of mankind generally, nor to increased happiness for the masses of men, nor to their increased love for home, liberty, or country. I do not propose to argue the trust question.

I merely want to warn my hearers against confusing the prices of these particular articles thus artificially and, I hope, temporarily put up, with the natural and normal, though slight, rise of prices which has taken place with commodities generally, owing to the decreased purchasing power of the gold dollar, caused by an increase of the number of gold dollars.

Now I will listen to the question of the gentleman from Minnesota.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. McCLEARY. The gentleman's statement——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Before you ask your question I want to say that a gentleman from Washington rose the other day and "made some unnecessary remarks." I do not know why it is that the State of Washington indulges in representative picturesqueness on both sides of the House—on our side in the last Congress, on yours in this—but it seems to be a fact. [Laughter.] He said that if any Democrat could explain to him why it was that when we had them tied together by a legislative ratio the moneys parted, or the metals, which ever it was, he would vote for this bill.

In a previous part of my remarks I have explained it. If he meant the metals, the answer is, because of a conflicting and stronger legislative ratio; if he meant the moneys, the answer is, they did not, but each was the equal in exchangeability with the other. "Why does a given amount of water with a fish in it

weigh the same as the same quantity of water without a fish in it." I once heard that question answered, "Because it don't."

I have not explained it for the purpose of obtaining the vote of the gentleman from Washington, because we are going to certain defeat on this bill and I rather it would not be defeat accompanied with shame, but I think I have secured his vote upon his own contract if I would take it. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. McCLEARY. The gentleman's statement of facts, as I understand it, appears rather contradictory. I must have misunderstood him. If the silver did not retire, although you have said it did—if the minor silver coinage did not retire, what was the purpose of the act of 1853? Now, I will put my two questions together.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. This is the first time that the act of 1853 has come into the discussion. Ask me about that.

Mr. McCLEARY. I have asked you about it just now. I understand the gentleman to say that the mistake of Hamilton was that he did not adopt the ratio of the world. Would it be a mistake now for us to do it?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Without any other bimetallic nation, we would make the ratio of the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.] There would be no conflict in legislative ratios; that is all.

Mr. McCLEARY. Will you state the purpose of the act of 1853?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Now, Mr. Chairman, I said a little while ago that the gentleman from Minnesota said we did not come down the aisle with our free-silver bills proposing them as substitutes. He says that is a Democratic inconsistency. I have shown that we do not because your special rule prevents. There are Republican inconsistencies, though. I do not believe much in the ad hominem, claptrap, "you-are-an-inconsistent-fellow" sort of an argument. I believe that, wherever a man comes to the conclusion that he has been wrong in the past and changes his mind, provided he does not take advantage of his people and change his base before he gives them a fair opportunity to see whether they are willing to support him in that change or not—for that is dishonest and lying—if he comes before them and frankly says, "I have changed my mind," they may not reelect him, but they will always respect him.

When you change your mind I believe all you have got to do is not to lie about it, but to say, "Yes, I formerly thought this; therefore I voted in this way. Now I think thus, and therefore I shall vote in this other way. If I thought as I formerly did, I would vote as I formerly did." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But there is another reason why I do not care to charge the Republican party with the inconsistency of their attitudes now and in 1896. I said upon the stump in 1896 that they were going to be inconsistent, and so did all of us.

I knew as well in the latter part of the Fifty-fourth Congress and in the Fifty-fifth Congress that gentlemen from Iowa, gentlemen from Illinois, and gentlemen from Kansas, if they remained in the Republican party, would have to make a change of base upon the money question as I knew that I was existing. And so during the campaign of 1896 I said so. I said that under the veil of "international bimetallism" you were hiding the gold standard. I said that under the veil of a "safe" currency you were going to withdraw the greenbacks and hand over all the paper currency issuance to the banks. I said that under the veil of "anti-repudiation" you yourselves were going to repudiate the silver dollar and your "bimetallic" platform. Why should I complain now when you have only done what I said and knew you would do?

Now, one other sentence and I am done. My friend Mr. DOLLIVER, with his eloquence, not alone "physical eloquence," as somebody said, but mental and moral eloquence—a grand fellow, and I like to hear him talk—said here the other day that Bryan said that "they had killed half the money of the country," and that the people had found out that that was not the fact—that not a silver dollar had been "killed." What we meant was that they had killed half of the annual crop of money by denying the annual product of silver access to the mints. That was true, was it not? The money already coined you had not then killed.

But now, to-day, in this bill you propose to do that. In the campaign of 1896 I said that in addition to having killed the annual crop as it came up you would kill the stock on hand in some way if you ever got full power. And now, although you are not literally "killing" it, you are "impounding" it. What is the difference between killing a horse and taking him out of harness and "impounding" him, swearing he shall never serve any more? For all practical horse purposes he would be dead. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] has five minutes of this hour remaining.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield that five minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KLUTTZ].

Mr. KLUTTZ. Mr. Chairman, in the five minutes allowed me I can hope to do little more than voice the protest of the good people who sent me here against both the matter and the manner of the legislation proposed in this bill.

Denied the privilege of considering its provisions in committee, denied the right of offering in its stead an alternative proposition, denied even a knowledge of its propositions until it was sprung upon this House, and with a debate limited by cast-iron rules which were forced upon us by a compact, caucus-ruled majority, we on this side of the House can hope, sir, to do no more than indignantly protest, however unavailing that protest may be.

Gagged in this way as we are, gentlemen on that side complain of us when we complain, charging us with useless consumption of time, reminding me of the little fellow who called to his father: "Pap, come here and make Bud behave himself. Every time I hit him on the head with the hammer he hollers." [Laughter.] The distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] derisively asks what predictions made by the Democrats in 1896 have been fulfilled.

I had the honor, sir, of being a Democratic electoral candidate in 1896, and in an active canvass I daily charged that the Republican party was hypocritical in its platform pretense of favoring bimetallism; that any effort of a Republican administration to secure international bimetallism would be perfunctory and for political effect only, and that if successful in electing William McKinley President that party would, in defiance of its pledges, force the single gold standard upon the people of this country.

My Republican opponents indignantly denied these charges, as did my distinguished colleague [Mr. LINNEY] who sits upon the other side of this Chamber, and as did the distinguished Republican Senator from North Carolina, neither of whom would be here to-day but for their professed friendliness to bimetallism.

Our people were assured that the Republican party was honestly in favor of bimetallism and that they differed from us only as to the best and safest manner of securing it. In the light of subsequent events, and particularly in the light of this proposed legislation, I can unhesitatingly point to these fulfilled charges and predictions in answer to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, why is this legislation demanded at this time? Why in this year, intermediate between Presidential elections, when neither party declared in favor of a permanent single gold standard in the last Presidential campaign, both declaring, on the contrary, in favor of bimetallism, and when an era of unparalleled prosperity is claimed by our friends on the other side; when it is boasted that we are already under the gold standard, with all its alleged blessings; when the people of this great country at the very latest opportunity have declared in favor of bimetallism by the election of William McKinley upon a professedly bimetallic platform—why, I ask, should the serenity of the politico-financial atmosphere be disturbed at this time by the attempted passage of this revolutionary measure?

I may be mistaken, Mr. Chairman, but in my opinion, sir, it is largely because, in the results of the recent elections, in the reduced Republican majority in this House, the forces behind the Republican party see the handwriting on the wall and realize that if this legislation is not forced at this juncture the opportunity may never again present itself to that party to write the single gold standard into the laws of our land. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But, gentlemen, in your eager haste to falsify your past pretensions, in your willingness to stultify yourselves to do the bidding of past and prospective campaign contributors, let me warn you that this bill, which carries in its belly a whole catalogue of woes, though it may be forced upon us here by unusual and revolutionary methods, is yet to pass under the consideration of an intelligent and indignant people.

When they learn, as learn they will, that you have been false to your professions and platforms; that you have covertly but effectually destroyed the greenback; that you have added silver to the endless chain for withdrawing gold from the Treasury; that you have changed every contract now in existence or hereafter to be made, public and private, in favor of the creditor and against the debtor by writing the cruel word "gold" into it; that you have abdicated the constitutional right of controlling the currency of this country to the sole control of the national banks; that you have renounced the right of Congress to control the issue of interest-bearing bonds and conferred that supreme and dangerous power upon the Secretary of the Treasury; that you have stricken down at one fell swoop $900,000,000 of legal-tender money and made gold the sole money of payment in the United States, leaving in circulation only gold and national-bank notes, my word for it, Mr. Chairman, a political revolution such as this country has never seen will sweep, as with a besom of destruction, from place and power the party which could dare to force this infamous legislation upon a deceived and outraged people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TONGUE. Mr. Chairman, when the debate upon this bill had reached a most exciting period, while orators upon either side, for and against it, were scattering wit and wisdom, logic, sarcasm,

and eloquence in great profusion, a distinguished member of this House, one who had rendered valuable services to his country both on the field of battle and in the halls of legislation, was seated quietly in his chair, his hands folded peacefully upon his breast, reposing quietly in the arms of Morpheus, utterly unconscious of the tempestuous storms being waged around him. The distinguished gentleman typified the attitude of the people toward this debate. For the time being he represented 75,000,000 of his countrymen. The time for real, earnest, and serious discussion of the principles involved in this bill, a discussion which is aimed to convince the reason and influence the action, long since passed.

The people of the United States have passed upon every issue involved in this debate. They have made up their minds upon every question discussed. Their opinions have been intensified and fixed by the course of current events and business conditions. Expressed emphatically in 1896, they have been reaffirmed whenever the opportunity has been presented. They expect of this Congress not reasons, but action; not discussion, but legislation. Our duty is, as promptly as possible, to record the verdict of the people, enter up their judgment, and give expression to their will in the laws of the land. There is little that is new proposed by this bill. We have been practically and legally under the gold standard for more than sixty years. The issue presented in 1896, fairly and squarely before the people, was whether we should maintain the existing gold standard or go to the silver standard. There was a time when people advocating the free coinage of silver might fairly and conscientiously believe that it would restore the parity between gold and silver at the old ratio and would not disturb their existing financial standards.

Up to 1878 the value of silver as compared with gold in a hundred years had not varied to exceed 5 per cent. No one at that time could foresee present conditions. In 1873, at a ratio of 16 to 1, the silver dollar was worth more than gold. In 1878 men could fairly believe that the slight decline in silver could be overcome by restoration of silver to free coinage; but it is impossible to believe that any thinking, intelligent man in the United States during late years, in the face of conditions that have surrounded us, could have possibly believed that the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 meant other than the silver standard. When the Senate of the United States was considering the Teller resolution, an amendment was proposed by Senator NELSON, as follows:

> It is the duty of the Government of the United States under existing laws to maintain the parity in value of its gold and silver money, so that the dollar of the one metal shall for all monetary purposes always be equal in value to the dollar of the other metal.

This amendment was laid upon the table by the vote of the members of the United States Senate favoring the free coinage of silver. They recognized the fact that if the policy of the Teller resolution were carried out and free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 should be adopted, it would be impossible to maintain the parity of gold and silver; in other words, that it would precipitate us to the silver standard.

Frightful calamities, it is said, will follow the enactment of this bill into law. This is but a repetition of the numerous and fearful prophecies of evil that were repeated with so much fervor upon every Bryan hustings in the United States in 1896. But "there were false prophets in the lands in those days." At the time of the last national election there were none so rash as to claim that any business prosperity existed among any class of our people or in any section of our country. The most hopeful could see no light upon the horizon except in the prospect of Republican success.

Now there is none to deny that a fair measure of business prosperity is in every State of the Union. The wheels of returning and returned industry are making sweet music everywhere. Labor is employed, wages are remunerative, the hungry are fed not by the hand of charity, but from the fruits of their own industry. What has wrought this magical change? Standing out as conspicuous causes are two great economic events—the determination of the American people, expressed with emphasis in November, 1896, and repeated on every appropriate occasion, to maintain the gold standard and an honest monetary policy, to permit no tampering with the measures of values, and the return to the national policy of protecting and fostering the industry of our own people.

The principal arguments, if arguments they can be called, that have emanated from the other side of the House during the discussion upon this bill have consisted of statements regarding the utterances, votes, or opinions of leading Republicans ten, twenty, thirty years ago, supposed to be inconsistent with the principles of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am not one of those who regard consistency as the most exalted of virtues. It is much more important to be right than to be consistent. Consistency has too often been the bugbear of small minds. It has prevented men, through a pride of opinion, from announcing honest convictions. It has demanded that the opinions formed hastily, upon insufficient data and upon slight information and examination, shall stand against the deliberate and mature judgment formed upon a full investigation and wider knowledge of all the facts and principles involved. It too often exalts the opinions of youth over the judgment of mature manhood. It values hasty first impressions more highly than carefully formed judgments. It holds to error men who are willing to be wrong rather than withstand the charge of inconsistency. When investigation and thought and experience and the deliberate judgment of matured manhood, when careful research upon full knowledge of all the facts involved ceases to be valuable, then consistency may be elevated, may become one of the greatest of virtues. But for myself, Mr. Chairman, I prefer to be right, even if to be right involves a change of hastily formed and erroneous opinions.

But, Mr. Chairman, upon the questions at issue under this bill a large majority of the other side of the House are neither right nor consistent. There have been no expressions of opinion or sentiments on the floor of this House, either in this Congress or the last, that could evoke more vociferous applause from members on that side of the House than the denunciation of Grover Cleveland, and especially his views upon financial questions. When anyone on that side of the House desired to secure the applause of his brethren he was always sure of meeting their hearty approval by a strong denunciation of Grover Cleveland. The more intemperate the language, the more outrageous the epithets, the more coarse the vituperation, the more vociferous the applause. The distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] received no more vigorous applause from his party associates for any utterance that he made upon this floor during the last Congress than when, comparing Grover Cleveland to Benedict Arnold, he apologized to the shades of Arnold. Comparing him to Judas Iscariot, he asserted that Judas was a good deal the better man, because he had the decency to hang himself.

I want to remind these gentlemen that there was a time when in their estimation no man in the United States or in the civilized world stood higher than Grover Cleveland. There was a time when no panegyrics were too extravagant, when he was held as the one great Democrat since Andrew Jackson, when no other Democrat could so unite his party or could so sweep the country. Has this change of feeling been produced by any change of principles on the part of Grover Cleveland? On that question I want to remind our friends on the other side of some undeniable facts of history. When Mr. Cleveland was first nominated in 1884, notwithstanding the many contests over the silver question, there had been at that time no utterance by any Democratic national convention in favor of free silver. The platform adopted by the Democratic convention of that year declared:

> We believe in honest money, the gold and standard coinage of the Constitution, and a circulating medium convertible into such money without loss.

On this platform Mr. Cleveland was elected.

Now, it is not my province to defend that gentleman or to vouch for the genuineness of his Democracy. In fact it is extremely difficult during these troublesome times to define Democracy. It seems to have run away from itself. It seems to be wearing a different garment and professing different principles, and changing both garments and principles so often that it is impossible to define it. I do want, however, to say that whatever political sins the late President of the United States may have been guilty of, he did not skulk into the Presidential chair in 1892, nor did he filch the nomination or election from the Democratic party during that year by disguising or concealing the principles for which he is now so severely denounced by those who were his abject worshipers then, his traducers now.

His position on financial questions was as well known then as it is now. His adherence to the gold standard, his hostility to the further coinage of silver, was publicly and repeatedly proclaimed. Before he had been installed into the Presidency the first time, when the amount of silver coined in the United States was not more than one-third of what it is now, long before the Sherman law was passed, Mr. Cleveland made known in a public way his hostility to the further coinage of that metal. He not only was opposed to free coinage, but opposed any further coinage of silver at that time. In a letter addressed to Hon. A. J. Warner and other members of the Forty-eighth Congress, written on the 24th day of February, 1885, and published on page 363 of the Writings and Speeches of Grover Cleveland, his views were fully and clearly expressed. That letter is as follows:

ALBANY, *February 24, 1885.*

To the Hon. A. J. WARNER and others,
Members of the Forty-eighth Congress.

GENTLEMEN: The letter which I have had the honor to receive from you invites, and, indeed, obliges me, to give expression to some grave public necessities, although in advance of the moment when they would become the objects of my official care and partial responsibility. Your solicitude that my judgment shall have been carefully and deliberately formed is entirely just, and I accept the suggestion in the same friendly spirit in which it has been made. It is also fully justified by the nature of the financial crisis, which, under the operation of the act of Congress of February 28, 1878, is now close at hand. By a compliance with the requirements of that law all the

vaults of the Federal Treasury have been and are heaped full of silver coins, which are now worth less than 85 per cent of the gold dollar prescribed as "the unit of value" in section 14 of the act of February 12, 1873, and which, with the silver certificates representing such coin, are receivable for all public dues. Being thus receivable, while also constantly increasing in quantity at the rate of $28,000,000 a year, it has followed of necessity that the flow of gold into the Treasury has been steadily diminished.

Silver and silver certificates have displaced and are now displacing gold, and the sum of gold in the Federal Treasury now available for the payment of the gold obligations of the United States and for the redemption of the United States notes called "greenbacks," if not already encroached upon, is perilously near such encroachment.

These are facts which, as they do not admit of difference of opinion, call for no argument. They have been forewarned to us in the official reports of every Secretary of the Treasury from 1878 until now. They are plainly affirmed in the last December report of the present Secretary of the Treasury to the Speaker of the present House of Representatives. They appear in the official documents of this Congress and in the records of the New York clearing house, of which the Treasury is a member, and through which the bulk of the receipts and payments of the Federal Government and of the country pass.

These being the facts of our present condition, our danger and our duty to avert the danger would seem to be plain. I hope that you concur with me and with the great majority of our fellow-citizens in deeming it most desirable at the present juncture to maintain and continue in use the mass of our gold coin as well as the mass of our silver already coined. This is possible by a present suspension of the purchase and coinage of silver. I am not aware that by any other method it is possible. It is of momentous importance to prevent the two metals from parting company; to prevent the increasing displacement of gold by the increasing coinage of silver; to prevent the disuse of gold in the custom-houses of the United States in the daily business of the people; to prevent the ultimate expulsion of gold by silver.

Such a financial crisis as these events would certainly precipitate, were it not to follow upon so long a period of commercial depression, would involve the people of every city and every State in the Union in a prolonged and disastrous trouble. The revival of business enterprise and prosperity, so ardently desired and apparently so near, would be hopelessly postponed. Gold would be withdrawn to its hoarding places, and an unprecedented contraction in the actual volume of our currency would speedily take place. Saddest of all, in every workshop, mill, factory, store, and on every railroad and farm the wages of labor, already depressed, would suffer still further depression by a scaling down of the purchasing power of every so-called dollar paid into the hand of toil. From these impending calamities it is surely a most patriotic and grateful duty of the representatives of the people to deliver them.

I am, gentlemen, with sincere respect, your fellow-citizen,

GROVER CLEVELAND.

There could be no misunderstanding of this language. It was a distinct assertion that the continued use of gold as well as silver was only possible "by a present suspension of the purchase and coinage of silver." At that time Mr. Cleveland had been elected as President of the United States. But if that had not been sufficient to make clear his position on this question and make his views sufficiently public, this was certainly done in his first annual message to Congress, December 8, 1885. In that message, which was somewhat lengthy, he used the following words:

Nothing more important than the present condition of our currency and coinage can claim your attention.

Since February, 1878, the Government has, under the compulsory provisions of law, purchased silver bullion and coined the same at the rate of more than $2,000,000 every month. By this process up to the present date, 215,759,431 silver dollars have been coined.

A reasonable appreciation of a delegation of power to the General Government would limit its exercise, without express restrictive words, to the people's needs and the requirements of the public welfare.

Upon this theory the authority to "coin money" given to Congress by the Constitution, if it permits the purchase by the Government of bullion for coinage in any event, does not justify such purchase and coinage to an extent beyond the amount needed for a sufficient circulating medium.

The desire to utilize the silver product of the country should not lead to a misuse or the perversion of this power.

The necessity for such an addition to the silver currency of the nation as is compelled by the silver-coinage act is negatived by the fact that up to the present time only about 50,000,000 of the silver dollars so coined have actually found their way into circulation, leaving more than 165,000,000 in the possession of the Government, the custody of which has entailed a considerable expense for the construction of vaults for its deposit. Against this latter amount there are outstanding silver certificates amounting to about $93,000,000.

Every month two millions of gold in the public Treasury are paid out for two millions or more of silver dollars, to be added to the idle mass already accumulated.

When the time comes that gold has been withdrawn from circulation, then will be apparent the difference between the real value of the silver dollar and a dollar in gold, and the two coins will part company. Gold, still the standard of value and necessary in our dealings with other countries, will be at a premium over silver; banks which have substituted gold for the deposits of their customers may pay them with silver bought with such gold, thus making a handsome profit; rich speculators will sell their hoarded gold to their neighbors, who need it to liquidate their foreign debts, at a ruinous premium over silver, and the laboring men and women of the land, most defenseless of all, will find that the dollar received for the wage of their toil has sadly shrunk in its purchasing power.

Those who do not fear any disastrous consequences arising from the continued compulsory coinage of silver as now directed by law and who suppose that the addition to the currency of the country intended as its results will be a public benefit are reminded that history demonstrates that the point is easily reached in the attempt to float at the same time two sorts of money of different excellence, when the better will cease to be in general circulation. The hoarding of gold, which has already taken place, indicates that we shall not escape the usual experience in such cases. So, if this silver coinage be continued, we may reasonably expect that gold and its equivalent will abandon the field of circulation to silver alone. This, of course, must produce a severe contraction of our circulating medium instead of adding to it.

We have now on hand all the silver dollars necessary to supply the present needs of the people and to satisfy those who from sentiment wish to see them in circulation, and if their coinage is suspended they can be readily obtained by all who desire them. If the need of more is at any time apparent, their coinage may be renewed.

That disaster has not already overtaken us furnishes no proof that danger does not wait upon a continuation of the present silver coinage. We have been saved by the most careful management and unusual expedients, by a combination of fortunate conditions, and by a confident expectation that the course of the Government in regard to silver coinage would be speedily changed by the action of Congress.

Prosperity hesitates upon the threshold because of the dangers and uncertainties surrounding this question. Capital timidly shrinks from trade, and investors are unwilling to take the chance of the questionable shape in which their money will be returned to them, while enterprise halts at a risk against which care and sagacious management do not protect.

As a necessary consequence labor lacks employment, and suffering and distress are visited upon a portion of our fellow-citizens especially entitled to the careful consideration of those charged with the duties of legislation. No interest appeals to us so strongly for a safe and stable currency as the vast army of the unemployed.

I recommend the suspension of the compulsory coinage of silver dollars, directed by the law passed in February, 1878.

Congress did not accept his advice or indorse his recommendation. Again, in his second annual message, sent to Congress December 6, 1886, he repeated the statement of his reasons why he believed the suspension of the silver coinage was necessary. On that subject his message is as follows:

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1886, there were coined, under the compulsory silver-coinage act of 1878, 29,838,905 silver dollars, and the cost of the silver used in such coinage was $23,448,960.01. There had been coined up to the close of the previous fiscal year under the provisions of the law 203,882,554 silver dollars, and on the 1st day of December, 1886, the total amount of such coinage was $247,131,549.

The Director of the Mint reports that at the time of the passage of the law of 1878 directing this coinage the intrinsic value of the dollars thus coined was 94¼ cents each, and that on the 31st day of July, 1886, the price of silver reached the lowest stage ever known, so that the intrinsic or bullion price of our standard silver dollar at that date was less than 72 cents. The price of silver on the 30th day of November last was such as to make these dollars intrinsically worth 78 cents each.

These differences in value of the coins represent the fluctuations in the price of silver, and they certainly do not indicate that compulsory coinage by the Government enhances the price of that commodity or secures uniformity in its value.

Every fair and legal effort has been made by the Treasury Department to distribute this currency among the people. The withdrawal of the United States Treasury notes of small denominations and the issuing of small silver certificates have been resorted to in the endeavor to accomplish this result, in obedience to the will and sentiments of the representatives of the people in the Congress. On the 27th day of November, 1886, the people held of these coins or certificates representing them the nominal sum of $166,873,041, and we still had $79,464,345 in the Treasury, as against about $142,894,055 in the hands of the people and $72,865,376 remaining in the Treasury one year ago. The Director of the Mint again urges the necessity of more vault room for the purpose of storing these silver dollars which are not needed for circulation by the people.

I have seen no reason to change the views expressed in my last annual message on the subject of this compulsory coinage; and I again urge its suspension on all the grounds contained in my former recommendation, reenforced by the significant increase of our gold exportations during the last year, as appears by the comparative statement herewith presented, and for the further reasons that the more this currency is distributed amongst the people the greater becomes our duty to protect it from disaster; that we now have abundance for all our needs, and that there seems but little propriety in building vaults to store such currency when the only pretense for its coinage is the necessity of its use by the people as a circulating medium.

Again, in his final message to Congress on December 3, 1888, after the Presidential election, he reiterates his views and position upon the silver question in the following language:

At the close of the fiscal year ended June 30, 1887, there had been coined under the compulsory silver-coinage act $266,988,280 in silver dollars, $55,594,310 of which were in the hands of the people.

On the 30th day of June, 1888, there had been coined $290,708,790, and of this $55,829,306 was in circulation in coin and $200,387,376 in silver certificates, for the redemption of which silver dollars to that amount were held by the Government.

On the 30th day of November, 1888, $312,570,990 had been coined, $60,970,990 of the silver dollars were actually in circulation, and $237,418,346 in certificates.

The Secretary recommends the suspension of the further coinage of silver, and in such recommendation I earnestly concur.

Gentlemen, you will remember that there was a time between the Presidential election of 1888 and that of 1892 when Senator Hill, of New York, seemed to be looming up into Presidential proportion and was apparently the choice of the Democrats in the United States as their candidate for President. He had been elected triumphantly as Senator from New York. He had been visiting Southern States and received with great enthusiasm. He was looked forward to as the future leader of Democracy. His position on the financial question seemed to be doubtful. It was not satisfactory. At that time, and when it seemed to the people at large that Cleveland had been forgotten, he wrote the following letter to the Reform Club, of New York, February 10, 1891:

E. ELLERY ANDERSON, *Chairman.*

DEAR SIR: I have this afternoon received your note inviting me to attend to-morrow evening the meeting called for the purpose of voicing the opposition of the business men of our city to "the free coinage of silver in the United States."

I shall not be able to attend and address the meeting as you request, but I am glad that the business interests of New York are at last to be heard upon this subject. It surely can not be necessary for me to make a formal expression of my agreement with those who believe that the greatest peril would be invited by the adoption of the scheme embraced in the measure now pending in Congress for the unlimited coinage of silver at our mints.

If we have developed an unexpected capacity for the assimilation of a largely increased volume of this currency, and even if we have demonstrated the usefulness of such an increase, these conditions fall short of insuring us against disaster if in the present situation we enter upon the dangerous and reckless experiment of free, unlimited, and independent silver coinage.

Yours, very truly,

GROVER CLEVELAND.

This letter was published in nearly every leading journal in the United States, East and West, North and South. Its effect was electrical. It served as a rallying cry for Democrats everywhere. The masses of the people, if not the political leaders, began to form around the banners of Grover Cleveland. Leaders endeavored to prevent his nomination, but they were trampled under foot. The South overrode New York, and when the national convention was held Grover Cleveland was selected as the nominee of the Democratic party for President by an overwhelming majority and amid intense enthusiasm. There has not been in this generation any Democrat who has been so universally lauded, praised, and almost worshiped by the Democratic party as their last President. His triumphant election by an overwhelming majority followed.

Can people who supported him then say they did not indorse his position on financial questions; that they did not know his views and opinions then; that his financial principles had been concealed? Certainly no intelligent Democrat can make such a statement. It was the principles that he professed, the principles to which he adhered, his outspoken utterances of them, his freedom from anything that looked like concealment or hypocrisy, the fact that the Democratic party believed in him and his Democracy, that made him the nominee and resulted in his overwhelming election. The Democratic conventions throughout the United States not only wanted Cleveland, but in many instances expressed their belief in his financial views. The Democratic convention of the State in which I live met in the city of Portland on April 20, 1892. It was unanimous for the renomination of Cleveland. It sent a unanimous delegation to support him in the national convention. It appointed its best men as a committee to construct its platform. There was a representative from every county in the State. The financial portion of that platform adopted by that convention was as follows:

The Democracy of Oregon hereby express their confidence in the courage, honesty, and statesmanship of Grover Cleveland and recognize him as a man preeminently qualified to fill the office of President of the United States.

We believe in honest money, the gold and silver coinage of the Constitution, and in currency convertible into such coinage without loss and of sufficient volume to meet all the demands of the people; we demand that all money coined or issued by the United States should be of equal monetary value and of equal purchasing power for the rich and the poor, and that all paper currency issued by the Government should be redeemable in either gold or silver coin, at the option of the holder and not at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The meaning and intent of that convention was not misunderstood in the State of Oregon. Governor Pennoyer, who had been elected by the Democrats, announced his intention not to vote for the nominees because the Democratic party "had gone back on free coinage."

The Wisconsin Democratic convention, held at Milwaukee on May 14, 1892, adopted a platform containing this provision:

We maintain that the true interests of the people demand a sound, honest, and stable money, composed of or based on and redeeming in gold and silver coin of equal intrinsic value. We therefore oppose the project of an unlimited coinage of silver dollars of less commercial value than the gold dollars as un-Democratic, dishonest, and especially hurtful to the farmers and laboring classes.

I have not the platforms of the different State conventions during that year, but the foregoing sample suffices to show that the Democratic party at that time was in accord with Grover Cleveland upon the financial question. The national convention did not act in ignorance. It knew what it was doing. It intended that their platform and candidate should be in harmony. While the convention was in session the Associated Press sent out the following dispatches:

CHICAGO, *June 21.*

The silver States held another caucus this afternoon, and in view of Gorman's refusal to permit the use of his name as a candidate for the Presidency, it was decided to cast their vote for Governor Boies. A subcommittee was appointed, headed by Patterson, of Colorado, for the purpose of presenting the silver views of the Western delegates to the committee on resolutions.

The history of that convention has been written. The views from the silver States were not adopted. The platform of that convention was in accordance with the principles of the candidate. It demanded the repeal of the only law then upon the statute book providing for the coinage of silver. It will be remembered that during President Cleveland's first term the Bland law was then in force. It required the purchase of less than one-half of the silver required by the Sherman law.

When President Cleveland was renominated, in 1892, the Sherman law was in force. He had recommended the suspension of the coinage of silver under the Bland law. What, then, could be the meaning of that portion of the platform that denounces the Sherman Act of 1890?

The Sherman Act of 1890 is a cowardly makeshift, fraught with possibilities of danger in the future, which should make all of its supporters, as well as its author, anxious for its speedy repeal.

This was not a demand for the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act, but a demand for the repeal of the entire act. It meant the wiping out of the last vestige of legislation that provided for the coinage of silver. It is true, this was not all the platform demanded. It declared—

We hold to the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country and to the coinage of both gold and silver without discriminating against either metal or charge for mintage, but the dollar of unit of coinage of both metals must be of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, or to be adjusted through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as shall insure the maintenance of the parity of the two metals and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts. And we demand that all paper currency shall be kept at par with and redeemable in such coin.

Has any Democrat on this floor or in any other place proposed the enactment of any law coining gold and silver by any such proportions that the dollar of each shall be of equal intrinsic value? Is there any member of that party in the United States now advocating such a doctrine? Was it expected at that time that anyone would do so? Had any bill ever been introduced upon that line? Has any ever been introduced since? Does anyone claim now that the coinage of silver and gold at the ratio of 16 to 1 would be dollars of equal intrinsic value or equal exchangeable value, or that they could be maintained at a parity?

How was the nomination of Cleveland and the platform adopted regarded in Congress? In that Congress the Democrats had a very large majority, something over two-thirds in the House of Representatives. Mr. Bland was chairman of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. He introduced House bill No. 4426, on the free coinage of silver. It was referred to his own committee and reported back for favorable consideration. There was a strong report by a minority of the committee, and this was signed by Charles Tracey, a Democrat from New York, and George Fred Williams, a Democratic member of the House from Massachusetts, and subsequently a very earnest advocate of free coinage. The House, in February of that year, fixed the 22d, 23d, and 24th days of March for the consideration of the bill. At the end of three days, after numerous speeches and a full discussion, occupying nearly 200 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, this Democratic House, presided over by Speaker Crisp, the bill in the charge of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Bland, failed even to reach a vote.

A motion to lay the bill upon the table received 149 votes for to 149 votes against. A motion to reconsider that was carried by 150 votes against 148. The House adjourned after numerous roll calls without bringing the bill to a vote. Subsequent to the meeting of the Democratic national convention, and in July of that year, the Senate of the United States passed a free-coinage bill and sent it to the House for consideration. On the 13th day of July the Committee on Rules reported a resolution for the consideration of this bill, the consideration to be continued from day to day until finally disposed of. While that rule was under discussion, Mr. Clark, a Democratic member of the House from Alabama, and prior to that day an ardent advocate of free coinage, opposed taking up the bill for consideration, and, among other things, said:

Is it pressed on this House to place Democratic members on record as favoring such free coinage? There have been several test votes, and it is well known that when now taken it will show changes against the bill on the part of Democrats who wish, as I do, to fight the enemy upon the ground upon which the whole party can and will stand united. Therefore, if that vote is to be forced by Democratic leaders in this House to make a Democratic record or to fix Democratic policy, it is from their own standpoint ill advice, because it will disclose growing weakness instead of strength. [Applause.] Besides, we are not authorized to make a platform for the Democratic party or to declare its policy upon that subject. That has been done lately by the Democratic national convention. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Apparently, few of us were commissioned as delegates to that convention, to make that platform or declare that policy. In voting for this bill we shall simply once more declare and record our individual views, with no expectation of enacting them into law. Why should we embarrass or weaken our party simply to emphasize personal views already recorded? On the other hand, I should vote against it, because since this House has thoroughly discussed and repeatedly voted upon this proposition the Democratic party has held its national convention and has framed and published its declaration of a policy upon this subject clearly inconsistent with the bill now proposed.

It did not accept the silver-coinage plank without clearly comprehending it. An able and zealous advocate of just such legislation as is now pressed on us urged upon the convention an amendment of the coinage plank, but could not secure support enough to call the roll of the States. Respecting as I do the sentiments of my own constituents above all others, I find support in the fact that 22 delegates from the State of Alabama, representing every part of the State, men of distinction, wise, strong, and patriotic, whom any country might be proud to claim and any deliberate body welcome into its counsels, without one dissenting voice accepted that coinage plank.

I am reminded that I have heretofore voted on the line of this bill and am advised to be consistent. It is a sufficient answer that conditions have changed and I am now called on by my party to sacrifice my views for the general good.

During the same discussion Mr. Patterson, a Democratic member from Tennessee, citing the Democratic platform adopted by the State convention of Tennessee for 1892, which declared in favor of "a currency of gold, silver, and of paper, convertible into coin at the option of the holder," and then citing the currency plank of the national Democratic party, recently adopted at Chicago, and a portion of the letter of Grover Cleveland, dated February 10, 1898, said:

Mr. Speaker, I submit, in view of the nomination of Mr. Cleveland at Chicago and in view of these expressed declarations, that the national Democracy is not committed to the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 18 to 1, but, on the contrary, has expressly declared against the free coinage, except on the basis that every coin dollar, whether of silver or gold, shall be equal in intrinsic value of every other coin dollar. So far as I am concerned, I shall merge my individual judgment into the aggregate judgment of the party to which I belong, and I shall accept its latest deliverances as the guide for my action. [Applause on the Democratic side of the House.]

When the final vote came upon agreeing to the adoption of the rule for taking up the bill for discussion, it was defeated by a vote of 136 yeas to 154 nays.

There is one noticeable fact in connection with these discussions. Both Mr. BAILEY, the gentleman from Texas, and Mr. Bryan were members of that Congress, were both present during the discussions, but so far as I have been able to ascertain neither of these gentlemen uttered one single word in favor of the free-coinage bill.

When the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], during the last Congress, was emptying the vials of his wrath upon the devoted head of Mr. Cleveland, and exhausting his vocabulary of vituperation, he was in candor compelled to acknowledge that "when Cleveland was renominated in 1892, we knew he was against silver."

There can be no question that the parting of the ways between ex-President Cleveland and the Democratic party upon the financial question was not caused by his change of views. In 1892 the party was thoroughly in accord with him, and his views remained to the end of the Administration as they had been at the beginning.

What will be the Democratic position in 1900? Will it go back to Cleveland or remain for Bryan? Will it espouse free coinage, or will it declare for the gold standard, or will it declare for the coinage of a silver dollar of equal intrinsic value with that of gold at a ratio of about 40 to 1? It is fair to say that, whatever policy it advocates, it will be governed by the probabilities of success and for the purpose of obtaining votes, rather than for the purpose of establishing a principle.

But what are the principal arguments against this bill? They are the ones we have heard so often. Divested of rhetorical flourishes, they consist of three statements of alleged facts:

First. That since the so-called "crime of 1873" silver has been demonetized, its use as money discouraged and decreased in amount.

Second. That, owing to this alleged decrease in the use of silver, gold has been insufficient to answer the monetary needs of the world and has appreciated in value.

Third. That growing out of this imaginary hostile legislation against silver there has been a large decrease in the amount of money in use throughout the world, and especially in the United States, and that this has decreased the price of all classes of products.

Now let us see, briefly, what the actual facts are—facts that can be proved by record and are beyond dispute.

First, as to the United States. From the time the mints in the United States were opened in 1792 until the 12th day of February, 1873, a period of eighty years, the total coinage of all classes of silver money by the United States amounted to $135,782,360.70. This was an annual coinage of $1,697,279.50. Of the amount of silver thus coined annually, $8,031,230 was in dollar pieces and of full legal-tender value. Since the 12th day of February, 1873, until the last day of April, 1898, there had been coined in the mints of the United States of all classes of silver the sum of $589,630,930, or an annual coinage of $23,185,233.20. Of this, there was $431,933,742 in standard silver dollars of full legal-tender value. Thus, in twenty-five years since the "crime of 1873" we have coined more than four times the amount of silver that we coined in the eighty years prior to that time and fifteen times as much each year. The coinage of silver at the mints of the United States last year was $27,711,586.65. For the year 1872 the total amount of silver coined by the United States was $2,504,488.50, in round numbers—ten times as much per annum after as in the year before "the crime." In 1873 the entire amount of silver money in the United States of all classes was $6,150,000. Not one dollar of this was in standard dollars of full legal-tender value.

On the 1st day of December, 1899, the total amount of silver money in the United States amounted to $562,132,735. In addition to this there was silver bullion in the Treasury against which paper was issued and in circulation to the amount of $89,026,280, or a total amount of silver money of $657,159,005, or more than $100 of silver in 1899 to every dollar of silver in 1873. Of the amount of silver money in the United States in 1899, $571,648,656 was full legal tender for all debts, public and private, except otherwise specified in the contract.

Now let us see the conditions in the rest of the world. Accurate statistics for all of the world in 1873 are not obtainable, but we have accurate information as to the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands, Austria-Hungary, Australasia, Denmark, and Sweden and Norway. These embrace the principal civilized countries of the earth. At that time the total stock of silver of these countries aggregated $1,057,685,000. These same countries on the 1st of January, 1898, had in circulation as silver $1,730,600,000. This was an increase of $720,915,000.

On the 1st day of January, 1895, the stock of silver money of the entire world was $4,070,500,000. On the 1st day of January, 1897, it was $4,286,300,000, or an increase in two years of $197,800,000. This completely disposes of the claim that the world is using less silver than formerly. On the contrary, the increase of silver in the civilized world, and especially in the United States, has been much more rapid since 1873 than before that time. The greatest increase has been in countries where the gold standard is in full operation.

Now let us see as to the condition of gold. In 1873 the entire stock of gold in the United States was $135,000,000. The entire stock of gold in the United States on the 1st day of December, 1899, including gold bullion in the Treasury, against which certificates are issued, amounted to $1,015,340,462.

Now let us examine the rest of the world. The principal civilized countries of the world in 1873 possessed an entire stock of gold coin amounting to $1,309,800,000.

On January 1, 1899, these same countries possessed gold coin amounting to $4,631,700,000, more than three times the amount of gold coin in 1899 than they possessed in 1873.

In the whole civilized world in 1899 there was 96 per cent more gold than there was of both gold and silver in 1873.

In the United States alone we had over seven and a half times as much gold on December 1, 1899, as we had of both gold and silver in 1873. If we had no silver at all, we should have more than seven and a half times the amount of metallic money in 1899 that we had in 1873. No one pretends that the population has increased at any such rate.

In 1873 the total coinage of the United States of both gold and silver was $61,147,748.

In 1899 the coinage of the United States amounted to, in gold and silver, $135,918,766.68. In addition to that we sold to foreign countries in silver more than we imported, of the value of $25,534,787, or a total increase of metallic wealth, based upon our gold and silver productions in the year 1899, amounting to $161,453,523.65.

From 1870 to 1880 the annual average gold production of the entire world amounted to $115,000,000.

In 1899 careful estimates place it at $378,000,000, much more than double. In 1897 the world's production of gold exceeded by $99,000,000 the entire production of gold and silver in 1873.

It will be seen, therefore, that if all our silver money was destroyed the world would have much more metallic money in proportion to its population than in 1873. This is especially true of the United States.

Let us examine this claim of scarcity of money from another standpoint.

In 1860 the entire amount of money in the United States, including bank paper of uncertain value, amounted to $442,102,477.

In 1878 it was $762,221,575, the largest amount of money that had ever been in circulation in the United States at any one time.

On the 1st of December, 1899, the total amount of money in the United States of all kinds was $2,707,240,114.

In 1873 the thirteen principal countries above referred to possessed a total stock of money consisting of gold and silver amounting to $2,267,485,000.

In 1897 these same countries possessed a stock of gold and silver coin amounting to $5,570,300,000, more than double the amount possessed in 1873.

In 1873 the world's production of gold and silver was $179,000,000.

In 1898 the world's production of gold and silver amounted to $501,144,000.

The price of products frequently fall because of increased power and invention. Bryan himself stated that accurately when he said:

> You must attribute it to the inventive genius that has multiplied a thousand times, in many instances the strength of a single arm enabling us to do with 1 man what 50 men could not do fifty years ago. That is what has brought down prices in this country and everywhere.

Prices of agricultural products are affected by seasons of drought or plenty in this or other countries, by the condition of industry, increasing or diminishing demand. But the safest measure of the value of gold is human labor.

The supply of this is not greatly increased or diminished except as the demand increases or diminishes. The fact is undeniable and beyond dispute that, measured by human labor, the value of gold has diminished more than one-half since 1840. In other words, it will buy less than one-half the human labor it would buy in 1840. It will buy less than half the human labor it would buy in 1865—much less than it would purchase in 1873. It needs only to be added that practically the entire increase of the money of the world has been in the countries that maintain the gold standard. With the exception of Mexico, the amount of money in the silver-standard countries has remained practically stationary.

These figures show conclusively that the maintenance of the gold standard is in the interest of increase of money, not decrease. No silver-standard country has any gold in circulation as money. Every country that has free coinage of silver at any ratio is upon the silver standard. No silver-standard country, practically, maintains in circulation any paper money, while the value of silver is so completely changing, so often fluctuating.

the whole civilized world recognizes the value of maintaining the gold standard.

In 1892 Austria-Hungary adopted the gold standard. In 1873 India ceased to coin silver on private account, and is unquestionably about to adopt the gold standard. In 1895 the gold standard was adopted by Chile, and Russia, Japan, and Venezuela have adopted the gold standard. China is about to be partitioned among the nations of the earth who have adopted the gold standard. There is not a civilized country on the face of the earth, except Mexico, that has a monetary system not based upon the gold standard. It is the only money system that preserves the currency of a country from rapid fluctuation. A fluctuating currency endangers business, checks enterprise, ruins the weak for the benefit of the strong, who can take advantage of the change in markets to fill their own pockets. If the United States should not maintain the gold standard, it will stand alone among the civilized nations of the earth. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, no haunting fear of possible embarrassment by reason of having former utterances of mine on the floor of the House on the subject of monetary standards hurled at me impels me at this time to make reference thereto, for I am satisfied that not one of the handful of budding statesmen who, manuscript in hand and nervous in anticipation of the effect upon themselves and their audience of the first sound of their voices in this Hall, who attended the session on the evening of February 7, 1896, has the slightest recollection of my maiden effort on that occasion.

The speech lies deep in the catacombs of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, from which deep interment gathering doubts in my mind of the mutual relationship of certain causes and effects therein accepted overcame the natural desire I might have had to resurrect and exhibit the rhetorical perfections of my Congressional firstborn. Hostile and unfriendly hands, however, dragged it from the oblivion in which I would have been content to have it rest and used garbled extracts as ammunition, through two campaigns, for both the siege guns and light artillery with which they assailed my political position. This fact, and the desire to be entirely frank with the House, alone overcomes my natural modesty in calling attention to former efforts. I have, however, no apologies to make for that speech, the central idea of which was embodied in the following sentence:

> Not until each recurring sunrise shall find a debt, as measured by the human effort required to pay it, no greater than when the sun last set; not until the investment of capital in legitimate lines of human effort shall pay greater returns than capital locked up in safety vaults; not until the day shall come when the miser hoarding his coin wealth shall no longer profit by its daily, weekly, and monthly enhancement of value, shall this nation return to an era of true prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, that day has arrived and more, for each day since the passage of a Republican tariff bill and the assurance of a stable currency under a Republican Administration has lightened the burden of the debtor, increased the rewards of the producer, and offered new avenues for profitable investment. There was a time when I, in common with many others, believed that the highest good of our country and the world demanded an attempt to maintain a double standard of monetary value. I reasoned then somewhat in the light of the past, but more with the thought of escape from desperate and deplorable conditions then existing.

I reason now, I believe, more fully, comprehending all the lights and lessons of the past, including the immediate past, and in the clear and steady radiance of present conditions, with their bright illumination of a glorious future. The gentlemen on the other side with whom some of us have partially agreed on this question in the past assume to be surprised at the change which has taken place in the opinions of many. I confess to an unbounded astonishment, in face of the demonstrated fallacy of all of the fundamental propositions laid down in the past by the champions of unlimited silver coinage, that they still continue to advocate their old theories, and can only account for it on the ground of political expediency. With you some of us followed with sinking hearts and straining eyes the deepening twilight that marked the fading of the last day of the double standard and mourned its passing, for, though oft obscured and uncertain had been its light, it was the best that we had known. But, my friends, our eyes have seen the bright-robed heralds of the ruddy dawn precede the glowing chariot of the golden sun of a better, brighter, and more glorious day, while you still linger weeping at the empty tomb of a defunct theory whose spirit and essence has risen in a newer and more perfect form.

Mr. Chairman, this bill proposes to express, in the form of a statute, what has been practically the monetary conditions for sixty-odd years, and unquestionably and beyond all controversy our practice and policy during the entire life of one generation of men. It rises above the vague and undefined terrors inspired by mysterious and meaningless catch phrases and with the splendid courage which has always characterized the Republican party writes upon the statute books the irrevocable decree of the eternal law of evolution. I have never understood what determined the choosing of the metal for the construction of the image of the infantile bovine before which the children of Israel worshiped while Moses lingered among the thunders of Sinai, but I have often thought how surprised those hard-hearted idolaters would have been could they have foreseen that their act was to be used by the silverites as a figure of speech to conjure with in the discussion of the currency question thirty-five hundred years after their sinful souls had been called to reward. Truly the evil which men do lives long after them.

No man has ever claimed, to my knowledge, that a double standard was the ideal condition, and no man who values his word will deny the statement that the two metals have never for any length of time circulated at a parity where there was free coinage for both. The only excuse for the effort to maintain a double standard has been the fear that there was not a sufficient amount of one metal in the world to answer all the purposes of a monetary standard. If there is a sufficient amount of gold in the world and shall continue to be in the future, then no man can deny the wisdom of maintaining a single standard or defend the stupendous folly of inviting the dangers and the disasters incident to the fluctuating relative values of a double standard. How are we able to decide whether there be gold enough to serve all purposes of a standard? If you believe in the quantitive theory of money, you find your answer in the trebled production of gold since 1873, while if the trend of the prices of products be your test, you have a practical answer and demonstration in the fact that in the face of cheapened methods of production under the gold standard the prices of commodities have risen and now stand at a figure which will yield the producer good returns for his labor.

In my opinion there is one test of the sufficiency of a monetary standard which transcends and outweighs all others; it is the test of its effect on the rewards of human toil and effort, and since men began to establish governments, since history's scroll first unrolled, there has never been a time when it has been recorded that human labor was so well rewarded as it is to-day in these United States and under this standard. It is astonishing with what assurance and alacrity the free-silver men have assumed in the past the mantle of prophecy and equally astonishing the composure with which they essay to continue the prophetic rôle in view of the utter failure of their past predictions. The consuming fires have persistently refused to descend in answer to their commands and appeals, while at the word of the Republican Elijah there arises the sweet savor of the sacrificial thank-offering of a happy, prosperous, and contented people. Need I remind the gentlemen on the other side of the just fate of false prophets and warn them to turn to the true monetary faith ere an outraged people whom they have deceived visit swift and condign judgment upon them?

Mr. Chairman, some of the gentlemen on the other side, greatly agitated over the effect of this legislation on the Republican party, clamorously insist that this measure is a step beyond any national declaration of our party, and point to our platform adopted at St. Louis in support of that contention. It is my opinion that the declaration made by the party at St. Louis, and upon which the party won a glorious victory, did not necessarily place us under the obligation to declare the gold standard by statute, but "God works in a mysterious way his wonders to perform," and we have another illustration of how the wrath of men may be turned to work out good ends, for the pledge we did not specifically give at St. Louis we have since given on the stump and in local platforms in answer to your declaration that we intended to fix and declare the gold standard. You threw down the gantlet; we accepted the challenge, and some of us have been surprised to find that our people have been more eager to accept it than we were.

During the entire period when a most earnest and zealous effort was being made by the Administration through the medium of a commission of able men of both parties friendly to the double standard, the opposition were discrediting the commission, and while praying for its failure, belittling its efforts. The commission failed to accomplish the purpose for which it was created, and with its failure multitudes of thoughtful men abandoned their faith in the possibility of the establishment of a double standard by international agreement, as they had already begun to doubt the efficacy of such an agreement, if entered into, to accomplish the objects sought.

Then came the campaign of 1898, the campaign which resulted in the issuance of commissions under which the members of this House are now serving their constituencies. The incidents of that campaign are still fresh in my memory. It began with lingering doubts in my mind as to the wisdom of finally fixing a single standard. The opposition insisted on a definite declaration and they received it. My constituency, men and women, have been considering this question carefully for years. I have never claimed

a wisdom superior to theirs with regard to this question, which we all studied alike, but the challenge of the opposition cleared away all doubts on the subject.

I accepted the challenge and declared that, if in the wisdom of the Republican party the declaration which we now propose to write should be required to set at rest all doubts and dangers of disturbance of our financial system and divert the possibilities of the disasters of a debased coinage and fluctuating standard, it would receive my support and my vote, and my presence here indicates that my constituents indorsed that declaration. Mr. Chairman, the opposition, nervous lest we exceed the definite obligations of our commissions from the people, say that we have had no command from them to do this thing. As for myself, if there is any one thing above all others which I have a commission to do it is this, and my commission comes not from any class, not from any one condition in life, but from the majority of the people of my State, of all classes and conditions, and from no portion of our citizens is my commission so clear and unmistakable as from the wage-earners, for it was from the communities where they predominated that I received my largest majorities. They understand this question, and I stand as their representative to see that the dollars which they receive in payment for their toil shall be the best dollars in the wide world, sound, safe, and enduring in value.

Mr. Chairman, I favor the bill because it is the expression of an onward step in the march of monetary evolution, a definite statement that in the future there can be no doubt as to the value of our dollars anywhere or at any time, and that all of them, silver, paper, or gold, shall be equal in honor and value. There are some provisions of the bill relative to the redemption of our currency as to the necessity and wisdom of which I have some doubts, but as to these provisions, as they commend themselves to the judgment of the majority of my party, I accept them as perhaps the best solution of a somewhat difficult problem. With the passage of this bill the Republican party rounds out and completes the legislation necessary to fulfill its promises made to the American people for the restoration of confidence and prosperity which it begun by the passage of the Dingley tariff, and with the passage of this measure I look forward confidently to a continuation of the growth and development of our country and the betterment of the condition of all our people under the guidance of that great party whose enlightened and constructive policies have made us prosperous and contented beyond measure at home and respected and honored beyond precedent abroad. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I have always liked the Republican party because it has had the courage to stake its fortunes and its life upon its convictions. I do not expect this afternoon to indulge in a eulogium upon the Republican party. I do not believe that at this time anything I can say would aid to place it in a different position in the history of the country than that which it now occupies.

All nations, Mr. Chairman, have perpetuated or commemorated or celebrated some great act or achievement, some great life or act of courage. Englishmen, as we know, take special pride in recollecting Wellington and Waterloo and old Nelson and Trafalgar. As I understand it, in France, upon the highest pedestal of martial glory stands the figure of old Napoleon, looking out on the field of Austerlitz. It is said that the Greeks still celebrate Marathon and the sea fight of Salamis. We have linked, Mr. Chairman, in imperishable remembrance, the names of Grant, Sherman, Sheridan, with Vicksburg, Winchester, and the march to the sea.

But, Mr. Chairman, when the figure that shall typify or represent the greatest deed of the Republican party shall be molded and shall be put upon its pedestal, it will not look out on fields of battle, but rather it will look over that long, persistent, courageous fight which the Republican party has made through the years to maintain at the highest point our public credit and to preserve inviolate the nation's plighted faith.

I was entirely satisfied, Mr. Chairman, to leave this bill where the able and exhaustive explanation of my colleague on the committee [Mr. OVERSTREET] left it at the close of his speech, but since that time debate has taken a wide scope, and it has traveled away so far from the formulated propositions which are supposed to constitute the topic of this discussion that I think it would be well to imitate the wisdom of that ancient mariner referred to by Webster in his great speech and turn once before this debate closes to the subject-matter of this bill.

I desire, Mr. Chairman, in the brief time that I take to sum up and put upon the record my understanding of the purposes and provisions of this bill, and if I get outside of that it shall be wholly by reason of the fact that this debate has not been confined at all to the subject-matter that was supposed to have been the issue in the discussion. If this bill is passed, Mr. Chairman, and it comes up to the expectations of those who framed it, it will accomplish four things. In the first place, it will remove all doubt as to the standard of value by putting that standard in express terms in the gold dollar. In the second place, it will remove all doubt as to the kind of money in which the interest-bearing obligations and the demand notes of the Government are to be paid, by putting in express terms a provision that they are to be paid in the gold coin of the United States; and in the third place, it puts in the power of the Secretary of the Treasury means and machinery adequate to maintain the standard in the gold dollar and to pay the obligations that I have enumerated in gold, and to maintain on a parity and of equal value all the money issued and coined by the United States.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if it accomplishes what I have indicated, it will settle our monetary system upon a foundation so firm and enduring that no disturbance of financial wind or storm will ever shake it.

I desire, Mr. Chairman, at this point to indicate, not because I have any personal pride in this bill, not that I care whether its present form is adopted or another in order to make potential the ideas that we find crystallized in the terms of this bill, but I want to point out wherein it differs materially from any proposition that has heretofore been presented to this House.

The first important provision in section 2 of this bill is one that is clearly distinct from the provisions of the other bills that have been introduced in this House. The Indianapolis commission bill and the bill introduced by my distinguished friend from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], and perhaps some other bills, provide that all obligations of the Government shall be paid in the gold coin of the United States.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I desire to justify the distinction between this bill, or this provision in this bill, and the provisions of other bills which relate to the payment or redemption of the obligations of the United States. This bill selects, first, the interest-bearing obligations of the United States; second, the United States notes, and third, the Treasury notes; and it makes these three classes of obligations—obligations that have been recognized by the Government for many years as gold obligations—and these alone, payable in the gold coin of the United States.

I desire, Mr. Chairman, to justify the attitude of the committee on that important proposition. When we come to examine the Indianapolis commission bill and the Hill bill and other bills of like character we found that under the broad and sweeping provisions of these bills that the millions of dollars paid out upon obligations for the improvement of rivers and harbors, the millions of dollars paid out to furnish supplies and munitions of war to the Army and Navy, the millions of dollars paid out for the purpose of paying the salaries of the officials of the Government, all of these amounting to many millions annually, by the terms of all these bills would be payable if demanded in the gold coin of the United States.

So this committee determined, Mr. Chairman, that it was wise to make a distinction, if we could make a distinction that was justified by practice and precedent, which would relieve the Government from the unnecessary and embarrassing burden of being compelled under form of law to pay every obligation of every kind and character in the gold coin of the United States.

So in this bill, and for the first time in the history of the legislation of this House, we formulate a law which agrees precisely with the practice of the Government, and which agrees in every particular with the promises that the Republican party frequently made during these years, that the interest-bearing obligations, the United States notes and the Treasury notes, should be paid in gold coin.

And then we distinguish between the obligations—we distinguished but did not discriminate between the interest-bearing obligations—United States notes and the Treasury notes and the great mass of other obligations, public and private, which did not desire to be paid in gold coin, but was satisfied with the money as good as gold, and we provide in this provision that all other obligations, public and private, shall be paid or performed in accordance with the standard established in section 1 of the bill.

It is clear, therefore, that thus far this bill is different from the other bills, but it differs in another particular, and has been criticised to some extent on that account. My friend from New Jersey [Mr. FOWLER] made a severe criticism on the bill, and my friend from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] made a kindly criticism upon it. The gentleman from New Jersey holds that the discretionary power to exchange gold for silver dollars or any other form of United States money in the division of issue and redemption relates back and makes the redemption of the demand notes discretionary. My friend makes this point, that by that provision, which leaves it discretionary with the Secretary of the Treasury to pay out gold in exchange for silver, it relates back as a matter of construction to the provision that is mandatory in its terms, requiring him to pay gold for the redemption of United States notes and Treasury notes, and that the latter discretion makes the whole power discretionary.

I want to call attention to a rule of construction. I do not

know that my friend is a lawyer, but I want to call his attention to a rule of construction recognized by the courts and the profession, and perhaps this rule of construction has misled my friend. It is that if in a later provision of an act the precise thing is made discretionary that in an earlier provision is made mandatory, by a rule of construction the entire power is left as a matter of discretion.

The application of this rule, Mr. Chairman, depends on the identity of the thing, the one that is made mandatory and the other made discretionary. In this bill the provision which requires the Secretary of the Treasury, upon demand of the holder, to pay out gold coin upon demand for United States notes or Treasury notes is a mandatory provision, and it is the operation legally or technically called "redemption."

The provision of the bill found later, and referred to by the gentleman, is an entirely different provision. It relates solely and entirely to that power that is exercised in the exchange of money, and the discretionary power is entirely distinct and separate from the power that he refers to in the earlier part of the bill.

But there is another provision of this bill to which I desire to call attention, and that is this: In the two provisions to which I have called attention, the first in section 2 of the bill and the other in the two sections following—sections 3 and 4—a means is provided, a means which has never been suggested in any other bill, so far as my recollection now serves me, for the purpose of maintaining and keeping this gold reserve to the point of safety and to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to maintain the gold standard and the parity of all our money.

This bill gives the Secretary of the Treasury the power—and this may have appeared in some other bill, but it has not within my remembrance—the Secretary of the Treasury the power to draw upon the general fund down to a balance of $50,000,000 for the purpose of maintaining the gold reserve fund to the required amount. The other bills have provided several kinds of devices for that purpose, but not one of them, so far as I now recall, ever gave the Secretary of the Treasury any power to draw upon the general fund except in the creation and the organization or setting apart of the reserve fund. Under this provision, without being compelled to issue bonds, without being compelled in any way to pledge the credit of the Government, this reserve fund can be kept up and maintained simply by drawing out of the surplus of the general fund which may exist beyond and above a working balance of $50,000,000.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman pardon me for a moment?

Mr. KERR. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. He will find that in the bill reported by the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, and also in the bill reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, by Mr. Mitchell, and prepared by Mr. Muhenburg, of New York. Both bills contain that provision.

Mr. KERR. I say to my friend that he is entirely mistaken about that provision appearing in any bill unless it appears in the McCleary bill.

Mr. HILL. Perhaps if I read the language the gentleman will be satisfied that I am right.

Mr. KERR. I ask the gentleman to indicate what bill he refers to.

Mr. HILL. The bill reported unanimously by the ten Republican members of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures at the close of the last session.

Mr. KERR. I will ask if that is the McCleary bill? That is the Hill bill, is it not?

Mr. HILL. That is the bill reported by the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Mr. KERR. And introduced by yourself?

Mr. HILL. Introduced by myself; and the same provision appears in the bill reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported by Mr. Mitchell, of New York. The language is as follows:

> And for this purpose he may from time to time transfer to such fund any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. KERR. Well, I was very sure, and I thought I had read all of these bills, but when the gentleman referred to this proposition I was not quite sure but that it appeared in the McCleary bill. The thing which I am referring to is the limitation to a balance of $50,000,000 in the general fund. I knew that that provision did not appear in the Hill bill, and I thought it did not appear in any other bill that had been considered by any committee of this House, unless it was the McCleary bill.

In the bill to which the gentleman refers the authority was conferred upon the Secretary of the Treasury to draw upon the general fund without limitation, but this bill fixes exactly the boundaries of this power, providing that he must keep in the general fund enough money always to constitute a safe balance, but that beyond that he has the entire surplus revenues of this Government upon which to draw in order to maintain intact or to the extent provided by this bill this gold-reserve fund which was to make good at all times the redemption of United States notes and the Treasury notes.

But I call attention to another criticism that has been made upon this bill, Mr. Chairman. It has been said by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FOWLER], who is an expert upon this subject and whose criticisms were not very kindly, in my judgment, and it has also been said by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], who is also an expert, and whose criticisms have been entirely kindly upon this bill, that it is fatally defective because it did not provide for the absolute and unconditional interchange or exchange of silver and gold at the Treasury.

Now, we had under consideration that proposition, and it was an exceedingly troublesome one. We had before us all the arguments of those gentlemen who have spent years in preparing to distinguish themselves in the positions they have occupied with honor for a good many years upon those committees which deal especially with this subject. But I have thought a good deal in accord with the opinion of my friend from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] who appointed the House committee in the last Congress. His idea was that men can become too wise upon these subjects [laughter], and when he appointed a committee of nonexperts, men who made no claim to special knowledge upon these subjects, he recognized the fact that men dealing too long with these subjects could so refine their knowledge as to be entirely incomprehensible to others and very largely incomprehensible to themselves. [Laughter.]

But the committee acted in the light of history and tested the arguments of these gentlemen of experience. The foundation of their argument for absolute exchangeability of gold for silver was that the declaration itself would make one as good as the other, and under such a condition one would not care to exchange. We looked to see if the declaration would of itself satisfy, and thus save the gold reserve from five hundred millions of silver. We recalled that the resumption act made greenbacks and gold or coin equal by providing that these notes would be redeemed in coin, and for years all were redeemed without trouble; but there came a time, in 1893, when the declaration did not satisfy. The people were not satisfied with the right to exchange greenbacks for gold—they took the gold. The declaration or provision in this bill making it mandatory upon the Secretary of the Treasury to pay gold for silver would only put the reserve fund, in such times as we had in 1893, in jeopardy by adding five hundred millions of silver to the United States Treasury notes or gold extractors.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. KERR. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. I think the gentleman said my criticism upon the bill had been very kindly.

Mr. KERR. Very kindly.

Mr. HILL. I am sorry to say that the criticism that he has just made will not bear a similar construction.

Mr. KERR. I was about to say that from that criticism I excluded the gentleman from Connecticut. I believe his knowledge has been utilized; and it never has reached the point of refinement where it has become useless. I can not say so much in regard to other gentlemen who have sought to criticise this bill. I want to say to the gentleman that in my judgment the ablest speech delivered in this House was by the gentleman from Connecticut, in which he not only paid a compliment to this bill, but he illuminated with his knowledge and his great intellect this entire subject. [Laughter and applause.]

I call attention, Mr. Chairman, to another thing. I have now called attention to about all I desire to mention that may be said to be the distinguishing features of this bill—features that make it distinct from other bills introduced here. I think the committee is entitled to some credit for having done that which no other committee of this House has been able to do, namely, report a bill and have it agreed upon by the Republican membership.

Mr. HILL. I wish the gentleman would be correct. The Committee on Coinage, by unanimous vote of the Republican members of that committee, did report a comprehensive bill at the last session.

Mr. KERR. That is the bill introduced by the gentleman from Connecticut. But it seemed that the House—and I have the greatest reverence for the gentleman's knowledge, and a good deal of it was crystallized in this bill—yet this House, either from lack of inclination or time (this side of the House, I mean), never has been able to join with the gentleman and say that it is a proper bill to take up and present to the country.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman pardon me?

Mr. KERR. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. It seems to me that a little unwritten history of the House of Representatives could be given at this time.

Mr. KERR. I do not yield for that purpose.

Mr. HILL. I will take time before the debate on this bill is concluded to give it, in view of the statement of the gentleman.

Mr. KERR. I have none but the kindliest feelings for the

gentleman from Connecticut. I believe him to have knowledge superior to that of anybody with whom I have had the opportunity of discussing this question. I have not had the opportunity to discuss the question with everybody, but I think his knowledge is superior and his comprehension of the subject is wider than that of any other person that I have had the pleasure and opportunity to talk with upon this subject.

Mr. HILL. Taffy is cheap.

Mr. KERR. I want to call the attention to some criticisms that have been made by gentlemen on the other side. The other day, when the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND], one of the ablest men on the other side, made a speech in the opening of this discussion, there came up some question as to what General Jackson thought or did and about the question of the standard.

I do not know, Mr. Chairman, all that General Jackson thought upon this subject; I do not know all that he did upon this subject; but I do know, however, that he recognized a fact that refutes every argument made on the Democratic side during the last three years. He recognized the fact that the two metals, gold and silver, would not circulate as money concurrently at a ratio substantially different from the ratio of their intrinsic value; and he made that opinion potential by signing the act of 1834, which carved out of the gold eagle enough grains of gold to reduce its intrinsic value to the intrinsic value of ten silver dollars; and when he did that he made an argument that has answered every argument that has been made by the Democratic party since it has been intent on fastening upon the country silver as standard money.

Now, I think, Mr. Chairman, that our Democratic friends would do well to recur more frequently than they do to the teachings of General Jackson, not only upon the subject of finance and money, but upon the more general subject of patriotism. In his day, Mr. Chairman, the flag of his country was never assailed, either at home or abroad, either upon the land or the sea, that he was not somewhere about its standard helping to bear it onward and upward to victory; and if General Jackson was living to-day he would be a Republican upon all the great principles and upon all the great propositions that now divide the two parties of the country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

He was in favor of a protective tariff, and you have abandoned Jackson not only upon that proposition, but upon the money question. You have forgotten Pierce and Polk; you have been trying to forget, for these many years, Buchanan; you have discarded and disowned Cleveland; you have extinguished all the beacon lights and upon a sea that is unmarked and unsounded you are searching for a harbor that you will never find.

If you will let me change the figure now from off the sea to the land; if you were starting a political pantheon you would be absolutely bankrupt. You have not a single political god until you reach Jefferson, three-quarters of a century in his honored grave at Monticello. But the Republican party has enough heroes to make a hundred political pantheons. It has a history that blazes and will blaze on to the end of time in the great temple of American liberty.

As I said when I started, I believe in the Republican party, because in a good many desperate situations, when public sentiment seemed to be running against it, it had the courage—the courage of its convictions—to stand always without a sign of wavering for everything that would raise higher the public credit and that would contribute to the maintenance and preservation of the national faith.

Mr. Chairman, I want to put in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial that appeared in the New York World two or three days ago. The heading of it is, "The triumph of a sound idea." I desire, without reading any more of it, to print it as a part of my remarks. I understand the World is good Democratic authority.

THE TRIUMPH OF A SOUND IDEA.

The unanimous indorsement of a gold-standard bill by the House Republican caucus is fraught with far-reaching consequences. It means that the bill will pass the House on the day set for the vote—Monday of next week. It means, furthermore, that whatever differences there may be with the Senate on other details of a currency bill, the essential principles of both bills—sound money and an unquestioned national faith—will be adopted and approved by the President.

This unanimous agreement is extraordinary in view of the unsoundness and timidity in the Republican party on this question down almost to the present year. Not so very long ago Mr. McKinley was advocating free silver; and the various forms of the financial craze that have prevailed during the last thirty years—the "rag baby," unlimited paper money, the "paying" of bonds in irredeemable greenbacks, and, finally, free silver at 16 to 1—have found strong support among the Republicans of the West. It is probably true, as Mr. RICHARDSON, the Democratic leader, said in the House on Friday, that if the proposition to reaffirm the gold standard had been made in the House three years ago "half the Republican side would have been up in arms against it."

Yet such has been the irresistible advance of a sound idea, and the inevitable decay of an unsound idea because it is unsound, that to-day the Republican party in Congress is united in support of a measure to reenact the existing gold standard, to declare that all interest-bearing obligations and all United States notes shall be redeemed in gold, and to give to the Secretary of the Treasury what is now lacking—explicit authority to maintain the gold reserve for redemption purposes.

In taking this position, under the encouragement of the march of events, and particularly of the Iowa election, the Republicans have displayed courage, capacity, and farsightedness. The time is ripe for a settlement of the question that has menaced business and disturbed politics for thirty years. And it is not surprising that several of the Democratic Congressmen of this State refuse to be drawn or driven any further in even tacit support of the fatal fallacy of "free silver." The Democracy of those honest-money Democrats—Jefferson, Jackson, Benton, and Tilden—is the only Democracy that can save and restore the party.

In addition to that, for the purpose of showing what the Republican newspapers have said about this bill, I desire that a portion, which I will indicate, of an editorial that appeared in the New York Press be published as a part of my remarks:

This is the sort of direct, uncompromising lawgiving on moot points that makes great parties and great nations.

"SEC. 2. That all interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the payment of money, now existing or hereafter to be entered into, and all United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the law of July 14, 1890, shall be redeemed and held to be payable in the gold coin of the United States as defined in section 1 of this act; and all other obligations, public and private, for the payment of money shall be performed in conformity with the standard established in said section."

All the fruits of twenty-two years' incessant warfare since silver fiat was substituted for paper fiat as an adulterate injection into the currency are secured to the nation by these few courageous lines.

Now, about all I want to say in addition, Mr. Chairman, is upon this proposition, that the time has arrived, and I think we have delayed a long time, when we should settle this question of the standard of value, and we should determine once for all in what coin or money these obligations which have been denominated coin obligations should be paid.

Now, the necessity of this may somewhat lie in Republican legislation, but it lies more largely in the declarations and the attitude of the Democratic party upon these propositions. The trouble, of course, occurred, and it is so familiar history that I am hardly inclined to refer to it. It occurred in the public-credit act of 1869, and later in the resumption act of 1875, where the word "coin" was used in reference to the money in which the bonds should be paid and the greenbacks should be redeemed.

Now, I charge, and I do it without any purpose to be offensive or without any purpose to apply it personally, that the Democratic party has never omitted an opportunity, whether it intended it that way or not, to do that which would impair the public credit and reflect doubt and uncertainty upon the nation's faith and obligations.

It commenced during the war, and by the discredit it cast upon the greenbacks reduced them in value millions of dollars. After they were issued and after that question was settled they then, in 1868, in the national convention of that year, demanded that the Government bonds, which at that time contained no certain stipulation as to the kind of money in which they were to be paid, should be paid in greenbacks, and that was the occasion of the great act I have referred to, called the public credit act, in 1869, which removed all doubts upon that subject by providing that these obligations should be paid in coin.

The necessity for the public credit act of 1869 lay in the declaration of the Democratic platform of 1868 that the bonds should be paid in greenbacks. The proposition was extremely dangerous and the argument in support of it was extremely seductive. They said the greenbacks have been good enough to pay the soldier for his valor; they have been good enough to pay the workman for his toil, the farmer for his wheat, and the merchant for his goods, and are they not now good enough to pay the bloated bondholder for his bonds? It took a courageous party to stand in the face of that argument. But with that supreme faith which has always characterized the Republican party in the ultimate justice of public opinion, it declared the bonds payable in coin.

They then propose that the greenbacks should never be redeemed. We did that proposed act of repudiation to death by the resumption act.

For sixteen years thereafter no considerable party organization made any direct attack upon the nation's honor. In 1896 the Democratic party again proposed repudiation in the demand that the bonds be paid and the demand notes be redeemed in silver. We propose to kill that off by this act.

I have always been interested in and have been able, in a measure at least, to comprehend the monetary arguments of my Democratic friends. But these gentlemen who lead and constitute the silver party have so refined their knowledge that they have got entirely beyond my comprehension. I shall not, therefore, undertake to penetrate the mysteries of their profound science. I desire, however, to notice a proposition or two advanced by the gentlemen who dominate the other side of the House.

I take as a starting point the speech of that able and subdued gentleman from Missouri, Mr. DE ARMOND. I take it, however, in connection with a speech he made in the Fifty-fourth Congress, prior to the campaign of 1896. In this latter speech he conjured up an invisible and intangible creature—what he called the "money power." That power, he said, had fastened upon the world the gold standard—that it fastened upon the world the gold standard to thereby reduce the volume of money and thereby reduce prices

and thereby command a greater amount of the goods and property of the world.

In his speech the other day I discovered that this same invisible creature still lived, but that it had changed its name and occupation.

He styles it a "trust" now, and declares that it is now engaged in putting up prices, so, I suppose, its money will buy less of the property and goods of the world.

My Democratic friends ought to determine among themselves whether the money power is putting prices up or down before they set up to enlighten the country.

Gentlemen who had spent many months and much of God's pure atmosphere in telling the people that under the gold standard the volume of money would constantly decrease and prices constantly shrink are now attempting to get out of a most ridiculous embarrassment by saying, "Why, we told you that prices and business depended upon the volume of money, and with the incoming and increase of gold prices raised and business increased, just as we told you."

That escape, if escape it is, is complimentary to your ingenuity, but your knowledge suffers.

How did this gold get out and here? Gold has no legs or power of locomotion; it keeps no carriage; it has no private car; it even has not a pass upon the railroad. It came here on the rising tides and currents of business and commerce. It came across on steamships to pay for the products of American shops and factories. It came from the pockets of workmen who work in these shops and factories.

Mr. Chairman, even if we could we can no longer remain insular, wide as our boundaries are. I believe, as firmly as I believe anything, that the nation's destiny and duty was marked in the plan of the universe from the beginning. In that regard I believe a good deal in the old Presbyterian doctrine of foreordination.

Have you thought that for nearly six thousand or six thousand million years this great domain, the richest of all of God's temporal gifts to humanity, lay waste before it was the habitation of civilization, and then the civilization that was to take root and grow was selected by Providence or the providence of events? I believe this heritage was saved for the Anglo-Saxon. At least, Latin civilization found no soil in which it could strike its roots, nor atmosphere that it could breathe.

Nearly every royal power of Europe sought possessions here before Great Britain. Ponce De Leon, old in years and infirmities, came for the Spanish Crown, but instead of seeking possessions, he sought the waters of perpetual youth amid the vines and the flowers of the Floridas. De Soto came upon the same mission, landed upon the Atlantic coast, penetrated to the Mississippi, only to find a grave beneath the rolling tide of that mighty river. The seed was being prepared by the alchemy of civilization on the other side. When it was ready, the hand of the Almighty gathered it and sowed it.

As as an eloquent gentleman once said on this floor years ago, "When the seed was gathered, it came from the worn and broken crew of the *Mayflower*, from the ruined bands of Raleigh, from the free communities of the fallow land, and from the companionship of William Penn."

We must take our place among the great nations of the earth, and we can not do this unless we add to our industrial supremacy the supremacy of the seas; we can not do this unless we have a sound money system. No nation has ever made great progress in international trade and business without a money system in which the world had confidence. England has planted Anglo-Saxon civilization from Plymouth Rock to the Indies around the world; her flag floats upon merchant ships upon every billow of the sea, but for three-quarters of a century her money system has been above doubt or question.

I am not in favor of territorial conquest further than we have already "conquested." I believe we should first eliminate our monetary weaknesses and then start upon a conquest of shipping and commerce that will have no limits save the ends of the earth.

On the other side of the western ocean are 500,000,000 people just emerging from barbarism. Civilization will multiply their desires and their wants a thousandfold. There is not a commercial nation in the world save ourselves whose merchant vessels are not headed toward the Orient. Why stand we here idle? [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BOREING. Mr. Chairman, as this seems to be Kentucky day on this floor, I desire to say a few things about the passage of the pending bill, not that I desire to enter into a discussion of its merits to any great length, because I regard the financial crisis as having passed and the fleeting beauties of free silver forever gone. [Applause on the Republican side.] But referring to what occurred between my distinguished colleagues on the other side this morning, I desire to say that I knew that the Democratic party in Kentucky had been defeated and routed, but I had not suspected that a guerrilla warfare, growing out of that contest, would be transferred here and fought out on the floor of this House between the contestants from that party. [Laughter on the Republican side.] But since it relieves the situation in Kentucky and gives my people a rest at home, I am entirely willing that the fight should go on. [Laughter.] I have no desire to take sides with either gentleman. As between them, I am willing to admit that one is just as bad as the other says he is. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

But in so far as the remarks of the gentleman from the First district [Mr. WHEELER] relate in an uncomplimentary way to the election of General Taylor, I desire to enter my protest. If I understood the gentleman correctly, he alleged that General Taylor had been elected by fraud and rascality.

Mr. Chairman, that statement is absolutely untrue, and comes in exceedingly bad taste from Mr. Goebel or from his representative upon this floor. Why, the election was held in Kentucky under a law that Mr. Goebel himself had passed for the benefit of his own party. I wish I had time to explain that law to you, and especially the methods by which that law was enacted in Kentucky. I shall content myself, however, with pleading it as a set-off; as a counterclaim against all the complaint of the other side; against what they have been pleased to term the ironclad rules adopted for the government of this body.

That law took the whole election machinery out of the hands of the people of Kentucky and placed it in the legislature. The law authorizes the appointment of three Democratic State commissioners, who hold the election. They hand down power to the county commissioners, who hold the elections and report back to their masters. They exercise all the functions authorized to be exercised by the coordinate departments of this Government. They held their election. They certified the results, and it goes to the honor of the State commissioners that two of them against one decided that General Taylor and the Republican ticket were elected. I say it must be humiliating to Mr. Goebel now to appeal from the decision of his own election board appointed under his own law. I deny and denounce as untrue the statement that General Taylor is elected by fraud or by rascality.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I see that the McKinley prosperity has been so manifest all over the country, and especially in the State of Iowa, that the other day when I introduced myself to the distinguished chairman of this committee [Mr. HEPBURN], he took it for granted that because I introduced myself as a Kentuckian I was a Democrat, and he referred me to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] when I asked him for a little time in which to discuss this question. [Laughter.]

Out there in Iowa they are so busy building barns and loaning money that they have no time to notice the political revolution which has been going on in Kentucky. Kentucky is the first State in this Union, and, so far as I know, the only State, that ever made the financial question a distinctive issue in a State campaign. Kentucky is the only State in this Union in which the Republican party ascended to power and has maintained itself in power upon a single gold standard. Kentucky is the only State in this Union in which the Democratic party, after it had held sway for a quarter of a century, lost power when it departed from the financial views of Thomas Jefferson and adopted the free-silver heresies of William Jennings Bryan.

In 1895 the Democratic party in Kentucky indorsed the national platform upon which Mr. Cleveland was nominated, a platform construed by him and generally regarded by the country as indorsing sound money. Upon that platform a free-coinage ticket was nominated in Kentucky. General Hardin, their candidate for governor, promptly renounced and repudiated the platform upon which he was nominated and declared for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. Governor Bradley, the Republican candidate, promptly declared for the gold standard and construed the platform upon which he was nominated to mean the gold standard, nothing more and nothing less. The campaign was fought out upon that issue, and the Republican party won their first victory by a majority of nearly 10,000.

In 1896 the issue was the gold standard on the one side and the free and unlimited coinage of silver on the other. This question was debated in every schoolhouse and in every family in Kentucky, and the verdict of the sovereign voters of Kentucky was for McKinley and sound money. Yet the sound-money Democratic ticket received a very respectable vote. Then came Mr. Goebel upon the scene. Yes, he came because he was not born in Kentucky. The man who originated the Goebel election law was not born in Kentucky. The soil that gave birth to Abraham Lincoln did not give birth to Mr. Goebel. Then came the election to which we have referred, and the people of Kentucky again elected the Republican ticket upon a sound-money platform.

Why, the gentleman from the Third district of Kentucky [Mr. RHEA] said this morning that no man who was contending for the passage of this bill had ever smelt fresh earth. I do not know any two districts in Kentucky where the people have plowed and hoed more corn than the one that I represent and the one that he

represents, and I beg leave to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that both his district and mine voted for sound money and General Taylor at the last election. [Applause on the Republican side.] My district gave nearly 17,000 majority for the Republican ticket, and his district gave a good respectable majority for the Republican ticket. [Applause on the Republican side.] The gentleman from the First district [Mr. WHEELER] and the gentleman from the Sixth district [Mr. BERRY] are not the only two gentlemen in Kentucky who must look out.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the time has passed when you can take anything for granted in Kentucky. The Democrats have to put the straightedge to a number of their former leaders to ascertain the stage of their political orthodoxy. The distinguished and gifted editor of the Courier-Journal, whose talent and ability all Kentuckians admire, who used to write the platforms and shape the policies of his party in the State and nation, now has to take his bearings in order to determine his own political status.

I congratulate the committee that prepared this bill for coming to Kentucky for sound financial ideas, and I trust the time may soon come when the country will look to Kentucky for its President. We gave it the best President it has ever had, the typical American and the great man of the nineteenth century. Mr. Lincoln stands for all in the nineteenth century that Frederick the Great, Napoleon Bonaparte, and George Washington stood for in the eighteenth century.

I have learned one thing during the progress of this debate—that there is one advantage in being a new member. While he goes foot on the committees and is expected to have but little to say in the shaping of the legislation of the country, neither side of the House can have any amusement at his expense by commenting upon the apparent inconsistencies of his record, connecting him with the unfortunate legislation that has befallen the country. But, Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, I am disposed to throw the broad mantle of charity over the mistakes of the statesmen on both sides of this House, for the country has outlived and, I trust, by the passage of this bill, will be able to outgrow the effects of all the bad legislation that has come to it from both parties.

I believe, sir, that the country will ultimately profit by all the legislative experiments of Congress on the silver question between the years 1873 and 1893, as it has profited and will continue to profit by its experience with the tariff legislation enacted by the Democratic Congress known as the Wilson bill. By reason of what has occurred in the past, we will the more easily in the future detect fallacy in logic and sophistry in argument, and will the more readily discover the pitfalls that lie in the pathway of the nation's progress. I predict, Mr. Chairman, that it will be a long time before the Republican party will again fool with silver or the Democratic party tinker with the tariff legislation.

The unit and standard of value and the parity of our currency have been before the country for discussion so long that the enlightening power of the press, the schoolhouse, and the statesmen has so thoroughly informed the people and educated the public mind that this debate is a mere formality, wanting in spirit and interest.

I am for the passage of this bill because it recognizes the true theory of money. If the doctrine of fiat money is sound, then all taxation is unjust, oppressive, and wrong, because, if the Government can make money by legal enactment, when it needs money it ought to make it and not tax the people to get it. If the doctrine of fiat money is good, then Mr. Cleveland did wrong when he issued and sold $260,000,000 worth of bonds to get money to run the country until a Republican Congress could be elected to repeal the only legislation that the Democratic party has given the country for a period of nearly forty years. If the law can not make money all fiat it can not make money one-half fiat, and Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton were right when they declined to read the acts of Parliament and Congress to ascertain the legal value, but went into the markets of the world to ascertain the commercial value of gold and silver in 1792, when the first mint was established in the United States.

Congress may put a statute behind a dollar that will give it a debt-paying power but not a purchasing power. You may compel a man to take a cheap dollar for a debt, but you can not compel him to take it for his property. The statute can not carry the debt-paying power of a dollar any further than the statute itself reaches. I conclude, therefore, that money is a commodity and has a commodity value; that there is 100 cents' worth of credit in every greenback dollar, and there is about 50 cents' worth of credit in a silver dollar, and there is no credit in a gold dollar. Its commodity value and its money value are the same, and it is, therefore, the most suitable substance for a standard of value and has been so recognized by the leading civilized nations of the world.

I am for the pending measure because it proposes to do that to which the country is already committed, to keep on a parity our ten different forms of money. The Republican party is the only party in this country that has been able to maintain this parity. Their success lies in the fact that they have acted honest with their creditors. Their record is a guarantee to the business world that they will continue to pay their obligations in the best money, their creditors being the judges. Our credit to-day stands first among the civilized nations of the world, and we can no more afford to back down from our position on finances than we can afford to haul down the American flag from where the valor of our soldiers and the achievements of our Navy have planted it.

I am for this measure because it will tend to increase the volume of our currency without impairing its efficiency; it authorizes the national banks to issue currency to the face value of their bonds. This ought always to have been the law. If the Government sells these bonds at face value, it ought to allow the banks to issue currency to the amount of the face value. The shifting of the Government tax from the currency to the franchise of the banks is another wise provision, because it will encourage the banks to buy more bonds and issue more currency when the business interests of the country demand it.

The only criticism I would make on this provision is that, in my opinion, it would have been better to make the franchise tax go to the capital stock alone. The franchise tax upon the surplus and undivided profits will have the tendency to make the country banks grow weak instead of strong, because it offers an inducement to the stockholders and directors to pay out, in dividends, the earnings of the bank rather than to add to the surplus fund. This, however, was so small a matter in comparison to the great benefits that I believed would result from the passage of this bill that I felt, in caucus, entirely willing to keep my hands off the bill if my Republican colleagues would do the same.

I am for the passage of the pending measure because it authorizes the organization of national banks in the smaller towns with $25,000 capital. In my judgment, this will be a great advantage to the South and West. The towns of 2,000 inhabitants and less will organize national instead of State and private banks.

The gentlemen on the other side of the House have had much to say in the way of pleasantry, criticism, and crimination upon the Republican legislation and the Republican administration of public affairs. A few of them, however, seem to have spoken wiser than they knew.

The gentleman from Virginia said that the Republican policy of paying our obligations in gold that had been contracted to be paid in coin was our Old Testament and the pending measure was our New Testament, and charged us, therefore, with insincerity and inconsistency. If the gentleman has read either the Old or the New Testament to any purpose, he must know that the New Testament is infolded in the Old, and the Old Testament is unfolded in the New. The pending bill, in so far as it relates to the standard and parity of money, is infolded in the custom of this country, and this custom will be unfolded in the pending bill when enacted into law. We will then do according to law just what we are now doing according to custom. The gentleman's logic therefore sustains our contention.

It has been also alleged that the pending bill has been enacted in the interest of trusts. In response to that I beg to call attention to the fact that the Republican party is the only party in this country that has ever gone on record in its legislative acts in favor of regulating trusts. I regard the pending bill as being wisely and conservatively drawn, laying the foundation upon which we can construct a financial system that will enable us to maintain our standing before the civilized world in finance, as we stand in civilization.

I have been a single-standard man since 1873 and shall cast my vote for the passage of this bill, knowing full well that my action in so doing will be approved by my party and my people. And I can truthfully say, Mr. Chairman, that the Republican party is the only political organization in Kentucky that now stands for civil liberty and an honest dollar. [Applause.]

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, in the limited time allotted to me I would not, if I could, attempt to analyze the provisions of this bill, and I could not, if I would, add anything to the clear and explicit statements that have been made by the gentleman from Indiana and other members from this side. I rise, however, as a Representative of a community vitally interested in its passage, a community whose banks are among the most conservative in the country, whose business men are among the most prosperous in all the land, whose manufactures find a market all over the earth and in certain lines lead the world; of a community in which there is a large German population whose political faith has been, "There is but one political god for us, and that is the Republican party, and John Sherman is its prophet;" of a farming community also outside of the city of Cincinnati, made up of as intelligent and progressive a population as is to be found in the country; a population which has never gone astray after greenbackism, fiatism, Bryanism, Jonesism, or any other ism; and I convey to you their hearty indorsement of this measure.

Gentlemen on the Democratic side derisively ask, "Where is the

prosperity that was promised when McKinley was nominated, and when did it begin?" The student of the weather has a means of knowing its changes long before they occur. When the storm center is passing over the land, while the clouds still lower and the rain falls and the wind blows, the tiny stream of mercury in his barometer begins to climb, and he knows the storm is passing and the sunshine coming. So the business interests of the country are a great political barometer which forecasts the changes to depression or prosperity long in advance of their coming. The political barometer, which had almost sunk out of sight during the last year of Cleveland's Administration, began to rise with the nomination of McKinley, and in July and August preceding his election had almost reached its normal condition. It has continued rising ever since, and is to-day still indicating a continuance of the prosperous condition which it forecasted three years ago. If that stream of prosperity to which Harrison alluded ran bank full in 1892, it has since 1896 crossed its banks and swept over the country as with a mighty flood. Gentlemen who say they can not see evidences of this prosperity must indeed live in a God-forsaken part of the United States if they do not see it at their own homes. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

But if they do not see it there and want to see it, I invite them down to the district which I have the honor to represent. There they will see the skies darkened by day by the clouds of smoke going up from the factories and lighted by night by the fires from the furnaces and the lights from the workshops running twenty-four hours of the day with extra shifts of hands. There I will show them the streets and depots clogged with the manufactured goods which they produce on their way to and waiting for the trains, to be carried and distributed all over the earth. They will see the streets emptied of idleness and filled with the rush of business. They will see the soup houses closed and the workshops open. Let them go with me to the farmers of my county and they will find abundant crops bringing profitable prices and their farms freed from the mortgages with which they were burdened during the Democratic Administration. They would be blind indeed could they not see these evidences of an actual, existing prosperity, and what they would find in my district they would find duplicated and repeated in nearly every other Congressional district in the country. But none are so blind as those who will not see, and I fear that some of our Democratic brethren belong to that class referred to in the Scriptures who having eyes see not and having ears hear not; neither do they understand.

There are four distinct and prominent provisions in this bill.

First. The establishment of the gold standard by law;

Second. The creation of a redemption division of the Treasury Department as distinct from its fiscal division;

Third. The permission to banks to issue circulation to the full amount of their security; and

Fourth. The authority to establish banks with a capital stock of only $25,000.

The establishment of the gold standard by law is nothing more than putting into practicable operation the declaration of our platform and the uniform practice of our party in the past. Upon that issue we went before the country and were successful in the last Presidential campaign. We are but keeping our plighted faith with the American people in establishing this principle upon a foundation which can not be shaken by political changes. We are placing a barrier in the way of any future President or Secretary of the Treasury, by a mere declaration of policy, throwing the country upon a silver basis. When we enact this provision into law we give stability to our credit and confidence in the sincerity of our obligations.

The establishment of a redemption division and the requirement that our demand and other obligations payable in gold by this act shall not be withdrawn from the Treasury for the purpose of raiding its gold reserve, unless upon the presentation of gold itself for their withdrawal, will prevent a repetition of the endless chain by which unscrupulous bankers and brokers, for their personal profit and advantage, weakened the credit of the nation, cost the country millions of dollars, and created a panic.

The permission to banks to issue to the full amount of their security is but a declaration that the bonds which the bank has deposited for its circulation shall no longer be discredited by their makers; that their Government will no longer say that its promise to pay a hundred cents on the dollar of its bonded debt shall only be accepted by it as safe security for 90 cents on the dollar. Not only is it a wise provision from this standpoint, but it is expedient as a business proposition in that, in connection with the reduction of the tax upon the banks, it will encourage the issue of additional bank notes and the increase of circulation to meet the varying demands of business. At the same time it gives that elasticity of the currency which is absolutely requisite to prevent stagnation. If more money is needed, the banks can increase their circulation to the full amount of their securities. If less is needed, they can withdraw a portion of their circulation and thus, from time to time, can meet the varying demands of trade.

The establishment of banks with smaller capital will not probably in my district lead to the creation of a single additional bank. We have now perhaps as ample facilities in that line as are needed. But we recognize the fact that there is a tendency to congestion in all the large banking centers of the country and depletion of money in the remoter portions of our country. This provision will to a great extent remedy that evil, and will enable every community to secure the necessary moneys for handling and moving its crops, and at the same time increase the general circulation in the country at large.

My attention has been called by an eminent financier, who has given a great deal of attention to this subject, to a slight inaccuracy of language in sections 3 and 4 of this bill, and I wish to call attention to it now instead of waiting until to-morrow, when the bill is being considered for amendment, in order that the committee may decide whether or not it should be amended in the following manner:

Amend section 3 by inserting, after the word "exchange," on line 15, page 2, the following words: "of the notes and certificates and of the exchange;" and also amend section 4 by striking out, in line 13, page 4, the words "issued or;" and inserting, after the word "coined," the words "or notes or certificates issued."

I do not know that I can more forcibly state the reasons for the desirability of these amendments than by using the language of the gentleman to whom I have referred (Col. D. W. McClung, of Cincinnati), and which I quote, as follows:

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *December 8, 1899.*

DEAR SIR: I have read—somewhat hurriedly, it is true—both the currency bills now before Congress. They are both in the right direction and a long stride toward permanent conditions.

But in both of them I notice an objectionable use of the word "money." Such phrases as "money coined or issued by the Government" occur. Money is not issued, and notes are not coined. They ought to be distinguished by the terms used. Money and notes ought not to be used as synonymous or convertible terms. Language abhors synonyms, and correct use of language requires that words be used in their strict sense.

In the hurry of the exchange and the tumult of ordinary speech colloquialisms, slang, abbreviations, misnomers, and all other barbarities are tolerated.

But surely in the high and solemn speech of a national enactment the terms used should rise to the great argument. The statutes of the United States should be a model of precise and unmistakable expression. And there is a much stronger reason for discrimination in the matter under discussion than decorous and exact use of words. To admit that notes are money is flat greenbackery. To use words with this implication is to give countenance to the fatuous falsities that have cursed us for a generation. Every man who has been required to discuss the "money question" before an American audience intelligently has been compelled to make this distinction, argue it, illustrate it, enforce it, namely, that notes are evidence of debt and must be paid and that money is final payment and needs no redeemer. Men can not think sanely without making this distinction and following it to the end. If Congress now enacts a law giving sanction to this confusing use of terms, I expect as long as I live to have it flung in my face by those who claim that paper is money and the Government stamp is a creative power.

Furthermore, it is of the highest ethical importance that these terms, "money" and "notes," be carefully discriminated and used with all the rigor of applied science. The moral obligation to pay notes has been our sheet anchor in holding the people to sound money. You perhaps know that hundreds of times I have stood face to face with home audiences and argued this question. I know what argument tells. If we now concede that notes are money, we lose our impregnable position.

I know that lexicographers as a secondary definition make notes or any other currency to be money. This is in deference to common usage. I know, too, that another definition is "anything that is wealth or valuable property." But these concessions to common speech are not law in drawing an instrument in which the distinction is vital.

Can you not call attention to this matter in some quarter where it will be effective?

Very truly, yours,

D. W. McCLUNG.

HON. JACOB H. BROMWELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

I wish for my own information, and possibly for that of others of the House to whom the point may have suggested itself, to inquire as to what provision is contemplated for taking care of the demand and other obligations of the Government which shall be in the hands of the Treasury Department at the time this act shall go into effect. The bill provides for the transfer to the redemption division of the gold coin and bullion held against outstanding gold certificates, the amount of United States notes held against outstanding currency certificates, the amount of silver dollars held against outstanding silver certificates, the amount of silver dollars and silver bullion held against outstanding Treasury notes of the act of 1890, and of gold coin and bullion for a reserve equal to 25 per cent of the United States notes and Treasury notes under the act of 1890 outstanding.

I see by the report of the Secretary of the Treasury that on this day there are gold certificates in the Treasury to the amount of nearly $30,000,000, silver certificates in the Treasury to the amount of over six millions, currency certificates to the amount of $770,000. Are these obligations to be retained in the Treasury Department and used for its fiscal obligations and in the payment of the ordinary expenses of the Government? Are they to be destroyed and wiped out of existence, or are they to be transferred to the redemption division and there held subject to withdrawal in the

same manner as other obligations which are to be hereafter presented? I see no provision in the bill which will answer this question and would like to have an explanation from the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. KERR, if he will be kind enough to give it.

Mr. KERR. The law now provides that they are destroyed when taken into the Treasury on redemption—not only the Treasury notes when redeemed in silver, but the currency certificates when redeemed in currency and the gold certificates when redeemed in gold.

Mr. BROMWELL. The answer of the gentleman is, I assume, correct, but it may be a question as to whether some definite statement to that effect ought not to have been incorporated in the bill itself.

And now, gentlemen, as to the expediency of passing this bill at this time. Surely there never could be a more opportune moment than this for carrying out the pledges made by the Republican party and placing our financial standing upon a firm basis. With a Republican President and a sufficient Republican majority in both Houses of Congress, we can make no excuse that we are unable to legislate upon this important question.

The country will hold us responsible for the promises we have made and demand their fulfillment at our hands. The balance of trade is in our favor and will continue to be for months to come. Our revenues are ample, not only for our current expenses, including the cost of a great war, but to furnish a surplus which, up to the present time, equals for this fiscal year over $16,000,000 and will at its close, it is estimated, amount to over forty millions. Manufactures and business were never so prosperous and confidence in our financial stability never greater than at the present time. Surely no combination of fortuitous circumstances could ever be expected to occur in the future which would give us greater confidence in trying this experiment, an experiment which, like those of the exact sciences, will amount to a mathematical and scientific demonstration of our wisdom.

It has been the pleasure of some members on the Democratic side to twit Republican members upon their apparent change of views in regard to the money question and to say that we have abandoned the positions we assumed in former sessions of this body. Were this charge true, it could be completely answered by the mere statement of the fact that wise men sometimes change their minds, but fools never. If it be the boast of the Democratic party, as represented on this floor, that it learns no wisdom from experience, that it can not be convinced of the error of its ways, and that even if convinced it persists in its error, the gentlemen are welcome to that position. But, as has been well said in this debate, the Republican party is a party of progression, is ready to admit that it is not omniscient, being only human, not divine, and that if it makes mistakes it is willing candidly to acknowledge them and readily to correct them. The gentlemen have referred to the votes of this side of the House in refusing to insert the gold clause in the bonds issued in the Cleveland Administration. I was one of those in the Fifty-third Congress who refused to do so. For that vote I have neither apology nor excuse. I was then as much as now in favor of a single gold standard, but I did not propose by my vote to cast any doubt or uncertainty upon the meaning of the word coin as contained in previous obligations of the Government. I believed then, as I believe now, that the word coin meant gold and that unless all the Government obligations could be declared payable in gold at that time, it would cast doubt upon and discredit previously issued bonds.

I, too, joined in the vote in favor of an attempt to secure the coinage of silver upon the same basis as gold by international agreement. I did not believe such an agreement could be reached, but I was willing to try the experiment because I believed, and still believe, that although even with such an agreement much embarrassment would be experienced in maintaining the double standard, even with the concurrence of all other great nations, it might be possible to find a market for years to come for the silver production of the country. I see nothing inconsistent in my present position and in my former vote on these two propositions.

This bill will pass without a dissenting Republican vote, and I am glad to know that it will have support from the other side of the House. When the war of the rebellion broke out, there were many patriotic Democrats who did not hesitate to break their party affiliations, take up their guns and swords, and march with Republicans to the defense of the country's flag. There were many equally patriotic Democrats who in 1896 left their party to march again, shoulder to shoulder, with sound-money Republicans in defense of their country's financial honor, and I am glad to see that there are to-day a number of gentlemen on that side of the House, small in numbers though they be, who are willing to rise above their party and join interests with us in promoting the future stability and success of our financial standing in the eyes of our own people and in the eyes of the world. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time to my colleague from Texas, Mr. BALL, as he may desire.

Mr. BALL. Mr. Chairman, having had the privilege on yesterday of discussing this bill, my purpose now is simply to give notice that before the vote is taken I desire to offer an amendment to strike out the enacting clause of this indefensible measure. It is so objectionable in its every provision that no antidotes in the shape of amendments could perfect the bill or extract its poison. Without trespassing further upon the time of the House now, I desire to place in the RECORD some specific objections to the bill, that they may be considered in connection with my remarks on yesterday.

First. This bill is intended to and does completely demonetize silver, destroys in effect the legal-tender function of silver, abandons the use of nearly one-half our redemption money as such, and permanently commits this country to the single gold standard.

Second. It is a complete sell-out of our Government and people to the bondholders, national banks, and creditor classes, in that it makes all debts, public and private, heretofore and hereafter contracted, which are now payable in coin or lawful money of the United States, payable in gold. As the bankers offered to take the sixty-two and one-half millions of coin bonds issued by Mr. Cleveland, if made payable in gold, at an interest rate which would have saved $16,000,000—a proposition against which nearly every prominent Republican then voted—some idea can thus be formed of the enormous bonus to be reaped by the holders of United States bonds by this provision. Certainly it will amount to nearly $200,000,000. This sum is but a bagatelle compared to the harvest provided for the holders of other debts, of which there is accounted for in this country, in round numbers, $20,000,000,000. Private debts not estimated therein will certainly double that amount.

Third. The three hundred and forty-six millions of greenbacks, now at par for having, so many years served us, are to be impounded in the Treasury when received and only paid out for gold, not reissued as by law now required.

Fourth. The division of redemption provided for will retire from circulation a large percentage of the money now available for business.

Fifth. The silver dollars and silver certificates as well as the coin certificates now outstanding, representing more than half our circulation, become simply a demand gold debt due by the Government, as they are made redeemable in gold by this bill.

Sixth. The privileges of the national banks are inexcusably and conscienceless extended. They are permitted to organize small banks in small towns, while the larger banks are relieved by its provision from competition in the cities, small banks being prohibited. By reducing the tax now levied the national banks now organized are given $1,000,000 per annum of taxes heretofore paid by them.

Seventh. The bill abandons the right to issue paper money by the Government, and surrenders to the banks that power. As the coinage of silver, except for change, has been already stopped, the power to contract or expand the circulation is thus vested in the money-lending class as their interests suggest, regardless of the rights or necessities of their debtors.

Eighth. The power to issue gold bonds in war or peace is vested in the Secretary of the Treasury, and the discretion of that bankers' agent is the only limitation upon the amount to be issued.

Had such a measure been admittedly the policy of the Republicans in 1896, Mr. McKinley would not now be President.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this bill and the reasons which have been offered in support of it exemplify the readiness of our Republican friends to abandon their own positions and to adopt the argument of their opponents. I remember that three years ago, when one of the most talented men that ever occupied a seat in this Hall, toward the conclusion of one of the most splendid speeches ever delivered on this floor, exclaimed that "the Republican party has not yet declared in favor of a single gold standard," he was interrupted by many voices on that side declaring, "And it never will." The RECORD shows that "Mr. Hardy and others" responded to Mr. Towne's declaration that "the Republican party had not yet declared in favor of a gold standard" with the confident exclamation, "And it never will." If it had been Mr. Hardy alone, I would not attempt to hold the Republican party responsible for his utterance. But it was more than Mr. Hardy, and it was more than any one or two men. If it had been only one other, the reporters of the House would have said "Mr. Hardy and Mr. ——." Had there been two or three, they might have recorded the names of all of the interrupters; but with a fidelity to the truth which does honor to the gentlemen who serve us in the capacity of reporters they recorded the interruption as by "Mr. Hardy and others," because those speaking were so numerous they could not enumerate them all.

I am aware that it does not embarrass my friends across the aisle to be reminded of these things. I have witnessed the absolute indifference with which they hear our accusations of inconsistency. They declare that they are ready to change their position whenever they change their minds, and that declaration

does credit to their moral and political courage; but it is not creditable to their wisdom that they so frequently take a position one year which they are compelled to abandon the next year. I honor them for being ready to change whenever they are convinced that they are wrong, but I am not willing to trust them in face of the fact that they find it necessary so often to repudiate their most solemn declarations. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The fact of it is, Mr. Chairman, that our Republican friends have always been so busy studying the trend of events that they have never found time to study the money question as a science. They know just as much about it—and they know no more—to-day than they knew four years ago, which was, and is nothing at all. They study events; they do not study principles. They have long since accepted the shallow drivel, which some men miscall a maxim, that statesmanship is the science of circumstances, and circumstances can not change more rapidly than they can. But, after conceding them all of the credit which they deserve for their eagerness to keep pace with the progress of public sentiment, I shall demonstrate, before I conclude what I desire to say, that they have taken advantage of what they conceive to be a change in public sentiment upon the coinage question to incorporate in this bill a totally different and indefensible proposition. Even if its coinage provisions are correct, it does not follow that its banking provisions are sound.

If I can have the attention of the House, I shall divide this bill into two parts and discuss each as a separate measure. It is intended by the first section of it to establish the gold standard. But, gentlemen of the majority, do you not know that the gold standard has long been established by the law of this country? Have you forgotten, or do you imagine that you deceive the people with your phraseology, that the coinage act of 1873, which, it is fair to assume, every member of Congress has read and re-read, solemnly declares that the gold dollar consisting of 25.8 grains of standard gold is our "unit of value?" That is the law to-day. Why, then, is it necessary to enact it a second time? You were so anxious to make the people imagine that you were proposing something new that you have absolutely committed the absurdity of describing the unit of value as a part of something else. Your bill declares "that the standard unit of value shall, as now, be the dollar, and shall consist of 25.8 grains of gold, nine-tenths fine, or 23.22 grains of pure gold, being the one-tenth part of the eagle." It is a new form of expression to describe a standard as a fraction of something else when the correct way to express it would be to describe something else as a dividend or a multiple of your standard. But you are so eager to make the people believe that you were doing something new and wise that you would write an absurdity like that upon the statute books of your country.

Gentlemen, if you know that the gold standard is at present established by law, for what purpose did you seek to establish it again? I have read of making "assurance double sure," but I thought that was merely the poet's license of expression; and I never supposed that sensible men commissioned to represent a great and free people in the House of Representatives would attempt to reduce the poet's license of expression to a legislative practice. Do you fear the present law is not strong enough, and will you make it stronger? It is not that; but it is because you are seeking to embarrass many members of this House by compelling them to vote against what they conceive to be the instructions of their people or else help you to establish your banking system. I shall attempt to prove that even a Gold-standard Democrat can not justify himself in voting for this bill, for whatever may be his judgment upon the question of a standard he violates every principle and tradition of our party when he votes in favor of a bill under which the Government establishes a standard and turns the absolute control of our circulation over to the national banks. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Our friends on the other side seem to think that they have completely answered our objections to the gold standard when they point to the existing good times, and the burden of every speech on that side has been that the prosperity of to-day refutes the arguments which we made in 1896. Let us examine that question for a moment and see how much weight that method of argumentation ought to possess with intelligent people. Let us recall what the issue and the arguments were then and compare them with the conditions which exist to-day. In 1896 the Democratic party affirmed that the annual increase in the production of gold was not sufficient to meet the increasing demands for gold, and that therefore the value of it was constantly enhancing. We contended, further, that as the value of gold enhanced the price of all commodities measured in gold necessarily decreased, and affirmed that this was an injury to the country. Our friends on the other side declared first that the low prices which then prevailed bore no relation to the supply of money, and then affirmed that an elevation of prices produced by an increase in the volume of money would seriously injure the country. Three years have elapsed since then, and, while they have materially changed conditions, they have not affected the validity of our argument or yours. Indeed, these three years have afforded the people an opportunity to judge between your wisdom and ours.

In 1895, the year before we made the arguments which you are now assailing with such vehemence and such a show of confidence, the world produced in gold and silver $307,000,000, and we declared that the whole amount was needed to meet the world's increasing need for money and to satisfy the industrial demands against those two metals. You said that was not true and contended that the supply of gold alone was ample. But throughout this debate, and without an exception on that side, we find you now rejoicing in the enormously increased production of gold. Answer me upon your candor, gentlemen of the Republican party, if the one hundred and seventy million dollars' worth of gold which the world was producing in 1895 was sufficient to meet the world's increased demands for gold, why it is that you are rejoicing now because the production of gold has almost doubled? Do not these good times, which you ascribe in large part to the enormously increased production of gold, instead of refuting our argument confirm it? [Applause on the Democratic side.] We demanded that the mints of our country should be opened to the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver, to absorb, if necessary, the world's entire annual supply of $307,000,000. To-day the accidents of mining have produced almost as much gold as the world was then producing of both gold and silver; and yet, not one of you will dare to tell the people of this country that the three hundred millions of gold which the world produces is more than the world requires. If over three hundred millions of gold is not more than the world needs now, how will you answer our argument made in 1896, that the $307,000,000 of gold and silver combined was not more than the world required? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Gentlemen on the other side have spoken as if our position requires us to deny the effect of the great and sudden increase in the production of gold; but nothing could be further from the truth. Indeed, the reverse of this is true. We do not deny that the increased production of gold has mitigated the distressing tendency toward falling prices; we go further even than that, and we assert that it has resulted in a slight elevation of prices. This does not conflict with anything that we have ever said; but, on the contrary, it establishes our contention both as to the cause of falling prices and as to the effect of rising prices. If attributed to the discovery of gold, the present rise of prices proves that we were right in connecting the low price of commodities with the insufficient supply of money; and the prosperity which has followed this advance in prices proves that we were also right when we declared that low prices make hard times and that good prices would make good times. What we said would happen if our mints were opened to the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver, you say has happened under the free and unlimited coinage of gold alone; but you can not conceal the important fact that the production of gold alone is now as great as the production of both gold and silver then. It seems to me that the very results which you so exultingly ascribe to the discovery of these new and richer mines proves conclusively that we were right in 1896 when we asserted that the world needed more basic money. But even if we were mistaken in that, and whether the increase of prices has come through the increased production of gold or through some other cause, are you not ready to admit that we were right when we declared that an increase in the price of all commodities would be a blessing to the people of this land and that you were wrong when you denied it?

Mr. DALZELL. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. DALZELL. Does the gentleman hold that the increase in the production of gold of which he speaks has dispensed with the necessity for the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I do not.

Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman still thinks that silver ought to be coined at the mints at the ratio of 16 to 1?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I do. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] I will say this to the gentleman from Pennsylvania: If the world could not only continue but could increase the production of gold until it was equal to the sum of $400,000,000 or $500,000,000 a year, then you would dispose of our demand for the free coinage of silver by supplying sufficient gold for basic money. Our position on this question has been not the result of any prejudice against gold or any preference for silver. We do not love silver because it is white nor do we hate gold because it is yellow. We desire to use both, because we believe that both are necessary to constitute a sufficient supply of real money. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] Give us that supply of gold and you dispense with the necessity for the free coinage of silver; but that simply fulfills our arguments and it does not refute them.

I warn the gentleman from Pennsylvania, however, that he is about to incorporate in the records of this House the same false phrophecies that were made in the years which have passed and gone. When gold was discovered in Australia and California the

world was advised that only one of the precious metals ought to be used for money; and, true to their instincts in favor of scarce money, and therefore what President McKinley has called "high money," they sought to demonetize the more plentiful and therefore the cheaper metal. When the commissioner of the United States to the Paris conference, Mr. Ruggles, urged the demonetization of silver, he predicted that the United States alone, before the close of this century, would be producing $500,000,000 of gold and silver. It has so happened in the history of the world that every time some new and rich gold or silver field has been discovered straightway the advocates of scarce and high money rise up to prophesy that the production will go on forever. When I heard the distinguished gentleman from Ohio read from the great French economist, Chevalier, I was tempted to ask him if that author did not predict, following the discovery of gold in California and Australia, that those mines would produce so abundantly and continue so long that they would deluge the world with cheap money. He was not alone in that prediction. All the men who belong to his school of thought expressed the same opinion.

My immediate concern, however, is not with prophecy, but is with the question of cause and effect. If it shall transpire that the world continues enormously to increase its production of gold, then it will happen that the gold mines will provide a sufficient supply to meet the world's increasing needs for gold, and will thus reverse the disastrous tendency to falling prices. It could not be, however, that the increase in the production of gold during the past three years could of itself and alone have produced the elevation of prices and the stimulation of business which we witness in this country to-day. That it has exerted an appreciable influence in both directions is unquestionably true; and that if it can be continued through a series of years it will exert a still greater and more beneficial influence is equally true, unless the demands for gold shall increase at a corresponding rate. But, gentlemen, if when the world is given an experience of rising prices coming from a more abundant supply of money for the next few years and then if in the providence of God these mines should be exhausted, or if by the industries of men the demand should be multiplied until the increased supply is more than absorbed by new demands, you will have found arguments in this experience beyond the power of your most skilled logicians to refute. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Let the world understand how much better the times are under rising prices than under falling prices, and all the sophistries you can invent will not save you from the enlightened judgment of the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But, Mr. Chairman, these gentlemen are altogether mistaken in asserting that the present rise in prices is due mainly to the increase in the production of gold. The increase in the price of wheat, which began in the fall of 1896 and has continued in a greater or less degree ever since, was largely due, as every intelligent man knows, to crop failures in the other wheat-producing countries of the world; the war with Spain added largely to the demand, and therefore to the price, of many articles; and the trusts, protected by a high tariff from foreign competition, have arbitrarily put up the price of their goods. We have also heard much about the increase in the price of cattle; but when our Republican friends claim credit for that they forget that the statistics show that in 1897 the people of the United States found themselves with ten million less cattle than they had in 1893. Not only so, but Australia had suffered the most prolonged and the severest drought that has visited any region in fifty years. It swept that great country bare of vegetation and withdrew it from competition with us in the meat markets of the world. With the shortage in our own country of more than ten million cattle, together with the shortage in Australia, is it surprising that the price of cattle should have risen during the past three years.

The question of price is a complex one. There are many factors, or rather, to be accurate, I should say there are two factors, entering into it; but each of these factors is subject to many influences. These factors are, first, the commodity whose price we seek to express; second, the money in which we must express the price of all commodities; and both factors are absolutely controlled by the great law of supply and demand. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY], when embarrassed a day or two ago by some question as to the present rise in the price of cotton, replied to one of our friends on this side by saying that only a few years ago we denied that the law of supply and demand regulated the price of cotton and other commodities. The gentleman wholly misunderstood our argument. He has never done us the honor to read our speeches. The least intelligent Democrat in this country has never denied the operation of the law of supply and demand. On the contrary, sir, we are the only men who have maintained steadily and at all times the universal application of that law. The difference between us and the gentlemen on the other side is simply this: They apply the law of supply and demand to commodities and there they stop, while we apply it to commodities and money. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We say that it is as true of money as it is of cotton; that the more of it there is the less it is worth, and the less of it there is the more it is worth. When we seek to explain a change in price we look first to the commodity itself, and if we find that there has been no great change in the relations of its supply and demand, we then turn to the money for an explanation.

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I will.

Mr. LACEY. I only ask the question to understand your position. Heretofore I understood that the claim was made that the supply of basic money, not money generally, will influence prices.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. There is no money but basic money. Everything else is simply a promise to pay money or a token. Of course, you must assume that when men undertake to discuss the money question they are not discussing the question of credit. I do not complain, as some of our friends do, about your obvious purpose to eventually withdraw the silver dollars from circulation. If the principle of this bill is correct, then the silver dollars ought to be retired; but that ought to be done by selling them as bullion in the open markets and not by locking them up as idle capital in the Treasury vaults. If you believe in your gold-standard doctrine, you ought to do with our silver, except the subsidiary coins, just as Germany did with her silver when she established her financial system on a gold basis. You ought to sell it for what it will bring in the open market, and you will do so just as soon as you think the people will permit you. The limited coinage of silver under a gold standard is not a question of money at all; it is simply a question of credit, and it can not possibly affect the prices of commodities any more than the issuance of so much paper. The advantage of paper over both gold and silver in point of convenience is universally recognized, and everyone knows how much cheaper it will be for us to print paper than it is to coin silver. Why, then, should we be required to use the less convenient and more costly silver, rather than the more convenient and less costly paper, when both are mere promises to pay gold.

I do not mean to say that this Government can make as good *money* out of paper as it can out of silver. I have not said that, and I do not believe it. I do not belong to that school which teaches that the law can create something out of nothing, and I have no sympathy with fiatism. But I do say and I do believe that this Government can make just as good a *promise-to-pay* money out of paper as it can out of silver, and can make it a great deal cheaper and more convenient for use. Unless silver can be coined on equal terms with gold and, like gold, left to stand upon its own value, there ought never to be another silver dollar coined in the history of this Republic, for it is a waste of the resources of the land to send men into the bowels of the earth to dig out its precious metals to be coined into promises to pay, when a substance equally as good for such a purpose can be obtained by the expenditure of infinitely less time and labor. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And if you had the courage of your convictions—that is, if you have any convictions on this question [laughter]—you would take these silver dollars and sell them in the open markets of the world for whatever they would bring. To this you will come, unless—and I see my distinguished friend from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], who has as much wisdom and more courage than his Republican associates, nods his head in assent. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. LACEY. If this bill passes, then, striking down silver as basic money, prices ought to be reduced one-half, ought they not?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Silver is not basic money now. The gentleman understands that, does he not? If he does not understand it, his lack of knowledge is a good excuse for supporting this bill. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Let me say to the gentleman from Iowa that I am an old-fashioned Democrat; and I do not believe that anything which is a promise to pay, or which must be kept at a parity with the standard coin by limiting its amount and making it receivable in dues to the Government, is money at all. It is a mere substitute for money. The existence of it, however, is an admission before the world that there is not enough of basic money and therefore we must use a substitute. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Silver will be retired, and you will thus contract the currency—mark the distinction when I say you will thus contract the currency—unless you authorize your favored national banks to make up the difference with their notes. I am tempted in this connection to discuss the effect of currency on prices, a question which I think is widely misunderstood; but as that more properly falls within the banking features of this bill, I will reserve it until I reach them, while I now return to a consideration of the law of supply and demand which I was about to discuss when interrupted by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY].

It is true that many prices are higher now than they were three

years ago, but that does not go back far enough. You must explain to me why it is, if we have gold enough in this country now, that the prices of all commodities are to-day less than half as much as they were when this advance in the value of gold first began in 1873. Some of our friends occasionally make the mistake of asserting that we begin this comparison at 1873 because that was the year in which you passed the law establishing the gold standard; but that is not the reason. We begin with 1873 because that is the year when the separation between gold and commodities began, and marks, according to our theory, the beginning of the rise in the value of gold or, according to your theory, the beginning of the overproduction of commodities. Whether you are right or we are right upon that question, it still must be correct to begin with 1873 to trace whatever causes have operated to produce the change in prices. Beginning with the year of 1873, let us take those great commodities whose prices can not be influenced by the formation or control of trusts, such as cotton and wheat. They are higher now than they were two years ago, and yet they are not as high as they were the day that William McKinley was elected President of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

What will explain the present difference in the prices of cotton and wheat as compared with their prices in 1873? You say that cotton is worth less than 8 cents in gold to-day as against 16 cents in gold in 1873, because the world has enormously increased its production of cotton. That the production of cotton has been greatly increased I grant you, but my admission calls for one upon your part. You must admit, if you are candid and well informed, that while the world has greatly increased its production of cotton, it has also greatly increased its consumption of it, until the consumption of cotton to-day as compared with the production of it is as great or greater than it was in 1873; and therefore whatever alteration in the price of it may have taken place could not be due to the law of supply and demand as it has operated upon cotton itself. There has been practically no change in the relation of its supply and demand, and consequently there could have been no change of price on that account. Where, then, will you look for an explanation of the fall in its price? You can not look to the cotton itself, and you must look——

Mr. FOWLER. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. FOWLER. Will you explain to this House how it was that in the five years from 1842 to 1847 the price was lower than it was in the five years from 1893 to 1898?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. It was, as Professor Jevons, an accomplished and ardent gold-standard advocate, has explained, because, owing to an insufficient supply of the precious metals, the value of money increased 145 per cent from 1809 to 1849 [great applause on the Democratic side], and all commodities fell in the same proportion. Then came the great gold discoveries in Australia and California, followed immediately by a rise in the price of cotton and all other commodities. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Cotton is the best of all articles for my present purpose of comparison, as it is the one article that can be traced from its production to consumption better than all others, because every pound of it that affects the price of it goes into the markets of the world, and a record of it is kept. Now, I challenge you to tell me why it is, if the relations between the supply and demand of and for cotton to-day as compared with 1873 are practically unchanged, that the price of it to-day is less than 8 cents in gold as compared with a price of 16 cents in gold in 1873. Gentlemen, do you know that the surplus cotton in the markets of the world at the close of this cotton year will not only be a smaller per cent of the total crop, but that it will be a smaller number of bales than the surplus that remained on the markets at the close of the cotton year of 1872-73? This conclusively demonstrates that the consumption of cotton has increased more rapidly than the production because it shows that the entire production has been consumed and the accumulated surplus has been trenched upon. How, then, can you explain the enormous fall in its price? There is but one explanation, and that is that the gold in which you measure the price has become twice as valuable to-day as it was in 1873. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why? Simply and only because the demand for gold has been increasing for twenty-five years more rapidly than the supply of it, and consequently the value of it has been rising.

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him one more question?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. LACEY. How much basic money had we in 1873?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. The gentleman from Iowa must know that the value of gold and silver is determined by the supply of them throughout the world as compared with the demand for them throughout the world; and while we had practically no gold and silver in 1873, as specie payments had not been resumed, still the price of cotton, as I have given it, was the gold price.

I am now going to give the gentlemen from the West, who are doubtless more familiar with wheat than they are with cotton, an example to solve. The average price of wheat at the farms of the United States for the year ending at 1873 was $1.24 a bushel. The price of wheat last year on the farms of the United States averaged less than 81 cents a bushel. How will you explain this? Some gentlemen with more readiness than wisdom will doubtless say it is because we only produced 230,000,000 bushels of wheat in 1872 as against 530,000,000 bushels in 1898. That is only half the truth, for while it is true that our production of wheat had a little more than doubled, it is also true that we had doubled our population to consume wheat. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Therefore, there could have been no change in the supply and demand for wheat to explain this enormous fall of over 35 per cent in the price. Instead of the change of price being explained, as some men attempt, by referring to the foreign demand, that aggravates the burden of your explanation; for while the increase in the domestic demand for wheat has kept pace with the increase in the supply of it, the foreign demand for it has more than doubled. The wheat exported to satisfy the foreign demand in 1872 was less than 17 per cent of the crop, while in 1898 we exported over 40 per cent of the crop. Thus driven from your home market into foreign lands, for an explanation you are confronted there with a condition which calls for increase rather than a fall in the price. Then, gentlemen, with a domestic demand as compared with the present supply as great as it was in 1872 and with the foreign demand as compared with the supply more than twice as great as it was in 1872, tell me why it is that the price of wheat is less by 35 per cent. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The law of supply and demand, as it operated on wheat, called for an increase in price, but instead of an increased price meeting an increased demand we actually find a fall in price of over 35 per cent. Where will you seek an explanation? There is but one, and that is that the law of supply and demand as it operated upon the value of the gold in which you express the price of wheat has enormously enhanced in value.

A friend who sits near me informs me that my time will soon expire. I had intended——

Mr. SOUTHARD. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I will.

Mr. SOUTHARD. I understand that taking the price of wheat each day for thirty years, between 1860 and 1890, the average price by decades shows that there was a difference of a very few cents during those years. It strikes me that that would be a very much fairer way to compare the matter.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Well, in the first place, I very emphatically deny the accuracy of that statement, because not in the last fifteen years has the price of wheat averaged within 30 cents of the price of 1872.

Mr. SOUTHARD. If I recollect correctly, the editor of a paper published in Dubuque, Iowa, has published a statement giving the figures——

Mr. HILL. I have the statement here. Wheat in 1882 was $1.10.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I think I could better employ my time, but I will hear the gentleman's statement.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman from Texas has stated that wheat was not so high in twenty years as it was in 1873. I have the record that in 1873 it was a dollar and in 1883 it was $1.10.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. That is a mistake. In 1873 it was $1.24 at the farms in the United States; and your 1881 price was the Chicago price. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL. That is a statement easy to make; but my price is the price in Dubuque, Iowa.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. That is worse still! The Dubuque price would be the Chicago price minus the freight to Chicago if they produced more than the local demand called for, and plus the freight if they produced less. No fair conclusion could be formed by considering the price in a purely local market.

Mr. HILL. If the gentleman will pardon me.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I can not yield for further statement. This is very interesting, Mr. Chairman; and if they will agree to let me conclude my argument, I will stand here until midnight and answer such questions as that. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

A circumstance which has contributed most largely to the business activity of the last three years, and which has been entirely overlooked by gentlemen on the other side, is the fact that many purchases which under ordinary circumstances would have been made in 1893, 1894, 1895, and 1896 have been made in 1897, 1898, and 1899. This has happened in this way: The low price of farm products in 1893, 1894, and 1895 rendered our farmers unable to provide for anything except the most urgent necessities, and every article which possibly could be dispensed with was left in the manufacturer's warehouse or upon the merchant's shelf. For the lack of patronage the merchant could not patronize the manufacturer, and an almost unprecedented stagnation of business

ensued. With the better prices which prevailed in 1897, 1898, and 1899 all this was changed, and the farmers not only found themselves able to provide for their current necessities and comforts, but they also found themselves able to make purchases and improvements which had been needed for years, but which had been postponed for the lack of means. When the exchanges which, under normal conditions, would have covered six years were crowded into the last three years, the necessary result was a greatly increased activity in all lines. Particular illustrations of this phenomena are within my personal knowledge, as they are within the knowledge of every gentleman on this floor. I have in my mind now an extensive cattle owner who determined in 1893 to subdivide his large pasture and supply each of the subdivisions with wells and windmills. He did not attempt, however, to execute his purpose under the low price of cattle which then prevailed, but immediately after the advance he made the improvements which he desired to make and which under normal conditions he would have made in 1893.

It is, Mr. Chairman, almost impossible to overestimate the extent to which cases like this have contributed to the revival of business for which the Republican party now so loudly claims the credit; and if Republican leaders were wise enought to look beyond the present, they would understand that with the return of low prices the old condition of stagnation will renew itself. Perhaps the men who now control the destiny of the Republican party are foolish enough to suppose that prices will not fall, and I sincerely hope that they will not; but much as I hope they will not I know they will, and I know too that when they do fall there will come an ebb in this tide of prosperity. That may happen next year in time to exert a decisive influence upon the Presidential election, or it may not happen so soon. It will happen, however, whenever the wheat and cotton crops of the world are normal both in this and in other countries. Notwithstanding the fact that the wheat crop of the world has been short for three years, and the surplus has almost been exhausted, still, sir, if the crop of next year should be above an average throughout the world the price of wheat will fall again to 50 cents at the farms of the United States; and whenever the cotton crop of the United States shall exceed 12,000,000 bales, with an average crop in the other cotton-growing countries, the Southern planter will be compelled again to accept 5 cents a pound for his cotton.

Whenever the purchasing power of the wheat growers in the West, and of the cotton planters in the South, is measured by 50-cent wheat and 5-cent cotton, then, sir, you will witness a misery which will again extend from our agricultural sections to the industrial centers of this land. The farmers constitute nearly one-half of those who must buy and consume manufactured goods, and whenever their purchases diminish the effect is immediately felt in every manufacturing and commercial establishment within the Union. Under the operation of a new and infamous system it may happen that the trusts will be able to maintain their prices; but if that shall be true, the one certain result will be to injure everybody except those who control the trusts, and the chief sufferers, next to the farmers, will be the laborers who work in the factories. It must never be forgotten by any man who seeks to comprehend this question that the income of every man limits his purchasing power, and he is a valuable customer or otherwise, according as his income is large or small. When wheat is worth 80 cents a bushel and cotton is worth 8 cents a pound the farmers in the West and South are liberal patrons of the manufacturers in the North and East. But when the prices of wheat and cotton shrink the people who produce them must correspondingly curtail their purchases, and thus while the farmers miss the comforts of a better income, the manufacturer suffers a serious loss of custom.

If manufacturers, by combinations among themselves, can keep up the prices of their commodities, it must of necessity ensue that the farmer will buy less in value in consequence of his diminished income, and he must also buy still less in quantity in consequence of the higher prices which he must pay for the trust-made articles. If this be true, and it does not seem to me that any rational man can doubt it, then upon the very face of it any man can discern the mischief which it brings at last to the men who labor in these great industrial enterprises. If the factories sell less goods, then fewer goods must be produced and fewer men are needed to produce them; and the sum of it all must be that thousands of industrious men will be denied employment. The wage-earner will become an idle citizen, and thus in his turn add to those who want but can not buy.

Gentlemen, we do not envy you the prosperity which the people now enjoy, and we fervently pray that it will continue with them through all the years to come. The Democratic party does not live upon the misfortunes of our country, nor does it die when plenty is scattered over a smiling land. We rejoice to see its crops abundant, though we grieve to see our own abundant crops coincident with crop failures and famine in other regions of the earth. And yet we are selfish enough to thank God, if He must scourge any of His children and bless others, that the blessings have come to us while the scourges have fallen upon our brothers in other quarters of the globe. While we grieve with the teeming millions that starve and die in India and in Russia, we would not deny to the American farmers the benefit of the increased price of wheat that came to him in consequence of the misfortune of an alien and inferior people. Nor do we complain that accidental discoveries have almost doubled the production of gold. If a remorseless and unrelenting Republican majority will not relieve the people by opening our mints to the free coinage of both gold and silver, we rejoice that human greed has found new mines to provide a more abundant gold supply. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If you imagine that this season of prosperity, which is due to causes wholly apart from politics, will destroy the Democratic party, you deceive yourselves. It has outlived panics under its own administration. It has outlived prosperous eras when its enemies administered the Government. It has outlived the rage and fury of a civil war. It has passed through the cruel days of reconstruction, and it will survive the taunts and jeers with which you now assail it. I am still a young man; yet I have seen it solemnly proposed to disband the Democratic party. In 1872 the Democrats of my native State, as loyal and as devoted as ever cherished the immortal principles of Thomas Jefferson, had reached the point where they were ready to despair and yield, and a convention was called in Mississippi to consider the advisability of disorganizing the Democratic party. But even in that trying hour there was a small though devoted band, in whose hearts the divine fire of the old Democracy was still burning, to protest with a tongue of flame and a voice of prophecy against the abandonment of our time-honored and undying organization. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Their wisdom prevailed. That convention adjourned, and instead of sending abroad the gospel of despair they sent a message of hope and courage that still animates the splendid men of that great Commonwealth. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, as a Democrat I favor the single gold standard and shall vote for this bill [applause on the Republican side], because if enacted into law it will fortify by statute the gold standard under which we are now living. There are features in the bill which I do not approve. It treats of too many subjects. I should like to see eliminated the provisions for retiring the greenback and Treasury notes and reissuing greenbacks only in exchange for gold, and for coining silver bullion to take the place of the Treasury notes that are canceled. These provisions are of far-reaching effect and will stir up the feelings of many of our well-meaning people in the West and South, who consider the greenbacks of a sacred order and the national banks a menace to the country's welfare. More deliberate action before so complete a revolution in our system is effected would tend to conciliation of all—a wise and desirable object in all forms of government, especially this of ours.

But the bill is a move in the right direction. The solution of the currency question overshadows all other questions in the eyes of the people. Facts and conditions should be accepted as they are found. Theories are meet food for debating societies. As our country is great, so is our responsibility great to sustain and build up the national credit. We are living under the gold standard to-day. The country is enjoying great and enviable prosperity. Business is booming, labor is employed, capital is active. These conditions should be assured to us so far as human foresight makes their assurance possible. The little cloud upon the horizon still threatening us and breeding distrust of the permanence of our prosperity is fear lest the unwritten law which our Secretaries of the Treasury of both political faiths have heretofore obeyed in meeting the obligations of the country in gold may, some day, at some unexpected hour, be violated.

The country demands that what is done now by a custom henceforth shall be done by mandate of law; that the haphazard basis under which we live, menacing alike the credit of the United States and the individual, shall be exchanged for a settled and definite policy, capable of modifications to meet new conditions when those conditions arise, but then only by the deliberate action of the Congress of the United States, and not at the will of a single Secretary of the Treasury. Confidence is an element of far greater importance in fixing and upholding prices than the amount of money in circulation. National not less than individual prosperity is dependent upon confidence, which in turn produces stability. A stable measure of value alone can produce stability. Be it ever so improbable, the threatened possibility of the debasement of the existing standard of value checks enterprise and locks up capital. Remove all doubt, restore confidence, and capital will find employment; employment will earn good wages, which mean prosperity for the people.

Gold is the only standard of value among the enlightened commercial nations. The only basis of equality upon which gold and silver can be concurrently coined into money is the basis of the

commercial value of the metal contained in the respective coins. The proposition that there can be but one standard seems to me self-evident. To-day silver is a commodity of fluctuating value, governed by the laws of supply and demand. A ratio can not be found between silver and gold which will remain constant. Under the double standard change in the ratio of value between the two metals gives two measures of value.

When the coinage laws of the country permit the free coinage of both metals with full legal-tender qualities at a ratio of value which substantially does not conform to their respective intrinsic values, both kinds of coin can not be kept in circulation at the same time. Debts will be paid in the less valuable, and the more valuable will be withdrawn from circulation or sent out of the country to markets where its full value can be obtained. History demonstrates the truth of this assertion; there is nothing new in it. Gold is the standard of value, the least liable to fluctuation, and therefore it is the best standard. The power does not lie in the Government to fix the price of a commodity through legislative enactment. Value is, and must ever be, intrinsic.

Work produces prosperity; confident capital gives work; stability of the currency creates confidence. A discredited currency is alike disastrous to the nation as a whole and to the individual citizen, restricts commercial enterprise, and limits the power to earn, therefore the thrift and industry of the people. In the gold standard lies the future prosperity and success of our beloved country. This is my rooted belief. I would not be representing the public opinion of my constituents if I took any other stand.

Yet it is hard to be at variance with many of one's party associates, and I appreciate and am deeply grateful to those whose views differ with mine for the generous treatment which has been extended to such of us on this side of the House sharing opinions on the currency question similar to those I have expressed. We will rejoice indeed when this currency question is settled right, in law, for good and for all, and is eliminated from the field of politics. [Applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I did not expect to take any part in this debate until within the last five minutes, but when I heard my friend from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], in his despairing tones, admit among the secrets of the Democratic party that it had been gravely considered whether under present conditions that great party had not better disband and go out of the calamity business, I thought it my duty to offer my condolence to the gentlemen on the other side of the House and at the same time to express my feeble wish that the Democratic party would not go out of business.

It is necessary to have an opposition party in this country, and nothing pleases this side of the House better than the present organized Democratic minority on the other side. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

I have listened somewhat to this debate, Mr. Chairman, and I have noticed the change of tone on the other side of the House. Three years ago, with the gloom that surrounded this country and every phase of industry, we were told morning, noon, and night, with a vehemence worthy of a better cause, that nothing would ever take this country out of the slough of despond except the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1; and it would seem almost as though the gentlemen on the other side were growing wiser from experience, because we have hardly seen a man who had the courage to come out now in this debate and avow himself vigorously a disciple of the 16 to 1 idea.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] says that the first section of this bill has been the law since 1873, and that the framers of the bill must have overlooked that fact, that this was the law. Why, we on this side of the House have known it for the past twenty-six years that gold was the standard of value in the United States, and it was only because some of you gentlemen on that side did not understand it that we proposed to put it into this bill and enact it into law, that the standard of value as now should be the gold dollar throughout the United States. But that is only a sort of a preamble to the bill.

There were other questions about which there were more serious difficulties. We held that coin, nominated in the bonds after the gold standard was fixed, was an agreement by which the United States pledged itself in every bond to pay according to the gold standard and that these obligations must be paid in gold dollars. It is true now and then a man arose and denied this proposition. It is true that the Democratic party were united against it.

It is true that in 1895, when the Treasury was bankrupt, when the gold had been driven out of the country because the balance due Europe was against this country from year to year and gold was being exported, when the Government was in distress, when your last Secretary of the Treasury was driven almost to despair and desperation, with only $40,000,000 in the gold reserve, some shrewd bankers from New York drove a hard bargain with the Government of the United States and demanded $16,000,000 more for $62,000,000 worth of bonds payable in coin than they demanded for the bonds payable in gold. They came to us with that proposition.

They said, "If you will give us gold bonds we will give $16,000,000 more for them than we will for the coin bonds you have been issuing." I was in the House; I felt it my duty then to vote to put the word "gold" in the bond and save the people of this country from paying that $16,000,000. [Applause on the Republican side.] I have never had occasion to apologize for it since, and I certainly do not do so now.

I can not at this moment remember the exact figures, but the market price of coin bonds on the very day this contract was made with the Secretary was very nearly, if not quite, the price this syndicate proposed to pay for bonds payable in gold. Notwithstanding this stab at the credit of the country, these thrifty gentlemen within sixty days had an opportunity to sell these bonds at a profit, which, with the interest thereon, will, by the time they become due, in 1925, approximate the sixteen millions we tried to save the Government.

But we propose by this bill to make it no longer doubtful to any citizen of the United States or to any man anywhere that the bonds and obligations of the Government are to be paid in the gold dollar of the United States.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. PAYNE. I will yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Did not the gentleman from New York, on the 25th day of August, 1893, declare here that there was not enough gold in the world, and that we should have silver also as the standard of value?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not know the day or date, but I remember once that I gave my views upon the coinage question. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman allow me to read this speech? It is very brief.

Mr. PAYNE. I think I can state it in fewer words.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have it quoted literally from what you said.

Mr. PAYNE. I will tell you also I have not read that speech in six years. I said in that speech, Mr. Chairman, that I believed the single gold standard was the best standard. Why? Because it fluctuated less than any other; that values under it were more stable, that the money would be worth a hudred cents in the morning and in the night and to every one who took it; and for that reason I would favor the gold standard.

There were two reasons why I would consent also to the coinage of silver. One was that silver was largely an American product, and I did not desire to take anything away from the value of an American product. I was willing to favor and to furnish a market for it; and I said in addition to that that I was willing to have the coinage of silver go along with the coinage of gold at a proper ratio between the two, and when the nations of the earth could agree to it we should take both metals as a standard of our coinage.

Mr. RICHARDSON rose.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman can not read a short extract from a speech that I made and do justice to the speech.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It will show some very great inconsistencies in the position of the gentleman.

Mr. PAYNE. All right, read it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman said on the 25th of August, 1893:

> Mr. Speaker, there is another reason why we should have another standard of value than gold, and that reason turns on the question whether there is enough gold in all the world to do the business of the world as a money basis. I believe there is not. I believe that of this metal, which can stand the test of fire, which is light and convenient to be carried about, there is not enough to do the business of the world. There is another that appeals strongly to me as an American. There is another metal, the white metal, one-third of which is produced in our own country, and for this reason I am all the more in favor of honoring silver as a standard of value.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Now, I said all that, Mr. Chairman, and I said more, too.

Mr. RICHARDSON. That is enough. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. That seems to be enough for the gentleman, and if he will go on reading it, he may be satisfied; but if he does not, before I conclude he may not be.

I said, Mr. Chairman, that I was willing to go with the other nations of the world for the free and unlimited coinage of both metals. I remember something about a cistern illustration about which much had been claimed in that Congress, I think, by Mr. Bryan. Mr. Bryan said something about connecting two cisterns with a pipe and the level of water would be the same in each cistern; but I said that if you had water in one cistern and something lighter, like oil, in another, the level would not be the same, and I said in the mere adoption of the free coinage of gold and silver at any ratio it always occurred that there was a difference between the coinage value and the market value, and that the one that was worth the least in the market would carry the burden of the circulation, while the other would go to the melting pot; and if the coinage of the world stood on the same ratio of silver and gold it

would always occur that one of the metals would carry the business of the world and the other would not. [Applause on the Republican side.]

And I said it would not make much difference which metal carries the business of the world, because exchanges between the countries would be on the same ratio and upon the same metal, and there would not be fluctuations between one and the other that would destroy the value over night. Now, I stated all that in 1893, and if the gentleman can get any consolation out of it, he is welcome. In 1896 I subscribed to the Chicago platform. [Great laughter.]

I have got a good place mixed up with a bad party. I subscribed to the St. Louis platform in favor of maintaining by all means the gold standard and at the same time in favor of international bimetallism. But the dream of that time is past, Mr. Chairman. I see no prospect of international bimetallism. Since I have sat here and heard this debate and seen the Democratic party just about ready to withdraw from their 16 to 1 proposition, so that they sit here almost mute on the subject, as if they wished they might let go this thing in the next campaign.

When I hear the gentleman from Texas say that we are for declaring the gold standard because we believe the people are now willing to let us declare the gold standard, I wonder if the gentleman has had his ear to the ground and heard from the people. When I hear all these things, Mr. Chairman, I begin to think that silver is a thing relegated to the past and that the commercial transactions of this country and of the world hereafter will stand upon that single metal which will stand the test of fire and which does not fluctuate in value, gold, as the basis of money. [Great applause on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is amusing sometimes to hear our Democratic friends claim every condition as favoring their idea. It is not a great many years ago that we used to hear about the high prices of things we had to buy, and they wanted to get back to the good old Democratic times and low prices. Well, they got back to them in 1894 by Democratic methods, and then they began to talk about falling prices, and we never could have prosperity with falling prices, and they demanded that we should have better prices. By what means? By taking all the silver burden of the world and opening our mints and coining 50 cents into a dollar—cutting the dollar in two to get better prices.

That was the burden of their song then, but they do not say much about it to-day. They say we have got better prices because more gold has been discovered and that there is more gold in this country than there was in 1896. My friend from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] says that wheat was twice as high in 1873 as it was in 1896; that cotton was twice as high in 1873 as it was in 1896; and he says that these conditions have changed because there was both gold and silver then and only gold now, and that prices have declined in accordance with the decrease of basic money.

Why, in 1873 there was of basic money in the United States, gold and silver combined, only $3.29 per capita, and to-day there is $13 per capita of gold, the basic money of the United States, four times as much as there was in 1873. If the reasoning of our friends was correct, cotton and wheat should be worth four times as much to-day as in 1873. But the gentleman admits they are worth not half as much now as then. This is the result of his argument to prove that they were right in 1896, when they told us that nothing in the world would bring this country back to prosperity except the free and unlimited coinage of silver.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, like my friend who preceded me, I had no intention to take any part in this debate. I had the honor to belong to the committee that framed this bill, and it represents my sentiments. Therefore, there did not seem to be any necessity that I should consume the time of this committee in the discussion of the bill. But some remarks that have been made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] have suggested to me the propriety of calling the attention of the committee to some historic facts. The United States has been practically on the gold standard since 1834, more than threescore years. In that year we undertook to establish that which all history has proclaimed to be impossible, a double standard. Silver was undervalued, its mint value was less than its bullion value, and as a consequence gold became the money and the standard of value of the country. From that day to this, even during the period of the suspension of specie payments, all contracts have been made and all articles bought and sold with relation to their gold value.

And so in 1853, when we reduced the amount of bullion in our subsidiary coin, the committee that reported the bill to this House declared on the floor of this House that the purpose of their bill was to establish gold as the standard of value. That is over forty years ago. And so the same declaration was substantially made in the much-abused act of 1873. And yet, despite all these legislative declarations, the necessity does exist to-day for the enactment of this law.

Now, our friends upon the other side say that the Republican party has changed. It has changed, Mr. Chairman, just as the man has changed from the boy. The change that has taken place in the Republican party has been the change of growth. The Republican party has changed because the Republican party is a progressive party. It is because it meets exigencies as they arise. It is because it is a party that legislates for the present upon the theories of the present and in answer to the demands of the present, and not a party like the Democratic party, that knows neither principle nor theory unless they are to be found within the pages of the writings of Thomas Jefferson. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, in 1896 the Republican party declared in its platform that gold was the standard of value, and it declared furthermore in these words:

> All our paper currency must be maintained at a parity with gold, and we favor all measures designed to maintain inviolable the obligations of the United States, and all our money, whether coin or paper, at the present standard, the standard of the most enlightened nations of the earth.

A declaration pursuant to the entire history of the Republican party, which has always stood upon the proposition that every American dollar, whether of metal or paper, should be the equal of every other American dollar, and that bondholder and wage-earner should be paid honestly, in accordance with the terms of their contract, according to the American standard of money.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] says, Why reenact what is already the law? Because the Democratic party, notwithstanding these historic facts, notwithstanding the declarations repeatedly made in our legislation, have uniformly contended that the obligations of the United States should be paid in coin. Gentlemen upon the other side of the Chamber will not forget the struggle in this House over the Teller resolution. They will not forget that it was by reason of a Republican majority that that resolution was voted down here, while at the other end of the Capitol, where the Democratic party was in power, it was voted up and a declaration made that the United States had a right under its legislation and its history to pay in a depreciated currency. It is because we would remove all doubt that we write into our statute book to-day, that we give it the force and effect and majesty of public law, that an American dollar is a dollar measured according to the gold standard, and that every creditor is entitled to be paid in conformity with that standard.

And there is another reason why we write into our statute books the gold standard, and that is, because, taking past experience as a lesson, we know that at some time or other it might be in the power of a Secretary of the Treasury to reduce this country to silver monometallism by exercising a discretion that under existing law it is contended he has to pay the national obligations in coin.

We would so have it that, whether there be a Democratic Executive in power, a Democratic Senate and a Democratic House, all the obligations of the Government shall still be payable in gold unless, in answer to the sovereign will of the people, a declaration shall be put upon the statute books to the contrary. That is the reason, I will say, in answer to my friend from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], why we write upon the statute books not a new principle, but give to an old principle the new value of enacted law.

Now, my friend has the honesty, that very few gentlemen upon that side of the House have had, to recognize that the country is to-day in the enjoyment of an unbounded prosperity; but he attributes that prosperity to the increase in the output of gold, and to other causes wholly separate and apart from the policies of the Republican party. I will tell the gentleman why it is that the country is enjoying prosperity to-day. When Mr. McKinley came into office this country was in the very depths of despair. The nation had almost collapsed. Everything seemed to be wrong, everything seemed to have gone to ruin, and yet Mr. McKinley was in office only a very short time when business revived and the country entered upon that upward career the climax of which, we have reason to believe, has not yet been reached. Why? Because Mr. McKinley had not been in office two weeks until he called the legislative branch of the Government into session, and that legislative branch had not been in session more than two weeks more when there was sent from this end of the Capitol to the other a tariff law that reversed the policy of the Democratic party and substituted for a deficit in our revenues abundant revenues to meet the national needs. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Because with the access to power of the Republican party there came to the people of this country renewed confidence and belief in the future. Why, from 1879, when we resumed specie payments, down till 1893, the first year of Mr. Cleveland's Administration, nobody supposed there was anything the matter with our currency. During all those years the $100,000,000 of the gold reserve never suffered the loss of a penny. Why? Because day by day there came into the Treasury of the United States from the custom-houses of the country revenues sufficient to meet the daily needs of the Government. Prosperity had not deserted us;

the clouds had not arisen over our horizon until the people had found that under Democratic policy, under the Wilson bill, our revenues became insufficient to meet our needs. And prosperity returned to us in the wake of confidence, awakened because an Administration was in power that stood upon the platform of protection to our industries, protection to our Treasury, and sound money. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this debate with attention as it has been participated in by both sides of this Chamber. It was opened on this side by a careful, clear, exhaustive analysis of the provisions of this bill. I have not heard any fair, logical answer made to that argument. I have not heard from that side of the Chamber, with possibly one or two exceptions, any attempt to assign a valid reason why the United States should not declare to-day that gold is its standard of value. You gentlemen have talked politics, you have prated about trusts, some of you have even denied that the full sunshine of prosperity is about you—that there was any prosperity. Those of you who have admitted that prosperity exists have assigned reasons for it wholly apart from the policy of the Republican party.

You told us three years ago, when you argued after the fashion of my friend from Texas upon the line of wheat prices and silver prices coinciding, that no prosperity would come, that no prices would rise, that we would not get out of the slough of despond unless we opened our mints to the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. With the exception of two or three gentlemen, in addition to the gentleman from Texas, not one of them occupying a position or having a standing that gives us any reason to believe that he spoke for anyone but himself has dared to say that you believe to-day in the doctrine of the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. You have talked bimetallism, but you have not dared to assert that you stand to-day upon your old doctrine, that doctrine on which the issue of 1896 was fought.

The real reason, the true reason, why you gentlemen are opposed to this bill has been stated in a sentence by that gentleman who has so successfully made demagogy a profession, as a means of livelihood; who from his wanderings out in Texas has said, "This bill ought not to pass because it is not in the interest of the Democratic party." [Applause on the Republican side.] That is the only reason that has been assigned against this bill, assigned by your leader, whose high ideal I trust you appreciate. What an inspiring leadership that must be! A great question, affecting the financial standing of the United States and its citizens, to be voted down because it is not in the interest of the Democratic party!

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will my friend allow me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. RICHARDSON. In the interview to which the gentleman has referred he did not use the language, "Democratic party." What he did say was, "a democracy."

Mr. DALZELL. He did not say "a" at all, but did say "the Democracy."

Mr. RICHARDSON. He said the Democracy, and not the Democratic party. I think the gentleman to whom he refers said "Democracy" and not "the Democratic party."

Mr. DALZELL. He said "the Democracy," possibly.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It is not fair to say "the Democratic party."

Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman knows as well as I do myself that the meaning of the interview was that the bill should not be passed because it was not in the interest of the Democratic party.

Mr. RICHARDSON. He did not say "the Democratic party," but said "Democracy."

Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman knows as well as I do that that was his meaning.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I deny it, and state that he said "Democracy."

Mr. DALZELL. Then I assert that that was his meaning.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Here is the interview, and the word that he used was "Democracy."

Mr. DALZELL. Well, then, I accept "the Democracy;" but I say that the leading Democratic press of this country caught the meaning of it, and I say further that he who stands for his party said in a sentence what it took you gentlemen a week to say, that this bill ought not to pass because it is not in the interest of the Democratic party. And he spoke truly. It is not in the interest of the Democratic party. It is contrary to your policy.

Your policy would reduce the country to the low grade of silver monometallism. You would cut in two every pension; you would cut in two the wages of every wage-earner; you would cut in two the money that is go to the beneficiary of every life-insurance policy, and the deposit of every savings-bank depositor. You would introduce a panic and financial ruin and sacrifice that which is dearer than life itself—the national honor. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] Thank God, you can not do it! [Renewed applause.] I say it reverently, thank God you can not do it. When the vote shall be taken on this bill, you will find all on this side of the House united, to a man, registering their votes in favor of national honor, and we shall not be alone. We shall welcome to our unbroken ranks not a few brave Democrats who are uncowed by the party whip and who are too true to themselves and their constituents to deceive them. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I had not expected until a few moments ago to say anything in regard to the pending measure, and the way I come to say anything now is that my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] informed me that he did not think he would speak out his time, and asked me to fill it for him.

I listened a few moments ago, Mr. Chairman, to the eloquent peroration of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] in regard to the immortality of the Democratic party. He told us how the Democratic party had survived all its iniquities, how it had come through the nullification stage, the war stage, the reconstruction stage, the greenback, rag-money stage, the free-trade stage, and the free-silver craze, and I supposed he was going to wind up with Mr. Macaulay's famous sentence how it would still survive when some traveler from New Zealand would stand upon a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's. [Applause on the Republican side.] Mr. Chairman, the very reason why we desire to put this bill into law is the undying quality of the Democratic party. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic party, if it had not the vitality of sin itself would have perished long ago. As long as sin and error last it will last. Not until the millennium comes will it pass away. When that time shall come, so fondly looked for and hoped for by suffering men, it, too, will cease to exist, with all the ills and errors which from the days of Adam until now have afflicted suffering humanity. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] The reason why we want to put this bill into law is because we fear, and the country fears, that God, in His infinite wisdom and inscrutable providence, may some day again see fit to chasten this country and deliver it over to the supremacy of the Democratic party. That is the reason why we want to put this measure into law, Mr. Chairman. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. SULZER. We will do it next year.

Mr. MORRIS. It may be. I have not forgotten the warning of 1892, how we stood on every stump and pointed to the magnificent conditions then existing, and warned the people against the supremacy of the Democratic party. I have not forgotten that for some unknowable reason the people for the first time in more than thirty years had then at last put the Government in all its branches in the possession of that party. And I have not forgotten that from that hour until the Republican party came into power again there was not a day that the people of the country did not repent it in sackcloth and ashes. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, this bill is only the crystallization into law of the uniform practice and unbroken policy of the Republican party ever since the war. This morning, for about five minutes, I took the time to run over some of General Grant's messages to Congress, and I find him there saying again and again that the standard of value of this country is the gold standard.

Now, gentlemen, I am not troubled like some others by what they may have said before. I have nothing to apologize for. I came into public life as the advocate of the existing gold standard. No free silver in my record. I remember in 1894 that I stood up in the campaign for the gentleman who preceded me and advocated that same standard, and he did, too. I have now in my pocketbook—I keep it as a lucky piece—here it is [holding it up], a Mexican silver dollar.

We stumped with these dollars in our hands—an American limited-coinage silver dollar and a Mexican free-coinage dollar—and we both held them up, the free-coinage Mexican dollar side by side with the American dollar, and we both proclaimed that the only reason why that American dollar did not fall as the Mexican dollar had, down to the value of the bullion in it, was that it was a limited-coinage dollar backed by the pledge and credit of the great American nation that it should be kept at par with gold. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DALZELL and others. Whom do you refer to?

Mr. MORRIS. Oh, they all know to whom I refer. That was our argument. We said that we favored and would welcome international agreement for the free coinage of silver, if we could get it.

Mr. LENTZ. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. MORRIS. Oh, I do not want to yield to the gentleman from Ohio; I have but five minutes. We said if we could not get international bimetallism we would stand everlastingly for that practice and that policy which would keep every dollar of American money worth 100 cents in gold. Oh, we soared into the very heavens in that campaign. I declared that as the eagle could soar to heaven and look into the sun, so the eagle upon our coined pieces should be able to soar into the heaven of the nations and look all

the world in the face and acknowledge the superiority of no other nation's money. [Applause on the Republican side.] That is what we declared.

Mr. RIDGELY. Does the gentleman think it could have carried any more silver.

Mr. MORRIS. I do not. I wish I had the time to analyze this bill. I want to state what is the matter with the Democratic party.

A MEMBER on the Democratic side. What is the matter with you?

Mr. MORRIS. I am all right. Give me a little water while I dress down these Democrats. [Great laughter.] They told me about five minutes ago that they wanted me to speak. I said, "I have not prepared anything, but I never saw a day when I could not dress down the Democratic party, and I can do it now." [Laughter and applause.]

I can do it now, and I will do it. What is the matter with you? What are you doing now? It is just exactly the same thing that you did in 1895, exactly the same thing; the same old game of attempting to stampede men with new battle cries and by playing upon prejudice and distress. I do not forget, gentlemen; I remember too well how in 1892 the people turned you into power and how then those troubles came upon us. In 1894 we went to the people again with woe, want, and desolation on every hand, we turned to the Republican party as to the shadow of a great rock in a thirsty land. We said, "Turn back, turn back, turn away from this Democratic party and put back the great party in charge of the country under which it is always prosperous."

And the people did turn back. The people turned back, and in 1894 they sent a Republican majority to this House of more than 100, among them my distinguished predecessor, elected here on a platform declaring that every dollar of our money should be as good as gold; declaring that we were in favor of a protective tariff; declaring that the only salvation for the country would be in announcing that the first thing we should do would be to restore to the laborer the opportunity to find a day's employment at a fair day's wages. That is what we said.

The Democrats saw the writing on the wall. They saw fate staring them in the face. They dared not go to the country on anything they had ever said or proposed before, and then they began to wander around in this mire of free silver. In those days of almost universal bankruptcy they caught many men, some strong-minded men and some weak-minded men. They caught some of the best men in my own district, and they came very near catching a majority of the district. Now what are they doing? They remember the prophecies they made in 1896. They see that not one of them has been fulfilled. They see that all their predictions have gone to pieces. They see that now that the people have brought the Republican party back into power we stand in the sunshine of an era of prosperity such as neither this nor any other country has ever seen before. [Applause on the Republican side.]

And with this record behind them, with these prophecies behind them, with all these things behind them, it is no wonder that they seek to escape from free coinage at 16 to 1 and begin to shout "Trusts!" "Trusts!" "Corruption!" "Fraud!" and nothing else. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] That is what is the matter.

Now, gentlemen, when I think of this Democratic party I am reminded of a little story that I heard last year. I did not expect to say anything in this debate, not a word, but it has taken a peculiar turn.

When we first began I thought it was going to be the most Chesterfieldian controversy that was ever seen; that we were going to hear long-winded discussions about falling prices and rising prices and silver going to par on the other side, and the stability and glory of the gold standard, and, perhaps, some apologies for past errors on this side.

I thought that sort of thing would proceed, and that it would be the "distinguished gentleman from this State and the distinguished gentleman from that," but we had not progressed a day before a gentleman on your side got up and talked about how we had carried the election in 1896 by the most outrageous fraud and corruption. Think of that coming from a party which clasps to its bosom this day a man who, after a great State has expressed its will in the only legal and orderly manner known to our institutions, has been attempting, willfully, feloniously, and with malice aforethought, to filch from the people the result of that expression. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Yes, to filch it from them, because he has not used the bold methods of the highway robber, but the sneaking and detestable devices of the pickpocket. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Now, I say you remind me of a story, and I remind myself of a story. [Laughter.] Out in Dakota once two gentlemen belonging to the same party made up their minds that they wanted to run for the same office.

At this point the hour of adjournment arrived and the Chairman's gavel fell.

Mr. MORRIS. I will tell you that story some other time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have time to give the Democratic party the devil. He has neglected to do so, so far. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The hour of 5 o'clock having arrived, the committee will rise.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HEPBURN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 1 and had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following joint resolution:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 80) to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1899, on the 19th day of said month.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to submit a report of survey and estimate for the improvement of the Great Peedee River, South Carolina, between Cheraw and the Wilmington, Columbia and Augusta Railroad bridge.

RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following resolution was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to submit a report of survey and estimate for the improvement of the Great Pedee River, South Carolina, between Cheraw and the Wilmington, Columbia and Augusta Railroad bridge—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will submit a request for the withdrawal of papers.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KERR asks leave to withdraw from the files of the House without leaving copies the papers in the case of William Thomas, Fifty-fourth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to this request?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I think the rules require that the request shall be coupled with the statement that there has been no adverse report in the case.

The SPEAKER. Such is the statement in this request.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It was not so preferred.

The Clerk read as follows:

No adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The Clerk did not read that before.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY] will act as Speaker during the evening session. The hour of 5 o'clock having arrived, the House is in recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 8 o'clock p. m. by Mr. RAY of New York as Speaker pro tempore.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House under the special order will resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. HEPBURN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1, the financial bill.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would be false to the district I represent, recreant to the trust reposed in me by the people of my State, the majority of whom declared in 1896 for the principles of the Chicago platform, if I failed as a Representative in the Congress of the United States not only to record my vote, but also my emphatic protest against the legislation proposed by this bill. In the limited time allotted me in this debate I can do no more. This much, however, I do fearlessly and with a calm confidence in the truth of my convictions upon the subject under discussion.

Section 1 of this bill provides:

That the standard unit of value shall, as now, be the dollar, and shall consist of 25.8 grains of gold, nine-tenths fine, or 23.22 grains of pure gold, being the one-tenth part of the eagle.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] said that—

The law of February 12, 1873, clearly adopts the gold one-dollar piece, at the standard weight of 25.8 grains of gold, as the unit of value. That statute has never been repealed nor directly amended and, by legal construction, is in force to-day. Yet subsequent acts have so affected it that there is some doubt as to whether gold is fully recognized as our monetary standard.

In other words, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET], the introducer of this bill, and the Republican party propose to make assurance doubly sure and fasten upon the American people beyond controversy, by the first section of this bill, the single gold standard.

Something has been said in this debate about our national honor and credit. I am ready to vie with any gentleman upon this floor in my love of country and my desire to maintain our national honor. I am proud of our past history from the day we overcame old England in 1776 and 1812, upon land and sea, up to our late glorious victories in the war with Spain. I love our flag and our free institutions, that Constitution which, says a distinguished North Carolinian, Judge Gaston, "with all its pretended defects, all its alleged violations, has conferred more benefit on man than ever yet flowed from any human institution," and which, says Mr. Gladstone, "is the greatest work ever struck off in a given time by the brain and purpose of man." But because I do love my country and its Constitution, the broad shield and panoply of our liberties, I do not wish to see her adopt a monetary policy subservient to England and English gold; a policy of subserviency to the money changers of Europe and America; a policy which strikes down as basic money one of the money metals of the Constitution. Such subserviency and such policy can not maintain our national credit or honor.

BRIEF STATEMENT OF WHAT THE BILL PROPOSES.

Very briefly stated, this bill proposes to pay every bond of the Government now existing or hereafter to be issued in gold and, if need be, exchange every form of our money for gold alone. It proposes to establish a bank or money trust with the Secretary of the Treasury as the sun and center of the financial system. All the bonds of the Government, including those issued by the Cleveland Administration, about $262,000,000, which the Congress of the United States expressly declined to make payable in anything but "coin," and those issued for the expenses of the war with Spain, about $198,000,000; all the Treasury notes issued under the Sherman law of July 14, 1890; all the United States notes or "greenbacks," and "all other obligations, public and private, for the payment of money" must be performed in conformity with the gold standard established by section 1 of this bill.

Even silver dollars and silver certificates are exchangeable in the division of issue and redemption, provided for in the third section of the bill, if, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury, such course be necessary. In the event there is not sufficient gold in the Treasury to carry out the provisions of the bill, full authority is given the Secretary of the Treasury to sell bonds without limit to supply the deficiency. Since the days of Andrew Jackson and the United States Bank no such scheme has ever been matured to place the whole money power in the hands of the banks. Since the foundation of our Government never before has any party, except the followers of Palmer and Buckner, declared unreservedly for the gold standard. Therefore this bill marks a new era in the history of our country.

Heretofore legislative restrictions have been suggested, if any at all, to regulate the coinage of both gold and silver, but in this bill there are no restrictions and there is no concealment. We adopt the policy upon which Great Britain entered in 1816, making gold alone our primary and redemption money. For the first time in its history the Republican party has declared without qualification, by this bill, in favor of the gold standard.

REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC PLATFORMS COMPARED.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] told us we had been living under the gold standard since 1834; and if not since 1834, then since 1853; and if not since 1853, then since 1873: but it is well known and it is not ancient history that the Republican party in its national platform of 1888 condemned the Democratic Administration for an alleged effort to demonetize silver. Mr. McKinley was chairman of the platform committee, and not only reported the platform, but was elected to Congress upon it and helped to elect Mr. Harrison President on it. This is the platform he submitted:

> The Republican party is in favor of the use of both gold and silver money and condemns the policy of the Democratic Administration in its efforts to demonetize silver.

They knew then that the great Democratic party, which has never taken a position as a party organization in favor of the gold standard and against the free coinage of silver, and which time and time again in its national platforms of 1880, 1884, 1888, 1892, and 1896 has indissolubly linked together both gold and silver as the honest money of the Constitution, had always been true to the white metal. Yet they professed to condemn us then, although the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] says we have been living all the time under the gold standard.

In 1892 in national convention the Republican party adopted a platform in which it declared:

> The American people from tradition and interest favor bimetallism and the Republican party demands the use of both gold and silver as standard money.

In 1896 the Republican party declared for international bimetallism. There has never been a Republican platform written up to 1896, inclusive, which did not profess some favor for some form of bimetallism. But now, in three short years, what a change has come over the spirit of its dreams! It has crossed the Rubicon! And the surrender to the gold syndicate is complete. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] insists that conditions have changed. True, the gold discoveries in the Klondike and in South Africa, giving us a more plentiful supply of gold as a money metal; the war with Spain, famine in Russia and in India, all creating a demand for American products, have affected prices to some extent; but these are things for which the Republican party can in no wise claim credit, though it is in the habit of claiming credit for most anything, even the rain and dews, the short crops, or the bountiful harvests.

Compare with the inconsistent platform utterances of the Republican party the repeated declarations of Democratic platforms in favor of both gold and silver coinage, beginning with the platform of 1880, in which the Democratic party says:

> We believe in home rule, strict maintenance of the public faith, honest money, consisting of gold and silver, and paper convertible into coin on demand.

THE SECOND BATTLE IN 1900.

Mr. Chairman, we accept the wager of battle. We are willing to contrast the platforms of the Democratic party with the platforms of the Republican party; we are willing to contrast the positions of both parties upon this money question; we are willing to enter the arena of national politics in 1900 and go to the country and before the people upon the issue which the people will raise upon this bill. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] referred to the first battle of the standards in 1896 in terms of derision. "He laughs best who laughs last," and the gentleman from Iowa had best await the decision at the ballot box in 1900—the second battle—which will be waged then. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Three years ago, in the Senate chamber of the capitol of my State, as an elector for President and Vice-President of the United States, I had the honor of placing in nomination for the Presidency that splendid champion of the plain people and of the money of the Constitution, William Jennings Bryan. I said then, and believe it will be verified if you pass this bill, though I do not assume the rôle of a prophet:

> The same forces and influences which in this year 1896 dominated the Democratic national convention at Chicago, promulgated its platform, and nominated its candidate, Mr. Bryan, by a two-thirds vote, and united in one solid and unbroken phalanx the voters of three parties upon the financial issue in opposition to the gold-standard Republican platform, in the next national election will again unite this army of American voters, vast and daily growing vaster, and this great army, with its banner flung to the breeze of heaven, inscribed with our battle cry, "Equality before the law, and the money of the Constitution," will sweep in that second battle not only the States of the South and far West, but the now pivotal States of the middle West.

Of course, other most important issues will press for consideration in 1900, such as the great questions of the regulation and control of trusts, the government of our new possessions, Puerto Rico and the Philippine Islands, imperialism or anti-imperialism, involving as these questions do to a large extent the future of our national life. But this bill, by the action of the Republican party, makes plain and clear an issue which that party insists in this debate is a dead issue, namely, whether we shall have gold monometallism, on the one hand, or bimetallism, the money of the Constitution, on the other hand, as the law of the land. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

THE MONEY OF THE CONSTITUTION.

Mr. Chairman, when we were only 3,500,000 strong, and had established our independence through eight years of blood and suffering, we adopted a Constitution. It provided for gold and silver as the constitutional money of the country. Section 8 of Article I of that Constitution gives Congress the power "to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures."

Section 10 of Article I prohibits the States from "making anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts." Immediately after the adoption of this Constitution the patriots who had led our armies to victory and constructed our Constitution passed in the Congress of the United States in 1792 the first coinage law. It not only provided for the use of both gold and silver, but adopted silver as the unit and fixed the relative value of gold and silver in coinage. Afterwards, when a change in the ratio between the two metals was made, it was done by reducing the number of grains in the gold dollar instead of increasing the number of grains in the silver dollar.

Under free coinage the young Republic was started upon its great career; under free coinage we fought the war of 1812 with our old mother England; under it we purchased the Louisiana Territory, from which so many great States have been carved out, adding so many stars to the flag of the Union; under it we conducted the war with Mexico, and under it we lived through the

Administrations of all the Presidents, with some slight changes in the ratio between the gold and the silver dollar, until the Administration of General Grant and the passage of the Mint bill of February 12, 1873. The ratio of 15 to 1, established by the act of 1792, was changed to 16 to 1 by the act of June 28, 1834, which reduced the number of grains in the gold eagle, and that ratio has been retained to date as the monetary ratio between the gold and silver dollar.

OPINIONS OF WEBSTER AND BLAINE AND OTHERS.

On the subject that gold and silver are constitutional money metals Daniel Webster said, in the United States Senate, December 21, 1836:

I am certainly of the opinion that gold and silver, at rates fixed by Congress, constitute the legal standard of value in this country and that neither Congress nor any State has any authority to establish any other standard or to displace this.

This is the opinion of the "great expounder of the Constitution." In this connection I will quote from the opinion of one of the most eminent men of the Republican party in all its history, the Hon. James G. Blaine, who, in a speech in the United States Senate, February 7, 1878, said:

I believe gold and silver coin to be the money of the Constitution—indeed, the money of the American people anterior to the Constitution, which that great organic law recognized as quite independent of its own existence. No power was conferred on Congress to declare that either metal should not be money. Congress has, therefore, in my judgment, no power to demonetize silver any more than to demonetize gold; no power to demonetize either any more than to demonetize both. * * * Few persons can be found, I apprehend, who will maintain that Congress possesses the power to demonetize both gold and silver or that Congress could be justified in prohibiting the coinage of both; and yet in logic and legal construction it would be difficult to show where and why the power of Congress over silver is greater than over gold, greater over either than over the two. If, therefore, silver has been demonetized, I am in favor of remonetizing it. If its coinage has been prohibited, I am in favor of ordering it to be resumed. If it has been restricted, I am in favor of having it enlarged.

* * * * * * *

I believe the struggle now going on in this country and in other countries for a single gold standard would, if successful, produce widespread disaster in the end throughout the commercial world. The destruction of silver as money and establishing gold as the sole unit of value must have a ruinous effect on all forms of property except those investments which yield a fixed return in money. These would be enormously enhanced in value and would gain a disproportionate and unfair advantage over every other species of property. If, as the most reliable statistics affirm, there are nearly $7,000,000,000 of coin or bullion in the world not very unequally divided between gold and silver, it is impossible to strike silver out of existence as money without results which will prove distressing to millions and utterly disastrous to tens of thousands.

Of like opinion have been the minds of some of the most eminent statesmen and public men of this and other leading nations of the world, such as Balfour in England, Bismarck in Germany, and Cernuschi in France, and such eminent public men in the United States as Senators VEST, COCKRELL, MORGAN, DANIEL, and TELLER, and a host of others. If there is any error in my views and the view of the Democratic party upon this money question, some of the best, wisest, and ablest men of the world have fallen into like grievous error. Our opponents may sneer at those who advocate silver coinage and contend that they are not keeping pace with the progress of the world, but as for myself, I do not feel at all lonesome among the distinguished men who have advocated bimetallism in the past and who advocate it now.

The issue is not so much between the gold standard and free silver coinage at the ratio of 16 to 1 as it is between gold monometallism and bimetallism. Had it not been for the adverse legislation, had it not been for the conspiracy entered into by those who own the gold and the bonds to strike down one of the money metals of the Constitution in order to satisfy their own personal greed, I believe that no question as to the parity would ever have arisen. It was not until the adverse legislation against silver began that the ratio between silver and gold began to part company. Mr. Chairman, the silver question is an old subject, but in order to make my argument and meaning clear and full I will review very briefly its history in this country.

BRIEF HISTORY OF SILVER COINAGE.

The act of 1792, establishing the mint, provided for the free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold on a ratio of 15 to 1, and "that all the coin should be legal tender for all debts, public and private."

The act approved January 18, 1837, reiterated said provisions of the act of 1792, with the modification that the gold in the gold dollar is fixed at 23.22 fine instead of 24.75, as in the previous act, thus changing the ratio from 15 to 1 to 16 to 1.

By the act of 1873 silver dollars were dropped from coinage, and by the act of 1874, adopting the Revised Statutes, the legal-tender quality of silver coins was limited to $5.

The Bland Act of February 28, 1878, provides that "there shall be coined at the several mints of the United States silver dollars as provided in the act of January 18, 1837," and further directed the purchase of silver bullion at market prices in amounts not less than two million nor more than four million dollars' worth per month, and for the coinage of said bullion into dollars of 412½ grains of standard silver each, and repealed all acts inconsistent therewith. It also restored the full legal-tender quality of the silver dollar, except where otherwise stipulated in the contract.

The act of July 14, 1890, known as the Sherman Act, directed the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase at the market price 4,500,000 ounces of silver bullion, and to issue in payment for such purchases Treasury notes of the United States, said notes to be redeemable in coin, and repealed so much of the Bland Act as required the monthly purchase and coinage of not less than two million nor more than four million dollars' worth of silver bullion.

Act approved November 3, 1893, repealed the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act, and declared it—

to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money, and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, such equality to be secured through international agreement or by such safeguards of legislation as will insure the maintenance of the parity in value of the coins of the two metals.

The act authorizing the refunding of the national debt (1870) and the act to provide for the resumption of specie payments (1875), under which the bonds extant were issued, both provide that the bonds issued thereunder shall be redeemable in coin of the present standard value, and the bonds so issued all so stipulate on their face.

Section 3693 of the Revised Statutes provides that the faith of the United States is pledged to the payment in coin of all the obligations of the United States, except in cases where the law authorizing the issue of such obligations has expressly provided that the same shall be paid in lawful money or other currency than gold and silver.

THE MATTHEWS RESOLUTION AND OUR UNITED STATES BONDS.

In 1878, the year of the passage of the Bland Act, Congress passed, further, a concurrent resolution known as the Stanley Matthews resolution, which was embodied in the concurrent resolution of the Fifty-fifth Congress introduced by Senator TELLER, which was as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution No. 22.

Whereas by the act entitled "An act to strengthen the public credit," approved March 18, 1869, it is provided and declared that the faith of the United States was thereby solemnly pledged to the payment, in coin or its equivalent, of all the interest-bearing obligations of the United States, except in cases where the law authorizing the issue of such obligations had expressly provided that the same might be paid in lawful money or other currency than gold and silver; and

Whereas all the bonds of the United States authorized to be issued by the act entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt," approved July 14, 1870, by the terms of said act were declared to be redeemable in coin of the then present standard value, bearing interest payable semiannually in such coin; and

Whereas all bonds of the United States authorized to be issued under the act entitled "An act to provide for the resumption of specie payments," approved January 14, 1875, are required to be of the description of bonds of the United States described in said act of Congress approved July 14, 1870, entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt;" and

Whereas at the date of the passage of said act of Congress last aforesaid, to wit, the 14th day of July, 1870, the coin of the United States of standard value of that date included silver dollars of the weight of 412½ grains each, declared by the act approved January 18, 1837, entitled "An act supplementary to the act entitled 'An act establishing a mint and regulating the coins of the United States,'" to be a legal tender of payment, according to their nominal value, for any sums whatever: Therefore,

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That all the bonds of the United States issued or authorized to be issued under the said acts of Congress hereinbefore recited are payable, principal and interest, at the option of the Government of the United States, in silver dollars of the coinage of the United States containing 412½ grains each of standard silver; and that to restore to its coinage such silver coins as a legal tender in payment of said bonds, principal and interest, is not in violation of the public faith nor in derogation of the rights of the public creditor—

Now, by the bill under consideration, the Republican party proposes to change the original contract made with the holders of the bonds of the Government and make all of the same payable in gold instead of "coin," thereby giving to the holders of these bonds a bonus of millions of dollars, which upon the 1925 issue of bonds alone, as shown by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCCLELLAN], would be $60,000,000. In order to show the magnitude and extent of this gift practically of the Government to the holders of its bonds, I append a statement showing amount of our bonds outstanding July 1, 1896, taken from good authority, as follows:

4½ per cent bonds continued at 2 per cent	$25,364,500
4 per cent bonds of 1907	559,686,850
5 per cent bonds of 1904	100,000,000
4 per cent bonds of 1925	162,315,400
Total	847,316,750

To this statement must be added the sum of $198,000,000 issued for expenses of the war with Spain.

The entire national debt, more than a billion dollars, now existing, as well as any subsequent additions thereto, is to be paid in gold, notwithstanding the original contract to pay in "coin," in either gold or silver, at the option of the Government.

ALL OTHER OBLIGATIONS TO BE PAID IN GOLD OR EXCHANGED FOR GOLD.

Again, by this bill all the Treasury notes issued under the Sherman law of July 14, 1890, $89,026,280, as well as all the United

States notes, commonly known as greenbacks or legal tenders, $346,681,016, aggregating over $435,000,000, are to be redeemed in gold. Nay, more, if in the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury such course be necessary, even silver certificates and silver dollars are exchangeable for the same coin. Never before by the policy of the Treasury Department or by any act of Congress has there been any proposition which would either redeem or exchange silver dollars and silver certificates for gold coin. As late as 1896 there was issued, under the authority of the Treasury Department, Circular No. 123, in which the Secretary says:

> Gold coins and standard silver dollars, being standard coins of the United States, are not redeemable. Silver certificates are receipts for standard silver dollars deposited and are redeemable in such dollars only.

I do not mean to insist that by this bill silver certificates and silver dollars are immediately redeemable in gold coin, like the United States notes or greenbacks and the Treasury notes under the Sherman law and the United States bonds, but I do say it is clear from this bill that even silver certificates, $400,643,504, and silver dollars, $81,978,872, may be either locked up in the division of issue and redemption of the Treasury Department or paid out in exchange for gold coin alone at the option of the Secretary of the Treasury under the provisions of this bill. The term "exchange" is used, but the meaning is practically the same. This bill means the locking up or destruction of nearly $500,000,000 of silver certificates and silver dollars.

It means, furthermore, in order to meet the constant drain upon the gold reserve in the United States Treasury, the further and constant sale of United States bonds to be issued at the option of the Secretary of the Treasury to maintain the gold reserve provided for under section 4 of this bill. It puts it within the power of one man, the head of the Treasury Department, to issue and sell gold bonds in his discretion, giving him an autocratic power over the finances of the Government without parallel or precedent. It places the issue of bonds and the exchange or redemption of every form of our money in the hands of one man, who in turn may be controlled by the bankers of the country.

SUBSIDIARY SILVER AND NATIONAL-BANK NOTES.

It is said this bill authorizes a larger amount of small money, subsidiary silver, but while that is true it does not increase our circulation per capita, which, on December 1, 1899, was $25.75, according to the circular issued by the Treasury Department, for the bill provides (section 5, last clause):

> Whenever any silver bullion purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, shall be used in the coinage of subsidiary silver coin, an amount of Treasury notes, issued under said act, equal to the cost of the bullion contained in such coin shall be canceled and not reissued.

The advocates of the bill also make much of a proposed increase of national-bank-note circulation by allowing national banks to issue notes up to the par value of their bonds deposited with the Treasurer of the United States, upon which their circulation is based. That is the sugar coating upon the bill. You refuse to open the mints to silver; you refuse to open the mints to the free coinage of anything but gold; silver and all other forms of money are made mere token money, based upon and redeemable in gold; you refuse to remove from State banks the 10 per cent tax and allow them to issue notes based upon the United States bonds or approved State bonds or other good securities, but you say to the national banks, "You may issue notes to the par value of your bonds."

But while power is given to expand their circulation to this extent they also have the right, power, and privilege to reduce their circulation. They may expand or contract the national-bank-note circulation at their own will and pleasure. They control the circulation, not the people or the Government. Those who hold the gold control the issue of bonds; the Government bonds are the basis of national-bank-note circulation; the banks expand or contract the issue of their notes as suits their interest and the demands of their business. The people must depend for a money supply upon the production and coinage of gold and upon national-bank notes. This forms a bank trust and money trust, the most gigantic of all trusts. You claim that it is a good feature to allow small national banks, with a capital of not less than $25,000, to organize in towns having a population which does not exceed 2,000.

Whatever good features this bill may possess, if it possess any, you know the rule of the House has been so framed as to preclude all amendments or vote upon any substitute or separate features of the bill. We must swallow the whole bill or vote against it as a whole. The effect of the last feature of the bill is destructive to private banks in many instances, destructive of competition, and already you are discussing the formation of branch banks. We will have at the great money centers the central luminary, the metropolitan bank, and in small towns the smaller country banks as satellites revolving around the great banking institutions of the money centers. Besides, you know the organization of these small banks is entirely at the option of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such banks, says the bill, may be organized "with the sanction of the Secretary of the Treasury."

THE MEANING OF THE BILL AND THE PROBABLE RESULT.

The distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] well said the other day this bill was to be passed to redeem a pledge made in the campaign of 1896 by the Republican party to the money power of the country. The time has arrived to foreclose the mortgage given by the Republican party, and in the light of history the allegation of the gentleman from Missouri does, indeed, seem to be true, and the words of the distinguished historian and scholar, Dr. John Clark Ridpath, upon the possible outcome of that campaign seem indeed to be prophetic. In his able article entitled "The Bond and the Dollar" Dr. Ridpath, speaking of the campaign of 1896, said:

> If plutocracy wins the impending battle, what follows? We do not venture on prophecy, but only point out the logical and historical tendency of a present victory of the money power over the people. * * *
>
> In the first place, the gold standard will be fixed and fortified, and under it all the values of the world will be bolted down. All legal-tender paper money will be canceled and destroyed. This part of the program is already openly declared. The existing silver coinage will next be attacked, and not a dollar of it will be spared as primary money. It will be sent to the silversmiths, to the smelting pots of two continents, to the bullion shops of every mart, to the mints for subsidiary coinage, to every place where it may be consumed, until not one dollar of our old constitutional money shall remain.
>
> The vacuum thus produced in the money supply of the people will be filled with bank bills, issued and loaned, expanded and contracted, at the pleasure of the owners. * * * Money may be wonderfully "easy," and for the day the false verdict against the people may be glorified. But in another day, the first day of alarm, this great nation will fall prostrate before the banks.
>
> Then will come a panic, in comparison with which all preceding financial storms that have swept the country will be as zephrys to the awful hurricane. Such will be the ruin that the fragments of exploded enterprises will not be worth the gathering. Before such a storm not a single legitimate business can survive. He who wishes to contribute to this catastrophe and to hasten its coming has only to follow his leaders until the victory of the money power over the people shall be confirmed by a majority of votes.

For myself, I do not propose to be a party to such a catastrophe, nor to legislation leading in such direction. I stand with the great Democratic party; that party which has ever stood for the plain people and for the money of the Constitution; with Jefferson, Jackson, Bryan, and its great leaders in defense of its immortal principles. Among those principles is the recognition of both gold and silver as the basis of our monetary system, and opposition to the centralization of the money power in the hands of the banks of the country.

For a century the Democratic party, true to those principles, has survived all the assaults made upon it, and by preserving them unimpaired it will win the second battle of the people in 1900. [Applause.]

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, the financial question is one that finds its way into every legislative body. Men may try to drive it from consideration, but, like the dream of the ancient ruler, it will not be banished. It seems to me, however, judging from the language of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and others on that side of the Chamber, that they are like that great king in one regard, that they have permitted the dream to go from them and are not able to interpret the words after they are made known. It would be surprising, and humiliating as well, if some of the remarkable statements made by them to-day were placed in parallel columns with the contradictory statements made by them on this floor in other years. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Ever since the framers of the Constitution gave to Congress the right "to coin money and regulate the value thereof" there has been contention about the coinage and its value; and, perhaps, when the shades of evening shall fall for the last time, and the end of time is reached, men will yet be contending about the money question. This body can not evade its duties because the issues are continuing. Our colleagues across the Hall propose now to settle the matter by fixing the single standard of gold and making all else subservient to it as a basis; but the youngest member on this floor will never see the financial question settled, no difference how much he may become bowed with age nor how long hoary hairs may crown his temples, unless silver is restored to the place given it in the early legislation, its constitutional place as one of the coins of the nation.

When the first lawmakers met under the Constitution, they fixed the ratio between gold and silver and established a bimetallic basis, giving to both metals equal debt-paying power in these words:

> That all gold and silver coins which shall have been struck at and issued from the said mint shall be a legal tender in all payments whatsoever.

Never was this equality and debt-paying capacity interfered with until the law of 1873 was enacted, which provided that silver should be a legal tender only in amounts not exceeding $5. If bimetallic currency could be sustained from 1792 to 1873, through the fearful crises through which this country was called to pass, who would say that at this day it could not sustain such currency?

It is claimed by some that conditions have changed. Yes, conditions have changed; yet they are more favorable to the maintenance of anything that this Government desires than ever in its history. At no time has it been so independent, never could it so

safely assert itself, never did it exert the influence upon the affairs of men which it does at present. Why, the war with Spain gave notice to the world of the strength of this nation and its power to defend itself at one of its weakest points—naval warfare. If this country could maintain a bimetallic standard in the early and struggling period of its existence, why can not it do so now? Give to gold and silver the same legal-tender qualities and the present disparity between the metals will vanish.

It is contended that there has been a gold standard since 1834 by some. All admit that such standard has existed since 1873. Mr. Chairman, the American people will be content with that kind of gold standard which existed up to 1873. During that period, when the commercial value of silver as measured in gold was more than 100 cents, or, if measured in silver, when gold was commercially worth less than 100 cents on the dollar. It is contended now that "gold has intrinsic value that silver has not; that the 100 cents in a gold dollar is worth commercially 100 cents anywhere in the world; that silver, by reason of the impress of the stamp of the Government upon it, becomes worth 100 cents, but intrinsically is worth less than 45; that it does not, therefore, have an intrinsic value which is permanent and fixed; that part of the value which it secures comes to it through the Government."

Suppose, however, that this nation had demonetized gold instead of silver and that the other nations of the earth had taken a similar step, would anyone then contend that the intrinsic value of gold would be 100 cents when measured in silver? Would it not then be true that silver would be worth 100 cents wherever gold is now worth that sum? The law fixes the permanent value of the standard. In this nation when gold and silver were alike recognized the commercial value of each was about the same, and who will say that if bimetallism were restored silver would not occupy a similar place to gold, both intrinsically and commercially?

It is surprising the good that is alleged to come from the rule of the dominant party. Republican supremacy, we are told, means continued prosperity. The panic of 1893–94 is charged to the minority party because at that time it is alleged there was a Democratic Administration in charge. Who had control of this Government in all its branches prior to and during the great panic of 1873–74? Who was the cause of the soup houses of that period? Gentlemen forget the distressing nature of that panic. If the causes are to be found in political supremacy, then the Republican party alone is responsible for the dire distress of that time. Gentlemen forget that the year 1892, referred to by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] as the most prosperous since the civil war, so wrought upon the Treasury of the United States that before the inauguration of the successive Administration plates had been prepared for a bond issue to avert the danger of a panic which had already partly spent its force upon this country.

The gentleman holds up his hands with amazement at what happened in 1893 and charges it to Democratic rule. He contends that prosperity comes when money comes this way from other countries and that financial adversity follows when money flows out of this country. He forgets what fearful drain was made on the gold of the Treasury in that year. The recent report of the Treasurer of the United States shows that the net exports of gold beyond imports for the year 1892 were $59,081,110. From the same report we learn that from March 1, 1892, to March 1, 1893, there had been drawn from the Treasury of the United States $64,450,444 in gold.

At the time Mr. Cleveland was first inaugurated President there was in gold in the National Treasury $240,029,843; when he vacated that office, in March, 1889, that amount had been increased to $326,700,939. This immense sum of gold in the Treasury at the time Mr. Harrison was inaugurated was reduced to $217,672,948 during his Administration. And this enormous reduction in the amount of gold in the Treasury, according to the gentleman's argument, well explains why it is that so soon following that time the great panic of 1893 was upon this country, due, not to Democratic mismanagement, because nothing had been done, but if chargeable to administration at all, it must be chargeable to the Republican Administration, which had depleted the Treasury and brought on this condition of affairs. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] said this afternoon that the prosperity now existing is due to the election of Mr. McKinley, "that the passage of the tariff law reversed the policy of the Democratic party." The gentleman perhaps is not reminded that the tariff law in existence in 1873, during the extraordinary financial depression of that time, which brought sorrow, starvation, and ruin to so many homes, was a Republican tariff. It may be to him as a dream, but the people well know that the McKinley tariff was in existence for over eighteen months after the Cleveland Administration began, and during the worst of the panic. That during that time nothing had been done in legislation except to repeal the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act, which the Republicans fully indorsed, and which was in line with the legislation now attempted. If tariff legislation is responsible for the panics of 1873 and 1893, it is chargeable directly to the Republican party.

It is now insisted that with the election of Mr. McKinley came prosperity; that any evidences of that kind which may now be seen are due to that cause. Let us inquire into the prosperity that does exist. What is the cause of it? Aside from the increased demand caused by the war at home and abroad and the shortage of crops in other countries there has been no increase in the prices of the products of labor, except that which is produced by the increased production of gold. I am anxious to see that kind of prosperity that will make glad the home of the farmer and laborer and place the farmer, especially, in a position that he can pay off the mortgage on his farm without being compelled to run the bluff on the money lender, as did the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

What will be said to the farmer after the gold standard is permanently fixed? You said to him in 1896 that Democratic supremacy meant cheap money—a depreciated dollar. You will say to him now, You have a dear dollar, the most precious thing on earth, but it is worth 100 cents anywhere." You will say to him, further, if you tell the whole truth, that a dear dollar means lower prices for the products of his farm. But you will doubtless insist that the farmer be content, for what he does receive will be in the dearest money of earth. You must say to him, You are burdened with debts and would receive far more for your toil with a bimetallic standard, and would be enabled to pay much more of the debts which harass you, but you should rejoice in the gold standard. For while you can not pay the incumbrance on your home and remove the shackles of financial bondage from your household, you have the assurance that if you could secure the money it would be sound money and as good as that of any government elsewhere. [Applause.]

I wish at this time to call attention to the statement made on this floor in the Fifty-fourth Congress by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], which shows his interest and that of many others on that side of the House in the producers of the country:

> I know of no man whose wail is heard because of the fall in prices of wheat, grain, food, cloth, clothing, and the implements of husbandry and of trade, and all that go to minister to the comfort, the health, and the needs of every man, rich and poor, in his own home, except the advocates of the free and unlimited coinage of silver. To my mind the decrease in the cost of the necessaries of life and the increase in the wages of labor indicate not depression, but prosperity.

What a compliment is here unwittingly paid to silver advocates. I am proud that I am classed among those who are interested in the prices of farm products. There is no class of laborers more essential to real prosperity than the agriculturists. Make farming prosperous, and all lines of trade and business will succeed. It is the standard of value in business. It is the basic element in trade. Yet no class of business enterprise is more oppressed, and none is less protected by law. What body of farmers has asked for the passage of this bill? Which of them have demanded a provision of law making their debts payable in gold? Who of them desire to be placed in the hands of their creditors and to be required to pay the mortgages on their homes in gold? Have you conferred with the laboring classes of the country? Have they asked you to enlarge the power of the national banks and to retire all kinds of money except gold and supplant the money now in circulation with national-bank notes? Are the producing and laboring classes—the plain people of the country—demanding that the money of the Government shall be retired and the promises to pay of corporations be substituted? Mr. Chairman, I enter my determined protest against this ruthless thrust at their interests and utter disregard for their rights, this movement which is in the interest of bond syndicates and aggregated wealth. [Applause.]

It is proposed to redeem and impound the obligations of the Government which paid the soldiers who saved the Union when it was hanging in the balance. They are to be supplanted by obligations of national banks. It is proposed that gold shall bear the burden of this redemption by exchanging for the outstanding greenbacks the sum of $346,681,016 and in addition thereto be exchangeable for the Treasury notes, silver certificates, and silver dollars now in existence, the sum of $629,445,056, making nearly $1,000,000,000 that must be redeemed in gold sooner or later. Where can the gold be obtained? There was in the Treasury December 12 last, after providing for the gold certificates, $242,060,396.19, which must bear the burden of government and make this redemption.

You observe, therefore, the necessity of issuing bonds under this system. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized by this bill to issue bonds whenever he finds it necessary to supply the gold reserve. The iniquity of this scheme, the extraordinary power given to the Secretary, is not equaled by any statute ever made in this country. Is it possible that the people of this free Government are ready to vest such absolute power in one man?

I do not believe that such consent will be given. I denounce any such attempt as an infringement upon the rights of the people. [Applause.]

I object to this bill because it is in the interests of a favored class and against the people; because it fixes the single gold standard, and makes all obligations, public and private, payable in gold; because it will retire all Government paper money and the silver dollar from circulation in the end, and, as stated by gentlemen on the other side, the promoters of this scheme will be better pleased the sooner it is accomplished; because it makes necessary the issuance of bonds to redeem the outstanding currency, and fastens a burden upon future generations which can not be met by this one; because it places the power of the issuance of bonds in one person; because no bill should ever become a law which in time of peace adds to the bonded indebtedness of the country; because it gives additional power to national banks in controlling the circulating medium of the country, and because it is in direct opposition to the best interests of the Republic.

I will therefore record my vote against it, with sincere regret that there are not enough votes to defeat this outrageous measure. [Applause.]

Mr. ROBB. Mr. Chairman, from a declaration in 1892 that "the American people, from tradition and interest, favor bimetallism and the Republican party demands the use of both gold and silver as standard money;" from a declaration in the last national platform of that party in favor of bimetallism, based upon an international agreement, which it promised to use its best efforts to promote, to the purpose now clearly indicated in this bill and openly avowed on that side of the House to abandon in favor of the single gold standard every idea of bimetallism and to disregard and violate every pledge made upon that subject, is a feat in political bad faith and treachery without a parallel in the history of the country. That for which they criticised and denounced Grover Cleveland in 1888—his efforts to demonetize silver—they now applaud and commend. So completely have they changed under the inspiration of the influences, seen and unseen, back of them that the crime of yesterday is the virtue of to-day, and the whole record of the party in the past is admittedly one of mistakes, falsehoods, and insincerity.

The question will very naturally arise in the mind of everyone, What hope is in store for the future from legislation emanating from and passed by the votes of a party self-convicted of so serious and so many offenses? What reliance can be placed in their promises and predictions of the results which are to be the outgrowth of and to flow from the policies which they now and here crystallize into law, but which before they never dared to publicly avow?

While the bill which we are now considering removes the last feeble support which silver had in legislation or legal construction, it goes far beyond the question of bimetallism; it goes far beyond the question of the coinage of silver as money of redemption or final account at the ratio of 16 to 1 or any other ratio. It is a bill in opposition to which everyone can well afford to stand who is opposed to the contraction of the currency, to the retirement of the greenbacks, and to the surrendering to the national banks the power and control of the Government over the currency of the country. It is a bill which is the culmination of the thought and design of those who in the past and who now oppose the free coinage of silver. It is a bill which has concentrated within its few brief pages the purpose of the gold conspirators of the world—the subjugation of the masses to the power of money. The question of morals, the question of right and justice and good faith, have no place in it.

What would Blaine, that great leader of the Republican party, have said of such a measure? He would have said as he did in the Senate of the United States on February 7, 1878:

> It is impossible to strike silver out of existence as money without results that will prove distressing to millions and utterly disastrous to tens of thousands. * * * If, therefore, silver has been demonetized, I am in favor of remonetizing it.

But you say by your bill, "If silver has not been demonetized, let us demonetize it," thereby completing and crowning the infamy of 1873. By laws, cumulative, I may say, you strip it of the qualities of standard money. Having once demonetized it, to make doubly sure you demonetize it again, and by law you propose to do that which you have heretofore done in defiance of law. You legislate it out of the contract between the Government and the creditors of the country where it has heretofore been construed out; you forbid that the bondholder shall be required to take that which he expressly agreed to take, and which the law at the time the bonds were purchased provided he should take in payment of his bond—either gold or silver coin of the United States. You make the whole superstructure of credit money and all the bonds and every other obligation rest on gold and gold alone.

You make the silver dollar redeemable in gold. In other words, you narrow the base and widen and enlarge the superstructure. You weaken the foundation, already weak, and add on another story or two—for the purpose, you say, of strengthening the building of sound money. The Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890, and the United States notes shall be redeemed in gold coin; the silver certificates are to be redeemed in accordance with existing law; but the silver dollars, having been paid out for silver certificates, are in turn presented and gold demanded in exchange, and gold is promptly delivered. Gold coin, as defined in section 1 of the bill, is the sole and only standard, the only full, complete, and unqualified redeemer of obligations, both public and private.

Notwithstanding the latitude allowed for construction in some other parts of the bill, and its elasticity and flexibility, I may say, to meet certain emergencies and in the end accomplish the general purpose of surrendering the functions of the Government with respect to the currency of the country to the national banks, there is left no room for doubt as to this proposition, for it is expressly provided in section 2:

> SEC. 2. That all interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the payment of money, now existing or hereafter to be entered into, and all United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the law of July 14, 1890, shall be deemed and held to be payable in the gold coin of the United States as defined in section 1 of this act; and all other obligations, public and private, for the payment of money shall be performed in conformity with the standard established in said section.

The United States notes or greenbacks, amounting to $346,681,016, and the Treasury notes outstanding, amounting to $91,167,280, you propose to retire. You redeem them in gold and then hold them locked up or impounded in the Treasury until some magnanimous banker with a heart bleeding for his country comes along and offers you gold for them. But still some of you have the boldness to assert that the withdrawal from circulation of this sum, amounting in the aggregate to $437,848,296, and the practical burial of it in the United States Treasury, will not contract the currency and will not injuriously affect business. I can not agree with you and do not believe experience will verify your predictions. That it is the policy of the supporters of this bill and one of the purposes of the measure to retire the greenbacks can not be questioned or denied. Hon. Maurice L. Muhleman, of the United States subtreasury of New York, in an article in the May number, 1899, of a monthly magazine called "Money," published in New York, has clearly set forth the intention and design on the part of those who control the machinery of the Republican party. He said:

> The general consensus of opinion of those who have given the subject of currency reform serious attention is that the continued use of United States notes, commonly called "greenbacks," as an important element in our monetary system is dangerous. This opinion is held not only by bankers, as Mr. Bryan and others would have us believe, but by many men who have absolutely no personal interest to serve except the ultimate improvement of the nation's money.
>
> It is true that, thus far, the preponderance of opinion favors only the conservative measure, which I have advocated for years, of suspending the reissue of Government notes once redeemed in gold, except when gold is again tendered for them; but this measure not only admits the danger involved in the continuance of the present status of the notes, but foreshadows their ultimate withdrawal or radical rehabilitation. So strong is the sentiment that some step must be taken to remove, in part at least, the danger to our entire system, that the Republican caucus committee appears to have concluded that their party must in the near future declare itself and, following the President's repeated recommendation, has outlined a proposition which may possibly become law before the Presidential campaign of 1900.
>
> When it is borne in mind how much of sentiment has existed among Republicans for the old "greenback," it must be conceded that this is a step forward; and if it be further borne in mind that the Coinage Committee of the last House of Representatives recommended in section 9 of its bill the ultimate retirement of all "greenbacks," the general policy is unmistakably foreshadowed.

Yes; this is the unmistakable purpose. What, then, is to take the place of this large sum of money which is to be withdrawn from circulation? The redemption fund is not to be diminished, and other large sums are to be held in the Treasury as a reserve. Must it not necessarily follow that this deficiency must be supplied either by a largely increased bank circulation or by gold purchased, from those who, in this and European countries, own and control it, by the sale of bonds of our Government? We must therefore meet the conditions which this bill will impose if enacted into law, all of which are evils, either of a contraction of the currency or of an increased bonded indebtedness or of a bank currency made to depend upon the whim and caprice and selfishness of the national banker. I am opposed to this bill, Mr. Chairman, because of the evil provisions which it contains separately and collectively. To give to the Secretary of the Treasury, as this bill does, the power, without limitation and at his own discretion and in his own judgment, to issue and sell bonds of the Government is a power greater than should be given a king, a power greater than should be given any man.

To give to the national banks the power and control over the currency of the country, the power to expand or contract it at pleasure as suits their interests, is too great a power to place in the hands of any man or any men or any corporation or combination of corporations. I commend to the consideration of this House and the country the words of warning of that great Missourian, Thomas H. Benton, in that other and historic struggle

between the people and the old United States Bank. They are not inappropriate and inapplicable to the pending bill and present discussion. He said:

It is too great a power to be trusted to any banking company whatever, or to any authority but the highest and most responsible known to our form of government.

The Government itself ceases to be independent, it ceases to be safe, when the national currency is at the will of a company.

The Government can undertake no great enterprise, neither of war nor peace, without the consent and cooperation of this company; it can not count its revenues for six months ahead without referring to the action of this company—its friendship or its enmity, its convenience or its opposition—to see how far that company will permit money to be scarce or to be plentiful; how far it will let the money system go on regularly or throw it into disorder; how far it will suit the interests or policy of that company to create a tempest or suffer a calm in the moneyed ocean. The people are not safe when such a company has such a power. The temptation is too great, the opportunity too easy to put up and put down prices; to make or break fortunes; to bring the whole community on its knees to the Neptune who presides over the flux and reflux of paper. All property is at their mercy.

The price of real estate, of every growing crop, of every staple article in the market is at their command. Stocks are their playthings, their gambling theater, on which they gamble daily with as little secrecy and as little morality and far more mischief to fortunes than common gamblers carry on their operations.

Mr. Chairman, is not the evil of allowing those who deal in money, who sell the use of money, control the character and supply of money far greater than the evil of allowing those who deal in any article of consumption by combinations to control or limit the output, the supply, and the price of that article? If it is wrong and injurious to the public for the dealer in coal or sugar or the manufacturers of iron or steel or other articles of consumption by combinations to limit the supply or output for the purpose of relatively increasing the demand and thereby increasing prices, are not the consequences far more serious and the wrong far greater and far-reaching when it is made possible for those who deal in money and speculate upon the credit of the country by any kind of manipulation to in any way affect its character or quantity, thereby affecting the price of every article of consumption?

If trusts are inimical to the best interests of the country, which seek to control and regulate the price of commodities, and if legislation should be enacted to destroy them, why, by this initial measure, House bill No. 1, authorize and render possible a greater trust than all the others—the money trust? Why throw around it the protection and encouragement of legislative sanction?

It is convincing evidence to me, Mr. Chairman, that the Republican party is no more sincere in its protestation against trusts than it was in its declarations in favor of bimetallism. The Republican party has been kept in control of the Government by the money power, and those of you who now propose to pass this bill are faithfully serving your masters. Notwithstanding it is denied to the States in the organic law the authority to pass any law violating the obligation of contracts, and notwithstanding this rule was, in the early part of the history of our country, held to apply to the Federal Government as well, you here, by express legislative provision, authorize the creditor class to violate every contract made between it and the Government for the last quarter of a century.

Mr. Chairman, I protest against the passage of this bill, and in doing so I record my own judgment and give expression to the opinion of a vast majority of the people whom I have the honor to represent on this floor.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest and attention to the debate that has taken place on this important measure, and especially to the remarks of the gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber who are responsible for its introduction and who advocate its passage. I had and still have a sincere desire to be enlightened both as to the necessity for its immediate enactment and the benefits to be derived under it.

But after all that has been said, Mr. Chairman, I must confess a confusion of ideas respecting this bill; that is, in so far as I am to believe all that has been said about it by those who are clamoring for its enactment. Some of you contend that it is but a declaration of existing law, of law that has been in existence and in force for more than a quarter of a century, with perhaps some slight amendment with reference to national banks, while others assert that it is the redemption of the pledges of the Republican party to establish the gold standard and make every dollar of the country as good as gold. Others content themselves with fulsome eulogy of Mr. McKinley and shameless denunciation of Mr. Bryan.

I am sorry for this latter, because it is neither edifying nor courteous. Mr. Bryan treats all who differ with him with courtesy and consideration. He is ever the gentleman, dignified and pure, and I am only sorry that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN] has not been benefited by the close personal contact with him which he the other day avowed with so much candor and vehemence. And, as he has otherwise displayed such an aptitude for observation, I am persuaded that the lantern which he said he used to illuminate his vision of that great man must have been of that variety of manufacture which supplies the needs of the burglar or the midnight assassin without too much disclosing his identity. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Bryan needs no defense by me or, indeed, by any other gentleman on this side of the Chamber. The magic of his name will at all times rally behind him millions, like himself, of unbought and unbuyable American citizens. And since I come to speak of it, Mr. Chairman, I might as well remark in passing that perhaps the apparition of Bryan still at the head of the great army of voters, with his battle-scarred banner yet flung to the breeze, may be the apology for the hasty manner in which this bill is to be passed and fastened upon the country. [Applause.]

But, Mr. Chairman, the question before this House is not the free coinage of silver, as one might suppose it to be from the fact that that question has been made to bear the brunt of the argument by our enthusiastic friends on the other side of this Chamber. Much as we would enjoy the privilege of registering our loyalty to free silver, we will not be allowed to do so when we come to vote on this bill. Neither does it relate solely to the standard, as well argued by my friend from New York, Mr. SULZER, and other gentlemen on this floor. The full import and significance of its provisions, though short and simple as they appear, may never be fully understood until they stand forth in all their nakedness in the light of future experience. Even its advocates, while professing a blind faith in its benevolent origin, do not undertake to say with any degree of certainty or probability what may be its results.

Mr. Chairman, it is a serious matter to indict the representatives of a great political party as being the subservient tools of designing and selfish interests, and so it is but charitable to suppose that the advocates of this bill are in the main sincere in their professed belief that it will promote the public good.

The so-called financiers, the large bankers of the country, have so long shaped the policies and molded the legislation of the Republican party—on the money question at least—under the idea that no one could speak advisedly or intelligently upon that topic save those who are at the head of great moneyed institutions, enlivening their teachings and concealing their purposes in such cant and catchy phrases as "sound money," "one hundred cents in the dollar," "repudiations," etc., that it is small wonder that their deluded and misguided servants, believing themselves and the people to be the beneficiaries of their thought and plans, though they are in truth but the mortgaged product, follow blindly and with perfect faith in the execution of the half-concealed purposes of the master minds.

Mr. Chairman, to my mind the tenacity of this trust in the bondholders and money brokers is but the manifestation of that spirit of fanaticism common to mankind and so aptly described by the Irish poet in delineating the sentiment that characterized the followers of "The Veiled Prophet of Khorassan" in "Lalla Rookh," when, notwithstanding pending, threatened, and apparent dangers, they followed him to the doom prepared and executed by his own hand because, it was said, they believed him.

> That the lover may
> Distrust the look that steals his heart away;
> The child may cease to think it can play
> With heaven's rainbow; alchemists may doubt
> The shining gold their crucible gives out;
> But faith, fanatic faith, once wedded fast,
> Hugs the delusive falsehood to the last.

Our prayer is, Mr. Chairman, that when the great commercial interests of this country are manacled with the single gold standard and contracted currency, and the purposes of its authors are unveiled in the light of experience, it may not witness the death of either liberty or hope, but that sufficient valiant and patriotic spirits may be found to march against its strongholds under the banners of Democracy and in the battles of ballots elect faithful public servants and write another emancipation proclamation for the people in the statutes of the country. [Applause.]

But, Mr. Chairman, while we thus credit the execution of this potential direction with humanitarian considerations, we would be derelict in our duty should we fail to subject to the severest scrutiny the origin, purpose, and effect of this proposed legislation. The beneficiaries of this measure care little for the consistency of those who are now falling over themselves to lend it their support. And from the facility with which they change convictions on important subjects, it appears that they care little themselves. Neither are they concerned with the character or value of the arguments by which their well-considered anticipations are about to be realized. On the contrary, secure in the enjoyment of present opportunity, they have simply contented themselves with securing the music hall and revising the programme. I say revising, Mr. Chairman, for no party in its official utterances has ever yet proposed to go the length of this measure.

The Republican party in its platform never proposed such a

revolution in our financial system, but, on the contrary, they pledged the country that until international bimetallism could be secured the existing gold standard should be maintained.

The existing condition of things is to be changed, radically changed, by this bill. Hence I say that the beneficiaries of this measure have revised the programme. But they have left the performers to their own devices as to the character of the short entertainment which is to be afforded the country in this debate.

And what is that program, Mr. Chairman? In the first place this bill—and I do not now propose to discuss it in detail—is a proposition of the bankers agreed upon in advance and to be enacted in this hasty manner without being considered by a regularly constituted and standing committee in that judicious deliberation which should characterize all legislation of such far-reaching importance, and where calm and careful analysis would develop all of its objectionable features and suggest proper remedies for defects.

In acting as you are with this bill you expose yourselves to one or the other of two just criticisms, and that is that you either arrogate to yourselves all wisdom and scorn suggestions, which is folly, or you fear your bill can not successfully undergo deliberate scrutiny, which is an indisputable evidence of bad faith and perfidy. You can not plead the excuse of immediate and pressing necessity, for you have stood here on this floor for hours felicitating and congratulating yourselves upon an overflowing Treasury and restored confidence. When you thus confess no necessity for this bill you challenge a suspicion that your motives in its enactment may not be to promote the public weal.

The first and second section of the proposed act involves not only a change in the present contracts evidencing the liabilities of the nation, the State, the municipality, the corporation, and the individual; not alone do they involve the powers conferred by the organic law; but they are so pregnant with possibilities of evil and distress that they excite, alarm, and challenge the most earnest attention of the country. Mr. Chairman, these obligations are enormous. We can only approximately estimate their proportions. That they should thus be made payable in gold places upon some one the obligation of furnishing the gold. It follows as a necessary sequence that all other moneys issued or provided for by the Government must be made redeemable or interchangeable with gold, which is the same thing, or the single gold standard as it is now defined by the Republican party could not survive its enactment long enough for explanation.

The act thus creates an enormously increased demand for the circulation or accumulation of gold, not alone as sponsor for silver and the paper currency, but as a guaranty of that vast system of credit which a restricted money volume is most largely responsible for. This places upon the Government a most serious and onerous obligation. May we not discern some politics in this as well as dangers? At present we have several kinds of legal-tender money—silver as well as different forms of paper currency.

Let us remember that in the campaign of 1896 threats were made that if Mr. Bryan was elected panics would ensue, entailing dire distress on the people in locking up capital and retiring money from circulation. With the control the Government then had over the finances, I believed those things impossible, and yet we all know that the national banks by refusing loans and writing gold payments in the notes for the loans they did advance were able to stimulate a genuine, though false, alarm throughout the country, and thus contribute a great deal toward the election of Mr. McKinley.

Do you doubt that the threat of exactions of gold payments in all the vast multiplicity of business transactions among the common people, which the passage of this bill will not only make possible but effective, will lead them to discredit or discount all other forms of money, and thus constitute a continuous demand among the people themselves upon an imperiled Treasury, make them innocent but potential agencies to exact tribute from the Government in a forced issue of bonds? There is no necessity for this.

National honor does not demand it. We all know the fact, as it is recent history, that even to maintain the present existing redeemable quality of our currency that it plunged the nation millions and millions of dollars further in debt in the shape of bonds. And now without necessity it is blind and besotted folly to take gratuitously upon ourselves further obligations. It is apparent that to increase the demand for gold will benefit some one. Whom? The gold syndicate who profited in the bountiful harvests in the dark days of Mr. Cleveland's Administration.

Mr. Chairman, to my mind there is no higher standard of public morality than to fear the Lord and keep his commandments, obey the law and execute our obligations according to our promise or contract. It can not be denied that all our obligations, both public and private, except as otherwise stipulated in the contract, were at the time they were executed and are now dischargeable in the coin of the Constitution—the coin of the contract, which any court governed and constrained by an oath of office and the law of the case would enforce without any sort of question.

And when it is remembered that the great moneyed syndicates, in a time of greatest depression, were willing—nay, eager and anxious—to take our bonds and pay for them in gold at par, when they were absolutely refused the condition of repayment in gold, thus making it doubly impressive upon them that the Government could, would, or might pay in silver, and which they did take in any quantity and subsequently sold upon the market at a premium, we are led to wonder at the anatomical construction of those people who yet assure us that silver, when recognized by the Government as money, in such form is a debased metal; who talk about bankruptcy and repudiation and clamor for an increased demand for gold.

But, Mr. Chairman, as grotesque and illogical as they appear, they pale into insignificance in contemplation of the spectacle of two such pioneers in American thought and leadership as the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], now waltzing upon the stage in the dress suit of gold bonds.

My colleague [Mr. COX] and other gentlemen in their speeches have called attention to the opinion of these gentlemen of such a measure proposed in the bygone history of this country, too recently uttered to be forgotten by the country or by the gentlemen themselves; and their opinions against the issue of gold bonds were too pronounced and too well fortified to be the result of hasty or ill-advised conclusions. Under these circumstances we had the right to indulge the hope that they, too, would not mount on the wings of an alleged general prosperity and soar beyond the range of our finite comprehension.

We had the right to expect that they who cheered on the rest and boasted no "habitation in ancient graveyards" would at least explain to us why a Government coin bond sold at par in a time of greatest depression can not continue to find a gracious market, should necessity so require, when, if they are to be believed, nature bursts with plenty and capital is on the hunt of investment with a search warrant. Under such circumstances, why not leave the silver and silver certificates to circulate on their own merits among that vast majority of the people who have no means, capacity, or inclination to organize vast moneyed institutions to traffic in gold? Why thus burden the already overstrained obligations of gold in its migratory world's service with the additional weight of this large volume of silver, as well as other mountains of debts, unless it be to promote the traffic therein?

To those who are not drunk with the false glamor of the world's best dollar and for that reason discredit their own, and who are not biased by the friendship of those who extend it but to become their masters, the explanation is apparent that the retirement of the greenbacks and Treasury notes will promote the interest of the national-bank currency while the silver and silver certificates will serve the purposes of the gold brokers and bond syndicate, as they can by this bill be made to construct the endless chain that afforded them such boundless opportunities and golden harvests in the dark days of Mr. Cleveland.

Gentlemen talk of parity of money, of the dangers of gold going to a premium if we have the free coinage of both gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. They forget the fact that any increase in the demand for gold will increase its purchasing power, and any increase in its purchasing power is in itself a premium in precisely the amount of such increase.

The silver dollar to-day will buy as much property as the gold dollar and could perform every service if allowed to do so. The two metals together would form a sufficient base for any volume of paper currency necessary to transact all the business of the country, develop our matchless resources, and make the waste places bloom with beauty and fruition.

Relieve distress, prevent panics, and then afford all the guaranty to those who distrust the stability of our institutions that they are in all good conscience entitled to, by leaving to them the commodity in the gold and silver that would be left to them should the flag of liberty and constitutional government be furled forever and the Constitution be buried itself beneath the crumbling ruins of the fortunes and hopes and aspirations of those who are yet willing to trust their country and have faith in that power that can write in the face of all money it provides the legal-tender quality and make it receivable for taxes and all other demands.

You flatter yourselves that you have kept all the money on a parity and prevented a premium on gold, which you say you are going to further provide against by the passage of this bill. May the Lord deliver our country from your misguided zeal and blundering incapacity. May He remove that plaster phrase, "one hundred cents in the dollar," which you have so long worn over your eyes that you can not see the national honor, in order that you may observe the fluctuating values in the vast property

interests that are the true base from which to make our reckonings on the premium.

When Cleveland sold the two hundred and sixty-odd millions of dollars in bonds to maintain the gold standard, he paid a premium on gold in that transaction in a sum precisely the amount the people will have to pay in interest and in premiums if purchased before maturity in order to retire the bonds. And yet you all can not see this, or will not see it, because none of you have even yet been able to discover that there is any difference in the actual number of cents in a gold dollar and the actual number of cents in a silver dollar. And lest you might discover that there is some difference, you are preparing to legislate against it. You thus lose sight of the value of the 100 cents in considering the number—you sacrifice substance for form. The money broker knows it, and no doubt laughs at you while he encourages your stupidity.

On February 8, 1895, in his message to Congress communicating his contract with the gold syndicate, President Cleveland made the following statement:

> The privilege is especially reserved to the Government to substitute at par, within ten days from this date, in lieu of the 4 per cent coin bonds other bonds payable in gold and bearing only 3 per cent interest, if the issue of the same should in the meantime be authorized by the Congress. The arrangement thus completed, which after careful inquiry appears, in present circumstances and considering all the objects desired, to be the best attainable, develops such a difference in the estimation of investors between bonds made payable in gold in favor of the latter as is represented by three-fourths of a cent in annual interest. In the agreement just concluded the annual saving to the Government in interest if 3 per cent gold bonds should be substituted for 4 per cent coin bonds under the privilege reserved would be $539,159, amounting in thirty years, or at the maturity of the coin bonds, to $16,174,770.

This is the proposition which patriotic Republicans then denounced and joined with Democrats in preventing, because they saw then the great vortex of debt it opened up in compelling the Government to pay gold, and hung back in terror from the danger which it presaged. Yet now, forsooth, because crops have been good for a year or two, with balances of trade in our favor, and because gold has taken a little spurt in increased production, and because extraordinary markets have been opened up in consequence of foreign wars, causes all of which are transitory in their nature and which may resolve themselves into similitudes of the pleasure which the poet described when he wrote the following lines—

> Pleasures are like poppies spread,
> You grasp the flower, its bloom is shed;
> Or, like the snow fall in the river,
> A moment white, then gone forever;
> Or like the rainbow's lovely form,
> Evanishing amidst the storm;
> Or like the borealis race
> That flits ere you can point its place—

you want to darken the people's hope and mortgage their future, and for what? Who has demanded this reckless folly? If gold was worth 1 per cent more than silver in 1895, is it not worth as much more now, though there is no one now demanding or able to exact the difference? What debt are you paying when you thus, without any apparent consideration or conscience, give to the bondholders the 1 per cent on the $1,046,049,020 which, according to the tables of the Bureau of Statistics, the Government owed in October, 1899? Is it a public or a private debt? You no longer regard the public contracts. Why should you not now pause in an awakened conscience and repudiate your private ones? It would be amusing, if it was not pitiful, to hear you prate of national honor. Does it consist in giving away the nation's substance? Is it secured by levying grievous burdens in unnecessary taxation upon those who trusted you? Do you reflect it when you thus gamble upon the hazard of future prosperity?

There is some comfort in the reflection that you will be called to account at no very distant day for the iniquitous work that you are about to perpetrate. You provide for an increase of reserves to be kept in the Treasury, thus at once contracting the currency. You provide for the retirement of the greenbacks and Treasury notes, which will be a further and an additional contraction. You increase the privileges of national banks and reduce taxation on them. You provide them with power to increase or contract their circulation at will, which inevitably will be used to augment their profits and impose hardships, poverty, and ruin upon the people, and yet you say you are the guardians of the public faith and are giving to the people the best money in the world. Let the people judge of these things when the issues are submitted to them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. STANLEY W. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, I have sought the privileges of this floor for a very few minutes, not that I hope to add anything to what has been so ably presented on both sides of this House, but to suggest a few reasons why I am opposed to the passage of this bill.

I have listened with close attention to the able arguments on this side of the House, and I am fully convinced that the conclusion I have come to is fully warranted. It has thus far developed in the discussion of this question that there are a certain few Democrats who feel compelled to vote for this measure. From their statements made on this floor, I for one am willing to concede them the right, and, under the circumstances of each particular case, honor them for it. They have here asserted that this question was before their people in the most emphatic form; that upon the stump, in the public press, and in private conversation, the most solemn and positive pledges were made to support any measure that might be proposed to establish the gold standard.

Again, if we are to believe the public press and statements made upon this floor, there are a few other Democrats who have lost faith in the issue of the free coinage of silver in the ratio of 16 to 1, but yet who are not willing to concede any possible measure that might be proposed to change the present financial laws of the country. These Democrats are opposed to the passage of this bill.

Our friends upon the other side have poured forth volumes of oratory proclaiming the era of good times and sound money. If prosperity is upon us and we are under the gold standard, why disturb the relation? We are told that in three years gold has poured into our Treasury by the hundreds of millions; that each kind of money is as good as every other kind of money. If we have an abundance of good money, why hazard a change? If your propositions are true, it is reckless to risk such a vital transformation.

This is a Republican measure. If it passes, as I believe it will, to them we will accord honor or opprobrium as the case may be. They have rallied their forces to a man. Each individual has stifled his objections to its parts and swallowed the whole. If they have reached the fruition of their hopes, I would not detract from their joy. But, in the event of failure of their plans, then will come the day of reckoning. As they will glory in their triumphs, so must they suffer when snags and pitfalls beset their pathway. This measure may be a success, but have they counted well the awful cost of a mistake of judgment?

But why so much haste in passing this bill—sweeping aside all precedents, rushing on to a fixed day, a fixed purpose? The bill must be passed. Why so impetuous? Not even one day could be spared, not even one day's postponement, in which to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the death of the Father of our Country!

I am against this bill because it sweeps aside greenbacks, the Treasury notes, and silver dollars, hundreds of millions, and substitutes an experiment. It is not known that the national banks will take out the full circulation offered by the terms of this bill.

It is assumed that they will, but who will vouch for it? Suppose it transpires when this bill is in full operation that the national banks decline to accept the privileges offered. What then results? A contraction of the currency to the extent of hundreds of millions! Would this not be a calamity? Congress would be immediately compelled to revise the system proposed, and in the meantime great crises might be upon us. I see no impropriety in any Gold Democrat voting against this measure. If all our money is now on a parity, a simple declaration that we are on the single standard ought to suffice.

Why ought we not take up other matters of more pressing necessity? The President in his annual message has something to say about trusts. Does the President expect his party to champion the attack upon the trusts who are laying their hands on the pocketbooks of the people? I apprehend not. Is it not true that the President's closest friend in Ohio, the Chairman of the Republican national committee, has already stood forth as the apologist of the trusts? Is it not true that his other close friend, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, Mr. GROSVENOR, has already intimated in this debate, that the trusts can not be reached; that no legislation is possible that will remedy the evils complained of? This proposition can not be true. Let us at all events take up the subject at once. Our people are demanding relief, and relief should be afforded. Let us proceed to this question, and ascertain at least if our people must continue to be robbed by concerns that combine, for profit, to the extent of scores of millions. Instead of 20 cents, the good housewives of our country now pay 40 cents for a broom with which to sweep out their kitchens.

Hours might be consumed in presenting the iniquities that have recently arisen through these enormous combinations of capital. To this vital question should we now devote ourselves instead of legislating upon a question which must be practically settled if, as our friends on the other side assert, we are living under the gold standard at the present hour. Let well enough alone and proceed at once to more urgent measures, checkmating the ravages and greed of the all-powerful trusts of the country, and our people will be truly grateful. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, having listened attentively to this debate for the past five days, I am firmly of the opinion that nothing has been said, or will hereafter be said, by any gentleman on this side that will cause any member of the majority party on

this floor to change his action. In view of this conclusion I would, under ordinary circumstances, pursue the course I had marked out for myself and be content to remain in my seat in silence. But when I contemplate the distressing consequences and conditions that must inevitably follow the passage of the pending bill, believing, as I do, that it is laden with every phase of national and individual disaster and distress, I can not refrain from entering my emphatic, vigorous, and solemn protest.

I have noted with surprise and astonishment the strangely inharmonious and wholly conflicting positions taken by some of the distinguished leaders who have spoken in advocacy of this harsh, unjust, oppressive, and monstrous measure. Beginning with the President's message and running through every speech made on that side, we have had presented to us, in the most gorgeous hues of word painting, the assumed fact that "the country is in a condition of unusual prosperity," which the gentlemen, with more arrogance than reason, insist is due to the fact that we have had the single gold standard in practical operation for the past thirty years.

I would be glad if some one on that side would tell us what they mean by "the country" and point to the evidences of this phenomenal prosperity of which they speak. As I understand it, one is said to be in a prosperous condition when he can by faithful and energetic exertion earn something in excess of the amount required, economically expended, to support himself and his family. A man may be prosperous and be in debt, but when indebted, he can in the course of time, under prosperous conditions, discharge, or at least reduce, his indebtedness.

This is also true of a nation. And yet, notwithstanding this unprecedented prosperity, which we are told swept over the country like a tidal wave of the deep after "confidence was restored" in 1873, and which has abided with us during all the years since, except during Mr. Cleveland's Administration, we have heard in this debate the startling and astounding admission of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] that the people of this highly favored land still have fastened upon them an indebtedness, quoting his exact words, "on contracts made since 1870, amounting to fifty or seventy-five billions of dollars, and contracted upon the present basis."

The gentleman who uttered these words has passed that period of life when the exuberance of youth might lead him to extravagance of speech, and therefore his statement should cause you on that side of this Chamber to pause and reflect, provided you have not completely surrendered to the money power of the country.

The highest reliable estimate places our population at about 75,000,000. If the maximum indebtedness stated by the gentleman from Illinois is reliable, we are confronted with the alarming condition that the average indebtedness of every citizen of the United States, regardless of age and sex, is $1,000. At the general election held in 1896 the total vote cast for all the candidates for the Presidency was 13,923,398; and if this colossal debt were prorated equally among them, it would make an average indebtedness of $5,386.70 for every man who voted at that election—for every adult male citizen of the United States.

With these facts asserted and contended for, gentlemen who advocate the enactment of this odious and infamous bill seek to chloroform the intelligent judgment of the masses of our country by their siren song of prosperity, while the people are being further plundered and robbed of $800,000,000 in obedience to the arbitrary demands of the banks and trusts that furnished the Republican party the sinews of war with which to wage "The first battle."

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] challenges us to refer to a single statement made by Democrats in 1896 which subsequent events has proven to be true, and without waiting for a reply satisfies himself and his admiring friends by saying we can not do so. In this conclusion he is mistaken. We said in 1896 that an increase of the volume of money in the channels of trade would cause rising prices and better wages and bring better times.

You conclusively admit this to be true by your repeated arguments on this floor based on the discovery of the Klondike, from which we have drawn large quantities of gold, and the fact that gold has come to us from other nations by reason of trade balances being in our favor, thus increasing the volume of our basic money. Your speeches are admissions that the quantitative theory of finance contended for by Democrats is a correct principle.

Again, we took the position and announced it everywhere that your St. Louis platform was a snare, a deception, a delusion, and a fraud, by which you hoped to deceive the voter; we said you would not make an honest effort to secure international bimetallism; we charged that you were at heart in league and sympathy with and under the domination of the plutocrats and capitalists of the nation, and that you would destroy the last hope of silver coinage, if in your power to do so, if you were intrusted with the reins of government.

I charge now that your attitude and conduct on this floor is a plea of guilty to each of the counts in the indictment. The mantle of hypocrisy has been carefully laid away for future use, and you now propose to "more securely establish the single gold standard," retire and practically cancel and destroy all the paper and silver money, aggregating some $800,000,000, and make the whole business and commerce of the country dependent upon gold.

By taking out of circulation, as this bill will do, about $800,000,000, you, in effect, add just that sum to the already stupendous indebtedness of the toilers and producers of our nation, reduce the level of prices of commodities and of labor, and place that amount to the credit of the bondholders, millionaires, and trusts which have been fostered and created under the policies of your unhallowed Administration.

With a record showing your every pledge violated, your vows broken, and the confidence of the people betrayed; with a colossal indebtedness that stifles the comprehension of man hanging over us; with all our great industries held in the grasp and control of the trusts you have inflicted upon us, you unblushingly say in the American Congress, in the language used by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] a few days ago, and indorsed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] to-day, "We intend to enact this law and make it impossible for you to repeal it for at least eight years to come, unless death shall intervene" in the Senate, thereby making it possible for the Democratic party to gain control of that body.

Ah, gentlemen, if the passage of this bill is right—if you believe you are doing the will of your constituents—why hedge this measure about with such iron-clad safeguards as to make it impossible for the American people, if they see proper to do so, to amend or repeal it? If you are conscientious in this matter and feel that you are truly voicing the sentiments of your people, then, in the name of all that is right, I ask you, why are you afraid to submit your action to the sober judgment of an enlightened people for their approval? Why make it impossible for the plain people of the United States to pass in judgment upon the acts of their servants?

Why "burn the bridges behind you," unless, indeed, your consciences "have made cowards of you all" and you fear you will be overtaken by a justly indignant and incensed people, and, amid the execrations and anathemas of an enraged nation, you will be hurled from place and power forever? You say you will pass this bill, and we, in the name of the debt-burdened and oppressed producers and wage-earners of our country, defy you. If you had had the courage to attempt its passage two years ago the majority would now be on this side of this Hall.

Pass it and I venture the statement that more Democrats will vote in the next Congress than will answer to the roll call at this session. Has the imperial policy of the present national Administration so frenzied your brain and intoxicated your judgment that you dare hurl defiance at a free people whose servants you are? Do you feel so secure in your power and disposition to intimidate the American voter that you no longer respect that great tribunal of final resort, the intelligent will of a free people?

I say to you that the shackles you are forging to-day and which you will fasten for a time upon us will be broken. The people of this country will rise in the strength of their sovereign manhood, break these fetters of gold, and smite their oppressors. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the principle of bimetallism is a living principle. No action of a mere partisan majority can smother it into lifelessness. The Republican party may thwart our desires and trample upon the sacred interests of the people for a season, but "time at last sets all things even." It can make no grave so deep or no sepulcher so strong as to permanently imprison the expressed will of thirteen and a half millions of people. In 1900 the united forces of bimetallism will move forward in solid phalanx to avenge the grievous wrong you are now about to perpetrate.

Back of us we will have the unqualified indorsement and approval of every prominent man in the Republican party since the days of the immortal Lincoln, including the distinguished gentleman who assists Mr. HANNA in administering the affairs of Government. To sustain us in our convictions and guide us aright we have the light of experience of more than a hundred years of our nation's life. We point with pride to the fact that for one hundred and eighty-six years prior to 1873 the commercial ratio of silver to gold was never as high as 16 to 1, except during a part of three years in the early part of this century, as will appear from an examination of tables contained in the annual report of the Director of the Mint for the year 1898.

During all the years embraced in these tables the value of the bullion contained in a silver dollar, as a mere commodity in the open markets of the world, was worth more than $1 in gold, as will appear from the following table, taken from the report above referred to, covering the period from 1837 to 1873.

Bullion value of 371.25 grains of pure silver at the annual average price of silver each year from 1837–1898.

Year.	Value.	Year.	Value.	Year.	Value.	Year.	Value.
1837	$1.009	1853	$1.042	1869	$1.024	1885	$0.823
1838	1.008	1854	1.042	1870	1.027	1886	.769
1839	1.023	1855	1.039	1871	1.025	1887	.756
1840	1.023	1856	1.039	1872	1.022	1888	.727
1841	1.018	1857	1.046	1873	1.004	1889	.723
1842	1.007	1858	1.038	1874	.988	1890	.809
1843	1.003	1859	1.052	1875	.964	1891	.764
1844	1.008	1860	1.045	1876	.894	1892	.673
1845	1.004	1861	1.031	1877	.929	1893	.603
1846	1.005	1862	1.041	1878	.891	1894	.491
1847	1.011	1863	1.040	1879	.868	1895	.505
1848	1.008	1864	1.040	1880	.886	1896	.522
1849	1.013	1865	1.055	1881	.880	1897	.467
1850	1.018	1866	1.036	1882	.878	1898*	.452
1851	1.034	1867	1.027	1883	.858		
1852	1.025	1868	1.025	1884	.861		

* Nine months.

The total production of gold and silver in the world since the discovery of America is as follows: Total gold production, 446,017,990 fine ounces, of the coining value of $9,220,012,100; total silver production, 8,351,339,167 fine ounces, of the coining value of $10,797,685,200.

Thus it will be seen that the ratio of production of silver and gold is practically the same as the legal ratio for which we contend. Indeed, it seems that the Creator, in His wisdom, has so deposited the precious metals in the hidden recesses of the mountain side that the genius and cupidity of man can only bring them forth in about the ratio of 16 to 1.

That silver has depreciated since 1873 none will deny. That this condition is due to hostile and unfriendly legislation an inspection of the tables referred to by me will make so clear that no sane person will controvert the proposition. By destroying the demand for silver for monetary use you destroyed its value. By again creating an unlimited demand for silver its value would be restored.

Gentlemen say we dare not longer advocate 16 to 1. They mistake us. We do advocate the free coinage of silver and gold at 16 to 1, and never entertained a thought of changing from it. We stand to-day on the platform and for the principles we advocated and supported in 1896; and, gentlemen, in 1900, 8,000,000 voters of the United States will follow the banner of Democracy, upon which will be inscribed, "Free coinage of silver and gold at 16 to 1," and with undiminished confidence in the wisdom of our declaration and with increased faith and trust in our peerless leader, that banner will be borne aloft to victory by the gallant statesman of Nebraska, William J. Bryan. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Chairman, the standard of value is that which the intelligence and experience of the commercial world has made it.

Government may make this or that a legal tender for the purpose of paying debts, but it does not thereby impart or create value. An ounce of gold in junk in the pocket of the man who is the farthest removed from civilization, if it is of equal fineness, possesses exactly the same value as any other ounce of gold with the stamp of the most powerful nation of earth upon it. Gold uncoined has within and of itself all the value it has when minted. Its value is the same in junk or money. [Applause on the Republican side.] The party to which I belong declared in its last national platform in favor of the gold standard. Its opponents contended for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1.

On the issue presented men aligned themselves and fought the fiercest political campaign in our history, and we won. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Duty, honor, and the confidence reposed in us by that mighty army of Democrats, the brain of the party in the North, who gave us their earnest, active support, demand that we write in statute that which we promised to maintain, so that the world may know that until the Republican party is overwhelmed and defeated in both the executive and legislative branches of the Government every dollar the wage-earner receives shall be equal in purchasing power to the best dollar under our flag and of the same value at home and abroad. To this extent I am earnestly in favor of the bill before the House. Whether it is in all other respects the best that could be formulated I am not prepared to say.

Whether the Government should remain in business as a banker it would be idle here and now to discuss.

I consider the pending measure, in some respects the most important that ever came before the American Congress. A failure on our part to say to the world by statute enactment that this people are for the gold standard would be a betrayal of confidence and neglect of duty which might in the chapter of political accidents make it possible for the advocates of cheap money to destroy our national credit, ruin the industries of our country, bankrupt our business men, and deprive the laborer of an opportunity to earn his means of support.

It is not my purpose to enter into an academic discussion of the subject. The solicitude which our friends on the other side of the Chamber profess for the toilers, as they are pleased to call them, has induced me to make some suggestions and to offer what seems to me competent evidence on that question.

I contend that the laborers of this country are for the gold standard, and that wherever they have an opportunity to express their views at the ballot box they vote for it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Their interest to preserve and perpetuate that standard is greater by far than that of all other interests combined. Cheap money, 50-cent dollars, would not only rob them of their accumulations of the past but of the legitimate fruits of their toil in the future as wage-earners.

I desire to say to gentlemen who are wasting their sympathy upon the toilers of the East, and especially to those who in the last Congress exhibited what to me seemed a suppressed joy when there were labor troubles in some localities in that section, that the toilers of New England, unlike those in the South, have the physical, mental, and financial capacity to assert and maintain their rights against any and all with whom they may differ. The toilers own New England, control New England, and legislate for it in their respective States, and the New England Representatives upon this floor are chosen and sent here by them.

Every member from New England on this floor is here by virtue of ballots dropped into the box from fingers hardened and calloused by toil. In New England they have a right to vote, and their votes are counted as cast. [Applause on the Republican side.]

How is it in the South? I wish to place in the RECORD indisputable evidence of the conditions that exist in the two sections of our country for the benefit of the toilers therein. In doing this I will make reference to the first three districts in Massachusetts, and compare and contrast them with certain districts in the South. The population of the First, Second, and Third districts of Massachusetts is 575,732. At the last Congressional election in the First district there were cast for member of Congress 24,820 votes, in the Second district 22,088 votes, in the Third district 22,179 votes. The total vote cast in the three districts was 65,087, and the member elected in each district stands for a dollar worth 100 cents. [Applause.]

I will take, for comparison, the First, Second, and Third districts of Mississippi. Population of the First district, 143,315; votes cast for member of Congress, 2,469. Second district, population 170,512; votes cast for member of Congress, 3,174. Third district, population 184,297; votes cast for member of Congress, 2,441. Total population of the three districts named, 497,124; total votes cast, 8,084, against 65,087 in the three districts in Massachusetts. Nearly as many votes were cast for member of Congress in the three Massachusetts districts named as were declared cast in the seven districts of South Carolina, five districts in Mississippi, three districts in Georgia, and three districts in Louisiana.

In the three New England districts 65,087 votes were cast for member of Congress. In the eighteen Southern districts just referred to only 66,650 votes were declared, and the population of some of the districts in the South is larger by many thousands than that of either of the districts in Massachusetts.

The following are the Southern districts referred to, with the total vote declared cast in each for member of Congress:

SOUTH CAROLINA, POPULATION 1,151,049.

First district	4,579
Second district	4,175
Third district	4,301
Fourth district	4,653
Fifth district	4,230
Sixth district	1,936
Seventh district	4,908
Total vote declared in the seven districts	28,881

MISSISSIPPI.

First district	2,469
Second district	3,174
Third district	2,441
Fourth district	4,653
Seventh district	3,604
Total vote declared in the five districts	16,321

The vote declared in the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth districts of Louisiana was:

Fourth district	6,002
Fifth district	4,328
Sixth district	2,494
Total vote in the three districts	12,824

The vote declared in the Fourth, Fifth, and Tenth districts of Georgia was:

Fourth district	3,247
Fifth district	3,091
Tenth district	2,290
Total vote in the three districts	8,628

The vote in the State of Arkansas makes an interesting exhibit in this respect. It evidences the extent to which the laborers of that State rush to the polls to support those who are to represent them upon this floor for free trade and cheap money.

The First district has a population of 220,261. The present member received 4,103 votes, and was elected, as the Congressional Directory has it, "without opposition." The ratio of votes to the population in that district is 1 to 53.

The Second district has a population of 206,187. The sitting member received 3,415 votes, and was elected "without opposition." Ratio of votes to population, 1 to 63.

The Third district has a population of 190,805. The sitting member received 3,866 votes, and was elected "without opposition." Ratio of votes to population, 1 to 49.

The Fourth district has a population of 147,806. The sitting member received 3,665 votes, and was elected "without opposition." Ratio of votes to population, 1 to 40.

The Sixth district has a population of 160,181. The sitting member received 3,500 votes, and was elected "without opposition." Ratio of votes to population, 1 to 45. That must have been a red-hot campaign. With a population of 925,240, only 18,549 votes were declared cast. [Laughter.] If all the laborers of Arkansas participated in that election, how few their numbers must be in proportion to the total population. There must be great opportunities in that State for a man who is willing to work and does not care to vote. What an Eden for the mugwump. [Laughter.] Where there are so few laborers, all industries must be either infant or post-mortem.

The 7 members from South Carolina, 4 from Mississippi, 3 from Louisiana, and 5 from Arkansas represent a population of 3,963,720. In the 22 districts from which they come there were declared cast for members of Congress 85,153 votes.

The 2 members from New Hampshire represent a population of 376,530. In the districts from which they come on the day they were elected 80,735 votes were cast for members of Congress, only 4,418 less than were declared cast for the 22 members who represent a population of 3,963,720. The laborers vote in New Hampshire. We have neither tramps, dudes, nor mugwumps. [Applause on the Republican side.] In the face of the facts I have recited does anyone believe that the laboring masses have any voice whatever in the selection of the Representatives to this House from the districts in the South which I have mentioned? Do they have any more to do with selecting officials to represent them than the mules that are their daily companions in toil? I fear that their financial condition is but little better than that of the mules.

The price of labor is not regulated by selling it on the auction block, as it formerly was, but from the exhibit in the figures I have quoted I fear they are not permitted to have a voice in the Government under which they live and that they are as impotent politically to-day as when they were slaves.

No people were ever prosperous who deprived the toiler of education and political rights. Those sections of the South to which I have referred have never been visited by prosperity. They are strangers to it and will remain so as long as the toiling masses of those sections are treated as beasts of burden and deprived of their political rights. As I have said, the laborers in New England own New England, control it politically, and legislate as their wisdom dictates in those States. [Applause.]

You charge us with favoritism to the bondholder. Who made the issue of bonds necessary? Patriotism and wise legislation combined made them valuable. We propose that the patriot who is a pensioner and he who contributed funds to equip and support the soldier when in the field shall each receive dollars of equal value—the best known to man. You assume that the bondholder is the great creditor class, and that all who own bonds are wealthy. You err in both cases. The laborers of our land have greater interests as creditors than all other classes combined, both by reason of their accumulated possessions and as perpetual wage-earners. [Applause on the Republican side.] They have $2,000,000,000 due them to-day on deposit in savings banks, nearly as much more in building and loan associations, nearly a billion in mutual-benefit associations, and hundreds upon hundreds of millions in life insurance.

The pensioners have an annuity of nearly one hundred and fifty millions due them annually. The wage-earners will receive more dollars this year for their labor than our entire bonded debt. Your proposition is by the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 to reduce the purchasing power of the dollar to 50 cents, to scale down the value of savings-bank deposits one-half, the widow's insurance and the soldier's pension to 50 cents on the dollar.

Why this divided opinion and contention? I think the answer will generally be found in this, that a community which adopts your policy has nothing to its credit, and that the converse is true, with a community which possesses accumulations respects the rights and cares for the interest of the laboring people. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I will refer to the condition of the people of my own State, who are toilers, who stand for sound money and protective tariff, and compare their condition with that of the people of other States where the free-trade and free-silver, cheap-money sentiment obtains, and where only a comparative few express their wish and evidence their political conviction at the polls. Political parties in New Hampshire had been uncomfortably near an even division for a third of a century, until Bryanism, a libel upon the Democratic party, which had stood for sound money and territorial expansion during its entire history, got possession of the organization of that party at its last national convention. At the election following, McKinley's majority was greater than the vote cast for Bryan.

No single Democrat who had been influential in his party in that State supported Bryan. Pigmies and Populists rattled around in places made vacant by intellectual and political giants. [Laughter.] The old leaders were patriots rather than partisans. National honor and individual integrity were dearer to them than political success to be purchased by sacrificing both.

Posterity will give to that host of men who for principle refused to be led by party nomination the most conspicuous pages in our civil political history, and no pen can ascribe to them praise that was not justly earned by their action.

In 1894 the laboring people of New Hampshire had deposited to their credit in savings banks $73,000,000. The people of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Virginia, Alabama, Louisiana, Texas, Mississippi, Missouri, Arkansas, and Nebraska, eleven States of the sunny South and one of the fertile West, twelve in all, with a population of more than 16,500,000, had in 1894 about $9,000,000 deposited in savings banks to their credit. New Hampshire, with less than 400,000 population, had more than eight times as much as the 16,500,000 raw materialists and Free Silverites in the twelve States named.

The people of Goffstown, a country town in my district with a population of less than 2,000, had $621,000 to their credit in savings banks in 1894. The people of Virginia, 1,600,000 population; Florida, with 400,000; Alabama, with 1,500,000; Texas, with 2,500,000; Missouri, with 2,679,000; Mississippi, with 1,280,000, and Arkansas, with 1,128,000, a total population of 11,087,000, had to their credit in savings banks $587,000. The 2,000 protectionists in Goffstown, N. H., had to their credit in savings banks $43,000 more than the 11,087,000 free traders and raw materialists in the seven States named.

Texas, with a population of 2,500,000, had $301,648 in savings banks. Merrimac, a country town in my district, with a population of 948, had $387,708 in savings banks, $86,060 more than the 2,500,000 people in Texas had. Yet the raw materialists from Texas are endeavoring to teach my constituents in Merrimac how to find prosperity. [Laughter.]

Georgia, with a population of 1,837,353, had in savings banks $749,596. Somersworth, a town in my district, with 6,027 population, had $918,309 in savings banks, $176,713 more than all the people of Georgia. The Georgian resolves himself into a master of finance and lectures my constituents in Somersworth on how they might adopt his methods and become wealthy.

Tennessee, with a population of 1,767,518, had $1,112,491 in savings banks. Rochester, a town in my district, with a population of 7,386, had $1,421,370 in savings banks, $308,879 more than all the people of Tennessee. In the face of these figures the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] is greatly disturbed over the condition of my constituents and solicits them to become raw materialists, and thereby adopt his system of political economy, which was borrowed from the aboriginal Cherokee Indians.

Louisiana, with a population of 1,118,587, had $2,057,845 in savings banks. Portsmouth, in my district, with a population of 9,811, had $2,921,053 in savings banks, $863,208 more than the entire people of Louisiana, and the pig-headed people of Portsmouth refuse to accept the advice of the statesman from Louisiana and march back to the condition which existed in old pod-auger times, the best ever known in Louisiana or that ever will exist under a free-trade policy.

Alabama, with a population of 1,513,000, had, in 1894, $102,347 in savings banks. I had to look some time to find a town in my district whose people were so poor that they had not more than that in savings banks. After considerable searching I found a little agricultural town, Madbury by name, having a population of 364 men, women, and children, who had in the savings banks only $157,770. That was the best I could do; and the 364 people in that little town have $55,423 more in savings banks than the 1,513,000 population of Alabama.

There is an opportunity and field for the raw materialist to do

missionary work. Free traders will find in Madbury a people who can exhibit something more than wind to prove the result of a protective tariff. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Florida, with a population of 400,000, had in savings banks $205,710. Against Florida's population of 400,000 of free traders, as represented in the House, I put the little town of Rye, in my district, with a population of 976 men, women, and children, who are sound-money protectionists and who have to their credit in savings banks $419,233, a sum more than twice as large as that of the 400,000 people of Florida.

I next turn to the State of Virginia, and I had no town or place in my district so small and poor that it had not more money to the credit of its people in savings banks than the 1,655,980 people of Virginia, ruled by free traders, Free Silverites, and raw materialists. I then added 1,289,600 Free Silverites and free traders of Mississippi, then took the 1,128,000 in Arkansas, making a population of 4,073,580 Free Silverites and free traders. Then I looked at Harts Location, the place having the smallest population of any in my district, only 187, and I found that the 187 people in Harts Location, under the shadow of Mount Washington, had $677.20 more to their credit than the 4,458,580 people in the States of Virginia, Mississippi, and Arkansas had in savings banks.

At sunset on that November day in 1896 when the toilers of the land repudiated Bryanism and called McKinley to the Presidential chair, the citizens of New Hampshire, less than 400,000 in number, had to their credit in savings banks four times as many dollars as all the people of all the States that voted for Bryan. And in the city in which I live, that has a population of 60,000, there was on deposit to the credit of laboring men, women, and children more money in savings banks than stood to the credit of all the people of all the States that voted for Bryan.

I have listened to the very able and eloquent speeches of our friends from the South in favor of free trade and free silver, but they have failed to satisfy me that their constituents, and especially the laborers, favor free trade or free silver; and until a vote in that direction at a ratio of more than 1 to 40 or 60 of the population of their districts is in evidence, I shall refuse to believe that they correctly represent a majority of the voters in districts from which they come.

I can not conceive how any wage-earner could ever desire to be paid in 50-cent dollars, unless in despair the hope of ever obtaining a 100-cent dollar had withered and died.

A comparison of the condition of wage-earners in sections where free trade and free silver are contended for the most strenuously with those in other sections who favor a protective tariff and dollars worth each 100 cents, has only strengthened my original conclusion, that a protective tariff and the gold standard have made this nation what it is to-day, the most powerful, wealthy, and prosperous of the nations of earth. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Mr. BINGHAM addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. WEYMOUTH. Mr. Chairman, the district which I have the honor to represent is devoted very largely to manufacturing and business industries of various kinds. As a business man, representing a business district, I am specially interested in this bill. I do not propose at this time to enter into a lengthy argument or go into the details, but simply desire to express my ideas in a general way on its most important feature, viz, "to define and fix the standard of value" and "to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States," commonly known as the gold standard.

While I shall confine my remarks to this feature, I will say now that I am particularly interested in section 5, which relates to the coinage of silver bullion into subsidiary coin instead of silver dollars, in accordance with the present law.

I shall support the bill because I believe that in so doing I represent the nearly unanimous wish of the people of my district and the State of Massachusetts, and because such a vote represents also the desires of the great business community of this country. The State of Massachusetts has always supported, without faltering, the cause of sound money.

She alone among the Eastern States refused to take advantage of the suspension of specie payments during the civil war and paid the interest upon her bonds in gold coin instead of depreciated paper. I speak with deliberation in declaring that the nearly unanimous wish of the people of my district and State is that gold shall be declared by law to be the standard of value. [Applause on the Republican side.] Both the great parties of the State asserted emphatically for the gold standard in the spring of 1896, when delegates were chosen to the respective national conventions.

The Republican State convention held on March 27, 1896, declared that every promise of the United States "must be rigidly kept, and every obligation redeemable in coin must be paid in gold." The Democratic State convention held on April 21, 1896, declared for the maintenance of the "the existing gold standard of value." When the latter declaration was reversed at a later date it was at the expense of driving from the Democratic party nearly half of those who had voted with it four years before. I may say, therefore, without fear of serious contradiction, that three-fourths of the people of Massachusetts will applaud and approve the passage of this bill, and that the Republican party will gain strength by its courageous and intelligent action which is here proposed.

I have said that it was the almost unanimous wish of the business community of this country that the gold standard should be enacted into positive law. It is not, however, a question of class interest or individual benefits which is involved. The fixing of the standard beyond the reach of reasonable or probable assault is for the advantage of every citizen, except perhaps the few who speculate on the fluctuations of the value of money. To the careful business man facing the severity of modern competition, fixity in the money in which he is paid, as well as in the value of the money he has to pay, are among the principal conditions of doing business.

The time has passed when large profits can be realized in any business except a few which deal with patented monopolies. The closer competition becomes, the more necessary it is that every element in the cost of production should be studied and reduced to its lowest limits. If the standard is uncertain, the rental of money will be high, capital will be driven by fear to withhold itself from new enterprises, and the cost of the raw materials of industry will be increased to cover the fluctuations in the currency and the risk of loss. The American business man meeting foreign producers under such conditions would be handicapped from the start. He would either be driven from the field or compelled to pay lower wages than his competitors. Thus labor will be the ultimate sufferer by any uncertainty regarding the standard of value.

Nothing can be so injurious to legitimate business interests, and labor as well, as a fluctuating standard, nothing so beneficial as a standard which places both upon the bed rock of certainty.

If competition is becoming more severe, it is of the greatest importance that the business interests of the United States should be freed from everything which places them at a disadvantage in seeking the markets of the world.

The time has gone by within which we can rely wholly upon the home market. When we face the producers of other countries we can look for no favors from our own laws except such as enable us to produce under the most economical conditions at home. One of these conditions is a money standard which shall permit the business man to base his calculations upon a certainty instead of making allowances for the possible changes in the value of the money in which contracts are settled.

While this bill is not intended to fully meet all the requirements of a perfect currency system, it is, in my opinion, the first step, and a courageous one, toward putting our system upon a sound foundation. I believe that it will soon be necessary for us to consider what amendments can be made in the banking laws to further perfect them. This is not, perhaps, the occasion to discuss all the plans that have been before the Committee on Banking and Currency. Many of these plans will undoubtedly be laid before Congress later on, and I believe the Republican party will face this problem with the same courage and wisdom with which it has faced the question of the standard. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Massachusetts had a system of banking even before the civil war whose benefits commanded the admiration of the country. The Suffolk system, as it was called, had the approval of the most competent students of finance, and may afford a model in some of its parts for the future amendment of our currency laws. We can not permit such a severe stringency in the money market through which we have just passed, or are now passing, to occur again, if this is due to defects in our currency system which are capable of remedy. High discount rates are almost as severe as instability in the standard.

The remedy of the one evil will naturally follow the remedy of the other. The Republican party of my State declared in its last State convention that—

> We look with confidence to the Fifty-sixth Congress for the enactment of measures to so perfect our monetary system that there shall be ample money for the expanding business of the country, and to so arm and guard the Treasury that it can at all times protect the national credit.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that our duty lies plain before us, and realizing this, that although this bill may not be perfect in all its parts, I believe it is such a long step in the right direction that I shall vote for it, if necessary, without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t."

In my opinion there has not been a more important measure before this House during the last quarter of a century, and when it shall have become a law, as I believe it will, with some possible amendments, it will prove a most beneficial one to every American

citizen, irrespective of their station in life, and a great blessing to the country at large, and the pledge made by the Republican party to the American people at the St. Louis convention will have been fulfilled. [Applause.]

Mr. MINOR. Mr. Chairman, I think I can say all I desire to say in about ten minutes. I would not attempt to say anything were it not for the fact that I feel it a duty incumbent upon me to rise here in my place and give voice to the sentiment of the people in the State of Wisconsin. I speak advisedly, sir, when I say "the people," because there is but little difference in the sentiment of those people within the borders of that State on the question of finance. When the ten Representatives on this floor shall have cast their votes in the affirmative on Monday next they will have but loyally represented their constituents, whose commissions they bear.

Mr. Chairman, in the State of Wisconsin we have not been overburdened with populistic wisdom, nor have we been often overwhelmed by Democratic majorities. Therefore we have been compelled to figure out as best we might this great financial problem. But I thank heaven that we have had in our employ for the three years prior to 1897 one of the most efficient teachers that ever was employed by man, and that teacher has left an impress upon the minds of our people that will not be eradicated by all the sophistry that you may bring or financial philosophy that you may produce.

Wisconsin is emphatically for the gold standard. I represent an original Democratic district—one that was made so by a Democratic legislature—but I say here in my place now that he who ever runs upon a platform proclaiming for the free and unlimited coinage of silver in that district will be buried so deep beneath a mountain of ballots that it will take a hundred men a hundred days with picks and shovels to dig him out. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to this House that I support this bill for the following reasons: First, in 1896, when the State of Wisconsin held its convention to elect delegates to attend that great national Republican convention held at St. Louis in 1896, we declared for Mr. William McKinley and the gold standard, and we were the first State in this Union that did do it. Sir, there has been no change of sentiment in that State up to this moment. Its delegates thus elected did support those two propositions, and in the election following in November the State of Wisconsin gave to those two propositions 104,000 majority.

On Monday next, so far as this House has power to do so, we will settle this financial question by proclaiming for the gold standard. The other proposition we will attend to in the next convention, by indorsing this Administration and its policy by a greater majority than we gave in 1896.

My second reason for supporting this bill is, that among the honest people in Wisconsin we have a great number of citizens of German extraction—and if there is a people on earth that are honest, a people who desire to pay their debts, and do pay them without evasion or repudiation in the best money on earth, it is the German citizens of this country—and in deference to their wishes, as well as all others in my State, I shall vote for this bill.

My next reason is this, that the State of Wisconsin never prospered as it is prospering to-day under the beneficent policy of this Republican Administration. Every wheel is turning, every mine is working, every mill is going, our agriculture and our dairy interests are flourishing, and our people ask no change. They are content with present conditions, and they ask only one thing at the hands of their representatives at this juncture, and that is that they place the question of the gold standard beyond the caprice and whims of political parties by enacting a statute so plain for the gold standard that he who runs may read.

There is still another reason why this bill should receive the approval of all fair-minded men, and that is the removal of all doubts arising from political or other considerations as to the stability of our money. So far as lies in our power we should make it known to all our citizens that the dollar invested to-day, this year, or next will be returned to them without being clipped of one jot or tittle of the value it possessed when invested.

Mr. Chairman, I want to refer to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD], whose sentiments in part I indorse. When he said that this was the grandest and greatest country on earth, I am with him. It is. And the grandest people and the most prosperous people, the most intelligent people; and I have no apologies to make to my countrymen because I uphold this gold standard that we may pay our just obligations in the best money under the light of the sun.

Oh, yes; and he spoke, too, of the terrible times in the last year of the Harrison Administration, in 1892–93. I want to say to the gentleman there never had been in this country such a measure of prosperity as there was in 1892 up to the election in November, and then the light went out, and it stayed out. [Laughter.] Sir, the industries of this country were paralyzed, the wheels of industry ceased to revolve, commerce languished, revenues failed, and perhaps he may be right in saying that under these conditions bonds would have to be issued, as they were issued by the Cleveland Administration, to keep this country out of debt and to maintain the credit of our country.

Grover Cleveland did a splendid work for this nation when he stood as a mighty barrier to a horde of people who clamored for free-silver coinage at a ratio of 16 to 1. Yes, he served his country loyally, and when he went out of power he carried with him the respect of honest Republicans and the censure of dishonest Democrats because of his wise financial policy. He did another and even a greater thing for his countrymen; he divided and scattered the Democratic party to the uttermost parts of the earth, and they have never been able to pull themselves together since. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Chairman, he would be put down as a man of more than ordinary self-confidence who could expect at this time to add anything new or instructive to the discussion of the general subject-matter to which this bill relates. I have no hope or expectation of being able to do this myself.

It is my view, however, Mr. Chairman, that in matters upon which great public interests depend and general public feeling is aroused, under the theory of the equality of rights and duties of members on behalf of their constituents in this body, the people of the country have a right to know, and it is the duty of Representatives to enable them to know, not only what are their actions here, but, at times at least, what are the reasons upon which they base their actions.

It is with this view, Mr. Chairman, that, in justice to myself and in deference in particular to the people of my district and State, who occupy a somewhat unique position upon this subject-matter, I desire to submit some very brief observations upon the questions involved in the pending measure.

In voting for this bill, as I shall, I have a right to feel that I shall be acting in accordance with the platform declarations of both political parties in my State.

In 1896, when the agitation upon the currency question along the present lines of thought and division may be said in a certain sense to have begun, the platform of the Republican party of the State of Maryland declared its unequivocal belief in the maintenance of the gold standard, subject only to the limitation of an international agreement for free coinage, which it, however, did not in any sense recommend.

The Democratic State convention, in its platform, which I have before me now, declared just as specifically in favor of what it was pleased to term "the existing gold standard," subject also and only to a similar international agreement, to which it said "the efforts of the Government should be steadily directed."

The Republican party has continued in our State to declare for the gold standard, omitting reference in later years to the matter of international agreement, and the Democratic party has at least made no conflicting declaration to that contained in its platform to which I have just alluded.

The purpose of this bill is to provide for the enactment into law of what has been the settled policy of the Government for more than a quarter of a century.

Assault upon that policy at times within the recent past has been productive of infinite harm to the business interests of the country.

It is now proposed by this bill to effectually protect the policy and the country from danger of such assault by writing upon the statute book a mandate for the preservation of the gold standard and for the payment of all the obligations of the Government in the best money known to the civilized world.

It declares for the maintenance of the parity of all our moneys, and provides the powers and the means and the machinery by which that maintenance can at all times and under all conditions be safeguarded and secured.

It provides against a recurrence of the consequences of what is known as the "endless chain," which will be long and vividly remembered as the parent of panics and kindred conditions that pressed with crushing effect upon the business interests of the country in 1893 and the immediately ensuing years.

It prevents encroachment upon the gold reserve in the Treasury, and forbids the touching of that reserve for other purposes than that of its declared legitimate function of exchange for and redemption of our other moneys.

It severs the connection of the redemption fund with the other ordinary fiscal functions of the Treasury, and makes adequate provision for the preservation and the repletion of this fund under all conditions, and this by direct and mandatory requirements of law instead of the indirect and inferential statements in reference to it found among the provisions now upon the statute book.

A bill that does all these things, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me, in the memory of the sad experiences of a recent past, in the flood of the light and the learning that, amidst the hardships of these experiences, has been poured out upon the country, ought to be sufficient to receive the commendation of the whole American people. This bill does all this, and more.

Of course, in the provisions for the operation of these agencies

some discretion is lodged, and must be lodged, in the Secretary of the Treasury as to the manner and the methods and machinery of their exercise. There can be no law framed with safety in the present condition of our currency system, crude and imperfect as it is through the unwisdom of compromises with principle in deference to a so-called silver sentiment, without a lodgment of discretion in these matters with somebody.

For instance, in line 9 and the following lines on page 4, section 4, of the bill, it said that—

> If at any time the Secretary of the Treasury deems it necessary, in order to maintain the parity and equal value of all the money of the United States, he may, at his discretion, exchange gold coin for any other money issued or coined, etc.

I had thought myself that it would be better to have the words "may at his discretion" left out. Read in the light, however, of the preceding unequivocal requirement and mandate, to redeem and maintain parity, it is but reasonable to assume that the word "may" can fairly be construed as "shall," and that the discretion committed to the Secretary is, as it ought to be, to exercise his judgment as to the fact and the time of the arising of the necessity for the exercise of the power thus given him for the maintenance of the parity as directed.

There is a provision also in the bill under which, as subordinate and ancillary to the purpose "to maintain the gold reserve," it is understood that greenbacks may be transferred to the ordinary fiscal departments of the Treasury, and, it is assumed, thereafter may be paid out in meeting the ordinary expenditures of the Government, if found to be so necessary in the discretion of the Secretary.

This is found on page 3, section 4, of the bill, beginning at line 12, wherein it is said that "for this purpose," meaning for the purpose just before recited, "to maintain the gold reserve," "he may, from time to time, transfer to such fund any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, or" (conversely), "he may exchange any of the funds in the division of issue and redemption for other funds which may be in the general fund of the Treasury." The assumption is, of course, that if this is done, an equivalent fund, and a more suitable and more utilizable fund, is placed into the redemption fund "in exchange" for the greenbacks, thus, and in pursuance of the purposes indicated, sent over to the general fiscal side of the Treasury, to be used, it may be assumed, if the Secretary sees fit, in the discharge of the ordinary obligations of the Government.

Under the act of 1878 the greenbacks, when redeemed, were compelled to be reissued.

Under this bill the compulsion to reissue them in any event is removed. The necessity to issue them is, in my judgment, removed. The permission to reissue them will, in my judgment, in the near future be removed, and removed absolutely except only in exchange for gold coin, which is the general requirement of this bill, departed from only in the exceptional case and under the circumstances in which, in the discretion given to the Secretary, they are permitted to be thus "exchanged" for, and for the more effective procurement of, funds to build up and keep up the redemption fund.

The sum and substance of these provisions, committing discretion to the Secretary as to the mode and manner and time of necessity for the exercise of these agencies referred to, tend to show that after all there is just one contingency in which there may be danger to the stability and permanence of the policy which we are now upbuilding, and that is, of course, through the instrumentality of a Secretary of the Treasury, who may be so hostile as to disregard plainly prescribed duty in the administration of the law and the spirit of the law which we are now seeking to enact for the guidance of the financial branch of the Government.

It is in the power of the people always, however, to see to it that no such Secretary shall be placed in charge of that Department.

Gentlemen talk about contraction as one of the consequences of this bill, and seek to find it in the provision for the redemption of greenbacks and other paper money, and their retention in the Treasury unless reissued again for gold, which is the general requirement of the bill as to this form of our currency.

There is no contraction in the bill arising from such cause or any other cause. For every dollar that goes into the Treasury for this purpose as good a dollar, or a better dollar, comes out and goes into circulation. Placing the currency of the country upon a safe, sound, and certain basis does not bring contraction. It rather brings confidence and security, the very essentials of activity of capital, and it is the activity of capital in circulation in the varied and myriad arteries of trade and commerce that brings business and brings investment and enterprise that build up and make prosperity in the land.

The alternative proposition to the policy embodied in this bill, in so far as the line of argument presented by the opposition indicates any affirmative proposition at all, is the old, familiar doctrine of the so-called double standard, or the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, "without the aid or consent of any other nation on the face of the earth."

The American people have heard of that doctrine before. They have seen and felt the blight and bane of its threatened influence in other days.

It would seem to me that the mere suggestion of the return of this policy ought to be a conceded absurdity in this day and under the bettered conditions which obtain in this country at this time.

In strictness and propriety of thought there is no such thing as a double standard. The idea, when analytically considered, is incapable of comprehension; the expression is a solecism in the language of finance. There can not rationally be more than one standard of values, one basis for the adjustment and measurement and comparison of other values, as there certainly can not be more than one unit of value.

There can be the use of two metals, the one secured by, measured by, and interchangeable with the basic and the standard metal, as under the present law and the state of the law as contemplated after the passage of this bill.

There can be, on the other hand, that which is advocated by the Populistic elements of our population as free coinage, under which, by an arbitrary ratio fixed by law, it is attempted to make two metals of unequal value circulate upon a parity and equality of purchasing power; but it has never been and never can be a success in practice.

The cheaper metal, under the operation of an unvarying monetary law, always drives the better metal from the field.

There has never been for any appreciable period of time a circulation side by side of both of these metals upon a parity at any ratio the law could fix upon, even when the commercial values of the two metals at such ratio were approximately equal and when corresponding ratios obtained by law in nearly every country in Europe; and it seems to me to be almost the insanity of delusion to suppose that the United States now, acting alone, could restore free coinage when the market value of gold is much more than 100 per cent greater than silver at the ratio proposed and free coinage is suspended in all the civilized countries of the world.

This placing of the currency system of the country upon a gold basis is needed for all elements of business and business people, but most of all for that great majority of the people of the country made up of the laboring class and of the men of moderate means.

It is not vouchsafed to these to give attention to the intricacies and subtleties of finance; but in times of great fluctuations of values and attendant want of confidence and insecurity in investment and enterprise, due to uncertain and unstable financial systems, it is that class of people that always suffers the first and the last and the longest and the most.

It is found to be in accord with the lessons of experience and of history that the articles of ordinary necessity in life in such periods are the first to go up and the last to come down. It is for the simple reason that they must be had and can not be dispensed with, and that those who depend upon them, to the extent that they can get them at all must pay for them at just such prices as those who control them and profit in them shall prescribe.

The laborer can not hoard his labor and wait for a falling market for goods, because in that waiting come hunger and want. He can not corner his labor and wait for a rising market for it, because in that waiting also come hunger and want to him and those dependent upon him for sustenance and support.

The capitalist can protect himself against appreciable loss, though he may not enter upon new fields for gain; he can hoard his money; he can cease investment; he can, in manifold ways not vouchsafed to the ranks of toil, guard against and weaken the blow of what seems to him to be hurtful financial tendencies.

The provisions of the bill relating to banking have for their object the encouragement of circulation and the expansion of the currency, in respone to the growing demands of business and the commercial and industrial development of the country.

It is their purpose to furnish more thorough and better facilities for the establishment of banks in small towns in the rural sections of the country, where there is most need of greater freedom and greater volume and activity of a safe and healthy circulating medium.

It has been said that the bill in this particular does not provide for elasticity of currency. It does not do all in that line, in my judgment, that might be done, but it does much that will contribute to this end.

It removes the tax upon circulation, which is a distinct aid and incentive to the quantum of circulation. It places the tax upon the franchise of the banks as measured by their property and profits. The chief business of the wealthier banks is in their deposits. The chief business of the smaller banks is in their circulation; and this is also the chief instrumentality of their benefit to the people in the localities where they exist. It permits the issue of their notes by the banks to the par value of the bonds

upon which they are predicated and by which they are secured, giving a capacity for a 10 per cent enlargement of the amount they are now allowed to issue. The placing of the tax upon the franchise removes what now operates as a hindrance to the circulation of their own notes by the city banks, and equalizes and fairly apportions the burdens in the way of taxation among the smaller and the wealthier banks.

Elasticity in its nature is a composite quality of action, embracing both the power to contract and the power to expand.

Through the operation of the agencies enumerated, it is apparent that the bill does give the power to expand. I opine that that is the principal function to be desired. The power to contract can well be intrusted to take care of itself. Money does not go out and stay out in circulation where there is no need for it and where there are not remunerative returns for it. It is to be hoped that under the beneficent agencies of business development that are at least aided and encouraged by this bill, and this portion of it, and under the splendid and all-prevailing prosperity that at this day prevails in the country, expansion will be the observable manifestation of the volume of currency in use, and that no one need go worrying himself about the drawing in or the contracting phase of what is called elasticity of money.

It has been said that these banking provisions have a tendency to create trusts.

I do not think that this charge can with fairness be laid to the operations of this bill.

That does not create trusts which multiplies and distributes the opportunities for business, whether it be the banking business or any other line of enterprise. It is the very agency which breaks up and prevents the formation of trusts, in that it provides an obstacle to the concentration of money in the chief money centers in the large cities of the country, which has heretofore operated with such detriment to the smaller towns and the agricultural interests and communities.

It has been said, by way of criticism of this bill, that it was a caucus measure.

So was the act for the resumption of specie payments, that great work in which there was much more difficulty to be met and overcome—in the period between the years of 1875 and 1879—than any which now confronts or threatens us in the accomplishment of the objects of this bill in these days, not of panic, but of plenty, not of paralysis, but of prosperity, in which we set about here to supplement and make fast the fruits of resumption in this measure, which, in my judgment, will stand out in the future, alongside of the resumption act, as one of the great landmarks in the financial history of this nation since the war.

There can be no steps backward now in this matter of financial reform. The Republican party has given the people the promise of that which is contained in this bill. It is well for it and the country, whether as the result of caucus action or otherwise, that it stands to-day as a unit, for the first time for a number of years with a majority in both Houses in favor of the principles upon which it is based, in placing upon the statute book this measure, in itself a substantive and substantial work of great good and the framework of yet further structures in the line of financial upbuilding that the future holds in store for this country if the policies that now guide it shall be permitted to continue and hold sway.

The State of Maryland, I want to say in conclusion, in my judgment, is almost a unit in favor of the principle and the essential features of this bill, and I hope, sir, that without regard to politics, in obedience to the higher interest of the people, which rests above party, the Representatives of that State will stand as a unit for this bill, and thus reflect here the best sentiment of the people of a State in which I do not hesitate to say that in proportion to her population, in the enjoyment now and in alignment with the agencies of the splendid progress of this land, under the leadership of our great commercial metropolis of Baltimore, there is more of independence in politics and more of earnest, honest sound-money sentiment than in any other State in this country.

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to vote for this bill. In coming to this determination I think it is due that I should state briefly the reasons which have actuated me. One of my colleagues on this side of the House has wondered at a man being called a "gold Democrat." I assure him there are a great many "gold Democrats" in the part of the country I come from, and the number is increasing. Coming as I do from the great city of New York, I am fully alive to the necessity of having a stable currency, fixed by law. The present bill, while not perfect, does serve the great purpose of enacting into law the recognized fact that the gold dollar is already our standard of value.

The interests of the country require that all our people—the employer and employee, the creditor and the debtor—should know beyond peradventure the meaning of the word "dollar" in their contracts. I believe the best way to accomplish this is to pass a law making gold the legal standard of value. In voting for this measure I do not wish to be understood as indorsing all its features, but I do feel that it is an improvement upon the present conditions.

The power of the President and his financial advisers to change at will from a gold dollar to a silver dollar intrinsically worth only about one-half as much is sufficient reason, even if no other existed, for the enactment of this law. Without wishing to question the patriotism or sagacity of President McKinley, I do submit that this power should not be left in the hands of any one man. In less than a year our two great parties must go before the country in a Presidential contest.

It is due the people that this matter should be so far settled that conservative men may be enabled to carry on their business without fear of a radical change in their currency, followed, as it certainly would be, by unnecessary disturbances and panics.

I believe the removal of the question of our money standard from politics, for some years, at least, will enable the people to pass upon the other and real issues fairly and squarely, and will, I believe, much improve the chances of success of the Democratic party.

The tyrannical rule which now obtains in this House prevents amendment of the bill. It is therefore necessary to vote on it as a whole. I trust that such amendments as may be made in the Senate or in conference will be in the nature of improvement. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, a measure of such great importance and far-reaching in its effects as the one now before this House should have been referred to a committee and discussed section by section before them, then reported and ample time given for every member on the floor, after consultation with his constituents, if he desired, to express his and their views.

This would have been in accordance with the genius of our institutions and in conformity to the usages that prevailed in the earlier days of this Republic. But the dominant party here has chosen to present this banker's bill and so limit discussion that a majority of the members on both sides can only obtain five or ten minutes to present their views. We take it that they feared dissension in their own ranks, for we know they were unable to agree to any bill in the Fifty-fifth Congress. Mr. Walker, the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, admitted on this floor that not one of his colleagues in the committee agreed with him.

What does this haste indicate? If the conditions are as favorable as Republican speeches declare, and prosperity is here to stay, as argued every hour by the Republicans on this floor, what can be the necessity for so drastic a measure? Why hurry it through under caucus rule with whip and spur? Do the New York bankers feel uneasy at their low reserves? Are they anticipating another application to the Treasury for the interest not yet matured, or are they fully conscious of the fact that with the revival of business in many lines of trade and commerce there is not sufficient amount of money in this community to do its business? Are they not calculating that with the opportunities afforded under the provisions of this bill, to retire the greenbacks and Treasury notes and redeem the silver dollars in gold, that they will reap a harvest by issuing their own notes to the par value of their bonds, letting them fill the vacuum created by the impounded greenbacks and the retired silver certificates?

I am aware, Mr. Chairman, that we can only enter our protest and register our vote against this whole scheme of banking that was foisted on this country during the civil war and has been the fruitful source of loss and suffering to many sections of this country and retarded the growth and development of the Southern States. I shall speak my honest convictions on this question, not with a view to enlightening any member on this floor or changing a single vote here, but for the purpose of voicing the views of a large majority of the voters of my district and entering an earnest protest against such hasty and vicious and destructive legislation.

Through the operations of this bill the bankers propose to obtain absolute control of the currency system of the United States. It is the fight of 1836 over again minus a Jackson to stand for the rights of the people. We will soon realize the truth of Jefferson's declaration to John Taylor in 1816:

> I sincerely believe with you that banking establishments are more dangerous than standing armies.

The old United States Bank was destroyed by Jackson's attack, and Benton said in the Senate:

> The tigress has been driven from her lair, but she has not been killed; she will come forth again surrounded by all her whelps.

We see her to-day, and her whelps number nearly 4,000. They are bold, earnest, and well organized.

I could easily fill whole pages with their wise utterances, forecasting the future and drawing on their vivid imaginations as they discern unutterable woes and sweeping disasters should we be strong and wise enough to rehabilitate silver, while predicting only good and improving conditions from the issuance by the banks of twice as much token money as free coinage could possibly bestow.

The president of the New York State Bankers' Association said, in April, 1895:

The politician, high or low, who to-day turns from the straight course of sound money and the gold standard stabs dead, once for all, his every chance for political success.

The charter of the old United States Bank was a small matter compared with this stupendous scheme. Our whole currency system is to be under the control of the banks. We are to be turned over, body and soul, to the tender mercies of a system that has been the fruitful source of trouble from the very foundation of this Government.

The letters of Jefferson are full and explicit. Writing to President Adams, in 1814, he said:

I have ever opposed money of banks; not of those discounting for cash, but of those foisting their own paper in circulation and thus banishing our cash. My zeal against those institutions was so warm and open at the establishment of the Bank of the United States that I was derided as a maniac by the tribe of bank mongers who were seeking to filch from the public, thus swindling on barren gains. But the errors of that day can not be recalled. The evils they have engendered are now upon us, and how are we to get out of them? Shall we build an altar to the old paper money of the Revolution, which ruined individuals but saved the Republic, and burn on that all the bank charters, present and future, and their notes with them? For these are to ruin both Republic and individuals.

He further said:

This institution [national bank] is one of the most deadly hostility existing against the principles and form of our Constitution. * * * Ought we, then, to give further growth to an institution so powerful, so hostile? * * * Now, while we are strong, it is the greatest duty we owe to the safety of our Constitution to bring this powerful enemy to a perfect subordination under its authorities. The first measure would be to reduce them to an equal footing with other banks as to the favors of the Government.

President Jackson, in his message of December 2, 1834, used this language:

Events have satisfied my mind, and I think the minds of the American people, that the mischiefs and dangers which flow from a national bank far overbalance all its advantages. The bold effort the present bank has made to control the Government, the distress it has wantonly produced, the violence of which it has been the occasion in one of our cities, famed for its observance of law and order, are but premonitions of the fate which awaits the American people should they be deluded into a perpetuation of this institution or the establishment of another like it. It is fervently hoped that thus admonished those who have heretofore favored the establishment of a substitute for the present bank will be induced to abandon it, as it is evidently better to incur any inconvenience that may be reasonably expected than to concentrate the whole money power of the Republic in any form whatsoever or under any restrictions.

Every student of American history knows that this banking question has been a source of inconvenience and mischief to the people from the days of Alexander Hamilton, our first Secretary of the Treasury, to the present time, and every patriot who contemplates the proposed workings of the bill under discussion knows that it is a very Pandora box of evils and prays for the time to come, as it will one day, when the outraged and wronged citizens of this Republic will rise in their might, and through the regular channel of legislation right the great wrong. Hamilton had little faith in democratic institutions. In the debates of the constitutional convention he said:

I believe the British Government forms the best model the world has ever produced. All communities divide themselves into the few and the many. The first are the rich and the well born, the other the mass of the people.

Hamilton was the originator of the first Bank of the United States, chartered with a capital of $10,000,000.

When the original States framed the Constitution they turned over to the Federal Government the power of issuing money. The States were then prohibited from coining money or making anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts.

Congress was empowered to borrow money on the credit of the United States, and surely the right to issue certificates of indebtedness was implied in the compact. Although a proposition to vest the Government with power to issue "bills of credit" was defeated, it was at the same time expressly declared that in case of war or any other great national requirements the Government could issue acknowledgments of value received, redeemable in taxes. This is the constitutional basis of our Treasury note as explained by John C. Calhoun, advocated by Jefferson and Jackson, and urged by John Tyler, of Virginia, in his third message to Congress.

The second section of the bill, Mr. Chairman, when enacted into law will be a disgrace and a crime, insomuch as it alters the contract and adds another burden to the long list of outrages perpetrated by the Republican party upon a patient and long-suffering people. To change a contract has always been regarded as a crime.

The nations of antiquity legislated against this. Savages even have been known to cry out against tampering with a pledge or promise. They restrain their animal instincts after tasting salt with their enemies. When an individual alters a note and writes in it more or less than the promise to pay it is called a forgery, and the offender is sent to prison. On this point I make no apology for quoting from one of the foremost writers of our country, who can not be accused of partisanship or self-interest, John Clark Ridpath says on the subject:

The contract is sacred and must be fulfilled, else there is an end of the social compact. What, therefore, shall we say of the fraudulent and covert alteration of all the contracts by changing the units in which such contracts are to be filled, substituting by national authority a new unit or counter, worth more than three times the unit or counter agreed upon and promised? Such a process is, as Lincoln declared it to be, a heinous crime against the people, a sin against mankind. For a long time the subtle work of extending and transforming the bond and at the same time of raising the value of the dollar of payment was so easily and noiselessly effected that the people did not awake to the realization of the thing done until it was done. The class in whose interest the various changes have been made have been able to coddle some, to hoodwink others, to corrupt many, and to terrorize a multitude. We have seen those who have been aroused to the pitch of denouncing and exposing the giant fraud of the century turn about and decry as repudiators, enemies of the national credit, and disturbers of interests of the nation the true friends of public honesty and good faith among men. At least two Secretaries of the Treasury have exhibited to mankind that species of tergiversation which in the administration of high office can hardly be distinguished from treason to the human race.

It is well known that the bonded debt of this country was purchased in time of war with the depreciated greenback. It is well understood that the first issue of sixty millions was receivable for "duties on imports," and was constituted lawful money and legal tender. These notes were as good as coin during the whole war, and at one time were at a premium in gold. This was the kind of money advocated by Jefferson and Jackson and Calhoun and Tyler—to supplement gold and silver. The bankers of Boston and New York and Philadelphia, seeing that their craft was in danger, besieged Congress, as their antitypes through the gold-bug Atlantic City bill are now doing, and secured the exception clauses that you see on the greenback.

These notes, not receivable for import duties and payment of interest on the public debt, were soon depreciated. The demand for coin had been created. Starting at par with coin in January, 1862, it took a dollar and thirty-seven cents to buy a dollar before the end of the year. Before the end of the war it took $285 to pay for $100 in metal. Thus the bonds were sold as low as $35 on the hundred, to be paid at their full face with high interest. The next move was to pass the credit-strengthening act, by which the interest on the bonds was payable in coin. Then came the interpretation of coin to mean gold and the action of Secretaries Foster and Carlisle, so often referred to and so well understood. The former was the first to interpret coin to mean gold and opened the door and invited these bondholders to come in and claim gold. Then Mr. Carlisle, notwithstanding his utterances in 1878, followed the example of Mr. Foster.

It is clearly within the right of the United States to pay these bonds, now amounting to $1,047,365,130, in coin of the standard value of the United States on July 14, 1870. This is the money of the contract, and no harm is done the creditor. There can be no greater injustice done a debtor than to extract from him a dearer dollar than the one denominated in the bond. Now, this is what the bill under consideration proposes to do, and this is what it will do as soon as enacted into law. Not only so, but under this law every private debt is to be discharged in gold.

Every branch of business and every form of obligation is to conform to this law. Every individual man who has purchased anything with deferred payment will stagger along under the ever-growing burden of his debt until, crushed to the earth, he will, bewildered and dazed, wonder whence came the blow that felled him. We witnessed this after 1873; we saw it in all its horror after 1893.

The English farmers and producers had a like experience in 1816; and if you will glance at the pages of her financial history, you will see a picture of distress and suffering such as you are now preparing for large numbers of your own citizens. If the blow could fall on the heads of the authors and perpetrators and supporters of this crime instead of the innocent victims of their selfishness and greed, we might look on with indifference and pity.

That the great law of compensation will follow no man can doubt. In time—it may be long or short—these covenant breakers and iconoclasts will destroy this temple of liberty and find themselves buried beneath its ruins. [Applause.]

THE GREENBACK TO BE RETIRED.

Under this act the Treasury note is to be paid in gold and not reissued save for gold. Thus $346,000,000 of legal-tender money, except for duties on imports and interest, is to be wiped out of existence.

How much better for our whole country it would be were these greenbacks called in and the exception clauses stricken out and then reissued as legal-tender money.

Let us look at this question in the light of law, experience, and common sense. The Federal Government is denied the right under the Constitution to emit bills of credit, and the States are prohibited from doing the same. What right has either to authorize a corporation to exercise a power they are prohibited from exercising themselves? Jefferson opposed Hamilton's bank; so did Madison. It was declared "unconstitutional and anti-American."

But there has never been coin enough in this country to represent the transfers of property; hence the necessity for supplementing with paper money. Who shall issue it? All governments have exercised this sovereign power and do so to-day. Why should the United States delegate this authority to private corporations who will not be able to control the volume and will be tempted by natural selfishness to contract or expand the issues as their interests would be subserved?

An intelligent banker in Virginia asked me several months ago how, in my opinion, this whole contention would end. I replied that no man could tell, but I hoped it would end in the issuance of all paper money by the Government and all banking being done—like other business—on private account. He said:

This seems probable now.

He felt, as so many do, that the bankers will be tempted to abuse the authority given under this act. While in moral qualities fully equal to our best citizens, they are not exempt from the selfishness that attaches to human nature.

We know that many of these gentlemen are patriotic and given to charity and good works and that some of them are even opposed to this bill, seeing that it will bear heavily upon the farmers of the country, who are prohibited from borrowing on their landed estates. To these we say, "You are not included in the list of economical and political sinners who have aided and abetted in framing and passing this bankers' bill." We say to you, as said a gentleman sitting by a young lady in church who appeared deeply moved by the minister's words:

Fair maid, you need not take the hint,
Nor idle texts pursue;
'Twas only sinners that he meant,
Not angels, such as you.

[Laughter.]

With this bill about to become a law the prospect is in the future, certainly, but with the changing attitude of the Republican party on all these questions, who can tell? Several years ago they were for the coinage of both metals. We might easily quote from many of the leading men in proof of this, and he whose name "leads all the rest" said in this House June 24, 1890:

I am for the largest use of silver in the currency of the country. I would not dishonor it. I would give it equal credit and honor with gold. I would make no discrimination. I would use both metals as money and discredit neither. I want the double standard.

He also voted for the original Bland Act and for the Bland-Allison Act. In the President's letter of acceptance, speaking of the Republican party, he says:

It has inaugurated no new policy. It will keep in circulation, and as good as gold, all the silver and paper money now included in the currency of the country.

In striking contrast with this language and in keeping with the changing attitude of his party on this question, we find in his message sent to us a few days ago the following:

In this connection I repeat my former recommendation that a portion of the gold holdings shall be placed in a trust fund from which greenbacks shall be redeemed upon presentation, but when once redeemed shall not thereafter be paid out except for gold.

The Republican platform of 1896 declared for international bimetallism. Indeed, it is safe to assume that it could not have carried the election had that declaration been left out. The history of the commission sent to Europe in the interest of bimetallism and the celebrated banquet in New York City, where the President committed his Administration unequivocally to the gold standard, is familiar to everyone.

The speeches, few and cautious, made on the Republican side during the Fifty-fifth Congress touching the gold standard are in striking contrast with those being made here every day on this subject. It is an interesting study to watch the course of our opponents upon this question and see how they have glided from one position to another until they have planted their feet, without disguise, upon this Atlantic City bill. Nothing more aptly describes their shifting attitude than the oft-quoted lines of Alexander Pope:

Vice is a monster of so frightful mien,
As to be hated needs but to be seen;
Yet seen too oft, familiar with her face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace.

[Applause.]

Do our opponents expect to quiet this agitation of the money question and put in the background the imperishable principles of the Chicago platform by enacting into law this selfish and ill-advised measure?

They need not lay any such flattering unction to their souls. The fight between the banks and the people will continue even after the gold standard has been firmly established.

The campaign of 1900 will be waged with earnestness born in a conviction of the right and stimulated by an enthusiasm not surpassed by 1896.

The question of paper money issued by Government instead of banks will be emphasized as it has never been before.

The power to issue money is a sovereign power and can not be delegated to banks. The States are incompetent to declare what is money or to regulate its value.

The power to determine what shall be lawful money and a legal tender is, in its nature and of necessity, a governmental power. It is in all countries exercised by the Government. (Supreme Court in Hepburn *vs.* Greswold, 8 Wall., 615.)

The various legal-tender decisions of the Supreme Court are along this line. Until the Republican party shall secure a court that will reverse these decisions, they have no legal warrant for retiring our Treasury notes and substituting bank paper.

We are familiar with all the bankers say about the issuance of money by the Government. They call this fiat money, while their notes issued on Government bonds is genuine money. What stands behind the bonds? The credit of the Government and power to tax. What behind the Treasury notes? The same power. Is the creature stronger than the creator? Why should the wealth producers of the country be taxed to pay the interest and principal on these constantly appreciating obligations of the Government? This bill will cause a rise in the bonds and impose further burdens upon the people.

The increased demand for gold in this and other countries will produce falling prices and fasten industrial slavery here as it has done elsewhere. But our opponents say the gold output increases. This is their only hope. In 1896 they contended that we had sufficient money—that confidence, aided by tariff duties, would bring prosperity. Now they admit that prosperity has come through increased volume of currency, and have said in their speeches on this floor that nearly $400,000,000 have been added to the circulating medium. I contend, Mr. Chairman, that present prosperity in certain lines and some sections is positive proof of the correctness of our contention in 1896.

The expenditure of large sums of money during a state of war has always created a demand for materials of every kind and brought prosperity to the successful side.

I need not consume time in discussing a question so plain, nor will I now dwell upon the other side of this question—the dire evils of returning hastily to a specie basis after any long protracted war. The conditions in England after 1816 and this country for the past quarter of a century show the ruinous policy of such a course.

Where is the gold to come from that will be needed to carry out the provisions of this bill? When the Secretary of the Treasury exercises this unusual and unprecedented authority to sell gold bonds—as he will be forced to do—he will find himself in the hands of the gold syndicates of the world and in sharp competition with every nation in Europe.

We understand that the gold in the Klondike is fast being exhausted, that no large deposits have been recently found in Alaska. We know that the South Africa mines are cut off by a reckless and destructive war and England will soon be raising her rates of interest and calling on America, presenting her loans, to be settled in gold.

When we bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, that the legal-tender money of this country, amounting to a billion of dollars, is to be redeemed in gold, and bank notes—not a legal tender—are to take the place, and thus every interest in this country is to be subservient to and at the mercy of the heartless and soulless corporations, we feel that this dominant party here is about to add another to the long list of political crimes with which they have stained the pages of our history.

Knowing that harm will surely come to plague the inventor, we feel satisfied that an outraged and indignant public sentiment will hurl this party from power and return here the friends of the people and the supporters of human rights. No man, unless his soul is warped by the love of a dollar, or his conscience quieted by his direct interests in stocks and bonds, or his party spirit stronger than his love of country and humanity, can approve of and desire such a measure as this.

It is not only in direct violation of our Constitution and opposed to the spirit of our Bill of Rights, not only condemned by men like Jefferson, Jackson, Calhoun, and Tyler, but it is framed in great part and advocated by those who are to be the chief beneficiaries under its operations. The people are denied the right to pass upon its merits, and the party with whose votes it will become a law were sent here instructed for international bimetallism. When you return to your betrayed and wronged constituents you will fall under their condemnation. Many a member across the aisle will sign his political death warrant when he votes for this bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The producers in this country are the men who will suffer most from the operations of this bill. Forty-six per cent of these are farmers, while nearly everything they buy has enhanced in price, owing to the conditions we have referred to. Nearly every article they sell is lower now than when Mr. McKinley was elected. Wheat is 20 cents lower; cotton is one-half cent lower than in 1896. So with many other products. This English financial system, Mr. Chairman, may, in case commotions and wars in Europe do not

drain away our gold, give prosperity to certain classes of our population—the stockjobbers, the bankers, and some lines of trade and manufactures—but the laborers, the artisans, the farmers, some 75 per cent of our people, will suffer the same privations and hardships that like conditions have produced in England and Ireland. This conflict is world-wide, and strong advocates of the right are in England and Germany as well as the United States.

The money power rules the kingdoms of the world. Its fetters bind the land of the Pharaohs. The blood of slaughtered Armenians cry from the ground against it. Ireland suffers and pleads and struggles in its grasp. India lies prostrate at its feet. And this "land of the free and home of the brave" sees it to-day, encouraging trusts and combines, fostering great railroad monopolies, surrendering to alien owners the right to public domain, setting aside the plain mandates of our written Constitution, ignoring a law of Congress plain to the ordinary mind, and ending in one monster monopoly—the placing of the lifeblood of the nation in the hands of a chosen few. [Applause.]

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, the scope which discussion of this bill has taken on this side of the House renders its further general discussion unnecessary.

It has brought forth on this side of the House some of the ablest, most comprehensive, and most exhaustive speeches ever delivered in this Chamber. A keynote has been struck which will echo and reecho with, in my opinion, constantly increasing force among the people of moderate means until the great battle of ballots in November of next year.

In the campaign of 1898 in the State of Illinois, on the issue of the free coinage of both gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, the Democrats doubled their representation in this Chamber, increasing from 4 to 8, and I desire to state that that increase was not made at the sacrifice of principle or by trimming or hedging.

In the event of the passage of the bill now under consideration I predict that the number sitting on this side of the House from the great agricultural and corn-growing State of Illinois will be materially increased.

I am pleased to note that our Republican friends, whether from conviction or the pressure of party caucus I will not now discuss, have unequivocably committed themselves to the single gold standard of money. We, at least of the central part of the Union, propose, from now until the election in November next, to keep this fact before the agriculturists and debtor class.

The participation of our Republican friends in this debate has eliminated from the campaign of 1900 the fast-and-loose policy of that party in 1896. You have forced this bill, this early in the session, before Congress for consideration, and we propose to hold you to every word spoken in debate in support of this bill.

We can not misstate our Republican friends, and would not if we could, as to their position on this bill.

There was an attempt on the part of the Republicans in the campaign of 1896 to make it appear that the Democratic party was opposed to and the enemy of men of means, and opposed to banks and capital.

I am satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that I voice the sentiments of this side of the House when I say that we as Democrats are not opposed to banks, either national, State, or private, or to capitalized corporations possessed of fully paid-up capital and operated for legitimate purposes, so long as those banks confine themselves to receiving money on deposit, and loaning it at not more than legal interest, subject to strict inspection and supervision.

We as Democrats, however, Mr. Chairman, are opposed to the issue of money, either paper or metal, by banks, either national, State, or private, and believe that to be a function belonging solely to the Federal Government and that the Government should not relinquish that attribute of sovereignty to any individual or corporation.

The national banks, as institutions or corporations, have the power under this bill of issuing circulation up to the par value of the bonds they hold.

You will note, however, that no bank is compelled to have more than one-fourth of its capital in bonds, while those of over $150,000 capital, even though their capital be one, two, three, five, or ten millions, are only compelled to take out circulation on $50,000 of bonds. This section permits national banks, to a large extent, to control the volume of circulation, and especially does it permit the utmost latitude of circulation on the part of banks having capitals running into the millions, thus allowing the large banks, in the interests of speculation, to either take out fifty thousand dollars of circulation or increase their circulation to the full amount of their capital.

I do not believe there is a person on this floor who believes that the larger banks of the East will have the welfare of the farmers of the West at heart in deciding the amount of circulation they will take out. If members on this floor from the West can not now see that this is class legislation of the worst sort, I believe that they will be made to see that it is by the voters next November.

To that extent and to that extent only are we opposed to banks. Keep them in proper bounds, and we will view them as favorably as any other legitimate commercial enterprise.

The legislation sought to be enacted by this bill in regard to national banks is, in my opinion, strictly class, and therefore un-American and dangerous. I view with extreme jealousy and distrust any legislation clothing any corporation with governmental functions.

The strictly class features of this bill are made still more evident by analyzing a part of its second section.

The only object of this bill, as set forth specifically, in terms in its title, is "To define and fix the standard of value, and to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States."

That is done by its first section. That this bill is in the interests of the holders of Government interest-bearing obligations as well as of the national banks is observable from the slightest inspection of its second section.

The effect of making, as does this section, United States interest-bearing bonds on their face payable in coin, payable in gold, is most certainly in the interest of the holders of such obligations.

If that step was necessary to bring those obligations to par or keep them at par, then such facts might be urged as reasons for such legislation. But, Mr. Chairman, those obligations, payable by their terms in coin, now command a premium, and that reason can not, therefore, be urged.

The committee in the report accompanying this bill does not attempt to show that such an enactment is necessary to the establishment or maintenance of the single gold standard. In the absence of such attempted proof, and with all United States interest-bearing obligations commanding a premium, the inevitable and only conclusion is that it is for the sole benefit of the holders of such obligations, and not to maintain the parity of all forms of money.

I submit that the framers of this bill should show to this House how changing the relations between debtor and creditor in regard to obligations antedating this bill serves to maintain the parity of all forms of money.

We on this side of the Chamber stand for and are in favor of sound money. We stand for gold and we stand for silver and we favor the free coinage of both as Constitution money, and we favor such an issue of money on the part of this Government in addition to the coinage of both gold and silver—and without the intervention of the national banks—as will bring the per capita circulation of this nation up to its business requirements.

This bill, as a piece of class legislation, stands, Mr. Chairman, without a peer, and as a monument to corporate greed without a rival. I raise my voice in opposition to it, not because I am not willing the opposition should have the opportunity to commit itself to it and the infamous provisions it contains, but because the district which I represent more than sustains me in my unfaltering opposition to this narrow piece of legislation. It affords me great pleasure to know that I will have an opportunity to record my vote against it. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ROBINSON of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, so little time has been allotted to me that I will not attempt while upon this floor to make any logical argument upon the merits of the measure now pending before the House; but I desire to reply briefly to some of the reflections made upon the State of Nebraska, which I have the honor in part to represent, and upon the great leader of Democracy, whom we have the honor to claim as our citizen.

A pet theme with some of the newly-fledged orators upon the other side has been to refer in sneering tones to Nebraska. The fact that Nebraska gave 15,000 majority in the last election against the Republican ticket seems to rankle in the breasts of some of the gentlemen upon the other side of this Chamber.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN] stated that he was at one time a resident of our State, and I am at a loss to understand why he now manifests so much of bitterness toward our citizens. What measure of Nebraska's far-famed hospitality was denied to him while he dwelt within the borders of our State that upon his leaving our soil he should carry within his bosom so much of venom and should wait until he stands upon this floor in order to give it utterance?

He also stated, if I remember his language correctly—

> That we started out in the campaign of 1896, after having reduced the people to a condition of poverty and distress, by giving to the country a brand-new soap bubble, filled with Nebraska wind, and that we in Nebraska wanted the American people to chase that bubble off over another financial and industrial precipice.

The gentleman is mistaken as to the facts in the case. The bubble to which he refers as coming from Nebraska was not furnished by the Democratic party and was not a product of our State. The soap out of which the bubble was formed came out of the Republican Congressional campaign fund. The wind came from everywhere. It is true it started from Nebraska, and as that bubble of Republican soap arose the Nebraska breezes lifted

it higher and higher. It passed from out the boundaries of our State and was carried to the far Northwest. It touched the earth for the first time at Tacoma, Wash., and from there rebounded, and lifting higher and higher it soared eastward in its course until it landed in the Capitol of the nation, and just exploded in this Hall Wednesday afternoon when the gentleman from Washington rose to speak. [Laughter and applause.]

The endurance of this immense bubble proved that plenty of soap was used in its formation; but to fill that mighty bag of wind was such a drain upon the resources of Nebraska that we have had neither cyclone, blizzard, nor tornado since it lifted its distended sides and sailed from the borders of our State.

The gentleman said that he lived in Nebraska a number of years ago, and in speaking of William J. Bryan he said:

> Yes, Mr. Chairman, I know him as well as though I had been through him with a lantern.

Why, the gentleman from Washington is so small, compared with the man whom he assails, that his "going through Mr. Bryan with a lantern," from an intellectual standpoint, could be likened only to a lightning bug wandering through the vast recesses of the mighty Mammoth Cave of Kentucky. [Laughter and applause.]

The gentleman further said in his remarks that he had heard Mr. Bryan speak from the rear end of a freight train in 1896; that Mr. Bryan "addressed the crowd, first from one side of the car and then from the other," and I infer that the gentleman from Washington was, on that occasion, in the same situation as the Republican party of to-day is upon the question of finances—on both sides of the track at the same time, trying to get with the biggest crowd.

He refers, however, in sneering tones to the fact that the train from which Mr. Bryan was speaking was a freight train, as if that fact in itself was a disgrace. If Bryan was speaking from a freight train, it was because he was using at the time one of the means of travel provided by the railway companies for the general public in many parts of the West. He was not then and is not now, thank God, the favorite and choice of trusts and railway magnates, and his fare was paid at the rate of 3 cents per mile, and paid by himself. [Applause.]

We have long since learned in Nebraska that all good to the common people does not come from gentlemen who ride in special trains and palace coaches, furnished by campaign contributions from the great trusts and corporations. What matters it whether truth be spoken from the front platform of a palace car or from the rear end of a freight-train caboose? Why, the greatest teacher the world has ever known, He who spoke words of love, of comfort, of hope, and mercy to mankind, entered the gates of Jerusalem surrounded by the common people of that time, riding upon the back of an ass. History is silent as to what became of the ass, but, judging from the voice alone, we might infer that it was a remote ancestor of the gentleman from Washington himself. [Laughter and applause.]

It might be said in this connection, without irreverence, among the first acts of Christ after entering the city was to go within the walls of the temple, which had been erected for the worship of God the Father, and drive the usurers and money changers of that age out of the sacred edifice. In all His journey upon earth the only time He was ever moved to anger, the only time He was ever moved to do an act of violence, was when He stood within the temple and saw the usurers and money changers robbing the poor of God; and it is recorded that the sight of greed and avarice in such a place moved Him to take whips and scourges and drive them from the temple, saying, "This was my Father's house, but ye have made of it a den of thieves."

Sir, the Democratic party in its humble way is trying to follow in the pathway of the Great Teacher. We are trying to purify this temple of liberty which our forefathers erected by driving from power the usurers and money changers of this age, who are seeking to fasten their grasp of avarice and greed upon the reins of this Government, and the Democratic party in this struggle has selected a man to lead them who is in earnest in the fight. Democracy asks of its leader only that he be loyal to the cause of the people; that he be true to the promises of the party made in its platform, and that when placed in power he will free this nation from the dictation and control of the usurers and money changers of this age; and such a man we will welcome to Washington as Chief Executive of this nation, even though his means of travel should be as humble as were the means of travel used by Christ when he entered the gates of ancient Jerusalem.

Bryan spoke from a freight train; well and good. We do not deny this serious charge against our leader; we even admit that it is true, and many of us are even proud of the fact. The people were there in mighty crowds to hear him, and I trust the time will never come in the history of this nation when the Democratic candidate for the office of President will sit in a cottage, vine-clad or otherwise, while special trains, run by money wrung from the coffers of greedy corporations, drag unwilling voters to his door, there to bow before him and pay him homage.

Much more has been said of Nebraska and its policy by gentlemen upon the other side. For what Nebraska has done we make no apology. When in recent years leaders proved false, and men high in the councils of Democracy of this nation betrayed the trust reposed in them and sought to lead the party of Jefferson and Jackson into the camp of organized greed, the Democracy of Nebraska was among the first to raise the banner of true Democracy and reach forth its hand to remove from power the leaders who were false, and in that contest she gave the bravest and best of all her sons to lead the fight.

Arrayed against Democracy in that struggle was every man who would coerce and threaten the vote of labor, every corporation whose greed for gain demands of the Government that the many be taxed for the benefit of the few, every trust which seeks to fatten by controlling the necessaries of life, every money changer who demands that this Government should surrender the mighty power of a nation's credit to banking corporations. Out of that struggle Democracy came defeated, but bearing in the grasp of her great leader the unsullied banner of a pure Democracy. At the end of that contest Democracy knew its friends and knew its foes. The alignment was made, and now with ranks unbroken we are waiting to again renew the battle. We have no compromises to offer. We want or seek no barren victory.

To the gentlemen upon the other side we say, "You are in the saddle; we know the powers which sent you here, and we bid you to go on and do the bidding of your masters." Between what you stand for and what Democracy represents there is hopeless and irreconcilable conflict. We stand for the man as against the dollar; we stand for human liberty as against inhuman greed; we stand for the Declaration of Independence, side by side with the American flag wherever it may be planted; we stand for republic as against empire, no matter where the struggle may be waged; we stand against polygamy and slavery, no matter whether practiced in the domains of the Sultan of Sulu, in the far-off islands of the sea, or within the boundaries of the sovereign State of Utah; and, above all and beyond all, we stand for Bryan as against McKinley. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the indorsement of this bill by the Republican party proves that the party as a whole is now worshiping the goddess of greed and gold in the Temple of Mammon. The commercial and manufacturing trusts now robbing our countrymen were created by the last Republican Congress, when it passed the Dingley Tariff Act.

The best definition of a trust is that it is a combination of capitalists formed for controlling the price of any given article. Trusts control prices by the destruction of competition. The Dingley tariff bill crippled or destroyed foreign competition, hence the organizers of trusts have only to combine the home producers of the article forming the basis of their trust into one great corporation and thus secure the control of the price of that article.

Barbed wire and binding twine, two indispensable articles to the farmers and stock raisers of the West, have doubled in price since they have been manufactured by a trust. These two trusts did not exist before the passage of the Dingley tariff bill, and if it was repealed foreign competition would restore the old low prices of these articles. The object of this gold-standard bill is to create the greatest of all trusts—a money trust.

The Republican party by the demonetization of silver destroyed one-half of our primary or redemption money and left gold without any competitor. This destruction of silver competition was forced unawares on this country by moneyed aristocrats who had even then conspired to form a great money trust. The same money kings are the promoters of this gold-standard bill. The first section of this bill violates the Constitution of our country. That great instrument makes both gold and silver coin primary money.

I will now prove my assertion by the greatest men our country has ever produced. Andrew Jackson, in his farewell address, said:

> My humble efforts have not been spared during my administration of the Government to restore the constitutional currency of gold and silver; and something, I trust, has been done toward the accomplishment of this most desirable object.

Mr. Webster, the great constitutional lawyer and statesman, in a speech in the Senate on December 21, 1836, said:

> I am certainly of opinion, then, that gold and silver, at rates fixed by Congress, constitute the legal standard of value in this country, and that neither Congress nor any State has authority to establish any other standard or to displace this.

This Congress by this bill establishes the gold standard, and, if Mr. Webster is right, every man who votes for this bill violates the Constitution of our country and their oaths of office.

Allen G. Thurman, the noblest Roman of them all, said in a speech in the Senate:

> Has there ever been, so far as we know, a more prosperous country than were the United States from 1789 to 1861? Did any nation ever exceed the progress we made in population, wealth, education, refinement, and the general well-being of the people in those seventy-two years? And yet during all

that period we had bimetallism, for we gave no preference to gold over silver or silver over gold.—*Congressional Record*, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, volume 7, part 1, page 787.

Mr. James G. Blaine sustains Daniel Webster's opinion that gold and silver is the money of the Constitution. He said:

I believe gold and silver to be the money of the Constitution—indeed, the money of the American people anterior to the Constitution, which that great organic law recognized as quite independent of its own existence. No power was conferred on Congress to declare that either metal should not be money. Congress has, therefore, in my judgment, no power to demonetize silver any more than to demonetize gold; no more power to demonetize either than to demonetize both.—*James G. Blaine in the Senate*, February 7, 1873; *Congressional Record*, volume 7, part 1, page 820.

According to the opinions of Mr. Webster and Mr. Blaine, the Republican party is now, at the bidding of its masters, the manipulators of bonds, determined to violate the Constitution and demonetize and retire silver from circulation. But let us examine the Constitution for ourselves. It declares that Congress "shall have the right to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin," etc. The term "coin" means both gold and silver. In defining the power of States, section 10 says:

No State shall * * * coin money, emit bills of credit, make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts, etc.

It is clear to my mind that the Constitution, by these two sections, makes both gold and silver coin a legal tender in the payment of debts. This bill, in its second section, in effect declares that all obligations, public and private, shall be payable only in gold; it changes all existing public and private contracts for the payment of money and makes them payable in gold only, thus violating the Constitution of our country and legislating untold millions of money out of the pockets of debtors and into the pockets of creditors. This bill, in the second section, declares that all interest-bearing obligations of the United States and all United States notes and Treasury notes under the law of 1890 shall be payable in gold coin.

This will legislate into the pockets of the bondholders of United States bonds hundreds of millions of dollars. Mr. Cleveland, during his last Administration, tried to force Congress to issue gold bonds. Congress wisely refused to do so. New York bankers then offered to take sixty-two millions of our gold bonds at 3 per cent interest rather than the coin bonds they did take at 4½ per cent, thus offering to pay the Government sixteen millions of money more for the sixty-two millions of gold bonds than for the coin bonds.

This bill now puts into the pockets of the men who own these same bonds the $16,000,000, and takes it from the great toiling and producing masses of the country. We must remember that we have more than $800,000,000 of outstanding United States bonds; hence, taking the above estimate, furnished by the bankers themselves, and applying it to our entire bonded debt, we find that the effect of this bill in changing the contract in the bonds from coin to gold will cost our taxpayers about $200,000,000. No wonder, then, that for years these bondholding plunderers of the country have been busy holding conventions at Baltimore, Indianapolis, and other cities, and in magnanimously furnishing Congress this bill for the purpose of fastening the gold standard on the people, and then legislating into their pockets hundreds of millions of unearned dollars. These patriots, who in time of war dodge conscription acts and hire substitutes, and in time of peace dodge taxation, are more than willing that the toiling millions of our citizens should fight the country's battles in war and pay its taxes in times of peace. It is easy to take the widow's son and put him in the Army, but we can not levy an income tax on the rich man's property.

I have had a resolution for the purpose of levying an income tax on the wealth of the country before a Republican committee of this House for three years, and they will not report it to the House. Their bondholding, tax-dodging masters will not permit them to pass my resolution. I have had a bill before the Judiciary Committee of this House for two years, taking away from the Federal courts jurisdiction in all corporation cases, so that State courts could enforce State laws against trusts and corporations without being perpetually enjoined by Federal judges. The Judiciary Committee refuses to act on this bill because trusts, bondholders, and corporations furnish the funds to elect Republicans to office. On the other hand, these plutocrats and their national banking allies have had no trouble whatever in getting this outrageous gold-standard bill before this House for discussion.

Let us analyze this infamous measure. It—

1. Makes the dollar of 25.8 grains of gold the standard unit of value.
2. Declares that all bonds now existing and hereafter to be issued shall be paid in gold.
3. Makes all greenbacks and Treasury notes under the Sherman Act payable in gold.
4. All silver certificates to be restricted to one, two, and five dollar notes; legal-tender quality of silver dollar not affected.
5. Establishes a division of issue and redemption, to which is assigned all records and accounts relating to the issue, redemption, and exchange of the several kinds of United States money.
6. Establishes a permanent gold reserve fund equal to 25 per cent of the total of greenbacks and Treasury notes outstanding.
7. Directs the Secretary of the Treasury to maintain this reserve and, if necessary, to sell gold bonds at not exceeding 3 per cent, payable in twenty years, but redeemable in gold, at the option of the United States, after one year.
8. Prohibits any transfer from the Treasury general fund to the division of issue and redemption that will reduce the general fund below $50,000,000.
9. Greenbacks and Treasury notes to be redeemed in gold at the will of the holder and to be paid out again only in exchange for gold.
10. Reserve funds to be used to maintain parity, and to do this the Secretary of the Treasury may, in his discretion, exchange gold coin for any other money issued.
11. Provides for coinage of subsidiary, worn, or uncurrent coins and repeals the law limiting issue of such coin and fractional currency to $50,000,000.
12. Provides for the issue of United States notes and Treasury notes in denominations not less than $1, as the Secretary prescribes.
13. Increases the issue of national-bank circulation up to the par value of bonds deposited to secure such circulation.
14. Repeals the 1 per cent tax on national-bank circulation and substitutes a tax of one-fifth of 1 per cent in the aggregate on the capital, surplus, and undivided profits of banks.
15. Authorizes the incorporation of national banks of $25,000 capital in towns of not to exceed 2,000 inhabitants.

This bill will retire the greenbacks permanently, and eventually impound silver and silver certificates except subsidiary silver coins.

The bill creates a penitentiary in which it imprisons the vast sum of $757,427,973. This bill calls this money penitentiary a division of issue and redemption, and the Secretary of the Treasury can impound the above great sum in that division as long as he desires. This is a dangerous power to put in the hands of one man.

This bill takes the tax off of the circulation of national banks, and on the other hand it increases the issue of their notes up to the par value of the bonds deposited to secure their circulation. Heretofore they could only issue 90 per cent of that amount. In short, this is a bill for the benefit of bankers and bondholders, and it should be so stated in its caption. The bankers of New York brought on a panic during Mr. Cleveland's last Administration for the purpose of securing the repeal of the silver-purchasing clause of the Sherman Act, and for the purpose of retiring the greenbacks, silver coin, and silver certificates. They failed then in their last objects, but they are now carrying out their designs.

A circular issued by them at that time shows the foul conspiracy they then formed and are now carrying out in full. They practically all belong to the American Bankers' Association, and through the executive committee decide as to policies and then act together. The executive committee is said to have mailed to each member of the association the following letter. That a letter of this character was sent out has been admitted by many of the bankers who received it:

DEAR SIR: The interests of national bankers require immediate financial legislation by Congress. Silver, silver certificates, and Treasury notes must be retired, and the national-bank notes, upon a gold basis, made the only money. This will require the authorization of from $500,000,000 to $1,000,000,000 of new bonds as a basis of circulation. You will at once retire one-third of your circulation and call in one-half of your loans. Be careful to make a money stringency felt among your patrons, especially among influential business men. Advocate an extra session of Congress for the repeal of the purchase clause of the Sherman law and act with the other banks of your city in securing a petition to Congress for its unconditional repeal, per accompanying form. Use personal influence with Congressmen, and particularly let your wishes be known to your Senators. The future life of national banks as fixed and safe investments depends upon immediate action, as there is an increasing sentiment in favor of Government legal tender and silver coinage.

Comment on the deep cunning and depravity of this circular is unnecessary. Its authenticity and hideousness is clearly shown by Senator David B. Hill in a speech in the United States Senate on August 25, 1893. Senator Hill was then and is now a gold standard Democrat, and his statement in regard to this bankers' circular and their acts should have great weight. He said that—

Some portion of the present panic may be traced to a concerted effort on the part of numerous monometallists to produce it in order further to discredit silver as the standard money of the country. With ghoulish glee they welcome every bank failure, especially in the silver States, little dreaming that such failures would soon occur at their own doors.

They encourage the hoarding of money; they inaugurated the policy of refusing loans to the people even upon the best of security, and attempted in every way to spread disaster broadcast throughout the land. These disturbers—the promoters of public peril—represent largely the creditor class, the men who desire to appreciate the gold dollar in order to subserve their own selfish interests, men who revel in hard times, men who drive harsh bargains with their fellow-men, regardless of financial distress, and men wholly unfamiliar with the true principles of monetary science.

Henry Ward Beecher, the father of Republicanism, in a speech in St. Louis in 1872, said:

Does anybody suppose that there is any legislature on this continent that could not be crushed or bought out by corporations? Compared with this despot even slavery itself were a small danger. When we see the slimy track of the monster, we may justly ask, What are we coming to? There has got to be a sentiment created on this subject, or we will be swept away by a common ruin. I do not believe in communism, but when I see what rich men as classes are doing with our legislatures, what laws they have passed, what disregard there is to the great common interest, I fear that the time will come when the workingmen will rise up and say that they have no appeal to the courts; no appeal to the legislatures; that they are bought and owned by consolidated capital. And when that time comes, unless it brings reformation it will bring revolution.

Since Beecher uttered this prophecy in 1872 the power of consolidated capital has increased an hundredfold. Twenty years ago John G. Carlisle in a speech on this floor said—

That the obvious trend, at that time, toward the single gold standard was not the mere procession of eyeless events, not the fortuitous progress of cumulative forces beyond human control, but the product of a cool, deliberate conspiracy—that the conspiracy was international; it straddled the ocean and planted one foot in Europe and one in this country.

Mr. Carlisle several years after this, in another speech on this floor, denounced the demonetization of silver as the greatest crime of the century. Now he is bending his knees to the golden calf, "that thrift may follow fawning." The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows that at one time or another Sherman, Wade, Morton, Blaine, Logan, Garfield, Ingalls, McKinley, and CHANDLER were fully cognizant of and admitted the conspiracy of consolidated capital, as alleged by Beecher and Carlisle, and each of them in turn have denounced the conspirators in the name of humanity. The Republican party was once led by statesmen; now it is led simply by the agents of the conspiracy of consolidated capital. The policy of the party in presenting and passing this outrageous bill is dictated by King Boodle.

Governor Pingree, a lifelong Republican, says:

To-day all the trusts, all the monopolies, every agency which is bleeding the people has taken refuge under the wing of the Republican party, because they fear the Democratic party, which has kicked them out. Government by bondholders has become quite common in the world; nations have gone into the hands of receivers. When anyone exposes their schemes they wrap themselves in the flag and cry, You are attacking the party. When they elect themselves to office by main force or money, they ascribe it to divine intervention of Providence in behalf of the nation and its honor.

Such hypocrisy and rascality is as apparent as it is appalling.

Senator THURSTON, the chairman of the last Republican Convention, in a recent speech in Baltimore said:

Capital in every form, alarmed at the free-silver agitation, rushed to the support of the Republican party, and it has happened thereby that the financial jugglers and manipulators and great trusts and combines were forced into the Republican party.

If further proof is needed that this bill is dictated by and to be made a law for the purposes of enriching—beyond even the dreams of avarice—the "financial jugglers," as they are called by Senator THURSTON, I will put on the witness stand another Republican Senator—the greatest of them all—James G. Blaine, who said in the Senate on February 7, 1878:

I believe the struggle now going on in this country and in other countries for a single gold standard would, if successful, produce widespread disaster in the end throughout the commercial world. The destruction of silver as money and establishing gold as the sole unit of value must have a ruinous effect on all forms of property except those investments which yield a fixed return in money. These would be enormously enhanced in value, and would gain a disproportionate and unfair advantage over every other species of property.—*Congressional Record*, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, volume 7, Part I, page 821.

Mr. Blaine was right, and this bill will retire from circulation four hundred millions of silver dollars and bring about the results pointed out in this speech.

Another Republican Senator very recently warned his party against surrendering to the money power which so effectively contributed to carrying the election of 1896, that made McKinley President. I refer to Senator CHANDLER, who on February 16, 1897, said in a speech in the United States Senate:

In repetition and conclusion, I declare my belief that President McKinley and the other leaders of the party, in its present advent to power may, by wise designs and virtuous deeds, indefinitely prolong its ascendancy in the country. This can surely be done by making it the true party of the people. * * * If, on the contrary, this is not done, and the Republican party shall content itself with seizing and enjoying the spoils of office, surrendering unreservedly to the money power which so effectively contributed to its recent victory, acquiescing permanently in the existing gold standard, and treating bimetallism according to the advice of the Portland Oregonian, as a juggling humbug, and the promise to support it, according to the New York Sun, as a pledge never intended to be fulfilled, Republicans will find the tide of political battle once more turned against them, and they will soon exchange places with their now sore, bleeding, and prostrate foes.

My countrymen, here is an admission and a prophecy by a great Republican leader. His admission is that the money power effectively contributed to Republican success in 1896. The prophecy is, "If the Republican party contents itself with seizing and enjoying the spoils of office, surrendering unreservedly to the money power, etc., that they will speedily find the tide of political battle once more turned against them." May this prophecy be speedily fulfilled is the prayer that goes up from the robbed and toiling millions of our people. The same Senator, writing in the North American Review in August, 1896, says:

The time of trial of the Republican party will come after its approaching victory. It will then be in order to determine whether it is the slave of the rich capitalists, of the promoters of trusts and monopolies, and of the bloated bondholders, as the Bryan Democrats will contend.

This bill completes the surrender of the Republican party to the money power, and will, according to the prophecy of Senator CHANDLER, turn the tide of political battle next year against his party and cause the election of a Democratic House and President.

The Democratic party has always supported the cause of the masses of the people. It was betrayed by Cleveland, but it promptly and bravely discarded him and repudiated his doctrines, and the last Chicago convention buried Clevelandism and Cleveland forever, so far as the Democratic party is concerned.

The Republican party in urging the passage of this bill is bartering its last vestige of manhood or honor for funds with which to corrupt voters and carry the Presidential election next year. The Dingley tariff bill paid the price of McKinley's first election, and the score of millions of dollars invested by manufacturing plutocrats in that election has already been repaid to them many times over by the American consumers. The Dingley tariff law is the father of the numerous trusts that have been created since its passage.

The pending bill to establish the gold standard will be the prolific mother of trusts. The gold trust is the worst of all trusts. It makes it possible for the national banks to control the volume of money in circulation among the people, and to contract and expand such volume as the interest of bankers may dictate. The bankers are thoroughly organized and can at any time after this bill becomes a law meet together and dictate as they are now dictating the financial policy of this Government. Now the national banks only own the Republican party; pass the bill and they will soon own the American people.

The Republican plutocrats argue that the Government should not enter into the banking business. I reply that the banks should not enter into the governing business. They now govern the Republican party, and that party is governing this Republic; hence the national bankers are running the Government in their own interest only. They have by this, their gold-standard bill, taken the tax off of their circulation. They have given themselves the right to issue 10 per cent more money than they had before. This bill gives them the right to issue and control all of the paper money that will be in circulation. All of the gold will be held as reserve funds. National-bank money will have no competition whatever in the paper-money field. The greenbacks will be impounded in less than twelve months in the Treasury penitentiary, and National Banker Gage will be the keeper of this penitentiary, in which seven hundred and fifty millions of the people's money will be locked up and kept out of circulation. Republican Congressmen always vote for an issue of gold bonds to aid national bankers to grow rich. The bankers in turn furnish the G. O. P. campaign funds.

The bondholding robbers of our country who are demanding the passage of this bill prate constantly about honest money and denounce the advocates of the free coinage of silver as repudiators and as favoring dishonest money. These bondholders by this bill repudiate the contract between themselves and the Government. Their bonds are payable in coin, and they demand gold, which change will put hundreds of millions in their pockets.

They are therefore guilty of extortion as well as repudiation and dishonesty.

The North American, a Philadelphia newspaper, a mouthpiece of plutocracy, commenting on this bill in a recent editorial, praises the Republican party for solidly supporting it and also admits the crime of 1873. I quote its language:

That can mean only one thing—that the Republican policy commands the confidence of a great majority of the people and that its Democratic opponents are in a forlorn hope.

It has been a long and weary task to bring the party and the country to this solid ground. When the silver question first became acute, in 1877, there seemed hardly any gold men, Republicans or Democrats, west of the Alleghenies. New York and Pennsylvania were honeycombed with heresy. Ohio was a hotbed of unsound financial ideas. Mr. McKinley himself voted for the free coinage of silver.

In 1890 the Republican party passed the Sherman silver-purchase law, by which the Government was compelled to buy 15 tons of pig silver every month and issue paper money to pay for it. In 1892 the Republican platform said:

"The American people, from tradition and interest, favor bimetallism, and the Republican party demands the use of both gold and silver as standard money," and as late as 1896 the convention that nominated President McKinley pledged the party to promote an international agreement for the free coinage of silver.

In 1873 Congress established the gold standard without knowing what it was doing. Now, after nearly a quarter of a century of discussion, it repeats that action with its eyes open, and the country indorses its action. There is no longer a "crime of '73."

This editorial admission of the duplicity and venality of the Republican party is as amazing as it is true. Republican plutocracy not only dictates legislation, as admitted by this editorial, but also controls the Federal courts. Let me prove this proposition. In 1894 the Democratic party passed an income-tax law, so as to force the wealth of the country to bear its just share of the burdens of Federal taxation. The Republican party did everything in their power to defeat this just law. Plutocracy then appealed to their other allies—the Federal courts—for the purpose of defeating the law. The Supreme Court of the United States, at their bidding, held the Democratic income-tax law unconstitutional, and in doing so surrendered without reserve to organized wealth. But there were four members of that court who refused to stultify themselves in the interest of plutocracy, and in their dissenting opinions sounded notes of warning that should open the eyes of the American people to the dreadful conditions that confront us.

I will quote these opinions.

Harlan, J., of Kentucky, said, in his dissenting opinion:

The practice of a century, in harmony with the decisions of this court, under which uncounted millions have been collected by taxation, ought to be sufficient to close the door against further inquiry.

In my judgment, this decision may well excite the gravest apprehensions. It strikes at the very foundation of national authority.

The decision now made may provoke a contest in this country from which the American people would have been spared if the court had not overturned its former adjudications.

The practical effect of the decision to-day is to give a certain kind of property a position of favoritism and advantage inconsistent with the fundamental principle of our social organization, and to invest them with power and influence that may be perilous to that portion of the American people upon whom rests the larger part of the burdens of the Government, and who ought not to be subjected to the dominion of aggregated wealth any more than the property of the country should be at the mercy of the lawless.

Brown, J., Michigan:

My fear is that in some moment of national peril this decision will rise up to frustrate its will and paralyze its arms. I hope it may not prove the first step toward the submergence of the liberties of the people in a sordid despotism of wealth.

As I can not escape the conviction that the decision of the court in this great case is fraught with unmeasurable danger to the future of the country, and that it approaches the proportions of a national calamity, I feel it a duty to enter my protest against it.

Jackson, J.:

The practical operation of the decision is not only to disregard the great principles of equality in taxation, but the further principle that in the imposition of taxes for the benefit of the Government the burdens thereof should be imposed upon those having most ability to bear them. Considered in all its bearings, this decision is, in my judgment, the most disastrous blow ever struck at the constitutional power of Congress.

White, J., Louisiana:

It takes invested wealth and reads it into the Constitution as a favored and protected class of property which can not be taxed without appointment, while it leaves the occupation of the minister, the doctor, the professor, the lawyer, the inventor, the author, the merchant, the mechanic, and all other forms of industry upon which the prosperity of a people must depend subject to taxation without that condition. A rule which works out this result, which it seems to me stultifies the Constitution by making it an instrument of the most grievous wrong, should not be adopted, especially when in order to do so the decisions of this court, the opinions of the law writers and publicists, tradition, practice, and the settled policy of the Government must be overthrown.

The meanest man that I ever heard of had borrowed his kind neighbor's blind horse to work, and at night he would feed the horse, but would steal the corn from him and give it to his own fat hogs. The Republicans by this bill are stealing corn from the blind horse—the people—and giving it to the fat hogs—the bondholders and bankers. If a man was to change a bond of the United States from $1,000 to $1,250 he would be justly sent to the penitentiary for his crime. His crime would be committed for greed and to gain 25 per cent more money than the bond called for.

This bill changes, for greed and gain, the same bond by striking out the word "coin" and writing the word "gold." According to President Cleveland this change makes the bond 25 per cent more valuable than it was before. These crimes are the same; one is the act of a rascally individual, the other of a depraved political party. That great commandment of the decalogue, "Thou shalt not steal," was plainly violated in both cases, but this commandment seems not to have any place in the Republican code of morals. They have been riding that blind horse—the people—for a third of a century, and all the time stealing corn from him. The question for solution now is, How long will this blind horse submit to such treatment? How long will the American people consent to be robbed by Republican plutocracy?

The patient people must be aroused from their lethargy and drive the Republican party from power next year. Unless the people scourge the agents of the money changers from the halls of Congress and promptly repeal their outrageous legislation, we may find that Mr. Beecher's prophecy will soon be fulfilled. He said that—

When the time comes that the people are bought and owned by consolidated capital, unless it brings reformation, it will bring revolution.

That time, as shown by this bill, has come. Shall the liberation of the people from plutocracy come through the ballot or the sword?

The mighty Roman Republic fell by the sword because Romans betrayed Rome. We are swiftly following in her footsteps. Mr. Walker, of Massachusetts, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee and a lifelong Republican, on the floor of this House, in a speech on March 23, 1892, in speaking of the demonetization of silver, said:

In relation to the effect of this law in the United States from 1873 to 1879, half the wealth of this country not in solid securities changed hands during that period, always in favor of the strong against the weak, and thousands of idle workmen walked our streets. In all our Northeastern States our highways and villages were filled with tramps.

The Republicans have retired Mr. Walker to private life for uttering these obvious truths. The remedy for existing evils lies only in retracing our steps, in remonetizing silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, in taking from national banks the right to issue money and in restoring that right to the Government, in preventing the retirement of the greenbacks, and, in short, by putting in power the Democratic party, so that it may write on the statute books of our country the principles enunciated in its last national platform in Chicago in 1896. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I am precluded by the limited time allotted me from analyzing and discussing in detail the provisions of the pending bill. I shall therefore merely enter my solemn protest against the passage of this measure, which I regard as vicious in principle and fraught with direful consequences to the masses of the American people. It is a measure which neither party has ever had the temerity to place before the people as an exposition of its views on the financial question, and is brought to our consideration by the representatives of a party which has heretofore steadfastly proclaimed its allegiance to the double standard.

For the first time the Republican party has openly espoused the cause of the single gold standard, which its ablest spokesmen have heretofore denounced in unmeasured terms as an unmitigated evil. The pledges of the Republican platform of 1896 are to be thrown to the winds; the promises of the Republican orators in the campaign of that year are to be abjured, and an Administration which came into power plighted to bimetallism is to fasten irrevocably upon the American people the yoke of gold.

In the campaign which resulted in the election of Mr. McKinley the people were promised, by his adherents, bimetallism through international agreement. Democrats then pointed to the illusory character of this assurance, which was unsupported by faith, and was meant to—

Keep the word of promise to our ear
And break it to our hope.

The mutations of time have disclosed what Democrats could then only predict. The bimetallic pledge in the Republican platform was a sop to Cerberus. It was a vote-catching device, whose promoters were more to be despised than its victims were to be pitied.

I wish to call attention briefly to the statement of the leading member of the commission appointed by Mr. McKinley on the part of the United States to negotiate the holding of an international monetary conference. After many months spent in Europe he elsewhere made a most interesting statement of the result of the commission's labors. In January, 1898, he said:

When Congress met a year ago, there was universal expression by the Republican membership in the Senate that the pledge of the party in its St. Louis platform to promote international bimetallism by every means in its power was an undertaking to be faithfully carried out without evasion or delay.

He said the commissioners appointed by Mr. McKinley were all bimetallists, who believed that "continued adhesion to the gold standard means only disaster to our agricultural and commercial interests;" that it "was the earnest desire of the Chief Executive to carry out in its integrity the promises of the platform of the Republican party, pledging it to every effort to bring about an international bimetallic agreement." He recited the hearty cooperation and active aid rendered by France in this movement, and quoted the resolution unanimously adopted in the English House of Commons March 17, 1896, as follows:

That this House is of opinion that the instability of the relative value of gold and silver since the action of the Latin Union in 1873 has proved injurious to the best interests of this country, and urges upon the Government the advisability of doing all in their power to secure by international agreement a stable monetary par of exchange between gold and silver.

He summarized the situation in Europe in these words:

The cause of bimetallism is not dead in Europe. It is a living, vital, and growing force. * * * It is as cowardly to abandon hope as it is false to talk about failure. * * * It is my sincere conviction that an international bimetallic agreement is still feasible.

In the face of these declarations of the President's commissioner we are asked to close our eyes to the realm of hope and to put upon the statute books legislative adherence to the gold standard. Is the world to understand that America abandons the money of its Constitution and will hereafter be deaf to entreaties for an international bimetallic agreement? Have three short years demonstrated the wisdom of a financial policy which neither party then had the courage to advocate? Bimetallism is superior to a single standard of either metal, or else the platforms of both parties in 1896 in this particular were based upon a fallacy.

The object then sought by both parties was the same. The Republican party looked to the attainment of bimetallism by the aid of foreign countries, while the Democratic party demanded its establishment without waiting for the consent of foreign nations. The excellence of a policy per se can not depend upon the means by which it is to be inaugurated, and the superiority of the double standard having been thus affirmed by the indorsement given it by both parties, its abandonment by the Republican party at this stage is either a craven surrender to the money power or a confession of the faithlessness of its own promise.

This bill, if enacted into law, must be taken as the sum total of Republican wisdom on the financial question. The legislative as well as the coordinate executive branch of the Government is in

the hands of our political opponents, and upon them must rest the responsibility of its enactment. It comes before this body with the unanimous indorsement of the Republican caucus of the House, as we have been assured by members on the other side. It is doubtless the result of mature study upon the part of Republican leaders, for more than two years elapsed after Mr. McKinley's inauguration ere its consideration was urged.

Meanwhile the fields have yielded abundant harvests; a period of diminished consumption and almost suspended production has logically and necessarily been followed by an era of increased consumption and corresponding prosperity in manufacturing; the God of battles has smiled upon our efforts to relieve an oppressed people in a neighboring isle. Reserving to a later occasion the discussion of a proper policy with respect to the islands which have come within our jurisdiction and sovereignty as a result of that conflict, I can not refrain from expressing my surprise that at a time when commercial America is looking toward enlarged trade relations with Cuba, Puerto Rico, the islands of the Pacific, and even China and Japan, the Republican party should seriously propose a large reduction in the amount of money in circulation.

Is there too much money per capita in this country? This contention can hardly be tenable when the slightest stringency in the money centers brings forth reports of the probable issuance of clearing-house certificates, an extra-legal device, or announcements from the Treasury Department of the anticipation of interest payments on Government bonds in order to place more money in circulation. No; the design must be to make money dearer; to increase the purchasing power of the dollar; to add unearned increment to the hoards of the wealthy, and to compel labor to yield more of the sweat of its brow to secure a dollar.

The squeeze has already begun. The New York stock market may not represent with mathematical exactness the material conditions existent in this country, but as a barometric reading of the money situation it is well-nigh infallible. There prices have already tumbled, and the end seems not yet in sight. England, the greatest creditor nation on earth, needs the yellow metal to prosecute its war against a people struggling for the maintenance of their god-given rights. American securities held in that country are sacrificed to a point where intrinsic value is lost sight of in the mad struggle to secure gold, and the consols of gold-standard England seek purchasers around par.

Banking institutions in New York, whose scheduled assets exceed their liabilities, are already embarrassed and will shortly be compelled to close their doors in the face of heartbroken depositors solely because of their inability to secure funds on collateral ordinarily deemed superabundant; and yet the gold standard, the system of contraction, is held out to us as a financial policy which will insure confidence in commercial circles and prosperity to our material interests.

The pending bill seeks to make a donation of untold millions of dollars to the holders of bonds of the United States in that it provides that all interest-bearing obligations of the Government now existing as well as those hereafter issued shall be payable in gold coin. The bonds which have heretofore been issued were sold with the option in the United States of redeeming in coin—that is, in either metal.

On February 8, 1895, Mr. Cleveland, then President of the United States, in a message to Congress, announced that he had arranged for the sale of 4 per cent bonds, payable in coin thirty years after their date, to the amount of a little less than $62,400,000, which were to be issued for the purchase of gold coin amounting to a sum slightly in excess of $65,000,000.

Such a premium is to be allowed the Government—

Said he—

as to fix the rate of interest upon the amount of gold realized at 3¼ per cent per annum. The privilege is especially reserved to the Government—

He goes on to say—

to substitute at par within ten days from this date in lieu of the 4 per cent coin bonds other bonds in terms payable in gold and bearing 3 per cent interest, if the issue of the same should in the meantime be authorized by Congress. * * * In the agreement just concluded the annual saving in interest to the Government if 3 per cent gold bonds should be substituted for 4 per cent coin bonds under the privilege reserved would be $539,159, amounting in thirty years, or at the maturity of the coin bonds, to $16,174,770.

The authority then sought by Mr. Cleveland to issue gold bonds instead of coin bonds was refused. The coin bonds to which he referred were issued, and yielded so much less because they were payable in coin instead of gold, as Mr. Cleveland claimed; hundreds of millions of dollars of other coin bonds have since similarly been issued and sold, and yet, notwithstanding the fact that the purchasers paid less therefor to the Government or the Government pays a greater rate of interest thereon because, as is alleged by Mr. Cleveland, the bonds are payable in coin instead of specifically in gold, the pending bill proposes to declare that all United States bonds shall be payable in gold.

Mr. Chairman, I wish time permitted as careful dissection of the provisions of the pending bill as its importance warrants. I should then in detail point out what I regard as the unsafe and unsound changes in the national-bank act which are now proposed. The issuing of money is one of the prime attributes of sovereignty, and its devolution, even in part, upon private individuals or corporations is in derogation of Government. To increase the amount of notes which a bank may issue upon the United States bonds deposited with the Treasurer, as the pending bill proposes, is merely the aggravation of an existing evil.

By reading between the lines I draw the conclusion that from the shading this measure will ultimately culminate in the greatest of all gigantic trusts, the national-bank trust.

I am unalterably opposed to a single standard of either metal. I believe in the free and equal coinage of both metals in sufficient volume to transact the business of the nation, both internal and external. I believe that the establishment and maintenance of the single gold standard is a wrong, the evil effects of which will be felt in an accelerated ratio as time progresses.

Thus believing, I give my voice and shall cast my vote against the pending bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. NEVILLE Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET], in the opening of the discussion upon this bill, advanced the proposition that legal-tender quality does not enable money to circulate beyond its intrinsic value without the pledge of the Government for its full redemption.

The standard silver dollar has circulated since 1878 at a greater value than the worth of the metal of which it was composed and without any law or guaranty for its redemption.

Standard silver dollars, by reason of their legal-tender quality, were always worth 100 cents, while the trade dollar, with 7½ more grains of silver to the dollar, but without legal-tender quality, would not circulate for 100 cents.

We assert that it is the legal-tender quality, and not the intrinsic value, that makes money circulate for its face.

The crippled greenback, prior to resumption of specie payment, never circulated for its face value, while the full legal-tender demand note always did.

From the 9th day of February, 1793, to 1857 the British, Portuguese, Spanish, and Spanish dominion gold coins and the Spanish milled silver dollar circulated in this country at their legal-tender value without regard to their intrinsic value, and ceased to circulate altogether when the legal-tender quality was removed; and it was the repeal of that legal-tender law, destroying such coin's use as money, that created the panic of 1857, and such panic was not caused by a too large per capita of money, as the gentlemen upon the other side of this House would have us believe.

It was a remarkable argument put forth by those gentlemen, that the three great panics were the result of too large a per capita of money. Such an absurd statement will be without fruit in my State. Every Populist farmer in Nebraska knows that the panic of 1857 was caused by destroying the legal-tender quality, and thus throwing out of circulation the foreign coins then in common use in this country.

Every Populist laboring man in Nebraska knows that the panic of 1873 was caused by leaving the standard silver dollar out of the revision of the Mint Act, and substituting in its place a non-legal-tender trade dollar. And all classes of people in Nebraska know that the panic of 1893 was caused by the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act, the threatened cessation of the coinage of standard silver dollars, and the agitation to that end by the fisherman from Buzzards Bay and his Republican allies.

No panic was created at the beginning of the war by the issuance of Government paper money in large volume, no panic was created by the coinage of silver in 1878, and no panic was created in 1890 by the passage of the Sherman Act. And yet we are confronted with the startling Republican argument that the coinage of standard silver dollars will create the greatest panic the world ever experienced.

The gentleman from Ohio, General GROSVENOR, is also frightened about the intrinsic value of money. He does not want 50 cents' worth of silver forced upon the laboring men and farmers for 100 cents' worth of the product of their toil. And yet that gentleman is old enough and has legal knowledge enough to fully understand that the same law which would force the metal in a dollar made of silver upon the laboring man and farmer would enable them to force it upon the merchant, the lawyer, and the doctor, and even upon the banker, for the same value given by them; and he also knows that that would result in making it a 100-cent dollar.

Again, my venerable friend from Ohio desired this side of the House to point to a single thing which we said in 1896 would happen if McKinley was elected that has since come true. And when we did not stand up from our seats, he took our love of comfort to be a confession similar to that enjoyed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], when he thought we were not vigorous enough in our defense of Bryan.

In fact, the gentlemen upon the other side of this House have a habit of trying to prove their cause by an assumption of authority over us, and I have made up my mind that they believe

we should move like jumping jacks when they open their mouths. In fact, I presume they think we are Tagals and need Christianizing. They surely do not believe we are wholly heathen; for, if they did, they would offer some of the conciliatory measures used upon the Sultan of Sulu.

For the benefit of the gentleman from Ohio, let me say that in Nebraska we predicted that if the Republicans were successful in electing McKinley before his term of office expired they would throw off the mask which made them appear to be friendly to silver—America's greatest natural resource—and fasten upon this country the gold standard.

While every Republican speaker in Nebraska denied the prediction that we then made would come true, yet it is rapidly approaching a verity.

We predicted that wheat, one of the great staple products of Nebraska, would continue to fall in price, and to-day it is selling for 23 cents less per bushel than it did on the day McKinley was inaugurated.

We predicted that prosperity would not come without an increased supply of standard money. And while the gentlemen upon the other side of this House then claimed that the quantitative theory of money had nothing to do with the question of prosperity or adversity, yet they are now claiming credit for a very largely increased supply of money.

Again, the members of the other side of this House wanted us to stand up and evidence a spot in the country where prosperity is not in full sway. And the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], for the purpose of clinching the inference, declared that last summer he could not find idle men enough to put a foundation under his barn; yet in the very next breath he accounted for his dilemma by telling us of a habit of reducing his liabilities by bluffing his creditors.

While I am sure this bill will retire the Republicans from power at no distant day, yet I fear and tremble for the suffering which I know the people must endure after getting into the clutches of the greedy bankers and trusts before they can get out again.

No doubt under the provisions of this bill the national bankers will inflate the currency by loaning to the Government and the people enough money to give us prosperity with a string to it, and in a few years thereafter the Republican leaders will be abroad in the country again explaining how the indebtedness of the people is an evidence of prosperity.

But when pay day comes those who are not as fortunate with their bluffs as the gentleman from Iowa will have learned enough about the cussedness of this bill to clamor for its repeal, and then the leaders of the Republican party will be climbing over each other in their effort to get back to the people.

No one doubts their ability to about face. It is an open confession with them in the discussion of this measure. It is not strange they expect us to stand up when they say "arise." It has become second nature with them to turn when HANNA says "flop."

The money issued by the national bankers under the provisions of this bill will be good enough to get the people in debt, but when the gold holders pull the string attached to prosperity the bankers will close their doors, and this money will not get the people out of debt.

However, a few years later the gentleman from Ohio, General GROSVENOR, can again come into this House and tell us of $65,000,000 in mortgages canceled, and he might add then, as he could have done a few days ago, the words: "By sheriff's sale at the east door of the court-house."

It is no trouble for the gentlemen controlling the action of the members on the other side to cause a panic when it can be turned to their own profit. Their illustrious ancestor, Nathan Rothschild, sped with great haste across the English Channel, and gave a false report of the result of the battle of Waterloo, in order that his agents, stationed in various parts of the Kingdom for that purpose, might buy at a sacrifice the property of the fleeing, panic-stricken people.

Slavery, crime, and suicide in every country have been the direct result of greed and avarice enforced by someone in power to compel submission.

In conclusion, let me ask the gentlemen upon the other side a few questions:

First. Is it not clear that to insure continued prosperity we must at all times have enough money to transact the business of the country, and that the money must be all legal tender, or that enough of it must be such to impress the people with confidence that the token money and bonds can be redeemed without affecting the business need for circulating medium?

Second. Will our own people retain confidence because the Government can bond us, and, if need be, afterwards execute upon our property to meet the bonds?

Third. If redemption money is necessary to keep up confidence and a parity with token money and to redeem bonds, is it not necessary to keep redemption money at home?

Fourth. If the gold standard is fastened upon the people of this country by this Congress, which will be the next nation that will come to the gold standard?

Fifth. As each nation comes to the gold standard will it not increase the demand for gold and therefore require more property to get it and continue the declining level of prices upon all commodities not controlled by trusts until all nations have adopted the gold standard, and then the level of prices go to the bottom?

Sixth. Will not universal gold standard force universal equilibrium of prices for like products and like labor, varied only by the cost of transportation?

Seventh. Under a universal gold standard if one nation is compelled to have gold to pay indemnity levied by a conqueror or to otherwise relieve her distress, will she not bid enough property and labor to get it? And as it is human nature to buy where we can the cheapest, would not our country be compelled to bid like amounts of property and labor to keep our gold at home?

Eighth. Would not universal gold standard also force universal free trade?

Ninth. Is it not true that our surplus is always in competition with home consumption until the home demand is supplied, and then goes into the markets of the world in competition with the surplus of like products of other nations?

Tenth. Is it not also true that the surplus never hunts a glutted market, and that the tariff would not enhance the value of our own surplus?

Eleventh. Could we prosper very long by selling the products peculiar to our country in competition with the world and buying the products peculiar to other countries at a value enhanced by our own tariff?

Twelfth. Would not bimetallism protect our products and labor?

Thirteenth. Under bimetallism, if a distressed nation was compelled to overbid for one of the metals as it went out would not the other come in in exchange for it and remain with us to keep up confidence and prices, enable us to do business at the old stand, and prevent the disaster of competition in products and labor with a nation forced by distress to bid? [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RAY of New York) having resumed the chair, Mr. HEPBURN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee had had under consideration House bill No. 1, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until 12 meridian to-morrow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Herbert Cossey against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Hugh P. Bone, executor of estate of Martha H. Bone against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of R. N. Terrell, administrator of estate of William S. Mullins against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for placing new vaults in the United States subtreasury building, New York—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WATERS: A bill (H. R. 4339) to prevent forest fires on the public domain—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 4340) making further provision for a civil government for Alaska—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 4341) to establish wind-signal

display stations at South Manitou Island, Lake Michigan—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 4342) to reward distinguished service in the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4343) granting an increase of pension to soldiers of the Mexican war in certain cases and providing for pensions to widows—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 4344) to provide for the erection of a public building and acquire a site therefor at Mount Clemens, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 4345) to create a new Federal judicial district in Pennsylvania, to be called the middle district—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 4346) granting the use of the Lake Tahoe Reserve to the University of California—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CURTIS (by request): A bill (H. R. 4347) to provide for the education of the blind, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GILL: A bill (H. R. 4348) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Steubenville, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SPALDING: A bill (H. R. 4349) to amend sections 2304 and 2305 of the Revised Statutes, relating to soldiers' and sailors' homesteads—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LINNEY: A bill (H. R. 4350) to reduce the tax on all distilled spirits to 70 cents on each proof gallon—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MUDD (by request): A bill (H. R. 4351) for the classification of clerks in the first-class and second-class post-offices of the United States—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 4466) to provide for the construction of a protected cruiser to be named the *Charleston*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 81) to authorize the President to appoint to the Naval Academy acting naval cadets who served during the war with Spain—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 82) directing the Secretary of War to cause the necessary examination to be made of the channel in Galveston Bay for the better accommodation of shipping, and to submit an estimate for the improvement of the same—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. REEDER: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 83) authorizing a committee for the purpose of investigating the feasibility of diverting waters from the head waters of the Missouri, Platte, and other rivers, for purposes of irrigation—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McCALL: A memorial, by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, commending Hon. William C. Lovering for his efforts to provide a uniform eight-hour law—to the Committee on Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 4352) granting a pension to Israel P. Covey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4353) granting a pension to Horace Boyd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4354) granting an increase of pension to George W. Moorehouse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4355) granting a pension to Oren E. Barber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4356) granting an increase of pension to Henry G. Bigelow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4357) granting a pension to Jakobina Halbertsma—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4358) granting a pension to Silas Osborne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4359) granting an honorable discharge to John Salter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4360) granting an honorable discharge to Henry M. La Core—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4361) granting an honorable discharge to James Frank Cole—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4362) granting an honorable discharge to Charles Miller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRENNER: A bill (H. R. 4363) to remove charge of desertion from record of Samuel Critchfield, late Company D, One hundred and thirty-third Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4364) to relieve G. W. Burkadoll from the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4365) to correct the military record of Jacob J. Brenner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4366) for the relief of George M. Duffy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKETT: A bill (H. R. 4367) granting a pension to Mary L. Stotsenburg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROMWELL: A bill (H. R. 4368) for the relief of Flora B. Hinds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 4369) to grant pensions to the East Tennessee bridge burners—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARMACK: A bill (H. R. 4370) to increase the pension of Annie B. Goodrich—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4371) to amend the military record of Charles Hentz, late private of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Connecticut Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4372) for the relief of William J. Smith and D. M. Wisdom—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4373) to amend the military record of Samson Mead, late private of Company G, Third Regiment Michigan Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4374) to increase the pension of George W. Gregory—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 4375) granting a pension to Nathan Warren—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4376) granting a pension to Harlon Scarlett—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4377) granting a pension to John L. Quiett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4378) for the relief of Zelma Michael—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4379) to pension Kate McClain—to the Committeee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4380) granting a pension to James E. Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4381) for the relief of Henry Stein—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4382) for the relief of Peter M. V. Underwood—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4383) for the relief of William D. Matthews—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4384) for the relief of Peter D. Staats—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4385) for the relief of Robert White—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4386) for the relief of George F. Heustis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4387) granting a pension to Joseph R. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4388) to remove charge of desertion from record of John Lawler—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4389) granting an increase of pension to Truman Wolf, of North Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4390) granting a pension to Mary Frost—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4391) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Hering, of Leavenworth, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4392) granting a pension to Samuel Myers, of Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4393) for the relief of John A. Clark—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4394) granting a pension to Mary Sanders—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4395) for the relief of the city of Atchison, State of Kansas—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4396) for the relief of the city of Leavenworth, State of Kansas—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHANLER: A bill (H. R. 4397) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Ellen Leddy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COWHERD: A bill (H. R. 4398) to grant a pension to Julius Vogt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4399) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4400) for the relief of Frank E. Kellogg, collector of the sixth internal-revenue district of Missouri—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EPES: A bill (H. R. 4401) for the relief of the estate of Richard M. Harrison, deceased, late of Prince George County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4402) for the relief of the estate of William G. Birchett, of Prince George County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4403) for the relief of S. D. Brown—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4404) for the relief of Simeon H. Wootton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4405) for the relief of the heirs at law of Maj. Tarleton Woodson, deceased, in accordance with the findings of the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4406) for the relief of W. H. Harrison, of Prince George County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4407) for the relief of the legal representative of John Avery, deceased, late of Prince George County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FARIS: A bill (H. R. 4408) granting a pension to Mary R. Warner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4409) granting a pension to Simpson P. Watson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4410) granting a pension to Alsey E. Potts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4411) to correct the military record of Sylvester Weaver—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 4412) for the relief of Augustus E. Gans—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4413) to reimburse the Mellert Foundry and Machine Company for money retained by the United States for failure to complete a contract within a specified time—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 4414) granting a pension to Adaline Powell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4415) granting a pension to Harry Gorman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 4416) to increase the pension of Henry Geesen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4417) for the relief of William H. Bentley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 4418) granting a pension to Samuel St. Clair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4419) granting a pension to Sophia Huber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4420) granting an increase of pension to Howard S. Stephenson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOFFECKER: A bill (H. R. 4421) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to rehear and render judgment in the case of William Donnelly and Patrick Egan—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 4422) granting a pension to William H. Brookins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4423) granting a pension to Rowland C. Harmon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 4424) for the relief of Isaac N. Jennings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4425) to correct the military record of David Cromwell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 4426) for the relief of Frank S. Sowers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4427) granting a pension to Matilda Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 4428) for the correction of the record of Michael Reahel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4429) to continue the pension to Alice E. Rodgers, the helpless child of Henry Rodgers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 4430) granting a pension to Catharine Coughlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINNEY: A bill (H. R. 4431) for the relief of William Lewis Bryan, of Boone, N. C.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4432) for the relief of the widow of R. D. Hay—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 4433) for the relief of Louis Miller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 4434) for increase of pension of Jesse C. Rhodabeck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4435) for the relief of James H. Turner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4436) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. B. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4437) granting an increase of pension to Frank B. Gillespie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POLK: A bill (H. R. 4438) to correct the military record of Capt. A. H. Rush, of Berwick, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4439) granting a pension to George W. Cromis, of Washingtonville, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4440) to grant a pension to Harriet L. Hughes, widow of the late Maj. Chester K. Hughes, Company I, One hundred and forty-third Pennsylvania Volunteers, of Berwick, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4441) for the relief of Samuel C. Krickbaum, of Benton, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 4442) to correct the military record of William B. McCloy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4443) to correct the military record of Peter V. Copp—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4444) to correct the military record of Charles M. Crane—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4445) to correct the military record of Joseph B. Ellis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4446) to correct the military record of Stephen G. Fishback—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4447) to correct the military record of McKenzie H. Grandy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4448) granting a pension to E. H. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHOWALTER: A bill (H. R. 4449) to correct the military record of George Collins, late a private of Company A, One hundred and sixth-ninth Pennsylvania Drafted Militia—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 4450) for the relief of the legal representatives of George M. Clapp, of the Washington Iron Works—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 4451) for the relief of Jeronemus S. Underhill—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 4452) for the relief of Henry R. Bryan, of Craven County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 4453) for the relief of Miss Eliza A. White—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WATERS: A bill (H. R. 4454) granting a pension to Eliza C. Laycock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WANGER: A bill (H. R. 4455) granting a pension to Louisa Weidner, otherwise called Louisa Milnor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4456) for the relief of Alice A. Hartz, helpless child of John Hartz, late a private in Company K, One hundred and sixty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4457) for the recognition of the military service of the officers and enlisted men of certain State military organizations—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARNEY: A bill (H. R. 4458) to remove the charge of desertion against Johial W. Boyd—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FARIS: A bill (H. R. 4459) granting an increase of pension to Matthew Comer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4460) for the relief of the heirs of David B. Sanders, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4461) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Andrew B. Ritter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4462) to correct the military record of Benjamin Cornwell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 4463) to increase the pension of John C. Sharp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4464) to increase the pension of H. C. Stroman—to the Committee on Invalid pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4465) for the relief of William H. Sprinkle—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MUDD (by request): A bill (H. R. 4467) for the relief of John F. Anderson and Cary C. Barr—to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARMACK: Petition of Mrs. Alexander Daniels, of Gibson County, Tenn., asking reference of her war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COWHERD: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Julius Vogt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Sarah E. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Frank E. Kellogg, collector of internal revenue, Sixth district of Missouri, for relief for the loss of a retail dealers' special tax book—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GLYNN: Resolution of the employees of the New York Navy-Yard protesting against discrimination against that yard in Governmental work—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Resolution of the Thirtieth Annual Reunion of the Society of the Army of the Potomac, held at Pittsburg, Pa., October 11-12, 1899, urging the continued support of the Government in preserving the lines of battle, etc., at Gettysburg—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: Petition of Benjamin Clow and others, of Dalton, Mass., in relation to the Philippine war—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCALL: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Alexander Sutherland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Resolutions adopted at the annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans, Charleston, S. C., May 10-13, 1899, commending the work of marking the lines and positions of the contending armies in several of the great battles of the civil war—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MINOR: Petitions of citizens and surfmen of Sturgeon Bay, Wis., relative to increase of pay and length of service of life-saving crews on lakes—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OTEY: Papers relating to the claim of John J. Lloyd, executor, and others, of Alexandria County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. POLK: Petition of W. J. Martin and other citizens of Catawissa, Pa., for the construction of canals to irrigate arid lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of W. T. Creasy and other citizens of Catawissa, favoring the election of United States Senators by popular vote—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, petitions of J. S. Hower and other citizens of Catawissa, Pa., for rural free mail delivery and in favor of postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Charles H. Miller and others, of Catawissa, Pa., for the enactment of anti-trust laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of C. A. Heiss and others, of Catawissa, Pa., for protection in the use of shoddy—to the Committee on Manufactures.

Also, petition of Jacob Fetterolf and others, of Catawissa, Pa., for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of George B. Keller and others, of Catawissa, Pa., in favor of the pure-food bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODENBERG: Petition of veterans of the civil war residing at Denmark, Ill., requesting the passage of the per diem pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHOWALTER: Paper to accompany House bill to correct the military record of George Collins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Petitions, etc., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah were laid on the Clerk's desk and severally referred to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case, as follows:

By Mr. BURNETT: Petitions of B. S. Fuller, George M. Truss, J. S. Gibson, and others of the Seventh Congressional district of Alabama.

By Mr. CURTIS: Petition of William H. Page and others, of Leavenworth, Kans.

By Mr. FOSS: Petitions of W. C. Denton, C. M. Burkholder, C. H. Howard, G. L. Wallace, A. L. Jillson, and others, of the Seventh Congressional district of Illinois.

By Mr. GLYNN: Protests of pastors and congregations of many churches in the Twentieth Congressional district of New York.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Athens, Ohio.

By Mr. JACK: Petitions of citizens of Blairsville, Pa.; also citizens of Westmoreland County, T. J. Henry, and other citizens of the Twenty-first Congressional district of Pennsylvania.

By Mr. McCALL: Petitions of Horace Richardson, H. B. Doland, and others, of the Eighth Congressional district of Massachusetts.

By Mr. NAPHEN: Petitions of George Skem, W. F. Cummings, A. E. Burton, E. C. Butler, A. G. Upham, and others, of the Tenth Congressional district of Massachusetts.

By Mr. POLK: Petitions of the Ministerial Association of Shamokin, Pa.; also petitions of citizens of the Seventeenth Congressional district of Pennsylvania.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of Rev. James A. Sprague and the Methodist Episcopal Church of Fremont, Ind.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: Petition of T. F. Stauffer and 16 others, of Sioux City, Iowa.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Petitions of James M. Parrott, Lon Taylor, H. T. Gergory, and others, of the Third Congressional district of North Carolina.

By Mr. WANGER: Petitions of Rev. B. G. Parker and others, of Jenkintown, H. H. Isett and 63 others, of Yardley, Howard S. Jones and others, of Montgomery County, Women's Literary Club of Conshohocken, and Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Pottstown, Pa.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *December 16, 1899.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

AMENDMENT TO THE RULES.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read, subject to the right of objection.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Rules of the Fifty-sixth Congress be amended as follows:

After section 57 of Rule XI insert as a new paragraph, numbered 58, the clause of the rules relating to the Census Committee, amended by the insertion of the word "Select," to read as follows:

"58. All proposed legislation concerning the Twelfth Census and the apportionment of Representatives: to the Select Committee on the Twelfth Census."

Change the numbers of the last two sections of Rule XI as follows: 58 to 59; 59 to 60.

In section 2 of Rule XIII change the words "clause 57 of Rule XI" to "clause 59 of Rule XI."

In Rule XLII change the words "clause 3 of Rule XXIV" to "clause 2 of Rule XXIV."

Mr. DALZELL. I would state, Mr. Speaker, that these changes are merely formal in their character. They are mainly a change in the number of the section arising out of the introduction of a new rule by this House, and are changes made necessary in order to conform to the action of the House already taken.

The last clause changes the words in clause 3 of Rule XXIV to clause 2 of Rule XXIV, which is made necessary by the action of the House itself. These are the only changes, and I presume that there can be no objection to them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not object to the consideration——

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. RICHARDSON (continuing). But I desire to be heard for a moment only. It is evident, of course, that the resolution proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is merely a formal one. But it seems that the amendments to which he has called attention are made necessary by the present condition of the rules. And I only arise now for the purpose of suggesting that this necessity emphasizes the position that we have taken, that it was improper and unwise to adopt a code of rules in such manner as these were adopted on the first day of this session. The rules should have been referred to an appropriate committee and should have been considered by them and reported properly to the House and have come before us for consideration in the usual way, as other reports come from committees.

I only desire to say that the course pursued was unwise, as is evidenced by the necessity for these changes, and that we ought to wait in the future until the committees are appointed to consider these matters. That is all I wished to say.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. DALZELL, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF THE DIGEST.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask also unanimous consent for the adoption of the following resolution, which I send to the desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 2,600 copies of the Digest and Manual of the Rules and Practice of the House of Representatives for the first session of the Fifty-sixth Congress, the same to be bound and distributed under the direction of the Speaker and Clerk of the House.

Mr. DALZELL. This is the ordinary resolution which is considered and adopted at every session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was considered, and agreed to.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolution of the following title:

H. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1899, on the 19th day of said month.

RECEPTION OF THE STATUE OF DANIEL WEBSTER.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Concurrent resolution No. 1.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a committee consisting of three members from the Senate and five members from the House of Representatives be appointed to make arrangements for the reception and unveiling, on January 18, 1900, of the statue of Daniel Webster presented to the United States by Mr. Stilson Hutchins and erected on Massachusetts avenue, in the city of Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] asked me before the introduction of the resolution if I desired to make any objection. I assured him that I did not. But I wish to inquire if there had been any previous agreement on the part of the Government to accept this statue of Mr. Webster.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the facts of the case are simply these: The appropriation bill of 1897 for the fiscal year of 1898 contained an appropriation of $4,000 for the construction of the pedestal on which this statue is to rest. I do not know whether there has been any other formal acceptance of the gift than that. I suppose that would commit the Government to the usual acceptance, provided the statue was found worthy as a work of art.

I understand this is in accordance with the usual precedents in such cases. It will lead to no expense. None is contemplated by the resolution, and none would occur in consequence of the passage of the resolution.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. My only purpose in making that inquiry was simply this, that it can not be assumed by any gentleman who desires to present the Government with a statue that the Government will accept it. It seems to me that there ought to have been something in the prior legislation of Congress indicating a purpose to accept it, even before the work was done. However, it is certainly something to ornament the city, and as it will cost no more than the amount that has already been expended, or authorized to be expended, I have no objection to the acceptance of it; but I do believe it is a bad precedent to allow a private citizen, or anybody, so far as that is concerned, to assume that the Government will accept his gift.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there may have been a formal acceptance. That would be indicated by the appropriation, but I do not know.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I move to amend the resolution by striking out the word "three" in line 3 and inserting in lieu thereof the word "five," so that the representation of the House may be five instead of three, which, I am informed, is the ordinary precedent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment to the Senate resolution, substituting five for three as the number of representatives from the House.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with the special order, the House will resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1, and the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. HEPBURN, will take the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill H. R. 1. The Clerk will report section 1.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the standard unit of value shall, as now, be the dollar, and shall consist of 25.8 grains of gold, nine-tenths fine, or 23.22 grains of pure gold, being the one-tenth part of the eagle.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I listened with a great deal of interest to a large portion of the speech made yesterday by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] and pondered in my mind the significance of his statements in regard to the effect that the pending legislation would have upon the interests and welfare of the country. The speech was an able one from the standpoint occupied by him and was significant in the matter of prophetic declarations which lie for their fulfillment away off in the future.

If I were compelled to accept his statements as correct, I should fear for the welfare of my country. I should have liked to ask the gentleman one question at the time, and that would have been whether or not, in his opinion, if the Democratic party had been successful in 1896 and had enacted a provision of law for the coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1—whether or not the tide of gold that has flowed into this country, and which the gentleman admits, and truthfully admits, has in large part helped to stimulate the prosperity of the country, would have come here? I should have liked to have him answer the question whether it is not a fact that in all history the influx of a cheap money into a country drives out of circulation the better currency.

But that was not the point that I desired to call attention to. I remember that the gentleman made a very able speech on the 19th day of March, 1897, upon this floor at the time of the debate upon the Dingley bill, and I have reflected since yesterday that from the circumstance of that speech and the subsequent history of the country great comfort may be drawn by us that his fearful forebodings of yesterday may not come true. I desire, Mr. Chairman, as a part of my speech, that the Clerk shall read two paragraphs which I have marked in that very able speech to which I have referred.

The Clerk read as follows:

[Congressional Record, Fifty-fifth Congress, first session, page 75.]

I desire to assure the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] that there is no disposition on this side of the House to unduly protract the debate upon this bill. If we could hope ultimately to defeat it, we would feel required by a sense of duty to employ all honorable means to do so; but knowing that we can not prevent its passage, we believe that it will be better for the country and, in the end, it will be better for our party, that it shall pass without unreasonable delay. [Applause on the Republican side.]

If it can produce the good results which its authors prophesy it will, then the people ought to have the benefit of it as speedily as possible, and if it can not produce those results, then the sooner it is tried and found wanting the sooner it will be repealed and the sooner the people will be relieved of its unjust exactions. I warn you now that if this bill fails—as fail it will—to bring the prosperity which the Republicans have promised, you will not live long enough to obtain a patient audience with the American people upon the absurd proposition that you can make them prosperous by increasing their taxes. [Applause on the Democratic side.] * * *

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I ask that the gentleman from Ohio may be permitted to proceed for five minutes longer.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I should like to complete the quotation, because it is better than my average production. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman from Ohio be permitted to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Now, you must put your principles to a practical test. If you were right, your task is an easy one; if you were wrong, it is an impossible one. As for my part, I was never more confident of any event in the future than I am that your bill will disappoint its promoters and the people. Our political opinions are all at fault if you can make the people more prosperous by making their taxes higher—if you can make them more contented by privileging incorporated greed to still further prey upon their wasted strength. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You can undoubtedly make the favored classes prosperous; but that was not your promise. You promised to make the times better for all the people; and you must redeem that promise or be driven from the high places which you occupy.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, in the light of the history of the past two years, I say to my friends here on this side of the House and to my friends on the other side of the House, there is hope for us yet. [Laughter on the Republican side.] May we not apply to our situation the words of the poet:

Ye fearful saints, fresh courage take;
The clouds ye so much dread
Are big with mercy, and will break
With blessings on our heads.

[Laughter.]

I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, Republican jubilation over the result of the recent elections is one of the most amazing phenomena that I have observed in forty-nine years of tabernacling in the flesh. [Laughter.]

It reminds me of a story I once heard. A young physician was called in a case of great delicacy. When he returned to the office, his veteran partner asked him how he got along. "First rate," replied the youthful disciple of Æsculapius. "The mother and baby are both dead, but I saved the old man!" [Great laughter.]

So with the Republicans. [Laughter.] They lost Maryland. Their beastly majority in Ohio was reduced to a minority of fifty-odd thousand. The Fusion majority in Nebraska was multiplied fivefold. The Fusionists made large gains in Kansas. The Republicans of Pennsylvania sustained great losses and were so badly scared that they imported a job lot of heelers and repeaters from this city [laughter], but Republicans howl with delight because they "saved the old man!" [Great laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

With their combs cut, both wings broken, and their tail feathers plucked, they still crow because they "saved the old man!" [Renewed laughter.]

After the celebrated Hampton Roads conference the following dialogue took place between Abraham Lincoln and William H. Seward: "Did you see Alexander H. Stephens?" asked the President. "Yes," replied the Secretary of State. "See him with his overcoat on?" "Yes." "See him with it off?" "Yes." "Did you ever see so small a nubbin in so large a shuck?" "No."

So with this Republican victory on which gentlemen plume themselves. It is a very small nubbin in a very large shuck.

It seems to me that they must feel much the same as did Pyrrhus, King of Epirus, when in walking over a field he had won by the skin of his teeth, gazing upon the piles of corpses of his brave followers, he mournfully exclaimed, "Another such a victory and we are undone!"

CIVIL SERVICE AS PRACTICED BY REPUBLICANS.

So far as I am advised, there is only one Republican in the House thoroughly justified in rejoicing over the November elections. That is my venerable and amiable friend from Ohio, General GROSVENOR; not because Nash is a minority governor, but because the means resorted to to elect Nash at all demonstrate that our beautiful and bewildering system of civil-service reform is now placed in "the process of ultimate extinction" [laughter], an object dear to the heart of the gentleman from Ohio. And it must be peculiarly gratifying to him that its overthrow was accomplished by two Ohio statesmen, President William McKinley and Hon. William F. Burdell, treasurer of the Republican State executive committee. They killed Cock Robin dead as a smelt.

When the President declared in his inaugural that "no backward step must be taken in civil-service reform," all the civil-service reformers in the land and all the beneficiaries of that system pronounced him "another Daniel come to judgment," and General GROSVENOR and other Republican spoilsmen retired into the Cave of Adullam. But the President, growing weary of beholding the mourning countenances of Grosvenorian pot-hunters, had compassion on them and, forgetting his inaugural, took a step—a long step—backward.

Indeed, he had on his seven-league boots and at one step went backward about one-eleventh of the entire distance traveled over and fought over inch by inch by the reformers in many long, wearisome years, for by Executive order of May 29, 1899, he turned over to the tender mercies of Republican spoilsmen between 8,000 and 10,000 timorous, trembling, tearful, squirming Democratic officials whom civil-service reform had clothed as with a garment. There has not been such a wholesale slaughter of the innocents since the days of King Herod. Thus was the countenance of General GROSVENOR made to shine. He and his coparceners emerged from the Cave of Adullam and fell upon the victims, tearing and rending them, while the reformers toppled into the Slough of Despond.

Another thing happened to warm the cockles of General GROSVENOR'S heart when Hon. William F. Burdell, treasurer of the Republican State executive committee of Ohio, issued his famous circular inviting—and his invitation was tantamount to a command—all Federal officials to come down with the dust to assist in the great work of political reform—with a big, big R—then being carried to fruition by Hon. MARCUS A. HANNA, Senator and chairman of the national Republican committee; Hon. CHARLES DICK, Representative in Congress and chairman of the Ohio Republican State committee, and Hon. George B. COX, the hoodlum chief of Cincinnati, the maker and unmaker of Ohio statesmen—a sort of Buckeye Warwick. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

How much fat Mr. Burdell fried out of the Federal employees I do not know. In round numbers, there are about 200,000 of them, with salaries ranging from $50,000 down. Assuming that the average salary is $1,000, we have a total of $200,000,000; and assuming further that the average "free-will offering" in the cause of reform under the thumbscrew process of Mr. Burdell was 10 per cent, the result is $2,000,000—a neat sum to be expended in conducting a pure election in a Republican State. Mr. Burdell may have received and disbursed more or less. He knows; and, if it will not disturb the equanimity of my learned friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BROSIUS], late chairman of the Committee on Civil Service Reform, I suggest that he introduce a resolution to appoint a committee with power to send for persons and papers to ascertain precisely how much blackmail Burdell received from Federal officials; and, while he is at it, to have a committee of exploration appointed to discover whether the Civil Service Commission has been kidnapped or destroyed or in any manner curtailed of its fair proportions or has become a mere tender to the Republican party. [Laughter on the Democratic side].

Contemplating these two stupendous victories of Republican spoilsmen, and varying the famous words of Wellington at Waterloo, I say, "Up, reformers, and at them!"

If the President takes ten more such steps backward, the civil service reform system will be a schoolboy's tale, the wonder of an hour; and if Burdell is allowed to run at large and to raid Federal employees when he pleases, Congress will soon be called on to establish a soup house here in Washington for their sustenance, for the money he squeezed out of them in 1899 in order to carry Ohio is not a drop in the bucket compared with the vast sum the Republicans will need to carry the country in 1900.

If Burdell and his ilk are not choked off, Federal employees had, one and all, better take the benefit of the bankrupt law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

There was no objection.

GENERAL GROSVENOR AND THE WILSON BILL.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Out in my county there dwelt a lawyer, Col. George W. Anderson, who for four years was a member of this House. He was always a brilliant orator, but in his younger days not well up in the technicalities of his profession. On one occasion he was about to be knocked out of court when Judge Porter, who was presiding—a very kind-hearted man—undertook to help him by saying: "Colonel Anderson, are you taken by surprise?" Whereupon Anderson electrified bench and bar by replying: "Good God, your honor! I am not only surprised, but utterly astounded!" [Great laughter.]

I was likewise astounded when I heard the gentleman from Ohio, General GROSVENOR, say that the Wilson tariff bill was a free-trade measure. [Laughter.] There is nowhere on earth or under the earth or in the air above the earth a scintilla of evidence on which to base that statement. It is absolutely preposterous. That bill carried an average tariff duty of nearly 40 per cent on about 4,000 articles of everyday consumption. Surely no sane man can believe or does believe that such a bill was a free-trade measure. Free traders voted for it holding their noses. They voted for it because it was the best they could get and cut down the rates of the McKinley bill of abominations about 8 per cent. It is a poor cause that necessitates such wrenching of historic facts to support it and only shows to what straits Republicans are driven to defend their present course.

A characterless, obscure, and ignorant stump speaker might be excused for making such a groundless assertion in the heat of debate out in the backwoods of Ohio, but General GROSVENOR can not be excused on any such theory. He can not afford to make such a ridiculous statement. He certainly can not be excused on the grounds of ignorance, for one of his foibles is omniscience; nor on grounds of inexperience, for he has long since passed the effervescent period of youth; sixty-six winters have frosted his head with silver, and he is a veteran, a conspicuous, an able member of this House. He is a great historic personage [laughter]; younger men look to him for guidance. He is the only real, simon-pure, major prophet now known to be on terra firma.

The public regards him as a sort of walking delegate for the Administration [laughter], its mouthpiece on this floor, the keeper of the king's conscience and groom of the Presidential posset.

He owes it to his own fame, to the dignity of this House, and to the cause of truth and justice to expunge that charge from his speech, for it is baseless as the fabric of a vision.

THE PENDING CURRENCY BILL.

"Consistency's a jewel." If the philosopher who wrote that famous sentence should return to earth and should find himself among the Republican majority of the House of Representatives, he would feel as lonesome as Adam before Eve impinged upon his enraptured vision or as Alexander Selkirk in the oppressive solitude of his desert island.

If Hamlet, Prince of Denmark, were speaking as of the political morals of the supporters of "the Atlantic City money bill," he would change his far-resounding exclamation: "Frailty, thy name is woman!" so as to read: "Frailty, thy name is latter-day Republicanism!"

With consciences of india rubber and cheeks of Hindoo gods, Republican Representatives and Senators are now doing the very thing which we charged in 1896 they would do, if given sufficient power, which charge Republican orators and editors west of the Alleghenies with one accord denied as bitterly and vehemently as Peter denied his Lord and Master. I suppose I owe an apology to the memory of the great apostle for placing him even temporarily in such ignoble company and make amends by stating at once the historic fact that he made noble atonement for his one act of weakness and unfaithfulness—an example which Republicans are not liable to emulate. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

The die is cast. Hugh H. Hanna and his confreres are anxious for the sacrifice. The majority here are eager to do his bidding. Argument has about the same effect upon Republican Representatives as it would if addressed to "the dull, cold ear of death." This House will pass "the Atlantic City money bill," and the Senate will pass it or something equally as bad. No Republican will dare to oppose it for two reasons—fear of the caucus lash and fear of being divorced from the pie counter. Our appeal is not

to the members of this House, but to those who make and unmake Representatives—the great body of the American people. In them we place our trust and not in those who are looking hungrily to the White House for favors to come.

History frequently repeats itself—a fact that gives the minority both confidence and consolation.

Thomas Campbell says:

I watch the wheels of Nature's mazy plan,
And learn the future by the past of man.

That is a good rule by which to judge. Let us apply it to this bill.

At the behest of Nicholas Biddle a supple Congress passed a bill to recharter the old Bank of the United States, and its members fondly hoped that they had thereby made their calling and election sure, if not to mansions in the skies, at least to good, fat offices; but, fortunately for the cause of constitutional government and of human liberty, at that time there sat in the Presidential chair one of the purest and bravest patriots that ever lived, the iron soldier of the Hermitage, Andrew Jackson, of blessed and immortal memory, who promptly vetoed that obnoxious and dangerous measure.

Both parties to that Titantic struggle appealed to the people, and after a historical contest Jackson was triumphantly reelected by an overwhelming majority, receiving 239 electoral votes to 49 for his opponent. The people stood faithfully by Jackson because he stood unflinchingly by the people. Unfortunately we have no Andrew Jackson in the White House now to veto this infamous measure, but upon the appeal to the people in 1900 William J. Bryan will be indorsed by as great a majority as was Andrew Jackson in 1832.

REPUBLICANS EAT THEIR OWN WORDS.

Nearly all the great Republicans who have lived since 1873—Grant, Garfield, Blaine, John Sherman, Logan, GROSVENOR, ALLISON, Don Cameron, Windom, JOSEPH G. CANNON [laughter], HEPBURN, DOLLIVER [laughter], Matthew Stanley Quay, WILLIAM E. CHANDLER, and others, as the sale bills say, "too tedious to mention" [laughter], have condemned the main features of "the Atlantic City money bill" by tongue or pen or vote. The silver speeches, the greenback speeches, and the anti-single-gold-standard speeches of Republican Senators and Representatives, now stultifying themselves by supporting this iniquitous measure, would if collected make a volume larger than the Bible. In the light of their votes now those speeches will constitute rare, rich, and racy reading when their authors are arraigned at the bar of public opinion. Out of their own mouths will these high and lofty political somersaulters be condemned.

PRESIDENT M'KINLEY RECANTS.

Of all the eminent Republicans who, first and last, have championed silver, President William McKinley is facile princeps.

In Congress he not only spoke eloquently and unanswerably for silver, but he voted for the Stanley Mathews resolution, for the original Bland bill, for the Bland bill with the Senate amendments, and his name is recorded in the roll of honor of those who voted to pass the Bland-Allison bill over the veto of pseudo-President Hayes.

[Here the hammer fell. By unanimous consent, Mr. CLARK was allowed five minutes more time.]

In Congress he made this wise and patriotic utterance:

I am for the largest use of silver in the currency of the country. I would not dishonor it. I would give it equal credit and honor with gold. I would make no discrimination. I would utilize both metals as money and discredit neither. I want the double standard.

That is a sound declaration, well worthy of remembrance.

At Toledo, Ohio, February 12, 1891, he excoriated Grover Cleveland for being hostile to silver in a highly artistic manner, as follows:

During all of his years at the head of the Government he was dishonoring one of our precious metals, one of our own great products, discrediting silver and enhancing the price of gold. He endeavored, even before his inauguration to office, to stop the coinage of silver dollars, and afterwards, and to the end of his Administration, persistently used his power to that end. He was determined to contract the circulating medium and demonetize one of the coins of commerce, limit the volume of money among the people, make money scarce and therefore dear. He would have increased the value of money and diminished the value of everything else—money the master, everything else its servant. He was not thinking of "the poor" then. He had left "their side." He was not "standing forth in their defense." Cheap coats, cheap labor, and dear money; the sponsor and promoter of these professing to stand guard over the welfare of the poor and lowly. Was there ever more glaring inconsistency or reckless assumption?

In reading those glowing words I am constrained to exclaim in the language of the immortal Squeers: "Here's richness!" And it appears to me that the President, having recanted the opinions he then held, should telegraph his apologies to his great prototype, "the Sage of Princeton," in whose footsteps he is now walking so faithfully and so enthusiastically. [Laughter.]

But an astounding change has come over the spirit of his dream, and he now "urgently recommends, to support the gold standard," a measure which not only establishes by law the gold standard, but which practically retires the greenbacks, thereby contracting the volume of the currency by $346,000,000, reduces silver coins to mere token money, gives carte blanche to the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds, abdicates the paramount function of government—that of regulating the quantity of money—and turns the financial interests of the country over to the tender mercies of the National Bank Association, conferring upon it the power to expand or contract the volume of our circulating medium at will, a power too vast and too dangerous to be intrusted to any private persons or to any corporation whatsoever.

Here are the exact words of his message. They constitute his latest utterance. He says:

In its earlier history the national banking act seemed to prove a reasonable avenue through which needful additions to the circulation could from time to time be made. Changing conditions have apparently rendered it now inoperative to that end. The high margin in bond securities required, resulting from large premiums which Government bonds command in the market, or the tax on note issues, or both operating together, appear to be the influences which impair its public utility.

The attention of Congress is respectfully invited to this important matter with the view of ascertaining whether or not such reasonable modifications can be made in the national banking act as will render its service in the particulars here referred to more responsive to the people's needs. I again urge that national banks be authorized to organize with a capital of $25,000.

I urgently recommend that to support the existing gold standard, and to maintain "the parity in value of the two metals (gold and silver) and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the market and in the payment of debts," the Secretary of the Treasury be given additional power and charged with the duty to sell United States bonds and to other effective means as may be necessary to these ends.

The authority should include the power to sell bonds on long and short time, as conditions may require, and should provide for a rate of interest lower than that fixed by the act of January 14, 1875. While there is now no commercial fright which withdraws gold from the Government, but, on the contrary, such widespread confidence that gold seeks the Treasury demanding paper money in exchange, yet the very situation points to the present as the most fitting time to make adequate provision to insure the continuance of the gold standard and of public confidence in the ability and purpose of the Government to meet all its obligations in the money which the civilized world recognizes as the best. The financial transactions of the Government are conducted upon a gold basis.

We receive gold when we sell United States bonds and use gold for their payment. We are maintaining the parity of all the money issued or coined by authority of the Government. We are doing these things with the means at hand. Happily at the present time we are not compelled to resort to loans to supply gold. It has been done in the past, however, and may have to be done in the future. It behooves us, therefore, to provide at once the best means to meet the emergency when it arises, and the best means are those which are most certain and economical. Those now authorized have the virtue neither of directness nor economy.

We have already eliminated one of the causes of our financial plight and embarrassment during the years 1893, 1894, 1895, and 1896. Our receipts now equal our expenditures; deficient revenues no longer create alarm. Let us remove the only remaining cause by conferring the full and necessary power on the Secretary of the Treasury, and impose upon him the duty to uphold the present gold standard and preserve the coins of the two metals on a parity with each other, which is the repeatedly declared policy of the United States.

In this connection I repeat my former recommendations, that a portion of the gold holdings shall be placed in a trust fund, from which greenbacks shall be redeemed upon presentation, but when once redeemed shall not thereafter be paid out except for gold.

I have no unkindness in my heart toward the President. I repeat now in this distinguished presence, what I have said repeatedly elsewhere, that he is a gracious, graceful, tactful, agreeable gentleman. As a Presidential politician he ranks with Martin Van Buren and Abraham Lincoln. He is never in advance of his party. He never lags behind it. He keeps abreast of it. His finger is constantly on the Republican pulse; his ear close to the Republican heart to catch its every throb. His position may always be safely taken as the position of the Republican majority.

So far as I know, he is the only occupant of the White House that ever by an oratorical tour elected enough of his party to the House of Representatives to change into a majority what would otherwise have been a minority. With consummate skill he converted popular enthusiasm for his high position to partisan advantage, a performance which can be complained of, if at all, only on grounds of taste. Whether to his "swing around the circle" may be applied the old Latin dictum "de gustibus non est disputandum" I shall not now undertake to say.

I assume that the President spoke and voted his honest sentiments when voting and speaking for silver in the years agone and that he voices his honest sentiments now in "urgently recommending" Congress to legislate in support of the single gold standard, but surely the evolutionary process in his case has been as miraculous and radical, if not as swift, as was that of Saul of Tarsus, who began his religious career by persecuting the early Christians and ended by becoming the chief propagandist of their faith: for from his official coigne of vantage the President speaks as one having authority—at least to a majority of this House, and, I have no doubt, to a majority of the other House.

"I urgently recommend that to support the existing gold standard," etc., says the President. Not only recommends, but "urgently" recommends. The chances are a thousand to one that had he uttered that sentiment in the campaign of 1896 he would not now be in position to send a message to Congress and there would be no gold-standard Congress to receive it. It was the pledge in the St. Louis platform to secure bimetallism by international agreement that landed him in the White House. So says Hon. JOHN M. THURSTON, Republican Senator from Nebraska.

The pledge of international bimetallism held enough Silver Republicans in line to give the election to Mr. McKinley.

REPUBLICAN DECEPTION IN 1896.

Indeed, all over the Western country we declared what we believed then to be true, and what we know now, that if the Republicans carried the country they would establish the gold standard by law. They denied the charge with indignation and boldly and falsely asseverated that they were better silver men than we were—that they were advocating a practicable and we an impracticable theory of restoring silver to its ancient place of honor in the coinage system of the world. Marvelous to tell, multiplied thousands believed them, swallowed the bait, and voted with them—which is proof positive that all the fools are not dead yet, or at any rate were not dead in 1896.

It will not do for Western Republican gold-standard advocates to say now that they are occupying in 1899 the same position they held in 1896, for by so doing they give the lie direct to nearly every Republican speaker who appeared upon the stump west of the Alleghanies in the Presidential campaign and to every Republican editor who supported Mr. McKinley throughout all that vast region.

Furthermore, they are estopped by their multifarious declarations in public speech and in the public press from now denying that the plank in favor of bimetallism by international agreement was placed in the platform in good faith, or that they then believed bimetallism to be correct in principle or that they intended to honestly endeavor to secure it in the manner therein proposed.

Should they enter such denial now, they would write themselves down as the most conscienceless set of tricksters and jugglers that ever played upon the credulity of a confiding people. It would be decidedly interesting to know precisely what Senator WOLCOTT, of Colorado, and the other American International Bimetallic Commissioners think of the sincerity of purpose of this Administration in the futile endeavor to secure bimetallism by international agreement.

Their candid opinion of the interview of Hon. Lyman J. Gage, with which he hamstrung them just as they were about to succeed in securing bimetallism by international agreement and brought all their labors to an inglorious conclusion, would contribute largely to the gayety of nations, if not to the gayety of the Secretary of the Treasury. I have often imagined the junior Senator from the Centennial State chewing the bitter cud of disappointment and repeating Tennyson's apostrophe to the ocean:

> Break, break, break,
> On the cold, gray stones, O sea!
> And I would that my tongue could utter
> The thoughts that arise in me.

Perhaps in the fullness of time he may unbosom himself, and if he ever does my prediction is that "WOLCOTT on Lyman" will rank with "Demosthenes on the Crown" or with Cicero when he thundered against Catiline.

There is one great advantage growing out of the present situation. The atmosphere is cleared. Hereafter, so far as gold and silver are concerned, it is the single gold standard in its baldness and badness against bimetallism. Certainly there can be no subterfuge, no paltering in a double sense hereafter. The Republican who next year goes yawping about the country claiming to be in favor of international bimetallism is likely to be hooted from the hustings.

If obtaining offices by false pretenses were a felony, as is obtaining money or property, the entire Republican party could be sent to the penitentiary for their conduct in carrying the election of 1896, thereby gobbling up the Presidency and something like 200,000 fat appointive offices; for it is a patent fact that they carried the election by advocating one proposition and are now enacting another and an entirely different proposition into law.

In 1896 both Democrats and Republicans declared for bimetallism—Democrats by independent American action, Republicans through international agreement. The Palmer-Buckner contingent, a mere bagatelle, were the only avowed single gold-standard advocates that year. They were the vanguard of the Republican army. The numerous and gorgeous bouquets which Republicans are throwing to each other for being goldbugs ought to go to the Palmerites of 1896. Republicans are only eleventh-hour converts. I am for giving the devil his due, and to the Palmerites belong the honor or dishonor of this bill.

PALMER CHIEF REPUBLICAN.

Gen. John M. Palmer is the real Republican leader. He blazed the way. He made the mark which Republicans are compelled to toe. They are three years late, but they are coming up to the scratch. Unless gratitude is a lost virtue, instead of sequestering General Palmer on a meager pension pittance of $50 per month, the national bankers, whose faithful servant he was, ought to dress him in purple and fine linen, stuff him with mushrooms, ortolan, tongues of humming birds, and flamingoes, terrapin, and canvasback duck so long as he lives, and then rear to his memory a lofty monument, on which should be chiseled these words:

> This man led the Republicans into committing the most colossal act of bad faith recorded in the entire annals of the human race.

REPUBLICAN FINANCIAL PLANK IN 1896.

In order that there may be no mistake about it, I here quote the financial plank of the St. Louis platform:

> The Republican party is unreservedly for sound money. It caused the enactment of the law providing for the resumption of specie payments in 1879; since then every dollar has been as good as gold.
>
> We are unalterably opposed to every measure calculated to debase our currency or impair the credit of our country. We are therefore opposed to the free coinage of silver except by international agreement with the leading commercial nations of the world, which we pledge ourselves to promote, and until such agreement can be obtained the existing gold standard must be preserved. All our silver and paper currency must be maintained at parity with gold, and we favor all measures designed to maintain inviolably the obligations of the United States and all our money, whether coin or paper, at the present standard—the standard of the most enlightened nations of the earth.

I undertake to say that William McKinley owes his election to the twelve words, "Except by international agreement with the leading commercial nations of the world." At least so says Hon. WILLIAM E. CHANDLER, Republican Senator from New Hampshire, and he ought to know, for he has had a good deal to do with Republican politics.

A QUEER CONTENTION.

Senator JOSEPH BENSON FORAKER, of Ohio, and Hermann H. Kohlsaat, editor and owner of the Chicago Times-Herald and the Chicago Evening Post, are at the present juncture engaged in a heated controversy as to which of them belongs the honor of having written that plank of the St. Louis platform. I understand that Mr. Kohlsaat keeps what he claims to be the original draft of that wondrous and wicked straddle, in his own handwriting, framed and hanging above his desk as evidence that he is the author.

I suppose that Senator FORAKER carries around in his inside pocket next his heart a copy in his handwriting; but I make bold to predict that the day is not far distant when Mr. Kohlsaat will be perfectly willing that Senator FORAKER shall have the dubious honor of its paternity, and that Senator FORAKER will be eager to unload the obloquy attaching to it upon the shoulders of Mr. Koh'saat; for I am certain, absolutely certain, that not only the United States but the whole world will return to bimetallism under an impulse of self-preservation too strong to be resisted.

In that day every man who had any hand in constructing that miserable and infamous straddle and every man who stood by consenting will hasten to disclaim any connection with that performance, which will stink in the nostrils of mankind. With that straddle staring them in the face, why are the Republicans in such a hurry to pass this monstrous measure? The solution of this apparent riddle is not far to seek. The national banks furnished a large portion of the vast sum of money used to carry the election of 1896, and they now demand their reward and are now foreclosing their mortgage on the Republican party.

THE OHIO FINANCIAL STRADDLE OF 1896.

As for months prior to the St. Louis convention Mr. McKinley was the leading Republican Presidential candidate—indeed, the inevitable nominee—it is not unreasonable to assume that the financial plank of the Ohio platform of that year reflected his sentiments on that subject. It has been denounced and ridiculed as a most skillful "straddle," but such as it is, it must have met with his approval. Whatever else it may be, it is not a declaration in favor of the single gold standard. Having quoted his message to show his position now, I quote the Ohio financial plank of 1896 to show his position then. Gaze upon that picture, then on this:

> We contend for honest money, a currency of gold, silver, and paper, with which to measure our exchange that shall be as sound as the Government itself and as untarnished as its honor; and to that end we favor bimetallism and demand the use of both gold and silver as a standard money, either in accordance with a ratio to be fixed by an international agreement, if that can be obtained, or under such restrictions and such provisions, to be determined by legislation, as will secure the maintenance of the parities of values of the two metals, so that the purchasing and debt-paying power of the dollar, whether of gold, silver, or paper, shall at all times be equal.

With a considerable rhetorical flourish that "straddle" was intended to be "all things to all men," hoping thereby to win votes for Ohio's favorite son at St. Louis. But the convention kicked that "straddle" out of the door and got up a "straddle" of its own, sufficiently ingenious to rope in enough of the unwary to elect Mr. McKinley. Truly 1896 was a good year for catching gudgeons.

All entomologists know that in nature there is a process of transition marked by three steps—larva, chrysalis, butterfly. In their progression Republicans have developed three statuses: Free silverites, international bimetallists, goldbugs; and according to my friend from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] they are now one and all full-fledged golden-winged butterflies. They have all bowed the knee to Baal.

WHY URGENCY?

Why this "urgency" on the part of the President in recommending the support of the gold standard? Is it a fear that our much-vaunted prosperity is about to vanish as a dream? It must be so, for he gives this reason for his "urgency:"

> While there is now no commercial fright which withdraws gold from the Government, but, on the contrary, such widespread confidence that gold

seeks the Treasury demanding paper money in exchange, yet the very situation points to the present as the most fitting time to make adequate provision to insure the continuance of the gold standard.

No question that the fear is there and that if the gold standard is not established by law now it can never be so established. Hence this hot haste.

Can such things be,
And overcome us like a summer's cloud,
Without our special wonder?

Particularly when we have been led to believe that this Administration caused the rains to fall, the sun to shine, and the crops to grow in America; produced a famine abroad, and scattered the golden nuggets in Alaska.

But stranger still, the President says:

Happily at the present time we are not compelled to resort to loans to supply gold. It has been done in the past, and—

"If ye have tears, prepare to shed them now!"—

may have to be done in the future.

So that, notwithstanding we are daily and hourly assured that we are now enjoying the greatest prosperity in our history, the President is actually contemplating a recurrence to bond issues, for in another place, in asking for more power to the Secretary of the Treasury, he says:

The authority should include the power to sell bonds on long and short time, as conditions may arise.

Wonders will never cease. A great many persons believe that the Secretary of the Treasury now has too much power touching the sale of bonds. Nevertheless, the President asks for more, and, sad to say, he will get it. National banks get what they ask from this Administration. The people get nothing but orders to pay more taxes; but a day of reckoning will come as certain as a just God reigns on high.

16 TO 1.

Certain Representatives from the East, rated as Democrats in the Directory and newspapers, avow their purpose to vote for this bill. In so doing they are out of touch with the great body of the party. The vast majority of Democrats are as much in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver as they ever were. Not as a matter of expediency, but as a matter of principle they and I believe in the Second Declaration of Independence with our whole hearts. The true situation might as well be clearly understood first as last, and it is this: We intend to readopt—not simply reaffirm, but readopt—the financial plank of the Chicago platform, word for word, syllable by syllable, abating neither jot nor tittle of that great confession of Democratic faith.

The free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the historical ratio of 16 to 1, without waiting for the consent of any other nation on earth, will be the supreme issue in 1900, as it was in 1896. Upon that platform we will place Bryan and elect him. Self-seeking politicians, timorous souls, may fall away from us, but the paramount issue and the peerless candidate will remain. Politicians do not make issues. The people make them. And they make something else. They make politicians, and when politicians do not do to suit them they unmake the politicians and make a new set who will do to suit them. The plain Democrats—those who seek no office and who expect none—know exactly what they want. They want Bryan and the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at 16 to 1, and these they intend to have. We would stultify ourselves by changing position in front of the enemy. Even as a matter of expediency we would lose by such a move, for every time we gained one vote in the East we would lose two or three or a half dozen in the South and West. To abandon the Chicago platform would not only be wrong. It would be suicidal.

Of course other issues will be presented, but they will be subsidiary to that of the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at 16 to 1. We will have strong anti-trust and anti-imperialistic planks—strong as language can make them. Also a plank in favor of an income tax, and another in favor of economy in the public service, that labor may be lightly burdened. But the overshadowing issue—the one on which the decisive battle will be fought, and on which the victory will be won—is free coinage of gold and silver at the old ratio of 16 to 1, without asking anybody's consent or waiting for anybody's assistance. This is the programme, and gentlemen may as well govern themselves accordingly. One swallow does not make a summer. The desertion of a soldier now and then does not portend that the silver hosts are either dejected or disintegrating. We know we are right, and we will persevere until complete victory perches upon our banner.

The average citizen has more sense than he is credited with, and he knows that the prosperity so widely bruited here grows out of accidental and ephemeral causes which have turned the balance of trade in our favor, which have increased our stock of gold; that should the balance of trade turn against us, as it may do next year, this country will be drained of its gold and times will grow harder, and, having no adequate quantity of basic money, conditions will be worse than during the panic of 1893. Therefore he is for silver—all we can get of it by free and unlimited coinage at 16 to 1. Consequently, he does not intend to permit that issue to be side-tracked, shunted out of the way, or overshadowed by any other issue, and the Democratic politician who tries to play him that trick will get his neck broken off as short as you can break a piece of glass. If we were right in 1896, we are right now, and we propose to stand by our guns, neither asking nor giving quarter.

AS TO PROSPERITY.

You Republicans exploit the prosperity which you claim is universal and enduring. It is not true. It is largely fictitious and altogether sporadic. What does it profit a farmer to have a rise of a few cents a bushel on his oats, wheat, corn, and potatoes above the prices of the panic year of 1893, and at the same time pay double and in some cases triple rates for what he buys? You claim, furthermore, that this boasted prosperity has been produced by reason of the fact that we have been on the gold standard. This is not true. It is the old and condemned fallacy of "Cum hoc, ergo propter hoc." Your logic in syllogistic form would run in this wise: "The gold standard produces prosperity; we have the gold standard; therefore our prosperity was produced by the gold standard. Q. E. D."

To overthrow that reasoning I will quote the ideas, if not the exact words, of a Republican authority as high and mighty as any here, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, the most ably conducted Republican newspaper in America, bitter as gall in its partisanship.

Not long since it had a flaming editorial congratulating the Republic of Mexico on her unprecedented prosperity. It was the finest and most glowing editorial that I have read in that paper in many a day.

Now, it is a fact known of all men, that the Republic of Mexico is on the silver standard. Consequently on the "Cum hoc, ergo propter hoc" theory, the syllogism would be stated thus: "Mexico is prosperous; Mexico has the silver standard; therefore the silver standard produces prosperity. Q. E. D."

Let's try this method of reasoning once more: "A bank broke in Boston to-day; we have the gold standard; therefore the failure of the bank was caused by the gold standard. Q. E. D."

By that sort of reasoning any proposition, however absurd, may be established.

INDECENT HASTE.

The indecent and inexcusable haste with which this bill is being railroaded through must forever remain a blot upon the history of the Republican majority of the Fifty-sixth Congress; and you need not be surprised if in the days to come this unseemly and outrageous precedent arises to plague its inventors. All summer the leaders of the majority have known the provisions of this bill and have had months in which to prepare their arguments. The minority had one week day in which to prepare for battle on a bill which revolutionizes our entire financial system.

If this had been simply an anti-silver bill, little preparation would have been needed; but this bill goes much further. It makes token money of silver, converts $500,000,000 of silver coin and certificates from an asset into a debt of the Government, to be redeemed in gold, practically retires the greenbacks, multiplies the power of the national banks—placing the prosperity of 70,000,000 persons within their keeping—and gives the Secretary of the Treasury power to issue bonds ad libitum. It broadens the financial question and lifts it to the high plane on which Andrew Jackson and the old Bank of the United States fought it out more than a half century ago, and for the discussion of this momentous question, which affects the welfare and happiness of every man, woman, and child in the Republic and of all the teeming millions yet to be, about twenty-seven hours of daylight have been permitted, that, too, without the bill ever having been referred to or considered by any committee of the House. Parliamentary tyranny can go little further and do little worse; but it is an old saying that "It's a long lane that has no turn," and history shows that majorities frequently dwindle into minorities, and our turn will surely come at last.

Do the people want silver coin converted into mere token money? They are not such idiots as to desire such wanton waste, for if it is to be mere token money, to be redeemed in gold, why waste fifty-odd cents in silver to make a token dollar, when 1 cent's worth of paper would do as well?

Do the people desire to convert 500,000,000 silver dollars, now an asset of the Government, good for the payment of all obligations, public and private, into a debt of that amount, thereby really diminishing their wealth by twice the amount of silver coin now outstanding? Surely they are not so insane. Do they hanker after a new and unlimited issue of bonds? Certainly they have not yet taken leave of their senses.

Is there any popular demand for the retirement of the $346,000,000 of greenbacks, thereby contracting the currency by that amount? Who says that we have too much money now? Let it never be forgotten that this bill practically retires the greenbacks and that that is its prime object, for nobody but a natural-born fool will be deceived by the euphemistic term "impounding."

The fondest dream of the national bankers for years has been to retire the greenbacks, and at last their dream is to be realized. Greenbacks are to be paid out for gold, are they? Tell that tale to the marines. The bankers have all the gold now, and they will never permit it to be exchanged for greenbacks in large quantities. They are not simpletons, even if Republican Congressmen are. I make this prediction now, without fear of successful contradiction, that after this bill becomes a law greenbacks in the hands of the people will be scarce as hen's teeth—like angels' visits, few and far between. A few of the one-dollar greenbacks, for the sake of auld lang syne, will be retained, framed, and displayed as curiosities to our children as samples of the money that saved the life of the Republic in the awful period of the civil war; but nearly all the greenbacks will remain forever in their long home—the newly created "division of issue and redemption."

Do the great body of the people wish the Government to abdicate its paramount function and to deliver the nation's prosperity, perhaps its life, unreservedly and absolutely into the hands of the National Bankers' Association? There has never been a day since Washington was first inaugurated when they so desired. They do not now so desire; and I warn gentlemen who are pampering these banks now and surrendering to them the rights which we temporarily hold in trust for the people that they will rue this day.

I recall to their memories the startling fact that in 1795, when Great Britain was engaged in a death struggle with Napoleon, the governors of the Bank of England emphatically, treasonably, and curtly, in a six-line letter, informed the younger Pitt that he could have no more money from that institution with which to fight the wonderful warrior whose towering ambition was universal dominion. Give to our national banks all power over our currency, as this bad bill proposes to do, and perhaps, indeed most likely, in some crisis of our country's fate, when we are engaged in a death struggle with some great power, it may be with all the great powers of the world, they, too, will play the traitor's part—withhold from the Government the sinews of war, and thereby imperil our liberty, our happiness, and our prosperity. I enter the solemn protest of the great constituency which I represent against such monstrous folly. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I have kept quiet during the general debate, and I should like to have fifteen minutes, if the House will grant that time to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that his time be extended to fifteen minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, in the time accorded to me I do not intend to discuss any of the features of this bill. I have been fully satisfied from what I have heard from both sides that my vote should be cast in favor of this measure.

In listening to the debate from the other side of the House two distinguished members of the Democratic party frankly and openly admitted that the country again had great prosperity. One was the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIBLEY] and the other was the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY]. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIBLEY] did not undertake to show that the cause of our prosperity came from any other source than the election of President McKinley and the restoration of the Republican party to power.

He admitted that their position on the money question and on the other questions that affected the interests of this country had brought about the prosperity we now enjoy, and then concluded his remarks by saying that he would not vote for this measure. That gentleman in the Fifty-third Congress was one of the idols of the Democratic party and of the Free Silver party. I remember him standing on that side of the Hall wildly applauded by every Free Silverite for his speech on that subject, wherein he predicted that unless we should have free and unlimited coinage of silver, disaster and ruin would overtake the country. The gentleman now admits that he was mistaken. Yesterday the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], in a masterly and forcible argument, presented his side of the case, and we all on both sides of this House listened to his eloquent speech with great pleasure, because the gentleman is always worth listening to whether we agree with him or not.

After presenting his side of the case against the gold standard he admitted the prosperity of the country, and the reason which the gentleman from Texas assigned why our country was prosperous was as follows (he was not as fair as the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who frankly admitted that it came from Republican rule): The gentleman from Texas, after thanking God that the country was prosperous, that our mills were all in operation, and our looms were all moving, stated that it was Divine Providence that had brought prosperity to this country and not the Republican party. He spoke of the famine in far-away India; he said that the Almighty in His providence had afflicted those people with a famine, and that he gave as a reason why this country is prosperous.

Why, Mr. Chairman, what use have the famine-stricken people of India for the products of this country? Famine in India never turned a solitary wheel in the United States. Famine in India never lighted a solitary furnace in this country. When the people of India are stricken with famine they have no use for our structural iron; they have no use for our clothing; they have no use for our great locomotives; they have no use for anything except one thing. A famine-stricken country has only one cry, and that cry is, "Give us bread!" If there is famine in India to-day, the only cry that will come from that land is, "Give us bread; give us bread!" Now, that plea was not worthy of the gentleman from the State of Texas. He should have confessed, like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIBLEY], that the prosperity of our country was brought about by Republican rule.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIBLEY] had the courage to do it, and it would have been more worthy of the gentleman from Texas if, instead of attributing our great prosperity to the famine in India, he had stated that it was brought about by the Republican party. He should have prayed for more courage. I am reminded of an occurrence which happened after the battle of Spottsylvania, and men on that side of the House and on this who were engaged in that struggle will freely admit that for the number of men engaged it was the bloodiest battle of the civil war and of all time. General Longstreet, who commanded a corps in that fight, says that on the evening following he happened to wander into a tent where they were holding a prayer meeting.

A Confederate soldier belonging to the headquarters guard was a devoted and pious man, a man in whom all had confidence, and he was leading the prayer meeting. The general stood in the rear of the tent and heard the following—they knew another conflict was to come, and this soldier who was leading the meeting said: "Oh, Lord, give us more courage for the coming conflict of the morrow." A rough, rugged fellow who was in the tent said to him, "Bill, what in thunder are you praying about courage for? We have got more of that than we can use. Why in hell don't you pray for more grub?" Now, the gentleman from Texas should pray for more courage, like the soldier who made that prayer.

I have listened to those gentlemen and their speeches carefully. I have failed to see a remedy which they can offer better than the remedy now given the people by the Republican party. What are they aiming at? I find nothing in their argument. They remind me of an incident that occurred when the Confederate raiders came down the Cumberland Valley. Approaching the city of Harrisburg, a squadron of them commenced firing across the river. The news was carried to Governor Curtin at the capitol, and he sent this telegram to President Lincoln:

DEAR PRESIDENT: The Confederate cavalry are in sight of the city of Harrisburg and they are firing. There is not a Union soldier within 200 miles of the city.

And the great Lincoln, in his quaint way, replied:

DEAR GOVERNOR: Will you be kind enough to inform me what the Confederates are firing at?

[Laughter.]

I would like to know what the gentlemen on the other side are firing at. We have had some firing going on for a week and during that whole time only two men have candidly acknowledged the truth, and that is that we are prosperous and at the high-water mark of prosperity in this country. But then the speech of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] was intended to stop the Republicans in their victorious march toward the Presidential election of 1900, and as great as his speech was in its way, and extraordinary as it was, I want to say to gentlemen on the other side it will not stop the onward march of the Republican party to victory in 1900. It reminds me of another incident of the civil war. In 1861, after the battle of Bull Run, Governor Curtin, whose patriotism and enthusiasm got away with him, telegraphed to Lincoln that if he would give him authority he would stop the war. He knew that he had 700,000 fighting men in his State. The President telegraphed back: "Your patriotic offer is received, but I am compelled to say to you that your stopper is not big enough."

I want to say to gentlemen on the other side, when this great country is prospering, with the demand for goods a year ahead, with the great warehouses empty, and the demand away beyond the supply, we propose to hold a convention in the city of Philadelphia on the 19th of next June and renominate President McKinley, and I can speak for my State that after the election in the following November we shall give the President 350,000 majority. [Applause on the Republican side.] The working people and the manufacturing and business men of my State, regardless of party, do not propose ever again that you gentlemen shall lay your hands upon the great interests of this country, as you did in Cleveland's free-trade Administration, and destroy the great industries of the country. They are now in the full blaze of prosperity, and we propose to go on.

Mr. Chairman, as I said before, I do not propose to discuss this bill. I listened to the careful analysis of this bill made by the

gentleman from Indiana who has the bill in charge. I am satisfied from his analysis that it is right. I have tried to master this money question. I read books on free silver and on sound money, and at last tackled the report of Mr. Walker, of Massachusetts, and after reading that three times serious symptoms of wheels in the head came to the surface [laughter], and I came to the conclusion that if I did not want to go mad and be taken to some lunatic asylum I would have to let it alone. [Renewed laughter.] So that, after having listened to the careful analysis of the bill given by the gentleman from Indiana, and knowing the ability and experience of the committee which reported it, I propose to vote for the gold standard.

I am very glad that the gentleman from Tennessee did not have any of my speeches on this question that he could quote from. But in the Fifty-third and Fifty-fourth Congresses I was a new member and did not get a chance to put myself in favor of the free coinage of silver [laughter]; and so I take my place now in favor of the gold standard, and if my people should allow me to remain here long enough, I hope I may not have reason to recant and recall this declaration upon the floor of this House or elsewhere. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I must ask for the reading of the next section. Let the bill progress a little. There is nothing before the House but by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. Several gentlemen have expressed a desire for recognition, and the Chair can not presume that they do propose to address themselves to the section.

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. SULZER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SULZER. Is it in order now to offer an amendment to the first section of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. It has been read for the purpose of amendment. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LEVY proceeded to address the Chair.

Mr. OVERSTREET. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. OVERSTREET. What is before the House?

The CHAIRMAN. A motion to strike out the last three words.

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Chairman, while this bill in all its features is not the best bill that might be presented for enactment, and while I regret that no opportunity has been given to us either to amend or consider it in committee, I am prepared to vote for it, confident in the hope that it will meet in conference the same fate that every other important measure originating in this House has met with, and that it will emerge purged of some of its imperfections and, in that respect at least, a better bill.

While I have the opportunity I would like to say, in this connection, a few words regarding the attacks on New York. Every currency bill or financial measure which comes before this House for discussion is made the pretext for these unjust attacks. She is characterized as the abiding place of all the evils that ever have afflicted or ever will afflict this Government and as the home and refuge of all the enemies who seek to destroy the welfare of our nation. These denunciations have been unnoticed because it was believed they were prompted either by ignorance or malice, and the former could not be cured by instruction, while the latter did not disturb the peace of the citizens of our great metropolis. But wherein lies the reason for these charges and calumnies? New York rejoices in the prosperity which has come to every State in the Union, and her own prosperity is only an index of the advancement of our country. She does not hoard her wealth; she is constantly applying it to the betterment of the various sections of our country seeking her aid.

She builds railroads and highways. She sells your securities and finds a market for your properties. She is the clearing house and clearing port of a majority of the States. She is their market for supplies to be purchased from or sent abroad. She controls, as it were, the markets of the world and brings them to your feet. She moves your crops and finds investment for money from East, North, West, and South. She does everything that brains can devise and activity carry out for the advancement of our Union. She has never been called upon by any section of this country in time of panic or disaster but she has responded quickly and generously. Her patriotic sons have been the first to offer themselves in defense of a nation's honor, and she has sustained and always will sustain the national pride with a dignity and a lavishness of outlay which should command the admiration of every sister city.

She should be looked upon as the product of the energy of this young nation, of which she is so intimate a part. You prosper when she prospers, you advance as she advances, and you fail when she fails. She is the great financial center of this greatest nation of the Western Hemisphere. She is the heart of that grand body of which these United States are members, and she supplies to the arteries of trade the stimulation and the energy which have made this country the healthy, powerful, aggressive nation it is, fit to stand shoulder to shoulder with the strongest nations of the world and ready to take the lead when it is properly equipped and when no doubt exists concerning its financial policy.

I am in entire sympathy with the chief purpose of this bill—the maintenance of the parity of all our money.

This was one of the most pronounced principles of the Democracy of Jefferson and of his followers in the apostleship of Democracy for generations.

I subscribe to his declaration that "The true proportions between the values of gold and silver is a mercantile problem altogether," and I welcome the company of converts to his views from whatever quarter. You gentlemen of the other side stand upon good Democratic ground, and the sound-money sentiment will rejoice over the courage you have displayed in exhibiting the possession of at least one conviction.

The enactment of this bill will remove from the arena of political agitation a question that of all questions is most disturbing to the material interests of the country. Any uncertainty respecting the standard of value for our currency, coinage, and bonded obligations tends to retard and cripple the business of the country at home and abroad, while certainty and fixedness upon that question stimulate and perpetuate the conditions that promote national and individual prosperity.

Gold is the standard to-day, the parity of the metals in the coinage of the country having been uniformly preserved, and an irrevocable declaration by statutory enactment that this shall always remain so has only become necessary because of the agitation of the last few years. The settlement of the question thus agitated, removing that question from the sphere of politics and serious controversy, must afford a mighty impetus to this nation in its progress in the fields of commerce and finance extending to all parts of the world, strengthened, as we shall be, by unimpeachable and unlimited credit at home and abroad and moving on to the manifest destiny of becoming the great commercial and financial center of the world.

The establishment by this bill of the gold standard makes also for economy in the expenditures of the country and relief from taxation. The rate of interest on Government bonds issued within recent years would have been as low as 2 per cent if on the face of the bonds the principal and interest had been made payable in gold, a saving of millions of dollars in interest.

The want of stability in the currency of a country tends to the accumulation of capital in the hands of the few and to the disadvantage of the masses.

The wage-earner suffers because his earnings are invariably based upon a depreciated currency, and he is paid in the coin having the least intrinsic value and lowest of purchasing power.

But this measure is not only sound in policy, it is sound also in ethics, in common honesty. There should be only one dollar, whether for public or private transactions, and common honesty, as well as sound policy, demands that the standard of value, whether in gold, silver, or paper, should be fixed according to the value of that form of the circulating medium the intrinsic value of which is the highest.

If—

Said Jefferson—

we determine that a dollar shall be our unit, we must then say with precision what a dollar is. This coin, as struck at different times, of different weight and fineness, is of different values.

And so you have defined with precision the standard unit of value and the weight and the fineness thereof. As suggested by Jefferson, you have inquired into the market price of gold in the several countries with which we shall be principally connected in commerce. You have sent a commission abroad to ascertain if there was any escape from the conviction that has long lived in the commercial world respecting the standard of value, and it has returned with the report that there was none. You have studied the statistics of Mexico, China, and Japan, and have learned that the condition of the wage-earners in those countries is distressingly suggestive of debased currency and unsoundness of values. You have seen the leaders among the nations of the world adjust their finances to the gold basis and prepare for their share of the prosperity which is sweeping over the globe; and yet you have lagged in the race for financial and commercial supremacy till finally opportunism, under the sting of a public sentiment, has yielded to the demand for the distinct declaration embodied in the opening clause of this bill. [Applause.]

This bill assures the gold standard, and the restoration of confidence will speedily follow, but there still remain obstacles which retard a healthy advancement to prosperity.

The United States Government is absorbing each day, through taxation, millions of dollars, which, taken from the legitimate channels of trade and industry, are locked up in the vaults of the Treasury and help to swell an idle surplus. Undoubtedly serious

financial difficulties will follow this withdrawal of active money, and the financial situation in the larger money centers will soon become acute. The Secretary of the Treasury from time to time seeks to relieve the money stringency by the purchase of bonds, but this, in my judgment, is a clumsy and uncertain method of affording relief in times of crises. The holders of bonds are unwilling to sell at the price offered by the Government when the market price for these same bonds is higher. The Secretary of the Treasury should be empowered to place the surplus accumulated from customs and other revenues with the national banks of this country, charging a rate of interest therefor to be fixed by him. This would release, in a businesslike manner, a part of the funds lying idle in the Treasury and give business men and banking circles the relief needed in critical times. Such a method would meet with approval in business circles and would secure a certain and available relief in times of money stringency.

In conclusion, I submit some correspondence between the Secretary of the Treasury and myself in which I directed his attention to an expedient which, in my judgment, was calculated to meet the demands of business, release the accumulated surplus in the Treasury, and make for the advancement of our national welfare. This correspondence was called forth by the following telegram, dated September 27, sent to the Secretary of the Treasury:

I respectfully suggest that you use every means possible to relieve the present tension in the money market. That in the midst of such extraordinary prosperity there should be a dearth of money to transact the country's business, the same being due solely to the absorption by the Treasury, through taxation, of the surplus, would be ludicrous were it not so costly to farmer, mechanic, and business man alike. Every resource should be exhausted to promptly end the present stringency.

This was answered by the following letter from Assistant Secretary Vanderlip, dated October 4:

Upon my return to Washington I find your telegram of the 27th ultimo addressed to Secretary Gage. The Secretary being absent from the city, it falls to me to reply to your statement that the scarcity of money is due "to the absorption by the Treasury, through taxation, of the surplus."

The available cash balance held by the Treasury one year ago was, in round figures, $109,000,000. Now, October 3, 1899, it stands at $287,000,000, which is $22,000,000 less than a year ago. While the Treasury thus has $22,000,000 less than it had the same season last year, it has on deposit with national banks about $1,000,000 more. The exact figures are as follows:

Deposits with national banks October 3, 1898	$82,344,000
Deposits with national banks October 2, 1899	83,183,000

It would thus seem that your premises are wrong. The Treasury is not absorbing the surplus money of the country. It would be well to bear in mind that our receipts and expenditures almost balance from day to day, so that there is scarcely any season when the Treasury is a factor in disturbing the equilibrium of the money market. When it has appeared that the Government was withdrawing funds from business channels, and thereby causing embarrassment, the head of the Department has invariably done what he could do legitimately to relieve the situation. You may recall that within a few weeks Secretary Gage, without solicitation, anticipated the payment of October interest to the extent of about $5,500,000, most of which, being payable in New York, doubtless contributed to relieve the situation there, either by reason of such actual addition to the money supply in New York or by the influence which the Department's action engendered.

In reply to this I wrote to Mr. Vanderlip as follows:

Your esteemed favor of the 4th instant received, and I regret my inability to agree with your conclusions. I assume, of course, that you do not wish to be understood as maintaining that the Treasury defends its present policy because under vastly different conditions existing a year ago there was little or no complaint. That the cash now held by the Treasury is less than it was a year ago, is no justification for tying up the whole of the enormous sum of $287,000,000, at a time when every industry is thriving and the demand for money from merchant, farmer, and mechanic most urgent.

The Treasury, by its present policy, puts a halter around the neck of every industry, cries halt to the prosperity which is the due of the enterprising and industrious, and gives unscrupulous manipulators an opportunity to cause an exorbitant rate of interest to prevail.

I call your attention to some figures not given in your letter, and which I had more particularly in mind when I sent my telegram. The Treasury collected last month from customs and internal revenue $40,000,000, of which $24,000,000 was from the last-named source. Crude as is our present system, it affords some means for relief, in that it authorizes the Secretary to deposit in the banks the internal-revenue collections.

You say in your letter:

"It would be well to bear in mind that our receipts and expenditures almost balance from day to day."

Nevertheless, the surplus for September was, as you know, $8,000,000, not an extraordinary sum but fairly large when compared with the item of $5,500,000, anticipated interest, referred to in your letter. If the $24,000,000 internal-revenue collections had been deposited as collected it would have been of benefit in every line of business and industry. Were my suggestions adopted there would be not only the benefit just mentioned, but it would do much to set at rest the visionary financial schemes now prevalent.

Every day's delay in affording relief means, in my opinion, a month's delay in the progress of the prosperity of the people.

I thereupon sent the following letter to the Secretary:

20 BROAD STREET, NEW YORK,
November 4, 1899.

DEAR SIR: I am moved by a sense of duty, and by that alone, to repeat my suggestion of some weeks ago that you use the authority vested in you by law to relieve the continuing stringency in the money market by depositing in the national banks the internal-revenue collections. Whatever the condition may have seemed to you when I sent my telegram in the latter part of September, it must now be evident to everybody that the scarcity of money is due to something more than professional manipulation.

The wonderful activity in trade, in all branches, in all parts of the country, is the principal moving cause toward tight money. That the Government, by its steady absorption of the ready capital of the country through the collections of taxes under the war-revenue law, should be the only factor in the way of the people's prosperity is well-nigh inconceivable. The larger national banks—the banks with enormous deposits of twenty-five millions and over—have a selfish interest in maintaining a close money market, as everyone knows. The freeing of the revenue collections by depositing them in the banks would be a boon to merchant, mechanic, and farmer alike, of which I hope you will not longer deprive them.

I am, sir, with great respect, yours, faithfully,

JEFFERSON M. LEVY.

HON. LYMAN J. GAGE,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

To which he replied as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., November 6, 1899.

DEAR SIR: Replying to yours of the 4th instant, suggesting an increase of public deposits in national banks in New York City, your attention is called to the fact that public deposits in national banks throughout the country now aggregate $81,650,000, of which amount about 3½ per cent is on deposit with the New York banks. It does not appear at this time that there is any great necessity for increasing deposits in national banks, and to do so in the case of New York banks would likely invite criticism of unfair discrimination against other sections of the country desiring also to be recipients of such deposits.

In this connection it may not be amiss to call your attention further to the fact that the Treasury now holds barely $2,000,000 more than it did a year ago. The available cash balance November 4, 1898, was $302,000,000, and deposits in national banks were $94,773,000, leaving within the Treasury $207,227,000. November 4, 1899, the available cash balance was $290,632,000, and deposits in national banks on that day aggregated $81,650,000, leaving in the Treasury $209,892,000. Last year at this time the market was comparatively easy, and yet the Treasury had within $2,000,000 of the amount it holds now. Whatever stringency there is in the market at this season of the year must, therefore, be attributed to some other reason than the absorption of the money of the country by the Treasury.

Very truly, yours,

LYMAN J. GAGE,
Secretary.

HON. JEFFERSON M. LEVY, *New York City.*

To which I replied:

HON. LYMAN J. GAGE, *Secretary of the Treasury.*

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of November 6, replying to mine of November 4, in which I suggested that you use the authority vested in you to relieve the continuing stringency in the money market by depositing the internal-revenue collections in the national banks. My suggestion was not that such deposits be made in the national banks of New York City as I am quoted in your letter. There was no such limitation in my suggestion, which was apparently misunderstood by you in that particular. The statement, however, in your letter that "public deposits in national banks throughout the country now aggregate $81,650,000, of which amount about 3½ per cent is on deposit in the New York banks," has directed my attention to the fact that the banks of that city have not now on deposit an amount of the public funds at all in proportion to the amount of the volume of monetary transactions made through them, or to the amount of collections by the Internal Revenue Department, to say nothing of customs receipts made in that city; so there would seem to be no reasonable ground for the apprehension expressed in your letter that "to increase the deposits of public funds in the banks of that city would likely invite criticism of unfair discrimination against other sections of the country desirous also to be the recipients of such deposits."

I fail to comprehend the relevancy of such criticism—even if the facts were such as to give rise to them—to the question of the use of the internal-revenue funds for the benefit of the people of the whole country, if the deposits of those funds in the banks located in any one section would best accomplish the purpose in view.

The clearings of the banks in New York City for the month of October, 1899, amounted to about $5,250,000,000, or about 62 per cent of the clearings of the whole country, which amounted in that month to about $8,250,000,000.

You ask my attention in your letter to the fact that the available cash balance in the Treasury a year ago, after deducting $94,773,000 on deposit in the national banks, was only about $2,000,000 less than it is at present after deducting $81,650,000 now deposited in those banks; and you suggest that as the market was comparatively easy a year ago, "the present stringency must be attributed to some other reason than the absorption of the money of the country by the Treasury."

There can be no doubt that the present stringency is to a large extent owing to the increase and expansion of the business of the country, and that condition has produced a requirement of a larger amount of money for the purposes of the business of the country than was required a year ago. There are, however, some other causes for the scarcity of the circulating medium, arising more directly from the operations of the Treasury itself. Many millions of dollars have been drawn from the people to meet the extraordinary war taxes, and have thus found their way into the Treasury.

The issue of $200,000,000 of bonds to meet the expenses incident to the war with Spain transferred from the pockets of the people to the National Treasury that large sum of money, which was found to be in excess of the amount required to be disbursed for the purposes of the war, a result which would have been avoided if the money had been obtained by the issue of interest-bearing certificates of indebtedness as the money was required, instead of the issue of bonds for the gross amount in the first instance.

The amount now collected from the people for taxes, exclusive of customs duties, exceeds $1,000,000 per diem and is continually increasing. It was about $34,000,000 in the month of October.

The volume of business this year, as compared with previous years, is reflected in the increase of bank clearings, which were nearly $23,000,000,000 more than last year in the country at large for the ten months ending with October, and of that excess nearly four-fifths was in the banks of the city of New York.

The prosperity evidenced by this exhibit is threatened by a scarcity of the circulating medium required for the business operations of the country—a condition which did not exist this time last year. Even if the absorption of the money of the country in the Treasury may not have had much potency in producing this condition, a large amount of the money so absorbed is in the Treasury, where it is not required. Why should it not be placed where it can be of service to the business men of the country, for whose purposes it is required? To say that it was not required last year at this time does not change the fact that it is required now. To say that the Treasury has not produced the requirement affords no reason why it should not supply the need.

The deposit in the national banks of the country of a sum equal to that now on deposit in those banks, distributed according to the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury, would, in my opinion, accomplish the desired end, and it seems to me that it is but just in morals, as it would be also wise in finance, that the people of the country, whose money has found its way into the Treasury by the sovereign power of taxation, should have the relief which would be afforded to them in the daily operations of their business, by depositing with the national banks as a medium of circulation the moneys

received from internal-revenue taxes, or so much thereof as may be necessary for the accomplishment of the purpose in view and as may not be required for the purposes of the Government itself.

Yours respectfully,

JEFFERSON M. LEVY.

NEW YORK, *November 12, 1899.*

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. Mr. Chairman, while I can not agree with the majority of my party associates on the pending bill, I do not intend to apologize for my position. I leave to the gentlemen on the other side of the House the full enjoyment of their recently created monopoly of that commodity. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] I will vote for the bill, but not under the pressure of party caucus action. I have a better reason, or "apology," if you prefer that expression, for my action.

It is beyond question that for many years this country has been upon a gold standard. The enactment of the present law merely gives the authority of law to the practice adopted and for many years followed by the Treasury officials. The people of the great commercial and financial center of this country, the city of New York, believe that it is necessary to enact some such law in order to permanently define the financial policy and standard of value of this country. They are entitled to have their opinion voiced in this House, and I merely perform my duty when I reflect their will by my vote. So far as this discussion has proceeded, however, gentlemen on the other side support this measure for the reasons best known to themselves and not disclosed either here or in their wordy effusions in the RECORD.

I have paid close attention to this debate in the vain hope that I would hear some intelligent discussion of the provisions in this bill, to which I am unable to give my approval. Even if I did believe in all of this bill, as you pretend to do, it would not be necessary for me, before I voted for it, as it will be for the most of you, to devour stacks upon stacks of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, filled with my freely expressed and honest opinion in direct opposition to my present position. Beware, my friends; be careful of your utterances, lest the time be short when you will be compelled to repeat your present gastronomical performances. The very apparent necessity that exists for gentlemen on the other side to even partially digest the unwelcome meal that is rudely forced down their throats is the only explanation I can find for the action of the Committee on Rules setting aside even a week for the discussion of this important measure.

With the limited knowledge that I possess upon the question of finance, Mr. Chairman—and in this respect I do not differ radically with many of my friends on the other side—I do not propose to minutely discuss the provisions of this bill. Discussion, indeed, is useless, since you prevent an honest effort at amendment. I can not, however, let the impression go abroad that I am in favor of the proposition to delegate or surrender to any class of individuals or corporations the governmental function of issuing and controlling absolutely the currency of this country. You on the other side have the power to perfect this bill, but apparently you have neither the wisdom nor the manhood to do it. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

I know that no human agency can produce anything that is perfect, and I am absolulely certain that no sane man ever even dreamed of seeking for perfection in the Republican party. [Applause on Democratic side.] Responsibility for this bill and its defects will rest upon you. It will avail you nothing on the inevitable judgment day that some Democrats have voted for the measure.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more to close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks that his time be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. In my humble opinion you are unconsciously doing the greatest possible good to the Democratic party by enacting this measure, because you remove for six years from the realm of politics the question of finance and the standard of value. While I weep with them that weep on that side for the defects in this measure, I rejoice with those on this side that rejoice at its passage for the welfare of my party. To the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN], who so eloquently pictured the other day the general uprising that trailed in the wake of his party's advent into power, I wish to call attention to the fact that he evidently overlooked the uprising in the State of New York.

One short year of Republican Administration convinced the people of that State that it was necessary for them to contribute their mite to the growing prosperity of their country, and they did it by increasing their Democratic representation in this House from 6 to 18 members. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] That is a result that you tell little and care to hear less about.

Mr. Chairman, I firmly believe that this bill, with all its defects, once a law, will prove a leaven to raise to the Presidency of the United States, irrespective of his creed or previous condition politically, the true servant of the people, the nominee of the next national Democratic convention. [Applause.]

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I should not think it worth the while of the committee to occupy the floor in response to what was said by my distinguished friend from Ohio, because he has read nothing from my speech of two years ago that contradicted anything that I said on yesterday. I said then, and I repeat it now, that high taxes can not make a prosperous people, and I endeavored, as best my time would allow on yesterday, to point out the natural causes that have produced whatever prosperity that may now exist.

It was not for the purpose of calling his attention to this fact that I took the floor, but for the other purpose of calling the attention of my friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE] to what I must, until he convinces me otherwise, assume was a serious misunderstanding on his part of what I said on yesterday. I find in the RECORD of this morning that he begins his speech in this fashion:

> Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to take any part in this debate until within the last five minutes, but when I heard my friend from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] in his despairing tones admit among the secrets of the Democratic party that it had been gravely considered whether under present conditions that great party had not better disband and go out of the calamity business, I thought.

And so forth.

Mr. Chairman, I did not utter one syllable that could have been distorted into an admission that I believe that now, or ever in the future, the Democratic party ought to disorganize. The assertion that I made in proclaiming its immortality was that it had lived through a season of depression when men of less courage than we now possess had advised its disorganization. I distinctly said that this was many years ago, and I added that if you hoped that present conditions would annihilate the Democratic party, you were deceiving yourselves. I told you then that you need not lay that flattering unction to your souls, and I have asked the Official Reporters to furnish to the gentleman from New York a copy of what I did say, and I rely upon his sense of decency and fairness to make the proper correction upon the floor and in the RECORD.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. PAYNE rose.

Mr. ADAMS. I yield one minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania yields for a moment. Mr. Chairman, what I said yesterday was said after the gentleman from Texas had concluded his speech, and in reference to what I understood in his speech——

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I will do the gentleman the justice to say that I am satisfied it was a mistake on his part, because I am satisfied nobody would have made such a statement if he had not misunderstood me.

Mr. PAYNE. When the gentleman prints his speech, it will show to the House and to him and to everybody else whether the remarks I made were justified or not.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I have asked the Official Reporters to furnish a copy of my remarks to the gentleman.

Mr. PAYNE. Of course I would not do the gentleman from Texas an injustice. If the remarks were not made in that vein, and if the sarcastic reply which I made was not suitable to what the gentleman said, of course my words fall to the ground. If the publication of his speech justifies my remarks, of course they will stand for what they are worth.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I have only to say that I have asked the Official Reporters to furnish the gentleman with the report of what I said, confident in the belief that the gentleman will then see the justice of making the correction. If not, of course we can then make such further comments as shall seem desirable.

Mr. PAYNE. I have not seen the stenographic report.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS] moves to strike out the last three words, and is recognized on that motion.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express the satisfaction and pleasure I feel in having an opportunity to vote for this bill. Representing, as I do, a great commercial, manufacturing, and trade district of Pennsylvania, I know that I represent the views of my district in so casting my vote. I feel, also, that as a member of the great Republican party I am fulfilling the pledges that it gave to the people of our country in the Presidential platform of 1896 to establish the gold standard. And I regard it, too, as an evidence of the sincerity of our party that at the first opportunity under present conditions, the two Houses of Congress and the Executive being in unison, we fulfill our pledge.

The gentleman who preceded me said that he had not heard a single Representative on this side of the Chamber give the reasons for his personal convictions of the benefit of the gold standard, but that we had simply been whipped into line by the caucus and

made to vote for this bill under the lash. I take up his challenge, and I will answer, at least for one member, as to the reasons for his personal conviction of the benefit of the gold-metallic standard.

In early life it was my privilege to travel somewhat extensively in Europe. Everywhere I went I found that so long as I had in my pocket the English gold sovereign I could exchange it in any country for par and very often at a premium, whereas did I carry the coin of any other country the moment I crossed the boundary into another nation I was compelled to suffer often a heavy discount to change it into the money of the country where I happened to be. Later in life, while residing and traveling in South America, I found the English sovereign of equal potency; even in countries where the measure of value rested on a silver basis I found the desire to exchange their currency for the English sovereign was quite as ravenous as that of the countries of Europe, even those which pretended to be on a silver basis. This led me to inquire into the system of English finance, their standard of value, and the banking system, and I became convinced that a currency founded on a single metal, and that metal gold, was the best that could be devised for domestic and foreign exchanges. From that time to this I have never wavered in my conviction, and long before I had the honor to sit in this body and ever since I have believed in a monometallic gold standard.

There is another reason under present conditions in our country that reenforces this conviction. Under the protective system of our country, coupled with our reciprocity treaties with foreign nations, and having acquired additional territory through the Spanish war, we are about to enter upon an expansion of our trade and commerce unprecedented in the history of our country. It is an undeniable fact that whatever may be the basic foundation of the currency of any given country the exchanges of the world are made on a gold basis. For this reason it strongly appears that it is essential upon entering upon a competition for the world's trade that our merchants and manufacturers should start out with our currency founded on the basis of the world's exchange. Cargoes purchased with gold and shipped to this country may fear no depreciation in the value of the contents exported, but that they will bring at least an equal price or an enhanced price if paid for in a depreciated currency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ADAMS. I would like five minutes more. I have had no time at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that he may be permitted to address the committee for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I come now to the features of this bill which relate to our banking laws. They are not satisfactory to me, but all legislation must be based upon a compromise, and as a good Republican I am entirely willing to moderate, in part, my individual views to the sense or opinion of our great party. In my judgment the great difficulty in the financial system of our country is that our Government plays the part of a bank of issue, but not of a bank of discount. It is therefore hampered with all of the disadvantages of issuing currency without any control over it after it is so issued through the power of regulating it through loans or discount. So also with restraining the outflow of gold from our country. The Government has no power, like the Bank of England, in raising the discount to retard its outflow. The provision in this bill which requires that the greenbacks once redeemed by gold can only be paid out again in exchange for gold, to my mind, is the strongest provision in the bill. The panic of 1893 was mainly caused by what is known as the endless chain, which enabled bankers and exporters of gold to drain the Treasury of this reserve fund for the security of the greenbacks to such an extent as to impair the Government's credit. This provision of itself is enough to warrant the adherence of any sound-money man in his support of this measure. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Another feature of this bill which seems a step in the right direction is the allowance of the national banks to issue circulation up to the par value of the Government bonds deposited for its security. But even this, in my judgment, does not provide sufficiently for the elasticity of the currency. As prosperity comes to the country, more money is needed for the transaction of daily business. With the same prosperity comes an increase of the purchasing power, and more goods are imported from abroad. This increases the revenue of the Government, and to-day the circulating medium of our country is being locked up in the Treasury because the revenues exceed the expenditures of the Government, and there is no way to restore the circulating medium to the channels of trade except by the Government anticipating the interest on its bonds or by the purchase of the bonds themselves. This latter course is objectionable, because the more bonds are purchased by the Government the higher they raise the market price.

Mr. Chairman, I have sat here for six years and listened to able debates on these intricate problems of currency and banking. I have studied the question and taken special courses at my university, and the conclusion I have come to is that the same rules that apply to an individual apply to a government. The man that pays as he goes and has the fewer obligations and promissory notes to meet is the man that is in the soundest financial condition. For this reason I consider that the outstanding greenbacks and Treasury notes of the United States should be retired at the earliest date possible, with a provision for the substitution of bank currency to take their place. I believe that bankers and men in business understand their own affairs best, the same as members of the medical and legal professions, whose advice we seek when we have need of their special services. Bankers are as necessary to civilization as are doctors, lawyers, and scientists.

The prejudice of the uneducated people of our country against bankers, in my judgment, is unfounded; even if, as they claim, they wish to rob the mass of the people, they at least wish to rob them of good money and not bad. It would certainly be more to their interest. The plan submitted by the Indianapolis convention appeals to my judgment as a good one, and I believe that the measure which we are now passing is a stepping-stone that will lead to the establishment of a currency for our country founded on a solid basis and not on a promise to pay or on the credit of the United States Government. For this reason I believe that the greenbacks of the country should be retired. If in the future our country should be involved in a war or in financial troubles, and, as was the case during the war of the rebellion, our bonds could only be sold at a high rate of interest as well as a heavy discount, and, as then, in the event that it should be necessary to issue paper money founded on the credit of the Government Treasury, we would be in a better position, with no such obligations outstanding, than to start out with liabilities of the same nature already outstanding.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that my views represent the thoughts, somewhat in advance, of the average sentiment of our country, but I believe them to be founded on sound reasoning and the experience of other nations. I am an American, heart, soul, and body, proud of my country and its rapid development and growth, but I am not so carried away by my feelings but that I think our Republic, young in years as compared with other nations, can learn from their methods, founded on long and well-tried experience. I congratulate our country on the near realization of the adoption of the gold standard, and sincerely hope it is but the entering-wedge to further unification in the system of the finances of our country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in the House to-day suffering and against the orders of my physician, but I could not leave this Chamber without the expression of my belief that this measure is the culmination of a hundred years of studied villainy and wrong. It is more dangerous than grasping imperialism, more outrageous than domineering militarism. It will destroy the constitutional rights and privileges of the people and bring direst woe, desolation, and ruin upon the agricultural and laboring classes, and deliver the great body of the people, bound hand and foot, over to the money power. [Applause.]

With its passage the national banks will be the Government, and the administration of government in all its policies will be at the dictation of the national banks. Through its operations there will be formed the mightiest trust that has ever existed since the world began. God pity the people when it shall become a law. Line upon line, paragraph upon paragraph, section upon section, in part and in its entirety it is the embodiment of the most hideous wrong and grossest injustice. So far-reaching is its effects that is is impossible for the mind to at once grasp the extent of its power!

It is not a measure that has been wrought out or thought out by the genius of our friends on the other side since 1896, but it it the culminating result of years of conference had with men across the seas, and conferences with men whose interests are not the interests of the American people. [Applause from the Democratic side and cries of "Oh!" "Oh!" from the Republicans.] Looking across the aisle into the eyes of my old friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE] I have the confidence to believe that this is not a combination of the people of the United States, but it is a combination in favor of an alliance between the moneyed interests of the United States and Great Britain.

As in 1873 it was British influence that demonetized silver and substituted the gold dollar as the unit of value, so in this hour the same influence is upon this floor and as surely dictates the policy of this bill as the God of nature dictates the rising and the setting of the sun. [Applause.]

You have no policy of finance; you dare not have a policy of finance except one handed you ready-made by the same hand and influence that directs the financial policy of Great Britain. Never was there a Congress convened since the hour of the birth of our nation that had any set of members so completely under the control, so absolutely subservient, and so thoroughly willing to obey and to respond to the whip and lash of the stock jobbers as the members of the dominant party in this Fifty-sixth Congress.

If it were not so serious a measure as to threaten the common

interests of our country, it would be amusing to listen to the great lights of the Republican party upon this floor, to hear them talk of changed conditions, and to utter their specious apologies for their past records; but knowing this bill, fraught with so much woe to the people, must become a law, it makes one heartsick to witness the flippancy and jocularity with which men intrusted with the happiness, the hopes, and the safety of the homes of millions of our people can place this great iniquity upon our statute books. The chameleon in the tropics is a harmless and interesting work of God's creation, but the human chameleon on the floor of Congress becomes as dangerous as a pestilence and as horrible to contemplate as a famine.

When the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] can base his reasons for his change of front and abandon his defense of the common people upon no more solid argument than the construction of a foundation for his cow barn, and my venerable colleague from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], the mouthpiece of the Administration, has no more valid reason for committing this outrage upon the people than the argument that conditions have changed since he stood upon the floor of the house of representatives of the State of Ohio shouting that common honesty, common decency, and the letter and spirit of the contract under which the great body of our indebtedness was assumed demanded the immediate restoration of silver money to its lawful place as primary money of our country, what can one expect of the Republicans here? What conditions have changed since then? Is it right now to assassinate the letter and spirit of the contract?

Has a condition of affairs come about where the vilest crimes have become resplendent virtues? Have we no longer need for respect of law and regard for the Constitution? Are we no longer to believe the sacred promises made to the people, or must we learn that from the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same there is no one hour in which they can trust the continuance of the plighted faith of those who make laws for this nation? But, Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised at the action of my colleague from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], for he can make his changes upon the political stage as rapidly, as easily, and with equal brazenness as any soubrette that ever graced the boards of the Bijou or Kernan's. [Laughter.]

Age but adds agility to his political joints, and whether going up or coming down the ladder on any proposition he always faces the public with the statement that "conditions have changed," and that he is thus justified in his acrobatic performances, dressed or undressed, before the American people. Like Noah's ark, he is built without a rudder or steering machinery, and he sails backward as readily as forward, and cares not in what direction he goes, so long as he lands on the winning side or the Ararat of notoriety.

Adopted by the Republican party, the very opening section of this bill, which reads—

> That the standard unit of value shall, as now, be the dollar, and shall consist of 25.8 grains of gold, nine-tenths fine, or 23.22 grains of pure gold, being the one-tenth part of the eagle—

is a repudiation of the pronouncement of that party at its last national convention, where it most solemnly made the declaration that it was in favor of bimetallism, a declaration which alone saved the party from ignominious defeat.

The advocacy of this bill by the party in power is a stultification of its record as a party, but not of its policy, and it is the confusion of its leaders from the Executive down.

It was introduced in this House by a gentleman from a State in which the Republicans, at the beginning of the open struggle for the accomplishment of this vile purpose, declared by a plank in their State platform:

> The public debt should be honestly paid; and all the bonds issued therefor should be paid for in legal tenders, commonly called greenbacks, except where by their express terms they provide otherwise.

Then we have the words of the eloquent Senator from Ohio, the recognized champion, at the time, of Republicanism, Mr. FORAKER, who in 1896 said:

> I sincerely hope some safe way may be found for the restoration of silver to its rightful place alongside of gold as a money of ultimate redemption. I shall favor every measure calculated in my judgment to bring about that result.

Again, we have the language of the standard bearer of the Republican party, the present Executive, William McKinley, President of the United States, who as late as when writing his letter of acceptance of his nomination as President outlined the pretended purpose of the policies of the Republican party. He then wrote:

> It is not proposed by the Republican party to take from the circulating medium of the country any of the silver we now have. On the contrary, it is proposed to keep all the silver money now in circulation on a parity with gold by maintaining the pledge of the Government that all of it shall be equal to gold. This has been the unbroken policy of the Republican party since 1878. It has inaugurated no new policy. It will keep in circulation and as good as gold all of the silver and paper money which are now included in the currency of the country.

Thus stands the record. How striking, how marvelous the change, since by the deception of confiding voters who, believing this to be the real purpose of the Republican party, gave it their votes in 1896 and continued it in power. The proof is voluminous. It could be extended for days, showing how that party made express declarations and promises against any such change as is proposed in this bill.

Yet, now, with indecent haste you seek to take from the money in circulation silver and paper; by a single paragraph in this bill you would take from the people $346,000,000 in legal-tender currency, commonly known as greenbacks. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, why this change of front on the part of our misguided confrères on the Republican side? There is no great question of national safety demanding the passage of this bill. We are not confronted by any crisis that calls for such heroic treatment. There is no such surfeit of gold hoarded in our Treasury as to imperil the destiny of our Government if no action be taken at the crack of the whip. Still, the Republicans here, with eager haste, seek to force immediate action.

Instead of allowing the usual and customary form of legislation to be followed, this bill, the first to be introduced in this Congress, is not referred to any committee for consideration and report, but even before committees are announced the bill is brought before this body for immediate action, the gag rule is applied, and under the lash of the party whip the bill will pass, in order that the Administration may obey the order of the money power, in whose hands and under whose control it placed itself in 1896. [Applause.] And the action is to be permitted through the fear, under the threat, that if it is not done, in the coming Presidential campaign the Republican party will lose the millions of campaign funds already promised and so sink into defeat and ruin.

It was with prophetic inspiration that the immortal Lincoln said:

> The money power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people until all the wealth is aggregated in a few hands and the Republic destroyed.

These words are too true, and I do not wonder that the Republicans of to-day seek to discredit and impeach their authenticity, although they do so in vain. This bill, by which our Government is to be formally committed to the single gold standard, is only an effort made by the aggregated money power of to-day to concentrate all the wealth in their hands.

Mr. Chairman, if the claim be true that is made upon this floor by the gentleman in charge of this bill [Mr. OVERSTREET], by the leader of the House on the opposite side of the Chamber [Mr. PAYNE], and concurred in by the entire Republican side, that we have had the single gold standard in operation in this country since 1834, strengthened in 1853, and made absolutely certain in 1873, then what is the necessity for the introduction of this bill or the consummation of a purpose already established?

I agree with you that certainly since 1873 you have had in operation, to all intents and purposes, by custom and law, the single gold standard; but you must not expect to deceive the people or hope to make them believe that the establishment of the single gold standard is the true and sole purpose of this bill. There is more behind it and deeper devilment embodied in its provisions than simply a gold standard. Its purposes are to build up within our borders a power greater than that ever conferred upon any king, emperor, or ruler in any land. The combined strength and influences of the banks, syndicates, monopolies, and trusts are at the back of the bill, demanding that into their rapacious maw shall be turned the savings of this nation and the hopes of generations yet unborn, and this Republican majority leaps with eager haste to do their bidding. [Applause.]

For years legalized robbery has been permitted in the land and a few score names have been added to the roll of the millionaires, while millions of the toiling masses have been made homeless thereby; and now, when, in the light of recent elections and by the growing determination on the part of the people to free themselves, there seemed to be a rift in the clouds of despair, when the prospect of a Democratic victory is bright ahead, a victory for and of the people, the Republicans in this Congress seek to fasten more firmly the galling shackles of financial slavery upon a long-suffering people. [Applause.]

And this they do upon the specious plea of "honest money." Honest money forsooth! There never was a dishonest dollar issued by the Government of the United States until the Republican party came into control. No one ever made a dishonest dollar except the Republican party and counterfeiters. The counterfeiter acts in open violation of law; the Republicans by fraud, deceit, and dishonesty place upon our statute books laws making certain money dishonest or depreciated; and they are at their old tricks now, seeking again to put appreciated gold into the coffers of the bankers.

Go back with me a little in our nation's history, when the great storm of the rebellion swept over our land, when on Southern battlefields brothers fought against brothers, when brave men

faced the deadly hail of shot and shell that our Union might live and that we might have a Government upon the face of the earth. Then, when the eyes of the nation were upon the boys at the front, when the prayers of the nation were for the successful issue of battle, the greed and avarice of the money power here at the nation's capital urged through Congress laws which gave them millions and the soldiers a pittance.

The soldier who gave his life upon the altar of his country received greenbacks, while they who gave only of their ill-gotten pelf demanded and received appreciated gold. Now, when we have another war, when our brave boys are showing the glory of American manhood and performing their duty as soldiers in the far Philippines—in a war begun, fostered, and maintained, not for freedom or for the glory of the United States, but a war of conquest and aggression instituted for the aggrandizement of combined syndicates, monopolies, and trusts—at this time there is a repetition of the tactics pursued by the vampires of the civil war, and the greenback, the greenback which saved the Union, is to be forever wiped away, and in its place they propose to permit the banks to issue their notes, and also, by this bill, double the value of the gold holdings of the trusts.

To issue money is a high Government prerogative and function, and it should remain so. It should never be handed over to any class. Banks should never be allowed or permitted to issue paper money for the people. To allow them to do so places the power of the inflation and contraction of the currency at all times in their hands and enables them to stand as blackmailers and highwaymen, endangering the well-being of the nation. [Applause.]

It will bring about distrust and fear, a loss of confidence; wildcat money will again be afloat and panics prevail. National banks sometimes fail. Already, since the discussion of this bill has commenced, Boston starts in with failures of gigantic proportion, and, mark my words, before another six months shall roll around the effect of this bill will be seen in failure after failure westward across the continent.

In the discussion of this bill the Republican leaders admit their changed position. They are forced to admit it, and yet they do not offer any consistent defense for their change; they hide behind their unanimous party caucus action, their fealty and allegiance to a shifting Administration, not their allegiance to the Government, not their patriotic adhesion to country and the best interests of the people, but sheltered under the protecting folds of Shylock's robes, they say they have changed, and taunt us because we do not change with them.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic party does remain true to its traditions and its policies. It stands to-day for a great principle, that of the right of the people to govern and to have the government administered in their interest. In its adhesion to the rights of the people it does not change. Conditions do change, the budding leaves and flowers of spring are followed by the ripened grain and fruit of autumn, these in turn by the winter's snow and sleet; the tides ebb and flow; the moon revolves around our earth, presenting continually changing phases, and yet, there is a great law which governs the seasons, that prescribes the undeviating accuracy of the planets in their orbits, which is absolutely unchanging, for it is based upon the eternal law of the Mighty Creator, the law of God, and, sir, the principles of the Democratic party are based and founded upon the eternal law of Truth and Right, which does not change. [Applause.]

This measure is wholly unnecessary and alien to our best good. The admission of the champion of the bill that "every dollar of our money in circulation is absolutely sound and unquestioned" is sufficient to condemn the bill. To by one fell stroke contract our money one-half, to destroy one-half of the volume of our money, which now is "sound and unquestioned," is not the act of anyone who loves his country. Intrinsic value in money is a fallacy long since exploded. In the relations of business all settlements are effected by a common standard of value, and that standard is the one recognized and authorized by law.

The people have had full and complete confidence in our money. Gold and silver and paper have passed from hand to hand, business transactions of magnitude unparalleled in the history of the world have been carried on, and no serious embarrassment was felt, but when the syndicate of shylocks began their ghoulish campaign against the people and sought to bring about a change of standards, when they sought to fasten upon the people and commit the Government to the maintenance of a single gold standard, then it was that confidence was shaken, our credit imperiled, and panic and ruin followed.

When in 1873 the change was effected, "so simple and unattended by the slightest disturbance," as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] observes, it was accomplished by means of such a monstrous crime that when discovered the nation stood aghast and the foundations of our financial honor and stability trembled. [Applause.]

The act of 1873, which, according to the champions of the present act, made gold the legal standard of our country, was a strange act. Why was not the issue made openly, so clear and plain that every member of Congress, every citizen of our land wherever a newspaper might be found, everyone, would know the truth, meaning, and extent of the bill?

But, no! Search the files of the newspapers of that year and you will not find a word anywhere to show that it was known that the standard had been changed and silver demonetized. The bill was prepared in Great Britain, brought here, and pushed through by stealth. Those voting for it have openly declared that it was not until years afterwards that they knew what they had done.

In 1873, twenty-four days after the passage of the codified mint law in England and the surreptitious repeal of the silver law, there was introduced into the Congress of the United States a codified mint law, in which the silver dollar was dropped from the list of coins given free coinage, and this omission was kept from the members of Congress, from the President who signed the revised mint law, and from the American people.

Three years after this surreptitious legislation was passed Senator Roscoe Conkling, on the floor of the Senate, said:

> Will the Senator [Mr. Bogy] allow me to ask him or some other Senator a question? Is it true that there is now by law no American dollar?—*Congressional Record*, March 30, 1876.

Mr. CANNON, of Illinois (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Forty-fourth Congress):

> It was not discussed, as shown by the record, and neither members of Congress nor the people understood the scope of the legislation.

Also Senator Beck, of Kentucky (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Forty-fifth Congress):

> It was never understood by either House of Congress.

Mr. Burchard, of Illinois (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 13, 1876):

> Unaccompanied by written report, * * * unknown to members of Congress, who without opposition, allowed it to pass.

Judge Kelley, of Pennsylvania (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Forty-fifth Congress):

> I was ignorant of the fact that it would demonetize the silver dollar. * * *

Mr. Blaine (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 15, 1878):

> I did not know anything that was in the bill at all.

The parents were afraid to own their child or ashamed to acknowledge the frightful monstrosity.

We are indeed a great nation, but of late we seem to have developed many of the characteristics of a big, blustering bully, so much has the domination of the money power lowered our moral standard and sense of honor. We are great in material resources. Tap the artery of a giant and draw his lifeblood from him—how quickly he becomes enfeebled and at the mercy of his foes!

Money is the lifeblood of our nation, and if its circulation be contracted, if the volume of our currency be lessened, then our strength as a nation becomes lessened. The giant may be kept up by stimulants to a fictitious strength, and the nation, by the effect of bond issues, may for a time show seeming vitality; but when normal conditions are resumed then the nation will sink into premature decay. This bill will absolutely draw from the lifeblood of the nation, shut out of circulation all the greenbacks, all the Treasury notes, all the silver coin, dishonoring the dollar of our fathers, and by this much depleting the volume of currency at the disposal of our Government. It is brought through no demand from the people. No cry has come up from the toiling masses of our land asking that this bill do pass. No! True to their past record, the Republican party ignores the people and listens only to the order of the money kings. [Applause.]

Every obligation of our Government to-day may be paid in silver, silver money whose soundness and honesty is beyond question. You would make every bond, every Treasury note, every greenback, every silver dollar, to be paid in gold. The contract calls for "coin," silver or gold, but you read it only "gold." You charge us with opposition only. I deny it. We do oppose robbery and dishonor, but we champion honesty, justice, and decency. It is as great a crime to alter the terms of a contract in favor of the holder of bonds as it would be to alter the contract in favor of the people who are to pay the bonds. Suppose you were to introduce a bill to the effect that every bond should be paid in the same kind of money with which it was purchased. Would such a measure be unjust? But we do not propose even that. We only claim that the bonds should be paid according to the terms of the contract, according to law, and that the money of the Constitution be not impaired, vitiated, or destroyed. [Applause.]

We have a large amount of gold and silver. In the last two years the increase in the supply of gold has been unprecedented, but under our laws that gold is subject virtually to free coinage and does not become the property of the Government by the simple act of its production. You give the holder of gold a privilege at the mint that you deny to the holder of silver. There is no limit placed upon the amount of gold that may be coined for private individuals save the natural limit of production and the

capacity of the mints. Often in our history the annual production of gold has been in excess of that of silver, and the argument of the advocates of the gold standard that the Government could not afford to permit the coinage of silver dollars for private individuals without limit applies with equal strength and justice to gold.

There never has been in all our history, in all the history of the world, a time when there was too much legal-tender money in circulation. There never will be. No one can draw aside the curtain of the future and reveal what a day will bring forth, but we may judge the future from the past, and it is a fair and reasonable proposition that our needs and demands will keep apace if not ahead of our opportunities to supply them. So if every ounce of silver and every ounce of gold that was mined should be coined into money and placed in circulation, there would not be a single dollar more than the needs of our people would require, but to strike from our resources one-half of our money must cripple, crush, and destroy.

You say you are prepared now to make this change, that there is a vast amount of gold accumulated in the Treasury. In the Treasury statement to-day we have in gold coin and bullion a little over $242,000,000. What would you do if you were immediately faced with the proposition to redeem $346,000,000 of greenbacks now outstanding. Issue bonds. Ah, there is the secret! Greenbacks do not draw interest and are the people's money; the bonds draw interest, payable in gold, and are in the hands of the few.

Yes, you will be forced to the "endless chain" of bond issuing to meet the expenses of the Government and also to pay the annual interest charges of $400,000,000 due and payable in Europe on our bonds and securities. You can not get enough gold in any other way. Even now, with all our forms of money, we are confronted with a big deficiency at the end of the fiscal year. The customs receipts upon imports under the Dingley law for last year were only $206,128,481.75, and as you dare not support an income tax your bond issues and war taxes must keep on.

There are many ways in which a drain would come upon your accumulation of gold, so many that your vast hoard would melt away like snow before the summer's sun. Take the vast aggregation of corporate capital in the State of trusts, New Jersey, where over $2,000,000,000 of trust securities have been, within a short time, combined in chartered organizations. These huge combines with their bonds and stocks must have their interest and dividends (payable in gold), for I can assure you the people who are in these trusts are not in them for fun or pleasure; they are in for business and profit alone, and in order to secure this gold will be needed.

Another feature connected with the operation of these trusts may well be mentioned here. In order to have dividends there must be profits, and for profit there must needs be both advanced price upon the output and decreased expenses in operation, resulting in reduction of wages and lower prices for raw material. This in a measure is already taking place, and the leaders in trust circles do not hesitate to state their determination to go still further in this direction, that it is their purpose and intention to proceed upon this line in every avenue open to them. This by the natural law of trade will then diminish our exports, and soon the balance of trade will be against us, driving more gold from our shores. Even now the stream is turning that way. [Applause.]

Another factor which every year draws a large amount of gold out of the country is the tide of foreign travel to European shores. In ordinary years the amount is vast, but in the coming year the Paris Exposition will be a lodestone to draw and attract a great mass of people, and intelligent, experienced, cautious, and conservative persons estimate that from this one item of foreign travel alone the startling sum of $250,000,000 will be drained from our land. With this enormous reduction from our resources the financial circles of our nation will have a dangerous condition confronting them, and the time does not certainly look propitious for the adoption of a gold standard now.

The total coinage of gold for the last fiscal year was $108,177,180, and the diversion from our business of more than double the annual coinage by one item alone can not but be a menace to the success of maintaining the single gold standard. The song of prosperity is chanted in this Chamber, but not in the workshop and on the farm. According to the Athenian orator from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], the light of happiness gleams in the home of every workingman in the land because of employment at high wages; the miners in his district are crying out to him that there is too much prosperity.

From the delightful speech of the eloquent gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] we gather that the heart of everyone who has aught to sell glows with joy because of advanced prices, higher prices for the necessities of life, and the voice of the employer is heard wailing in the streets because there are no idle men to be employed. Verily their songs are siren-like, their panegyrics beautiful, their eloquence sublime; but when we descend from the clouds and in cold, sober realism behold facts, when we enlarge our vision and look over the whole country beyond the limited horizon which shuts in around Farmer DOLLIVER's barn, we see strange sights which raise a doubt as to the truth of universal or general prosperity. [Laughter.]

In Idaho the underlings of the Administration have erected corrals in which to confine, under guard of armed soldiers, people guilty of no crime, but because they are suspected of being in sympathy with striking miners, and the commanding general sets forth in general orders that these miners must work at the wages he names. In Pennsylvania one of the great trusts builds a trocha of wire fencing around one of its mining villages, and the poor miners must submit to its dictation or starve. These are samples of the slavery which this trust prosperity would speedily bring about if its power be not curtailed.

There is an enormous amount of money in the country, but its distribution is glaringly unequal. In the vaults of Wall street, in the coffers of the trusts, there is an abundance, but among the toiling millions there is penury and want. As for labor, all over the land are seen closed factories. Every branch of industry that the octopus grasp of the trusts has gathered in—and where is there one that has not been taken—has had competition destroyed. A factory here and there in each line of manufacture has been selected to continue in operation, while hundreds of others under the trust control are closed and silent as the tomb, the operatives discharged by tens of thousands, their traveling salesmen called in and told that their services are no longer needed, in one instance alone, that of the tobacco trust, 3,000 salesmen, "drummers," losing their position in one day because of trust "prosperity."

Go over the nation, among the farmers of the land. Are they prosperous? It is true that nature has given them abundant harvests, and the necessities of the world, war, pestilence, and famine, have combined to temporarily raise the prices of a few of their products, but have their farms increased in value; have their prices kept equal pace with improvements and the advancing price of bank stock? Is it not true that land can be purchased in almost every farming community in the United States to-day at a price far below the original cost of the same and the improvements made thereon?

Are taxes lower in proportion to the decrease of land values? No; and this bill will not aid the farmer. The only beneficiary of this measure is the trust and the banker, and from them, and them alone, come words of approval of the action of their tools who present this bill. By the operation of this act money will double in value as it will decrease in circulation among the people. It provides for the payment of the entire bonded debt of the nation, some $1,037,049,690, and the annual interest on the same in gold; for the abstraction of Treasury notes, $89,026,280, of $346,681,016 of greenbacks, and of $482,622,376 of silver dollars, all to be redeemed in gold—a total greater than twice all the production of gold in the United States for the past twenty-five years.

Thus will gold money double in value, and the trusts will receive full compensation and return for their vast outlay of money for the retention in power of the Republican party, while the people will be compelled to "still make bricks, but without straw." [Applause.] Every bond, mortgage, note, or indebtedness must also double in value, because they are payable in money, not in labor or products of labor, and therefore this legislation is wholly in the interest of the creditor classes; proposed and introduced solely in subservient obedience to the demands of the grasping trusts of to-day, and especially that of the mightiest trust of all, the banking trust, because that is the breeder of all trusts.

In this trust no small bankers are allowed to enter. It is a national-bank scheme, and they are to be a law unto themselves, forming a mighty combination whereby the small banker will eventually be frozen out; the large banks will follow the example already set in large cities and consolidate in a single institution. This, with its board of directors in one place, would be to center the whole financial interests of our country in the control of a dozen men; then given the power, as this bill contemplates, of issuing or withholding paper currency at their pleasure, the result would be either the conversion of the people of this nation into serfs or bring about an armed revolution.

This last possibility is what they have feared, and for years they have studied to educate the people into a condition of submission, as well as make preparation to defend their position by force. The attempt to create a large standing army was a part of their plan. Having the Army of sufficient size to overawe and put down any concerted revolt, they apply the pressure by means of contraction of money, and very soon the holdings of a whole people will pass into their hands, and instead of being a free and enlightened nation, we will become a nation of slaves, disheartened, discouraged, driven to our daily duties by the lash of the brutal taskmaster.

I know it is useless to speak upon this measure. Reason, argument, facts, are of no avail. No appeal to your manhood, your love of country and of home, will reach you. You are deaf to

cries of distress. Your consciences are seared, and you will obey orders and pass the bill, selling yourselves, your countrymen, and your country to gain the support and praise of your masters, the trusts; but I protest against the iniquitous act. In the name of the people whose servant I am, in the name of justice, honor, virtue, truth, and the Constitution upon which our Government is founded and whose teachings you are violating, I call you to witness that upon you and your party must rest the foul blot of this crime against the homes and fortunes of our land. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS] withdraws his formal amendment.

Mr. GLYNN. Mr. Chairman, the pending financial measure consists of several propositions more or less distinct from each other. To some of these no substantial objections can well be interposed.

So long as the present national-bank system remains, it is difficult to discover why the public interests would not be subserved by permitting national banks to be organized with a capital of $25,000 in any place the population of which does not exceed 2,000 inhabitants. This extension of banking facilities to small localities throughout the country seems to be a wise provision and is likely to meet with general approval, especially in the rural districts.

National banks, under existing laws, are permitted to issue their bank notes to an amount equal to 90 per cent of the bonds deposited as security for their circulation, and another proposition is to permit such notes to be issued to an amount equal to the par value of such bonds. This feature would not contract our currency, but would expand it, and as all our Government bonds are much above par, there can be no danger involved in the proposed amendment. There are times when such an increase of the currency would be most desirable, not so much in the interests of banks as in the interest of the people, and when such increase can be accomplished safely it is good policy as well as good politics to permit it to be done. The "dog in the manger" policy is never popular and is sometimes detrimental.

The provision for the retirement of our greenback currency involved in the scheme of not reissuing such currency except for coin received in exchange therefor would materially strengthen the Treasury and relieve it from much of the embarrassment from which it has suffered in the past, especially in periods of financial excitement and peril. The greenback currency has always been an anomaly in finance; it has no intrinsic value; it is fiat money pure and simple; it has proved a menace to the Treasury ever since 1879, and it should no longer be tolerated, at least not without having a coin fund on hand at all times and under all circumstances for its redemption.

I have no time to discuss this phase of the question further, and simply content myself with asserting that this provision of the pending bill is a step in the right direction.

We come now to the main object of the bill.

The ostensible and principal purpose of the measure, as proclaimed by its friends, is the establishment of the gold standard.

In one view of the measure it does that, and in another it does not. It is true it declares in one section that the standard unit of value shall be the gold dollar; but it declares in another section that "nothing herein contained shall be construed or held to affect the present legal-tender quality of the silver dollar."

It is clear that a gold dollar, which is to be the "standard unit of value," should logically and consistently be the money of final redemption, the money with which all other money or currency of the Government should be redeemed.

The bill is inconsistent in its details. It faces both ways.

It ostentatiously proclaims in the second section that all the interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the payment of money now existing or hereafter to be entered into, and all United States notes and Treasury notes, and all other obligations, public and private, for the payment of money, shall be paid and performed in conformity with the gold standard established in section 1; and in the next sentence provides that the silver dollar shall still be a legal tender for everything, the same as now, and therefore all the public and private obligations mentioned, as well as United States notes and Treasury notes, may still, under that section, be paid or redeemed in silver dollars, as now.

In plain words, it is the establishment of the gold standard, with a string to it.

If it be urged that section 4 provides that United States notes and Treasury notes shall be redeemed in gold coin at the will of the holder, then it conflicts with section 2, or at least it leaves United States bonds and all other public as well as private obligations payable in silver coin, and it may well be asked what kind of a (single) "standard" dollar is it which tolerates by its side another and a rival dollar possessing substantially equal powers of payment and redemption.

It will also be observed that section 4 does not absolutely, positively, or impliedly provide for the redemption of silver certificates in standard gold dollars, but declares that "all silver certificates presented for redemption shall be redeemed in accordance with existing law," to wit, in silver coin.

The bill, so far as it assumes to establish a gold standard, is a fraud on its face, and is only intended to deceive the people.

There can not logically or consistently be a single gold standard with other forms of money used at the same time for purposes of legal-tender payments and for final redemption.

The creation of a single gold standard by the United States Government must necessarily and inevitably virtually demonetize every other form of money in use by that Government, or else there is no gold standard established in the proper sense of the term.

The promoters of this portion of the measure are seeking to claim credit for doing something which they have not done.

If they have discovered that the gold resources of the Government are not sufficient at this time to warrent the attempt to maintain a complete, perfect, and entire gold standard, then they should frankly acknowledge the fact.

No provision can be found in the bill which absolutely requires the Secretary of the Treasury to pay all the obligations or redeem all the other money of the Government in gold coin; and without some such provision the establishment of the gold standard becomes impossible.

The provision which simply authorizes the Secretary, in his discretion, to exchange gold coin for other coin or money of the Government is not enough, and falls far short of establishing a gold standard.

Besides, that provision confers no new authority. He has that power already under existing laws, or at least frequently exercises it without question from any source.

There is another answer to this portion of the pending measure. If the gold standard already exists "as now," as the friends of this bill so stoutly claim, then it is conceded there is no necessity for this measure.

An unnecessary measure is usually a mischievous measure.

But even conceding that the bill is sufficient in form and substance to do what its friends assert in its behalf, it is unwise to enact it.

The establishment of the single gold standard by law is contrary to the established policy of the Government.

No such bill was ever enacted since our nation was created.

While there has not at all times been the free coinage of both metals (owing to various causes unnecessary to here mention), there has never been a single standard adopted by the country since the Government was organized.

Our national policy has been that of bimetallism. We have always favored the double standard. Both political parties have been committed to it. The platform of both the Republican and Democratic parties in 1892 favored the double standard.

The statute of 1893, repealing the Sherman silver law, pledged the country to the policy of bimetallism, and that statute, supported by nearly all Republicans and many Democrats alike, and approved by President Cleveland, was as follows:

> And it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to maintain the use of both gold and silver as standard money, and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, such equality to be secured through international agreement or by such safeguards of legislation as will insure the maintenance of the parity in value of the coins of the two metals and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts.
>
> And it is hereby further declared that the efforts of the Government should be steadily directed to the establishment of such a safe system of bimetallism as will maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States in the markets and in the payment of debts.

Moreover, the Republican national committee of 1896 expressly declared in favor of international bimetallism.

But now all disguises are to be thrown off, all past policies are to be repudiated, and a new and untried experiment is to be entered upon.

It may be pertinent to inquire, if this measure becomes a law, what becomes of the provisions of the war-revenue law of 1898 which provide for the coinage of the seigniorage in the Treasury, under which we are now coining a million and a half of silver dollars each and every month, which are declared in the law itself to be "standard" silver dollars?

Is that law to be deemed repealed, or is the spectacle to be witnessed of our Government establishing the gold dollar as the standard dollar and at the same time permitting the coinage of "standard" silver dollars which are to be a legal tender, not only for all existing debts and obligations, but for all those which may hereafter be entered into?

The provisions of the bill are crude, incongruous, and deceptive.

Sound-money men, sincere believers in a single gold standard, as well as bimetallists, may all, with propriety and consistency, oppose such an objectionable and unsatisfactory a measure.

If a separate vote could be had on some of the commendable features of the measure, I would cheerfully support them; but as they can not be separated from the objectional provisions of

the bill, I feel constrained to vote against the measure as an entirety so long as it remains in its present shape. [Applause.]

Mr. GROW. Mr. Chairman, having at a previous Congress given my views at length upon the good faith, the fair business faith, of the Government to pay all of its obligations, unless there was a specific mode of payment provided, in such legal tender as the creditor of the Government might require at the time of payment, if there be more than one legal tender, I have not had any desire to take part in the general discussion of this bill.

The broad principle, if it be admitted, that the Government in good faith should thus pay its obligations covers everything in the bill. As the Government makes all legal tenders for the payment of debts, in the exercise of this arbitrary power it is in good faith incumbent on the Government to see that all of its legal tenders for the payment of debts are kept equal, or as nearly so as possible, in commercial value. Hence the creditor has the right to demand any legal tender that he wishes, if there be more than one at the time of payment. Individuals can not make legal tenders; therefore the debtor has the right to pay at his option in any legal tender, if there be more than one.

This bill is based on the plighted faith of the Government given in acts of Congress at different periods. On February 25, 1862, Congress passed a law for the first issue of the greenbacks and for the loan of $500,000,000, known as the 5-20 bonds. In that act, which is the basis of all the indebtedness of the Government to-day unpaid, except a very little, the Government pledged its faith to collect its duties in coin, and the coin so collected to be set apart in a special fund to be used as follows:

First, to pay the interest on the bonds and notes of the United States. Second, to redeem 1 per cent of the indebtedness of the Government annually every fiscal year after the 1st day of July, 1862. That is the pledge of the Government to pay its debt, principal and interest, in coin; and "coin" meant, when that law was passed, gold. It meant gold in contradistinction to paper. In all of this discussion I have listened to, most gentlemen seem to imply that coin means either gold or silver, and that either could in good faith be paid to discharge the public obligations. The duties provided for here were collected in gold except amounts less than $5. The obligation was to pay in coin, and the coin so collected at the custom-house was set apart in a special fund.

That coin was gold. The following is the wording of the act of February 25, 1862, on this point:

SEC. 5. That all duties on imported goods shall be paid in coin, and the coin so paid shall be set apart as a special fund and shall be applied as follows:

First. To the payment in coin of the interest on the bonds and notes of the United States.

Second. To the purchase or payment of 1 per cent of the entire debt of the United States to be made within each fiscal year after the 1st day of July, 1862.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GROW. No; I have only five minutes, and I can not yield. If my statement of facts is incorrect, any gentleman can correct it.

The plighted faith of the Government at the beginning of the issuing of the greenbacks was that the duties of the Government should be collected in coin.

Even the greenback was not to be received for customs dues, and that law was never changed until the law was passed providing for the Treasury notes to be issued to pay for the purchase of silver bullion. The greenback is not receivable to-day at the custom-houses, in pursuance of the pledge the Government gave at that time. The Treasury notes given for the purchase of silver bullion were made receivable at the custom-houses. That is the only paper to-day received for duties.

In 1869, in order to strengthen the public credit, an act was passed. How did the public credit get into a condition to need strengthening? It came from the idea that sprang up in Ohio, of which Mr. Pendleton was the father, that the 5-20 bonds could be paid in greenbacks, paid in paper, interest and principal, when the pledge of the Government was to collect its customs dues in coin, and pay that coin, first in interest on the bonds of the Government and its notes, and next to redeem annually 1 per cent of its debt, and its customs dues were collected in gold.

A pledge of the Government was passed then that it would pay its obligations in coin. There was neither gold nor silver in circulation. Coin was put in opposition to paper, and the promise was given that they should not be paid in paper, but should be paid in coin, and coin from 1862 down to 1878 was understood to mean gold. All the discussions in Congress on the issue of greenbacks show that the word "coin" was used generally interchangeably with the word "gold" on the part of everybody discussing the question.

The act of March, 1869, is worded:

The faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment in coin or its equivalent of all the obligations of the United States.

In the refunding of the national debt in 1870 the Government pledged itself to pay its obligations "in coin of the present standard value;" that is, the present standard value in 1870. There was no question of weight about it. No one ever thought of counting weight as value until this attempt to use silver to pay off the indebtedness of the Government. In the minds of the silverites of this country 412½ grains of silver in the standard dollar are always of the same value. They are of the same value for debt paying, and that is all.

But there was never any idea on the part of the lawmakers of the country, from 1862 down to the resumption of specie payments, that "coin" meant anything but "gold," and the pledge of the nation to the world which gave it credit was to collect coin at the custom-houses and pay it specifically for the purposes named, and the coin that was collected was gold, and, Mr. Chairman, no bond of the United States has ever yet been paid at its maturity in anything but gold.

The act of July 14, 1870, that authorized the refunding of the national debt, declared that the bonds were payable "in coin of the present standard value." It is value, not weight.

The first bond the United States shall pay in silver will put it out of the markets of the world, except with the credit of Mexico, and it must then sell its bonds at a discount to meet the discredit that has been put upon it by such an act.

These pledges, in three different acts of Congress, only rest upon the broad principle that whoever makes legal tenders to pay debts is under a moral obligation to keep all such legal tenders on the same or nearly the same commercial value.

The private debtor pays in any tender, because he has nothing to do with making the legal tender. Private citizens take their chances in the use of money. The debtor selects whatever legal tender he pleases. That is his right. It is not the right of the Government. The Government could defraud its creditors out of every cent of its obligations, if that doctrine is correct, by making a tender perfectly worthless to pay its debts with. It never was put into law, except on the Treasury notes issued to buy the silver bullion, that the Government had the option to pay its obligations in gold or silver. On those notes it was put in to be paid at the option of the Secretary of the Treasury in gold or silver.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

Mr. GROW. I only wish to conclude my remarks on this branch of the subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the time of the gentleman be extended for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROW. When that provision was put in, that the Secretary of the Treasury had the option to pay the Treasury notes in gold or silver, why was that option given to him? There is no other law that does that; never was and never will be while the credit of the Government stands unsuspected and unimpeached in the markets of the world. That option was given to him because the notes were issued for the purchase of silver. Hence, the law makers thought it fair to pay the debt in the article that we received. That was the reason the option was given to the Secretary of the Treasury to pay those Treasury notes in gold or silver, the only option of that kind on any indebtedness of the United States.

In the bonds issued to the Pacific railroads "lawful money" was put in as the mode of payment. Why? We were making the loan to the railroad company. Neither gold nor silver was in circulation. The Government had issued its paper money and made it a legal tender. Hence, they provided that those bonds should be paid in lawful money. That is the only bond ever issued by this Government which contained any such provision, and that was the reason for that. The reason the option was given to the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the silver Treasury notes in gold or silver was that the money was used in buying silver bullion.

Good faith and fair business dealing, such as men recognize between man and man, requires this Government to pay all of its obligations, I care not what they are, unless there is a specific mode of payment provided at the time of the contract, in a legal tender specified by its creditor, if there is more than one at the time of payment.

All that this law does is to put on the statute book, in plain and intelligible language, that these obligations of the Government are just what was put in in 1862, except that coin was used then, so as not to discredit the money under $5, which would have to be paid in silver. Hence coin was always used, and no one ever thought, in either branch of Congress, that the bonds of the United States would ever be paid in silver, and never thought that the duties to be collected at custom-houses would be collected in anything but gold, except the smaller sums of less than $5, until the Government made the silver certificate, issued for the purchase of bullion, receivable in that way, thus discrediting the greenback.

No paper was ever authorized to be received in payment of

duties until the Treasury notes which were issued for the purchase of silver bullion.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. Chairman, I have only asked the indulgence of the House for ten minutes. In that time I can not attempt fully to review the evils of the pending measure. This bill, sir, was never intended by those who are urging its passage to strengthen or reform the currency system of the country. It is not being pressed by them in obedience to any popular necessity or popular demand. It is born of an arrogant overconfidence in the security of their position and in the omnipotence of the evil power that stands behind them. Inflated with pride and drunk with victory they have come to believe that the people will endure any burden that may be laid upon them.

Mr. Chairman, it was said by one reputed to be wiser, perhaps, than even the authors and advocates of this bill that "Pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall." At a time like this, when there is a wave of prosperity due to unusual and extraordinary causes, the people may indeed be tolerant of misgovernment and unjust laws. But let gentlemen beware how far they presume upon the power of corruption and the patience of the American people.

We have been told by Republican leaders, from the President down, that the country is now fixed upon a stable money standard, and that every dollar is as good as gold. We are told that as a result of this condition confidence has been restored, that trade is active, that labor is employed, that the people are enjoying a prosperity unparalleled in the country's history. If all these things be true, whence comes the necessity for this tinkering with the currency?

It was not for the people that this law was framed.

It is provided in the second section that the bonds of the United States shall be payable in gold and not according to the terms of the contract, "in coin." For whose benefit was this provision inserted? Why are not pensions and all other obligations put on the same footing? During the Administration of President Cleveland, when an issue of bonds was to be made of only $50,000,000, the bondholders proposed in effect to pay the Government a difference of $16,000,000 if the bonds were expressly made payable in gold. Congress refused to sanction such a contract and they were made payable in coin. If, sir, those bonds had been made payable in gold and the Government had subsequently changed the terms of the contract so as to make them payable in coin, every holder of those bonds would have cried out that the Government was a robber and a thief.

But now, sir, after the Government has paid $16,000,000 for the right to pay in coin, the bondholders come forward and insolently demand that the terms of the contract shall be again changed for their especial benefit, without any consideration to the Government whatever. I say that this transaction is just as dishonest as the one I have supposed, the only difference being that in this case the Government and the people are being robbed for the benefit of the bondholders. If, sir, the authors of this bill had simply desired to be just to all concerned, why did they not say to the bondholders, "We are ready to deal with you now according to the terms of the proposition you made to the Government during the Cleveland Administration. Bring us your coin bonds and we will give you in exchange a gold bond bearing a lower rate of interest. The Government has paid you for the privilege of paying its bonds in coin and it will not change the contract for your benefit without consideration." We hear, sir, a great deal of honesty and good faith whenever the profits of the bondholders are endangered, but who cares for honor or good faith when only the people are to be robbed? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is proposed in this bill to break "the endless chain" by impounding the greenbacks in the Treasury whenever presented for redemption, whence they are never to be taken except in exchange for gold. This provision, Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, will not break the power of those who have habitually manipulated the currency of the country to control prices and to force bond issues. The greenbacks and Treasury notes presented for redemption will be hoarded in the Treasury, the gold will be hoarded in private vaults, and the currency will be contracted to that extent. They can in this way force an issue of bonds whenever they choose.

Mr. Chairman, the greenbacks are constantly represented as a menace to the peace of the Treasury. We heard a great deal during Mr. Cleveland's Administration of the havoc that was wrought by the "endless chain." But what, sir, are the facts? At that time we were suffering from a deficit in the revenues. There was not sufficient money coming into the Treasury through the regular channels to meet current expenditures. The Treasury was holding a reserve of $100,000,000 in gold, available only for redemption purposes. Now, sir, the practical operation of the "endless chain" was that whenever greenbacks were presented for redemption they went into the general fund and became available for current expenses. The Treasury in this way exchanged idle gold for useful greenbacks. Instead of being a burden upon the Treasury, the greenback was its greatest friend in its hour of need. Whenever the current revenues of the Government are sufficient to meet current expenditures every greenback presented for redemption is that much surplus in the Treasury and need not be reissued. The "endless chain" can only operate effectively when there is a deficit in the revenues.

Mr. Chairman, we are informed that the object of this bill is to more firmly establish and perpetuate the single gold standard. Gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber have argued that present conditions justify the advocates of the gold standard, and put to shame those who followed William J. Bryan in the campaign of 1896. If it does, sir, those who taunt us must share our humiliation, for if there is any one thing upon which the two great political parties were agreed in the campaign of 1896, it was in their advocacy of bimetallism and their opposition to the gold standard. They only differed as to the method by which the end was to be accomplished.

My friend from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] was one of the most brilliant advocates of bimetallism in that campaign.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I beg the gentleman's pardon; that is not one of my troubles.

Mr. CARMACK. Oh, I know it is not now, but it used to be. I do not know exactly when my friend got over it.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I trust my friend will take his object lesson from those who are victims of that delusion.

Mr. CARMACK. Well, if my friend was not afflicted in that way, he certainly had some very violent symptoms. [Laughter.]

The whole Republican party in 1896, from the President down, was unequivocally committed to bimetallism, just as much as the Democratic party was; but my friend has suddenly undergone a transformation, for in reply to a question from my colleague [Mr. SIMS] he heaped scorn upon the platform of his own party and declared himself an uncompromising champion of the single gold standard. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Mr. Chairman, in the first Congress that assembled after the election in 1896, a gentleman from New York by the name of Lemuel Eli Quigg had the audacity to stand on this floor and utter just such a sentiment as that proclaimed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER]. In an instant the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] and the gentleman from Iowa now in the chair [Mr. HEPBURN] pounced with ferocity upon that unfortunate person, and when they got through with Lemuel Eli his mother would not have known him if she had met him at the door. [Laughter.]

The gentleman from Iowa now presiding read the Republican platform of 1896, denounced the assertion that it had pledged the Republican party to the gold standard, and declared that any Republican who opposed bimetallism was an apostate to Republicanism and faithless to the pledges of the Republican party. Mr. Chairman, I thought it would be interesting to my friend from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] to know what his distinguished colleague who is now in the chair thinks of his conduct. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] I would be glad to know how many more recreants and apostates there are on that side of the Chamber. If there are any who disagree with my friend from Iowa, let them stand up. It is interesting, Mr. Chairman, to see the entire Republican party, from the President down, abandoning its platform and its pledges and rallying to a new war cry under the glorious leadership of Lemuel Eli Quigg. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, let us pause for a moment to ask whether in fact present conditions have vindicated the advocates of the gold standard in the last campaign. Let us see what was the issue joined between the Republican and Democratic parties in that campaign. The Democrats contended that the free coinage of silver would increase the prices of commodities and that rising prices meant prosperity. Our opponents admitted that the free coinage of silver would cause a rise in prices, but they said that the effect of this would be ruin and disaster. The Democrats declared that the effect of the gold standard was to depress prices and that this meant depression in trade and universal hard times. The Republicans admitted that the effect of the gold standard was to beat down the prices of commodities, but they declared that this condition was favorable to the great masses of the people.

The real issue joined between us and the question of debate was between higher and lower prices. Wherever you went you declared it was your purpose to increase the purchasing power of the workingman's dollar by keeping down the prices of all the necessaries of life. You appealed to the great army of pensioners throughout the country by telling them that the Democrats would increase prices and thereby diminish the value of their income. One of the greatest advocates of the gold standard made a speech in my city in which he said that he was glad that the prices of farm products were low, and he hoped they would go lower, because the lower they went the greater would be the purchasing power of the poor man's dollar.

Now, sir, it is true that we have better times; it is true that

we have a measure of prosperity; but it has come with a rise in the prices of commodities, with a decrease in the purchasing power of every dollar in the country. It has come through the very conditions which it was the avowed purpose of the gold standard to prevent. It has come through the very conditions which you yourselves have said the free coinage of silver would create.

Why, sir, your candidate for President, Mr. McKinley, declared that he was opposed to any policy that would reduce the purchasing power of the dollar, or, in other words, to any policy that would increase prices. Yet you have the nerve to stand here and boast of the fact that prices have increased and that the purchasing power of the dollar has decreased. Has your policy brought this about? If so, I want to tell you that Mr. McKinley is opposed to it. [Laughter.] You solemnly promised in the last campaign that you would defeat the base conspiracy to increase prices and thereby reduce the purchasing power of the workingman's dollar, and now you think you ought to have a chromo because you have failed to do it. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped to say something with regard to the real causes of improved conditions and also in regard to the increased gold supply so often adverted to in this debate. But I see that my time is about to expire, and I can not enter upon the discussion of those questions.

I thank the House for its very courteous attention. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I should have been entirely content to leave this bill where it now is, in so far as this discussion is concerned. It needs nothing that I could say for it. That it will pass the House is certain. But the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] a few moments ago dropped a remark that I think requires attention here, and as a citizen of Ohio, having an interest in the great men whose fame constitutes a part of the glory of our State, I am not content to allow what he said to pass without comment, though necessarily it must be brief.

I understood the gentleman to say, much after a fashion that has prevailed upon that side of the House during the little time that I have been a member, that one of our citizens—a man who was born in our State, who lived his boyhood in our State, who grew to manhood in our State, and who was honored by the people of our State and respected by all parties in our State—was a "pseudo man," or a "pseudo President." I am not certain which was the exact remark that he made, and I am not very particular which it was. What is a pseudo thing? The dictionary states that it is a term that signifies false, counterfeit, pretended, or spurious.

Mr. Chairman, when the history of this country comes to be written, free from the partisan animosity that manifests itself on the other side of this Hall at times, it will never be said of the boy or the man, the Congressman, the governor, or the President, Rutherford B. Hayes, that he was false, that he was counterfeit, that he was pretended, or that he was spurious.

Who was Rutherford B. Hayes, who is assailed by this sort of recklessness, by this sort of vituperation, by this sort of slander that does not end even when the grave hides his mortal remains—the remains of one whose good name and fame will live long beyond the time that the gentleman from Missouri and I are figuring in our small way on this stage of action?

Who, I say, was Rutherford B. Hayes? I can tell you who he was. After the massacre of Massachusetts soldiers in the streets of Baltimore, at the beginning of the civil war in 1861, this young Ohio man, Rutherford B. Hayes, writing to a friend, speaking of Stanley Matthews, another illustrious and worthy young Ohioan, said this:

> Matthews and I have agreed to go into the service for the war; if possible, into the same regiment. I spoke my feelings to him, which he said were his also, namely, that this was a just and necessary war; that it demanded the whole power of the country, and that I would prefer to go into it if I knew I was to die or be killed in the course of it rather than to live through and after it without taking any part in it.

There was nothing false, counterfeit, pretended, or spurious in or about this manly and patriotic declaration. On the contrary, it was the real thing. It was the brave and glowing spirit of patriotism, the spirit which then broke into full flame throughout the loyal land and never ceased to burn with consuming power until war ended in the restoration of the Union.

Let me go a little further; and I ought to have taken time to get better prepared, but I did not want the words of the gentleman to get cold before some citizen of the State of Ohio secured the floor and resented them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN. I ask unanimous consent to have five minutes more.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes more, and that I may have five minutes in which to reply.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. One of the biographers of this Ohio man, Rutherford B. Hayes, writing about the battle of South Mountain, says this, and I call the attention of the gentleman from Missouri to the language:

> Lieutenant-Colonel Hayes soon after again made his appearance on the field, with his wound half dressed, and fought, against the remonstrances of the whole command, until carried off.

I should have thought the gentleman's regard for bravery, for heroic character, for the courage that wins for a soldier an encomium like this for gallantry on the field of battle, would prevent the application to him of the language which fell from the lips of the gentleman from Missouri to-day. Let me read one more extract. Speaking of the battle of Opequan, the biographer uses this language, referring to Hayes:

> He was everywhere exposing himself recklessly as usual. He was the first over the slough; he was in advance of the line half the time afterward; his adjutant-general was severely wounded; men were dropping all around him, but he rode through it all as if he had a charmed life.

That was the boy, that the man, that the soldier, whom Ohio saw fit to reckon as one of her great citizens, and may the day be long distant when we cease to give him the credit that belongs to him. He moved to Hamilton County and practiced his profession—that of a lawyer—a county which adjoins that in which I live. He was an honorable practitioner. He was afterwards sent to this House. Later he became governor of the State of Ohio, and afterwards, by the larger call of the citizens of the Republic, he became President of the United States. And I want to say this: That whatever opinion may be held as to any particular measure of the Administration of President Hayes, it was pure and clean, as he was himself pure and clean. It was guided by intelligence. The love of country which inspired the soldier inspired the President. How did Hayes come into the Presidency? I answer, legally, constitutionally, and rightfully. Is the truth never to be acknowledged by the political enemies of Hayes? Is the hatred of those who lost never to disappear? I have only time to declare that through all the temptations and perils of a close and contested Presidential election Rutherford B. Hayes bore himself every day and every hour as the honest, fair, upright man that he was, and that, notwithstanding all that is or can be said, no stain, however slight, attaches to the record of this period of his honorable career.

And I recall to the memory of gentlemen on the other side of the House the fact that President Hayes was one of the first of the public men of the North, one of the first of the leading Republicans of the North, one of the first of the soldiers of the North, to extend the olive branch to the old Confederates. In making up his Cabinet you will remember that it was President Hayes who went to Tennessee for his Postmaster-General and selected a man who had worn the uniform of the Confederacy. This fact you will surely remember to the credit of Hayes this day, this happier and better day, when in the North and in the South, on that side of the aisle and this, we are thankful for the restoration of the sentiment that makes us one people now and henceforth. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN. I ask for two minutes more.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN. I want only a little more time. Rutherford B. Hayes was of Ohio birth. He was an Ohio boy, an Ohio soldier, an Ohio Representative in this House, an Ohio governor, and an Ohio President. As a boy he was industrious, energetic, and ambitious; as a lawyer he was honorable and able; as a soldier he was true and courageous; as a Representative, as governor, and as President he was intelligent, capable, and patriotic. After he left the Presidency he went back to Ohio and became the dignified but unassuming and kind-hearted citizen. He was a member of the Grand Army of the Republic. The last time I saw him was at one of the camp fires of that great organization, where he was the central figure, the welcome guest, the loved comrade, and when he died there were no more sincere mourners at his grave than the brave men who had served with him in the Army of the Union. He sleeps now in an honorable grave. Whatever Missouri may do, we in Ohio will defend his memory. His life and deeds fill one bright page of the shining record that tells the story of the many good and great men of our glorious State. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that my friend from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] should take exceptions to my applying the word pseudo to Rutherford B. Hayes. That is a very mild term in his case, it appears to me. That pure, illustrious, superb Republican, Roscoe Conkling, always spoke of Hayes as Rutherfraud B. Hayes. I never said that Rutherford B. Hayes was a "pseudo-man." I think he gave ample evidence that he was of the male gender. I said that he was a "pseudo-President," and I repeat the statement. I accept the gentleman's definition that he was a "counterfeit President." [Laughter on the Democratic side.] A genuine coin is one made by legitimate authority; a counterfeit is made by illegitimate authority. Other Presidents of the United States were made by the people. Hayes

was made President by that infamous eight to seven commission [applause on the Democratic side], the "eight" of whom Judge Jeremiah S. Black denounced as "blistered, perjured miscreants." I do not care if he was a brave soldier. Benedict Arnold was a brave soldier, but he sleeps in a grave of obloquy.

I say this, I am not hidebound about politics. [Laughter.] There are great and distinguished Republicans. I have great admiration for Abraham Lincoln. I claim a part of the honor of Grant's fame as an American citizen. Garfield was a wonder of learning and brains. The younger Harrison was far above the average President in character and capacity. I admire McKinley in some respects, but I entertain a supreme contempt, although he is in the grave, for Hayes, because he stole the Presidency of the United States, the greatest crime committed in all the flood of time. I do not care if he is dead. Public men live after they are buried. They live in their records. I wish Hayes had been compelled to live forever and had had to bear the scorn of decent men until the end of the world itself. The shot fired at Sumter, which was heard around the world, was not so great a shock to republican institutions as was the fact that Hayes, never elected, should sit in the Presidential chair; and upon his tombstone this legend should appear: "Here lies a man who committed the monumental crime against human liberty." Now, if they can make anything out of that let them make it. [Laughter on Democratic side.]

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Chairman, the day on which this bill becomes a law will mark the beginning of a new period in American history—a radical change in our monetary system. Therefore, while I have refrained from participating in the general debate, out of a desire to give opportunity to many gentlemen who are new acquisitions to the House to be heard, I can not be content with the appearance of my vote alone in the official record of this Congress without having it reenforced by a word of protest against a most unfortunate and iniquitous measure. It will afford me satisfaction in the future, if I should live to see the logical results of this legislation—and unless I die before my time I believe I will—to remember that I was not a silent witness of the perpetration of a great wrong.

I would ask, Mr. Chairman, by what authority this measure is to be forced on the country? Who has demanded it, sir? What influences in the land are impelling Congress to pass this measure, bringing the country by the enactment of law to the gold standard? The great campaign of 1896 was conducted, not upon the question as to whether we should be a bimetallic or monometallic Government, but whether the United States should independently coin gold and silver free at the ratio of 16 to 1. The Democratic party came boldly to the assertion that the Government of the United States was able by herself, acting courageously and independently, to give our people a bimetallic standard of gold and silver on terms of perfect equality. We then contended that the gold standard was an evil thing not to be desired; that a bimetallic standard was a good thing, and that it was to be desired because it would give us more good metallic money. We did it in the light of past history, the past history of our own Government and of the world; in the light of economic science; in the light of the wise counsels of economic scholars; we did it at the demand of our people for more money to make life more prosperous for them and its burdens more tolerable.

The Republicans did not say we should not have bimetallism. They insisted that we ought to have a bimetallic standard. They put it in their platform unequivocally, and promised their honest efforts to bring it about, in the St. Louis convention in 1896, after having a few years before that, in 1888, denounced Grover Cleveland and the Democratic party for trying to demonetize silver. They said "the gold standard is a bad thing, and we promise the country they shall not have it; we will strive for a bimetallic standard, but the only way it can be obtained is by international agreement." They said "the Democrats are crazy; they are wild on this subject. Our Government is not strong enough to accomplish it acting by itself. We will do it in the orthodox, proper way. We will get the consent of the powers of Europe to accomplish it, and then the people can have the blessing of a bimetallic standard."

We went to the country. There were more than 13,000,000 men who voted in that great election; and of all those who voted, the only ones who voted for the single gold standard were those who followed Palmer and Buckner, one hundred and thirty-odd thousand in number. All the rest voted for the double standard of money.

I ask, therefore, again of the Republican party by what authority they enact this law? The people have not spoken since 1896. Who demands it, then? We all know, everybody knows, it is the banker, the capitalist, the creditor—the great creditor class demand it. The capitalist demands it because it will make his money worth more to him and everything that money buys worth less.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the time of the gentleman be extended for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINSMORE. Those are the classes in this country to whose interest this legislation will redound; whether that is the motive in the minds of gentlemen who are about to enact it into law or not, they are the inspiration behind this measure. That influence, without whose aid the Republican party would be a powerless political organization, the influence of wealth ill got. We speak to-day for the people who voted for William McKinley in the contest of 1896, as well as those who voted for Bryan. They did it by the thousands, upon the faith of the pledges made to them that they could have bimetallism, upon the faith of the declarations made by the President himself, for whom I have unmeasured respect, as a citizen and a gentleman of most courtly and generous characteristics. I believe that Mr. McKinley was honest and sincere as a bimetallist and that he thought his party would try to bring bimetallism about; but his masters are stronger than he. He can not be a Republican President and be loyal to the interests of all the people or even loyal to the promises he and his party have made.

We have been amused—perhaps I should not say amused, because of the gravity of the situation, because the evils which are involved and with which this measure is fraught are so great that however grotesque may be the situation of our friends on the other side of this Chamber, it is too serious a matter for amusement. Let us say it has been pathetic to see them come into this great confessional, one by one, acknowledging their past errors, errors of a generation (if they have been errors), and announcing a new doctrine, a new faith, and claiming that they have progressed into the regeneration of the single gold standard. My distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] the other day, in response to the unkind reminders of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], said:

> Conditions have changed and I have progressed. I live in the present, without pride of opinion, ready to meet the present emergencies, and he [Mr. RICHARDSON] dwells with the ghouls of ancient graveyards.

Ghouls and graveyards indeed! Ghouls of Republican broken faith, graveyards of buried hopes, inspired by Republican promises, unkept and dead. My friend the distinguished and honorable gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] is also a progressor, and in his remarks took occasion to felicitate himself and his colleagues that God abides with the Republican party. In truth, Mr. Chairman, it does seem that God is with them now, for what inscrutable purpose I do not know, but He moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform. A temporary and partial prosperity has visited the country with new and largely increased gold production and with the enormous demands incident to two years of war. Business has been stimulated and revived by these causes, and but for the conditions they bring the majority would not have dared to unmask themselves and propose this bill.

Prosperity has in a measure come. For this blessing we owe our thanks to the Divine God and not to the Republican party. Every assertion of the Democratic party with reference to bimetallism has been vindicated by the situation that now exists. Ours was the quantity theory of money. You derided it. You now congratulate the country that money is abundant. Why do you do so, and why is it abundant? Because the gold supply has been doubled and we have a product of gold equal to the supply of both gold and silver in the past. The volume of that product has been increased, and in addition a war has been waging for two years, unlocking millions of dollars from every secret sleeping place and putting them out into the arteries of commerce and trade. There is another war on the other side of the world, which has increased demand for our merchandise, and hence the money in our country. Men are now in my country buying mules to ship to Africa to meet the demands of the British army.

These things have vitalized industry for the present; but when the war ceases, Mr. Chairman, when again the mines close up their mouths and the yellow stream ceases to come forth for the use of men and we go down again into a dearth of money, as history shows has ever occurred in the past; when the wars are ended and expenditures are reduced, then these same gentlemen who boast of their progress will bewail the evil hour when they went back upon their promises of the past and gave themselves over utterly to Mammon and the golden calf.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, one word further. My distinguished friend from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE] has had something to say about inconsistencies, and my friend has had the misfortune to commit himself in a moment of prophetic condition to a suggestion on this very question. This was not a question of protective tariff that he was talking about; it was another question. I should like to ask him, "Have we had free and unlimited coinage?" and he will say "No." Then, how much will your opinion

to-day be worth in the light of what you said on the 30th of March, 1897? I will read it:

Mr. Chairman, when a Congress shall come here and pursue the policy which was laid down in the Democratic platform and give us a bimetallic currency in this country—give us a currency which will prevent this constant absorption of the value of property into an enlarged and enhanced dollar—then we may see prosperity come, but not till then. While the hiatus between money and property is widening and widening there never can, in my judgment, be prosperity.

What we need is a return to silver and gold as standard money, and the people will have it yet, whether you will or no. Until we return to real bimetallism there can be no prosperity, and you in this House are afraid to put yourselves on record against it and admit the necessity for it. When a proposition came up on the other side of this Chamber upon the question of money and an international agreement, there were only four gentlemen over there who had the courage to stand up and say by their votes that they believed in the gold standard, which every one of you advocated all over the country on the stump last fall.

Now the gentleman comes to-day and thanks the Lord for prosperity. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Well, I want to remind the gentleman that, good as the Lord is, gracious as He has been to the American people, He always works through instrumentalities, and at present He seems to be operating through the instrumentality of the Republican Administration. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILSON of New York. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the few remarks I am about to make will not be as an argument for or against this bill; I desire to give expression to my constituency, whom I have the honor to represent.

There may be some defects in this important measure, but the main feature—the establishment of a gold standard and removing the currency question from the field of politics—makes my position in supporting this bill truly a representative not only of my own district but also of sentiments of a majority of the people of the entire State of New York.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the discussion of the provisions of this bill can be with entire safety begun by its opponents with the statement that at the present time there has been a relaxation of the hard times and great business depression for so many years prevalent.

That such relaxation should have taken place is entirely natural, in accordance with the laws of nature in all her creations, and in accordance with the teachings of history.

Prosperity and depression have succeeded one another at intervals regular and irregular. For years the ingenuity of the statesman and politician alike have been exercised to discover a panacea for the evils of depressed times and conditions. Their search has been equally vain with the search of mankind for the "philosopher's stone" and the "fountain of perpetual youth." I believe at all times it will be vain. No honest man of sound mind, whatever may be his party affiliations, will give the credit of the present change to legislation. Despite what has been vainly boasted by prejudiced, ignorant, or credulous men, no law has been enacted which can claim the present improved conditions as the result of its enforcement.

As a general proposition, the prayer of the American people has been, "Stop legislating for business; let business work out its own salvation; leave it alone to be governed by its natural laws. Take away the brakes and clogs at present upon it; let it stand on its own natural base, and you will have done the country and its people a world of good."

Would this not be a good rule to follow now, instead of again seeking to hamper our returning prosperity by the enactment of this piece of legislation, which at best will create a change of values and affect the credits of the people of this land?

It would be a happy plan to follow the good old rule of letting well enough alone.

Nor has there been a good reason so far given why this bill should be enacted into law. Its advocates say we are to-day, in practice and in reality, upon a gold-standard basis. If we take for granted, for the sake of argument, that statement to be true, then why enact the first section of this bill or any other section?

Throughout the length and breadth of this land I find no one among the working masses asking for it.

The national banks of the land, except those of the great cities, perhaps, are not asking an enactment of any of the national-bank clauses. Did they desire it, our country banks, I mean, would not be backward in asserting their wishes. Not one has said a word, sent a delegation, sent a letter or a telegram asking me to support it.

On the contrary, they want to be left alone. Those who do an honest, fair, and useful business all ask to be let alone and not interfered with.

I well remember that on one occasion a proposition came up before the senate of Pennsylvania on third reading and final passage on a Thursday to take a tax levied by the State off of manufacturing corporations. All through that week, every hour, every minute, aye, almost every second, a message came by mail or wire, delegation after delegation appeared upon the scene, until the legislature was fairly inundated with messages, letters, and pleadings. Is that the case with this bill? It certainly is not. But a small coterie of speculators are the brains and substance behind this bill.

I have said that times have been improving, and not the result of legislation.

What, then, has been the cause, or rather causes, for they are legion? Some appear on the surface; some lie deeper, and their results can be traced with greater difficulty.

Among the most apparent has been the famine in India and the general short crops of cereals entering into the manufacture of bread throughout the consuming world, with the particular and almost single exception of the United States. Then the short, nay, almost total failure of the great Cuban tobacco crop, owing to the long period of war in that country, has given a direct stimulus and greatly enhanced the price of our native tobaccos. The certain falling off in the quantity of this year's cotton crop and its attendant rise in price has assisted such portions of the country where the crop was good or fair.

Then this country has been for over a year engaged in war, and the expenditures of this Government have been enormously increased. All the material and articles of manufacture and consumption required by the Government in carrying on this war, from this unnatural demand, have risen in price and their production stimulated by this demand. The stocks in the stores and at the manufacturing plants, which for a number of years have been allowed to run down to their very lowest point, had to be replenished. The wear and tear on our railroads had to be replaced. Projected improvements and absolutely needed repairs had to be resumed, and were only waiting for a time when it was possible to move on. The slack occasioned by the long season of depression had to be taken up.

But added to this, and the most important reason for the present resumption of business enterprises, has been the large output from the new and old gold fields of the world. This has been abnormal, and this has in large part gone directly into the money, the circulating medium of the commercial world.

Neither the advocates nor the opponents of this bill deny that there has been by reason of this increased output of gold an increase in the circulating medium, and both now, perhaps for the first time, agree that prosperity is never possible without there being a sufficient quantity of money in circulation. The greater the quantity, the greater the business activity.

Is it not a good time, instead of passing new legislation, to leave business alone, naturally to resume its natural channels, aiding it only by providing, so far as it is possible to do so by legislation, an increased supply instead of diminishing this quantity of money under the pretext of adding to its quality? This is a plain business proposal, which requires no juggling with statistics nor any abstruse theories to determine. It can be understood by laymen.

But there are many other evils inherent in this bill. The bill creates a great change in the values of the bonded indebtedness of the United States. By reading into these contracts the "gold clause" it largely increases the value of those issued and now in the hands of the money lenders and bondholders, which are very largely confined to the wealthy corporations and money kings, who have by favored legislation largely absorbed the results of the producing and laboring classes of the country.

But, more than this, this increased value and unjust profit created by the provisions of this bill is at the direct expense of the taxpayers of the land.

Not content with this injustice and highway robbery, it goes still a step farther; it reads into every mortgage, bond, note, or certificate of indebtedness, into every contract to pay given by the private individual, this much detested and much feared gold clause.

I well know what consternation was created in the community in which I live a few short years ago by a few of the money-lending individuals and corporations endeavoring to have the contracts already existing changed so that they were payable in gold. With all the necessities of the debtor class, which were exceeding great at that time, they were able to accomplish it only in a small part. There was a revolt, and such names as "thieves" and "shylocks" were most forcibly applied to those who sought to make this change. This bill at one fell swoop seeks to write into every debtor's contract this dreaded and objectionable word.

If I judge the debtor classes aright, the men who perpetrate this outrage by voting for the pending bill will feel the heavy hand of a constituency whose interest, instead of defending, they have betrayed. Ponder on the seer's warning to the highland chief:

> Lochiel, Lochiel, beware of the day
> When the lowlands shall meet thee in battle array;
> For a field of the dead rushes red on my sight,
> And the clans of Culloden are scattered in flight.

What hope have you for the continuance of the present condition of affairs? Only one, the continued increase and increasing output of the gold mines. That is the only ground upon which you have any right to base such hope.

The pockets of the Klondike are fast being exhausted. No large deposits of gold have been found in Alaska recently. California had its day, quickly reached its climax in the production of gold, and declined. The expense of mining in the Arctic region is enormous. The rush of the multitude to these parts is over. The cost of labor with a decreased and constantly decreasing labor market must largely increase. Only new and rich finds can be relied upon, and this, as ever in the past, is largely problematical. The output from the gold fields of the Transvaal, for a time at least, will or rather has almost entirely stopped. Working the lower levels is more expensive each year. A rise in the price of Kaffir labor will render them entirely unprofitable, and that rise it is but natural to expect. With that the yield of gold decreases.

If a gold standard is established in this great commercial country the increased demand must increase its purchasing power when measured by commodities. How much harder will it be for the debtor classes to meet their obligations, interest and principal? Then your day of reckoning will come. Who will pity you? Not the men of your own party whom you have plundered. Surely not those who have warned you of a crisis which may be expected in a few short years at least.

You have another reason for not pressing this measure, one which can not be overlooked by the lowest among you. Its passage will break your promises to the very people by whose votes you occupy your seats upon the floor of this House. You promised them bimetallism. I care not what kind or in what manner it was to be brought about, still it was bimetallism, not the gold standard.

You will, if you pass this bill, do more to defeat international bimetallism than any thing you could do. Philanthropists and humanitarians, not only in this country but throughout the world, have for years been working for this result. They have been striving to bring in the era when in all the world gold and silver will be used as money, primary money, side by side at a fixed ratio. You, under this guise and protestations of friendship, have done your best to postpone the time of the consummation of international bimetallism. One hope remains to them, that the reaction may be sharp and sudden, so that the evil results of your action will be less seriously felt. The educated and enlightened world, the unselfish and humane world, believe in bimetallism, and your action will create a reaction you little dream of; and it may be in the fitness of things this very action of yours will hasten the day of its general establishment among the nations of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out for the purpose of the ornamentation, as it were, of this debate that if all that is alleged on the other side as true be true, which we deny, about the inconsistency and change of front of the Republican party we have had a most illustrious example set by the Democratic party. It may take me about ten minutes to remind gentlemen on the other side of the history that they themselves have made during the last fifteen years. Going back to 1884, when you nominated Grover Cleveland, you put a sound-money plank into your platform and used for the first time in a national platform, as I remember, the words "sound money."

A MEMBER. Honest money.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Honest money; I meant that. But they are convertible terms.

Now, Mr. Cleveland put his construction very early upon that platform, and he did it in a way to give it special emphasis for the people of the country. He did not wait to take his place as President.

He feared that the Democratic party might not quite understand the terms of their platform, and so, before he was sworn into office, he wrote a letter to a distinguished gentleman, formerly a member of this House from Albany, on the 24th of February, 1885. I shall put that letter in full into my remarks, under the order of the House, so that my friends on the other side can have it within reach at all times [laughter] as a landmark of the movements and travel through which they have passed.

He gave notice to the Democratic party that the coinage of silver ought to be stopped. Here is a single sentence. Speaking about the necessity of maintaining sound money, he says, "This is possible by a present suspension of the purchase and coinage of silver." That was the first public declaration by any distinguished and prominent man in favor of the crime of 1873 and the perpetration of the single gold standard.

Now, then, my friends will say, "But that was Grover Cleveland; what have we to do with that?" Your years afterwards, my friends, when Grover Cleveland had lived right square up to that platform at every step of his way, you renominated him for President of the United States.

That was not all; recognizing the distinct utterance that he had made, notwithstanding that we had reached the period of 1888 and this discussion of the question of silver had been going on all that time, you did not put a word into your platform on the subject-matter of silver. Cleveland was defeated for President. Then came 1892, and so fond were you, and every one of you, of the great champion of the gold standard, and the great enemy of bimetallism, and the sworn foe of free silver, that you renominated him for the third time, and adopted a single gold standard platform, as I will show you.

Your platform in 1892 declares in favor of money in the following terms:

> We hold to the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country and to the coinage of both gold and silver without discriminating against either metal or charge for mintage, but the dollar unit of coinage of both metals must be of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, when we come to you with a message that as to both these propositions is the very beacon light of its purpose, you undertake to denounce us for having changed front upon this question. You were on the gold standard in 1892.

Mr. LENTZ. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will.

Mr. LENTZ. Is it not a fact that you ran for Congress in 1894 on a platform that favored an increase of the currency to $40 per capita, as they had done in the State of Pennsylvania?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I should not be surprised. I ran on the Republican platform of Ohio, whatever that was. [Laughter and applause.] You can always charge me with having been in accord with the Republican platform when I run for office.

Mr. SULZER. Right or wrong.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have never changed very suddenly, like my colleague, in my views. Whatever change I have made has been of a gradual character. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. LENTZ. I think the gentleman is in the habit of changing so gracefully that we do not see when he does it. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. My colleague, when he does it, does it in such an awkward way that we can all of us see it. [Laughter.]

Now, my friends, that was your platform. You were not only willing to use words of doubtful import, but you wanted to make the people of the country understand that there was something left of the old Jacksonian Democracy on your side, and so you put in that very idea that this money should be "interchangeable and of equal intrinsic value." Now, that is a good platform for the soundest Democrat on earth; that is all that we want to get, and if you will get out of our way we will be there in a very short time. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Now, one word further. My distinguished friend from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE], has had something to say about inconsistencies, and my friend has had the misfortune to commit himself in a moment of prophetic condition to a suggestion on this very question. This was not a question of protective tariff that he was talking about it; was another question. I should like to ask him, "Have we had free and unlimited coinage?" and he will say "No." Then, how much will your opinion to-day be worth in the light of what you said on the 30th of March, 1897? I will read it:

> Mr. Chairman, when a Congress shall come here and pursue the policy which was laid down in the Democratic platform and give us a bimetallic currency in this country—give us a currency which will prevent this constant absorption of the value of property into an enlarged and enhanced dollar—then we may see prosperity come, but not till then. While the hiatus between money and property is widening and widening there never can, in my judgment, be prosperity.
>
> What we need is a return to silver and gold as standard money, and the people will have it yet, whether you will or no. Until we return to real bimetallism there can be no prosperity, and you in this House are afraid to put yourselves on record against it and admit the necessity for it. When a proposition came up on the other side of this Chamber upon the question of money and an international agreement, there were only four gentlemen over there who had the courage to stand up and say by their votes that they believed in the gold standard, which every one of you advocated all over the country on the stump last fall.

Now the gentleman comes to-day and thanks the Lord for prosperity. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Well, I want to remind the gentleman that, good as the Lord is, gracious as He has been to the American people, He always works through instrumentalities, and at present He seems to be operating through the instrumentality of the Republican Administration. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

The letter is as follows:

ALBANY, *February 24, 1885.*

The Hon. A. J. WARNER and others,
Members of the Forty-eighth Congress.

GENTLEMEN: The letter which I have had the honor to receive from you invites, and, indeed, obliges, me to give expression to some grave public necessities, although in advance of the moment when they would become the objects of my official care and partial responsibility. Your solicitude that my judgment shall have been carefully and deliberately formed is entirely just, and I accept the suggestion in the same friendly spirit in which it has been made.

It is also fully justified by the nature of the financial crisis which, under the operation of the act of Congress of February 28, 1878, is now close at hand. By a compliance with the requirements of that law all the vaults of the Federal Treasury have been and are heaped full of silver coins, which are now worth less than 85 per cent of the gold dollar prescribed as "the unit of value" in section 14 of the act of February 12, 1873, and which, with the silver certificates representing such coin, are receivable for all public dues. Being thus receivable, while also constantly increasing in quantity at the rate of

$28,000,000 a year, it has followed of necessity that the flow of gold into the Treasury has been steadily diminished.

Silver and silver certificates have displaced and are now displacing gold, and the sum of gold in the Federal Treasury now available for the payment of the gold obligations of the United States and for the redemption of the United States notes called "greenbacks," if not already encroached upon, is perilously near such encroachment. These are facts which, as they do not admit of difference of opinion, call for no argument. They have been forewarned to us in the official reports of every Secretary of the Treasury from 1878 till now. They are plainly affirmed in the last December report of the present Secretary of the Treasury to the Speaker of the present House of Representatives. They appear in the official documents of this Congress and in the records of the New York clearing house, of which the Treasury is a member and through which the bulk of the receipts and payments of the Federal Government and of the country pass.

These being the facts of our present condition, our danger and our duty to avert that danger would seem to be plain. I hope that you concur with me and with the great majority of our fellow-citizens in deeming it most desirable at the present juncture to maintain and continue in use the mass of our gold coin as well as the mass of silver already coined. This is possible by a present suspension of the purchase and coinage of silver. I am not aware that by any other method it is possible.

It is of momentous importance to prevent the two metals from parting company; to prevent the increasing displacement of gold by the increasing coinage of silver; to prevent the disuse of gold in the custom-houses of the United States in the daily business of the people; to prevent the ultimate expulsion of gold by silver. Such a financial crisis as these events would certainly precipitate, were it now to follow upon so long a period of commercial depression, would involve the people of every city and every State in the Union in a prolonged and disastrous trouble. The revival of business enterprise and prosperity, so ardently desired and apparently so near, would be hopelessly postponed.

Gold would be withdrawn to its hoarding places, and an unprecedented contraction in the actual volume of our currency would speedily take place. Saddest of all, in every workshop, mill, factory, store, and on every railroad and farm, the wages of labor, already depressed, would suffer still further depression by a scaling down of the purchasing power of every so-called dollar paid into the hand of toil. From these impending calamities it is surely a most patriotic and grateful duty of the representatives of the people to deliver them.

I am, gentlemen, with sincere respect, your fellow-citizen,

GROVER CLEVELAND.

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Chairman, I had the misfortune to be out of the Hall when my friend from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] began to refer to me and what I said, but I did hear what he read from the RECORD.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will say to my friend from Arkansas that that was the only reference I made to him.

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Chairman, I want to refer to that. I reassert what I said on that day, in the sense in which it was then used. I meant then that there could be no permanent prosperity in this country with a single gold standard, because the gold of the world is inadequate to supply the people with sufficient basic money.

I say so now. In my remarks a few moments ago I stated that we are in a season of temporary prosperity, and I mentioned the causes. Now, sir, the very cause of the prosperity that we have to-day is what I was asking for when I had the honor to speak on the floor at the time the gentleman has referred to, the abundance of money, though accomplished by different means. But I meant abundance of money permanently for the people. We are now enjoying the benefits of discoveries of gold which have added vastly, and almost without precedent, to the gold stock of the country, and made our gold money sufficient to meet the deficit which would have happened provided the discoveries had not been made.

In addition to that, we must recognize the fact that hitherto the money was locked up in the strong boxes of the country. There was lack of opportunity for investment to bring a return to capitalists. That money was not in use; but we went to war, and the war created a demand on the part of the Government for the use of millions of money—hundreds of millions—that came out of hiding and was invested. Moreover, there was a strong demand on the population of the country to supply soldiers, and these men have now occupation, leaving a smaller number of men to compete for occupation in the home industries. These causes have brought about a stimulus of the business of the country, which has increased its prosperity.

But the time will come, Mr. Chairman, as it has come in the past, and I am justified by all the history of the world from the beginning, when these temporary causes will cease to exist, when the supply of gold will again fall short, when grim-visaged war will smooth his wrinkled front, our soldiers return to peaceful occupations and claim their places as workers, when the circulation caused by war expenditures will be again restricted. Then when the supply of money fails, when the wars have ceased, when we are brought back under the gold standard and decline of prices come, gold will begin to climb again and prices grow less and less, to the misery of the people. If it does not happen history will reverse itself and experience is no safe guide for the conduct of men.

Mr. Chairman, I have confined myself to an effort to expose the false claims of the majority made in attempt to justify this atrocious bill, and could not in this brief manner attempt to discuss its various provisions, all of which are bad.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has one minute.

Mr. DINSMORE. I thank my friend from Georgia. I am sorry I took up his time.

Mr. FLEMING. I have no doubt it was better occupied than if I had occupied it myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Arkansas was recognized in his own right, and will now recognize the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLEMING].

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, since this debate began a number of gentlemen upon the other side of the House have lauded President McKinley as the chief factor in the establishment of the single gold standard. A few moments ago the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] reverted to the historical record in the case, and he makes it plain to this House that the credit is not due to President McKinley but to ex-President Cleveland. There may be some difference of opinion among gentlemen as to which of these two Presidents of the United States is entitled to the greater credit for establishing the gold standard; but in my opinion the impartial historian, when he comes to write the truth of the situation, will say that the honor or the dishonor, the glory or the shame (whichever it may eventually prove to be) of having fastened that financial policy upon this country will belong, not to President McKinley, but to President Cleveland.

But, Mr. Chairman, that was not my purpose in rising. I wish to discuss one serious and grievous injustice which it seems to me is connected with the practical operations of this bill, in connection with the peculiar tax system of the United States. I have no doubt that this bill will accomplish the object for which it was intended. The experts of the Republican party, assisted by the experts of the Democratic gold party, have expended their best efforts upon it, and all the Republican members of this House, in caucus assembled, have unanimously indorsed it. With so much of brains behind this measure, I would not be rash enough to doubt that it will accomplish the identical purposes for which it was framed.

But what are those purposes? Chiefly, they are two: First, to establish the gold standard and make gold the only money of final redemption in the United States; second, to give the national banks unrestricted power to control the volume of the currency. I am opposed to the bill because I am opposed to both these objects. I am opposed to taking such action now as will prevent the Government of the United States from using silver as a money of final redemption under any and all possible emergencies of the future. I am opposed to giving the national banks any greater power to control the destinies of the people of this country than they have to-day.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. FLEMING. I will if my time will permit.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you not remember that in its platform of 1892 the Democratic party provided for the removal of the 10 per cent tax on bank circulation, so that the banks could have all the money?

Mr. FLEMING. Oh, Mr. Chairman, that is an entirely different question. You gentlemen here are going onto a financial system under which the currency of the country is obliged to depend on the indebtedness of the country, and when the people clamor for more money to carry on their business these controllers and presidents and directors of national banks will answer that clamor by saying, "Yes; issue more bonds on your country and we will give you more currency, and if you do not issue more bonds you will get no more currency." [Applause on the Democratic side.] The result of it is, Mr. Chairman, that by a continuing and increasing ratio you will put another force at work in our politics to pile up an incalculable debt on the people of the United States.

It is true that by an increase in the gold production of the world, oringing it up now to some $300,000,000 a year, together with other favoring causes, we have had increased prosperity. But, Mr. Chairman, no man can give us any assurance that the future years will continue to give us this increased production of gold. We must have it in order to keep the standard of measure at a proper and equitable ratio between the debtor and the creditor. But this whole financial legislation is based upon the hope, with no assurance for the realization of that hope, that the gold production of the world will increase in similar proportion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FLEMING. I have not occupied any time in this debate previously, and I should like to have five minutes more.

Mr. PAYNE. I ask that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman have five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, by this bill four hundred and eighty-two millions of silver money, capable now of being used as money of final redemption, are to be converted into four hundred and eighty-two millions of promises to pay in gold money. That such legislation will increase the value of the gold dollar can

not be doubted. It is just as true as that effect follows after cause.

How much that dollar is to be increased in value I do not know. No man can compute it with mathematical accuracy, but that there will be an increase no man can deny. This whole financial question is a matter of deepest concern between the debtor and the creditor in their relations under the obligations of time contracts. There is not a debtor in this country, from one end to the other, who is not financially interested in the operations and the result of this bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, passing over all private debts, passing over all private corporation bonds and municipal bonds and State bonds, let us come to the one single item of the national indebtedness of the United States. That indebtedness is now, in round numbers, $1,000,000,000. By the passage of this bill you inevitably increase the burden of this debt upon the people of the United States. How much that unearned and unpromised increment is going to be no man can accurately compute, but that increased burden, whatever it may be, is going to fall upon the shoulders of the people. Yet we can get a side light upon it.

When Mr. Cleveland proposed to issue only $60,000,000 worth of bonds, he was offered a price equivalent to a premium of about $16,000,000 on the $60,000,000, if he would write "gold" in the face of the evidence of indebtedness. That is about 25 per cent. Now, gentlemen, if conditions have changed and you think it will not be worth 25 per cent now, will you be willing to fix it at 12½ per cent? And if you think 12½ is too much, will you not fix it at 10 per cent?

On a basis of 10 per cent on our $1,000,000,000 indebtedness, you are putting an increased debt of $100,000,000 on the backs of the people of this country for which you are giving them no consideration whatever. When the President signs his name to this bill, by those few strokes of his pen he will add at least $100,000,000 to the burden of the people. I ask you upon what principle of law or justice or equity or morals you make such an imposition upon them?

That would be bad enough, Mr. Chairman, to be done in any country with an equal and just system of taxation; but what I want to emphasize is the peculiar and the cruel injustice that is involved in it when you consider the peculiar tax system of the United States, for you do not propose to take this money—this $100,000,000—through taxes out of the wealth of the country. If that were your purpose you might excuse yourselves by saying, "Why, it is not so bad after all. We tax the wealth of the country. We take the money out of one pocket of wealth and put it into the other pocket of wealth." But, gentlemen, you have got to consider that the Federal revenues are not based on wealth, but are taken from the people as consumers in proportion to their consumption. When you consider that you can not fail to see the crying injustice that follows this bill.

Federal taxes are not proportioned according to wealth. Two persons having the same average personal expenditure for food, clothing, shelter, etc., pay the same tribute under our tax system for the support of the Federal Government. That is true, though one person has a balance of a million dollars to his credit and the other has not a cent beyond his actual expenditures.

By this bill you establish another conduit by which and through which the small earnings of the many are to be silently but effectually transferred to the pockets of the few. To the principal and interest of these bonds the holders are justly entitled, but to that unearned and unpromised increment they have no right or title in law or morals.

In no other civilized nation in the world could such a bill work so great an injustice, for the simple reason that there is no other civilized nation that does not compel its wealth to contribute to its revenues either by a direct tax or a tax on incomes.

But the Republican party that now champions this bill is the party that fought the income tax, and under whose powerful influence the judicial decisions of a century were overturned and the income tax declared unconstitutional. Well might justice demand that this bill be halted in its progress until the law has been altered so as to make the wealth of the country bear its due share of this new burden.

This bill you, gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber, may think will knock the props from under the silver plank of the Chicago platform, but it will only strengthen the supports of that other plank demanding an income tax. Every time you turn this financial screw on the people you bring nearer the day when national wealth shall be made to pay its share of national burdens.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I have in my hands the official report of the remarks of the gentleman from Texas made yesterday, from which I find that I was not warranted in saying that according to the gentleman's version the Democratic party was now considering the question of whether it ought to disband or not. I will read from his remarks, Mr. Chairman. He says:

If you imagine that this season of prosperity, which is due to causes wholly apart from politics, will destroy the Democratic party, you deceive yourselves. It has outlived panics under its own Administration; it has outlived prosperous years when its enemies administered the Government.

I cordially indorse both of those statements.

It has outlived the rage and fury of a civil war and has survived the cruel and horrible days of reconstruction times, and it will survive the taunts and jeers with which you now assail it. Ah, gentlemen, I am still a young man, and yet in my life I have seen it solemnly proposed to disband the Democratic party. In 1872 or 1873 the Democrats of my native State, as loyal and as devoted as ever cherished the immortal principles of Thomas Jefferson, had reached a point where they were ready to despair and yield. I saw a convention called in Mississippi to consider the advisability of disorganizing the Democratic party.

But there and everywhere there was a small and devoted band, in whose hearts the divine fire of the old Democracy was still burning, and with a tongue of flame and a voice of prophecy they protested against the abandonment of our time-honored and undying organization. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Their wisdom prevailed. That convention adjourned, and instead of sending abroad the gospel of despair, they sent a message of hope and courage that still animates the splendid men of that great Common wealth. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, not alone in Mississippi, but in other State conventions, the Democratic party met in 1872 and considered the question of the disorganization of the Democratic party. In the State of Iowa, as you will remember, the Democratic party met in convention and formally disbanded the party, the chairman of that convention stating that the Democratic party was "dead, rotten, and buried." [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Now, I did not know, Mr. Chairman, but what the Democracy of to-day had taken in the situation. I did not know but that in the midst of its discouragement that organization, in the midst of this splendid prosperity which they prophesied never could come unless Democracy was in the saddle, the Democratic party were ready to see the error of their ways, disband the organization, bury the dead past out of sight, organize again on a new basis, and try to find some principle that would interest the people of this country, and start out with a new argument.

Mr. CARMACK. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. PAYNE. I wish the gentleman would not interrupt me now. Feeling this, Mr. Chairman, and having observed in this debate a lack of courage on the part of the Democracy to stand up for their principles of 1896, a lack of courage to declare for the silver coinage, the unlimited coinage of silver, or what they term the "double standard," which was really nothing but a single silver standard for this country, I believed that they were despondent, and when I heard the words of the gentleman from Texas it was no wonder that I thought they were actually talking now about disbanding the Democratic party.

But it seems, Mr. Chairman, that I gave them credit for too much good sense and good judgment. [Laughter on the Republican side.] They do not propose to do anything of the sort, and therefore my condolence was ill-advised and ill-timed, and my fear that we were going to lose them and that the Democratic party was going to drop out of sight was not based upon the words of the gentleman from Texas.

I congratulate the Republican party, I congratulate the country, that as long as we are to have an opposition party in this country it is to be under the organization of the Democratic party, even if the Populists have captured the organization, have instilled into their platform the principles of the Populistic party, and that we are still to meet the ever-undying Democracy by name, whatever their principles may be and however they may depart from the old time-honored principles of the Democratic party. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I ought to congratulate the Republican party that they are to have a floor leader who, after having been compelled to admit that he had misrepresented the statement of a member of the House, then seeks to escape the consequences of his misconduct by a malignant and contemptible partisan speech. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I was not compelled to make any withdrawal on this floor. I did it as a matter of courtesy to the gentleman from Texas, because he does not seem capable of appreciating a pleasantry in debate, and takes everything as serious; thinking, perhaps, that words of mine might have some effect in the State of Texas upon a certain contest which is now being made there.

I have no apologies to make for my speech; I have no apologies to make for what I said yesterday. I was willing to let it stand on the record of the gentleman's speech and my own. I simply made this statement this morning, and gave the gentleman and the House the full benefit of every word he said from the reporter's minutes, as a matter of good-natured admission toward the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I had imagined that when any gentleman found himself mistaken he was compelled by his own sense of decency to correct his error. I desire simply to say that my misunderstanding with the gentleman from New York was this—although a service of eight years with him ought to have taught me before—that he is never so serious as when he tries to be funny, and never so funny as when he tries to be serious. [Great laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Chairman, as I listened a short time ago to my friend from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] I was reminded of a character in Shakespeare of whom it was said, "He came splitting the air with sound," and as he proceeded I was further reminded of a friend of mine in my old town in "Egypt." This young man was given to making political speeches, and one day he went out into a little country village where among his auditors was an old leader of his party whose good opinion he most highly desired. After the young man had made the very best speech that was possible for him to make, he listened for some applause or encomiums or congratulations from the good old Colonel, but he said nothing. After a while the young man edged up to him and said, "Colonel, what do you think of my speech?" "Well, young man, I tell you, sir, you have a magnificent voice." "Oh, thank you, Colonel." "And, sir, you have a grand form." "Oh, I am very much pleased, Colonel." "And, sir, your gestures are of the finest." "Oh, you flatter me, Colonel." "And, by Gad, sir, if you had some ideas you would be a match for any of us." [Laughter.] And so I thought if the gentleman from Missouri had some ideas he would be a match for anybody. I know, however, that my friend from Missouri is not always thus.

Now, gentlemen, I have learned another thing during this debate. There is one fact to which that side of the House and this side of the House will agree, and that is that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is loaded. I have been very much amused at my friends on this side who have been so frequently meeting themselves in their crooked walk on the silver question. It teaches me that I ought to be very careful what I put in the RECORD, because in the future it may come up to confront me. I thought that, as those of my friends on this side and that side were trying to evade or explain what they said a few years ago, discretion was the better part of valor; and they should say they did not know then what they were talking about. We on this side learn as the years go by; you on that side can, but you will not.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] warned the Western members the other day to beware of an indignant constituency after we vote for this bill.

He need not worry about us. We will take care of ourselves. I come from a Western State, the grand State of Washington, and I want to remind him and our friends on this side that we have had another election since 1896. You seem to forget the elections in 1898. The Republicans in the State of Washington took advanced ground. They went beyond the St. Louis platform. In our State platform we declared that "we are in favor of the gold standard and opposed to the free coinage of silver;" and, my friends, on that platform my colleague and myself were elected by a majority of nearly 4,000, overcoming a Democratic majority of 13,000 votes in 1896. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I want to say to my Democratic friends that in 1900 the whole Pacific coast will be for William McKinley by an enormous majority. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] I was very much amused when one of our friends from New York closed his speech with the peroration that he joined hands with the Democrats of the Pacific; for, when you look over the Pacific coast, you find only one solitary Democrat in this body, and I do not think he will be sent back in 1900. Let me remind you of this fact, that from the Pacific coast you have your majority on this side of the House—from Washington and California——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. I ask that the time of the gentleman be extended five minutes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I thank the gentleman for this courtesy.

The CHAIRMAN. The request is made that the time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JONES] be extended for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The States of Washington, California, and South Dakota have furnished us with our majority on this floor, or the State of Washington and the State of Kansas have furnished us with our majority upon this floor, by replacing Democrats with Republicans. I have said all that I really desired to say in this debate. My people know where I stand and have no time to read a rehash of what they heard in 1898. In the balance of the time so kindly given me I will call your attention, however, to a few statements made during this debate. Our friends on the other side tell us that we said two years ago, or four years ago, that we wanted less money in the country. Gentlemen, we did not tell you that. We told you that we were in favor of a policy that meant the greatest use of the greatest amount of money. We said that your policy of free silver was nothing more than silver monometallism, and that we believed in a policy that would use not only gold, but that would also use the greatest amount of silver. Secretary Carlisle never made a truer statement than when he said that there is not a silver-standard country in the world that uses gold, and that there is not a gold-standard country in the world but that uses millions and hundreds of millions of silver. Why, gentlemen, we believe in practical bimetallism. We believe in a bimetallism that means the use as money of both sorts of metals, instead of the use of one kind of money that means the use of only one metal. Your policy meant and means monometallism. Your claim of being bimetallists is contradicted by all history and is a sham.

Oh, but you say, Providence has helped us out. Oh, well, my friends, we are willing to admit that, and I want to say that I am going to stand by the party that Providence stands by [applause on the Republican side], and I will say to my friends on the other side, if you will get a little closer to Providence and a little further away from William J. Bryan, you will come out a great deal better in the end. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

But you come around now to just exactly what we told you in 1896. We told our people in our State that it was the law of supply and demand that regulated these things. You have been confronted by the record which shows that you said nothing but free silver would do it, and that is what you said in our State, and you got the people to believe it. You rested your whole case upon free silver. It and it alone was the sole panacea for all the ills of life. The logic of events has overcome your logic, and you now rely on the law of supply and demand. I met one old fellow and we were talking about the prices of articles and I told him that it was regulated by the law of supply and demand. He said, "Oh, is there such a law as that?" I said, "Why, certainly there is." "Well," said he, "when we get into power we will repeal that law." [Laughter.]

I am glad that that is one law you can not repeal even if you should come into power. And we did say then, and we do say now, that that law of supply and demand regulates these things, and that the bimetallism that we are in favor of, the use of gold with hundreds of millions of silver along with it, will bring and keep a permanent prosperity in this country more surely than free silver at 16 to 1. But you say we have prosperity "slightly." Some of you admit this; some of you do not even go that far. Some of you say we have it in spots, and I heard my Adonis-formed, leonine-locked, and classic-faced friend from Tennessee state that in his district there was prosperity, but that all around the country there was no prosperity.

I would ask my friend to withdraw his eyes from the putrid spots of adversity that are only in his own mind's eye, and look upon the prosperity that is round about him, and then we will find, as it enters into his soul, that there will be such a reflection of the joy within from that classic-featured face that he will appear to this House as the evanescent essence of a delightful dream. You say even if we have prosperity that it has been brought about by the Klondike, war with Spain, and famine in India. Prosperity began in one State before any of these things happened. When it first began you blamed HANNA for it. It lasted too long, and you had to find other reasons. No, gentlemen, confidence was restored. This brought money from its hiding places. It began to work, to circulate, and the result is our prosperity. We do not deny that these other causes have an effect in this great result, however.

Yes, my friends, we have prosperity. I am glad you have admitted it; I am glad you have confessed it. But you say it will not continue. Always a song of distrust and discouragement; always a song that leads to lack of confidence. You would make a well man sick. [Laughter and applause.] Oh, my friends on that side of the House, just come with us a while. [Laughter and applause.] Just come along with us and look upon the bright side of life just a little while. It will do you good; you will feel better; you will sleep better to-night. [Laughter and applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, if it is as hard for an Iowa farmer or day laborer to obtain money during these days of "newspaper prosperity" as it is for a newly elected member to get recognition and time in which to express his views on questions of national import, I am not surprised at the gentleman from that State [Mr. DOLLIVER] confessing the fact in his speech at the opening of this debate that when he paid the interest this year on his indebtedness, which he incurred during President Harrison's Administration, he found himself, in the language of the street urchin, "financially busted."

It will be remembered, too, that the gentleman made this confession while expounding on the glories of the present Republican prosperity, which he had been enjoying for the three past years.

The learned gentleman from Iowa, like all those on that side of the House following him in this discussion, has attempted to justify the passing of this bill on account of the great wave of prosperity now passing over this country.

The gentleman painted in glowing terms the prosperous condition of his State, especially how every man in the State was constantly employed, in consequence of which he was unable to employ help the past season and had his own barn to build.

This may sound encouraging to the Republicans and a few galvanized Democrats of the East, but to us who live West it only carries the weight true conditions warrant.

Illinois is a sister State to Iowa—has the same climate, soil, people, and industries—and it can only be expected that like conditions exist, and I believe they do.

Now let me tell you what the conditions of Illinois are. She is controlled by a Republican governor and State legislature. In its wisdom the legislature last session, to protect the unemployed laborers of the State, passed a law creating a free State employment bureau, which went into effect July 1.

Since that time there has been nearly 20,000 applications made to that bureau to obtain employment, one-fifth of whom were turned away unable to secure it. Strange, is it not, with so much prosperity, a Republican legislature should see fit to establish a free employment bureau in the great State of Illinois?

Strange, is it not, that this bureau has only been in operation five months and 20,000 applications have been made to it to get employment?

Stranger still, is it not, that one-fifth of these were turned away empty handed?

I would advise the gentleman from Iowa when he desires to build another barn to inform the Illinois State bureau of labor. I would advise the gentleman at the same time to assure the bureau that he has the money with which to pay the workmen, or at least that his credit is good; on either of which conditions I doubt seriously if the gentleman would have to leave his own State to get help.

The old story of the country schoolhouse debating society is certainly applicable here and now. Since coming upon the floor of this House and witnessing the automatic, acrobatic antics of the learned gentlemen on the other side in their desperate efforts to avoid discussing the subject-matter of this most infamous measure, I now have the most profound respect for the country schoolhouse debater who invariably stuck to the text.

I have the first gentleman on that side of the House yet to see or hear take up this measure and attempt to defend it section by section.

The first section of this bill provides that the standard of value shall, as now, be the dollar and shall consist of 25.8 grains of gold, nine-tenths fine, or 23.22 grains of pure gold, being the one-tenth part of the eagle, thus committing the finance of the country to the single gold standard, making it the only basic money for all time to come. Not but what such a state of affairs has existed since 1873, and most certainly since 1890; yet, to comply with the demands of the bankers and brokers of the country they desire to make assurance doubly sure by the passing of this bill. If for no other reason, I should be against this obnoxious bill on this account.

If I had never had convictions of my own on the question of the needs of this country demanding more than one kind of basic money, I could go to the pages of history made by leading Republicans and find ample evidence to convert any unbiased Republican to the iniquity of this measure.

In order to show the position of the Republican party no later than 1888, I quote from the financial plank of the Republican national platform of that year:

> The Republican party is in favor of the use of both gold and silver as money, and condemns the policy of the Democratic Administration in its efforts to demonetize silver.

Also, in 1892, the Republican platform declared:

> The American people, from tradition and interest, favor bimetallism, and the Republican party demands the use of gold and silver as money.

No later than 1890 President McKinley declared on the floor of this House:

> I am for the largest use of silver in the currency of the country. I would not dishonor it; I would give it equal credit and honor with gold; I would make no discrimination; I would utilize both metals as money and discredit neither. I want the double standard.

This was before Mr. McKinley received new light on the financial question. This was when he was only a poor Congressman, honest to his constituency. It was before the Republican party was mortgaged to the banks, corporations, and bondholders of the country.

This was before the negotiation was completed between the Republican party and the money power that a money panic should be brought upon the people.

The money panic of 1894, 1895, and 1896 was described by Mr. DOLLIVER of Iowa as having been brought about by the lack of confidence of the money owners of the country in the Democratic Administration. Yet at the same time the learned gentleman lauds Mr. Cleveland, who was then President of the United States, on account of his sound ideas on the money question.

The same law was on the statutes then that exists to-day. If Mr. Cleveland was safe on the money question and the law was the same that controls the present Administration, what reasonable explanation can you make for the panic of 1893, 1894, and 1895, and the alleged prosperity of 1899? The only attempted explanation was lack of confidence in the Democratic Administration. Who maintained this lack of confidence? It is claimed by the gentleman that it was the money owners and banks, corporations, etc., and in consequence of this lack of confidence they drew in all outstanding money from circulation, producing a money panic. Just so soon as Mr. McKinley was elected, this money was again dumped back on the banking counters and rushed into circulation.

There is a better explanation than that of a lack of confidence in Cleveland's Administration. In the light of all that has occurred since, including this present designing measure, it is more in keeping with reason that there was a compact entered into by the leaders of the Republican party and the banking corporations and money-changers of the country that this panic should be brought on to discredit the Cleveland Administration and restore the Republicans to power, which was done; and the enactment of this bill into law is the final foreclosure proceedings.

You are forever bound to do the bidding of the money power in order to maintain this confidence. You forge your own chains. The position you occupy before the people is not one to be envied. We are ready to go before the people with you on this issue.

By the second section of this bill you make "all interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the payment of money, now existing or hereafter to be entered into, and all United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the law of July 14, 1890, and all other obligations, public and private, payable in gold coin."

This bill strikes out the word "coin" and writes in its place the word "gold." All our Government obligations were written "payable in coin," and the word "coin" is written in all our bonds. It was understood when these bonds were sold that they were to be redeemed in either gold or silver.

This little change in one word will put millions in the pockets of the bondholders.

The prime reason for the Democratic party's hatred of Grover Cleveland to this day grew out of his special message to Congress, asking them to substitute the word "gold" instead of "coin" in the bonds he was compelled to issue during his second Administration, telling them that the bonds would sell for fourteen to sixteen millions more if they would only do so.

You Republicans were with the Democrats then in refusing to do so. Now, since the bonds were sold on a basis of being payable in "coin" for a sum of fourteen to sixteen millions less than they might have done had the word "gold" been substituted, you gentlemen now propose to write the word "gold" in the place of "coin" in those identical bonds, thereby enhancing the value of those bonds more than sixteen millions to-day in favor of the bondholders.

Why should they not have confidence in you? Why should they not contribute largely to your campaign fund? It is a fraudulent transaction on its face against the taxpayers. It is one of your practical ways of producing prosperity. Ask your constituents which one of them has prospered by this transaction.

This small bond issue by the Cleveland Administration is but a drop in the bucket to the millions you give to the holders of other outstanding obligations which were sold on a "coin" basis, but by this act you make them redeemable in "gold."

But there are other provisions in this bill even more obnoxious and more dangerous to the welfare of this country, if such a thing could be possible, than the one I have just described. In section 4 of this bill "the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to issue and sell, whenever in his judgment it is necessary to the maintenance of the reserve fund, bonds made payable in gold coin."

The Secretary is thus made subservient to no man. This tendency toward imperialistic one-man power, which is the sole sentiment of Republicanism to-day under the guidance of its present leaders, is the most dangerous and far-reaching feature of this bill. No such power was ever delegated to one man in all the past ages in the financial history of any country.

When asked to explain the occasion for turning the whole financial policy of our Government over to a one-man power, the answer is the inevitable stereotyped one, "On account of changed conditions."

What are the changed conditions? Is it possible that because we paid $20,000,000 for 10,000,000 of inoffensive Negrito and Malay creoles, situated on a group of lonely islands thousands of miles from the seat of Government, that we might have them to use for targets in our rifle practice, that we distrust our capability of self-government any more, and step by step the several Departments are to be turned over to the one-man power? The measure pending is the first long step in that direction. It turns over to the Secretary of the Treasury the whole financial system of the Government to control at his sweet will for the benefit of the money changers who will sit upon his right hand.

There were never two more menacing words to the property owners and industries of the country than the words "flexibility" and "contraction," especially when all power is delegated to the banks. The banks established under this law will have the power of crushing every private bank in the country and compelling every national bank as now constituted to become branch national banks under this law, provided that three comptrollers of the new

division of issues in the Treasury Department, which this law establishes, will grant them the privilege to do so.

James A. Garfield said while in Congress:

Whoever controls the volume of money of any country is absolute master of all industries and commerce.

Secretary Gage says in his report:

The power of needful expansion must be intrusted to the banks.

Note the contrast: The former a statesman speaking the sentiment of his soul in behalf of the masses, the latter a hireling voicing the demands of the few.

"Flexibility," the power of "expansion" and, necessarily, of "contraction," also, must be intrusted to the banks.

The bank trust which this scheme, if enacted into law, will certainly establish will be the most gigantic of all trusts and will dominate and control every other trust in the country or, rather, by an arrangement with other trusts will dominate and control the commerce of the country, regulate the rise and fall of stocks to their own advantage, and cause a money panic whenever it subserves their own interest best.

By a contraction of currency they can reduce the values of property; and when the best securities have been gathered up by them, they will have it in their power to expand the currency and make for themselves fortunes at the expense of the unprotected public. By this bill the "greenbacks" now in circulation in the country are withdrawn and embalmed in the vaults of the Treasury, and to this extent the volume of currency will be contracted and diverted from the channels of trade.

Lincoln said:

If a government contracts a debt with a certain amount of money in circulation, and then contracts the money volume before the debt is paid, it is the most heinous crime a government can commit against the people.

This bill proposes to give the banks the power to periodically or permanently do this very thing.

The power to issue money and fix the value and the volume thereof is the highest act of sovereignty in any form of government. It is a power too sacred, too mighty for good or evil, and entirely too dangerous to be self-delegated to the banks or any special class of people.

The ordinary Republican apologizes for his change of front on the money question by saying it is on account of the sudden change of conditions. Permit me to quote the language of President McKinley in a speech he made at Toledo, Ohio, in 1891. He said:

During all of Grover Cleveland's years at the head of the Government he was dishonoring one of our precious metals, one of our own products, discrediting silver and enhancing the price of gold. He endeavored even before his inauguration to office to stop the coinage of silver dollars, and afterwards and to the end of his Administration persistently used his power to that end. He was determined to contract the circulating medium and demonetize one of the coins of commerce, limit the volume of money among the people, make money scarce and therefore dear.

He would have increased the value of money and diminished the value of everything else. Money the master; everything else the servant. He was not thinking of the 'poor' then. He had left their 'side.' He was not standing forth in their defense.

Cheap coats, cheap labor, and dear money! The sponsor and promoter of these professing to stand guard over the welfare of the poor and lowly! Was there ever more inconsistency or reckless assumption?

If you should ask President McKinley why his sudden change of front, I presume he would reply that it was a change in his "environments."

This change is great enough, but it will not be the last. It will come after the enactment of this bill into a law. I warn you, gentlemen, of the power you are creating in this bill, lest it rise in its might and crush its creators.

The next change to follow will be a revision of the golden rule. Instead of its reading, "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you," the few benefactors of this most vicious measure will have it read, "You have done unto us all that we demanded; now what we do to you will be a plenty." [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, Missouri has been much in evidence in this debate, and her Representatives have been very severe on Mr. Cleveland, the only Democratic President this country has had in the last third of a century. But one gentleman from Missouri lifted up his voice in the last convention that nominated Mr. Cleveland. His name was Wallace—Hon. William H. Wallace. He delivered a speech seconding the nomination of Mr. Cleveland, voicing the sentiment of Missouri Democracy at that time. Although Mr. Wallace delivered the speech, I have a suspicion that another distinguished gentleman from that State wrote it. I will read the speech and leave the members of the House to guess who wrote it. I read from the book giving the proceedings of the national Democratic convention of 1892:

Mr. Chairman and delegates of this great convention: Men come and men go. Parties and governments rise and fall. The very stars leap from their sockets in the skies and rush on to ruin in their trackless voyage. The sun is often eclipsed, and once, we are told, it stood still. But the Democratic majority of grand old Missouri goes on forever.

No man or devil can divide it; no defeat can conquer it; no sophistry can change it; no money can buy it. It is as fixed and as resplendent in the political heavens as Venus, as warlike as Mars, as resistless as Jupiter. Roll what way it will, whether it be Knownothingism, or Prohibition, or Farmers' Alliance, or Republicanism, it dashes against Gibraltar and gathers sea foam for its victory when it reaches the Missouri lines.

[Laughter.]

Say whatever else you will about us; let Republicans scheme and plan until their heads are gray; let the battle rage until filthy Mammon has expended his last dollar and red-plumed Lucifer has shouted himself hoarse with urging on his fiery steeds, yet never will the Democratic flag go down on Missouri soil.

[Laughter.]

We have served you so long and so faithfully that my heart is trembling and has trembled all along with the thought, seeing we have served you so faithfully, that possibly in this grand council chamber you do not wish to hear me. I wish you knew us better. Come and see us. Come all of you at once—delegate, audience, Tammany braves, and all. Come! Come!

[Laughter.]

I invite you to come to us as the disciples went forth to the world, without purse and without scrip. Come!

[Laughter.]

Twenty thousand hospitable Christian homes will receive you, and bed and board shall be as free as the song of the whip-poor-will that serenades you by night or the mocking bird that wakes you up when Aurora strews the skies with her flowers.

[Laughter.]

Gentlemen of the convention, I bear but one message from magnificent Missouri. As the prairie flower turns its face to the king of day as he mounts up into the sky, as it looks toward him, receiving from him light and warmth and strength, so, I say to you, does the Democracy of Missouri, with her loving, confiding, childlike heart, turn toward and follow Grover Cleveland. Intending, as I believe to-night, to say my last word with one joyous hope, I come in the name of Missouri to second the nomination of Grover Cleveland.

[Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, that was the sentiment of Missouri Democracy only seven years ago. [Laughter.]

Mr. VANDIVER. Mr. Chairman, that last remark of the gentleman from Michigan "was the most unkindest cut of all." [Laughter and applause.] I wish to say, however, that I am not among the number of those who must pray forgiveness for having been one of the advocates of the nomination of the late lamented Grover Cleveland. [Renewed laughter.] It is true that at one time in our history we of Missouri were led to believe that the fat-witted candidate for the White House was a Democrat (though I never did consider him a good one), but we have long ago and a thousand times repudiated him. He is a good Republican. If you can make anything out of him take him. [Laughter.]

I have been highly entertained during this debate—in fact, I have been at times very much amused. The progress of this debate has reminded me of an Irishman who went out into a graveyard and read the inscriptions on the tombstones. Seeing one which read, "Jonathan A. Jones, born July 1, 1831; died January 1, 1891; an eminent lawyer, an honest man," and so on, he stopped and looked again. "'An eminent lawyer, an honest man!' Faith and be gosh, and the soil must be very dear when they have to bury two men in the same hole." [Laughter.]

This bill seems to be a burying hole not only for two men but for nearly every man on the Republican side of the House. One after another we have heard them stand up here and swallow their own words and repudiate the pledges of their own platform. One after another we have heard them announce that they were not to be embarrassed by any expressions of their own on former occasions. They have buried those speeches, and this bill will bury them.

In the few minutes at my command I shall content myself with a brief discussion of three propositions.

First, that the somersault of the Republican party completely demonstrates their insincerity and utter hypocrisy in dealing with the public.

Secondly, that the business activity which they now offer as an excuse for this change of front is only bogus prosperity, based on artificial and unnatural conditions, and not calculated to last.

Thirdly, that the effect of this bill will necessarily be, not only to fasten the gold standard permanently on the people, but also to turn over the whole machinery of Government finances into the hands of the national banks, and thus create a banking syndicate with absolute power to control the currency of the country and produce panics at pleasure.

These are the three fundamental propositions involved in this whole subject, and to them I invite your most candid consideration. I congratulate you, gentlemen on the other side of the House, upon having at last cast off the mask of false pretenses of friendliness to bimetallism and marched out to fight your battle in the open field; and this challenge to combat we gladly accept. We only wish you had given us this opportunity four years ago, but at that time you claimed to be the true bimetallists. Your orators and your editors asserted with vehement persistency your faith in bimetallism. Your platform of 1892 had declared that the American people by interest and tradition are bimetallists. Your platform in 1896 declared in favor of bimetallism by international agreement and pledged your party by all honest means to promote it.

Aye, your President himself had gone so far as to charge Grover

Cleveland with the unpatriotic purpose to destroy silver as money of the people, thereby making money dearer and labor cheaper; or, as he expressed it, "To make money the master and all things else the servant." In short, your loud professions in favor of bimetallism were so persistent and prolonged as almost to deceive the very elect, and when on the rostrum and the stump, in the press and the forum, we denounced your pretensions as hypocritical, and pointed to the potent agencies then in control of your party machinery as proof that you had no such intentions of really promoting bimetallism, your indignation rose high, and with the air of injured innocence you told us that we were demagogues appealing to prejudices, and anarchists ready to "overthrow the foundations of the Government." Now you have demonstrated that our charge was true, and the honest thousands in your party who then believed in your sincerity will now know that we were right.

And therefore, while we deplore for our country the evils which this bill must bring upon it, we thank you from a political standpoint for having verified our predictions. That it was your purpose in the beginning to acquiesce in the gold-standard policy of the bank-ridden governments of Europe is proven most conclusively by the half-hearted and perfunctory manner in which your alleged effort to promote international bimetallism was carried on, because at the very moment when Mr. McKinley's commissioners were pretending to preach bimetallism to representatives of the British Government in London his Secretary of the Treasury was preparing a bill to be introduced in Congress, the chief purpose of which, in his own language, was "to more thoroughly establish the gold standard," and giving it out in interviews to the press, cabled at once to the London papers, that this country did not want bimetallism, but was going to adopt the English gold standard. And when a distinguished Senator of your own party, himself a McKinley Republican, urged Mr. McKinley to call down his Secretary of the Treasury and make an effort in good faith to carry out the pledge of the St. Louis platform, he was treated with the contempt of absolute silence. And thus was the farce enacted by this Administration early in its career, of preaching bimetallism abroad and at the very same instant stabbing it in the back at home.

You spent $100,000 of the people's money in an ostensible effort to promote bimetallism by international agreement, while proclaiming at the same time through the trusted representative of the Administration at home that you had no such purpose. Such a record of broken pledges is enough to make you gentlemen on the other side stand up here one after another and announce to the House and country that you have received new light; that you do not propose to be handicapped by your own promises or your own arguments made in the past. No wonder that the distinguished orator from Iowa found it necessary to make public apology on this floor for his change of front; no wonder that every one of you gentlemen should feel so embarrassed by the crookedness of your record on this question that you must needs stand up here and proclaim in advance that you are not going to be bound by words uttered even by yourselves only a few years past. It is an easy matter for gentlemen to say that they have discovered new light and will not be embarrassed by this confession of stupidity in the past.

But I warn you that this "plea of confession and avoidance" will not shield you and your party from the scorn and contempt of honest men who believe in consistency, of those who believe that truth to-day will be truth to-morrow; those who despise a timeserver in politics and a pretender in the science of government. You need not suppose that the great American public can be whistled out of a conviction as quickly as you can be shuffled out of your shoes. You are to-day confronted with this dilemma: If the gold standard is a good thing, why did you spend $100,000 of the people's money trying to get rid of it? If it is a bad thing, why are you now endeavoring to enact it into law? There it is; take either horn of it you please. I impale you upon it and nail you to the wall. Let the affable and eloquent gentleman from Iowa who stood here on Monday and invited us to stand up at his beck and call, on a much-confused and half-stated proposition, now face the music. Let him stand in his place and say which horn of this dilemma he proposes to hang himself on; and before I get through, if my time does not expire too soon, I will also give him a chance to stand upon his own proposition, when fairly stated.

I will go a step further, and invite the gentleman from Iowa, or any other gentleman, to rise in his place and answer whether or not this Administration has made any honest and persistent effort to secure international bimetallism, according to its platform pledge. The whole country knows that you have not, and your loud boast now that you do not intend to be bound by that pledge, nor even by your own individual utterances, on the stump and here in this Hall, we cheerfully accept as evidence and as advertisement to the world that no pledge that you can make is hereafter to be considered binding. While for our country's sake we deplore the fact that a great political party has become so reckless, so unscrupulous, that its proclamations and its promises can only excite the ridicule and contempt of honest citizens, at the same time, from a party standpoint, we thank you again for having given this consummate demonstration of your faithless pretenses and the perfidious hypocrisy of Republican platforms.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VANDIVER. I should like to have permission to occupy five minutes' more time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I move that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The request is made that by unanimous consent the gentleman be permitted to continue his remarks for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. VANDIVER. I thank you, gentlemen.

And now to the second proposition—your excuse for this acrobatic and tragic performance. You tell us that the wonderful activity in business is such a change from the conditions which existed in 1896 that it demonstrates to your satisfaction the wisdom of maintaining the gold standard. I tell you frankly that no man who is at the same time honest, intelligent, and unprejudiced can survey the field of present conditions and find in them any confirmation of your claim that it is due to the gold standard. The prosperity that exists is mainly the prosperity of trusts, syndicates, corporations, and protected manufactures. It is not the prosperity of the masses.

From 1886 to 1896 the wages of labor had gone down from $1.25 to 85 and 90 cents per day, which may be considered the low-water mark for all the history of this country. When now they have been increased to $1, you herald it abroad as a period of immense prosperity for the laborer, forgetting that in no other period of our history for more than forty years has the average daily wage of the man who makes his living in the sweat of his brow been less than $1.25 per day. Likewise comparing 50-cent wheat in 1896 with 60-cent wheat now, $4 pork now with $3.50 pork then, and 4½-cent cattle now with 4-cent cattle then, you cry great prosperity for the farmer, expecting him to forget the time when he sold cattle and hogs at 10 cents and wheat at $1.50. Furthermore, he must now pay $24 per thousand, instead of $16, for lumber if he wishes to build a house (and all other material for it in the same proportion), and an increase of 200 per cent in the cost of nails and barbed wire if he wishes to build a fence; and gets only 15 pounds of sugar for his dollar instead of 20 pounds; in short, an increase of 10 or 15 per cent in wages and farm products, with an increase of from 40 to 200 per cent in everything that the farmer and laborer must buy, is the prosperity which you ask us to shout for.

It is mainly, I say, the prosperity of trusts and corporations.

But, for the sake of argument, let us admit that prosperity has come and that it is general. The question for the statesman to ask himself is this: How can it be made more general and lasting? Let us not be deceived by false appearances. We all rejoice that business is better than it was; that the panic, like all other panics, had to have an end. But did your legislation bring it to an end? You may try to persuade your unthinking constituents that your tariff bill did it; but you can not persuade yourselves. You know better. You know that it was eighteen months after the election of Mr. McKinley before you even claimed yourselves to discover this revival of business.

Be it remembered that the decline in business and prices began about the middle of Harrison's Administration, lasted all through Cleveland's and well into the middle of McKinley's—the worst of it coming in the last year of Cleveland's term and the first year of McKinley's. The panic of 1893 lasted longer than the panic of 1873. Do you claim credit for bringing it to an end? You might as well claim credit for the rain and the sunshine; and I believe you would do so if you thought the people were as ignorant of the laws of nature as they are of the effects of legislation. I undertake to say that better times have come in spite of your legislation and that your proposed legislation, instead of prolonging the period of prosperity, will cut it short.

It is my candid belief that the causes which have produced the revival of business and the rise of prices may all be included under three heads.

First, the most prolonged and widespread famine ever known in India, affecting 50,000,000 people in 1896 and 1897, created unusual demand for our agricultural products, and that famine has been followed by another, which is still raging and which affects over 30,000,000 people. These, together with short crops in our own country, would naturally affect prices in a very marked degree, as our products, though not going to India directly, must go to other countries that had been dependent upon India. India had supplied Europe with wheat, but her famine and distress gave us that market.

Secondly. The war with Spain created an immense and sudden demand for great quantities of our products, both of farm and

factory. And the $375,000,000 for the Spanish war went quickly into circulation, as also the $100,000,000 already spent on the Philippine war. Besides this, the British-Boer war has quickened the markets of Europe as well as our own. It is well known that war breeds extravagance of every kind, and higher prices always follow. But what of that theory of government finance which must depend upon war and famine to bring prosperity? It is a Republican theory, and that is the worst I can say for it.

Thirdly. I submit your own claim that $385,000,000 have been added to the circulating medium. Was it done by act of Congress or the President? You know that this is the very first bill that has been introduced in this House on the currency question since the election of McKinley.

You know that your party had not made any effort to increase the amount of money in circulation, but that in spite of you and without your help or encouragement vast quantities of gold have been brought out of the mines, and this has greatly helped to raise the embargo on business and advance the general level of prices. We told you in 1896 that more money was needed, and we proposed to coin both gold and silver. You said there was money enough. Now you boast that in three years $385,000,000 have been added to our circulation. At that time the total annual output of the gold mines of the world was but $200,000,000. This year it is $300,000,000 or more. Now, whatever of general prosperity prevails or is likely to prevail or rest on a permanent basis is due to this permanent addition to our stock of gold. The other causes are transitory and can not last. In short, an addition of $100,000,000 a year to our stock of primary money has already raised the general level of prices from 10 to 12 per cent and quickened the pulse of business to a proportionate degree. If this be true, then a like increase by adding $100,000,000 of silver as money of full legal-tender value or primary redemption money would produce a like result. Your argument, then, demonstrates the truth of the quantitative theory of money, and our argument for the free coinage of gold and silver both is strengthened rather than weakened by the facts of recent history.

The brilliant and eloquent gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] on Monday last read an extract from one of Bryan's speeches declaring that the fall of prices was due to a contraction of the currency, and predicting still further decline if the gold standard should be made permanent, and then with great gusto and monumental gall—aye, with the most colossal conceit—straightened himself up with an air of exalted satisfaction in the fullness and profundity of his logic and challenged any Democrat on the floor to rise in his place and say whether or not, in view of the recent rise in prices, Mr. Bryan knew anything about the subject he was discussing. Now, then, let me state the proposition as Mr. Bryan meant it, and as all bimetallists have presented it. It is this: That so long as the quantity of primary or redemption money continues to fall or fails to keep pace with the growth of population and business, the general tendency of prices is downward.

In testing the proof of this general proposition no reasonable man, especially no statesman who values his reputation for fairness and breadth of thought, will take the prices of a few commodities for a short period of time, or even of all commodities for a short space of time. Every intelligent man knows that particular conditions may arise that will temporarily arrest the general tendency, just as short eddies may occur in the channel of a great stream, or even the whole stream be temporarily turned backward upon its course by artificial obstructions in its path. But the candid reasoner, seeking for truth rather than party advantage, will look backward over a long period of years and make his comparisons and find his averages for the prices of many commodities under many varying conditions.

Now, I hold in my hand a table of prices of 45 different articles of common consumption, including wheat, corn, oats, beef, pork, tea, coffee, sugar, iron, copper, lead, coal, cotton, wool, and other things in most general use, for every year, averaged up from the prices of every day, during the past twenty-five years. This table was prepared not by a politician nor by a statesman; not by an advocate of any theory; but by a man whose business it has been for many years simply to collect the facts, the actual figures from the market reports in the city of London, the great commercial center of the world, which practically may be said to fix the prices of every other market in the world. These are the tables prepared by the great London statistician, the most reliable anywhere in the world, the great London statistician Sauerbeck. Taking the average of these 45 articles of commerce, beginning twenty-five years back, in 1873, taking that date as the point of departure, and assuming the average of the whole 45 for that year as the unit of comparison, and hence marking that as 100 in the table, the list runs down to 92, 85, and so on down to 54, the lowest point in the whole scale, which occurred in 1896. There are but two breaks in the descending scale, one beginning in 1888, when the average rose from 61 to 63 and then 65, and then falling again, it comes down to 54, and has since risen to 56.8.

Mr. Sauerbeck's index numbers, to which is added the annual average price of silver in London and to which is added index numbers of the same 45 commodities, taking as their base the average prices of 1873, and a table showing the increase of the purchasing power of a dollar, taking the average prices of 1873 as the base.

Year.	Sauerbeck's index numbers of 45 principal commodities, taking average price of 1867–1877 as their base = 100.	Index numbers of same 45 principal commodities, taking the average price of 1873 as their base = 100.	Table showing increase of purchasing power of a dollar, taking the average prices of 1873 as the base = 100.	Sauerbeck's index numbers of silver, taking the price 1867–1877 of 60.84d. = 100.	Annual average price of silver in London.
					Pence.
1873	111	100	$1.00		
1874	102	92	1.09	95.8	58⅛
1875	96	86	1.16	93.3	56⅝
1876	95	85	1.18	86.7	52⅝
1877	94	84	1.19	90.2	54¾
1878	87	78	1.28	86.4	52⅜
1879	83	75	1.33	84.2	51⅛
1880	88	79	1.27	85.9	52⅛
1881	85	76	1.31	85	51⅝
1882	84	75	1.33	84.9	51½
1883	82	74	1.35	83.1	50⅜
1884	76	68	1.47	83.3	50½
1885	72	65	1.54	79.9	48½
1886	69	62	1.61	74.3	45⅛
1887	68	61	1.64	73	44⅜
1888	70	63	1.59	70.4	42⅝
1889	72	65	1.54	70.2	42½
1890	72	65	1.54	78.4	47½
1891	72	65	1.54	74.1	45
1892	68	61	1.64	65.4	39⅝
1893	68	61	1.64	58.6	35½
1894	63	57	1.75	47.6	28⅞
1895	62	55.8	1.78	49	29¾
1896	61	54.9	1.82	50.5	30⅝
1897	62	55.8	1.79	45.3	17⅜
Jan., 1898	62.8	56.6	1.77	43	26⅛
Feb., 1898	63.4	57.1	1.75	42.1	25½
Mar., 1898	63	56.8	1.76	42.2	25⅝

Now, because the unforeseen events of famine and war, aided by the unforeseen enlargement of the gold output in Montana, Dakota, Alaska, South America, and South Africa—because, I say, these unforeseen events have temporarily arrested the decline in prices and brought them up to about 57 per cent of what they were twenty-five years ago, and only 3 per cent above what they were three years ago, the gentleman from Iowa, availing himself of a little technicality in the wording of the argument of the great champion of free silver, narrows it down to a particular time and boastfully proclaims that he has overthrown the whole logic of twenty-five years of history. In short, this magnificent gentleman with utter abandon and chivalrous courage, more reckless even than his logic, jumps out into an eddying current, utterly incapable of sounding the depths beneath him, unable to see his length ahead of him, and unwilling to look behind him, but, mounted on a raft, shouts to the world that the Mississippi River is flowing north instead of south.

Now, I invite him, with Sauerbeck's tables before his eyes, to stand up before this House and recant the miserable makeshift of logic which he attempted on Monday to palm off on us. Let him rise in his place, if he dares, and deny the truth of Mr. Bryan's fundamental proposition, and when he does so he must also retract his own proud boast that $385,000,000 added to our circulation is the cause of our prosperity. Here again let him choose which horn of the dilemma he pleases. Either Bryan's fundamental proposition is true, or the much boasted addition to our stock of gold is a calamity. Let him admit the truth of Bryan's proposition or stop the coinage of this calamity.

But why this legislation now to establish a gold standard by law? Gentlemen, the Dingley tariff pays the debt of the Republican party to the manufacturers and protected trusts. The war-revenue bill provided the means of paying their debt to the Government contractors and provided holes for the surplus pegs. And now this bill is intended to pay another debt. What is it? We are informed by several distinguished gentlemen, one of them from Iowa, and also by the distinguished veteran statesman from Ohio——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. To which gentleman from Ohio do you refer?

Mr. VANDIVER. Not being permitted under the rules of the House to call gentlemen by name, I will designate him as the gentleman from Ohio who looks like Santa Claus and talks like Satan. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] We are gravely informed by these gentlemen that this Republican House is to redeem a pledge. Wonderful thing! They have repudiated the pledge on which they were elected, but they are to redeem a secret pledge made to the Gold Democrats. In 1896, Mr. Chairman, there were 7,000,000 people in this country who voted for William McKinley on a platform of international bimetallism; six and a half

millions voted for the matchless champion of the people, William J. Bryan, on a platform of independent bimetallism. There were less than one-eighth of a million, I think it was, who voted the Palmer and Buckner ticket for a gold standard.

Now, the seven million and the six and a half million of men are all expected to bow the knee to Baal while you pay your debt to the one-eighth of a million who voted the Palmer and Buckner ticket. We are informed that you are to redeem a pledge made to them; and so the Gold Democrat, now bloated with the price of his perfidy, sits mounted, booted, and spurred upon the G. O. P., not as an elephant but as an ass, and rides him down the highway, plunging headlong over the precipice to destruction; and as we witness this spectacle we shout our last farewell, "Sic itur ad hades." [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I desire to enter my protest against the most monstrous of all the iniquitous provisions of this bill—that relating to bonds and banks. I had hoped to be able to offer an amendment, and at least to secure a vote on a proposition to tax the holdings of the bondholder, as we do the homes of the farmer, the laborer, and the mechanic. But under the ironclad rule which you have adopted for the passage of this bill you preclude the possibility of amending it, and have even provided against putting yourselves on record by a yea-and-nay vote on such an amendment. Your audacity is great, but you dare not go before the country with your record on a direct vote against requiring the bondholder to bear his proportion of the burden of government, and therefore you have deliberately and arbitrarily refused to allow such a proposition to be voted on. But you can not escape the responsibility for this bill allowing no tax to be levied upon a Government bond, and even reducing the small tax which has heretofore been levied upon national banks merely for the purpose of defraying the office and clerical expenses connected with the issuance of bank notes. But, further than this, you can not escape the record of that vote which originally exempted the Government bonds from taxation, because when this very amendment authorizing the taxation of Government bonds was originally submitted to Congress 63 Democrats in this House voted in favor of it and not one against it, while 77 Republicans voted against it and thus defeated it.

Now, sir, if any reason can be shown why this discrimination should be made in favor of the bondholder, exempting him from taxation, while the heavy hands of the taxgatherer rest with crushing weight upon every other citizen, why have you not the courage to produce that reason and justify yourselves before the country. I believe you have not undertaken the task, because no reason can be given.

But your bill goes still further. It will practically withdraw the greenbacks from circulation and turn over to the national banks the whole business of issuing credit money, thus putting almost the entire volume of currency of the country under the control of a few great moneyed corporations, which can inflate the currency or contract it at their pleasure, thus completely governing the markets and the prices of all the products of labor, producing panics at their pleasure and gradually absorbing the wealth of the country.

Such a complete surrender to the money power has never been made by any party in this country, even in times of dire calamity. Neither the extraordinary emergencies of war nor the exigencies of party politics have ever brought the Government so completely down upon its knees before the money kings of the world as this piece of legislation now proposes to do.

But, sir, the crowning infamy of this disgraceful proceeding is that which proposes to give the Secretary of the Treasury absolute power, without having to come to Congress and getting the consent of the people, to issue bonds where his judgment or his pleasure may so decree. Another step in the direction of imperialism! Up to this time in our history Congress has reserved to itself the right to determine when there should be a new issue of bonds. It has also generally reserved to itself the authority to increase the standing Army, but in the last session of Congress you passed a bill through this House, which fortunately was defeated in the Senate, giving the President authority to increase the standing Army to 100,000 men; and now you are to pass another authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury, who, of course, is to be the creature of the President, to issue bonds at his pleasure. Is anything more needed to turn this Government into an empire? Only one more step, and that is to make the temporary organization permanent, and proclaim William of Canton emperor for life.

Against this policy, sir, against all of this reckless and shameful surrender of the Republican party to the gold syndicate, the trust magnates, and the imperial bosses, we erect the standard of the people, and proclaim the Chicago platform as the embodiment of the wisdom and patriotism of the great masses of the American people. That platform was a second Declaration of Independence, and it will be reaffirmed without abatement in the next Democratic convention. Its declaration in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 will offer some hope for a continuous enlargement of the financial basis, on which all permanent prosperity must rest. Its candid declaration against the encroachment of the Federal courts will be strengthened by a further and much stronger declaration against the dangerous and diabolical encroachment of the trusts upon the business and prosperity of the private citizen, and the doctrine that "all men are born free and equal," that "all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," will again kindle the flame of human liberty and proclaim to all the world that this is still to be a republic and not an empire, a friend and not a foe of other peoples struggling to establish republican governments in other quarters of the globe. This shall be our slogan, and no man whose faith is weak in these great principles of our party should be trusted with its leadership, either in the nation or any Congressional district in the Union. With these principles emblazoned on our banner, and under the matchless leadership and magic name of William J. Bryan, of Nebraska, we will again give you battle, confident in the ultimate triumph of truth over falsehood and justice and wisdom over prejudice and ignorance.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I have been surprised in many directions during this debate, and I am a little provoked now with some of the remarks I have heard this morning from my respected friend from Missouri. From a very early period in the history of Kansas our friends in Missouri have been in the habit of saying and doing things that were aggravating to us in Kansas. One of the gentlemen this morning quoted us as having been in the column that added Democratic gains in the last election. I want to correct him far enough to say that in the last election we returned to this House six Republican members of Congress in place of six Populist members in the Fifty-fifth Congress. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That was in the election before the last. Now, in the election of 1899, I ask you if the Republicans of Kansas did not lose twice as many counties as in 1898?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I will state that the Republicans in the election of 1899 did not lose twice as many counties as in 1898. I am not able to give the exact figures, but I think the Republicans in Kansas in 1899 made a gain of 35 per cent in the number of counties they carried over the number of counties carried in 1898. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, I want to go back far enough to say that we have been accused of all kinds of motives in the support of this bill, and some of us have had to correct our records. It is some satisfaction that the delegation from Kansas does not have to correct its record on this question.

In the year 1894 we campaigned our districts and told our people plainly and distinctly at that time that we were willing to vote for the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1 at any time when it could be done without depreciating the value of any of our money. We told them also that we never would vote for it at any time when the necessary result would be to depreciate the value of any of our money, and it is for that reason and upon that ground that the delegation from Kansas is here to-day solidly supporting the bill that is now offered to the House. And the only answer that is offered to us is that we are doing it now to pay a corrupt political debt which in some way or other we incurred in the last national election.

One of the eloquent gentlemen from Missouri repeated that over and over again in his speech, although he must be conscious himself that it is either the merest demagogy addressed to his constituents or that it is childish nonsense addressed to this House. The Republican party to-day represents one-half of the voters, one-half of the homes, one-half, at least, of the laborers of this nation, and it has never at any time sold itself to any corrupt influence in the nation for the purpose of injuring any portion of its ranks. The Republican party has had substantial care of the laborers of this nation for many years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. OVERSTREET asked unanimous consent that the time of Mr. CALDERHEAD be extended five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. From the earliest period of its history the Republican party has had peculiar care of the labor of this country, and there never has been a time when the labor of this country trusted to the Republican party that it has been betrayed; never once. There never was a time when the patriotism of the country trusted to the Republican party that it was betrayed.

There never was a time when the business of the country trusted to the Republican party and suffered any loss by it. It was Grant, whose memory seems to be so highly honored by the distinguished and eloquent gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], who said in his message of 1869:

> Let it be distinctly understood that no repudiator of a single farthing of our public debt shall ever be recognized in public office.

And said that in response to an attempt to inflate the currency of the country. It was President Hayes, concerning whom the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] spoke in language that was discreditable to that gentleman himself, either as a man or as a member—it was Hayes who said that he vetoed the bill in 1878 for the express reason that the dollar which it provided for was worth 10 cents less than the actual dollar which was the standard of value in the country and by that process every laboring man in the country would be defrauded in the payment to him of that which was due to him.

From the hour of that message until this time the Republican party has been battling continually for a standard which means justice to the laboring man as well as justice to every man who transacts business in the country. It is true enough that if at any time it had been possible to make a double standard, in which there would have been no variation of value, the Republican party would have been ready at any time to do that thing; but the business transactions of the country and the current history of the world have been a course of education to us, while it does not seem possible that any history or any course of events could be a course of education to the Democratic party. [Laughter on the Republican side.] They seem to be unwilling to learn the facts either of history or of business.

There is no other response to the bill which we present except that you complain that we do not provide for the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. All the rest of the talk which you have given us for a week is mere political demagoguery that you have delivered here for the purpose of spreading broadcast among your constituents another attempt to keep Missouri in the benighted condition in which it has been for the last forty years. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

There are things in the bill which I do not think are necessary, and some things which I think I would amend—some things which I imagine will be amended before the bill is finally enacted. But the first section of the bill is a declaration of the gold standard, and it would not be necessary to make that declaration again if it were not for the fact that the Teller resolution passed the Senate by votes of members of your party; if it were not for the fact that you Democrats made a great campaign in 1896, demanding that the country should be put upon a silver standard, and if it were not for the fact that you are here perpetuating that campaign and endeavoring to lay it as a foundation for your next national campaign, and trusting then, along with William J. Bryan, that "in the meantime something will turn up." [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Next we provide for the payment of the public obligations in gold. What objection is there to that? The world has expected us to pay them in gold in all our history, and we always have paid in gold. In 1861 the Secretary of the Treasury said to the bankers who were furnishing the money to carry on the Government for sixty days until Congress should decide whether the Government would make a battle for the life of the nation—the Secretary said to them: "The United States has always paid in gold." From that time to this we have paid in gold when we were able to pay anything, and for the last twenty-three years there has not been a question concerning it except the questions which you have raised, and there is not a question now in any place in the world except because of the fact that you are in existence. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes.

Mr. CLAYTON of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I object. I have been trying all day to get five minutes, and have not been able to do so.

Mr. OVERSTREET. That will pin every gentleman down to five minutes. There have been no objections over here.

Several MEMBERS (on the Democratic side). Do not object.

Mr. CLAYTON of Alabama. At the request of gentlemen I will withdraw the objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Request is made that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CALDERHEAD] may have five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I thank the gentleman, and I will certainly endeavor to extend the same courtesy to my friends on the other side so far as I have the opportunity. There is a provision which our friends attempt to construe into a retirement of the greenbacks, the provision that these Government notes shall not be reissued again except for gold or except for its equivalent. But there is no more necessity for the retirement of the greenbacks by the face of that provision in the bill than there is for the retirement of the gold. Neither one of them will retire from the business of this country until you make it apparent that you are going to carry the country to a silver basis.

When the world is pouring its flood of gold into this country because business demands it here, you answer, "Let us go to a silver basis." I remind you of one fact in the history of the world that you seem to have entirely overlooked and our own friends have somewhat overlooked. It is a fact that a little over a hundred years ago, when the Government of France was attempting by the severest kind of penalties to compel the people to receive paper money in payment of obligations; at a time when there was a death penalty for a man who refused to receive the notes of France secured by her public lands; at a time when if a man refused to sell his wheat or his cattle or his horses and accept that kind of money in payment for it, he had his property appraised by the public appraiser and sold by him for that money; at a time when that kind of money depreciated until it took a thousand francs to buy a loaf of bread in Paris, that Government repealed all their legal-tender laws, and from every crack and crevice in France, in Germany, and all Europe came the pennies and silver and gold coins crossing over to France, and in six months from the time of that repeal Napoleon paid an army of 200,000 men with gold coin. It is not alone legislating concerning the standard which brings gold into circulation or drives it out of it. It is the promise or the threat to depreciate the legal-tender money that drives the valuable money of the country from circulation.

One more suggestion concerning the bill. There is a provision in it for the establishment of small national banks. It was my privilege four years ago to suggest to the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I was then a member, that the provision should be inserted in one of the bills then under consideration, and a bill was afterwards reported to the House by Mr. VAN VOORHIS, and passed the House. There was no objection to it then. It meets no opposition now. In fact, nearly every distinct proposition contained in this bill was at one time or another, in some form, considered and ordered to be reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency in the Fifty-fourth Congress.

No question in it is a new question, but this is the first time we have offered it so squarely in this House and in the Senate with the power to fight the battle to a finish. Gentlemen, you may depend upon it that the State of Kansas, which my distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] correctly credited with having extinguished $65,000,000 of its public and private indebtedness, and which in the same year put into her banks $55,000,000 of deposits—that State will stand by every effort for sound legislation upon the money question. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I think I have detained the committee long enough, and perhaps longer than I ought; but I will take the privilege of extending my remarks with this single word, that amongst those who have presented the question here from our side of the House none have given a more correct view of the entire financial question than my distinguished friend, Mr. HILL, from Connecticut and my friend, Mr. FOWLER, from New Jersey. [Applause.]

Both of them have made honest and able efforts to state correctly the facts and foundation principles of a correct financial system for our country. What consideration have you given to them? None.

What amendments do you offer? None. What arguments do you make in reply to them? None. You only demand that we shall adopt the free coinage of silver. Why did you not do this when you had both Houses of Congress and the Executive in your day?

This bill provides for the payment of all our Government obligations in gold. Well, we have always paid in gold; that is no new thing.

The second section also says that all other obligations, public and private, shall be performed in conformity with this standard, and provides that nothing in this bill shall be construed to affect the legal-tender quality of the silver dollar or of the paper currency of this country. Every dollar which is now legal tender is to remain legal tender. No change is made in our money except the power to increase the circulation.

There is no discrimination laid against silver in this bill which does not exist now. It will still be legal tender as now. The tax is removed from national-bank circulation, and so is removed from the rate of interest charged in loans of it. Small banks with small capital may be organized in small cities where business demands them, so that the people will be able to use their own capital at home and not be dependent on large banks at a distance for daily business.

In six days' debate what substitute or amendment have you offered or proposed to offer? Nothing but vituperation and declamation rehearsed from the campaign speeches with which you have deluded your constituents. We have never been able to do things to suit you. When we piled up a surplus in the Treasury you said, "Why do you lock up the people's money?" When we paid off the debt with it, you said, "What are you paying debts before they are due for?"

Then you got hold of the Administration. You got hold of that surplus, and what became of it? You can not tell to this day what you did with it. You can not tell how you managed to get rid of our splendid revenue by a tariff for revenue. You can not tell

how you ran us in debt $262,000,000 in three years. Then when we proposed a measure for raising revenue you said, "What are you doing that for? Why don't you declare war for Cuban independence?" You had been wanting Cuba for eighty years, but now you must have Cuban independence.

When we proposed first to protect our own country and protect our own workingmen by a tariff that not only protects them but also would support the Government, you said, "What are you pretending to help the people for? Why don't you go to war with Spain?" Then, when we had the war and had won the victories and made the peace with honor by a solemn treaty and undertook to perform our part of that treaty in the Philippines, it was your new apostle of peace who denounced us for imperialism, for militarism, and for making war upon the principles of liberty.

And now, when we have fulfilled every promise we made to the people in 1896—now, when we have made the revenue sufficient, when we have made Cuba free, when we have restored the business of the country and the wages of our workingmen—now, when we have kept faith and are about to fulfill the last promise of our covenant with the people, you answer and say, "Why don't you do something else? What are you doing this for?"

Meantime your leaders assemble and consult auguries and pour out libations and look through glasses at birds of omen in the air and pray for a delusion to confuse the minds of the people again. What for? What condition of our country would you change now? Are our working people too busy? Are our business men too busy? Selling too much abroad? Bringing too much gold into our country? Have we too much revenue?

Is our money too rich that it must be diluted for you?

Every prophecy you have made on this subject has failed, and you know it. What now remains for you but to stand aside and let the country do business in peace and in security while you keep silent and abstain from evil.

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Chairman, I desire at the outset of my remarks to read the caption of this bill introduced by Mr. OVERSTREET. The language is as follows:

A bill to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes.

And now, my colleagues, let me put special emphasis on these last four words, for they contain the real purpose for which this bill was introduced. I refer to the words "and for other purposes." Here again we see the wisdom of an old saying of a French diplomat, who declared that "language was invented to conceal thought." Much of the time has been consumed throughout the past week in talking about the gold standard, bimetallism, and about prosperity, and still more time has been consumed by tedious and poor excuses for changes of faith and mind on the money question by those who three years ago promised the people to secure for them international bimetallism. Of course we have seen enough since the inauguration of this Administration to know that pledges and promises by the Republican party were made for campaign purposes only, as, for instance, their pledges to assist Cuba in securing independence and their pledges in behalf of civil service.

My friend from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] charges me with having changed my position on the money question. In a sense this is true; in another it is not. I had accepted without examination, as thousands of others had accepted as correct political philosophy, the theory of the gold worshipers that the only money that could be sound and honest was gold. I had been busy with my work as a lawyer and had paid no more attention to the science of money than I had to the science of astronomy or chemistry. In fact, at that time I was as ignorant of the principles and facts involved in an intelligent consideration of the money question as most of the gentlemen on the Republican side of this House are to-day. I was for a gold standard at that time, as I fear many of my Republican colleagues and a few of my New York Democratic colleagues are to-day, simply because it was fashionable. I took up the subject in the early part of 1896 as a student, with the expectation and intention of proving that the gold standard was for the best interests of the masses of the people of the American Republic.

Investigating that case as I had been accustomed as a lawyer to investigate cases of clients, I found, and so declared to the public, that the gold standard is to the best interests of the few—that is, the money-lending classes in Wall street and Lombard street; but when you take up the same question with reference to the best interests of 98 per cent of the people of this Republic you will agree with Mr. GROSVENOR when he voted in favor of the Stanley Matthews resolution, which declared that the Government could honestly pay its bonds in silver dollars.

Bismarck in 1881 stated his case in these words:

Before I concerned myself personally with customs questions I did not represent my own convictions, but those of my colleague, Delbrück, whom I regarded as the right man in the right place, for I had no time to form my own views. I can not properly say that I formerly held other views than now. I deny that my former views were opposed to my present, for I had none. I was the obedient disciple of Delbrück, and I supported his views when I supported views at all.

And so I, like Bismarck, was the disciple of the bankers and others, whom I regarded as authority on the money question. In 1896, when almost everybody, in the heat and excitement of the discussions of the day, took up the money question, I investigated the subject for myself and made my declaration to the people, stating that I was prepared to support my judgment in favor of bimetallism either in speeches or debates. In the Congressional contest which followed, although my opponent had carried the capital district of Ohio by 1,591 in 1894, I succeeded in drawing him into four debates on the money question, and by the judgment of the people of the district defeated him by 49 votes out of 47,000 votes cast.

As a result of that election I held my first public office as a member of the Fifty-fifth Congress, and I deny that on any issue raised between the St. Louis platform and the Chicago platform I have had to become a Janus-faced legislator, either on the floor of this House or elsewhere; and I have had the satisfaction of supporting with such zeal and sincerity not only the Cuban plank of the Chicago platform, but also the plank of the St. Louis platform on the question of Cuban independence. In fact I drew down upon me the ill-will and malice of every hypocrite in the Republican party who pretended to be in favor of Cuban independence throughout the campaign of 1896, but was too cowardly to assist in securing a declaration either in favor of their independence or their belligerent rights when that question was repeatedly brought to the attention of this House.

There is still another difference between any apparent change I have made on the money question and the changes made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] and many of his Republican colleagues. I changed to the side of the poor and struggling millions, while they changed to the side of the national bankers' trust and other trusts. I went over to the side where neither social nor financial profit would follow and where the slander and libel of a venal and syndicated press would be my only reward, while the gentleman from Ohio and others with him by their change secured the constant and persistent attention of a friendly press as well as liberal contributions to corruption funds to secure their reelection, so that the national honor might be maintained even at the price of bribery, fraud, intimidation, and coercion.

James Russell Lowell said:

Wise men change their opinions; the foolish and dead alone never change theirs.

From the number of changes made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] it is safe to say that he must be the wisest man on the floor of this House. He voted for silver dollars under the Stanley Matthews resolution to pay Government bonds, and in 1894 he stood in his district and made a campaign on a platform demanding an increasing volume of currency, even to such an extent as a volume equal to $40 per capita. In 1896 he ran on a platform, when our per capita was $20, or only one-half as much, and said that such a volume was sufficient, unless the English Government would consent to allow us a larger amount, and if England would not consent, then that was enough, because you had got a dollar that would buy twice as much as you could buy before with the dollar. In one breath he was for plenty of money, and in the next for a scarcity of money. But, gentlemen, this is not a money bill; this is not a coinage bill; this is neither a gold-standard nor a bimetallic-standard bill. This is a bill prepared by the National Bankers' Association for this House, and it is their underlying scheme that lies between the lines in this bill.

Two years ago we were called in extra session to pass an alleged tariff bill, and but a few months since one of the members of the sugar trust stepped upon the witness stand and testified that the tariff bill was the "mother of trusts." It was argued here as a bill to stimulate industry; but instead of that it has proven to be a bill to legalize wholesale robbery. Since the passage of that bill the trusts have consummated their schemes, so that to-day the farmer, instead of paying from $17 to $20 a ton for wire, is obliged to pay from $40 to $42 a ton, and the home builders instead of buying nails at $1.75 a keg are compelled to pay $3.00 a keg. In other words, when the farmer steps up to buy a ton of wire he not only pays for it, but must tamely submit to the long fingers of the trust going down into his pocket and taking out $20 for nothing. So the home builder, when he buys 10 kegs of nails, is also sad to find that a trust has picked his pocket and left him $20 short.

How much better are these trusts than highway robbers? Why should Jesse James have been punished for holding up a train and taking the watches and purses of the passengers? He did business by retail, while the party that pretends to be so solicitous about our national honor and the flag permits and aids and abets the trusts in doing a hold-up business by wholesale. Why not introduce a bill in all frankness to amend one of the Ten Commandments, and instead of saying "Thou shalt not steal," say "Thou shalt not steal except on a large scale." Such, in substance, was the effect of the Dingley bill; and knowing your great wisdom and long-headed ability on the side of the Administration forces, I must concede that you undoubtedly knew what was wanted, and you framed

the bill accordingly. Notwithstanding the caption and the speeches you prepared, for it seemed to be for a "tariff bill," yet it is now plain that between the lines you prepared a trust bill, and that is why it has since been called "the mother of trusts."

This bill before the House to-day is for the benefit of the 3,600 national banks, who constitute a secret society that has more power than the million Masons, the million Odd Fellows, and the half million Knights of Pythias combined. No secret society on the face of the earth ever wielded such influence and such power. The National Bankers' Association undoubtedly prepared this bill, and that is why the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] said in his remarks that the President recommended this bill and that it is the same bill recommended by the National Bankers' Association last summer. Of course it is the same bill. Their attorneys and agents prepared it, and you would scarcely expect a father to repudiate his own child. And, in this connection, I ask that an editorial in the New York Sun of the 12th of December, under the caption, "A leader in Congress," be read with reference to this bill. I send the editorial to the Clerk's desk to be read there:

The Clerk read as follows:

[New York Sun, December 12.]

A LEADER IN CONGRESS!

In his speech in the House of Representatives yesterday on the currency bill Mr. OVERSTREET, of Indiana, the introducer of the bill, said that the Secretary of the Treasury, "by a single order directing the use of silver in the discharge of our obligations, may completely destroy the parity and shift the standard to the metal so used."

This is sheer nonsense. The Secretary of the Treasury has no more power to use the metal silver in the discharge of our obligations than he has to use the metal gold. He can use only gold coin or silver coin.

Gold coin is, indeed, worth as currency no more than the gold it contains, because any owner of gold can at pleasure have it converted into coin in unlimited quantities free of charge, but the case is quite different with silver. Silver dollars pass current as equal to gold dollars to the number of 450,000,000, although the metal of which they are composed is equal in value to only about 40 cents in gold, for the reason that the coinage of them is a Government monopoly and is not open to the public.

Nothing but unlimited free-silver coinage can reduce the value of the silver dollars to their value as metal, and Mr. OVERSTREET betrays on the subject an ignorance of fact and of law which in a leader in Congress is ludicrous, not to say disgraceful.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for ten minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LENTZ. "Mr. OVERSTREET," says the New York Sun, "betrays an ignorance of this bill which is ludicrous, not to say disgraceful." If my friend Mr. OVERSTREET, against whom I have nothing whatever to say, made so unsatisfactory a presentation and explanation of this bill on the floor of this House that it demoralized the bankers of New York, and made himself ludicrous in their supreme eye, it would be certified to by just such an editorial in the New York Sun.

The New York Sun, if it speaks for anybody, speaks for the money-power of New York City. It is evident from that editorial that Mr. OVERSTREET did not understand the bill which he presented to this House. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] It is apparent, my friends, that before this country gets through with this infernal bill, and after the Treasury Department and the other Departments have placed their interpretation upon it, which the national bankers and the attorneys for the national bankers well know will be placed upon it, you will again be using your explanation machines on the other side of the House with even greater diligence and with greater continuity, if possible, than you have during the past week. You will have to stand before this House and say, "I stood by the bill because the caucus indorsed the bill."

I say to you, my friends, that if Mr. OVERSTREET does not understand the bill which he is responsible for, and if New York City says it is ludicrous for him to talk on the floor of this House about this bill in the way he is talking, then you will pass another bill here which, like the Dingley "mother of trusts," will be equivalent to carrying another serpent to the firesides of the people; and when the serpent is thawed out sufficiently, it will sting the children. This bill is intended to increase the power of the national banks, and, in my opinion, it has no other purpose. All there is in it on the standard dollar of the country is already in the law of 1873. This bill is the bill of the national bankers, and will be passed for the national bankers at the request of the national bankers by the agents of the national bankers. Why have you not provided in it that the Government should issue currency to any of the 9,000 banks other than the 3,600 national banks upon the deposit of bonds?

Why should not the Government issue to private banks, to State banks, and to individuals a thousand dollars when they deposit a thousand-dollar bond? Answer, if you please. Why should not any man or woman who happens to have a thousand or two thousand dollars in bonds be able to send it to the Treasury and have the Treasury deliver to him or her his thousand or two thousand dollars with which to build a little house or buy a little home? Answer why that should not be in this bill. If the Government can issue good money to the national banks upon the deposit of bonds, why can it not issue to the other 9,000 banks and to individuals equally good money upon the deposit of bonds? Answer me if you can! Answer me if you dare!

If the Government can issue good money to national banks for bonds, why could not it issue good money to the widow and orphan if they happen to inherit a bond, and why should not the widow and orphan at the same time draw interest on it while they are using the money in building a home and while the national banker is using his money in building stacks of surplus and dividends? No; you will never answer that question fairly and squarely, because this bill is in the interest of the national banks.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LENTZ. Yes; for a question or an answer.

Mr. HILL. I will read a part of the national platform of the Democratic party, which will answer the gentleman's question.

Congress alone has the power to coin and issue money. We therefore demand that the power to issue notes to circulate as money be taken from the national banks and that all paper money shall be issued directly by the Treasury Department.

Mr. LENTZ. I do not see that that is any answer to my question. Nobody but an owl from Maine would think that was an answer to the question I have been asking.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Or from Connecticut.

Mr. LENTZ. No, I mean Mark Twain's owl from Maine.

If the Government will hand out a thousand dollars or $25,000 to a national bank upon the deposit of bonds, why not pass out a thousand dollars to some poor man who is unfortunate enough to own only one bond? Answer that in your own time. I repeat it and you dare not answer. And I repeat my first proposition, that this is not a coinage bill and that it is purely a national-bank bill, and nothing more nor less. The purpose of this bill is not so much to fasten the gold standard upon us as it is to fasten the national banks upon us.

Now, I make this prediction: That the time will come when you will confess that this bill had things in it that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] did not understand and that no man on the committee that reported it here understood; and that no man who went down to Atlantic City last spring to come back with this bill understood.

In 1896 there was a shortage in the money supply, and, as usual, falling prices and hard times resulted from this condition. The Democrats and other reform forces, in order to remove this disastrous condition, advocated a larger money supply, and had the courage and honesty to declare that this could most surely be done by returning to the money of the Constitution, bimetallism, and they were frank enough to tell the people in words and figures that they agreed with Lincoln in the ratio of 16 to 1, and that they also agreed with Lincoln in his last public utterance, on the 14th day of April, 1865, wherein he said:

The more gold and silver we mine so much the easier we make the payment of the national debt. I am going to encourage that in every possible way.

In strange contrast with Abraham Lincoln, who wanted the payment of the national debt and other debts made "easier," by directing the whole people, as well as the million disbanded soldiers, to the mining of gold and silver, we see to-day the Administration of William McKinley recommending that this House pass the bill we are to-day considering, and which, as stated by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], has been recommended by the National Bankers' Association. In other words, the Administration in this measure, as well as every other measure which has come before this House, shows itself unhesitatingly and unmistakably in favor of anything demanded by the national banks, the trusts, and other forms of organized greed, while Abraham Lincoln, from whom this Administration claims to be a legitimate heir, proclaimed to the people not only of this Republic, but to the world, in his first annual message to Congress that—

Labor is prior to and independent of capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital and deserves much the higher consideration.

In other words, Abraham Lincoln believed that labor is the superior of capital, while this Administration by every act demonstrates that it believes that capital is the superior of labor.

I have already stated what the Democrats, the Populists, and Lincoln Republicans stood for in 1896. The McKinley Republicans and Hanna Democrats contended that falling prices were a distinct advantage, that the dollar could not be made too good, that it could not be made to buy too much, that if dollars could be made so scarce that one of them would buy 4 bushels of wheat instead of 1 bushel, or 10 bushels of corn instead of 3, such a dollar would be an honest dollar and more sound and more reliable than the dollars advocated by Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln. The gold worshipers in 1896 argued throughout that memorable campaign that to increase the volume of money, to make more dollars, would be to cheapen them and would be doing an injustice to those holding insurance policies, or deposit books

of the savings banks, or mortgages, or bonds, or other evidences of credit. Throughout the past week the advocates of this bill have boasted much of prosperity and are particularly profuse and elaborate in claiming that the increase in the volume of currency which we now have is to the honor and glory of the very party that argued against an increasing currency three years ago. No man will undertake to point to any legislation of this Administration and claim that such legislation is responsible for our increased volume of currency unless he is willing to have either his honesty or intelligence questioned by those who hear him.

Since 1896 the volume of money has increased in the United States from natural causes, such as shortage of crops and famines abroad, which produced in the United States increased exports of commodities and increased imports of cash. In addition to this we have had an increased output of gold in our own country, and in consequence of this increased volume of money an era of rising prices has followed, stimulating industry and business, thus proving the principles advocated by the Democratic party in 1896. And under these conditions the farmers and laborers of the land would have shared much more of the fruits of this increase had it not been that the Republican party has promoted and developed an empire of trusts, which, by the power of monopoly, hold down abnormally low the prices of labor and the prices of the products of the farm and the mine, while, on the other hand, the prices of all articles manufactured by the trusts are thrust up beyond all reason, conscience, or decency. Thus trusts counteract and prevent profits which should accrue to all legitimate laborers, farmers, and business men from the increased volume of money.

The owners of these trusts are not satisfied with the mere control of the output of all the commodities which enter into the food, clothing, and shelter of humanity. To-day we see their great and all-controlling influence at work in what ought to be a free and independent parliamentary body. Crude, indeed, must be the legislator here who can not see that the hand of the attorney of the National Bankers' Association has written this currency bill, so that the same men who control the output of tin and wire and nails shall also control the output of money. The organization that moves this body and dominates the majority side of it contends that the 80,000,000 American citizens can not make a good dollar out of silver, but that 3,600 national bankers can make good money out of paper, and the paper based not on labor but on the debt of the Government. In other words, the Bankers' Association, that is responsible for this bill, has made a sight draft on the majority side of Congress, and the passage of this bill must be delivered before the close of banking hours next Monday.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] spoke of delivering this bill as a Christmas gift to the business interests of the country. He evidently considered that the 3,600 national bankers are the "only" business interests of the United States, and for some reason his party has a debt of gratitude to pay in the form of a Christmas gift. Is that debt the debt created by the gigantic corruption fund of 1896? In addition to opening the eyes of many by your catering to the bankers you will by this act emphasize the doctrine we have maintained as to the blessings which follow an increasing currency. Either you must concede this or you must confess that the additional 10 per cent of currency herein provided for national banks to receive upon deposit of bonds is purely for the benefit of the banker and not for the public good. And while you are bragging about prosperity are you not afraid someone will ask you why you meddle with a currency system that was in force at the time this prosperity blew in upon us? Are you not afraid that it may be necessary to write upon the tombstone of your party this epitaph which the Persian King ordered to be placed over his grave—

I was well, but wished to be better. Took physic and died.

In no other first-class country in the world is the speculative class in control of the range of prices as it is here in the United States. In Germany, Austria, and Russia the government controls entirely the range of prices within the country by controlling the bank rate. In England it is the commercial class that controls the bank rate, and thereby the range of prices. No banker is permitted to become a member of the board of directors of the Bank of England. Bagehot emphasizes this in his volume entitled Lombard Street.

In France the control of the price level is maintained by a combination of representatives of the commercial classes, and of appointees of the Government. While in the United States the speculative class controls the range of prices by controlling the volume of money and the bank rate, and the same class by the agency of trusts also controls the output of shops, mills, and factories, and thus are enabled to dictate the wages of labor, and in due time they expect and intend to destroy every labor union in this Republic, and when they have done this they will have destroyed the one remaining class who still have some conception of the meaning of the expressions free speech, free thought, free press, free schools, and a free ballot. When they have blotted out of existence the organizations of labor they will have destroyed the last hope of a free government.

This bill is framed in behalf of the National Bankers' Association and this association after the passage of this bill will be the most powerful and arrogant trust on the face of the earth. It will be the oligarchy that will eventually convert the American Republic into one of the several forms of despotism which have characterized the decay and destruction of all the efforts and all the hopes of the philosophers and the patriots of the centuries gone by in their struggles for free government.

The policy of the reform forces in this country is to adopt a system of finance which will take from the speculators the control of the money volume and prices. It will continue to be our battle cry in the future, as it was in the memorable campaigns of Andrew Jackson and William Jennings Bryan that, "The national banks must go out of the governing business." For my part, I know of nothing that will go farther toward opening the eyes of the voters of the land than the fact that every man on the Republican side of this House has been driven in under the lash of the caucus whip to confess his absolute subserviency to the National Bankers' Association.

In 1878, at the passage of the Bland-Allison bill; in 1890, at the passage of the Sherman law; in 1893, at the repeal of the Sherman law, and in the Presidential campaign of 1896 the monetary discussions among the people of this Republic continued with increasing intensity, and each time that the matter came before the American people the differences grew apace, until the plutocratic element of the old Democratic party joined the Wall-street end of the Republican party, and the Lincoln Republicans separated themselves from their old associates and identified themselves with the Jeffersonian Democrats and Populists and other reform forces of the country. To-day there are two well-defined parties.

We of the one espouse the cause of the farmer, the merchant, the small manufacturer, the miner, the wage-earner, and all other producers and creators of wealth. You champion the cause of the speculators, whose greed for dollars has made them as blind as misers to the just rights of man, the reasonable comforts of the homes, and the education of the children of the plain people, the honest and industrious millions. The aims and schemes of your party as now constituted all tend to intrench in castles and palaces the lords and barons of trusts, whose power is already so gigantic that when compared with the power of the feudal lords of the dark ages the latter sink to the stature of pigmies.

The aim of the reform forces is to destroy not only the money trust, but all the trusts that fatten in this land of liberty, and your united vote as you walk up and register the same on Monday next, like dumb driven cattle under the lash of the National Bankers' Association, will in itself be such an object lesson that it will be easy for the people to understand and interpret your complete subserviency to the money power and your complete idolatry and worship of the golden calf.

I take the liberty, unauthorized though I be, to challenge you now to release your imperial President from his vine-clad porch in Canton, Ohio, in the next campaign, and let him meet if he dare in debate on any rostrum our standard bearer, William Jennings Bryan. I challenge you now to prepare your Chief Executive, if you dare, to come before the people and defend his policy in placing the entire money volume of the land within the control of the National Bankers' Association. And I challenge you now to prepare him to explain this repudiation and destruction of the greenback, which was good enough and honest enough to pay Abraham Lincoln's hundreds of thousands who sacrificed their lives and their health that the Union might live.

You have talked about prosperity. If war and foreign complications cause prosperity, then let us, like the Romans, carry our spears and battle-axes into every clime and every nation. If commercial greed and trade justify our course in the Orient, why not look after additional trade in Europe also? Why not offer England $20,000,000 for Ireland, telling her we need the island as a coaling station in order to extend our commerce, and to carry our flag across Great Britain and the Continent? If England refuses to accept the $20,000,000, let us shoot benevolent assimilation into her and all the while increase our prosperity. What has your party done for prosperity? What legislation has made prosperity? We voted in the Fifty-fifth Congress $100,000 to pay for free transportation of the food that was donated to the starving millions in India. That famine was so far-reaching in its horrors that it was said that 12,000,000 human beings were swallowed up in its greed.

Was that famine the result of anything the Republican party did? If you could go down and ask the spirits that sank beneath the earth in that trying ordeal I think they would say that that was not an act of Providence, but they would rather impute it to the imps of hell. You claim the credit of it for the Republican party on that side of the House. You may have it if you desire,

As a result of that famine and other shortages of food in the Eastern part of the world, we have largely increased our exports of farm products, and in return have received large imports of cash and increased our circulating medium, and there is a temporary betterment of conditions.

You complain that each one of us does not stand here and reaffirm the Chicago platform, does not repronounce the name of Bryan, does not declare that he is for each of them, and you say that therefore we have abandoned them. Must we stand here each day and repeat the multiplication table or be accused of abandoning that? Does the preacher each Sunday preach on the texts, "Thou shalt not steal," "Thou shalt not bear false witness," "Thou shalt not commit adultery"? And if he does not repeat these sermons each Sunday do you say on Monday morning that he is in favor of all of them and that he has abandoned his opposition to them? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

That is an absurdity; that is childish talk. I say to you that so far as I am concerned—and I know I represent at least 16 to 1 of the Democrats on this floor when I say it—we are in favor of the reaffirmation of the Chicago platform of 1896. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We are in favor of renominating William Jennings Bryan. [Applause on Democratic side.] And in addition to reaffirming the Chicago platform, we shall declare against trusts, militarism, and imperialism, and add a plank against slavery and polygamy in the Sulu Islands, and a plank against the British alliance—an alliance that is now open and apparent. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Great Britain is shooting down liberty in South Africa, while you are shooting it down in the Philippine Islands. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

That is evidence sufficient that both Governments are operating upon parallel lines. The first blossom of liberty in the Orient is to be cut off by the Republican party of the United States, and the first substantial struggle for liberty in Africa is to be shot down in its infancy by the Queen of England, while the Czar of Russia is asking for peace. If things are not upside down, how can the Republican party stand impotent and silent while England is shooting to death a republic in South Africa, and while, under the military and imperialistic power that patronage has delivered to the President here, the crime of crimes is being committed in the Philippines under the Stars and Stripes of the Union?

The President, at Madison, Wis., said:

> Only one small fraction of one small tribe is resisting our authority in the Orient.

Aye, my friends, and the President is sending an army there of 75,000 men to subdue "one small fraction of one small tribe." An army larger than Sherman had when he marched to the sea, an army larger than Grant needed to take Vicksburg, an army larger than Lee surrendered at Richmond, is now called into requisition and kept there for nearly a year to subdue "one small faction of one small tribe." Is this the source of your prosperity?

Does anyone believe if General Miles had been sent to the Philippines a year ago, with full power to restore peace, that he would not have secured it long since without the waste of life and health and treasure expended in a war which John Sherman, ex-Senator Edmunds, ex-Speaker Reed, Carl Schurz, Senator Hoar, ex-Governor Boutwell, and thousands of other Republicans think "an unnecessary, an uncalled-for, and an unjust war?"

Aside from passing the Dingley "mother of trusts," you have also passed a bill under which you have sold two hundred millions of bonds, and in that way your war with Spain drew from the vaults and hiding places an additional volume of currency, which, by the storms of war, was scattered throughout all the avenues of business and trade. In addition to this you have burdened the people with stamp taxes and war taxes that are taking from their meager pockets hundreds of millions of dollars to carry on a war against liberty on the other side of the earth that will be the shame and humiliation of the American people for generations to come, and will require us in some sane moment to apologize to the spirits of Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln.

Aside from the legislation I have already mentioned, what, if you please, has the Republican Administration done since the 4th of March, 1897? As I recall it, its first act was to coax and wheedle John Sherman out of a seat in the Senate, promising him a place in the Cabinet. Is this the source of your prosperity? A little later on you unceremoniously kicked the sage of Mansfield, the nestor of the Republican party, out of the Cabinet without daring to give to the world your reason or excuse for the same. Is this the source of your prosperity? You remained impotent and whined that you would have "peace at any price," although a Spaniard insulted you with the charge that your President was nothing but a "low politician." Is this the source of your prosperity?

Your Administration sent the *Maine* in January, 1898, carrying the Stars and Stripes as an emblem of good will to Spain, rather than as a ray of hope to Cuba struggling for independence.

Although in the St. Louis platform you professed sympathy for Cuba in "her struggles to free herself from European domination," you sent our good ship *Maine* as an encouragement to Spain, and as a result of it 266 American lives were sacrificed to Spanish treachery. Is this the source of your prosperity?

In your St. Louis platform you also promised the old soldiers who saved the Union that they should receive fair treatment and generous recognition, whereas in fact throughout these three years you have left almost neglected 600,000 applications of the old soldiers for pensions, and to-day are practicing the same policy of delay in the treatment of our soldiers in the Spanish-American war who came home permeated with diseases imposed upon them by the beef trust and the horse doctors. Is this the source of your prosperity?

After Attorney-General McKenna was sent from the Cabinet to a place on the Supreme Bench you took into the Cabinet as Attorney-General a man who was governor of New Jersey, the home and stronghold of these pirates known as trusts and syndicates, who, like pirates of old, day and night scan the seas to loot and plunder other vessels too weak to cope with them. And this Attorney-General promptly discovered that the laws against trusts were impotent and unavailing. Is this the source of your prosperity?

After Eagan had been court-martialed and found unworthy of a place in the American Army your President restored him to a full salary of $5,500 a year for the next six years and $4,125 a year for the remainder of his life. In all he will draw from the National Treasury $75,000 if he lives his natural expectancy, although he will never render another day's service to our Government. Is this the source of your prosperity?

Your beef trust and horse doctors murdered about 4,800 men, while the Spaniards only killed 350. Is this the source of your prosperity? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

You humiliated and subordinated that man who won the most magnificent naval victory that the world has ever seen—Winfield Scott Schley. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Is this the source of your prosperity? You have subordinated and humiliated General Miles, whom Abraham Lincoln promoted for deeds of skill and heroic courage from battle to battle until he had climbed up the ladder of military fame from a clerk in a store to that of brevet major-general of the United States Army. Is this the source of your prosperity? You ignored and humiliated scores of military leaders and experts trained at West Point and in the Indian wars at an expense of millions of dollars, and subordinated such as these by putting politicians in the army saddles. Is this the source of your prosperity? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If you have done anything to produce prosperity, answer me, if you please, and tell me what it was. You will live to be ashamed of your record. One gentleman talked about prosperity and the consequent result of the election in 1898. In the last Congress you had the advantage of the reform forces by 57 votes. In this House we are in the minority by only 13 votes. Is this an evidence of your prosperity? We are satisfied with the progress we have made. And now in closing let me give you all my New Year greeting in the language of Howard S. Taylor, of Chicago:

> Did our Liberty Bell ring in vain?
> Was our Declaration a lie?
> Must we turn to the Old World again,
> With the penitent prodigal's cry?
> Must we arm us and march in the van
> Of Europe's barbaric parade,
> And boom out a gunpowder gospel to man
> To open a pathway for trade?
> Shall we strut through the world and bluster and brag
> With the dollar mark stamped on the brave old flag?
>
> Nay, haul up the flag—raise it high—
> Not yet is its spirit spent!
> Let it sing in the wind and the sky
> The truth that it always meant!
> Let it sing of the birthright of man,
> Of progress that never can lag,
> Let it sing that trade may go where it can,
> But liberty follows the flag!
> Yea, haul up Old Glory—but, comrades, take heed
> That no man shall part the old flag from the creed!

[Prolonged applause.]

Mr. OVERSTREET. The language of the gentleman who has just taken his seat reminds me of a homely expression of Josh Billings:

> It is better not to know so many things than to know so many things that ain't so.

[Laughter.]

I shall undertake to reply in a very few words to the personal criticism made by the gentleman. He could well have supplemented his remarks in relation to the New York editorial by a quotation from the same speech, which I delivered upon this floor, in which I stated that there came to this bill no criticisms against the banking feature except demagogic attacks from the other side of the Chamber.

That is the same character of answer which this week has demonstrated to have been presented by the opponents of this measure. The gentlemen who were selected to frame this bill, having for

their guide the study and care of financiers of this country for many years, have given the broadest opportunity for criticism in debate, and the answer comes only in the character of the language of the editorial used by the gentleman from Ohio.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that the bond of this Government which he attacked is the only bond which the people of this country have ever accepted in the fullest faith. I call his attention to the fact that of all the bonded indebtedness of the United States there is held by foreign holders less than $18,000,000; $13,676,000 of it is held by foreign insurance companies; and that of the $200,000,000 of bonds issued to conduct the Spanish-American war, less than $900,000 are held by foreigners and not one dollar by foreign individuals. These statistics demonstrate that the American bond is largely held by the American people, who received them welcomely and patriotically. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have but one remark to make relative to the editorial. The gentleman reads from the New York Sun. No apologies are necessary for the statement that is there made. It can be easily demonstrated by fair argument. But it is a strange anomaly, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Ohio, who in a ten-minute debate has undertaken rapidly to pass over all the subjects in modern politics, with a speed only equaled by that with which his good friend Aguinaldo is measuring the territory of Luzon [laughter and applause], should have undertaken to prove the verity of his statement by the New York Sun. It reminds me of a little verse by Coleridge:

> The river Rhine, it is well known,
> Doth wash the city of Cologne;
> But tell me, nymphs, what power divine
> Shall henceforth wash the river Rhine?

[Laughter and applause.]

Mr. CLAYTON of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill in its entirety and in its every feature. On the question of the standard of value or bimetallism or free coinage at the existing legal ratio I can add nothing to what I have had the honor to say before the people whose commission I hold and to what I had the honor to say in this House in the Fifty-fifth Congress. When the Teller resolution was under consideration in the Fifty-fifth Congress, I argued at length against the payment of the United States bonds and other obligations of the Government in gold only. But I knew then, as I know now, that the Republican party would take the position that the representatives of that party have assumed in this discussion.

Mr. Chairman, in the brief time allowed me I shall not attempt to discuss the financial or coinage question. I shall not at this late hour inflict a speech upon the House. Nothing that I can say would change the vote of any Republican here, as nothing that they have said or may say could change me. I am satisfied that I am right and that those whom I represent are right in their opposition to the features of the pending measure. Time will prove the correctness of this opposition.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to put in the RECORD a Republican argument made against the national-bank system. This argument is applicable to that feature of the bill which proposes to enlarge the national-bank system—a system that I believe is intended by the framers of this bill and those whose tools they are to enlarge and perpetuate, and I do not doubt that their plan is bottomed upon an ever-increasing and perpetual public indebtedness.

Public debts are not blessings to the plain and honest people, who pay the taxes that are absorbed by interest on bonds. A trust composed of the national banks of New York and their allies given the exclusive power—the governmental function—of issuing the currency of the country is the most dangerous of all trusts and the most criminal of all combines.

Mr. Chairman, I read from House Report No. 1575, second session of the Fifty-fifth Congress. The report was made by Mr. MCCLEARY, of the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FOWLER] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], both of whom now favor this bill, were members. I put into the RECORD these quotations from the report, so that some of you on the Republican side can explain some more of your inconsistencies and answer some of your arguments against national banks. The report goes on to say:

> But the system of bond based bank-note issues is by its very nature open to serious objections.
>
> The vital thing to remember in considering this subject is that currency is simply an instrument of trade, a means of effecting exchanges; that it has no other use or purpose, and that therefore its volume should depend upon and be responsive to the demands of trade. But in this vital matter a system of bond-based bank notes signally fails.
>
> In the first place, the volume of notes under this system is largely determined by the state of the Government's credit. The issue of notes is conditioned upon the prior purchase of Government bonds. If, then, the credit of Government be low, the bonds bear a high rate of interest and yet can be bought for a small price. Under such circumstances it will be profitable to buy the bonds and issue notes upon them. But as the credit of the Government improves the bonds bring a higher price and pay a lower rate of interest. Then it becomes unprofitable to invest in the bonds and issue the notes. * * *
>
> In the second place, the higher the prevailing commercial rate of interest, the less likely are bond-based notes to be issued. * * *
>
> In other words, to those sections of our country where capital is plentiful and where the rates of interest are low, our present system gives increase to abundance; while to those sections where rates of interest are high, showing the need of loanable funds, the system gives little relief. In order to secure bank notes for circulation, a community must invest more capital in bonds than it gets back in the form of bank notes—that is, a community is required under our present system to send away a part of its loanable capital for investment at a low rate. But this is precisely what a community having inadequate loanable capital can not afford to do. And if a portion of the loanable capital be sent away for this low-rate investment, the rate of interest on the remaining funds must be raised.
>
> In the third place, as a corollary of the above, a system of bank-note issues based on Government bonds can not be responsive to seasonal demands. In the agricultural communities of the West and South the demand for currency during the three or four months in which the bulk of the crop is being moved is very much greater than it is during the rest of the year, and to be of most service the funds must be in the form of coin or bills, preferably the latter. These extra funds the banks in the vicinity ought to be able to provide through increased issue of bank notes based upon the values, promptly realizable, of the crops themselves; but to this seasonal demand the local banks are under the present system utterly unable to respond.
>
> To secure the funds the buyers of the products must go to the money centers and borrow. Their demand for funds must there meet and compete with other demands of the same kind, and the consequence is that they can command the necessary funds only by offering a higher rate of interest. This, of course, means that so much less can be paid for the products, and in so far as the rate is unnecessarily high there is an unnecessary loss to the producer. * * *
>
> In the fourth place, as a second corollary of the above, bank-note issues can not under the present system respond promptly to emergency demands for note currency. A good illustration of the delay in responding to such demand was furnished in the summer of 1893:
>
> "The New York banks held on June 1, 1893, a surplus of $21,000,000 in excess of their legal reserve. At that time the volume of national-bank notes outstanding was about $177,000,000. By the 1st of August extraordinary demands for currency had drawn down the reserve to $14,000,000 below the legal minimum, and the outstanding notes were only about $5,000,000 more than on June 1.
>
> "By September 1, however, when the reserves were but $1,500,000 below the minimum, when the urgency was past and currency was once more comparatively abundant, the notes had begun to expand and had already reached $199,800,000, subsequently rising to $209,300,000 on November 1, notwithstanding the continued decrease in the demand for them."
>
> Having been called into existence not by the requirements of trade but by the exigencies of the Government, being based on the debt of the country instead of its wealth, on what our people collectively owe instead of what they individually own, our present system of bank-note issue is not a true bank currency, and is therefore unresponsive to the demands of trade, coming forth when and where there is little demand for it and responding slowly or not at all when and where the need is urgent. And the trouble is inherent in the system; it can not be remedied except by a change of basis.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly aware that the most logical, eloquent, and earnest protest against the pending measure—even though it carried with it that conviction which follows a demonstration—would prove wholly ineffective in the matter of changing a single vote on the Republican side of this Chamber.

I therefore frankly confess that I am absolutely without hope of converting any one of them to oppose the bill under consideration; but I take advantage of this opportunity merely to record an honest, emphatic, and conscientious protest against a measure being foisted upon the people which will, as certainly as time lasts to put its blighting principles into active operation, bring chaos and destruction to our business interests, and prove a curse to the masses of our people.

Sir, the amount of sorrow and distress this hateful measure will bring and the fearful cost in toil and sweat it will entail upon our countrymen is impossible of computation. And after this bill shall have been passed, as pass it surely will, in obedience to the demands of the "money changers," the time will not be far distant when the men and women throughout this land, begging for the mean privilege of earning a living, will keenly realize that: "There has been a gang of pirates thundering at the door of this Capitol until they drove their representatives into the most preposterous acts of bad faith and legalized robbery ever perpetrated against a free people."

This bill commits us by express legislation more firmly to the single gold standard, and it further means that all Government bonds and interest-bearing indebtedness now existing or to be issued or contracted shall be paid, not in coin—gold or silver or both—as the original contract provides, at the option of the Government, but both interest and principal shall hereafter be paid in gold; that all United States Treasury notes and greenbacks shall be redeemed in gold; that the silver dollar, so long a constitutional primary money and full legal tender in payment of all debts, public and private, shall become token money, to be redeemed in gold. Silver certificates can only be issued in denominations of one, two, and three dollars, which restricts their use to minor transactions. This bill further means that national banks may issue their notes to the full amount of their capital stock, and at the same time their taxation is decreased. It clothes the Secretary of the Treasury with full power to issue and sell bonds of the United States at his pleasure.

We submit, sir, that the single gold standard is disastrous to the best interests of the country, because there is an inadequate supply of gold to meet the requirements thus made upon it. Our

contention for the double standard does not grow out of any prejudice against gold or love for silver in themselves, but proceeds from an adherence to the quantitative theory of money.

Statistics prove that the business world has always enjoyed seasons of greatest prosperity when the largest volume of money was in circulation, and that the periods of greatest financial depression, shipwreck, and disaster invariably occurred when the volume of money was contracted. When money is plentiful and doing active money service in the channels of commerce and business enterprise, wages and the products of labor are high and the country generally is prosperous. The converse of this is equally true. In fact, it has become an axiom in political economy that "the volume of money in any country determines the prices of its products."

The contention of the Democratic party has been fully justified by the events and conditions of recent years. Our platform of 1896 declared for the restoration of silver to the position it occupied as a constitutional money metal prior to 1873. We then held that there was an insufficient volume of money to meet the demands of trade and commerce, and that the free and unlimited coinage of silver, with full legal-tender qualities in payment of all debts, public and private, would in some measure relieve the situation by increasing the quantity of basic or primary money.

Our great antagonist, the Republican party, in its national platform of 1896 agreed with the Democracy in advocating bimetallism, but with the qualification that bimetallism should be with international agreement alone, and until such agreement could be secured the single gold standard should be maintained. And upon this proposition the two parties joined issue and appealed to the country.

While both contending parties claim a vindication of their policies, yet, sir, I submit without fear of successful contradiction that, although the Democratic party went down to defeat, the principles for which it contended have triumphed signally.

The gentlemen upon the Republican side of this Chamber have well depicted the direful financial and social condition of 1896. They spoke in graphic terms of the "soup houses" then established to feed the hungry poor. They cited the multiplied bankruptcies among our merchants, and referred to the idleness among mechanics and artisans. They described the miners out of employment, with their dependent families to be fed, clothed, and sheltered from the rigors of approaching winter. The farmers are said to have been groaning under the weight of mortgaged homes; and then, pointing to present conditions with an air of arrogance and bigotry truly astonishing, they exclaim: "See what we, the original and only Republican party, have done for the people!" Gentlemen, unless you are in league with the Supreme Ruler of the universe and the God of harvests, how very ridiculous, in the light of reason, your boast appears. So utterly groundless is it that if seriously uttered it becomes a brazen affront to intelligent men.

Relief from the recent financial depression came largely from the unexpected and unprecedented output of gold from the Klondike, Cripple Creek, and South Africa, which has added to the world's supply more than $300,000,000 of gold, an amount greater than the combined yield of both gold and silver for any previous year in the world's history.

The report of the Secretary of the Treasury says:

> The amount of gold and silver coin and certificates, United States notes, and national-bank notes in circulation November 1, 1899, was $1,963,716,148, which gives us, with an estimated population of 76,699,000, a per capita circulation of $25.60—

which, according to the same authority, is a much larger per capita circulation than in 1896. With this increased circulation has come proportionate prosperity, but neither for the increased circulation nor the consequent increased prosperity is the Republican party in anywise responsible.

The Republican financial policy contributed nothing to the discovery of the gold fields of Alaska, Cripple Creek, or South Africa. What had the Republican party to do with the seasonable sunshine and rain which gave the farmers their late bounteous harvests? Without these agencies, which came from the generous hand of a beneficent Providence to the relief of a suffering people, the conditions which prevailed in 1896 would now be so intensified that throughout this land anarchy and revolution would stalk uncovered in public places.

While there are, under existing conditions, undeniable evidences of reviving prosperity, yet the Republican party, true to its instincts and inclination for scarce and consequently dear money—which means hard times and low prices, affluence for the rich and oppression for the masses—will foist this bill upon the country, the inevitable effects of which will be to decrease the volume of money to the extent of the ultimate retirement of the greenbacks, Treasury notes, silver certificates, and silver dollars, aggregating the vast sum of about $1,000,000,000.

It is urged, it is true, that national-bank notes will be issued to take the place of the currency so retired. Without entering upon a discussion of the charitableness, benevolence, or fair dealing of national banks in their relation to and dealings with the public in financial matters, suffice it to say that it is always unwise and never expedient to lodge with individuals or corporations the power to thus expand or contract at will the volume of the currency. The granting of such power deliberately places the hands of such corporations or individuals upon the throat of the body politic. The power that controls the volume of money of any nation controls its destinies. In respect to national banks this bill contemplates a money trust more gigantic and potential than any trust heretofore conceived. The power to issue money, which is peculiarly a governmental function, should never and of right can not be delegated to the banks; yet this is the purpose of this bill.

Instead of protecting the gold reserve in the National Treasury this bill provides additional means whereby the gold reserve may be depleted. The payment of national bonds, principal and interest, must now be paid in gold, the option secured in the original contract to the Government to pay in coin having been transferred by this bill to the bondholders, who may now demand payment in gold.

The effect of this bill in making our national bonds payable in gold instead of coin means many millions of money to the holders of such bonds, gratuitously presented by their ever obedient servants—the Republican party. It will be remembered that on February 8, 1895, President Cleveland, in a message to the Congress calling attention to our financial condition and advising measures for "reenforcing and maintaining in our Treasury an adequate and safe gold reserve," asked Congress to issue "in lieu of the 4 per cent coin bonds, other bonds in terms payable in gold and bearing only 3 per cent interest," stating as an inducement that "in the agreement just concluded (between the President and 'parties abundantly able to fulfill their undertaking') the annual saving in interest to the Government, if 3 per cent gold bonds should be substituted for 4 per cent coin bonds under the privilege reserved would be $539,159 annually, amounting in thirty years, or at maturity, to $16,174,770." It is needless to add that the Democratic Congress refused to comply with this request.

The obvious effect of this bill will be to enhance in the same ratio the now outstanding interest-bearing indebtedness of the country, which indebtedness was, October 31, 1899, $1,046,049,020. Taking into consideration the different rates of interest and different dates at which these bonds mature, it is a conservative estimate to say that the enhanced value of these bonds upon the passage of this bill will be $150,000,000, and that magnificent sum represents the Christmas gift presented to the bondholders by the Republican party at the expense of the taxpayers of this country. That is, more specifically, to say, that it will require after the passage of this bill the additional amount of $150,000,000 worth of labor or the products of labor to pay those bonds than would have been required to pay them before.

Divide this sum of $150,000,000 by the estimated population and we find that it amounts, in round numbers, to $2 per capita or $10 to each family in the United States.

Since by the provisions of this bill silver dollars, silver certificates, greenbacks, and Treasury notes may be taken to the Treasury and gold demanded for them, the reserve fund may be readily reduced below the required amount, which would, as heretofore, destroy confidence and precipitate financial panic. The fact that the balance of trade is in our favor affords little protection, since the truth is that notwithstanding the large balances in our favor which have existed for some years past, yet our exportations of gold have been generally largely in excess of our importations, and in hard times have reached enormous figures. Taking, for instance, the year 1896, we exported $78,000,000 more of gold than we imported, and then the balance of trade was $102,000,000 in our favor.

Another objectionable feature of this bill, sufficient of itself to eternally damn it in the estimation of the intelligent masses of the American people, is that provision whereby the Secretary of the Treasury is clothed with absolute authority to issue and sell bonds of the United States at his pleasure. This officer, who is appointed by the President, is far removed from the people and is in a large measure absolutely independent of them; may at his pleasure, without let or hindrance, increase the nation's bonded indebtedness ad libitum. And the debt or debts thus created shall be paid, principal and interest, in gold, earned in the sweat and toil, principally, of the common people of the land—those who bear, as they have ever borne, an unjust proportion of the burden of taxation, who produce the nation's wealth in times of peace, and defend the honor of its flag in times of war.

Mr. Chairman, this bill precipitates a second battle of the standards. That gallant champion of the true principles of good government and the rights of the people, William Jennings Bryan, will again be the captain of our forces. Although in 1896 he was temporarily defeated, yet he went down before the guns of the enemy carrying with him, absolutely unsullied, his honor and his flag; but after the greater conflict of 1900, with banner proudly

streaming in the breeze and victory written upon its ample folds, he will mount over the prostrate form of Republicanism into the Presidency.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Chairman, there appeared in the Washington Post of the 13th the following:

BRYAN ON THE GOLD BILL—SAYS THE FINANCIAL MEASURE IS VERY BAD AND SHOULD NOT BE PASSED.

AUSTIN, TEX., *December 12.*

In an interview to-day William Jennings Bryan expressed himself upon the financial bill now before the House. He said:

"Following in the line of the President's message, Congress is at present considering a bill that is an extremely bad measure. I refer to the financial bill now under discussion in the House. This bill is a very bad one, indeed. It is a part of the gold-standard people's plan, and I hope that it will be defeated. It should certainly never be permitted to pass the House, because it is not in the interest of Democracy."

It is headed "Bryan on the gold bill." "Says the financial measure is very bad and should not be passed"—a very natural and proper heading and comment. On Thursday last in course of, indeed at the beginning, of his speech the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] quoted only the last sentence of this supposed interview and said, "We had better discuss the effect of this bill on the country rather than its effect on the Republican or Democratic party," which clearly shows the gentleman misconstrued the word "Democracy" as applied here, even if the interview had been genuine, and it is not, as I shall show. On yesterday a further misconstruction of the same sentence was made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], who neither read nor quoted the whole supposed interview, but contented himself in referring to it in this erroneous and partisan manner.

The real reason, the true reason, why you gentlemen are opposed to this bill has been stated in a sentence by that gentleman who has so successfully made demagogy a profession as a means of livelihood; who from his wanderings out in Texas has said, "This bill ought not to pass because it is not in the interest of the Democratic party." [Applause on the Republican side.] That is the only reason that has been assigned against this bill, assigned by your leader, whose high ideal, I trust, you appreciate. What an inspiring leadership that must be! A great question, affecting the financial standing of the United States and its citizens, to be voted down because it is not in the interest of the Democratic party!

To settle the matter I sent to-day the following message:

WASHINGTON, *December 16, 1899.*

Hon. W. J. BRYAN, *Austin, Tex.:*

Wire your interview on House currency bill few days ago; application of term "Democracy" being perverted here.

JNO. W. GAINES.

AUSTIN, TEX., *December 16, 1899.*

Hon. JOHN W. GAINES, *Washington, D. C.:*

Have seen report in morning paper, but do not recall any interviews which is the language criticised. Have said that bill is bad in every particular and should be defeated, but have not said that it would hurt the Democratic party or Democracy; believe it will injure the country, and it ought to drive out of the Republican party all sincere believers in bimetallism.

W. J. BRYAN.

[Laughter on the Republican side.]

Ah, gentlemen, you may laugh at his righteous condemnation of this unprecedented measure, but in this House in '95 you applauded his patriotic and withering onslaught on Mr. Cleveland's measure to issue $62,500,000 gold bonds, claiming, as he did, though erroneously, that it would save to the Government $16,000,000, but here you are now passing a gold measure actually giving untold millions to "syndicates" whom you denounced in 1895 as robbers.

Mr. Chairman, in 1895 Mr. Bryan stood on the floor of this House and opposed the issuing of gold bonds. He stood then where the genuine Democrat stands to-day. He stands to-day where the Republicans in this House do not stand. He stood then where, in 1895, the distinguished occupant of the chair [Mr. HEPBURN] stood, and your distinguished colleagues, the present Speaker, Mr. HENDERSON, and Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. LACEY stood, opposing gold bonds. He stood then where the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] stood, opposed to gold bonds; where the distinguished gentlemen from Minnesota [Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. MCCLEARY, and Mr. TAWNEY] stood, opposed to gold bonds; where the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] stood, opposed to gold bonds; where the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and his colleagues [Mr. HOPKINS and Mr. HITT] stood, opposed to gold bonds; where the distinguished gentlemen from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW, Mr. MAHON, and Mr. ROBBINS] stood, opposed to gold bonds; indeed, where every patriotic citizen, I believe, who was in the House at that time stood—against the issuance of gold bonds. And yet to-day we find these gentlemen deriding the position that this distinguished son of Nebraska has taken against this gold bill, and are themselves ready with the balance on that side to vote Monday, horse, foot, dragoons, for gold bonds now and hereafter. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman, during the debate on this question I asked the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] whether, if the Secretary of the Treasury exercised his power to redeem the silver dollars in gold, it would not produce a contraction of the currency to the extent of $482,000,000. He answered that it would not; that for the money that went into the Treasury the gold which went out would take its place in circulation. It seems to me that such an answer could not deceive anyone, and yet it drew applause from the Republican side of the House. Where on earth can the money be obtained to redeem the $482,000,000 unless the Treasurer has withdrawn it from circulation? When you take into consideration that $346,000,000 can likewise be redeemed under the bill and $89,000,000 of Treasury notes can be redeemed under the bill, making a total of $918,000,000, to say that that money can be redeemed and it does not contract the currency, when we know the currency must be contracted by the withdrawal of the gold in circulation for the purposes of making redemption, seems to make it plain and clear.

I asked the gentleman another question: Whether or not the double contraction would not occur in the event that this option to redeem in gold is exercised. I asked him whether, when there was a foreign demand for gold, the gold you drew from the Treasury would not be shipped to foreign countries and taken from the circulation, and he said that it would only occur in Democratic days, and there was no danger of that. The state of the European market to-day is such that not only gold is threatened to be expressed from this country, but the papers of this morning tell the story that there have been millions of dollars withdrawn from the subtreasury in New York for the purpose of shipping to Europe upon the *Lucania*, which sails to-day.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, I had expected that somebody on the other side would occupy five minutes in closing the debate, and that this side would have the same length of time, but it seems that an arrangement is made whereby there shall be five minutes on this side and fifteen minutes on the other side. Perhaps that is on the theory that three times as much time is needed on that side as on this, and if that is the theory we will not dispute it.

I had hoped, Mr. Chairman, that there would be sufficient progress made on this bill, and some disposition on the other side to permit amendments, or some amendments, that might be offered, but we are still on the first section. It is very evident that the gentlemen on that side who control the affairs of the committee, as well as those of the House, either are entirely content with the bill or fear that they may be unable to hold their own forces in line if an opportunity be given to vote upon amendments.

It is believed here (I will not say what is believed on the other side) that the deliberate purpose of this bill is to create a huge, far-reaching, all-pervading bank trust. The less discussion about that the better for those who propose it. Since the bill was brought forward as the measure of the agents of the banks, I had thought to offer an amendment which I will ask the Clerk to read, but not in the expectation that the gentlemen on the other side will vote for it or permit a vote to be taken upon it, because it might defeat the purpose which they have in view. I propose to offer this amendment to the eighth section, which has not been read.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment will be read in the gentleman's time for information:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding the following at the end of section 8:

"*And provided further*, That it shall be unlawful for any bank organized or doing business under this act, and for each and every officer, director, stockholder, employee, and agent of any such bank or banks, either directly or indirectly, to combine, cooperate, confederate, or collude, in any manner or by any means whatsoever, with any other bank or banks, or with any officer, director, stockholder, employee, or agent thereof, to increase or decrease the amount of coin or currency at any time in circulation, or to call in loans, restrict credit, or increase interest, or to put Government bonds or other securities upon the market, or to force or induce any issue of bonds by the United States or any officer thereof, or to depreciate in public estimation or in commerce or exchange any money of the coinage of the United States, or any currency issued by the United States, or any bond or bonds of the United States; and each and every person who shall willfully violate any of the provisions of this section shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by imprisonment in the penitentiary for a term of not more than ten years and shall be fined not to exceed $10,000; and each and every bank which, by any of its officers, directors, stockholders, employees, or agents shall be guilty of a violation of any of the foregoing provisions of this section, shall thereby forfeit its charter, and such forfeiture shall be declared by the Comptroller of the Currency, and the affairs of such bank shall be wound up under the provisions of existing law governing national banks, which are hereby made applicable to such cases."

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, an amendment something like that might be out of harmony with the bill. It certainly would tend to prevent, and I hope might prevent, the combinations for the creation of which, for the operation of which, for the fruition of which, I believe, and we believe, this bill is designed. If the purpose is not to give over control of the currency of the country to the national banks, and not merely to national banks individually, but to the aggregation of national banks, to the head center and chief director or dictator of the national banks, for the benefit of the banks and the Republican party, such an amendment ought not to be objectionable.

The Government is to issue no more currency; the national banks are to issue it all, and not a solitary check is put upon them

by this bill. They can combine, they can confederate, they can do anything they please, so long as they operate in the joint interest of themselves and the Republican party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the gentleman in charge of the time on the opposite side of the Chamber if any gentleman over there desires to be heard any further? I take it that this side has the right to the closing.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I answer very positively that that side has the right to five minutes, but the gentleman is seeking to get fifteen minutes, and I have informed him an objection would be made to that. Now let the debate proceed under the rule. I demand the regular order.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I think that throughout a week's discussion, under what all members must concede to have been a very equitable distribution of the time——

Mr. RICHARDSON. Oh, there is no complaint. We are perfectly satisfied with that. We only want to proceed under the rule of five-minute debate; that is all we ask. We are perfectly satisfied.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask, for information, whether or not an amendment is going to be offered providing for the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I demand the regular order, Mr. Chairman. I do not know how the gentleman can make such a request as that under the guise of a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. If no gentleman claims the floor the Chair knows of no rule by which he can be compelled to take it. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. I did not understand the suggestion of the Chair. I move that the committee rise and report the bill back to the House, if no gentleman wishes to speak.

Mr. PAYNE. The next thing in order is the reading of the next section.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I move that the committee rise.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I make the point of order that that motion is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair declines to entertain the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The whole effort is to enable one gentleman who is hoping to get fifteen minutes in which to close the debate to do so.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Regular order.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I insist upon the regular order.

Mr. PAYNE. The regular order is the reading of the next section.

The CHAIRMAN. If any gentleman claims the floor on this side, he will be recognized.

Mr. GROSVENOR rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] is recognized. [Cries of "Read!"]

Mr. GROSVENOR. When I get through with the few able remarks I have to make, then the Clerk can read.

Mr. Chairman, at the time we entered upon this discussion there was a fear expressed on the other side of the House that there would not be time enough to discuss the merits of the bill under consideration. We are rapidly approaching the end of a whole week devoted to this discussion.

We added to the time provided in the rule three hours of additional debate by meeting an hour earlier each day, and we also adopted night sessions, and there has been a large volume of debate. Now, the real question between the two sides is, upon the one side, the adoption of the gold standard, and upon the other side, the question of free and unlimited coinage of silver.

Now, I say with all sincerity, and at this late hour truth compels me to say that there has been mighty little advocacy of the free and unlimited coinage of silver on that side, and I begin to have the fear that in some way, by some devious process, the Democratic party is about to rehabilitate itself, to reorganize itself, and take up a new position in national politics.

I have seen the signs coming, and warned the gentleman from Tennessee that he would have as much as he could do to hold together his cohorts. I fear, and I am sincere in that statement, that there is a disposition to slightly pass over this burning question of the free and unlimited coinage of silver. Is it possible that in six days' time no man has presented a serious argument in favor of the future adoption of such a proposition as that?

I fear that a close examination of the RECORD will show that nothing of the kind has really been done. Just reconsider our debate. We have had the gentleman from Missouri, one gentleman from Missouri to-day, who has discussed the whole field of personal politics, and did it well, did it beautifully, and did it so well that I think it would be a good substitute for the platform of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the next election, if he could just be heard all the time, to deaden the memory of the people of the United States upon this question. [Laughter.]

And then came another gentleman from Missouri, late this afternoon, and he came into the field of American politics and got down to a description of the personal appearance of the Representatives on this side. I never retaliate when anybody makes a personal assault upon my personal appearance.

I know how distinguished and handsome I look [laughter], but if I were going to retaliate in kind, I would say, "I thank God, when a man looks at me, he is not reminded of that familiar sign, the skull and crossbones and death head on a poison jar in an apothecary shop." [Laughter and applause.] And I further rejoice that when he hears the sound of my voice he would not really think it is such a voice as suggested to the poet:

> Hark, from the tombs a doleful sound,
> Mine ears attend the cry.

[Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, out of this debate, in my judgment, has come a settled conviction on both sides of this House that the enactment of this measure into law, or something equivalent to it, will be but putting into a printed page of our statute books the policy that has governed and guided this country for nearly thirty years of administration, and that in doing this act the representatives of the American people will but heed the voice of the American people and do an act which will be declared an act well done by our masters who sent us here. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I did not exactly understand what was said by the gentleman from Ohio and some remarks made by gentlemen on the other side. Here we are at the close of this debate. The gentleman from Ohio, I think, says that he has not heard the free coinage of silver discussed on this side of the House. If he has not heard it discussed on this side of the House, it is simply because he has not been in his seat. Some of the ablest speeches that I have heard in the House have been made advocating that proposition.

But, Mr. Chairman, only one single section of this bill has yet been considered. The gentlemen in control of that side of the House have not perfected this bill. They have had read only a single, solitary section of the bill under the five-minute rule. Gentlemen did not want any amendment offered. The iron-clad rule precludes the offering of amendments from this side of the House for the free coinage of silver as a substitute to this bill. The gentleman himself in charge of the bill has not intended to have this bill read by sections in order that each section might be open for amendment.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. RICHARDSON (continuing). Because the gentleman knows that under the rule at any stage of debate after we have entered upon debate under the five-minute rule on any one section it was in order to close debate, and bring us to a vote upon the section, so that other sections could be considered.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Will the gentleman yield to a question? Does the gentleman desire to offer an amendment?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have not sought the floor at this late hour to offer an amendment. I want to answer what has been said. How could I offer an amendment? I have not had any opportunity to do so. The express terms of the rules would prevent me from doing so. We sought an opportunity through the Committee on Rules (that is, the minority members of it) at the beginning of this matter, when the special rule was adopted, to allow us to have an opportunity to offer amendments and a substitute.

Mr. DALZELL. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I can not yield now.

Mr. DALZELL. I will take my own time.

Mr. RICHARDSON. You can take your own time. If the gentleman had intended to consider proper amendments on any subject he could have stopped this debate at any point after we had entered upon the debate under the five-minute rule and could have brought us to a vote. And, Mr. Chairman, if he had desired, if he had wished to have brought the committee to a vote upon any section of this bill he could have done so; and he knows it.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Your amendment is in order now.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have offered no amendment now. I have no amendment that I desire to offer to this section. But why did you not have debate closed and proceed to the consideration of other sections, where we might offer amendments?

Mr. DALZELL. Why do not you have debate closed?

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] has just stated that he desires to offer an amendment, but to a subsequent section in this bill, and it would not be in order to offer it now, and the gentleman well knows it would not. He has conducted the debate premeditatedly and deliberately for the purpose of preventing amendments being offered to the subsequent portions of this bill [applause on the Democratic side], and the gentleman will not deny it. At one time this morning he did

arise and suggest that we close debate upon the first section of the bill, but he did not press it.

Consultations were held on the floor, and while I am not prepared to say, because I did not hear the result of the conversation, I judge from the results that the gentleman was dissuaded from his effort to get a vote on the section, and he has sat in his seat and permitted the debate upon one section of the bill to run through five long hours, and then comes in a hypocritical way—for it is hypocritical on that side of the House—and says "You can offer an amendment to some section of this bill."

It is too cheap, gentlemen, and it is beneath the dignity of a great political party. You did not intend to give us that opportunity. You tied our hands in the beginning by your cast-iron rule, and you tied them premeditatedly, and you have accomplished your purpose. We would have been glad to see some modification of the rule. You shaped the rule as you wanted it in the beginning. The gentleman from Ohio says we have not discussed the free coinage of silver. The question in this bill was not the free coinage of silver, but the establishment of the gold standard. When you accomplish that you destroy bimetallism in every form, and that is the end of free coinage of silver at any ratio.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I trust no member of this committee will be misled by the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] that this rule prevents the offering of amendments. On the contrary, it was in the power of any gentleman on that side of the House, at any time to-day, to call for the reading of the next paragraph and to offer an amendment, and when the gentleman stands in his place and talks about hypocrisy, I hurl back the charge, and I say that you did not dare, you dare not now, you would not if you had the opportunity, rise in your place any man on that side of the Chamber, and risk a vote upon a proposition to amend this bill and provide for the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. [Applause on the Republican side.] There is no man on that side of the House so much of a leader that he dare to rally his cohorts to follow him by an affirmative vote upon that proposition.

Mr. HILL. And the first section is the place to do it.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, that our week's controversy about this bill——

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I will hear what the gentleman has to say.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. I have an amendment, which I prepared as long ago as last night, to section 10, and I have been at my desk all day seeking an opportunity for——

Mr. DOLLIVER. I do not yield for that purpose, but I will yield and ask unanimous consent for any gentleman to offer an amendment in favor of the 16 to 1 proposition.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment to that effect.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. We challenge the gentleman from Iowa to ask unanimous consent for that proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has the floor.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield the floor for the purpose of any gentleman offering an amendment of that nature.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I ask unanimous consent to offer that amendment.

Mr. RICHARDSON. We all join in it.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I ask consent to offer an amendment for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. [Great applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SULZER. I offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman, for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. I ask to have the amendment read.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. Gentlemen will take their seats.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will first be in order. Gentlemen must take their seats.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I think I have the floor to offer the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York does not have the floor. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] has asked unanimous consent to so change the order as to admit of offering an amendment to this bill providing for the free and unlimited coinage of silver——

Mr. SULZER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will take his seat while the Chair is stating the proposition. The gentleman from Texas knows, I think, that this committee has no power to modify or change an order of the House. [Derisive cries on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DOLLIVER rose.

Mr. SULZER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] has the floor.

Mr. SULZER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. I understood——

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SULZER. One moment; wait until I state it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] has the floor.

Mr. SULZER. We were challenged to offer a bimetallic amendment. I have offered it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will take his seat. The Sergeant-at-Arms will seat the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SULZER. I called the bluff. [Laughter.]

The Sergeant-at-Arms bearing the mace appeared, and Mr. SULZER took his seat.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. I would like to ask the Chair whether, in the opinion of the Chair, the gentleman from Indiana understood beforehand that that was parliamentary law, and that you were compelled to rule that way under the special rule?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that the gentleman knows that that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. But it is a very good one.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] has the floor.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I will only say in yielding the floor for the purpose of allowing the committee to rise that as soon as the House resumes its session the opportunity will be given to these gentlemen both to offer that amendment and to vote upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. The hour of 5 o'clock having arrived, and that being the hour fixed for the rising of the committee, the committee will now rise.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HEPBURN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House without amendment.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a typographical error in the bill may be corrected. I refer to the word "July," in line 7, section 10, in the bill, on page 8. It should be "June." It is a mere reference to a law now in existence.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio rises to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LENTZ. I should like to know whether it is now in order to offer an amendment to section 10 to provide that any individual as well as association may offer bonds and receive currency for them.

The SPEAKER. That is not in order.

Mr. LENTZ. And if not in order, when will it be?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Ohio that that will not be in order.

Mr. OVERSTREET rose.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] was on his feet. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I ask unanimous consent that the rule under which we are now operating may be considered as amended to the extent that an amendment may be offered and voted upon providing for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. [Applause.]

Mr. DRIGGS. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] asks unanimous consent that the rule under which the House is operating may be amended so as to permit the offering of an amendment to provide for the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. Is there objection?

Mr. DRIGGS. Mr. Speaker, when the Greeks offer me jewels, I object, and I object now.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DRIGGS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry——

The SPEAKER. The hour of 5 o'clock having arrived, in accordance with the rule under which we are operating, the House stands adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of State submitting an estimate of appropriation for an additional translator—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a statement of the leases of the property of the United States, under authority of the act approved March 3, 1879—to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Carters Creek, Lancaster County, Va.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Assistant Quartermaster-General relating to the relief of the estate of Maj. Guy Howard—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a statement of the documents received and distributed by his Department for the year ended December 31, 1898—to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 4468) to authorize the city of Tucson, Ariz., to issue bonds for waterworks, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4469) to provide for the payment of claims for losses by old pioneers in the Territory of Arizona, during the years 1862 and 1863, by Indian depredations committed upon these pioneers while holding the mountain passes and trails for immigrants after they were abandoned by the soldiers of the United States Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 4470) granting pensions to certain officers and enlisted men of the Life-Saving Service, and to their widows, and minor children—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 4471) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Dover, in the State of New Hampshire—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 4472) for the erection of a public building at Hastings, Nebr.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BREAZEALE: A bill (H. R. 4473) to authorize the Natchitoches Railway and Construction Company to build and maintain a railway and traffic bridge across Red River at Grand Ecore, in the parish of Natchitoches, State of Louisiana—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLMSTED: A bill (H. R. 4474) relating to the terms and return days in the district and circuit courts of the United States for the eastern district of Pennsylvania—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 4475) to reimburse the State of Colorado for moneys expended in the suppression of Ute Indian depredations during the year 1887—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4476) providing for the appointment of members of the medical profession on the board of appeals in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, to whom shall be referred all medical and surgical questions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4477) to adjust the pensions of those who have lost limbs, or are totally disabled in them, or have additional disabilities—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4478) to adjust the pensions of those who have lost limbs or are totally disabled in them—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4479) to equalize the rate of pension of those who have lost limbs or are totally disabled in them—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 4480) to authorize the establishment of a life-saving station at or near Bogue Inlet, North Carolina—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURTON: A bill (H. R. 4481) to amend "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1899—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BARBER: A bill (H. R. 4482) to equalize the hip-joint and shoulder-joint pensions on the pension laws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 4483) for an increase in the Medical Department of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4484) to relieve agricultural and horticultural societies from taxation under the provisions of the war-revenue law of 1898—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 4599) to extend the laws relating to customs and internal revenue over the Hawaiian Islands ceded to the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 4557) for the erection of an equestrian statue of Maj. Gen. John Stark in the city of Manchester, N. H.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SULZER: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 84) declaring that a state of public war exists between Great Britain and the Transvaal Republic and that belligerent rights be accorded to the Transvaal Government—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 85) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to report a survey and estimate of Sabine Pass Channel—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PAYNE: A resolution (H. Res. 47) providing for the distribution of the President's message—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 4485) to compensate W. T. Godwin for transportation, rent, and supplies furnished United States authorities engaged in suppressing a riot in Harris County, Ga., in 1867—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 4486) to remove the record of dishonorable discharge from the military record of Louis Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARBER: A bill (H. R. 4487) for the relief of Richard Blay—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4488) to correct the military record of Charles Mohn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4489) to increase the pension of Solomon Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4490) for the relief of Emanuel Peck—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4491) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Derr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 4492) for the relief of Thomas Smith—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4493) for the relief of Archie Nunneley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4494) for the relief of Mary I. Chenoweth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKETT: A bill (H. R. 4495) granting a pension to George Saunders—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 4496) correcting the war record of V. W. Macfarlane, late of One hundred and sixty-fifth New York Regiment—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLAYTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 4497) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Michael Fox—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4498) to remove the charge of desertion against William Fudge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 4499) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen O'Rorke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: A bill (H. R. 4500) to grant a pension to John Heaney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 4501) granting a pension to Ellen Kenney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4502) removing charges against the record of James Delaney—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 4503) for the relief of Michael B. Ryan, son and administrator de bonis non of John S. Ryan, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 4504) granting an increase of pension to William Taylor, private, Company D, Fourteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 4505) granting an increase of pension to Lewis W. Graham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 4506) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Patrick English—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 4507) granting a pension to Edna Buchanan, of Columbus, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4508) directing the Secretary of the Interior to reissue a certificate of pension to Maj. Samuel R. Glenn, of Greensburg, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4509) granting a pension to Angeline Stark, of Aurora, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4510) granting a pension to Lewis Noble, of Risingsun, Ohio County, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALL: A bill (H. R. 4511) granting an honorable discharge to James Garrabrant, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-eighth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4512) granting a pension to Mary A. Woods, of Boalsburg, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4513) granting a pension to John Williams, of Clarion, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 4514) for the relief of Joseph Johnson, alias Sidney McKizzie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4515) granting a pension to Alexander Purdy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4516) granting a pension to Burwell Hinchman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4517) for the relief of Abel Patrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4518) increasing the pension of Alfred Botton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4519) granting a pension to Henry W. Rupright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 4520) increasing the pension of George H. French, Company A, Forty-eighth Wisconsin Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANE: A bill (H. R. 4521) for the relief of Maj. George A. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 4522) for the relief of Dr. Asa Wall, of Virginia—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LYBRAND: A bill (H. R. 4523) for the relief of Joseph Swisher, of Bellefontaine, Ohio—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4524) to correct military record of John Wash, Company E, Tenth Michigan Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4525) for the relief of W. S. Hammaker, of Findlay, Ohio—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4526) for the relief of Nicholas White and John White—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4527) to correct the military record of Peter Trossell, Company K, One hundred and thirteenth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4528) for the relief of K. G. Vaughan, of Urbana, Ohio—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4529) granting a pension to Jacob Feaster, late private, Fifth Ohio Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LESTER: A bill (H. R. 4530) for the relief of Jacob Cohen—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MESICK: A bill (H. R. 4531) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Cyrus Mills—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEVILLE: A bill (H. R. 4532) granting a pension to Patrick Welsh, of Shelton, in the State of Nebraska—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4533) for the relief of George W. McCloughan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLMSTED: A bill (H. R. 4534) granting a pension to Absalom Cunningham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4535) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John P. Leitzell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OTEY: A bill (H. R. 4536) for the relief of the legal representatives of Eliza A. Lloyd, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. QUARLES: A bill (H. R. 4537) for the relief of William Wheeler Hubbell—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4538) to pay just compensation to William Wheeler Hubbell for his invention of high-power steel guns, and improvements in other guns, made and adopted by the United States for its military service and Navy at the present time—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RIXEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 4539) for the relief of Griffith E. Thomas—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4540) for the relief of Robert E. Adams—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4541) for the relief of the estate of Francis and Thomas Coffer, deceased, late of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4542) for the relief of Mrs. Amelia A. H. Richards, administratrix of Felix Richards—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4543) for the relief of the legal representative of William Y. Dulin, deceased, late of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4544) for the relief of B. M. Yancey, Culpeper County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4545) for the relief of the legal representative of Alexander F. Dulin, deceased, late of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4546) for the relief of John H. Eggborn, of Culpeper County, Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4547) for the relief of the heirs of William Shreve, deceased, late of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4548) for the relief of James K. Skinker, of Fauquier County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4549) for the relief of the estate of William A. Bowen, deceased, late of Fauquier County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4550) for the relief of Sina Hughlett, of Fauquier County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4551) for the relief of the heirs of James M. Catlett, deceased, late of Fauquier County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4552) for the relief of the heirs of John H. Rixey, deceased, late of Fauquier County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RIDGELY: A bill (H. R. 4553) correcting the military record of George Beadnell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 4554) granting a pension to Margaret M. Badger, widow of the late Commodore Oscar C. Badger, United States Navy—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4555) granting a pension to Harriet Grannis—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPRAGUE: A bill (H. R. 4556) for the relief of Bertha M. Schimmelfennig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 4558) for the relief of Emma Howell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 4559) for the relief of the legal representatives of Merrick, Merrick & Cope—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 4560) granting a pension to Mrs. Lydia E. French—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 4561) to correct the military record of Sylvester Bartron, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Illinois Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4562) for the relief of Lois A. Fields, widow of George W. Fields, late of Company I, Forty-seventh Pennsylvania Militia Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4563) for the relief of Forrest E. Andrews, Company I, Sixth United States Artillery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4564) for the relief of Jacob Horning, late of Company A, One hundred and seventy-first Pennsylvania Infantry, and Company H, Fifteenth New York Engineer, Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4565) for the relief of Samuel H. Sentenne and Paul Boileau—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4566) for the relief of Helen Gillen, widow of Daniel F. Gillen, late captain Company I, Sixty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON: A bill (H. R. 4567) granting a pension to Elizabeth McGinniss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 4568) for the relief of Elias E. Barnes—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 4569) for the relief of the Mechanics' Institute of San Francisco—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WANGER: A bill (H. R. 4570) for the relief of the owner or owners of the barge *Charlie*—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4571) for the relief of Helen W. Mauck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4572) granting a pension to Helen V. Rorer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 4573) granting a pension to Napoleon B. Greathouse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4574) granting a pension to John Drew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4575) granting a pension to Albert H. Grayson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4576) for relief of John H. Walters—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4577) to increase the pension of John D. Craig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4578) for the relief of Fanny Pemberton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4579) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John W. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JETT: A bill (H. R. 4580) granting a pension to Amos Gustin, invalid son of Hugh A. Gustin, late corporal of Company G, One hundred and thirtieth Illinois Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4581) to increase the pension of John Purkapile—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4582) granting a pension to Emma T. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4583) for the relief of David Morgan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4584) to increase the pension of Charles Lapp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4585) for the relief of William B. Craig—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4586) for the relief of Andrew H. Jordan, alias Andrew Hannon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4587) granting a pension to Peter Francisco—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4588) granting a pension to Peter M. Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4589) to grant a pension to William H. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4590) granting a pension to William Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4591) for relief of Louisa M. Keppler—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4592) for relief of Isaac N. Enloe—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4593) for the relief of Sergt. James W. Kingon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4594) granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Helton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4595) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John R. Butler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4596) for the relief of Henry J. Fleming—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4597) removing the charge of desertion from the record of William Moore, Company I, Twenty-third Regiment Kentucky Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANSDELL: A bill (H. R. 4598) for the relief of the heirs of John T. Mason—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMSON: Petition of the estate of Timothy Markham, of Muscogee County, Ga., asking reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: Petition of the heirs of James F. Broyles, deceased, late of Greene County, Tenn., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. EMERSON: Paper to accompany House bill granting an increase in the Medical Department in the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GROUT: Petition of Branch 432, National Association of Letter Carriers, Montpelier, Vt., favoring the passage of the bill to equalize the salary of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of W. R. Mumford Company and others, of Chicago, Ill., favoring amendments to the interstate-commerce act—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER: Petition of old soldiers of Woodson County, Kans., in favor of a service pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLMSTED: Petition of the Harrisburg (Pa.) Board of Trade, urging legislation in aid of American merchant marine—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RIXEY (by request): Petition of Oliver Haws, of Loudoun County, Va., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Petition of Harriet Graun's to accompany House bill granting her a pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce, of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the enactment into a law of an act providing for the punishment as a misdemeanor of all defacement and misuse of our national flag—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Petition of Frank Boyette and others, asking for dental surgeons in the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: Petition of the brewing industry of the United States, asking for a reduction of the tax upon fermented liquors—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Petitions, etc., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah were laid on the Clerk's desk and severally referred to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case, as follows:

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: Petition of David Lloyd and others, of Brownville, Me.

By Mr. BURKETT: Petition of Nebraska Christian Missionary Society, Hastings, Nebr.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Belfast, Me.; A. B. Green, and others.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: Petitions of citizens of Raymore, Mo.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petitions of citizens of Marys Landing, Point Pleasant, Burlington, Manahawkin, and citizens of Burlington County, N. J.

By Mr. GILBERT: Petition of citizens of Harrodsburg, Ky.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petitions of J. W. Baer and others, of Boston, Mass.; citizens of Detroit, Mich.; Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Fort Sill, Okla.; W. E. Brooks, Theo. W. Curtis, and others.

By Mr. HEDGE: Petition of the Presbyterian Church of Mediapolis, Iowa.

By Mr. JACK: Petitions of citizens of Summersville, New Florence, Corsica, Apollo, Marion Center, Bellevernon, Westmoreland, Brush Valley, Reynoldsville, Presbyterian Church of Saltsburg, Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Apollo, and citizens of the Twenty-first Congressional district of Pennsylvania.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Resolutions of the New York Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

By Mr. KNOX: Petition of Charles H. Hartwell and others, of the Fifth Congressional district of Massachusetts.

By Mr. LENTZ: Petition of Alfred L. Eily and others, of the State of Ohio.

By Mr. MESICK: Petition of S. C. Robinson and others, of Clare, Mich.

By Mr. MILLER: Petitions of citizens of Waverly, Strong City, Osage City, Burlington, Americus, Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Douglas, and citizens of the counties of Osage and Wabaunsee, Kans.

By Mr. O'GRADY: Petition of the Federation of Churches and Christian Workers in New York City and J. B. Murray, of New York.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of H. E. Withington and Young People's Society of Epworth League of Fremont, Ind.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Petition of Hanson Powers and others, of Willard, N. C.

By Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS: Petition of W. H. Hart and others, of Benton, Ill.

By Mr. ZENOR: Petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Canton, Women's Missionary Society of Fredericksburg, and the Teachers' Association of Washington County, Ind.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *December 18, 1899.*

Prayer by Rev. JOHN F. HURST, D. D., bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Friday last; when, on motion of Mr. DAVIS, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

LEASING OF PUBLIC PROPERTY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to the act of Congress approved March 3, 1879, a report relative to the leasing by the Secretary of the Treasury, at his discretion, for a period not exceeding five years, of such unoccupied and unproductive property of the United States under his control for the leasing of which there is no authority under existing law; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

LANDS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in further compliance with a resolution of January 27, 1898, together with a communication from Col. Theodore A. Bingham, Corps of Engineers,

the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds of the city of Washington, together with a list of lots in the District of Columbia sold by the United States, covering the squares numbering from 247 to 760, inclusive; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

REVISION OF CRIMINAL LAWS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, transmitting a letter from the Commission to Revise and Codify the Criminal Laws of the United States, together with a report made by the commission under the act approved March 3, 1899; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

INTERNATIONAL PRISON COMMISSION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting the report of the Hon. Samuel J. Barrows, commissioner for the United States on the International Prison Commission, on "crimes, misdemeanors, and penalties" in the United States, etc.; which was read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the communication, with the accompanying papers, will be ordered to be printed, and the Chair judges that the communication should go to the Committee on the Judiciary. It will be so ordered, if there be no objection.

Mr. CHANDLER. Should not the papers go to the Committee on Printing before the order is made to print them?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the rule, but it is a rule which can be laid aside by unanimous consent. The Chair put it in that form—if there was no objection.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Chair have stated again the substance of the communication?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will again read the communication.

The communication was again read.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have no objection to the printing of the communication, but there may be very lengthy documents accompanying it which should not be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There are a large number of papers.

Mr. CHANDLER. I move that the communication and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is no necessity for such a motion. If the Senator objects to the printing, they will go to the Committee on Printing under the rules. That order will be made.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair presents resolutions adopted at a public meeting in the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that they be read.

Mr. HALE rose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions are very short.

Mr. HALE. How do the resolutions come before the Senate? Are they in the form of a memorial?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. They are directed to the President pro tempore of the Senate as a memorial to the Senate.

Mr. HALE. It is in the nature of a memorial?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. It is in the nature of a petition, I understand. As it is brief, I ask that it be read to the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will read the resolutions.

The resolutions were read, and referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico, as follows:

To the President of the United States Senate:

At a public meeting of the citizens of Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands, held on July 4, 1899, to celebrate the one hundred and twenty-third anniversary of the declaration of American independence, the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted, viz:

Whereas under and by virtue of the joint resolution of annexation the Hawaiian Islands have been annexed as a part of the territory of the United States and are now subject to the sovereign dominion thereof; and

Whereas the said resolution further provides that the municipal legislation of the Hawaiian Islands not inconsistent therewith nor contrary to the Constitution of the United States shall remain in force until the Congress of the United States shall otherwise determine; and

Whereas by the failure of the last Congress of the United States to enact necessary legislation at its late session much uncertainty exists as to the present status of the Hawaiian Islands in their relation to the Government, Constitution, and laws of the United States; and

Whereas this is deemed a fitting occasion for a public expression of opinion on the matter: Now, therefore, it is

Resolved, That this assemblage earnestly and respectfully asks of President McKinley and his advisers and the Congress of the United States to take such action as will cause the speedy extension of American Territorial laws to Hawaii.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Signed on behalf of citizens as above.

GEORGE W. SMITH,
Chairman of Public Meeting.
B. HAYWOOD WRIGHT,
Secretary.

HONOLULU, HAWAIIAN ISLANDS, *November 23, A. D. 1899.*

Mr. FORAKER presented resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of Holland-American citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring the extension to the Government of Great Britain and to those of the South African Republics of our good offices in the interests of peace; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. McMILLAN presented sundry petitions of citizens of Michigan, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HOAR presented the memorial of Henry S. Mackintosh and 207 other citizens of Massachusetts, remonstrating against any extension of the sovereignty of the United States over the Philippine Islands, in any event, and over any other foreign territory without the free consent of the people thereof; which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented sundry petitions of citizens of Massachusetts, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. QUARLES presented the petitions of Rev. James Churm and 56 other citizens of Waupun, of N. Matteson and sundry other citizens of Clintonville, M. C. Miner and 13 other citizens of Evansville, Mrs. Ellen S. Gray and 26 other citizens, of B. F. Hanks and 88 other inmates of the Wisconsin Veterans' Home, of Waupaca; J. T. Kidder and 41 other citizens of Ripon, L. E. Osgood and 112 other citizens of Sturgeon Bay, J. K. Kilbourne and 24 other citizens of Pewaukee, and of the Wells Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Racine, all in the State of Wisconsin, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented the petition of Rev. Thomas H. Drake and 49 other citizens of Oakland City, Ind., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PERKINS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of the Pacific Slope, remonstrating against the proposed reduction of duty upon prunes, nuts, preserved fruits, olive oil, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented sundry petitions of citizens of Corning, Lodi, Oakland, Ione City, Merino, Armada, Elsinore, and Willard, all in the State of California, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Santa Ana, Cal., remonstrating against the ratification of the so-called Jamaica treaty; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Manufacturers and Producers' Association of California, remonstrating against the ratification of the reciprocity treaties between the United States and France and Jamaica; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HANNA presented the petitions of Mathias Denton and sundry other citizens of Lancaster, Ohio, praying for the enactment of a per diem pension law; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MASON. I desire to present a number of petitions. I do not ask to have them published in the RECORD, except the heading of the first petition, taking not over a quarter of a column of printed matter. As it is reported to me, there are several hundred thousand signatures to the petitions I present, and they come from different parts of the United States. I was asked to introduce the petitions and have them referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, although the petitions are in form addressed to the President of the United States. I called the attention of my correspondent to this fact, and he said that others would be presented to the President, and he asked to have all these presented to the Senate and referred.

Mr. HALE. What are the petitions about? The Senator has not stated the purport of the petitions.

Mr. MASON. They are petitions expressing sympathy with the continued life of the South African Republic. I will not stop the Senate to have them read, but I ask that a copy of the first heading be printed in the RECORD, and that it and all the rest be sent to the Committee on Foreign Relations for information.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the matter indicated was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the President of the United States.

SIR: The undersigned, without regard to party, respectfully represent that Great Britain is trying to force upon our sister Republic—the South African Republic—the granting of naturalization and the right to vote to Uitlanders—that is, to foreigners—without the latter forswearing their original allegiance.

We protest against the United States, because of any sentimental or real "Anglo-American alliance," or for any reason, being placed in the position of indorsing the aforesaid action of Great Britain or of giving even moral support to any course of action that is wrong.

Such aid and support in this instance would amount to national suicide.

England has no right to interfere with the internal autonomy of the South African Republic.

Our great country must not forget Washington's advice to "observe good faith and justice toward all nations" (which includes the poor little South African Republic), and, further, that "against the insidious wiles of foreign influence the jealousy of a free people ought to be awake."

We fear that the violation of Democratic-Republican principles involved in aiding and countenancing England's oppression of the Boers will some time react to the injury of our own country.

And we are unwilling that our great country should, for any advantage however great, condescend to do wrong.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. HALE presented the petition of G. M. Parker and sundry other citizens of Gorham, Me., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition signed by Hon. George B. Myers, the county officials, and other citizens of Bollinger County, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation giving to various Missouri militia organizations a pensionable status; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. THURSTON presented petitions of 38 citizens of Leigh, 25 citizens of North Bend, 19 citizens of Atkinson, 22 citizens of Indianola, 11 citizens of Lincoln, 66 citizens of Sutton, 15 citizens of Norfolk, 17 citizens of Hartwell, and of 95 citizens of Omaha, all in the State of Nebraska, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GEAR presented a petition of 75 citizens of Iowa, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WOLCOTT presented sundry petitions of citizens of Colorado, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FRYE presented the petition of Rev. H. W. Conley and 5 other citizens of Bristol and Walpole, in the State of Maine, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENLISTMENT IN THE NAVY.

Mr. HALE presented a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, relative to enlistment in the Navy; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, to accompany the bill S. 1631, and ordered to be printed.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS BY NAVAL OFFICERS.

Mr. HALE presented a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, relative to the adoption of certain amendments to the act of January 25, 1895, authorizing certain officers of the Navy and Marine Corps to administer oaths; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, to accompany the bill S. 1632, and ordered to be printed.

CONSOLIDATION OF BUREAUS IN NAVY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. HALE presented a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, relative to the consolidation of the Bureaus of Construction and Repair, Steam Engineering and Equipment, and to provide for the distribution of the duties thereof; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, to accompany the bill S. 1630, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. PETTIGREW, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 762) granting settlers the right to make second homestead entries, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 718) to authorize the President of the United States to cause certain lands heretofore withdrawn from market for reservoir purposes to be restored to the public domain, subject to entry under the homestead law with certain restrictions, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. McBRIDE, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 386) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers on the public lands, and to provide for the repayment of certain fees, purchase money, and commissions paid on void entries of public lands," reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

EXAMINATION OF MONTHLY ACCOUNTS.

Mr. HAWLEY. I report back favorably, from the Committee on Military Affairs, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 4152) to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts by bureaus and offices of the War Department. It is a bill of considerable importance, and I am instructed to ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. HALE. It is a House bill.

Mr. HAWLEY. It is a House bill that has just come over. It is recommended by the Secretary of War, the Quartermaster-General, the Commissary-General, the Inspector-General, the Paymaster-General, the Surgeon-General, the Chief of Engineers, the Chief of Ordnance, and the Chief Signal Officer. The law requires that accounts of disbursing officers shall be examined within twenty days and sent over to the Auditor. You can imagine that with the enormous quantity of reports of disbursing officers it is impossible to get hold of those from Manila, Puerto Rico, and so on, and dispose of them within twenty days and give them the examination that is required before they are sent to the Auditor. The present law has been extended two or three times. This bill gives another extension. The present extension expires on the 4th of January next, and the War Department is very anxious to have a new extension. I ask that the bill be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the bill for the information of the Senate.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for examination of monthly accounts by the bureaus and offices of the War Department after the date of actual receipt and before transmitting the same to the Auditor for the War Department, as limited by section 12 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved July 31, 1894, is hereby extended from twenty days to sixty days for the period of one year from the date of the passage of this act.

Mr. HAWLEY. I will just read a word or two showing the necessity for the passage of the bill:

If we do not pass this bill the paymasters, the quartermasters, the commissaries, and all their bureaus will be held up until the accounts for the current month are passed. The Auditor for the War Department has notified the War Department that he will insist on a strict compliance with the twenty-day law. So unless we pass this bill it will be impossible for the paymaster to pay a regiment; it will be impossible for the commissary to furnish food; it will be impossible for the paymaster to furnish a tent or supplies of any kind until his accounts for that current month are passed.

It is a mere matter of form, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I introduce by request a bill authorizing the Delaware Indians in the Cherokee Nation to bring suit in the Court of Claims. I have not examined the bill enough to say whether I approve of it or not, and I wish it to be noted that I introduce it by request.

The bill (S. 1742) to authorize the Delaware Indians in the Cherokee Nation to bring suit in the Court of Claims against the United States, and the Mississippi Choctaws to sue the Choctaw Nation, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I introduce by request, without committing myself to its provisions, another bill.

The bill (S. 1743) to establish a division in the Treasury Department for the regulation of insurance among the several States, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 1744) for the relief of the Atlantic Works, of Boston, Mass.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1745) granting a pension to Patrick Moran; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. STEWART introduced a bill (S. 1746) to provide for the inspection of the boilers of the *Alvena* and *Ailsa;* which was read twice by its title.

Mr. STEWART. This is to take the place of a bill formerly introduced by me. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STEWART introduced a bill (S. 1747) to change the name of the "Potomac Insurance Company of Georgetown," and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. TURNER introduced a bill (S. 1748) to pay Carlos W. Shane for services rendered in the winter of 1847 and 1848 in the first Cayuse war; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1749) for the payment to Joshua T. Roberts of balance due for surveying public lands; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1750) to correct the military record of George Haskin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1751) for the relief of Thomas Waterworth; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally

read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1752) for the relief of James J. Wheeler;

A bill (S. 1753) granting a pension to Lieut. Col. Ogden Street;

A bill (S. 1754) granting a pension to Burton Packard;

A bill (S. 1755) granting a pension to John M. Core;

A bill (S. 1756) granting an increase of pension to Amos P. Curry;

A bill (S. 1757) to increase the pension of Samuel Hamilton; and

A bill (S. 1758) to increase the pension of Farnham J. Eastman.

Mr. WARREN introduced a bill (S. 1759) for the relief of William A. Richards, late surveyor-general of Wyoming; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 1760) for the relief of William H. Caine; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1761) granting a pension to Girard Welch; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McMILLAN (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1762) for the extension of Seventeenth street to the Walbridge subdivision of Ingleside; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1763) to amend the charter of the East Washington Heights Traction Railroad Company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1764) granting a pension to Julia Rowland Mizner; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1765) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. Gridley; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 1766) to restore the annuities of the Sisseton and Wahpeton bands of Dakota or Sioux Indians and of the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota bands of Sioux Indians, otherwise known as the Santee Sioux Indians; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1767) authorizing the cession of certain Sioux Indian land; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1768) pertaining to and regulating certain additional fees to be allowed to registers and receivers of United States land offices; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1769) granting an increase of pension to Henry Frank; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1770) to provide for the acquisition, purchase, construction, and condemnation by the United States of America of railroads lying in the Territories of the United States, the respective States, and the District of Columbia engaged in interstate commerce in carrying the mails, and to provide for the operation of said roads by the United States, and amending the act of Congress of February 4, 1887, entitled "An act to regulate interstate commerce," and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I wish to say in this connection that the bill has been prepared with considerable care, and that I was assisted in its preparation by David Lewis, a lawyer of Cumberland, Md., who is a very able investigator and writer upon this and kindred subjects. I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and I hope very much that the committee will take the matter up. I wish to secure a report, either favorable or adverse, upon it during the present session of Congress.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PETTIGREW subsequently said: I ask unanimous consent to have printed the paper which I send to the desk, to accompany a bill which I introduced this morning for the Government ownership of the railroads of the United States. The document which I wish to have printed is a speech delivered by Judge Walter Clark, of North Carolina, before the national convention of railroad commissioners at Denver last summer. I ask unanimous consent for the printing of the document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota asks unanimous consent for the printing of a document which he has sent to the desk and explained. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. QUARLES introduced a bill (S. 1771) granting a pension to Ellie Kee; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 1772) for the payment of the claim of M. M. Defrees for the construction of a sewer adjacent to the lands of the United States known as the "Arsenal grounds," in the city of Indianapolis, Ind.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1773) for the relief of the Marion Trust Company, administrator of the estate of Samuel Milliken, deceased, of Indianapolis, Ind.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BAKER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1774) to increase the pension of R. J. Petty;

A bill (S. 1775) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Arnett;

A bill (S. 1776) granting a pension to John Carr;

A bill (S. 1777) granting an increase of pension to Diana Clark;

A bill (S. 1778) granting a pension to Lydia M. Cutshall, and

A bill (S. 1779) granting a pension to Mary Jackson.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 1780) for the relief of William H. Wilson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PLATT of New York introduced a bill (S. 1781) granting a pension to Julia MacV. Henry; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1782) to issue warrants to acting assistant surgeons of the United States Army who served as medical officers either in the late civil war or the Spanish-American war or the Philippine rebellion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SULLIVAN introduced a bill (S. 1783) to provide for the construction of an interoceanic canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

Mr. SHOUP introduced a bill (S. 1784) to provide a code of civil procedure for the district of Alaska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. BEVERIDGE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1785) granting an increase of pension to Wallace Foster;

A bill (S. 1786) granting an increase of pension to Fielding Marsh;

A bill (S. 1787) granting an increase of pension to Maj. Joseph P. Pope; and

A bill (S. 1788) granting a pension to Margaret Porter.

Mr. BEVERIDGE introduced a bill (S. 1789) for the relief of William F. Denmure; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 1790) granting additional homestead certificates to the Missouri Home Guards; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1791) for the relief of Montgomery Patton; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. In connection with the bill, I present the petition of Montgomery Patton, of West Plains, Mo., together with the affidavits of Col. Robert Lindsay, Robert L. Lindsay, David Gunton, John W. Speck, and Joseph Huff. I move that the bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Claims.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. THURSTON introduced a bill (S. 1792) granting a pension to Martha C. M. Fisher; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1793) granting a pension to Elizabeth McGaw; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1794) for the relief of Fred Weddle; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1795) for the relief of Flora A. Darling; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 1796) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca P. Quint; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 1797) to found a branch soldiers' home in California for the relief and support of invalid and discharged soldiers of the Army of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1798) referring to the Court of Claims certain claims arising in California in the years 1846 to 1848; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1799) granting the use of the Lake Tahoe Reserve to the University of California; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1800) providing for the retirement of John Briercliff Brown, light-house keeper at Point Bonito, and providing for the payment to him of $40 per month; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 1801) providing for submitting the claims of the loyal Creeks, being the soldiers who enlisted in the Federal Army, loyal refugees, and freedmen of said Creek tribes of Indians, to the United States Senate for arbitration, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. That bill has been before the Committee on Indian Affairs formerly, and I suppose the Senator from Arkansas desires to have it referred there now.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS introduced a bill (S. 1802) granting a pension to Lucy Pratt Estabrook; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HANNA introduced a bill (S. 1803) granting an increase of pension to Richard L. Titsworth; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1804) granting an increase of pension to Rida B. Haskell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1805) to correct the military record of Levi G. Fessenden; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MASON introduced a bill (S. 1806) for the classification of clerks in the first and second class post-offices; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1807) fixing the salary of the postmaster at Washington, D. C.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1808) for the relief of Thomas Sherman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1809) for the relief of Charles Joseph Francis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1810) granting a pension to Julia Watkins Brass;
A bill (S. 1811) granting a pension to Maria Wilder Ragan;
A bill (S. 1812) granting a pension to Georgia R. Demarest;
A bill (S. 1813) granting a pension to Louisa M. Keppler;
A bill (S. 1814) granting a pension to Isaac N. Strickler;
A bill (S. 1815) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel J. Esseu:
A bill (S. 1816) granting an increase of pension to John Rahler;
A bill (S. 1817) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Houghton;
A bill (S. 1818) granting an increase of pension to J. F. Wade;
A bill (S. 1819) granting a pension to Anna Schuman;
A bill (S. 1820) granting a pension to F. M. Wallis;
A bill (S. 1821) granting a pension to James Anderson;
A bill (S. 1822) granting an increase of pension to Isaac M. Shup;
A bill (S. 1823) granting a pension to Johann G. Fleckles;
A bill (S. 1824) granting an increase of pension to William Rolley;
A bill (S. 1825) granting a pension to John K. Ely;
A bill (S. 1826) granting a pension to Caroline Frances Spiegel;
A bill (S. 1827) granting a pension to Lizzie Blackmore;
A bill (S. 1828) granting a pension to Emma T. Martin;
A bill (S. 1829) granting a pension to Frank J. Melton;
A bill (S. 1830) granting a pension to Charles L. Randall;
A bill (S. 1831) granting a pension to Henry H. Lewis;
A bill (S. 1832) granting a pension to Morris B. Evans;
A bill (S. 1833) granting a pension to Mary B. Christopher;
A bill (S. 1834) granting a pension to Joshua Ricketts;
A bill (S. 1835) granting an increase of pension to Emma Ochs (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 1836) granting a pension to Michael McGrail.

Mr. MASON introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 1837) for the relief of John E. Thompson;
A bill (S. 1838) to correct the military record of John S. Dodge, alias Charles E. Leslie;
A bill (S. 1839) to correct the military record of Thomas Wayne;
A bill (S. 1840) to grant an honorable discharge to Richard P. Gardner;
A bill (S. 1841) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Adolph Dincklage;
A bill (S. 1842) for the relief of Joseph Bowman; and
A bill (S. 1843) for the relief of Lorenzo F. Brown.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 1844) granting a pension to Hattie M. Smith; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 1845) for the relief of Frank J. Burrows; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1846) revising and amending the statutes relating to patents; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1847) making Chester, Pa., a subport of entry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1848) granting a pension to Mary Idle;
A bill (S. 1849) granting a pension to Sarah Stoner;
A bill (S. 1850) granting an increase of pension to James C. Delaney;
A bill (S. 1851) granting an increase of pension to L. H. Peck (with an accompanying paper); and
A bill (S. 1852) granting a pension to Robert M. McCormick.

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 1853) to correct the military record of Hays Gaskill;
A bill (S. 1854) to correct the military record of Christopher McDonald;
A bill (S. 1855) for the relief of Robert McClermont (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 1856) to correct the military record of Jesse H. Wagner.

Mr. ELKINS introduced a bill (S. 1857) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Hall; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1858) granting a pension to Edgar Travis;
A bill (S. 1859) granting an increase of pension to I. H. Duval;
A bill (S. 1860) granting a pension to E. G. Welch;
A bill (S. 1861) granting a pension to N. A. Mann;
A bill (S. 1862) granting a pension to Charles H. Dollman; and
A bill (S. 1863) granting a pension to Annie E. Eads.

Mr. ELKINS introduced a bill (S. 1864) for the relief of the heirs of Benjamin Wilson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. WOLCOTT introduced a bill (S. 1865) for the relief of Lewis B. Brasher; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HOAR introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 41) for the relief of August Bolten, of New York City, and Gustave Richelieu, of Boston, Mass., American seamen; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PROCTOR introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 42) authorizing the purchase of a bust of Justin S. Morrill and of Daniel W. Voorhees for the building of the Library of Congress; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. MASON introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 43) granting a life-saving medal of the first class to Lieut. Fidelio S. Carter, of the United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

THANKS OF CONGRESS TO COMMODORE SCHLEY AND OTHERS.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I introduce a joint resolution, which I ask to have read at length and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The joint resolution (S. R. 44) tendering the thanks of Congress to Commodore Winfield S. Schley, United States Navy, and to the officers and men of the squadron under his command, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the thanks of Congress and the American people are hereby tendered to Commodore Winfield S. Schley, of the United States naval force operating against the Spanish forces in Cuban waters, for highly distinguished conduct in conflict with the enemy, as displayed by him in the destruction of the Spanish fleet off the harbor of Santiago, Cuba, July 3, 1898.

SEC. 2. That the thanks of Congress and the American people are hereby extended, through Commodore Schley, to the officers and men under his command for the gallantry and skill exhibited by them on that occasion.

SEC. 3. That the President of the United States be requested to cause this resolution to be communicated to Commodore Schley, and, through him, to the officers and men under his command.

Mr. HALE. The joint resolution should be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution has been twice read; and if there be no objection, it will be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I offered a similar resolution at the last session, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and, I think, has never been reported back. I supposed, of course, at this new session of Congress the resolution would have to be again introduced in order to receive the consideration of that committee, and I reintroduce it for that purpose.

POLICY REGARDING THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. BACON. I introduce a joint resolution, which I ask may be read in full and then lie upon the table subject to call hereafter.

The joint resolution (S. R. 45) declaring the purpose of the United States with reference to the Philippine Islands was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, First. That the Government and people of the United States have not waged the recent war with Spain for conquest and for the acquisition of foreign territory, but solely for the purposes set forth in the resolution of Congress making the declaration of war, the acquisition of such small tracts of land or harbors as may be necessary for governmental purposes being not deemed inconsistent with the same.

Second. That in demanding and in receiving the cession of the Philippine Islands it is not the purpose of the Government of the United States to secure and maintain permanent dominion over the same as a part of the territory of the United States or to permanently incorporate the inhabitants thereof as citizens of the United States or to hold said inhabitants as vassals or subjects of this Government; and the United States hereby disclaim any disposition or intention to exercise permanent sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said islands.

Third. That the United States having accepted the cession of the Philippine Islands from Spain, and having by force of arms overthrown all organized authority and opposition to the authority of the United States therein, the duty and obligation rest upon the United States to restore peace and maintain order throughout the same; to protect in said islands the enjoyment of life and property and the pursuit of lawful avocations; and to continue such protection until the power and duty to maintain said protection shall have been transferred and intrusted by the United States to a government of the people of said islands deemed capable and worthy to exercise said power and discharge said duty.

Fourth. That when armed resistance to the authority of the United States shall have ceased within said islands and peace and order shall have been restored therein, it is the purpose and intention of the United States, so soon thereafter as the same can be practically and safely accomplished, to provide the opportunity and prescribe the method for the formation of a government by and of the people of the Philippine Islands, to be thereafter independently exercised and controlled by themselves, it being the design of the United States to accord to the people of said islands the same measure of liberty and independence which have been pledged by the Congress of the United States to the people of Cuba.

Fifth. That when a stable government shall, by the method aforesaid, have been duly formed and erected in said islands, competent and worthy in the judgment of the United States to exercise the powers of an independent government and to preserve peace and maintain order within its jurisdiction, it is the purpose and intention of the United States, reserving to themselves only such harbors and tracts of land as may be needed for coaling stations or other governmental purposes, to transfer to said government, upon terms which shall be reasonable and just, all rights and territory secured in said islands under the treaty with Spain, and to thereupon leave the dominion and control of the islands to their people.

Sixth. That when said government has been thus formed and set up in the Philippine Islands and approved by the United States, it is the design and intention of the United States, through treaties with the leading nations of the world, to secure the guaranty of the continued independence of the same.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia asks that the joint resolution lie on the table, subject to his call. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

WILLIAM E. WOODBRIDGE.

Mr. KYLE. On December 7 I introduced the bill (S. 794) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of William E. Woodbridge for compensation for the use by the United States of his invention relating to projectiles, for which letters patent were ordered to issue to him March 25, 1852. The bill was referred to the Committee on Claims by mistake. It should have gone to the Committee on Patents. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Claims be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Patents.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

STATEMENT OF SPECIAL PENSIONS.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, at my request the Commissioner of Pensions has furnished me with a statement showing the special acts of Congress passed since March 4, 1861, granting pensions to commissioned officers and to the widows of commissioned officers of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

This statement is very exhaustive and very interesting. It shows the name of the officer or of the widow, the rank and service, the date at which the pension was granted, the rate of the special act, and the rate granted by the general laws, provided any pension had been granted.

I feel sure that this is a statement, Mr. President, that will interest every Senator as well as the country to a considerable extent, and I therefore ask that it be printed as a document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GALLINGER subsequently said: Mr. President, a little time ago I presented a statement from the Commissioner of Pensions showing special acts granted from 1861 to the present time to officers and widows of commissioned officers of the Army and Navy and Marine Corps, and asked that it might be printed as a document. Since presenting it the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] has suggested to me that it would be well to have this document include all special acts, if any were granted prior to 1861, including all the wars preceding the civil war. Agreeing with the Senator that it would be a wise thing to do, I ask that the document may lie upon the table for the present and not be printed as I requested.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The former order will be rescinded, and the document will lie on the table for the present.

REMOVAL OF CHARGE OF DESERTION.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, I desire, as it is somewhat opportune, in connection with the document just presented by the Senator from New Hampshire, to make a brief statement.

On the 6th of this month I introduced a brief bill, the purport of which is "to grant an honorable discharge to all soldiers who were at any time in the actual service of the United States, and who have for more than thirty years been held to be ineligible for such honorable discharge by reason of any charge of desertion which may stand against them."

That bill was handed to me as I came into the Senate. Upon a glance at it I supposed it was probably right, and so I introduced it. However, I had my attention called to its provisions since, and I desire to say that I am not for the bill. I have so notified members of the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom it was referred. The understanding, I think, is that the committee will probably report adversely upon it, and I shall be entirely agreeable to that report. The bill is broader than I supposed it was when I introduced it, and really I had not read it except at a glance, as I came in, to know what its provisions were.

I wish to say further that in the same mail I had a number of letters from soldiers who are charged with desertion and whose cases seemed to be very meritorious, and at the time it occurred to me that possibly some general bill might be passed by Congress to give us some relief from the numerous bills which come to us for special relief and relieve meritorious cases. But upon investigation I find the door would be thrown so wide open that it would be very unfair to the Government as well as unfair to the soldiers who had not the charge of desertion against them.

Mr. COCKRELL. I desire to say simply that I believe it was on the same day the Senator from Illinois introduced the bill that he spoke to me about it. He said that he had introduced, by request, the bill, and asked me, as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, to look into it, and I gave expression to my views, which seemed to be entirely different from what the Senator from Illinois had anticipated. He supposed it was a bill for the relief of real soldiers who were suffering under disabilities with regard to just claims.

Mr. CULLOM. The Senator makes the exact statement, and I am very much obliged to him.

Mr. HAWLEY. The Senator from Missouri can give me the date, perhaps, but a few years ago we reported a bill and it was passed through both Houses, making very liberal arrangements for relieving soldiers from the charge of desertion. In substance, the bill required that it should be shown there was no purpose really to desert the service.

Mr. COCKRELL. Just as the Senator from Connecticut has said, Congress has been very liberal. We have passed, I think, three separate acts extending the classes of meritorious cases which have been developed from time to time.

Mr. HAWLEY. Leaving it in the discretion of the War Department.

Mr. COCKRELL. Leaving it in the discretion of the War Department. We believe that the laws are amply sufficient now to afford relief to every soldier who was not really a deserter and justly chargeable with desertion, except in a few isolated cases which are exceptional and which the Committee on Military Affairs reports favorably when the case is clearly presented. In the law now existing there is an express provision which bars the bounty jumpers that infested the country and feasted off of it, so that no bounty jumper can, under the existing law, be relieved.

PAYMENT OF STENOGRAPHER.

Mr. CHANDLER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the stenographer employed to report the arguments before the Committee on Privileges and Elections concerning the right of Matthew S. Quay to a seat in the Senate from the State of Pennsylvania be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

CLAIMS OF LETTER CARRIERS.

Mr. MASON. I submit the following resolution which I send to the desk, together with certain accompanying papers, which I desire to have sent to the Attorney-General with the resolution after it shall have been adopted.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Attorney-General be directed to transmit to the Senate a list showing the amounts which have been reported by the commissioners of the Court of Claims or found by the court as representing services actually performed by letter carriers in excess of eight hours per day under the act of May 24, 1888, entitled, "An act to limit the hours that letter carriers in cities shall be employed per day," but which have been excluded or excepted from judgment for the sole reason that the same were barred by the statute of limitations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois requests that certain papers accompanying the resolution may be referred with the resolution to the Attorney-General. In the absence of objection that order will be made.

POLICY REGARDING THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. TILLMAN. I offer a resolution which I wish to have read and then lie upon the table. I will call it up at some future time and address the Senate upon it.

The resolution was read, as follows:

First. *Resolved*, That, in the words of the Declaration of Independence, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

Second. That under the Constitution of the United States the Federal Government has no power to rule over colonial dependencies, but it is restricted in its operations to States as integral parts of the Union and to Territories intended for future States.

Third. That the expansion of our commerce has not been and can not be dependent upon the adoption of a policy of imperialism involving the subjugation and annexation of Asiatic colonies, but would in the end be hindered by such a policy.

Fourth. That we are opposed to the retention of the Philippine Islands by the United States, and that it is our purpose to consent to the independence of the Filipinos as soon as a stable government shall be established by them, and toward the prompt establishment of such government we pledge our friendly assistance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina asks that the resolution lie upon the table subject to his call.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will be printed and lie on the table subject to the call of the Senator from South Carolina.

INTEROCEANIC CANALS.

Mr. McBRIDE. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Librarian of Congress be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the Senate the sources of information in print in regard to the Nicaragua and other interoceanic canals.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President——

Mr. HALE. Let the resolution be again read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will again read the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The resolution was again read.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I rose with the question in my mind whether we had authority to direct the Librarian to report to us, but I suppose that we have, and so I make no objection to the resolution. I only suggest that I presume he would furnish the information on the request of any Senator.

Mr. HALE. It occurs to me, Mr. President, that this is an innovation. I do not remember in my service here of the Senate directing the Librarian to furnish information.

The practical trouble would be in the Librarian selecting and discriminating as to what he should transmit to the Senate. The Librarian is the custodian, not of documents and communications relating to a special branch of the Government but of an immense number of books upon an immense number of subjects, and I should think, Mr. President, that it would be better that this resolution should be referred to the Committee on the Library, in order that they may consider how much of a task they shall impose upon the Librarian. Shall the Librarian, under this resolution, begin and study up the subject, read books, and prepare an article and submit to us a thesis upon a certain subject-matter—because, if that is so, that certainly is an innovation—or shall he transmit to us every book from which a citation can be made throwing light upon this subject? That would be an innovation.

The more I think of it as I am speaking, Mr. President, the more it occurs to me that before we do this the resolution should be referred to the Committee on the Library, who may take it and see just what is contemplated, see how it should be restricted in its scope, if necessary, and whether we should begin to embark in inquiries upon the Librarian to furnish us with the knowledge which his books contain upon any particular subject-matter.

Therefore, I hope the Senator who offered the resolution—I do not know who it was—will let it go to the Committee on the Library for that purpose, or otherwise I shall make that motion.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not understand that this resolution calls for an article from the Librarian or a discussion upon the subject of canals or the furnishing books or opinions of any kind. I understand that it simply asks the Librarian to give us a list of the works relating to the subject-matter. There is no other way of getting at the bibliography of the subject, so far as we command it in the Library of Congress, except through the Librarian. A list of the works relating to the subject is all, I understand, the resolution calls for. It is simply to make the Library available for Senators and Members of the House of Representatives who desire to get at books relating to that topic. I do not understand that the resolution goes any further than that. If I am wrong, the Senator from Oregon will correct me.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I suggest that the resolution be again read, Mr. President.

The Secretary again read the resolution.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, that goes very far—all "the sources of information in print." I should think the Senator offering the resolution had better recast it or send it to the Committee on the Library and let them report in connection and in conference with him.

I move the reference of the resolution to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, before that is done, I want to make a remark or two. I wish to call the attention of my colleague on the committee to the fact that the late Committee on the Nicaraguan Canal at the last session made a report on all the sources of information—that is to say, all the papers that had their origin in any action of either of the two Houses upon this subject—and that report is in print. Outside of that, of course, there is a very broad, an almost inexhaustible field of literature, which would include, I suppose, the writings of men in all the different enlightened countries of the world, for the subject has been before the world for a couple of centuries. The resolution, it occurs to me, is unnecessarily broad in that particular. I think if the Senator will inquire of the superintendent of the document room and examine that document he will find there a full statement—I think it is complete—of all of the action taken in Congress and all the reports that have been to Congress on the subject of the Nicaraguan Canal. It is quite a complete document, and I think it will answer his purpose if he will take the pains to examine it.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I should like to make a suggestion to my honorable friend from Oregon [Mr. McBRIDE] which, I think, will meet everybody's difficulty and answer his purpose, that instead of directing the Librarian of Congress to make this report, we direct the committee on that subject to make that report to the Senate. They can command the services of the Librarian for all purposes that they choose and it will save any difficulty. On any committee of Congress requesting the Librarian to furnish information, he would do so if it were possible. I suggest, therefore, to amend the resolution so as to direct the Committee on Interoceanic Canals to give that information to the Senate and furnish everything that is desired on the subject.

Mr. McBRIDE. I accept the proposed amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], but I desire to say that I do not accept it because I believe there is any impropriety in the resolution as framed and presented. On the contrary, it is in line with resolutions introduced here day by day calling for information within the power of the officer addressed to give. I see no impropriety whatever in addressing this resolution to and directing the Librarian of Congress to give us a list of the books and documents, so far as he has knowledge, relating to this great subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McBRIDE] accepts the modification of the resolution suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR]. The resolution as modified will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interoceanic Canals be, and it is hereby, instructed to report to the Senate the sources of information in print in regard to the Nicaragua and other interoceanic canals.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the resolution as modified.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon whether or not the Librarian of Congress has declined to furnish this information at the personal request of any Senator? I think we are all of us from time to time in the habit of calling upon the Librarian of Congress for information, and I think, no matter who has been the Librarian, we have always found a very quick, ready, and intelligent response to all such requests. If, however, we are going to make this in the nature of an official call, what measure of responsibility is to be attached if the Librarian leaves

a book out? It may become a question of how far it is within the line of his public duties to furnish detailed reports upon a resolution of Congress. I ask if this information has been asked for and declined?

Mr. McBRIDE. I take pleasure in saying that I have not asked for the information called for from the Librarian of Congress, nor has he at any time declined to answer a reasonable request.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am very glad to hear that, and I have no objection to this resolution; but at the same time I know the Librarian would with equal readiness furnish any Senator with the same information if it had been personally requested.

Mr. McBRIDE. Permit me to add that the resolution does not imply any delinquency or discourtesy on the part of the Librarian of Congress to any Senator.

Mr. HAWLEY. I suggest the inquiry, Has this proposition been submitted to the present Librarian or to his experienced predecessor, Mr. Spofford, who is still connected with the Library? I would not think of passing such a resolution without asking them. I understand, however, that this resolution has been referred to the committee.

Mr. McBRIDE. In further answer to the suggestion of my friend the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT], and the suggestion of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] that this resolution is an innovation, I ask that the letter of transmittal, which I send to the desk, of a list of books relating to Cuba, which was voluntarily sent to Congress by the Librarian of Congress in 1898, be entered in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that order will be made.

The letter of transmittal referred to is as follows:

FEBRUARY 22, 1898.

SIR: I have the honor to inclose a report containing a list of all the works relative to the island of Cuba, as well as references to collated works and periodicals upon that subject now in the Library of Congress.

Also a bibliography of maps of Cuba now in the department of maps and charts.

The general interest felt in Cuban affairs will, it is believed, give this report special value.

The catalogue of books was prepared by A. P. C. Griffin; the bibliography of the maps by P. Lee Phillips, members of the Library staff.

Yours, very truly,

JOHN RUSSELL YOUNG,
Librarian of Congress.

Hon. GEORGE P. WETMORE,
Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. PETTIGREW. It seems to me the method selected by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McBRIDE] for securing this information is entirely proper. If he had sent a private inquiry to the Librarian he would have had this information; but if the resolution is passed by the Senate the information will be printed and we shall all have it. For my part I should be very glad to receive from the Librarian a list of books in the Library upon this subject, and I think it would be proper to follow this resolution by another asking for a list of all books and documents that are in the Library with regard to the islands we have recently acquired. I hope some Senator will offer such a resolution. I therefore hope that the resolution will be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

CLAIMS AGAINST SPAIN.

Mr. HOAR. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations be directed to inquire and report to the Senate at an early day the character and conditions of claims by citizens of the United States against the Government of Spain outstanding at the beginning of the late war, and what, if any, provision has been made for their payment, and to inform the Senate, if no such provision has been made, what remedy should be pursued by the claimants.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I desire to say that I have shown the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations. Applications are beginning to come to me by letter, as I suppose they are to other Senators, from persons having various old claims against Spain. A large part of the information required in the resolution was given by a report drawn by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations at the last session. This resolution merely inquires as to all the claims. I thought it the better course, under the circumstances, to address the inquiry to the committee rather than to the Department of State, as the committee will be less hampered by any difficulties with foreign countries in regard to the matter.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

EMPLOYMENT OF STENOGRAPHER.

Mr. FRYE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce be, and the same is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary, to report such hearings as may be had on bills pending before said committee, and to have the same printed for the use of the committee, and that such stenographer be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

SENATOR FROM NEBRASKA.

Mr. THURSTON. I rise to a question of privilege. I present the credentials of William V. Allen, appointed a Senator of the United States from the State of Nebraska by the governor of that State, and ask that they be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska presents the credentials of Hon. William V. Allen, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

STATE OF NEBRASKA, EXECUTIVE CHAMBER.

This is to certify that on the 13th day of December, 1899, William V. Allen was duly appointed by me a Senator from the State of Nebraska to represent said State in the Senate of the United States to fill vacancy caused by the death of the Hon. Monroe L. Hayward, said appointment to be in full force and effect until his successor is elected by the legislature of the State of Nebraska.

Done at Lincoln this 13th day of December, A. D. 1899.

[SEAL.] W. A. POYNTER.

By the governor:

W. F. PORTER, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, there will be no objection to the swearing in of Senator Allen when he appears under that certificate; but the certificate is not correct in that it undertakes to define the term for which Senator Allen will hold—"until his successor is elected by the legislature of the State of Nebraska." The appointment should be only until the next meeting of the legislature of Nebraska. It is not, perhaps, a matter of much moment; but as the Senator is likely to appear at any time to be sworn in, and I have no objection to his being sworn in, that clause in the appointment must be regarded as void and of no effect.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be received and placed on file.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HALE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President——

Mr. HALE. If the Senator from Alabama desires to take the floor, I will withdraw the motion for the present.

Mr. MORGAN obtained the floor.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that the first bill upon the Calendar may be taken up and considered. If it occupies any time, I will not press it.

Mr. MORGAN. I ask the Senator from New Hampshire not to press his request at this moment. I desire to submit some remarks on a joint resolution which I wish to have referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CHANDLER. Does the Senator object to having this bill taken up first? It is in order.

Mr. MORGAN. No; it is not in order till 2 o'clock. There are reasons——

Mr. CHANDLER. Of course the bill I desire to have passed is not so important as the speech the Senator from Alabama is about to make. So I shall not make any objection.

INJURIOUS TRADE COMBINATIONS.

Mr. MORGAN. I ask the Secretary to read Senate joint resolution No. 37.

The Secretary read the joint resolution (S. R. 37) to prohibit combinations between corporations to control interstate commerce and transportation, introduced by Mr. MORGAN December 11, 1899, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That any contract, agreement, or combination between two or more corporations which has for its purpose the control of the price of anything which is the subject of or enters into interstate commerce, or the cost of the transportation thereof, so as to increase the same at any place or locality in the United States, or to discriminate in favor of or against any class of dealers, traders, or consumers of such articles within the United States, is contrary to the public policy of the United States, and every such contract, agreement, or combination is illegal and is prohibited.

SEC. 2. That any person being a member of any corporation, or acting as its agent, officer, or employee, who enters into any such contract, agreement, or combination, or knowingly assists in the execution or performance thereof, is guilty of a misdemeanor and is liable to prosecution for such offense on information or by indictment in the district court of the United States in and for the district in which such offense is committed; and on conviction thereof such person shall be fined in a sum not less than $100 and not to exceed $5,000, and also be imprisoned for a term, in the discretion of the court in which such conviction is had, not less than one month and not greater than two years.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, the evils that are called "trusts" in our political parlance are all included in the effort to destroy or to prevent healthy competition in trade, whereby a monopoly is secured to some powerful person or combination of persons. What one man can fairly do, single handed or in partnership with others, in controlling trade is usually legitimate, whatever amount of money is used or whatever credit is employed in conducting the business. That is private business, not conducted under any separate or exclusive privilege granted by the

Government, and the personal risk and labor required in its prosecution are a sufficient check upon those who embark in it to keep the business within reach of control through free competition.

This is not always true in commercial experience, but it seldom happens that capital concentrated in private hands is able to usurp or monopolize a particular line of trade so as to destroy competition. It has not often been the task of the legislator to deal with this phase of monopoly, if it can be properly so called; but for centuries it has been the onerous duty of lawmakers and judges to relieve trade and commerce against unjust and oppressive combinations.

Trades associations, guilds, and corporations have been the usual means of creating combinations of men for such purposes, and when it is found to be necessary for the general welfare to check or to suppress them the courts and the lawmakers have endeavored to prevent the agreements under which such combinations have been formed.

This is the object of the joint resolution under discussion, which is supported as to its purpose by the legislative and judicial history of the Anglo-Saxon race since it was organized for self-government.

It may be said with confidence that there exists in what we call the common law of England, imported into this country, a penal law for the repression of every trust and monopoly that affects injuriously the people of our States and our interstate commerce. But our Federal courts are not fully empowered with the broadest common-law jurisdiction, and statutes are needed to reach the evils that injuriously affect the scope and the freedom of our commercial dealings, which are exclusively subject to regulation by Congress. Any State could enact a law in the terms of this joint resolution to regulate trade among its own people, and Congress can do this to regulate interstate and foreign commerce.

I admit that this joint resolution, if it is enacted into a statute, can only operate to prevent the combinations it describes as between natural persons when they directly relate to or affect interstate commerce, and I insist that Congress has the right, and it is a high duty, to declare that any such combinations are illegal and may be declared criminal when they injuriously affect commercial intercourse between the States. As to corporations, the powers of government are more extended. Natural persons are under many disabilities as to their capacity to make valid agreements, and these may be added to by restrictions imposed by the statute laws for the common good. Contracts that are valid when made are carefully protected against legislative impairment, but the capacity to make contracts is largely subject to legislative control.

Sunday contracts and others that are contra bonos mores, such as the sale of lottery tickets, and contracts that violate the public policy, such as selling liquors to Indians, may be prohibited by statute and punished criminally, although they are made by persons who are otherwise competent to contract. They are contrary to the public policy.

Every State has the right to declare its public policy and to prohibit its violation by the subsequent making of such agreements, even by natural persons.

This joint resolution does not deal with natural persons except such as hold a responsible relation to corporations, as their officers, agents, employees, or owners.

A corporation differs in its rights and powers from a natural person by the breadth of the whole distance that divides a creature from its creator. The natural person, as a citizen of the United States, has all civil rights and powers that are not prohibited by law, while a corporation can have no existence aside from the express grant of the laws and no rights or powers that are not given to it by law.

Corporations also owe specific duties to the State or the public, which are expressed in their charters or are implied in the purposes for which they are created, such duties being the real consideration for which their franchises are granted. They must find authority in their charters or in the general laws for every act they perform and every agreement they make, and they must not cease to perform the duties to the public which are expressed or implied in the purposes for which they were created. Two fatal objections to the acts and agreements of corporations, which can not be waived or condoned, are that they are ultra vires, or that they are contrary to the public policy.

I believe it is true that in the vast number of corporations that exist or have existed in the United States not one of them has been given the authority, express or implied, to do what is prohibited in this joint resolution. It may be assumed with entire safety that any such agreement as is described in the resolution would be ultra vires as to all the contracting parties.

Neither the United States nor any State has ever attempted to place corporations on a footing with natural persons as to their capacity to enter into agreements or as to the scope of the agreements they might make. Corporations are strictly limited to the powers expressly conferred on them by law and those to be justly inferred from such express grants.

No decision can be found in our courts that sustains the doctrine that a corporation can lawfully act in excess of its actual powers conferred by law, even so far as to bind itself by estoppel. So strong and uniform are the rulings of all the courts on this point that this doctrine has become a settled public policy, and its violation may be denounced by statutes as a crime without creating any conflict with recognized rights or privileges.

When the act of a corporation is not only ultra vires, but violates a public policy established in morals or in law, there can be no doubt of the power of the Government to punish such an act or to prevent it. If an act when performed by a corporation is in violation of law or public policy, a conspiracy or agreement to do such an act may be prohibited by a penal statute; and if such an act is ultra vires, it may be declared by statute as being for that reason violative of public policy.

The capacity of corporations for evil when they exceed their charter powers or abuse their franchise to be a corporation is so great that such abuses may so grow into intolerable public wrongs that the State is compelled to repress or prevent; and when the evil becomes national, so that the State which grants the franchise can not repress it, it is the right of the United States, as a general proposition, to denounce and punish it. This may be done even where natural persons violate the public policy, as in the case of the issue of lottery tickets, and all who deal in or circulate them are made liable to punishment.

A like principle applies to the propagation of diseases, the adulteration of food, the circulation of treasonable or obscene literature, the poisoning of waters, the destruction of game and food fishes, the holding of intercourse with foreign governments to promote civil discord, and many other matters that are made evil because they are prohibited or because they are in their nature evil.

Every government exercises these powers for the protection of its own citizens and of the inhabitants of its country.

Corporations have no powers, certainly none that are expressly granted them, that are invaded by any authorized legislation for the protection or promotion of the general welfare.

In legislating for the control of corporations, if no such charter powers are injuriously affected, the field is clear; it is free from difficulty, and we may proceed with confidence.

In the vast and rapidly increasing number of corporations that threaten to absorb every important line of business of our country and to sink the individuality and personal enterprise and responsibility of men in the artificial character of officers and agents of these artificial persons, each corporation having a grant of special privileges and the means of indefinite perpetuity, there has grown up a danger to the people and the Government that is becoming so actual, so real, and so overpowering as to excite general alarm.

The courts are beginning to use their powers, aided and directed by imperfect statutes, toward the resistance of this vast and threatening movement.

In this great and patriotic task the Supreme Court of the United States has assumed advanced and firm ground, especially in the class of cases that involve interferences with interstate commerce, while in some of the States the courts are finding excuses for the violation of the general public policy in the supposed sanctity of the contract rights of the corporations or in the inability to connect the particular transaction with the purpose of creating monopolies or of placing unjust restrictions on trade and commerce.

In the case of United States *vs.* Britton (108 U. S., 199) it is held that there are no common-law offenses against the United States. A conspiracy or agreement, therefore, that violates the public policy of the United States in relation to interstate commerce is not punishable as an offense until it is defined and made penal by an act of Congress. The conspiracy must be evidenced by some act that is prohibited by the statute before it can be reached, as the laws regulating interstate commerce now stand. If the direct effect of the vicious agreement is to affect injuriously interstate commerce, it violates the Constitution and is void; but if it is made criminal by statute, it is punishable.

If Congress or the courts have the power to annul contracts that in terms are interferences with the freedom of interstate commerce, Congress has the power to denounce and punish as crimes contracts that have that purpose. And Congress can impute that purpose to any contract between two or more corporations that relates to dealings between them as to articles that enter into interstate commerce, if the intent is found to exist, and can punish them for entering into such an agreement. To declare that such agreements are criminal, whether they are express or are proven by a series of facts, and to punish the evil intent as a statutory crime, is a necessary power of Congress which can alone protect interstate commerce from such abuses.

The power of Congress to define and punish such offenses is affirmed in United States *vs.* Fox (95 U. S., 670).

The laws of the United States for the protection of interstate commerce afford ample civil remedies for that purpose, but they stop short of the necessary provisions to declare the public policy and to prohibit and punish the intent and the purpose to violate those laws.

To attempt to do a forbidden act does not imply its completion

or any definite progress toward its completion. Any effort or endeavor to effect it meets the requirements of the law. (United States *vs.* Quincy, 6 Peters, 455; United States *vs.* Riddle, 5 Cranch, 110.)

The entering into a contract for such a purpose is an attempt, an effort to do what the statute denounces as being illegal, and is within the legislative power of the United States. For the purpose of showing the exclusive Federal jurisdiction over this subject and of properly ascertaining the power of corporations to make such agreements as are denounced in these resolutions as being illegal and the power of Congress over corporations, I will present some extracts from decisions of our Supreme Court, some of them being of recent date, and will read extracts from some other authorities.

These cases, which I will presently read, establish broadly the Federal authority to protect interstate commerce against State laws and against the alleged rights of persons and corporations to regulate or to affect it injuriously.

They emphasize the rules of law that are older than our Government, and maintain them in full vigor, which confine corporations strictly to the powers granted to them; which forbid any transgression by them of the public policy; which hold all their powers subordinate to legislative control with reference to public policy and the general welfare, and forbid any infraction by them of the laws of the land.

On these foundations we can safely rest such penal statutes as will save the country from a systematic usurpation of rights and powers by corporations such as no other country ever experienced.

I read from Cook on Corporations:

The State may compel all insurance companies to make detailed reports as to their condition. (Eagle Insurance Company *vs.* Ohio, 153 U. S., 446 [1894].) The legislature may prescribe the conditions upon which corporations or individuals may carry on the insurance business, provided it does not discriminate in favor of its own citizens. (State *vs.* Stone 118 Mo., 338 [1893].) The legislature may enact stringent regulations of insurance business and prescribe a forfeiture of charter for noncompliance. (Chicago Life Insurance Company *vs.* Needles, 113 U. S., 574 [1885].) The legislature may make it a criminal offense for agents of insurance companies to pay rebates on insurance premiums. (People *vs.* Formosa, 131 N. Y., 478 [1892].)

The case of Chicago Life Insurance Company *vs.* Needles, cited in the note, decides that the right of a corporation to exist and the authority to conduct the principal business for which it was created "were granted, subject to the condition that the privileges and franchises conferred upon it should not be abused or so employed as to defeat the ends for which it was established and that, when so abused or misemployed, they might be withdrawn or reclaimed by the State in such way and by such modes of procedure as were consistent with law. Although no such condition is expressed in the company's charter, it is necessarily implied in every grant of corporate existence."

This case, in its further discussion by the court, covers the whole subject of the right to regulate and control corporations and thoroughly sustains the resolution now under discussion.

I will read some further extracts from that decision. The opinion was delivered by Mr. Justice Harlan:

Equally implied, in our judgment, is the condition that the corporation shall be subject to such reasonable regulations, in respect to the general conduct of its affairs, as the legislature may from time to time prescribe, which do not materially interfere with or obstruct the substantial enjoyment of the privileges the State has granted, and serve only to secure the ends for which the corporation was created. (Sinking Fund Cases, 99 U. S., 68, 70; Commonwealth *v.* Farmers' and Mechanics' Bank, 21 Pick., 542; Commercial Bank *vs.* Mississippi, 4 Sm. & Marsh, 497, 503.)

If this condition be not necessarily implied, then the creation of corporations, with rights and franchises which do not belong to individual citizens, may become dangerous to the public welfare through the ignorance or misconduct or fraud of those to whose management their affairs are intrusted. It would be extraordinary if the legislative department of a government, charged with the duty of enacting such laws as may promote the health, the morals, and the prosperity of the people might not, when unrestrained by constitutional limitations upon its authority, provide, by reasonable regulations, against the misuse of special corporate privileges which it has granted and which could not, except by its sanction, express or implied, have been exercised at all.

I read from a note to Cook on Corporations:

Congress has the power to reduce railroad rates charged by an interstate land-grant railroad for the transporting of soldiers. (Atlantic, etc., Railroad *vs.* United States, 76 Fed. Rep., 186 [1896].) A legislative reduction of railroad rates is constitutional, though thereby the road will pay but 1½ per cent on its original cost and only 2 per cent on its bonded debt, there being no evidence as to the "water" in the bonds or of the cost of the road to the present owner. Rates may be regulated to correspond to gross earnings. (Dow *vs.* Beidelman, 125 U. S., 680 [1888].) Railroad rates may be reduced by statute and made to depend upon the length of the road. (Dow *vs.* Beidelman, 49 Ark., 325 [1887].)

In Railway Companies *vs.* Keokuk Bridge Company, 131 U. S., page 384, the court say:

The outlines of the doctrine of ultra vires and the reasons on which it rests have been clearly stated in previous judgments of this court.

The reasons why a corporation is not liable upon a contract ultra vires—that is to say, beyond the powers conferred upon it by the legislature, and varying from the objects of its creation as declared in the law of its organization—are: First. The interest of the public that the corporation shall not transcend the powers granted. Second. The interest of the stockholders that the capital shall not be subjected to the risk of enterprises not contemplated by the charter, and therefore not authorized by the stockholders in subscribing for the stock. Third. The obligation of everyone entering into a contract with a corporation to take notice of the legal limits of its powers.

These three reasons are clearly brought out in the unanimous judgment of this court delivered by Mr. Justice Campbell in the leading case of Pearce *vs.* Madison and Indianapolis Railroad (21 How., 441), in which it was held that a railroad corporation was not liable to be sued upon promissory notes which it had given in payment for a steamboat received and used by it and run in connection with its railroad.

So it has been repeatedly adjudged by this court that a lease made by one railroad corporation to another, either of which is not expressly authorized by law to enter into the lease, is ultra vires and void. (Thomas *vs.* Railroad Company, 101 U. S., 71; Pennsylvania Railroad *vs.* St. Louis, etc., Railroad, 118 U. S., 290, 630; Oregon Railway *vs.* Oregonian Railway, 130 U. S., 1.)

In McCormick *vs.* Market Bank, 165 U. S., pages 49 to 50, the court say:

When the corporation is created by a charter granted by the legislature, any person dealing with it is bound to take notice of the terms of the charter and of the general laws restricting or defining the powers of the corporation. (Pearce *vs.* Madison and Indianapolis Railroad, above cited; Zabriskie *vs.* Cleveland, etc., Railroad, 23 How., 381, 398; Thomas *vs.* Railroad Company, 101 U. S., 71; Pennsylvania Railroad *vs.* St. Louis, etc., Railroad, 118 U. S., 290, 630.) In like manner when the corporation is formed under general laws, by the recording or filing in a public office of the required articles of association and certificate, any person dealing with the association is bound to take notice of the documents recorded or filed, upon which, as authorized and controlled by the general laws, depend the existence of the corporation, the extent of its corporate powers, and its capacity to act as a corporation. (Oregon Railway *vs.* Oregonian Railway, 130 U. S., 1, 25; Central Transportation Company *vs.* Pullman Car Company, above cited.)

* * * * * * *

It is settled by a long series of decisions of this court that a lease of a railroad by one railroad corporation to another which is beyond the corporate powers of either is unlawful and void, and can not be made good by ratification or estoppel so as to sustain an action upon the lease; that this is so not only when the lease is ultra vires of the lessor corporation and therefore open to the objection of disabling it from performing those duties to the public, its performance of which was the consideration upon which it received its charter from the State, but even if the lease is ultra vires of the lessee corporation only, and therefore not open to that particular objection. (Thomas *vs.* Railroad Company, Pennsylvania Railroad *vs.* St. Louis, etc., Railroad, Oregon Railway *vs.* Oregonian Railway, and Central Transportation Company *vs.* Pullman's Car Company, above cited; St. Louis, etc., Railroad *vs.* Terre Haute and Indianapolis Railroad, 145 U. S., 393, 404.)

In Addyston Pipe Company *vs.* The United States, United States Opinions, recently handed down, the court says:

It is undoubtedly true that among the reasons, if not the strongest reason, for placing the power in Congress to regulate interstate commerce was that which is stated in the extracts from the opinions of the court in the cases above cited.

The reasons which may have caused the framers of the Constitution to repose the power to regulate interstate commerce in Congress do not, however, affect or limit the extent of the power itself.

In Gibbons *vs.* Ogden (supra) the power was declared to be complete in itself and to acknowledge no limitations other than are prescribed by the Constitution.

Under this grant of power to Congress that body, in our judgment, may enact such legislation as shall declare void and prohibit the performance of any contract between individuals or corporations where the natural and direct effect of such a contract will be, when carried out, to directly, and not as a mere incident to other and innocent purposes, regulate, to any substantial extent, interstate commerce. (And when we speak of interstate we also include in our meaning foreign commerce.) We do not assent to the correctness of the proposition that the constitutional guaranty of liberty to the individual to enter into private contracts limits the power of Congress and prevents it from legislating upon the subject of contracts of the class mentioned.

The power to regulate interstate commerce is, as stated by Chief Justice Marshall, full and complete in Congress, and there is no limitation in the grant of the power which excludes private contracts of the nature in question from the jurisdiction of that body. Nor is any such limitation contained in that other clause of the Constitution which provides that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. It has been held that the word liberty as used in the Constitution was not to be confined to the mere liberty of person, but included, among others, a right to enter into certain classes of contracts for the purpose of enabling the citizen to carry on his business. (Allgeyer *vs.* Louisiana, 165 U. S., 578; United States *vs.* Joint Traffic Association, 171 id., 505, 572).

But it has never been, and in our opinion ought not to be, held that the word included the right of an individual to enter into private contracts upon all subjects, no matter what their nature and wholly irrespective (among other things) of the fact that they would, if performed, result in the regulation of interstate commerce and in the violation of an act of Congress upon that subject. The provision in the Constitution does not, as we believe, exclude Congress from legislating with regard to contracts of the above nature while in the exercise of its constitutional right to regulate commerce among the States. On the contrary, we think the provision regarding the liberty of the citizen is, to some extent, limited by the commerce clause of the Constitution, and that the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce comprises the right to enact a law prohibiting the citizen from entering into those private contracts which directly and substantially, and not merely indirectly, remotely, incidentally, and collaterally, regulate to a greater or less degree commerce among the States.

We can not so enlarge the scope of the language of the Constitution regarding the liberty of the citizen as to hold that it includes or that it was intended to include a right to make a contract which, in fact, restrained and regulated interstate commerce, notwithstanding Congress, proceeding under the constitutional provision giving it the power to regulate that commerce, had prohibited such contracts.

* * * * * * *

As has frequently been said, interstate commerce consists of intercourse and traffic between the citizens or inhabitants of different States, and includes not only the transportation of persons and property and the navigation of public waters for that purpose, but also the purchase, sale, and exchange of commodities. (Gloucester Ferry Company *vs.* Pennsylvania, 114 U. S., 196-203; Kidd *vs.* Pearson, 128 id., 1, 20.)

If, therefore an agreement or combination directly restrains not alone the manufacture, but the purchase, sale, or exchange of the manufactured commodity among the several States, it is brought within the provisions of the statute. The power to regulate such commerce—that is, the power to prescribe the rules by which it shall be governed—is vested in Congress, and

when Congress has enacted a statute such as the one in question any agreement or combination which directly operates not alone upon the manufacture but upon the sale, transportation, and delivery of an article of interstate commerce by preventing or restricting its sale, etc., thereby regulates interstate commerce to that extent and to the same extent intrenches upon the power of the National Legislature and violates the statute. We think it plain that this contract or combination effects that result.

* * * * * *

We have no doubt that where the direct and immediate effect of a contract or combination among particular dealers in a commodity is to destroy competition between them and others, so that the parties to the contract or combination may obtain increased prices for themselves, such contract or combination amounts to a restraint of trade in the commodity, even though contracts to buy such commodity at the enhanced price are continually being made. Total suppression of the trade in the commodity is not necessary in order to render the combination one in restraint of trade. It is the effect of the combination in limiting and restricting the right of each of the members to transact business in the ordinary way as well as its effect upon the volume or extent of the dealing in the commodity that is regarded. All the facts and circumstances are, however, to be considered in order to determine the fundamental question, whether the necessary effect of the combination is to restrain interstate commerce.

The joint resolution which I have the honor to present may not cover the entire evil, which is becoming so great and so alarming to the country. The words in which I have drawn the proposed statute may not be such as are most apt to repress this great national wrong. Whatever law we shall enact for this purpose will doubtless be improved hereafter by further legislation. The evil I am attempting to repress is already so great that it threatens to overmaster the governments, State and Federal.

Its chief promoters are corporations chartered by the States. If the corporations are stopped, or even checked in this dangerous work, I believe that the courts will take courage and put an end to it.

The combinations of corporations, already formed and now forming with tremendous activity, have for their purpose the monopolistic control of the food and raiment of the people, and all of the staple commodities, such as sugar, salt, grain, fruits, iron, steel, copper, tin, petroleum, lumber, and many leading lines of manufactures, and of the railroads that transport them. It can not be a distant period when the progress of these combinations will unite most of the great corporations in their respective classes into central bodies of control that will be able to dictate measures for their benefit to State legislatures and to Congress.

Under the pretense of economic administration they pile up great incomes for their officers and price the labor of their employees to suit their convenience; having no rivals to create competition in the labor market, their boasted service of the public through a reduction of prices is all at the expense of the just reward of labor and of the personal independence of the men whose skill and fidelity to their trust earns them their more than princely incomes.

I desire to know whether this Congress will respond to the almost despairing demand of the people for relief against the unlawful tyranny of the corporations?

Now, Mr. President, I wish to exhibit to the Senate and the country some object lessons of very recent occurrence and of somewhat concealed history which show the necessity for denouncing contracts of corporations as crimes when they are made for the purpose of controlling interstate commerce.

The Addyston Pipe and Steel Company and all the other corporations that were parties to the contract that the Supreme Court has denounced, rebuked, and annulled in the case of that company against the United States have formed a new company, under a New Jersey charter, under a new name.

They are of the class of wise men who, "foreseeing the evil, hide themselves." They saw that the Supreme Court would decide their contract illegal, and, being determined to work out their plan in disguise, the same men who owned and controlled the corporations in Tennessee and Alabama organized the New Jersey corporation. This is the fact, though it may not appear on the face of the papers.

Then, to consummate their illegal purpose, the New Jersey company has bought out all the property of the Alabama and Tennessee companies, real and personal, or has taken over all their property under long leases, and will conduct the same business at the same places and under the same arrangement and divide the profits—the spoils is the true word—on the same basis of distribution as is provided in the contract that the Supreme Court was then about to declare and has since declared to be illegal.

It is the same old jackass with the lion's skin thrown over him.

It is a crafty attempt at the evasion of the law, by uniting all the parties in interest, under the supposed shelter of a New Jersey corporation, who, under the guise, can transact the same business that the Supreme Court has declared illegal, through resolutions of a board of directors, without the necessity of entering into a contract with any persons outside the new corporation. All these corporations in Alabama and Tennessee, thus swallowed up and now sleeping in the belly of the New Jersey corporation, hold a relation to the public, to the State, and to interstate and foreign commerce which forbids them to surrender their property and their business to the New Jersey corporation, and their contract of sale, or lease of their property of every kind, of their business, and the control and management of their furnaces and manufactories is void, as being ultra vires and against public policy.

If this joint resolution had been enacted when this new deal was made, these men would have been amenable to criminal prosecution, and they would not have ventured on this artful and presumptuous defiance of the law of the land.

These are not such private corporations as can sell out their property and charter privileges to other persons. The public, the State, has claims on them of a high order for the full execution of their powers and duties.

They, with others, are the pioneer developers of the iron and coal mines that these States rely upon for the support of a vast interstate and foreign commerce. No more vital question ever touched the interests of a State and no subject over which the constant supervision and control by the State is more needed for public reasons and for the protection of mines and miners.

Neither Tennessee nor Alabama ever intended that their mines of coal and iron should be opened and worked by corporations of New Jersey.

If that is ever done, it will only be done with the consent of the legislatures of those States, not otherwise. They have not consented, and they will never consent, to such foreign control of their most vital interests.

Before I read the decision of the Supreme Court touching this point, in the case of the Central Transportation Company *vs.* Pullman Car Company, I will point out another recent combination in Alabama of the same kind to show the rapid and dangerous growth of this usurpation of powers by corporations and the necessity for its repression. A number of corporations in Alabama, chartered for the purposes of opening mines and working furnaces, in which coal and iron are the products, have created a New Jersey corporation to take over all their properties and to conduct their business with a capital of $20,000,000.

They have sold their property of every kind to the New Jersey company, which is only the counterfeit presentment of all their rights, powers, properties, and holdings, without any duties or responsibilities to the State of Alabama. This sale covers a vast area of land and many mines, furnaces, and short lines of railway. It is a monster monopoly, that had to leave Alabama to find a home and shelter in New Jersey, and a large corporation in which the governor of Alabama has, or had, a large amount of stock, leads the procession.

Now I read from the case of the Central Transportation Company against the Pullman Car Company (139 U. S., beginning at page 48) certain extracts that apply particularly to the remarks I have just uttered:

The clear result of these decisions may be summed up thus: The charter of a corporation, read in the light of any general laws which are applicable, is the measure of its powers, and the enumeration of those powers implies the exclusion of all others not fairly incidental. All contracts made by a corporation beyond the scope of those powers are unlawful and void, and no action can be maintained upon them in the courts, and this upon three distinct grounds—the obligation of everyone contracting with a corporation to take notice of the legal limits of its powers; the interest of the stockholders, not to be subjected to risks which they have never undertaken; and, above all, the interest of the public, that the corporation shall not transcend the powers conferred upon it by law.

A corporation can not, without the assent of the legislature, transfer its franchise to another corporation and abnegate the performance of the duties to the public imposed upon it by its charter as the consideration for the grant of its franchise. Neither the grant of a franchise to transport passengers nor a general authority to sell and dispose of property empowers the grantee, while it continues to exist as a corporation, to sell or to lease its entire property and franchise to another corporation. These principles apply equally to companies incorporated by special charter from the legislature and to those formed by articles of association under general laws.

By a familiar rule every public grant of property or of privileges or franchise, if ambiguous, is to be construed against the grantee and in favor of the public, because an intention on the part of the Government to grant to private persons or to a particular corporation property or rights in which the whole public is interested can not be presumed, unless unequivocally expressed or necessarily to be implied in the terms of the grant; and because the grant is supposed to be made at the solicitation of the grantee, and to be drawn up by him or by his agents, and therefore the words used are to be treated as those of the grantee; and this rule of construction is a wholesome safeguard of the interest of the public against any attempt of the grantee, by the insertion of ambiguous language, to take what could not be obtained in clear and express terms. (Charles River Bridge *vs.* Warren Bridge, 11 Pet., 420, 544-548; Dubuque and Pacific Railroad *vs.* Litchfield, 23 How., 66, 88, 89; Slidell *vs.* Grandjean, 111 U. S., 412, 437, 438.)

This rule applies with peculiar force to articles of association which are framed under general laws, and which are a substitute for a legislative charter, and assume and define the powers of the corporation by the mere act of the associates, without any supervision of the legislature or of any public authority. (Oregon Railway *vs.* Oregonian Railway, 130 U. S., 26, 27.)

* * * * * *

The validity of the plaintiff's incorporation, as well as its power to make that indenture, however, depends not solely upon the original charter and the general laws under which it came into existence, but mainly upon a special act of the legislature of Pennsylvania of February 9, 1870. By this act the validity of the charter for the object therein named was clearly recognized; the charter was extended for ninety-nine years, nearly fivefold the period for which the corporation was or could have been formed under general laws; and the corporation was expressly empowered to double its capital stock and "to enter into contracts with corporations of this or any other State for the leasing or hiring and transfer to them, or any of them," of its "railway cars and other personal property."

The plaintiff, therefore, was not an ordinary manufacturing corporation, such as might, like a partnership or an individual engaged in manufactures, sell or lease all its property to another corporation. (Ardesco Oil Company *vs.* North American Oil Company, 66 Penn. St., 375; Treadwell *vs.* Salisbury Manufacturing Company, 7 Gray, 393.) But the purpose of its incorporation, as defined in its charter and recognized and confirmed by the legislature, being the transportation of passengers, the plaintiff exercised a public employment and was charged with the duty of accommodating the public in the line of that employment, exactly corresponding to the duty which a railroad corporation or a steamboat company as a carrier of passengers owes to the public, independently of possessing any right of eminent domain.

The public nature of that duty was not affected by the fact that it was to be performed by means of cars constructed and of patent rights owned by the corporation and over roads owned by others. The plaintiff was not a strictly private, but a quasi public corporation; and it must be so treated as regards the validity of any attempt on its part to absolve itself from the performance of those duties to the public, the performance of which by the corporation itself was the remuneration that it was required by law to make to the public in return for the grant of its franchise. (Pickard *vs.* Pullman Southern Car Company, 117 U. S., 34; York and Maryland Railroad *vs.* Winans, 17 How., 30, 39; Railroad Company *vs.* Lockwood, 17 Wall., 357; Liverpool and Great Western Steam Company *vs.* Phœnix Insurance Company, 129 U. S., 397.)

* * * * * * *

The provision of this statute, by which the plaintiff is empowered to contract with other corporations "for the leasing or hiring and transfer to them, or any of them," of its "railway cars and other personal property," is fully satisfied by construing it as confirming the plaintiff's right to do as it had been doing, to "lease" or "hire" (which are equivalent words) to other corporations in the regular course of its business, and to "transfer" under such leasing or hiring its "railway cars" and "other personal property" either connected with the cars or at least of the same general nature of tangible property.

It can hardly be stretched to warrant the plaintiff in making to a single corporation an absolute transfer or a long lease of all that might be comprehended in the words "personal property" in their widest sense, including not only goods and chattels, but moneys, credits, and rights of action. In any view it would be inconsistent alike with the main purpose of the statute and with the uniform course of decision in this court to construe these words as authorizing the plaintiff to deprive itself, either absolutely or for a long period of time, of the right to exercise the franchise granted to it by the legislature for the accommodation of the public.

* * * * * * *

Considering the long term of the indenture, the perishable nature of the property transferred, the large sums to be paid quarterly by the defendant by way of compensation, its assumption of the plaintiff's debts, and the frank avowal, in the indenture itself, of the intention of the two corporations to prevent competition and to create a monopoly, there can be no doubt that the chief consideration for the sums to be paid by the defendant was the plaintiff's covenant not to engage in the business of manufacturing, using, or hiring sleeping cars; and that the real purpose of the transaction was, under the guise of a lease of personal property, to transfer to the defendant nearly the whole corporate franchise of the plaintiff and to continue the plaintiff's existence for the single purpose of receiving compensation for not performing its duties.

The necessary conclusion from these premises is that the contract sued on was unlawful and void, because it was beyond the powers conferred upon the plaintiff by the legislature and because it involved an abandonment by the plaintiff of its duty to the public.

There is strong ground also for holding that the contract between the parties is void, because in unreasonable restraint of trade, and therefore contrary to public policy. Of the cases cited by the plaintiff upon this point, those which have most resemblance to the present case are quite distinguishable.

I hope, Mr. President, the committee that will have the joint resolution in charge, which, I think, ought to be the Committee on the Judiciary, will examine carefully the whole of that great opinion, one of the most carefully studied cases in the reports, involving a vast amount of property and involving turpitude on the part of the Pullman Car Company that is almost unequalled in the transactions of any organization, where they bought and received a vast amount of personal property, four or five patents for sleeping cars, obligations, contracts, dues to the transportation company at the time of the transaction, leasing the whole of it for ninety-nine years and agreeing to pay a very large stipend annually, $264,000, for the lease.

When they came to demand the last two of these stipends for the leasing of the property under their contract, the Pullman Car Company coolly announced that it was not bound by the contract; that it was ultra vires. "But," said the transportation company, "you have got our money; you have got our patent rights; you have been for twelve or fourteen years running under these patents, manufacturing cars; you have made an enormous amount of money; you paid us up to within the last one or two installments; and now you propose to take all that you have received from us upon the plea that you violated your charter in making that contract and hold to the money and the property?" "Yes;" and they quietly informed them that that was their purpose; and the Supreme Court was compelled to sustain them.

That leading and strong case, Mr. President, shows that where a contract is made between two corporations, as to either of which it is ultra vires, or when a contract is made contrary to public policy by these artificial and fictitious beings, the powers of legislation, whether State or Federal, according to the nature of the subject which they affect, are complete and full not only to set aside the contracts, but they are complete and full also to treat the agreement made between these parties as an effort, an endeavor, a movement to carry into effect this illegal purpose, and that is the whole scope of the simple joint resolution I have offered.

If that, or something equivalent to it, is adopted by the Congress of the United States, it will break the back of every trust in this Union, and it will save to this people millions upon millions, untold millions, of money that is now and will hereafter be wrung out of them, and it will save to this country the most profound disgrace that was ever visited upon a civilized country in the world.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What disposition does the Senator from Alabama desire to have made of the joint resolution?

Mr. MORGAN. I desire that it shall be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will, without objection, be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROMOTIONS IN NAVY AND MARINE CORPS.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I now ask that the first bill on the Calendar may be taken up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Calendar under Rule VIII is in order. The Secretary will state the first bill on the Calendar.

The bill (S. 330) to restore to their original status as to promotion officers of the Navy and Marine Corps losing numbers by reason of the advancement of other officers for exceptional and meritorious service during the war with Spain was announced as first in order, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It provides that the advancement in rank of officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, whensoever made, for service rendered during the war with Spain, pursuant, respectively, to the provisions of sections 1506 and 1605 of the Revised Statutes, shall not interfere with the regular promotion of officers otherwise entitled to promotion, but that officers so advanced to higher grades by reason of war service shall be carried thereafter as additional to the numbers of each grade to which they may at any time be promoted; that each such officer shall hereafter be promoted in due course, contemporaneously with and to take rank next after the officer immediately above him; and that all advancements made by reason of war service shall be appropriately so designated upon the official Navy lists; but no promotion shall be made to fill a vacancy occasioned by the promotion, retirement, death, resignation, or dismissal of any officer who, at the time of such promotion, retirement, death, resignation, or dismissal, is an additional member of his grade under the provisions of this act.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to hear an explanation of the necessity for the passage of the bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. I explained this bill before it passed the Senate last summer, on the request of the Senator from Missouri. In brief, it simply provides that when advancements of officers have been made in pursuance of the existing law so that they get promotions, those advancements shall not delay the promotions at the appropriate time of other officers of the Navy. It is a bill which the Senator from Missouri well understood when it passed the Senate before. It is a bill to which I know of no just objection, and, indeed, I know of no one who does object to it in the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is the bill in the same form as the bill that was passed at the last session?

Mr. CHANDLER. In the same form exactly, the same language as it was when it was passed at the time the Senator from Missouri called my attention to it.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After thirty-five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

STATUE OF DANIEL WEBSTER.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution of the Senate providing for the appointment of a committee on the part of the Senate and House of Representatives to make arrangements for the reception and unveiling, on January 18, 1900, of the statue of Daniel Webster, which was in line 3, after the word "and," and to strike out "three" and insert "five."

Mr. CHANDLER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment made by the House of Representatives.

The amendment was concurred in.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. How shall the committee on the part of the Senate be selected?

Mr. CHANDLER. By the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. ALLISON, and Mr. BACON as the committee on the part of the Senate.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM L. GREENE.

Mr. THURSTON. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the resolutions of the House of Representatives announcing the death of Hon. WILLIAM L. GREENE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At the request of the Senator from Nebraska, the Chair lays before the Senate the resolutions

of the House of Representatives referred to by him, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. WILLIAM L. GREENE, late a Representative from the State of Nebraska.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to his memory the House do now adjourn.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. President, I offer the resolutions which I send to the desk, and ask for their immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska submits resolutions, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. WILLIAM L. GREENE, late a Representative from the State of Nebraska.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolutions submitted by the Senator from Nebraska.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 19, 1899, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 18, 1899.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE ARMY.

Second Lieut. Robert C. Foy, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, December 15, 1899, with rank from February 16, 1899.

Second Lieut. Reginald E. McNally, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, December 15, 1899, with rank from February 16, 1899.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

ARTILLERY ARM.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. John F. B. Mitchell, jr., Twelfth Infantry, September 20, 1899, vice Normoyle, Fifth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. James P. Drouillard, Sixth Infantry, September 30, 1899, vice Brady, First Infantry, resigned.

Second Lieut. Martin L. Crimmins, Eighteenth Infantry, October 1, 1899, vice Grubbs, Sixth Infantry, deceased.

Second Lieut. Marion M. Weeks, Twenty-first Infantry, October 2, 1899, vice Alexander, Eleventh Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. James M. Love, jr., Twenty-first Infantry, October 8, 1899, vice Wild, Twelfth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Paul H. McCook, Fifth Infantry, October 10, 1899, vice Johnson, Second Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Frederick W. Coleman, jr., Thirteenth Infantry, October 11, 1899, vice Lindsay, Eighth Infantry, promoted.

TO BE CAPTAIN OF INFANTRY.

First Lieut. George A. Detchemendy, First Infantry (now serving under the name of George A. Detchmendy), to be captain of infantry, to fill an original vacancy.

PROMOTIONS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

FORTIETH INFANTRY.

First Lieut. Eugene E. Barton, Fortieth Infantry, United States Volunteers, to be captain, December 13, 1899, vice Whitthorne, declined.

Second Lieut. Cullen C. Mitchell, Fortieth Infantry, United States Volunteers, to be first lieutenant, December 13, 1899, vice Barton, promoted.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

FORTIETH INFANTRY.

Private William J. Whitthorne, jr., Troop —, Eleventh Cavalry, United States Volunteers, to be second lieutenant, December 13, 1899, vice Mitchell, Fortieth Infantry, United States Volunteers, promoted.

To be assistant surgeon, with the rank of first lieutenant.

Frank W. Dudley, of California, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, December 13, 1899, vice Cook, Thirty-second Infantry, United States Volunteers, promoted.

SUPERVISOR OF CENSUS.

Daniel F. Healy, of Manchester, Hillsboro County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of New Hampshire. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 18, 1899.

CIRCUIT JUDGE.

George Gray, of Delaware, to be United States circuit judge for the Third judicial circuit.

CONSUL.

Daniel S. Kidder, of Florida, to be consul of the United States at Algiers, Africa.

DISTRICT JUDGE.

Joseph A. Gill, of Kansas, to be judge of the United States court of the northern district of the Indian Territory.

SUPERVISOR OF TWELFTH CENSUS.

Albert Steinhart, of Greenville, Butler County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Alabama.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

INFANTRY ARM.

To be second lieutenants.

Corpl. Henry A. Hanigan, Troop G, Eighth United States Cavalry, April 5, 1899.

Q. M. Sergt. Thomas A. Vicars, Company A, Twenty-first United States Infantry, April 5, 1899.

Acting Hosp. Steward William L. Reed, United States Army, April 5, 1899.

Sergt. Charles L. McKain, Battery B, Fourth United States Artillery, April 5, 1899.

Corpl. James D. Reams, Company D, Battalion of Engineers, United States Army, April 5, 1899.

Sergt. Andrew J. Dougherty, Troop B, Third United States Cavalry, April 5, 1899.

Sergt. Oliver S. Eskridge, Company E, Eighteenth United States Infantry, April 5, 1899.

Hospital Steward Joel R. Lee, United States Army, April 5, 1899.

Private George E. Stewart, Battery A, Fifth United States Artillery, April 5, 1899.

Sergt. Bernard Sharp, Battery L, Third United States Artillery, April 5, 1899.

Battalion Sergt. Maj. Alden C. Knowles, Thirteenth United States Infantry, April 5, 1899.

Sergt. Earnest M. Reeve, Troop A, Sixth United States Cavalry, April 5, 1899.

Private Olin R. Booth, general service, United States Army, April 5, 1899.

Sergt. Ernst Hagedorn, Company E, Eighth United States Infantry, April 5, 1899.

First Sergt. Hjalmer Erickson, Troop M, Eighth United States Cavalry, April 5, 1899.

Corpl. James W. Furlow, United States Signal Corps, April 5, 1899.

Sergt. Joseph Herring, Battery E, Third United States Artillery, April 5, 1899.

Sergt. Clark D. Dudley, Battery H, Sixth United States Artillery, April 5, 1899.

Corpl. Ben Holladay Dorcy, Battery G, Fourth United States Artillery, April 5, 1899.

Corpl. Robert I. Rees, Battalion of Engineers, United States Army, October 1, 1899.

Corpl. Paul A. Barry, Company L, Twentieth United States Infantry, October 1, 1899.

Sergt. Albert C. Osborn, Company E, Eighteenth United States Infantry, October 1, 1899.

Sergt. Paul Draper, Company D, Sixteenth United States Infantry, October 1, 1899.

Corpl. Frank W. Ball, Company A, Seventeenth United States Infantry, October 1, 1899.

Private George Deiss, Battery D, Sixth United States Artillery, October 1, 1899.

Private Adrian V. L. R. de Beaumont, Company C, Seventh United States Infantry, October 1, 1899.

First Sergt. Hugh K. Taylor, Battery O, Fourth United States Artillery, October 1, 1899.

Sergt. Jesse M. Cullison, Battery C, Fifth United States Artillery, October 1, 1899.

Sergt. William H. Noble, Company E, Battalion of Engineers, October 1, 1899.

Sergt. Andrew C. Wright, Battery C, Fifth United States Artillery, October 1, 1899.

Sergt. Evert R. Wilson, Battery I, Seventh United States Artillery, October 1, 1899.

Sergt. Haywood Robbins, Battery L, Fifth United States Artillery, October 1, 1899.

Corpl. Edward C. Bolton, Company H, Nineteenth United States Infantry, October 1, 1899.

Sergt. Sidney S. Burbank, Company H, Nineteenth United States Infantry, October 1, 1899.

Sergt. Clenard McLaughlin, Company H, Nineteenth United States Infantry, October 1, 1899.

Sergt. Maj. Lynn S. Edwards, Second United States Artillery, October 1, 1899.

Private Edward B. Mitchell, Hospital Corps, United States Army, October 1, 1899.
First-Class Sergt. Clarence N. Jones, Signal Corps, United States Army, October 1, 1899.
Corpl. James H. Como, Battery I, Third United States Artillery, October 1, 1899.
Sergt. George M. Brooke, Battery O, First United States Artillery, October 1, 1899.
Battalion Sergt. Maj. William E. Bennett, jr., Sixth United States Infantry, October 1, 1899.
Corpl. Wilbur A. McDaniel, Company G, Sixth United States Infantry, October 1,1899.

CAVALRY ARM.

To be second lieutenants.

Corpl. Henry W. Parker, Troop K, Sixth United States Cavalry, October 1, 1899.
Private Charles E. McCullough, Troop A, Sixth United States Cavalry, October 1, 1899.
Corpl. William H. Winters, Troop B, Sixth United States Cavalry, October 1, 1899.
Sergt. Douglas McCaskey, Troop K, Sixth United States Cavalry, October 1, 1899.
Sergt. Samuel B. Pearson, Troop I, First United States Cavalry, October 1, 1899.
Sergt. Albert A. King, Troop I, First United States Cavalry, October 1, 1899.
Sergt. Dorsey Cullen, Troop B, Third United States Cavalry, October 1, 1899.
Freeborn P. Holcomb, Troop L, Eighth United States Cavalry, October 1, 1899.
Frederick C. Johnson, of Illinois, April 10, 1899.
Paul T. Hayne, jr., of South Carolina, May 1, 1899.
Roger Stanley Fitch, of New York, June 1, 1899.
Eurubian H. Rubotton, of California, June 1, 1899.
William B. Cowin, of Nebraska, June 1, 1899.
Fred E. Buchan, of Kansas, July 1, 1899.
Leslie A. I. Chapman, of Iowa, July 1, 1899.
Aubrey Lippincott, of Colorado, August 1, 1899.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

SIGNAL CORPS.

To be lieutenant-colonel.

Maj. James Allen, Signal Corps, December 1, 1899.

To be major.

Capt. Richard E. Thompson, Signal Corps, December 1, 1899.

TO BE CAPTAIN OF INFANTRY.

First Lieut. George A. Detchemendy, First Infantry.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

George H. Kearny, formerly a chief engineer in the Navy, to be a commander in the Navy from the 3d day of March, 1899, under the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1899, entitled "An act to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States."

William S. Moore, formerly a chief engineer in the Navy, to be a commander in the Navy from the 3d day of March, 1899, under the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1899, entitled "An act to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States."

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles T. Vogelgesang, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 11th day of June, 1899.
Lieut. Commander George Cowie, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899.
Lieut. Charles C. Rogers, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles B. McVay, jr., to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899.
Lieut. Commander Charles P. Howell, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899.
Lieut. John T. Newton, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Lay H. Everhart, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899.
Lieut. Waldemar D. Rose, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Claude Bailey, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law).
Lieut. Charles F. Pond, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) John H. Dayton, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899.
Lieut. Walter McLean, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Lucius A. Bostwick, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899.
Lieut. Washington I. Chambers, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) William A. Moffett, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899.
Lieut. James C. Gillmore, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Julian L. Latimer, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899.
Lieut. Benjamin Tappan, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Doctor E. Dismukes, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899.
Lieut. Charles A. Gove, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) John R. Edie, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Reginald R. Belknap, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 2d day of July, 1899.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) DeWitt Blamer, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 6th day of July, 1899.
Lieut. Commander Charles P. Perkins, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 8th day of July, 1899.
Lieut. DeWitt Coffman, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 8th day of July, 1899.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) John K. Robison, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 8th day of July, 1899.
Commander Charles H. Stockton, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 8th day of July, 1899.
Lieut. Commander Charles G. Bowman, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 8th day of July, 1899.
Lieut. William G. Hannum, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 8th day of July, 1899.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Arthur L. Willard, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 8th day of July, 1899.
Capt. Alexander H. McCormick, to be a rear-admiral in the Navy, from the 9th day of September, 1899.
Commander Asa Walker, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 9th day of September, 1899.
Lieut. Commander William P. Potter, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 9th day of September, 1899.
Lieut. Richard Henderson, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 9th day of September, 1899.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Edwin T. Pollock, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 9th day of September, 1899.
Lieut. Commander William H. Beehler, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 22d day of September, 1899.
Lieut. Thomas D. Griffin, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 22d day of September, 1899.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Clark D. Stearns, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 22d day of September, 1899.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Henry C. Kuenzli, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 24th day of September, 1899.
Commander Oscar W. Farenholt, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 25th day of September, 1899.
Lieut. Commander Giles B. Harber, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 25th day of September, 1899.
Lieut. Henry Minett, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 25th day of September, 1899.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) John H. Rowen, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 25th day of September, 1899.
Capt. Albert S. Barker, to be a rear-admiral in the Navy, from the 10th day of October, 1899.
Commander Edward T. Strong, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 10th day of October, 1899.
Lieut. Commander John B. Briggs, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 10th day of October, 1899.
Lieut. Richard T. Mulligan, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 10th day of October, 1899.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Henry H. Hough, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 10th day of October, 1899.
Commander Robert E. Impey, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 2d day of November, 1899.
Lieut. Commander Newton E. Mason, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 2d day of November, 1899.
Lieut. William Braunersreuther, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 2d day of November, 1899.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Milton E. Reed, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 2d day of November, 1899.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Harley H. Christy, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 21st day of November, 1899.
Commander Eugene W. Watson, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 22d day of November, 1899.
Lieut. Commander Arthur P. Nazro, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 22d day of November, 1899.
Lieut. Francis H. Sherman, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 22d day of November, 1899.

TO BE LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE).

From the 17th day of April, 1899.

John P. J. Ryan.
John R. Morris.
Chester Wells.

From the 1st day of July, 1899.

Irvin V. Gillis.
Ridley McLean.
Raymond Stone.
David F. Sellers.
Charles Webster.
John T. Tompkins.
John M. Hudgins.
Provoost Babin.
Simon P. Fullinwider.
Lewis B. Jones.
Boling K. McMorris.
Stephen V. Graham.
Alfred W. Hinds.
Ernest L. Bennett.
Roscoe C. Moody.
Fritz L. Sandoz.
Leland F. James.
John McC. Luby.
Ralph H. Chappell.
Joseph M. Reeves.
William P. Scott (subject to examination).
Arthur G. Kavanagh.
Ignatius T. Cooper.
Carlton F. Snow.
Henry T. Baker.
Frank Lyon.
Charles S. Bookwalter.
Hutch I. Cone.
Roscoe C. Bulmer.
Gilbert S. Galbraith.
Emory Winship (subject to examination).
Roscoe Spear.
Robert W. McNeely.
Walter S. Turpin (subject to examination).
George L. P. Stone.
William S. Whitted.
Robert H. Osborn (subject to examination).
Walter J. Manion.
George E. Gelm.
Clarence England.
Edwin H. De Lany.

POSTMASTER.

Minot Wales Baker, to be postmaster at Randolph, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *December 18, 1899.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

Mr. BARTLETT appeared and took the oath of office.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the special order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That on Monday, December 11, immediately after the reading of the Journal, the House shall resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. No. 1, entitled "A bill to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes;" general debate thereon shall continue to not later than 5 o'clock p. m. of Friday, the 15th day of December, and thereafter debate under the five-minute rule until 5 o'clock p. m. of Saturday, the 16th day of December, at which time the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House, with any amendments adopted by the committee, and a vote shall be taken on the bill and amendments, if any, without intervening motion, to final passage, immediately after the reading of the Journal on Monday, the 18th day of December.

And during said debate the House shall on each day adjourn not later than 5 o'clock p. m.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GAINES. Is it not now in order to move to recommit the bill to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union——

The SPEAKER. It is not.

Mr. GAINES. For the purpose of reporting a bill for the free coinage of silver at the present legal ratio?

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the bill be engrossed for a third reading?

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and it was accordingly engrossed and read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Speaker, on that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas, 190, nays 150, not voting 14; as follows:

YEAS—190.

Acheson,	Dick,	Lacey,	Reeves,
Adams,	Dolliver,	Landis,	Roberts, Mass.
Alexander,	Dovener,	Lane,	Rodenberg,
Allen, Me.	Driggs,	Lawrence,	Ruppert,
Babcock,	Driscoll,	Levy,	Russell,
Bailey, Kans.	Eddy,	Linney,	Scudder,
Baker,	Emerson,	Littauer,	Shattuc,
Barham,	Esch,	Littlefield,	Shelden,
Barney,	Faris,	Long,	Sherman,
Bartholdt,	Fitzgerald, N. Y.	Lorimer,	Showalter,
Bingham,	Fletcher,	Loud,	Smith, Ill.
Boreing,	Fordney,	Loudenslager,	Smith, H. C.
Boutell, Ill.	Foss,	Lovering,	Smith, Samuel W.
Boutelle, Me.	Fowler,	Lybrand,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Bowersock,	Freer,	McAleer,	Southard,
Brick,	Gamble,	McCall,	Spalding,
Bromwell,	Gardner, Mich.	McCleary,	Sperry,
Brosius,	Gardner, N. J.	McPherson,	Sprague,
Brown,	Gibson,	Mahon,	Steele,
Brownlow,	Gill,	Mann,	Stevens, Minn.
Bull,	Gillett, Mass.	Marsh,	Stewart, N. J.
Burke, S. Dak.	Graff,	Mercer,	Stewart, N. Y.
Burkett,	Graham,	Mesick,	Stewart, Wis.
Burleigh,	Greene, Mass.	Metcalf,	Sulloway,
Burton,	Grosvenor,	Miller,	Tawney,
Butler,	Grout,	Minor,	Tayler, Ohio
Calderhead,	Grow,	Mondell,	Thayer,
Cannon,	Hamilton,	Moody, Mass.	Thomas, Iowa
Capron,	Haugen,	Moody, Oreg.	Thropp,
Chickering,	Hawley,	Morgan,	Tompkins,
Clarke, N. H.	Heatwole,	Morris,	Tongue,
Clayton, N. Y.	Hedge,	Mudd,	Underhill,
Cochrane, N. Y.	Hemenway,	Needham,	Van Voorhis,
Connell,	Henry, Conn.	O'Grady,	Wachter,
Cooper, Wis.	Hepburn,	Olmsted,	Wadsworth,
Corliss,	Hill,	Otjen,	Wanger,
Cousins,	Hitt,	Overstreet,	Warner,
Cromer,	Hoffecker,	Packer, Pa.	Waters,
Crump,	Hopkins,	Parker, N. J.	Watson,
Crumpacker,	Howell,	Payne,	Weaver,
Curtis,	Hull,	Pearce, Mo.	Weeks,
Cushman,	Jack,	Pearre,	Weymouth,
Dahle, Wis.	Jenkins,	Phillips,	White,
Dalzell,	Jones, Wash.	Powers,	Wilson, N. Y.
Davenport, S. A.	Kahn,	Prince,	Wright,
Davidson,	Kerr,	Pugh,	Young, Pa.
Dayton,	Ketcham,	Ray,	
Denny,	Knox,	Reeder,	

NAYS—150.

Adamson,	De Armond,	Little,	Ryan, Pa.
Allen, Ky.	De Graffenreid,	Livingston,	Salmon,
Allen, Miss.	De Vries,	Lloyd,	Shackleford,
Atwater,	Dinsmore,	McClellan,	Shafroth,
Bailey, Tex.	Dougherty,	McCulloch,	Sheppard,
Ball,	Elliott,	McDowell,	Sibley,
Bankhead,	Epes,	McLain,	Sims,
Barber,	Finley,	McRae,	Slayden,
Bartlett,	Fitzgerald, Mass.	Maddox,	Small,
Bell,	Fitzpatrick,	May,	Smith, Ky.
Benton,	Fleming,	Meekison,	Snodgrass,
Berry,	Foster,	Meyer, La.	Sparkman,
Bradley,	Fox,	Miers, Ind.	Spight,
Brantley,	Gaines,	Moon,	Stark,
Breazeale,	Gaston,	Muller,	Stephens, Tex.
Brenner,	Gilbert,	Naphen,	Stokes,
Brewer,	Glynn,	Neville,	Sulzer,
Brundidge,	Gordon,	Newlands,	Sutherland,
Burke, Tex.	Green, Pa.	Noonan,	Swanson,
Burleson,	Griffith,	Norton, Ohio	Talbert,
Burnett,	Griggs,	Norton, S. C.	Tate,
Caldwell,	Hall,	Otey,	Taylor, Ala.
Carmack,	Hay,	Pierce, Tenn.	Terry,
Chanler,	Henry, Miss.	Polk,	Thomas, N. C.
Clark, Mo.	Henry, Tex.	Quarles,	Turner,
Clayton, Ala.	Howard,	Ransdell,	Underwood,
Cochran, Mo.	Jett,	Rhea, Ky.	Vandiver,
Cooney,	Johnston,	Rhea, Va.	Wheeler, Ky.
Cooper, Tex.	Jones, Va.	Richardson,	Williams, J. R.
Cowherd,	Kitchin,	Ridgely,	Williams, W. E.
Cox,	Kleberg,	Riordon,	Williams, Miss.
Crawford,	Kluttz,	Rixey,	Wilson, Idaho
Crowley,	Lamb,	Robb,	Wilson, S. C.
Cummings,	Lanham,	Robbins,	Young, Va.
Cusack,	Latimer,	Robinson, Ind.	Zenor,
Daly, N. J.	Lentz,	Robinson, Nebr.	Ziegler.
Davenport, S. W.	Lester,	Rucker,	
Davis,	Lewis,	Ryan, N. Y.	

NOT VOTING—14.

Bellamy,	Catchings,	Joy,	Vreeland,
Bishop,	Davey,	Robertson, La.	Wheeler, Ala.
Broussard,	Gillet, N. Y.	Smith, Md.	
Campbell,	Harmer,	Stallings,	

So the bill was passed.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. HARMER with Mr. BROUSSARD.

Mr. BISHOP with Mr. CAMPBELL.

For this day:

Mr. VREELAND with Mr. DAVEY.

Mr. JOY with Mr. CATCHINGS.

Mr. GILLET of New York with Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Montana, Mr. CAMPBELL. I therefore withdraw my vote. If he were present he would vote "nay," and I would vote "yea."

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say on behalf of my colleague, Mr. JOY, that he is detained by serious illness in his family. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. BELLAMY, is necessarily detained from the House this morning. If present, he would vote "nay."

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

[Loud applause on the Republican side.]

On motion of Mr. OVERSTREET, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Speaker, I ask indefinite leave to print some remarks upon the financial bill which has just passed, and with it an appendix of some speeches heretofore made by me and an analysis of various votes upon coinage and currency legislation.

The SPEAKER. For what length of time does the gentleman ask?

Mr. McRAE. I would like to have the time unlimited, because of my ill health.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent that he be permitted to print remarks on the bill just passed and to have unlimited time to do so, he having been confined to the hospital during the consideration of the bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the House to grant me the privilege of printing, without any limit now, on account of the fact that I was not present during the debate.

The SPEAKER. A similar request to that last granted is made by the gentleman from Georgia. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I make a similar request. I was absent on account of a death in my family.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts, absent on account of a death in his family, submits a similar request. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to submit the following designation of committees, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Elections No. 1.—Messrs. Robert W. Tayler, Ohio; Romulus Z. Linney, North Carolina; James R. Mann, Illinois; Edward L. Hamilton, Michigan; Samuel A. Davenport, Pennsylvania; E. J. Burkett, Nebraska; Charles L. Bartlett, Georgia; Andrew F. Fox, Mississippi, and M. H. Glynn, New York.

Elections No. 2.—Messrs. Walter L. Weaver, Ohio; Martin E. Olmsted, Pennsylvania; C. B. Landis, Indiana; J. M. Miller, Kansas; C. H. Burke, South Dakota; Lot Thomas, Iowa; James M. Robinson, Indiana; John Wesley Gaines, Tennessee, and Henry D. Green, Pennsylvania.

Elections No. 3.—Messrs. William S. Mesick, Michigan; Aaron V. S. Cochrane, New York; G. W. Faris, Indiana; E. W. Roberts, Massachusetts; Edgar Weeks, Michigan; M. E. Driscoll, New York; Robert W. Miers, Indiana; Robert E. Burke, Texas, and Frank A. McLain, Mississippi.

Ways and Means.—Messrs. Sereno E. Payne, New York; John Dalzell, Pennsylvania; Albert J. Hopkins, Illinois; Charles H. Grosvenor, Ohio; Charles A. Russell, Connecticut; Jonathan P. Dolliver, Iowa; George W. Steele, Indiana; James A. Tawney, Minnesota; Samuel W. McCall, Massachusetts; Chester I. Long, Kansas; James D. Richardson, Tennessee; Samuel M. Robertson, Louisiana; Claude A. Swanson, Virginia; George B. McClellan, New York; Francis G. Newlands, Nevada, and S. B. Cooper, Texas. (One vacancy.)

Appropriations.—Messrs. Joseph G. Cannon, Illinois; Henry H. Bingham, Pennsylvania; William W. Grout, Vermont; James A. Hemenway, Indiana; Samuel S. Barney, Wisconsin; William H. Moody, Massachusetts; Samuel J. Pugh, Kentucky; H. C. Van Voorhis, Ohio; James T. McCleary, Minnesota; Lucius N. Littauer, New York; Leonidas F. Livingston, Georgia; Thomas C. McRae, Arkansas; John M. Allen, Mississippi; John C. Bell, Colorado; Rice A. Pierce, Tennessee; Mæcenas E. Benton, Missouri, and George W. Taylor, Alabama.

Judiciary.—Messrs. George W. Ray, New York; John J. Jenkins, Wisconsin; Richard Wayne Parker, New Jersey; Jesse Overstreet, Indiana; DeAlva S. Alexander, New York; Vespasian Warner, Illinois; Winfield S. Kerr, Ohio; Charles E. Littlefield, Maine; R. H. Freer, West Virginia; Julius Kahn, California; William L. Terry, Arkansas; David A. DeArmond, Missouri; Samuel W. T. Lanham, Texas; William Elliott, South Carolina; Oscar W. Underwood, Alabama; David H. Smith, Kentucky, and William H. Fleming, Georgia.

Banking and Currency.—Messrs. Marriott Brosius, Pennsylvania; Charles N. Fowler, New Jersey; Ebenezer J. Hill, Connecticut; George W. Prince, Illinois; Adin B. Capron, Rhode Island; Joseph R. Lane, Iowa; W. A. Calderhead, Kansas; Jesse Overstreet, Indiana; W. C. Lovering, Massachusetts; W. B. Shattuc, Ohio; Nicholas N. Cox, Tennessee; Jesse F. Stallings, Alabama; E. H. Driggs, New York; W. Jasper Talbert, South Carolina; John S. Rhea, Kentucky; John R. Thayer, Massachusetts, and E. B. Lewis, Georgia.

Coinage, Weights, and Measures.—Messrs. James H. Southard, Ohio; Edward S. Minor, Wisconsin; Ebenezer J. Hill, Connecticut; Theobold Otjen, Wisconsin; H. S. Boutell, Illinois; F. W. Cushman, Washington; J. D. Bowersock, Kansas; Thomas Hedge, Iowa; J. M. E. O'Grady, New York; Russell J. Waters, California; Edwin R. Ridgely, Kansas; Charles F. Cochran, Missouri; John F. Shafroth, Colorado; James M. Griggs, Georgia; John Wesley Gaines, Tennessee; R. D. Sutherland, Nebraska; J. M. Levy, New York, and John F. Wilson, Arizona.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce.—Messrs. William P. Hepburn, Iowa; Loren Fletcher, Minnesota; James S. Sherman, New York; Irving P. Wanger, Pennsylvania; Charles F. Joy, Missouri; John B. Corliss, Michigan; James F. Stewart, New Jersey; John A. Barham, California; R. B. Hawley, Texas; James R. Mann, Illinois; William C. Lovering, Massachusetts; William McAleer, Pennsylvania; Robert C. Davey, Louisiana; William C. Adamson, Georgia; Robert W. Davis, Florida; Nicholas Muller, New York, and D. W. Shackleford, Missouri.

Rivers and Harbors.—Messrs. Theodore E. Burton, Ohio; Walter Reeves, Illinois; Blackburn B. Dovener, West Virginia; Roswell P. Bishop, Michigan; Ernest F. Acheson, Pennsylvania; Page Morris, Minnesota; De Alva S. Alexander, New York; Thomas H. Tongue, Oregon; G. P. Lawrence, Massachusetts; J. H. Davidson, Wisconsin; Thomas C. Catchings, Mississippi; Rufus E. Lester, Georgia; John H. Bankhead, Alabama; Philip D. McCulloch, Arkansas; Albert S. Berry, Kentucky; Stephen M. Sparkman, Florida, and Thomas H. Ball, Texas.

Merchant Marine and Fisheries.—Messrs. Charles H. Grosvenor, Ohio; Albert J. Hopkins, Illinois; James R. Young, Pennsylvania; Archibald Lybrand, Ohio; William S. Greene, Massachusetts; E. S. Minor, Wisconsin; Fred C. Stevens, Minnesota; W. L. Jones, Washington; J. W. Fordney, Michigan; Frank C. Wachter, Maryland; John F. Fitzgerald, Massachusetts; Marion De Vries, California; Thomas Spight, Mississippi; William D. Daly, New Jersey; J. E. Ransdell, Louisiana; William Astor Chanler, New York, and John H. Small, North Carolina.

Agriculture.—Messrs. James W. Wadsworth, New York; E. Stevens Henry, Connecticut; William B. Baker, Maryland; William Lorimer, Illinois; William Connell, Pennsylvania; George H. White, North Carolina; W. J. Bailey, Kansas; C. F. Wright, Pennsylvania; Gilbert N. Haugen, Iowa; H. B. Dahle, Wisconsin; John S. Williams, Mississippi; J. William Stokes, South Carolina; John Lamb, Virginia; James Cooney, Missouri; R. B. Gordon, Ohio; H. D. Allen, Kentucky; William Neville, Nebraska, and J. F. Wilson, Arizona.

Foreign Affairs.—Messrs. Robert R. Hitt, Illinois; Robert Adams, jr., Pennsylvania; Robert G. Cousins, Iowa; William Alden Smith, Michigan; Joel P. Heatwole, Minnesota; Frederick H. Gillett, Massachusetts; C. N. Fowler, New Jersey; C. B. Landis, Indiana; F. G. Clarke, New Hampshire; Seth W. Brown, Ohio; Hugh A. Dinsmore, Arkansas; Champ Clark, Missouri; John S. Williams, Mississippi; Albert S. Berry, Kentucky; William M. Howard, Georgia; A. S. Burleson, Texas, and Townsend Scudder, New York.

Military Affairs.—Messrs. John A. T. Hull, Iowa; Benjamin F. Marsh, Illinois; John H. Ketcham, New York; Walter P. Brownlow, Tennessee; Richard Wayne Parker, New Jersey; A. B. Capron, Rhode Island; Fred C. Stevens, Minnesota; Charles Dick, Ohio; F. W. Mondell, Wyoming; J. J. Esch, Wisconsin; William Sulzer, New York; Nicholas N. Cox, Tennessee; John J. Lentz, Ohio; James Hay, Virginia; Thomas M. Jett, Illinois; J. L. Slayden, Texas; Robert F. Broussard, Louisiana, and Pedro Perea, New Mexico.

Naval Affairs.—Messrs. Charles A. Boutelle, Maine; George E. Foss, Illinois; Alston G. Dayton, West Virginia; Henry C. Loudenslager, New Jersey; R. B. Hawley, Texas; Thomas S. Butler, Pennsylvania; Melville Bull, Rhode Island; Sydney E. Mudd, Maryland; James E. Watson, Indiana; Victor H. Metcalf, California; Amos J. Cummings, New York; Adolph Meyer, Louisiana; Farish Carter Tate, Georgia; John F. Rixey, Virginia; W. W. Kitchin, North Carolina; W. D. Vandiver, Missouri, and Charles K. Wheeler, Kentucky.

Post-Office and Post-Roads.—Messrs. Eugene F. Loud, California; John H. Ketcham, New York; George W. Smith, Illinois; John J. Gardner, New Jersey; Nehemiah D. Sperry, Connecticut; William Lorimer, Illinois; Jacob H. Bromwell, Ohio; Henry H. Bingham, Pennsylvania; Smith McPherson, Iowa; George W. Cromer, Indiana; Claude A. Swanson, Virginia; John A. Moon, Tennessee; James M. Griggs, Georgia; R. E. Burke, Texas; John S. Little, Arkansas; Joseph C. Sibley, Pennsylvania; W. S. Cowherd, Missouri, and Pedro Perea, New Mexico.

Public Lands.—Messrs. John F. Lacey, Iowa; Frank M. Eddy, Minnesota; F. W. Mondell, Wyoming; J. M. Miller, Kansas; C. H. Burke, South Dakota; W. L. Jones, Washington; E. J. Burkett, Nebraska; John J. Esch, Wisconsin; M. A. Moody, Oregon; J. C. Needham, California; John F. Shafroth, Colorado; Rudolph Kleberg, Texas; Marion De Vries, California; David Meekison, Ohio; Francis M. Griffith, Indiana; Edgar Wilson, Idaho; S. Brundidge, jr., Arkansas, and D. T. Flynn, Oklahoma.

Indian Affairs.—Messrs. James S. Sherman, New York; Charles Curtis, Kansas; Frank M. Eddy, Minnesota; Alexander Stewart, Wisconsin; John F. Lacey, Iowa; Horace B. Packer, Pennsylvania; Charles E. Pearce, Missouri; Robert J. Gamble, South Dakota; C. D. Shelden, Michigan; Joseph J. Gill, Ohio; John S. Little, Arkansas; John H. Stephens, Texas; William T. Zenor, Indiana; Stanyarne Wilson, South Carolina; John R. Thayer, Massachusetts; John J. Fitzgerald, New York; John Dougherty, Missouri, and D. T. Flynn, Oklahoma.

Territories.—Messrs. William S. Knox, Massachusetts; Loren Fletcher, Minnesota; E. L. Hamilton, Michigan; B. F. Spalding, North Dakota; A. L. Brick, Indiana; Joseph R. Lane, Iowa; W. H. Graham, Pennsylvania; F. W. Cushman, Washington; Vincent Boreing, Kentucky; William McAleer, Pennsylvania; John A. Moon, Tennessee; R. C. De Graffenreid, Texas; John A. McDowell, Ohio; D. E. Finley, South Carolina; S. P. Epes, Virginia; Pedro Perea, New Mexico, and D. T. Flynn, Oklahoma.

Insular Affairs.—Messrs. Henry A. Cooper, Wisconsin; Joseph G. Cannon, Illinois; Robert R. Hitt, Illinois; Sereno E. Payne, New York; William P. Hepburn, Iowa; Eugene F. Loud, California; James A. Tawney, Minnesota; Joseph W. Babcock, Wisconsin; William H. Moody, Massachusetts; E. D. Crumpacker, Indiana; W. A. Jones, Virginia; John W. Maddox, Georgia; J. R. Williams, Illinois; R. L. Henry, Texas; E. W. Carmack, Tennessee; H. D. Clayton, Alabama, and Joseph C. Sibley, Pennsylvania.

Railways and Canals.—Messrs. Charles A. Chickering, New York; James H. Davidson, Wisconsin; William B. Shattuc, Ohio; Joseph B. Showalter, Pennsylvania; Seth W. Brown, Ohio; Rossenu O. Crump, Michigan; E. W. Roberts, Massachusetts; H. C. Smith, Michigan; R. C. De Graffenreid, Texas; J. W. Denny, Maryland; John S. Burnett, Alabama; J. W. Atwater, North Carolina, and John D. Bellamy, North Carolina.

Manufactures.—Messrs. George W. Faris, Indiana; W. B. Baker, Maryland; J. E. Thropp, Pennsylvania; John K. Stewart, New York; L. W. Emerson, New York; Joseph J. Gill, Ohio; W. D. Vandiver, Missouri; John D. Bellamy, North Carolina; John Q. Underhill, New York; D. E. Finley, South Carolina, and T. F. Kluttz, North Carolina.

Mines and Mining.—Messrs. Rossean O. Crump, Michigan; Frank M. Eddy, Minnesota; William Connell, Pennsylvania; Carlos D. Shelden, Michigan; Robert J. Gamble, South Dakota; W. C. Lovering, Massachusetts; Frank W. Mondell, Wyoming; M. A. Moody, Oregon; Farish Carter Tate, Georgia; James W. Ryan, Pennsylvania; E. Wilson, Idaho; A. J. Campbell, Montana; J. K. P. Hall, Pennsylvania, and J. F. Wilson, Arizona.

Public Buildings and Grounds.—Messrs. David H. Mercer, Nebraska; Charles W. Gillet, New York; Richard Bartholdt, Missouri; Edwin C. Burleigh, Maine; George W. Weymouth, Massachusetts; Benjamin F. Howell, New Jersey; Alexander Stewart, Wisconsin; J. B. Showalter, Pennsylvania; W. A. Rodenberg, Illinois; John H. Bankhead, Alabama; John H. Little, Arkansas; William G. Brantley, Georgia; James Norton, South Carolina; J. W. Smith, Maryland, and C. R. Thomas, North Carolina.

Pacific Railroads.—Messrs. H. Henry Powers, Vermont; William P. Hepburn, Iowa; George W. Faris, Indiana; William B. Shattuc, Ohio; William Alden Smith, Michigan; S. A. Davenport, Pennsylvania; S. W. Brown, Ohio; George E. Foss, Illinois; J. E. Thropp, Pennsylvania; M. E. Driscoll, New York; James L. Slayden, Texas; J. M. Quarles, Virginia; J. L. Sheppard, Texas; D. E. Finley, South Carolina, and E. T. Noonan, Illinois.

Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River.—Messrs. Richard Bartholdt, Missouri; Page Morris, Minnesota; C. P. Joy, Missouri; G. W. Prince, Illinois; J. J. Jenkins, Wisconsin; R. B. Hawley, Texas; Thomas Hedge, Iowa; W. A. Rodenberg, Illinois; John M. Allen, Mississippi; Willis Brewer, Alabama; Robert Broussard, Louisiana; William M. Howard, Georgia, and A. Gaston, Pennsylvania.

Education.—Messrs. Galusha A. Grow, Pennsylvania; W. S. Knox, Massachusetts; H. H. Powers, Vermont; H. S. Boutell, Illinois; Washington Gardner, Michigan; A. S. Tompkins, New York; S. M. Jack, Pennsylvania; S. R. Morgan, Ohio; David A. De Armond, Missouri; C. L. Bartlett, Georgia; William D. Vandiver, Missouri; Thomas Cusack, Illinois, and J. W. Denny, Maryland.

Labor.—Messrs. John J. Gardner, New Jersey; J. T. McCleary, Minnesota; William Lorimer, Illinois; Joseph B. Showalter, Pennsylvania; Richard Bartholdt, Missouri; E. S. Henry, Connecticut; W. H. Graham, Pennsylvania; Louis W. Emerson, New York; W. Jasper Talbert, South Carolina; John S. Rhea, Kentucky; Amos J. Cummings, New York; Ben F. Caldwell, Illinois, and D. J. Riordon, New York.

Militia.—Messrs. Benjamin F. Marsh, Illinois; Edwin C. Burleigh, Maine; John A. T. Hull, Iowa; George W. Steele, Indiana; Richard Wayne Parker, New Jersey; W. H. Graham, Pennsylvania; Charles Dick, Ohio; Washington Gardner, Michigan; William L. Stark, Nebraska; W. A. Young, Virginia; Oscar Turner, Kentucky; Joseph B. Crowley, Illinois, and Jacob Ruppert, jr., New York.

Patents.—Messrs. Winfield S. Kerr, Ohio; Walter Reeves, Illinois; S. S Barney, Wisconsin; J. B. Corliss, Michigan; R. H. Freer, West Virginia; J. M. E. O'Grady, New York; A. S. Tompkins, New York; S. M. Jack, Pennsylvania; William Sulzer, New York; Champ Clark, Missouri; T. Y. Fitzpatrick, Kentucky; P. Breazeale, Louisiana, and W. H. Rhea, Virginia.

Invalid Pensions.—Messrs. Cyrus A. Sulloway, New Hampshire; Henry R. Gibson, Tennessee; E. S. Minor, Wisconsin; J. V. Graff, Illinois; Samuel W. Smith, Michigan; W. A. Calderhead, Kansas; A. V. S. Cochrane, New York; Thomas Hedge, Iowa; J. H. Hoffecker, Delaware; Robert W. Miers, Indiana; James A. Norton, Ohio; Edmund H. Driggs, New York; Thomas Spight, Mississippi; Joseph B. Crowley, Illinois, and A. Gaston, Pennsylvania.

Pensions.—Messrs. Henry C. Loudenslager, New Jersey; Jacob H. Bromwell, Ohio; George W. Weymouth, Massachusetts; Carlos D. Shelden, Michigan; Vincent Boreing, Kentucky; E. B. Vreeland, New York; Henry C. Smith, Michigan; Edgar Weeks, Michigan; Jesse F. Stallings, Alabama; R. C. De Graffenreid, Texas; Thomas Y. Fitzpatrick, Kentucky; S. W. Davenport, Pennsylvania, and W. T. Crawford, North Carolina.

Claims.—Messrs Joseph V. Graff, Illinois; Charles E. Pearce, Missouri; Loren Fletcher, Minnesota; H. S. Boutell, Illinois; Lot Thomas, Iowa; J. C. Needham, California; J. H. Southard, Ohio; Joseph Thropp, Pennsylvania; W. J. Bailey, Kansas; Edward A. Robb, Missouri; John F. Rixey, Virginia; P. J. Otey, Virginia; John Q. Underhill, New York; F. O. Phillips, Ohio, and J. J. Fitzgerald, New York.

War Claims.—Messrs. Thaddeus M. Mahon, Pennsylvania; Henry R. Gibson, Tennessee; Theobold Otjen, Wisconsin; William S. Mesick, Michigan; Walter L. Weaver, Ohio; G. N. Haugen, Iowa; B. F. Spalding, North Dakota; Chrrles E. Pearce, Missouri; Patrick Henry, Mississippi; Thomas J. Bradley, New York; John L. Brenner, Ohio; T. W. Sims, Tennessee, and Ben F. Caldwell, Illinois.

Private Land Claims.—Messrs. George W. Smith, Illinois; R. P. Bishop,, Michigan; A. V. S. Cochrane, New York; A. Lybrand, Ohio; H. B. Packer, Pennsylvania; J. E. Watson, Indiana; Abram L. Brick, Indiana; J. M. E O'Grady, New York; W. A. Jones, Virginia; P. D. McCulloch, Arkansas; Mitchell May, New York; D. E. Johnston, West Virginia; G. G. Gilbert, Kentucky, and Pedro Perea, New Mexico.

District of Columbia.—Messrs. Joseph W. Babcock, Wisconsin; Alfred C. Harmer, Pennsylvania; Sydney E. Mudd, Maryland; John J. Jenkins, Wisconsin; Charles F. Sprague, Massachusetts; David H. Mercer, Nebraska; George H. White, North Carolina; Samuel W. Smith, Michigan; Amos L. Allen, Maine; George A. Pearre, Maryland; Adolph Meyer, Louisiana; Asbury C. Latimer, South Carolina; W. S. Cowherd, Missouri; Peter J. Otey, Virginia; J. A. Norton, Ohio; T. W. Sims, Tennessee, and B. T. Clayton, New York.

Revision of the Laws.—Messrs. Vespasian Warner, Illinois; Henry R. Gibson, Tennessee; Alston C. Dayton, West Virginia; Romulus Z. Linney, North Carolina; Theobold Otjen, Wisconsin; Archibald Lybrand, Ohio; M. E. Olmsted, Pennsylvania; A. S. Tompkins, New York; James T. Lloyd, Missouri; G. A. Robbins, Alabama; J. S. Robinson, Nebraska; William Elza Williams, Illinois, and J. S. Salmon, New Jersey.

Reform in the Civil Service.—Messrs. Frederick H. Gillett, Massachusetts; Charles B. Landis, Indiana; J. F. Lacey, Iowa; J. H. Bromwell, Ohio; C. N. Fowler, New Jersey; J. D. Bowersock, Kansas; J. R. Mann, Illinois; Victor Metcalf, California; S. M. Robertson; Louisiana; W. L. Terry, Arkansas; William Elliott, South Carolina; John F. Fitzgerald, Massachusetts, and M. H. Glynn, New York.

Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.—Messrs. John B. Corliss, Michigan; H. Henry Powers, Vermont; Robert G. Cousins, Iowa; Thomas S. Butler, Pennsylvania; C. A. Sulloway, New Hampshire; W. P. Brownlow, Tennessee; Charles Curtis, Kansas; F. O. Phillips, Ohio; W. W. Rucker, Missouri; C. E. Snodgrass, Tennessee; E. D. Ziegler, Pennsylvania; G. P. Foster, Illinois, and P. Breazeale, Louisiana.

Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.—Messrs. N. D. Sperry, Connecticut; S. J. Pugh, Kentucky; J. D. Bowersock, Kansas; Washington Gardner, Michigan; Amos L. Allen, Maine; S. R. Morgan, Ohio; Oscar Turner, Kentucky; Laird H. Barber, Pennsylvania; J. S. Burnett, Alabama; R. K. Polk, Pennsylvania, and W. H. Ryan, New York.

Irrigation of Arid Lands.—Messrs. Thomas H. Tongue, Oregon; John A. Barham, California; John J. Jenkins, Wisconsin; George W. Ray, New York; Vespasian Warner, Illinois; W. A. Reeder, Kansas; F. O. Phillips, Ohio; John F. Shafroth, Colorado; R. D. Sutherland, Nebraska; Edgar Wilson, Idaho, and A. Gaston, Pennsylvania.

Immigration and Naturalization.—Messrs. W. B. Shattuc, Ohio; Joseph V. Graff, Illinois; Robert Adams, jr., Pennsylvania; B. F. Howell, New Jersey; W. B. Baker, Maryland; G. P. Lawrence, Massachusetts; Julius Kahn, California; Peter J. Otey, Virginia; A. J. Campbell, Montana; Jacob Ruppert, jr., New York, and Frank E. Wilson, New York.

Ventilation and Acoustics.—Messrs. George W. Prince, Illinois; E. L. Hamilton, Michigan; W. A. Reeder, Kansas; S. R. Morgan, Ohio; David H. Smith, Kentucky; Frank E. Wilson, New York, and J. W. Atwater, North Carolina.

Expenditures in the State Department.—Messrs. William Alden Smith, Michigan; Horace B. Packer, Pennsylvania; Robert Adams, jr., Pennsylvania; F. G. Clarke, New Hampshire; Rufus E. Lester, Georgia; Laird H. Barber, Pennsylvania, and Willis Brewer, Alabama.

Expenditures in the Treasury Department.—Messrs. Robert G. Cousins, Iowa; James W. Wadsworth, New York; G. A. Pearre, Maryland; J. W. Fordney, Michigan; William L. Terry, Arkansas; John Lamb, Virginia, and E. D. Ziegler, Pennsylvania.

Expenditures in the War Department.—Messrs. William W. Grout, Vermont; Charles A. Russell, Connecticut; Walter P. Brownlow, Tennessee, James R. Young, Pennsylvania; W. L. Stark, Nebraska, and J. S. Burnett; Alabama.

Expenditures in the Navy Department.—Messrs. James F. Stewart, New Jersey; W. S. Greene, Massachusetts; Louis W. Emerson, New York; R. J. Waters, California; Stanyarne Wilson, South Carolina; J. L. Brenner, Ohio, and Thomas Cusack, Illinois.

Expenditures in the Post-Office Department.—Messrs. Irving P. Wanger, Pennsylvania; Joseph J. Gill, Ohio; F. C. Wachter, Maryland; G. W. Cromer, Indiana; Edward Robb, Missouri; G. G. Gilbert, Kentucky, and J. K. P. Hall, Pennsylvania.

Expenditures in the Interior Department.—Messrs. Charles Curtis, Kansas; B. B. Dovener, West Virginia; M. A. Moody, Oregon; A. L. Brick, Indiana; D. J. Riordon, New York; Edward T. Noonan, Illinois, and H. D. Green, Pennsylvania.

Expenditures in the Department of Justice.—Messrs. Jonathan P. Dolliver, Iowa; W. H. Moody, Massachusetts; Julius Kahn, California; R. Z. Linney, North Carolina; Thomas C. Catchings, Mississippi; Thomas J. Bradley, New York, and W. A. Young, Virginia.

Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.—Messrs. Charles W. Gillet, New York; C. F. Wright, Pennsylvania; H. B. Dahle, Wisconsin; W. J. Bailey, Kansas; James W. Ryan, Pennsylvania; Mitchell May, New York, and J. W. Atwater, North Carolina.

Expenditures on Public Buildings.—Messrs. Robert J. Gamble, South Dakota; Richard Bartholdt, Missouri; W. A. Rodenberg, Illinois; J. H. Hoffecker, Delaware; J. H. Small, North Carolina; T. Scudder, New York, and David E. Johnston, West Virginia.

Accounts.—Messrs. Melville Bull, Rhode Island; Charles F. Joy, Missouri; Eugene F. Loud, California; M. E. Olmsted, Pennsylvania; E. B. Vreeland, New York; H. C. Smith, Michigan; Charles L. Bartlett, Georgia; Hugh A. Dinsmore, Arkansas, and Henry F. Naphen, Massachusetts.

Select Committee on Census.—Messrs. Albert J. Hopkins, Illinois; Charles A. Russell, Connecticut; Joseph W. Babcock, Wisconsin; Joel P. Heatwole, Minnesota; E. F. Acheson, Pennsylvania; E. D. Crumpacker, Indiana; E. C. Burleigh, Maine; Walter P. Brownlow, Tennessee; Francis M. Griffith, Indiana; John A. McDowell, Ohio; Stanyarne Wilson, South Carolina; William H. Ryan, New York, and Theodore F. Kluttz, North Carolina.

Library.—Messrs. Alfred C. Harmer, Pennsylvania; J. T. McCleary, Minnesota, and Amos J. Cummings, New York.

Printing.—Messrs. Joel P. Heatwole, Minnesota; Vincent Boreing, Kentucky, and F. C. Tate, Georgia.

Enrolled Bills.—Messrs. W. B. Baker, Maryland; E. L. Hamilton, Michigan; J. K. Stewart, New York; Henry C. Smith, Michigan; James T. Lloyd, Missouri; Stanyarne Wilson, South Carolina, and R. K. Polk, Pennsylvania.

During the reading of the above, and immediately after the reading of the Committee on Ways and Means, the following occurred:

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my attention was diverted for a moment and I did not hear all of the names just read. Does that last assignment include the name of the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. Wheeler?

The SPEAKER. It does not.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT RICHARD P. BLAND.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the delegation of which I am a member, I announce to the House the death of the Hon. RICHARD P. BLAND, long a Representative in Congress from the State of Missouri and elected a member of this House. His death occurred at his home, near Lebanon, Mo., on the 15th of last June. At a later date we shall ask that a time be set apart for paying suitable tribute to his high character and memory. At present I ask the adoption of the resolutions which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the resolutions.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Hon. RICHARD P. BLAND, long a Representative in Congress from the State of Missouri and a member-elect of this body.

Resolved further, That these resolutions be communicated to the Senate, and that, as a special mark of our high regard for the deceased and out of reverence for his memory, the House do now adjourn.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to; and accordingly the House (at 1 o'clock and 4 minutes) adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Catherine Metz, administratrix of estate of Jacob Metz, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Supervising Architect submitting an estimate of appropriation for providing accommodations for post-office inspectors in the custom-house and post-office building at Cincinnati, Ohio—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Supervising Architect submitting an estimate of appropriation for fireproof outbuildings for the Bureau of

Engraving and Printing—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Supervising Architect submitting an estimate of appropriation for the renovation of the plumbing and drainage system of the post-office and court-house building, Philadelphia, Pa.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Supervising Architect submitting an estimate of appropriation to complete the post-office building at Buffalo, N. Y.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Supervising Architect submitting an estimate of appropriation for the buildings at the immigrant station, Ellis Island, New York Harbor—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Supervising Architect submitting an estimate of appropriation for additional sum to complete the post-office and custom-house building at Kansas City, Mo.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Supervising Architect submitting an estimate of appropriation for an extension of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting an estimate of appropriation for new boilers, etc., in the Treasury building—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting an estimate of appropriation for increased rent for temporary building for post-office at Chicago, Ill.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for new plumbing in the Treasury building—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Supervising Architect, submitting estimates of appropriation for the custom-house and post-office building at St. Louis, Mo.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting report of Hon. Samuel J. Barrows on crimes, misdemeanors, and penalties in the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Attorney-General, transmitting a letter from the commissioner to revise and codify the criminal laws of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 4600) to authorize the construction by the Wadley and Mount Vernon Railroad Company of a bridge across the Oconee River, in the State of Georgia—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 4601) to fix the time for the convening of Congress—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 4602) to authorize the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Fort Reno and Fort Sill military reservations in the Territory of Oklahoma, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 4603) to establish a branch mint of the United States at Omaha, in the State of Nebraska—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. MUDD (by request): A bill (H. R. 4604) to amend the charter of the East Washington Heights Traction Railroad Company—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 4605) to erect a custom-house and post-office building in the city of Paris, State of Tennessee—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PARKER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 4606) to authorize a one-story addition to the post-office at Newark, N. J.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: A bill (H. R. 4607) to increase the number of officers of the Army to be detailed to colleges—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEWART of New York: A bill (H. R. 4608) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Schenectady, in the State of New York—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 4609) providing for the construction of a steam revenue cutter for service in the Third light-house district, with headquarters at Newport, R. I.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: A bill (H. R. 4610) to regulate the collection of special liquor taxes for the sale of intoxicants—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4611) to secure the right of homestead entry to certain citizens—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4612) to amend section 878 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4613) to provide for the permanent improvement of Upper White River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. EPES: A bill (H. R. 4614) for the improvement of the Appomattox River, Virginia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4615) to revive and amend an act to provide for the collection of abandoned property and the prevention of frauds in insurrectionary districts within the United States, and acts amendatory thereof—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 4616) repealing the provisions of the desert-land act requiring cash payment for desert lands, and providing for the payment in desert-land entries of the same fees now required in the case of homestead entries—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 4617) to grant a pension to officers and enlisted men who served ninety days or more in the Union Army in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 4618) for the establishment of a food bureau in the Department of Agriculture, and for preventing the adulteration and misbranding of foods in the District of Columbia and the Territories, and for regulating interstate commerce therein, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 4619) for the relief of the Pottawatomie and other Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Idaho: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Idaho, favoring the American merchant marine—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Idaho, favoring the free coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Idaho, favoring the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people—to the Committee on Election of President and Vice-President and Representatives in Congress.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Idaho, favoring the free-homestead bill—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Idaho, favoring the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home at Fort Sherman, Idaho—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Idaho, favoring an amendment to the homestead and desert-land act—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Idaho, favoring the immediate construction of the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Idaho, favoring the improving of the Columbia and Snake rivers and their tributaries—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 4620) granting a pension to Henry L. Reger, of Connellsville, Pa.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4621) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Calvin T. Holmes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4622) to correct the military record of William F. Magee, of Uniontown, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 4623) for the relief of Catherine Burger, widow of Thomas Burger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 4624) granting a pension to Ethan A. Drake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4625) granting a pension to James M. Long—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4626) granting a pension to John L. Branson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4627) granting a pension to Rachel M. Harvey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4628) to remove the charge of desertion against Marion M. Barton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4629) granting an increase of pension to R. J. Petty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4630) granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. Huff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: A bill (H. R. 4631) for the relief of James Erwin, of McBee Landing, Marion County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4632) for relief of James Erwin, of McBee, Marion County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4633) for the relief of John Calvin Lane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4634) for the relief of the estate of Henry C. Toms, deceased, late of Monroe County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURKE of Texas (by request): A bill (H. R. 4635) to quiet the titles of certain lands in the State of Mississippi, and for the relief of the estate of Eli Ayres, deceased—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

By Mr. COCHRANE of New York: A bill (H. R. 4636) to grant a pension to Rebecca A. Heimstreet—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4637) for the relief of Daniel Craver, Company G, Thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CROWLEY: A bill (H. R. 4638) to correct the naval record by inserting the name of Jacob A. Krieg for that of Charles Hart, and to remove the charge of desertion against said Jacob A. Krieg—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4639) to remove the charge of desertion from Edward Wesner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 4640) for the relief of the heirs of Stephen Staley, deceased, late of Jefferson County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. S. A. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 4641) for the relief of the legal representatives of John Boyle, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 4642) to increase the pension of James T. Holt, of Moundsville, Marshall County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FARIS: A bill (H. R. 4643) increasing pension of Isaac N. Adams—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4644) for the relief of Jacob Taylor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4645) to increase the pension of Robert M. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAINES: A bill (H. R. 4646) to present to the city of Nashville, State of Tennessee, the opening or first gun fired in the recent war of the United States with Spain from the gunboat *Nashville*, the mayor and city council having, by resolution regularly passed, agreed to "receive and hold it as a sacred trust and zealously keep and care for it that it may, as a monument of past valor and heroism, inspire our people with a higher idea of liberty and incite them to patriotic deeds in war and in peace"—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 4647) granting a pension to Sarah Gordon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENDERSON: A bill (H. R. 4648) granting a pension to William G. McLain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4649) granting a pension to William Bates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4650) granting a pension to Mrs. Sarah Parrish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4651) granting a pension to Mrs. Emily Alder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4652) granting a pension to Charles Perkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4653) granting a pension to August Zimmerman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4654) granting a pension to Simon Van Der Vaart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEDGE: A bill (H. R. 4655) granting pension to Mrs. Elizabeth C. Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 4656) for the relief of Henry Crangle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JACK: A bill (H. R. 4657) granting a pension to Mrs. Laura S. Pontious, of Dayton, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 4658) to pension Anna Hering—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 4659) to correct the military record of Collin P. Leiter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOVERING: A bill (H. R. 4660) to correct the military record of Frederic E. Fiske—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 4661) for the relief of Edward Hounsom, of Glenwood, Mo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4662) for the relief of the Catholic Church at Macon, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 4663) to amend the records of the War Department—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4664) to amend the records of the War Department—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LYBRAND: A bill (H. R. 4665) granting a pension to George E. Reid, Company C, One hundred and eightieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4666) granting a pension to Julia A. Coughlin, widow of Owen Coughlin, Company F, One hundred and thirty-second Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4667) granting a pension to Sarah E. Helpman, late matron of the hospital of the Seventh Veteran Reserve Corps—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LORIMER: A bill (H. R. 4668) authorizing the placing of the name of Joseph Hooker Wood upon the retired list of the United States Army with the rank of first lieutenant of cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 4669) to grant a pension to William D. Humbard, of Coahulla, Tenn.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4670) to correct the muster in of Capt. James H. Galbraith, late captain Company I, Seventh Regiment Tennessee Mounted Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4671) to remove the charge of desertion against the name of George W. Flinn, late private, Company C, Fifth Tennessee Regiment, and of Company D, First Tennessee Artillery Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 4672) granting a pension to James W. Boden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4673) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Standley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4674) granting an increase of pension to William Connell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 4675) to recognize the rank and rerate the pension of Robert H. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4676) for the relief of Frank E. Williams, of Hillsfork, Ohio—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEYER of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 4677) for the relief of the heirs of Pierre Sauvé—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 4678) granting a pension to James W. Edwards—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4679) granting a pension to Micager Philpot—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4680) correcting military record of Jesse L. Meeks—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4681) granting a pension to Elizabeth Keiff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 4682) for the relief of Bvt. Col. Thomas P. O'Reilly—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4683) for the relief of John G. Rose—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4684) for the relief of Emma R. Rusling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4685) granting a pension to Abbie L. Tucker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARCE of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 4686) for the relief of J. A. Ware—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 4687) to correct the record of Daniel W. Andrews—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 4688) to remove the charge of desertion against Lewis Jenkins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 4689) granting an increase of pension to James Nutt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBBINS: A bill (H. R. 4690) for the relief of the estate of William Johnson, deceased, late of Dallas County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 4691) granting an increase of pension to Philo S. Bartow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4692) granting a pension to Jane E. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 4693) for the relief of Sarah E. E. Perine, widow and administratrix of William Perine, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 4694) granting a pension to Mary Scovil—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4695) granting a pension to Alice Harrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4696) granting an increase of pension to Ruthven W. Houghton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4697) granting an increase of pension to William C. Bradley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4698) granting an increase of pension to John C. Fitnam—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4699) granting a pension to Irene E. Burghardt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4700) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah Mitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 4701) to correct the military record of Milo A. Lucas—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4702) to correct the military record of Harlow M. Jones—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4703) to correct the military record of Charles Graham, alias Charles Gregg—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4704) granting a pension to Phebe S. Hunt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4705) granting a pension to Julia A. Holcomb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4706) granting a pension to Mystic L. Hamilton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4707) granting a pension to Mrs. H. J. Huntington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4708) granting a pension to Richard Dobson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4709) granting a pension to Alvin D. Hubbard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4710) for the relief of Josephus Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4711) granting a pension to Lucy Keller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4712) granting a pension to Henry Knoop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4713) granting a pension to Jerry Lyke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 4714) granting a pension to Mary A. Morton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOMPKINS: A bill (H. R. 4715) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John W. Terwilliger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WATERS: A bill (H. R. 4716) to remove charge of desertion against Silas B. Root—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4717) to increase the pension of Richard Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A resolution (H. Res. 48) relative to an assistant clerk to the Committee on Military Affairs—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A resolution (H. Res. 49) relative to the death of Hon. Richard P. Bland.

By Mr. LORIMER: A resolution (H. Res. 50) relative to the appointment of P. L. Coultry, the acting assistant foreman of the folding room, and for payment for such service—to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, and referred as follows:

By Mr. COCHRANE of New York: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Daniel Carver—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of W. H. Webster, of Lansingburg, N. Y.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CORLISS: Petition of M. H. Dempsey and others, Christian Endeavorers, favoring the establishment of an international tribunal of arbitration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CROWLEY: Paper to accompany House bill No. 3013, granting a pension to Theodore Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Jacob A. Krieg—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, testimony relative to the removal of the charge of desertion from the military record of Albert Boker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOX: Resolutions of North Mississippi Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, asking for increase of pay of chaplains in the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the brewing industry of the United States, asking for a reduction of the tax upon fermented liquors—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of—— —to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Josiah Standley—to the Committee on Invalid pensions.

By Mr. MOON: Papers to accompany House bill to correct the military record of Capt. James H. Galbreath—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 2889, to remove the charge of desertion against George W. Flinn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PEARCE of Missouri: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of J. A. Ware—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POWERS: Papers to accompany House bill for the removal of the charge of desertion against John Levingne—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Paper to accompany House bill placing Nora Stokes on the pension rolls—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RODENBERG: Petition of 168 citizens of Monroe County, Ill., for the permanent improvement of the harbor of the Mississippi River at Harrisonville, Ill.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: Petitions of citizens and surfmen of St. Joseph, Mich., relative to increase of pay and length of service of life-saving crews on lakes—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: Petitions of W. J. Parker and others, of Bogota, N. J., and Charles Burrows and others, of Rutherford, N. J., for the reclassification of the Railway Mail Service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Petitions, etc., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah were laid on the Clerk's desk, and severally referred to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case, as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Home Missionary Society of Calvary Church, New York; also, resolutions of the New York Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

By Mr. ACHESON: Petitions of Isaac T. Crouch and others, of Thomas Station; J. P. Jordan and others, of McDonald; J. T. Russell and others, of New Salem, and Charles H. Pridgeon and others, of Cannonsburg, Pa.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: Petitions of Christian Endeavorers of Paola, Kans.; citizens of Ottawa, Iola, and others, in the State of Kansas.

By Mr. BURKETT: Resolution of the Nebraska Christian Endeavor Union, Omaha, Nebr.

By Mr. CORLISS: Petitions of Anna Sparks and others, H. F. Rose and others, and George C. Cowan and others, of the First Congressional district of Michigan.

By Mr. FOX: Resolutions of North Mississippi Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church South.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petitions of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Chicago, Ill.; D. S. Miller and others, of Hillsboro, Ohio.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Petition of F. M. Lawson and others, of Fall River, Mass.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Unionville, Conn., and W. O. Turner and others, of Hebron, Conn.

By Mr. HULL: Petition of Mrs. L. F. Culmer and other women of Warren County, Ohio.

By Mr. JACK: Petitions of the United Presbyterian Church, Glade Run Presbyterian Church, and Methodist Episcopal Church, of Dayton, Pa.; Convention of Christian People of Leechburg, Pa.; Ministerial Association of Indiana County; Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Armstrong County; Presbytery of Kittanning, and Presbyterian Church of Baxter, Pa., and citizens of the Twenty-fourth Congressional district of Pennsylvania.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of What Cheer, Iowa.

By Mr. MAHON: Petition of citizens of East Waterford, Pa.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Petition of Isaac N. Kimbrough, of Mitchell, Ind., and others.

By Mr. PRINCE: Petitions of Charles T. Mack, of Sterling, Ill., and others.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Petition of Sarah P. Moreland and 10 other women of Everett, Mass.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Columbia City, Ind.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: Petition of E. M. McMillin and others, of Adrian, Mich.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: Petition of 46 voters of the Eleventh Congressional district of Iowa.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: Petitions of missionary societies of various churches and citizens of Philadelphia, Pa.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *December 19, 1899.*

Prayer by Rev. JOHN F. HURST, D. D., bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. MCMILLAN, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

SENATOR FROM NEBRASKA.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. President, Hon. William V. Allen, a Senator by appointment from the State of Nebraska, is present, and I ask that the oath of office be now administered to him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will present himself and take the required oath of office.

Mr. Allen was escorted to the Vice-President's desk by Mr. THURSTON, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. RICHARD P. BLAND, late a Representative from the State of Missouri, and transmitted resolutions of the House thereon.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the bill which has just come from the House of Representatives may be laid before the Senate.

The bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. KYLE presented the petitions of M. J. McLaughlin and 40 other citizens of Sioux Falls, of Frank Mitchell and 16 other citizens of Faulkton, of M. J. Dewey and 67 other citizens of Hot Springs, and of the congregations of the First Methodist Episcopal Church, the Congregational Church, and the First Baptist Church, and of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Pierre, all in the State of South Dakota, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DEBOE presented the petitions of J. P. Mitchell and sundry other citizens of Harrodsburg, S. H. Jackson and sundry other citizens of Oakley, J. B. Myers and sundry other citizens of Milledgeville, and of Rev. Edward L. Warren and sundry other citizens, all in the State of Kentucky, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BERRY presented the petition of J. B. Ray and sundry other citizens of Marble, Huntsville, and Alabam, all in the State of Arkansas, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut presented the petition of Donald Miller and sundry other citizens of Lyme and Blackhall, and the petition of E. J. Wilcox and sundry other citizens of Hebron, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NELSON presented the petitions of Charles Knapp and 10 other citizens of Alexandria, A. E. Anderson and 5 other citizens, J. W. Mooney and 17 other citizens of Minnetonka, William Gardner and 13 other citizens of Wells, E. T. Schallert and 17 other citizens of Brighton, L. Bergsten and 10 other citizens of Nelson, and of E. W. Haley and 27 other citizens of Fillmore, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming presented a petition of sundry members of the bar of the supreme court of the Hawaiian Islands, praying for the enactment of legislation relative to the tenure of judicial officers in those islands; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CHANDLER. I present the petition of J. K. Richards, Solicitor-General, John G. Carlisle, Frank W. Hackett, John B. Cotton, J. Hubley Ashton, and 50 other members of the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States. The petitioners "invite attention to the urgent need of better quarters for the law library of Congress, now overflowing a basement room of the Capitol." They say that "it is the greatest law library in the world," but that "there is no proper ventilation or light, and no accommodation whatever for access to the books and work of counsel preparing a case for argument before the Supreme Court of the United States;" that "gentlemen from a distance have no convenience for consulting each other or carrying on conversation," and they suggest "that some of the space lately occupied by the Library of Congress be given over for the purposes of the law library."

Mr. President, I am uncertain as to what committee I ought to have the petition referred. We have a Committee on the Library, we have a Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, we have a Committee on Rules, and we have a Committee on the Judiciary. I leave it to the Chair to decide.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that the petition should go to the Committee on Rules. It will be so referred.

Mr. CULLOM presented the petitions of Charles T. Mack and 158 other citizens of Sterling, J. De Haan and 13 other citizens of Summit, Rev. W. L. Pierce and 100 other citizens of Rock Falls, L. H. Holtkamp and 15 other citizens of Mound, F. P. Crouch and sundry other citizens of Oak Park, Charles E. Dunlevy and sundry other citizens of Dana, J. W. Tennyson and 24 other citizens of Piasa, Rev. C. Virder and 111 other citizens of Yorkville, and of C. M. Piper and 50 other citizens of Bridgeport, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of 17,844 members of the Society of Christian Endeavor throughout the United States, praying for the establishment of an international tribunal of arbitration; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petition of Hon. Richard Olney and sundry other members of the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States, praying that better facilities be granted in the law library of Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SEWELL presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Passaic, N. J., praying for a full and free competition looking to the canceling of the monopoly of the Western Union Telegraph Cable Company in Cuba; which was referred to the Committee on Relations with Cuba.

He also presented a petition in the form of resolutions adopted at the Thirty-third National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, praying that an appropriation be made to enable the Gettysburg National Military Park Commission to continue its work; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented the petitions of Rev. T. M. Sinnanton and 30 other citizens of Califon, Rev. F. Chadwick and 18 other citizens of Ridgewood, M. Dicker and 19 other citizens of Jersey City, Charles Hamilton and 32 other citizens of South Branch, Louis Campbell and 19 other citizens of Metuchen, J. R. Hursh and 15 other citizens of Crawford, J. W. Atkinson and 25 other citizens of Jersey City, Lora E. Palmer and 13 other citizens of Newark, and of C. Vreeland and 37 other citizens of Echo Lake, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ESTATE OF GEORGE H. WELLS.

Mr. FORAKER presented a paper to accompany the bill (S. 877) for the relief of estate of George H. Wells; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. PETTIGREW, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 764) fixing times when, regulating the manner in which, and declaring the character of the accounts between the United States and the several public-land States, relative to the net proceeds of the sales and other disposition of the public lands made and to be made therein by the United States, which shall hereafter be stated and certified to the Treasury Department for payment, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am directed by the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes, to report it with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The substitute reported has the approval of a majority of the members of the Committee on Finance, and I desire to give notice that I shall ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of this bill on Thursday, January 4, at 2 o'clock.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to ask if the bill reported by the Senator from Rhode Island will be printed with the substitute?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be, under the rule.

Mr. VEST. What was done with the bill reported by the Senator from Rhode Island?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It was placed on the Calendar.

Mr. ALDRICH. It was placed on the Calendar and ordered printed, under the rule.

Mr. VEST. The Senator from Rhode Island, I understood, was to state that it was only the majority report.

Mr. ALDRICH. I did so state.

Mr. VEST. I beg your pardon; I did not hear it.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 1866) granting a pension to Laura S. Picking; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1867) granting a pension to William Penn Mack; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1868) for the relief of John G. Care; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1869) to correct the military record of Henry Schley; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1870) increasing the pension of Alexander Hughes;

A bill (S. 1871) granting a pension to George White; and

A bill (S. 1872) granting a pension to Hiram J. Reamer.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1873) to provide for the purchase of certain property for school purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. WELLINGTON introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1874) granting an increase of pension to Henry Appel;

A bill (S. 1875) to restore the name of James E. Riley to the pension roll; and

A bill (S. 1876) granting an increase of pension to John J. Wilson (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. WELLINGTON introduced a bill (S. 1877) for the relief of Mrs. Sarah C. Mitchell, widow and executrix of Richard T. Mitchell, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 1878) granting a pension to Phœbe Riley; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1879) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Howey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. KYLE introduced a bill (S. 1880) granting a pension to Simon Price; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 1881) defining and regulating proof in certain pension cases; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BERRY introduced a bill (S. 1882) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a bill (S. 1883) to establish a high court of patents, trade-marks, and copyrights; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1884) to create a Capitol art commission, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. CULLOM introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1885) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Summers (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1886) granting a pension to W. D. Wyatt (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1887) granting a pension to Theodore Harris; and

A bill (S. 1888) granting an increase of pension to John M. Smith (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. SULLIVAN introduced a bill (S. 1889) to refund to the Southern cotton-producing States the proceeds of cotton captured after the close of the war of the rebellion, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1890) granting an increase of pension to S. E. Treadway; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1891) granting an increase of pension to Amy Goodman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TILLMAN (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1892) for the relief of the estate of Robert Fishburne, sr., deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. WARREN introduced a bill (S. 1893) to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to complete the public building at Cheyenne, Wyo.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 1894) for the relief of the Union Iron Works, of San Francisco, Cal.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1895) for the relief of John Williams; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1896) providing for the restoration to the Navy of Spencer M. Kase; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1897) to amend an act entitled "An act to relinquish the title of the United States to certain property in the city and county of San Francisco, Cal.;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1898) granting a pension to Ynez Shorb White; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1899) to amend the laws relating to the naturalization of aliens; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1900) for the relief of the estate of Samuel J. Jones, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1901) granting a pension to Elvira Hunter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 1902) for the relief of Eva Moore and others; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1903) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jacob Eckert; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DEPEW introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1904) granting a pension to Ellen O'Rorke;

A bill (S. 1905) granting an increase of pension to Lillian Capron;

A bill (S. 1906) granting an increase of pension to Agnes Capron; and

A bill (S. 1907) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Paulding Meade.

Mr. HANNA introduced a bill (S. 1908) granting a pension to James M. Miller; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 1909) granting a pension to Cecilia A. Price; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McCOMAS introduced a bill (S. 1910) for the purchase of the oil portrait of Maj. Gen. William Smallwood; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1911) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of John Clemson and John C. Cookson;

A bill (S. 1912) for the relief of the heirs of John H. Waring;

A bill (S. 1913) for the relief of the Locust Point Company, of Baltimore, Md.; and

A bill (S. 1914) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Salome Main.

Mr. McCOMAS introduced a bill (S. 1915) granting a pension to Catherine Meade; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1916) for the extension of Fifth street NW. in Takoma Park, District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 1917) to provide for the erection of a monument for Joseph Anthony Mower; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1918) granting an increase of pension to John E. Higgins; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 1919) granting a pension to Consolacion Victoria Kirkland; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1920) to establish the Fredericksburg and Adjacent National Battlefields Memorial Park in the State of Virginia; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. COCKRELL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1921) granting the right to the United States and West Indies Direct Telegraph Company to lay and operate cables between the United

States and the island of Cuba and such other islands that the United States has sovereignty over; which was read twice by its title.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1922) authorizing the West Indies Development Company to acquire, lease, sell, and convey rights, franchises, and concessions from the local government of Cuba and such other islands that the United States has sovereignty over; which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What reference does the Senator desire?

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not know really to what committee the bills ought to go. I suppose they should go to the Committee on Relations with Cuba, but I am not positive.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Both bills relate to Cuban affairs.

Mr. COCKRELL. One of them relates to a right in Cuba to be obtained from the Cubans, and the other provides for a cable between the United States and Cuba.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I think they ought to go to the Committee on Relations with Cuba.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be referred to the Committee on Relations with Cuba.

Mr. STEWART introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 46) to grant a permit to the Commercial Cable Company of Cuba to lay and operate a submarine cable; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Relations with Cuba.

WILLIAM C. DODGE.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. On the 7th of December I introduced a bill (S. 1008) for the relief of William C. Dodge. I asked at the time to have it referred to the Committee on Patents, which had considered it for a number of years previously and reported favorably upon it, but by some mistake it was referred to the Committee on Claims. I ask that the reference be changed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the former action will be reconsidered and the bill will be referred to the Committee on Patents.

ADULTERATION OF FOOD.

On motion of Mr. MASON, it was

Ordered, That the evidence taken before the Committee on Manufactures on the adulteration of food be printed for the use of the committee.

DIGEST OF DECISIONS AND PRECEDENTS.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 3,000 additional copies of Senate Miscellaneous Document 278, second session Fifty-third Congress, the same being a "Digest of decisions and precedents of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, relating to their powers and privileges respecting their members and officers, and to investigations, contempts, libels, contumacious witnesses, expulsions," etc., as revised and new matter added, together with decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and other courts, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

STATISTICS RELATING TO THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines, and ordered to be printed.

Resolved, That there be compiled under the direction of the Committee on the Philippines, for the use of the Senate, the best statistics available in regard to the area, population, agricultural and mineral resources, export and import trade of the Philippine Islands, together with such other information on this subject as the committee may deem desirable.

MARBLE PEDESTAL FOR BUST OF SUMNER.

Mr. HOAR submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Architect of the Capitol be directed to procure a suitable marble pedestal for the bust of Charles Sumner near the entrance to the Senators' gallery, and that the sum of $250, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be appropriated therefor from the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I should like to state in regard to the resolution that there are, I think, eight marble busts in this gallery, some of them of a very high order of merit, and among them is the bust of Mr. Sumner, which was procured by the order of the legislature of Massachusetts and presented to the late George William Curtis, who delivered his eulogy, and by Mr. Curtis's family presented to the Senate. I believe that bust had a handsome marble pedestal when it came, but by some accident or change a wooden pedestal has been substituted. All the other busts have pedestals of marble. I thought instead of undertaking to reclaim the right one the best way would be to order the purchase of another, which would be necessary if either course were taken.

LEASING OF INDIAN LANDS FOR GRAZING PURPOSES.

Mr. PETTIGREW submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish the Senate all documents, correspondence, reports, and papers relating to the leasing of grazing lands in the Ponca, Otoe, and Missouria Indian reservations, in the Territory of Oklahoma, since the commencement of the year 1897.

PAYMENT OF STENOGRAPHER.

Mr. MORGAN submitted the following resolution; which was read:

Resolved, That the stenographer employed to report the testimony of W. B. Sorsby before the Select Committee on the Construction of the Nicaragua Canal, February 3, 1899, be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. MORGAN. I ask for the present consideration of the resolution for the reason that there is a very small sum involved, and this item was omitted from the resolution adopted at the last session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks it is necessary to send the resolution to the Committee on Contingent Expenses.

Mr. MORGAN. I suppose the Senate can waive that reference. It is not necessary to refer the resolution if the Senate agrees by unanimous consent to take it up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama asks unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think I shall object to that course; but I will say to the Senator from Alabama that if he will let the resolution go to the committee we shall report it back immediately.

Mr. MORGAN. It is a matter of only a few dollars, and the payment was omitted accidentally.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think it would be a bad precedent set to have such a resolution acted upon without a reference.

Mr. MORGAN. Very good.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported the foregoing resolution without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

LANDS IN MINNESOTA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is completed and the Calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 718) to authorize the President of the United States to cause certain lands heretofore withdrawn from market for reservoir purposes to be restored to the public domain, subject to entry under the homestead law, with certain restrictions.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to have the Senator from Minnesota explain the bill.

Mr. NELSON. Some years ago certain lands in the northern part of Minnesota, at the head waters of the Mississippi River, were withdrawn from market for the purpose of constructing reservoirs—to be flooded by the reservoirs. The reservoirs have been filled, and these are lands that are not required for reservoir purposes. It is the object of the bill to restore the lands to open entry. It relates only to lands in Minnesota.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REVISION OF PENSION LAWS.

Mr. ALLISON rose.

Mr. GALLINGER. I hope the Calendar will be proceeded with now. The first bill on the Calendar is one of importance, and I should like to have it acted upon.

Mr. ALLISON. I rose to move an executive session.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator that if the first bill on the Calendar occasions debate I will not insist on its consideration this morning. I think it will pass without debate.

The bill (S. 1476) creating a commission to revise and codify the pension laws of the United States was announced as the first bill on the Calendar, and the Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to its consideration as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have an amendment to offer to section 4, which I will send to the desk. Let a semicolon be inserted and the words that I have written be added.

The SECRETARY. At the end of section 4 strike out the period and insert a semicolon, and add the following:

And the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to provide suitable rooms for the commission in which to hold their meetings, and to detail such clerical assistants as in his judgment may be necessary and proper.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I have not the bill before me, so I can not designate the line, but——

Mr. GALLINGER. I hand the Senator a copy of the bill.

Mr. HAWLEY. I thank the Senator. In the fourth line of the first section I move to strike out "three" and insert "five." I think there ought to be more than three members. It might happen easily that the commission would be disabled with but three.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, having reported this bill from the committee, I feel sure that I represent the views of the committee in saying that I have no objection and that the committee will have no objection to the amendment, if the Senate thinks it is a wise thing to do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut will be read.

The SECRETARY. In line 4, section 1, before the word "members," it is proposed to strike out the word "three" and insert the word "five;" so as to read:

That the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a nonpartisan commission of five members.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After forty-five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE RICHARD P. BLAND.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the resolutions of the House of Representatives relative to the death of Hon. R. P. BLAND.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolutions referred to by the Senator from Missouri, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *December 18, 1899.*

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Hon. RICHARD P. BLAND, long a Representative in Congress from the State of Missouri and a member-elect of this body.

Resolved further, That these resolutions be communicated to the Senate, and that, as a special mark of our high regard for the deceased and out of reverence for his memory, the House do now adjourn.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, at some proper time we shall ask the Senate to join in paying fitting tribute to the memory and worth of Mr. BLAND. For the present I ask consideration of the resolutions which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri submits resolutions, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. RICHARD PARKS BLAND, late a Representative from the State of Missouri.

Resolved, That as an additional mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 20, 1899, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 19, 1899.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Hamilton G. Ewart, of North Carolina, to be United States district judge for the western district of North Carolina, to which position he was nominated on January 27, 1898, vice Robert P. Dick, resigned; but Congress having adjourned without taking action thereon, he was temporarily appointed July 13, 1898, during a recess of the Senate. On December 13, 1898, he was again nominated to the above-named position, but Congress adjourned without confirming said nomination; and on April 13, 1899, he was again temporarily appointed during a recess of the Senate.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Horace Speed, of Oklahoma Territory, to be attorney of the United States for the Territory of Oklahoma, vice Samuel L. Overstreet, deceased.

SUPERVISING INSPECTOR OF STEAM VESSELS.

John D. Sloane, of Minnesota, to be supervising inspector of steam vessels for the Fifth district, to succeed W. R. Tibbals, removed. Mr. Sloane is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate. This nomination is made in lieu of former one, to correct residence of Mr. Sloane. His former nomination, giving his residence as Iowa instead of Minnesota, is withdrawn.

POSTMASTERS.

Charles A. Edwards, to be postmaster at Prattville, in the county of Autauga and State of Alabama, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Caroline B. Andrews, to be postmaster at Presidio, in the county of San Francisco and State of California, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899.

Jennie B. Smith, to be postmaster at Carrollton, in the county of Carroll and State of Georgia, in the place of G. M. Smith, deceased.

Thomas E. Burgoyne, to be postmaster at Melrose Park, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899.

Richard M. Boyd, to be postmaster at Sanborn, in the county of O'Brien and State of Iowa, in the place of J. F. Kerberg, whose commission expires January 15, 1900.

John F. Lyons, to be postmaster at Murray, in the county of Clarke and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899.

Matthew Richmond, to be postmaster at Armstrong, in the county of Emmet and State of Iowa, in the place of W. R. Flemming, whose commission expires January 15, 1900.

George L. Minott, to be postmaster at Gardner, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts, in the place of G. K. Stratton, superseded by reason of consolidation of offices.

George H. Seymour, to be postmaster at Monson, in the county of Hampden and State of Massachusetts, in the place of J. P. Herlihy, jr., whose commission expired December 18, 1899.

Agnes J. Smith, to be postmaster at Stockbridge, in the county of Berkshire and State of Massachusetts, in the place of Agnes J. Smith, whose commission expired December 18, 1899. (Reappointed.)

Edgar B. Gregory, to be postmaster at Jonesville, in the county of Hillsdale and State of Michigan, in the place of William Keough, whose commission expires December 30, 1899.

W. R. Edwards, to be postmaster at Tracy, in the county of Lyon and State of Minnesota, in the place of O. J. Rea, whose commission expires January 15, 1900.

Ernst G. Winter, to be postmaster at Jefferson Barracks, in the county of St. Louis and State of Missouri, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899.

Charles T. Knight, to be postmaster at Monroe, in the county of Orange and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899.

William G. Simpson, to be postmaster at High Bridge, in the county of Hunterdon and State of New Jersey, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1899.

Harlow N. Aldrich, to be postmaster at Elmore, in the county of Ottawa and State of Ohio, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899.

Frederick G. Withoft, to be postmaster at Dayton, in the county of Montgomery and State of Ohio, in the place of Ira Crawford, deceased.

Albert A. Atterholt, to be postmaster at Rochester, in the county of Beaver and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Frank Feyler, whose commission expires January 7, 1900.

Charles Graffin, to be postmaster at Catasauqua, in the county of Lehigh and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Henry Davis, deceased.

Anne D. Moore, to be postmaster at Avondale, in the county of Chester and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1899.

Eugene R. Phillips, to be postmaster at Phillipsdale, in the county of Providence and State of Rhode Island, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Charles N. Cooper, to be postmaster at Huron, in the county of Beadle and State of South Dakota, in the place of David R. Jeffris, resigned.

Frank L. Bradley, to be postmaster at Gilmer, in the county of Upshur and State of Texas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1899.

William Kelly, to be postmaster at Lockhart, in the county of Caldwell and State of Texas, in the place of J. F. Anderson, removed.

William R. Baker, to be postmaster at Colville, in the county of Stevens and State of Washington, in the place of T. A. Winter, resigned.

Michael J. Madden, to be postmaster at Cudahy, in the county of Milwaukee and State of Wisconsin, in the place of M. J. McNamara, whose commission expires December 30, 1899.

CHIEF OF BUREAU OF STEAM ENGINEERING.

Capt. George W. Melville, United States Navy, to be Engineer in Chief and Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear-admiral, from the 16th day of January, 1900.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 19, 1899.

MEMBER OF INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION.

Albert Clarke, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Industrial Commission authorized by act of Congress approved June 18, 1898.

CONSULS.

Robert E. Mansfield, of Indiana, to be consul of the United States at Zanzibar, Zanzibar.

William Ross Davis, of Ohio, to be consul of the United States at Alexandretta, Turkey.

Peter Lieber, of Indiana, to be consul of the United States at Düsseldorf, Germany.

Max J. Baehr, of Nebraska, to be consul of the United States at Santos, Brazil.

Heaton W. Harris, of Ohio, to be consul of the United States at Mannheim, Germany.

Ethelbert Watts, of Pennsylvania, to be consul of the United States at Kingston, Jamaica.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Charles T. Duke, of Monticello, Ark., to be register of the land office at Camden, Ark.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Owen Summers, of Oregon, to be appraiser of merchandise in the district of Willamette, in the State of Oregon.

SPECIAL EXAMINER OF DRUGS, ETC.

Benjamin P. Ashmead, of Pennsylvania, to be special examiner of drugs, medicines, and chemicals in the district of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania.

MARSHALS.

William H. Grimshaw, of Minnesota, to be marshal of the United States for the district of Minnesota.

Trevanyon L. Mathews, of Nebraska, to be marshal of the United States for the district of Nebraska.

Lemuel Gustine, of Louisiana, to be marshal of the United States for the western district of Louisiana.

Eugene P. Nute, of New Hampshire, to be marshal of the United States for the district of New Hampshire.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Edward Banks, of Maine, to be collector of customs for the district of York, in the State of Maine.

Albert R. Day, of Maine, to be collector of customs for the district of Bangor, in the State of Maine.

Fred W. Wight, of Maine, to be collector of customs for the district of Waldoboro, in the State of Maine.

SURVEYOR-GENERAL.

Edward P. Kingsbury, of Centralia, Wash., to be surveyor-general of Washington.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, DISTRICT SUPREME COURT.

Job Barnard, of the District of Columbia, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the District of Columbia.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Albert J. Apperson, of McMinnville, Oreg., to be receiver of public moneys at Sitka, Alaska.

Othello Scribner, of Fresno, Cal., to be receiver of public moneys at Visalia, Cal.

Joel R. Scott, of Newkirk, Okla., to be receiver of public moneys at Perry, Okla.

Frank M. Foote, of Evanston, Wyo., to be receiver of public moneys at Evanston, Wyo.

INDIAN AGENTS.

William R. Logan, of Alhambra, Mont., to be agent for the Indians of the Blackfeet Agency, in Montana.

Maj. George W. H. Stouch, United States Army, retired, of Colorado, to be agent for the Indians of the Cheyenne and Arapahoe Agency, in Oklahoma.

Alonzo A. Armstrong, of Phœnix, Ariz., to be agent for the Indians of the Fort Apache Agency, in Arizona.

John E. Edwards, of Junction, Mont., to be agent for the Indians of the Crow Agency, in Montana.

Ira A. Hatch, of Mound City, S. Dak., to be agent for the Indians of the Cheyenne River Agency, in South Dakota.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

William M. Byrne, of Delaware, to be attorney of the United States for the district of Delaware.

Charles H. Brown, of New York, to be attorney of the United States for the northern district of New York.

John J. Sullivan, of Ohio, to be attorney of the United States for the northern district of Ohio.

CHIEF JUSTICE COURT OF PRIVATE LAND CLAIMS.

Joseph R. Reed, of Iowa, to be chief justice of the Court of Private Land Claims for the term ending June 30, 1900, as provided for by act of Congress approved February 24, 1899.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICES COURT OF PRIVATE LAND CLAIMS.

Wilbur F. Stone, of Colorado, to be associate justice of the Court of Private Land Claims for the term ending June 30, 1900, as provided for by act of Congress approved February 24, 1899.

Henry C. Sluss, of Kansas, to be associate justice of the Court of Private Land Claims for the term ending June 30, 1900, as provided for by act of Congress approved February 24, 1899.

Thomas C. Fuller, of North Carolina, to be associate justice of the Court of Private Land Claims for the term ending June 30, 1900, as provided for by act of Congress approved February 24, 1899.

William W. Murray, of Tennessee, to be associate justice of the Court of Private Land Claims for the term ending June 30, 1900, as provided for by act of Congress approved February 24, 1899.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Carl Ramus, of Illinois, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Walter W. King, of Michigan, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

John W. Amesse, of Michigan, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Charles E. D. Lord, of Maine, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Halstead A. Stansfield, of California, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

PROMOTION IN THE MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Asst. Surg. Arthur R. Thomas, of Illinois, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Byron A. Minor, of Wisconsin, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Thomas M. Molloy, of Massachusetts, to be a third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Harold L. Hinckley, of Massachusetts, to be a third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Henry W. Pope, of Massachusetts, to be a third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Second Asst. Engineer Henry K. Spencer, of Wisconsin, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. John E. Reinburg, of Illinois, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Third Lieut. Charles Satterlee, of Connecticut, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Third Lieut. Leonard T. Cutter, of New Hampshire, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

SUPERVISING INSPECTOR OF STEAM VESSELS.

John D. Sloane, of Minnesota, to be supervising inspector of steam vessels for the Fifth district.

POSTMASTERS.

Edward Madigan, to be postmaster at Clarksville, in the county of Butler and State of Iowa.

Jennie B. Smith, to be postmaster at Carrollton, in the county of Carroll and State of Georgia.

Samuel H. Hedrix, to be postmaster at Allerton, in the county Wayne and State of Iowa.

Irving W. Tyson, to be postmaster at Schuylkill Haven, in the county of Schuylkill and State of Pennsylvania.

Georgie E. Shaw, to be postmaster at New Kensington, in the county of Westmoreland and State of Pennsylvania.

Theophilus G. Fowler, to be postmaster at Uniontown, in the county of Perry and State of Alabama.

Lovett E. Sherwood, to be postmaster at Shellrock, in the county of Butler and State of Iowa.

Cornelius C. Platter, to be postmaster at Red Oak, in the county of Montgomery and State of Iowa.

Dallas B. Smith, to be postmaster at Opelika, in the county of Lee and State of Alabama.

George B. Hanlin, to be postmaster at Avondale, in the county of Jefferson and State of Alabama.

Wiley F. Kennamer, to be postmaster at Demopolis, in the county of Marengo and State of Alabama.

John E. Wilson, to be postmaster at Centerville, in the county of Queen Anne and State of Maryland.

Marcelene Lucas, to be postmaster at Chestertown, in the county of Kent and State of Maryland.

Lansing T. Smith, to be postmaster at Anniston, in the county of Calhoun and State of Alabama.

Harry E. Meyers, to be postmaster at Yuba City, in the county of Sutter and State of California.

Horace B. Gardiner, to be postmaster at Crockett, in the county of Contra Costa and State of California.

Frank H. Hudson, to be postmaster at Clifton, in the county of Graham and Territory of Arizona.

John F. Morgan, to be postmaster at Colorado City, in the county of El Paso and State of Colorado.

William P. Harbottle, to be postmaster at Salida, in the county of Chaffee and State of Colorado.

Albert L. Paulsen, to be postmaster at Weaverville, in the county of Trinity and State of California.

William Holmes, to be postmaster at Shelton, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut.

Edmund E. Crowe, to be postmaster at South Norwalk, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut.

Charles T. Wade, to be postmaster at Buena Vista, in the county of Chaffee and State of Colorado.

Joseph P. Bozarth, to be postmaster at La Grange, in the county of Oldham and State of Kentucky.

Edward L. Maudlin, to be postmaster at New Carlisle, in the county of St. Joseph and State of Indiana.

Amos A. Covalt, to be postmaster at Greentown, in the county of Howard and State of Indiana.

Henry S. Moore, to be postmaster at Hudson, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

William L. Lathrop, to be postmaster at Orange, in the county of Franklin and State of Massachusetts.

Charles H. Cummings, to be postmaster at Attleboro Falls, in the county of Bristol and State of Massachusetts.

Willard E. Holt, to be postmaster at Bellevue, in the county of Eaton and State of Michigan.

Archibald K. Dougherty, to be postmaster at Elk Rapids, in the county of Antrim and State of Michigan.

Corydon Beach, to be postmaster at Galesburg, in the county of Kalamazoo and State of Michigan.

Nels A. Lilyquist, to be postmaster at Winthrop, in the county of Sibley and State of Minnesota.

Charles F. Hendryx, to be postmaster at Sauk Center, in the county of Stearns and State of Minnesota.

Victor Gillrup, to be postmaster at Albert Lea, in the county of Freeborn and State of Minnesota.

Charles W. Paige, to be postmaster at Dawson, in the county of Lac qui Parle and State of Minnesota.

Peter S. Nelson, to be postmaster at Argyle, in the county of Marshall and State of Minnesota.

James H. McCune, to be postmaster at Benson, in the county of Swift and State of Minnesota.

Samuel L. Stanchfield, to be postmaster at Camden Place, in the county of Hennepin and State of Minnesota.

Justin E. Stiles, to be postmaster at Wells, in the county of Faribault and State of Minnesota.

Charles F. Searle, to be postmaster at Milaca, in the county of Millelacs and State of Minnesota.

James McNally, to be postmaster at Edgar, in the county of Clay and State of Nebraska.

Ambrose M. Colson, to be postmaster at Plainview, in the county of Pierce and State of Nebraska.

Edmund J. Burke, to be postmaster at Bancroft, in the county of Cuming and State of Nebraska.

J. D. Stine, to be postmaster at Superior, in the county of Nuckolls and State of Nebraska.

Samuel H. Reesman, to be postmaster at University Place, in the county of Lancaster and State of Nebraska.

Jessie W. Phillips, to be postmaster at Table Rock, in the county of Pawnee and State of Nebraska.

Daniel M. Merchant, to be postmaster at Morris Plains, in the county of Morris and State of New Jersey.

Lewis E. Jeffries, to be postmaster at Mays Landing, in the county of Atlantic and State of New Jersey.

Lewis W. Davis, to be postmaster at East Jaffrey, in the county of Cheshire and State of New Hampshire.

George E. Marcellus, to be postmaster at Leroy, in the county of Genesee and State of New York.

George T. Eveland, to be postmaster at Franklin, in the county of Delaware and State of New York.

Thomas H. Dickinson, to be postmaster at Champlain, in the county of Clinton and State of New York.

Lillian I. Pearsall, to be postmaster at Sea Cliff, in the county of Nassau and State of New York.

Clarence E. Parker, to be postmaster at Nepera Park, in the county of Westchester and State of New York.

William Holden, to be postmaster at Portville, in the county of Cattaraugus and State of New York.

Isaac S. Slaight, to be postmaster at Tottenville, in the county of Richmond and State of New York.

George L. Rapelye, to be postmaster at Corona, in the county of Queens and State of New York.

Frank M. Preston, to be postmaster at Oswego Falls, in the county of Oswego and State of New York.

Clarence H. Ashar, to be postmaster at Carthage, in the county of Hamilton and State of Ohio.

Mathew Lynch, to be postmaster at Lidgerwood, in the county of Richmond and State of North Dakota.

Hans A. Alm, to be postmaster at Hankinson, in the county of Richland and State of North Dakota.

Edgar M. Kane, to be postmaster at Vermilion, in the county of Erie and State of Ohio.

Robert S. King, to be postmaster at Glouster, in the county of Athens and State of Ohio.

Lee L. Cassady, to be postmaster at Dresden, in the county of Muskingum and State of Ohio.

John A. Allen, to be postmaster at Peace Dale, in the county of Washington and State of Rhode Island.

Leonidas H. Smith, to be postmaster at Arcanum, in the county of Darke and State of Ohio.

Nellie F. Sheridan, to be postmaster at Somerset, in the county of Perry and State of Ohio.

George G. Jennings, to be postmaster at Clark, in the county of Clark and State of South Dakota.

Lyman J. Bates, to be postmaster at Lake Preston, in the county of Kingsbury and State of South Dakota.

E. R. Booth, to be postmaster at Nephi, in the county of Juab and State of Utah.

Catherine M. Dougall, to be postmaster at Springville, in the county of Utah and State of Utah.

Clarence V. Rattan, to be postmaster at Cooper, in the county of Delta and State of Texas.

Reuben Matson, to be postmaster at Brookings, in the county of Brookings and State of South Dakota.

Henry G. Blanchard, to be postmaster at Newport, in the county of Orleans and State of Vermont.

Harlow C. Ayer, to be postmaster at Richford, in the county of Franklin and State of Vermont.

Martha W. Arnold, to be postmaster at Bethel, in the county of Windsor and State of Vermont.

Edward J. Tyler, to be postmaster at Enosburg Falls, in the county of Franklin and State of Vermont.

Charles E. Hall, to be postmaster at Swanton, in the county of Franklin and State of Vermont.

Henry J. Fisher, to be postmaster at Morrisville, in the county of Lamoille and State of Vermont.

Charles A. Booth, to be postmaster at Monroe, in the county of Green and State of Wisconsin.

William H. Glover, to be postmaster at Terra Alta, in the county of Preston and State of West Virginia.

William Chambers, to be postmaster at Point Pleasant, in the county of Mason and State of West Virginia.

John F. Gillmore, to be postmaster at Durand, in the county of Pepin and State of Wisconsin.

George W. Dodge, to be postmaster at Menasha, in the county of Winnebago and State of Wisconsin.

Wilbur H. Bridgman, to be postmaster at Stanley, in the county of Chippewa and State of Wisconsin.

George L. Walker, to be postmaster at Toccoa, in the county of Habersham and State of Georgia.

Lizzie Hamilton, to be postmaster at Buford, in the county of Gwinnett and State of Georgia.

Moses E. Williams, to be postmaster at Foxlake, in the county of Dodge and State of Wisconsin.

Addison B. Hallock, to be postmaster at Peotone, in the county of Will and State of Illinois.

Lucian Bullard, to be postmaster at Forrest, in the county of Livingston and State of Illinois.

Hugh Bennett, to be postmaster at Coal City, in the county of Grundy and State of Illinois.

Charles F. Renich, to be postmaster at Woodstock, in the county of McHenry and State of Illinois.

William A. Chapman, to be postmaster at Cedartown, in the county of Polk and State of Georgia.

James P. Mathis, to be postmaster at Toluca, in the county of Marshall and State of Illinois.

Oscar H. Harpham, to be postmaster at Havana, in the county of Mason and State of Illinois.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *December 19, 1899.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CASE OF BRIGHAM H. ROBERTS.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses incurred and to be incurred by the Special Committee on the Case of Brigham H. Roberts shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, and the Clerk of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized to pay out of the contingent fund of the House such sums as said committee may deem necessary for said purpose, and said committee shall submit vouchers for the expenditure of all sums of money disbursed under its order in the execution of this resolution, which disbursements and vouchers shall be subject to the approval of the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the Chair will pardon a word, I desire to say, for the information of the House, that the

immediate purpose of the resolution is to provide for the expenses already incurred and arranged to be incurred by the committee. It is the hope and expectation at present of the committee that it will not need to make a journey to Utah, but in that hope it may be disappointed. If it should be necessary, it will ask for further instructions or direction of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. TAYLER of Ohio, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution to have the same committee that is investigating the Roberts case investigate the case of the two postmasters, John C. Graham and Orson Smith. I ask that the resolution be read and be disposed of at this time.

Mr. SHERMAN. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. LENTZ. I would like to know who objected, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York.

Mr. SHERMAN. I made the objection.

CLERKS FOR ELECTION COMMITTEES.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Election Committees Nos. 2 and 3 are each authorized to employ a clerk, at an annual compensation of $2,000 each, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided for.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, is it usual to give these committees an annual clerk?

Mr. WEAVER. It has been.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Has this resolution been considered by the Committee on Accounts?

Mr. WEAVER. It has not.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think it ought to go to the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

A bill (H. R. 4152) to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts by bureaus and offices of the War Department.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 330) to restore to their original status as to promotion officers of the Navy and Marine Corps losing numbers by reason of the advancement of other officers for exceptional and meritorious service during the war with Spain.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate appointing a committee of each House to make arrangements for the reception and unveiling of the statue of Daniel Webster.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore had appointed Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. ALLISON, and Mr. BACON as the members of the committee on the part of the Senate to make arrangements for the reception and unveiling of the statue of Daniel Webster.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

S. 330. An act to restore to their original status as to promotion officers of the Navy and Marine Corps losing numbers by reason of the advancement of other officers for exceptional and meritorious service during the war with Spain—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PRINTING FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means be authorized to sit during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. PAYNE, a motion to reconsider the votes by which the two resolutions were agreed to was laid on the table.

PRINTING FOR COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs be, and hereby is, authorized to have printed and bound such papers and documents as may be necessary for the business of said committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I did not raise any objection to the resolution offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] a moment ago, which resolution was similar to this, but it occurs to me from listening to the reading of the resolutions that they are not in the usual form in which we have heretofore passed them.

Mr. HULL. This one is, I think.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not object to giving the committees the right to print and bind matter on hearings, or on matters pending before them, but this, as I understood the resolution of the gentleman from New York, and also this resolution, gives them unlimited power to print on any matter in their discretion. I do not think that ought to be done.

Mr. HULL. With the exception of the words "and bound," this is the same resolution that we have had heretofore, and the committee have not understood that the resolution gives them unlimited power, but only the power to print on matters which come before the committee in hearings and in the transaction of their business.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think the committee ought to have that power, and I think it ought to be limited to that.

Mr. HULL. That is all we have considered that we had under this authority during the chairmanship of my predecessor, Mr. Outhwaite, and since I have been chairman of the committee.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to say to the gentleman that the resolution for the Committee on Ways and Means was drawn by the clerk, and he informed me that it was in the usual form.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If it is in the usual form, I shall not object to it; but it occurred to me that it was not in the usual form.

Mr. PAYNE. I did not compare it myself.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not object, but I should like to compare the resolutions with those which have been passed heretofore.

Mr. HULL. This is in the same form as former resolutions which have been offered by the Committee on Military Affairs, with the exception which I have stated to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. HULL a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

PRINTING FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture be authorized to have printed and bound whatever documents and papers may be necessary for the use of said committee in the transaction of its business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE TO SIT DURING THE SESSION.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That Committee on Elections No. 1 be authorized to sit during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL CLERK FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be authorized to appoint an additional clerk for said committee, whose salary shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to ask the gentleman from Iowa if this has been customary in the past?

Mr. HEPBURN. I did not understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I wish to ask the gentleman if it has been usual and customary in the past to allow this additional clerk?

Mr. HEPBURN. It has, Mr. Speaker, for the last three Congresses. That committee has had this additional clerk, and I think if there is any committee for which it is necessary to have such additional clerk—and I know there are a number where it is necessary—this is one of the committees. No one clerk can perform all the labor which is there to be performed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa whether similar resolutions do not usually go to the Committee on Accounts for consideration?

Mr. HEPBURN. I think you are correct about that; but the report from that committee on the subject has invariably been unanimous. The probability is that there will be no meeting of that committee for a considerable time, and a report can not be made by it soon.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman expect to have a meeting of his committee to transact any business before the holiday recess?

Mr. HEPBURN. The gentleman knows that the chairmen of many of the committees have no private clerk during the session of Congress, and I think that it is only right and fair that they should have some one to perform some portion of the duties that devolve upon them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resoution?

Mr. LOUD. I hope the gentleman will let the matter lie over. There are several requests of a similar kind before the Committee on Accounts, and I hope you will let this take its course with the rest of them.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California objects.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

Mr. RAY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution and ask unanimous consent for its consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be, and is, authorized to have printed and bound such papers and documents as may be necessary in the transaction of its business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken; and the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. RAY of New York, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs be authorized to have printed and bound such papers and documents for the use of said committee as it may deem necessary in connection with subjects considered or to be considered by the said committee during the Fifty-sixth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. This is the customary resolution.

Mr. RICHARDSON. As I gather, this resolution——

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. It is the customary resolution, I would say to the gentleman from Tennessee——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine will kindly suspend a moment until the House is in order. The gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The resolution offered by the gentleman from Maine contains the language which I suggested a moment ago was not included in the previous resolutions, if I could hear them. This resolution says:

To have printed and bound such papers and documents for the use of said committee as it may deem necessary in connection with subjects considered or to be considered by said committee.

I think that is accurate, Mr. Speaker, and I have no objection to this resolution. It is the usual resolution and ought to pass; but we ought not to give to the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Military Affairs, and the Committee on the Judiciary unlimited power to print on subjects not pending and not to be considered by those committees, and the gentlemen offering those resolutions stated that the resolutions were in the usual form. Now, as I suppose they made that statement under misapprehension, I take it they will not object, by unanimous consent, to have inserted in those former resolutions these words. The House certainly was misled, and I was misled and would not consent to give these committees power to print and bind, indiscriminate power and unlimited power to print on matters not coming before those committees to be considered.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I understand the gentleman from Tennessee does not make any objection to this resolution.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not. I take pleasure in saying that this resolution ought to pass.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I thank the gentleman for his eulogy and ask that the resolution be passed.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the former resolutions—one from the Committee on Ways and Means, one from the Committee on Military Affairs, and another from the Committee on the Judiciary, and any other committee that may have escaped my notice—the language I have suggested where they differ from this one.

Mr. HULL. I did not notice where this differed from the other.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It differs in this, that the leave authorized is confined to "subjects considered or to be considered" by the committee.

Mr. HULL. I am perfectly willing, so far as I am concerned, for unanimous consent to be given that those words be inserted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the resolutions giving authority to certain committees to print be confined to matters pending before the committee——

Mr. RICHARDSON. To "matters considered or to be considered." Just use the exact language of the resolutions heretofore adopted for all time since I have been here.

The SPEAKER. The leave to print shall apply to matters "considered or to be considered" by those committees. Is there objection to the request that this amendment shall be adopted? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the change will be made in the resolutions.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution:

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Public Lands be authorized to have printed and bound all documents considered or to be considered by said committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not object. The language the gentleman has sought to use indicates that those words have been added while these matters have been pending. If he will read the resolution he will see that it does not comply with the former resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the amendment heretofore agreed to will apply to this resolution also. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. LACEY. I tried to get the exact language while the gentleman from Tennessee was suggesting it.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

NAVAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE—LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to sit during sessions of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. FOSS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF PAPERS, DOCUMENTS, ETC.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the following resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor be authorized to have printed and bound whatever papers and documents in connection with subjects under consideration by the committee that may be necessary to the transaction of its business.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if that privilege has been heretofore extended to this committee? I can understand why this privilege should be accorded to committees that have appropriation bills; that would seem to be necessary, but this committee has no jurisdiction over appropriation bills. I do not see the propriety of this, and I shall object, unless the privilege has been heretofore accorded that committee.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. I can not speak from the

record; but my understanding is that the privilege has been twice extended to this committee, with a limitation of $500. In the last Congress the privilege was not extended to the committee, because it was not asked for; but it was found before the close of the session that not asking for it was an error. There were papers that should and ought to have been printed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will not the gentleman be satisfied with asking for it when it becomes necessary? Perhaps it will not be necessary at all. I do not want to stand in the way of what is necessary, but I do not see now that there can be any immediate call for it. It will add unnecessarily to the ordinary expenses of the Government.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. I concur with the gentleman that it may not be necessary for every committee to have this authority. I wish to assure the gentleman from Tennessee, however, that this committee that now asks for it will not abuse its privilege. There are subjects under consideration at Detroit, subjects under consideration by the Industrial Commission, that will unquestionably make it necessary for the committee to have this privilege.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Under that view, Mr. Speaker, I will not object.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON ROBERTS CASE.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Special Committee on the Case of Brigham H. Roberts be authorized to have printed and bound the proceedings and testimony taken by said committee and such documents for the use of said committee as it may deem necessary in connection with subjects considered and to be considered by said committee.

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what was the first part of that resolution.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to have the resolution again reported?

Mr. LENTZ. I do.

The resolution was again read.

Mr. LENTZ. I shall object, Mr. Speaker, unless the committee be also authorized to investigate John C. Graham and Orson Smith.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

UNVEILING STATUE OF DANIEL WEBSTER.

The SPEAKER. The Senate having agreed to an amendment of the resolution in respect to making preparations for unveiling the Webster statue, the Chair desires to announce the House members of that committee.

The Clerk will read the names.

The Clerk read as follows:

Messrs. W. C. LOVERING, Massachusetts; ROBERT G. COUSINS, Iowa; FRANK G. CLARKE, New Hampshire; AMOS J. CUMMINGS, New York, and JOHN WESLEY GAINES, Tennessee.

COMMITTEE ON THE ROBERTS CASE.

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection. I am told by gentlemen of the committee that they need this authority.

The SPEAKER. The objection having been withdrawn to the resolution offered by the gentleman from Ohio, the Chair will ask if there is any further objection to the consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolution was then agreed to.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Ways and Means to report back House resolution 47 for distributing the President's message, with amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be considered in the House at the present time as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York reports from the Committee on Ways and Means a resolution distributing the President's message to appropriate committees, and asks unanimous consent that the same may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would like to ask the gentleman what debate he proposes to have on the resolution?

Mr. PAYNE. I know of no debate on this side, except the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW] desires to make some remarks.

Mr. RICHARDSON. How much time will be occupied?

Mr. PAYNE. About thirty or forty minutes, the gentleman says.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I suppose the gentleman will not object to our taking forty minutes on this side?

Mr. PAYNE. None in the least; no trouble about that.

Mr. RICHARDSON. And that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. We have no objection to that.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That so much of the annual message of the President of the United States to the two Houses of Congress at the present session as relates to the revenue, the bonded debt of the United States, and the treaties affecting the revenue be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

That so much as relates to the foreign affairs, the consular and diplomatic service, including appropriations therefor, together with the accompanying correspondence and documents, and to the revision of treaties other than treaties affecting the revenue, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

That so much as relates to the appropriations of the public revenue for support of the Government as herein provided, namely, for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses; for sundry civil expenses; for fortifications and coast defenses; for pensions; for the District of Columbia, and for all deficiencies, and also for the exposition at Paris in 1900, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

That so much as relates to the judiciary of the United States, to the administration of justice, and the organization of courts, be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

That so much as relates to banks and banking and the currency be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

That so much as relates to the mints of the United States and to the coinage of gold and silver bullion be referred to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

That so much as relates to the commerce of the United States, domestic and foreign, except so far as it affects the revenue, to intercolonial railways, and the Nicaragua Canal, be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

That so much as relates to agriculture and appropriations therefor be referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

That so much as relates to the merchant marine and fisheries be referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

That so much as relates to the military establishment and appropriations therefor be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

That so much as relates to the naval establishment and to the construction of additional vessels for the Navy, and appropriations therefor, be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

That so much as relates to the post-offices and post roads and to the carrying of the foreign mails and appropriations therefor be referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

That so much as relates to the public domain be referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

That so much as relates to the relations of the United States to the Indian tribes and appropriations therefor be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

That so much as relatates to the Territories, Alaska, and the Hawaiian Islands be referred to the Committee on the Territories.

That so much as relates to the islands which came to the United States through the treaty of 1899 with Spain, and to Cuba (except so much as relates to the revenue and the appropriations), be referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

That so much as relates to pensions be referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

That so much as relates to the Pacific railroads be referred to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

That so much as relates to the civil service be referred to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

That so much as relates to quarantine regulations and foreign immigration be referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

With the following committee amendment:

Insert at the end of the resolution the following:

"That so much as relates to the census be referred to the Select Committee on the Twelfth Census."

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the House that this is the usual resolution for the distribution of the President's message. It conforms to the amendment which was made by the House in the last Congress as to the matter to be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and that to be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Two or three new clauses have been added, because new topics have been treated in the message. That relating to insular affairs and to Cuba is referred to the committee appointed under the rules upon that subject, in the language of the rule. The committee have also recommended an amendment so that what is said in reference to the census is to be referred to the Select Committee on the Twelfth Census. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW].

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman from New York yields to the gentleman from Pennsylvania will he yield to me for a question?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. HEPBURN. As I understood the reading of that resolution, matters relating to quarantine are referred to the Committee on Immigration. Heretofore the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has uniformly had jurisdiction over that matter under the rules of the House.

Mr. PAYNE. This resolution is in the form in which a similar resolution was adopted in the last Congress.

Mr. HEPBURN. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had jurisdiction of that matter during the last Congress, and always has had so far as my knowledges goes.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, suppose the gentleman allows the general debate to proceed, and we will look that matter up. I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW].

The SPEAKER. How much time does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. PAYNE. I yield forty minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW].

Mr. GROW. Mr. Speaker, what is the duty and present responsibility of this nation to liberty and humanity? On the 21st

day of April, 1898, Congress authorized and directed the President to use the Army and Navy of the United States to compel Spain to withdraw her flag and abandon forever her sovereignty over the island of Cuba. Never was an act of Congress more universally approved by the people.

Within ten days after this direction to the President, a squadron of the American Navy, cruising in Asiatic waters, in obedience to orders received by its commander to strike the enemy wherever found and "to capture or destroy his ships," sailed into the harbor of Manila and destroyed the Pacific squadron of the Spanish navy in a victory unparalleled in the world's history of naval warfare. From that time to this the flag of the United States has floated supreme in the Bay of Manila, and within one hundred days from the declaration of war by Congress it floated in triumph over Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippine Islands, from all of which the flag and sovereignty of Spain was forever expelled.

Thus, by the fortunes of war, approved in its beginning almost unanimously by the people, were Puerto Rico and the Philippine Islands added to the territory of the United States. Such territory, whether desirable or not, was thenceforth to be either Spanish or American. This was the only alternative. The war, it is true, was begun on our part in behalf of liberty and humanity for a million and a half of people in the island of Cuba. Are liberty and humanity questions of latitude and longitude? Spanish rule for three hundred years in the Philippine Islands had been scarcely less cruel than in the island of Cuba. In the fortunes of war the first act against the enemy was the destruction of Spanish sovereignty over eight or ten millions of people in the far-off Philippines instead of the million and a half in Cuba.

Puerto Rico and the Philippine Islands were acquired in the fortunes of war and by a treaty of peace with Spain, in the same way that California and other territory was acquired in the fortunes of war and by a treaty of peace with Mexico. Twenty millions of dollars was paid to Spain in concluding with her a treaty of peace. Fifteen millions was paid to Mexico in concluding with her a treaty of peace. The twenty millions paid to Spain was for her relinquishment of sovereignty over Cuba, Puerto Rico, and all her islands in the West Indies, and over the island of Guam and the Philippines, in the Pacific Ocean.

These $20,000,000 offered by the American commission in the form of an ultimatum at the close of negotiations, before a single article of the treaty had been finally concluded, were to cover all cessions of territory and all questions in controversy as to the debts and public property of Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippine Islands. The fifteen millions paid to Mexico was for the relinquishment of her sovereignty over the territory we acquired lying west of the Louisiana purchase. The payment in both these cases was, as defined by Vattel in his Law of Nations, the act of "an equitable conqueror."

This Government has never acquired any territory outside of the original thirteen colonies without the payment of a money consideration satisfactory to the parties in interest. There is no question of forcible annexation of territory before the American people now, nor has there been. But there is a question of forcible suppression of an insurrection against the authority and sovereignty of the United States.

The flag of our fathers floats to-day over Puerto Rico and the Philippine Islands just as rightfully as over Alaska or any of the territory acquired from France or Mexico. Whether this acquisition of far-off territory is good or bad, it has fallen to us unsought and unexpected in the fortunes of war—a war that marks a new era in the history of the nations, begun in no spirit of conquest or desire for territorial expansion, but only in response to the piercing cries of a common humanity by a people doomed by their oppressors to extermination by starvation and the sword.

After American arms had triumphed on land and sea, the only alternative presented was whether the Stars and Stripes of the United States or the Castles and Lions of Spain should float over these islands. Where is there an American heart, or one anywhere else in Christian civilization, so craven as to have justified the great Republic in giving back these islands, with their eight or ten million people, to the cruel despotism of Spain? Such a disgraceful act on our part, under the circumstances, would have been an indelible stain through all time upon the character of the American people.

After boldly proclaiming to the world that we were fighting the battles of liberty and humanity on behalf of a people crushed by a cruel despotism, were we to sheath the sword as soon as we became apprehensive that the contest might in the end impose something of a burden not foreseen upon ourselves, and for that reason were we to remand the helpless oppressed whom we had rescued back to the care of the oppressor?

What shall be done with these islands and what shall be the government for their inhabitants is now a question to be settled by the Congress of the United States.

But our anti-imperialist statesmen claim that, instead of Congress, it rightfully belongs to Aguinaldo to say what kind of government shall be established for the eight or ten millions of inhabitants in the Philippine Islands. If Aguinaldo and his little band of Tagalos drove Spain from these islands and compelled her to sue for peace, then in that case he might, as conqueror, have the right to dictate the kind of government to take the place of the Spanish government overthrown.

Whatever power destroys organized government over a people becomes morally responsible to the civilization of the age to replace the government overthrown by one equally if not more efficient for the protection of life and property. Spain relinquished her sovereignty over the Philippine Islands to the United States of America, not to Aguinaldo. From the time that was done the United States became responsible in the forum of nations to see that an efficient government is established for these islands.

We are told by the defenders of Aguinaldo and his Tagalo insurgents, as an excuse for their acts, that one nation can not govern another nation. The inhabitants of the Philippine Islands never were a nation and never had a government of their own. The eight or ten millions of their inhabitants, scattered over some thousand or more islands, consist of different tribes speaking different languages and of all degrees of civilization. Is not Congress just as competent to legislate for these former subjects of Spain as for the inhabitants of Alaska, former subjects of Russia, or for the people in the Territories of the Union?

Under the Government of the United States, since the last amendments to the Constitution, the personal, civil, and religious rights of all its inhabitants, whether near or far off, are secured to them, in the language of the Supreme Court, "by the principles of constitutional liberty, which restrains all the agencies of Government, State, and nation."

In these paramount rights the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands would be protected by Congress just the same as are the inhabitants of the District of Columbia. Will even the anti-imperialists say that the inhabitants of the District of Columbia are living under a despotic government and would therefore be justified in taking up arms against the Government of the United States?

The defenders of Aguinaldo claim that he and his Tagalo insurgents are justified in warring upon the United States, which released them from Spanish despotism, just the same as they would be if they were fighting Spain, for it is only, as they say, a change of masters. Thus they malign the institutions of their own country and libel the character of the people's chosen representatives. There can be no valid legislation by Congress inconsistent with the principles of constitutional liberty. The history of Spanish rule over her colonies has always been a blood-stained record of cruelty and lawless violence. Would not the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands be under a free government when under the Government of the United States? A people everywhere are justified in warring against despotism. But in this age of Christian civilization they are not justified anywhere in warring against free government.

Never was there an American gun turned upon any of the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands until its Tagalo insurgents began killing American soldiers, who in the fortunes of war came to their country not as conquerors, but as their deliverers from the cruelties of Spanish rule, while prosecuting a war for the delivery of a million and a half of Spanish subjects under the same rule in the island of Cuba.

The first great duty of the United States now is to suppress the Tagalo insurrection against its authority and to establish order in the Philippine Islands. And when that is done, to provide a government for the protection of the civil and religious rights of their inhabitants, the same as is now done for the inhabitants of the District of Columbia or the Territories of the Union.

There is no question of territorial expansion or forcible annexation to be settled. That was settled by American guns at Manila and San Juan Hill, ratified by a treaty of peace with Spain. Right or wrong, good or bad, American territory has already been expanded. Our flag, raised first by a triumph in arms and next, from our unavoidable position, by a treaty of peace, floats to-day over the Philippine Islands just as rightfully as over this Capitol.

Wherever on the earth's surface that flag shall once rightfully float it can never be removed, save by an act of Congress or by an order of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy in time of war. Any attempt to remove it in any other way would be an act of treason against the sovereignty of the United States, the same as it was in 1861, when General Dix said:

> If anyone attempts to haul down the American flag, shoot him on the spot.

The terms that General Grant fixed for all persons engaged in such attempts was "unconditional surrender." Why should any different terms be made now for Malay or Mongolian insurgents than was made then for American citizens born on American soil.

History is constantly repeating itself. Then there were those who claimed that war was Lincoln's war; now there are those who declare this war is McKinley's war; then it was copperhead; now

it is anti-imperialist. Then there were self-assumed superior patriots who saw great danger to the liberties of the country in the disbanding of the two armies, composed of over 2,000,000 of armed men. Now the same kind of patriots see great danger for the future of the Republic in the development of a spirit of militarism should the Regular Army exceed 25,000 men.

Can the liberties of the American people—now 75,000,000 and doubling in number every thirty years, scattered over a territorial area of almost 4,000,000 square miles, with 45 independent States, to be hereafter increased in number, each fully organized with executive, judicial, and legislative powers, and each with an organized militia of its own citizens—be in danger of overthrow now, or any other time in the hereafter, by fifty or sixty thousand or any other number of citizen soldiers in the Regular Army? When the American people shall forget the glorious traditions of a heroic ancestry and become themselves fit subjects for slaves, then, and not till then, will their liberties be in danger of overthrow from any spirit of militarism within or from foreign aggression without.

This nation is not running the race the old lost nations ran, that "died of unbelief in God and wrong to man." No nation ever yet died or ever will, no matter what the extent of its territory or how vast its population, if governed by just laws and its people are imbued with a spirit of humanity as broad as the race.

Before the declaration of war with Spain the wisdom of far-off territorial acquisitions might have been a proper subject for consideration by the people of the United States. But as to the acquisition of territory in Puerto Rico and the Philippine Islands, it is a question settled by the arbitrament of the sword in the fortunes of war and by a treaty of peace recognized as valid by all nations.

There always was and probably always will be a class of "has beens" who delight in perverting the facts of history in order to put their own country in the wrong so they can have an excuse for opposing its Administration, and who are always uttering warnings of danger and weeping in pathetic sorrow over the degeneracy of the times in the closing years of their own existence. So, to-day, these prophets of evil from the hilltops of a happy and prosperous Republic are, Jeremiah-like, pouring out their lamentations over the extension of American free institutions. Legislative wisdom, statesmanship, and patriotism in the chosen representations of the American people will not die with this generation, and I trust will not in any other.

Over a century ago our fathers, by their heroic deeds, consecrated the Fourth of July, 1776, as the birthday of a new era in the cycles of civilization. Is there anybody that would now change, if he could, the final results as we have them of this great experiment of free constitutional government? The result has come to us only by each generation of the people boldly meeting in peace or war their responsibilities to liberty and humanity as they have been cast upon them in the providences of human events.

Let this generation, then, imitating those of the bygone, shrink not from a manly discharge of its duty and responsibilities to liberty and the rights of a common humanity, though they may have been cast upon it unexpected and unforeseen in the fortunes of a just war. Every acquisition of territory by the United States heretofore, though opposed at the time by some self-assumed superior patriots, has always received the hearty approval of the people.

From my first entry into public life I have never had any fears for the future of the Republic by reason of the expansion of its territory and the extension of its free institutions. Pending the repeal of the Missouri compromise in Congress in 1854, I then said relative to expansion:

> Who believes that the territorial expansion of the Republic will not continue until it covers the whole continent? It is one of the incidents of our position, resulting from the habits of our people and the character of surrounding nationalities. While the pioneer spirit presses on into the wilderness, snatching new areas from the wild beast and bequeathing them a legacy to civilized man, it is in vain you attempt to stay his progress by meridian lines or legislative enactments.
>
> The habits of his life and the promptings of his nature are stronger than the river or mountain barriers of nations. When he has covered the whole continent with the abodes of civilized life, seizing the standard of the Republic, he will bear it, with the spirit and genius of free institutions, across the mighty deep to regenerate old dynasties and breathe new life into decaying empires. This, no matter what may be the views of statesmen or the policy of legislation, is our mission, our manifest destiny. For energy, intelligence, and superior enterprise are destiny, and whoever attempts to stay it may be borne down by the tide, but he can not change the current.

These words, uttered in no spirit of prophecy, and which at the time were only a plain statement of the characteristics of the American people and the surrounding conditions of national existence are, to-day, by the fortunes of war, prophecy fulfilled. But what prophetic ken can pierce the veil of the now overhanging future? The Atlantic Ocean, rolling between two mighty hemispheres, is a German, French, and English sea. But the Pacific Ocean, with almost twice the area of waters washing the shores of nationalities containing two-thirds the population of the globe, is henceforth to be an American sea covered with American ships laden with the products of American industry. The commerce of half the world, realizing the dream of Columbus, will go westward to find the Indies.

England, facing eastward, carrying her Magna Charta of personal rights and all her great institutions of civil and religious liberty, and the United States of America, firstborn of these institutions, facing westward, carrying the same institutions, with the practical experience of over a hundred years in self-government, will some day meet in the far-off Orient, having belted the globe with institutions of civil and religious liberty and constitutional free government for all mankind.

The white man can never lay down his burden so long as oppression and national injustice and wrong exist among the children of men. Nations, like individuals, owe something to a common humanity, for they are the trustees of civilization. It is ordained in the retributions of that overruling Providence which controls in the affairs of men that nations can not shirk their responsibilities to liberty and humanity when cast upon them, in the course of human events, without bitter retributions soon or late in national disasters.

> The ships will part the unknown sea,
> The march of thought will reach the strand;
> The onward wave of destiny
> Will change the features of the land.
>
> The evil must give place to good,
> The false before the true must fade;
> There is no stay in Nature's way.
> Men can not choose or peace or war;
> She sets the task, and none may ask
> What her far-reaching councils are.
>
> Not in the way the world would please
> The needed changes may be wrought;
> When and wherever fate decrees
> The destined battles will be fought.
>
> The towers of strength give way at length,
> If they be not by right maintained,
> And in their place a higher race
> Shall build as it has been ordained.

The American defenders of the Tagalo insurgents have no excuse for themselves in any acts of the American colonists. Our fathers in 1776 took up arms against unjust legislation and the attempt by the ministry of George III to restrict the rights and privileges of Englishmen. The colonists had Governments of their own, which they were defending against encroachments by the British Parliament.

The Tagalos in attacking the American Army, which delivered them from Spanish despotism, had no government of their own to defend, for none had ever been established; and they were not resisting unjust laws, for no laws of any kind had been passed; nor had any act of any kind been done by the American people or its Army injurious or even unfriendly to the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands.

President Lincoln on the 4th of March, 1861, from the eastern portico of this Capitol, in addressing his dissatisfied fellow-countrymen, said:

> You can have no conflict without yourselves being the aggressors.

In like manner President McKinley, through his commanding general, notified the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands that they could have no conflict with the United States without they themselves being the aggressors.

General Otis, January 9, 1899, in a communication to Aguinaldo, said:

> I am under strict orders of the President of the United States to avoid conflict in every way possible. There shall be no conflict of forces if I am able to avoid it.

In the evening of February 4, 1899, Aguinaldo and his Tagalos became the aggressors and opened fire along their whole entrenched line upon the American soldiers guarding Manila. The same night Agoncillo, friend and special agent of Aguinaldo, leaves Washington hastily by the midnight train for Canada, hours before anyone else in Washington knew of the attack of the Tagalos upon the American army. From that time to this the Tagalo insurrection has continued, in pursuance of the plans formed by Aguinaldo in August, 1898, before the capitulation of Manila, when he announced himself dictator and addressed a communication to the leading powers, asking their recognition of the independence of the Philippines, and in pursuance of his purpose to capture or drive the American army out of Manila.

The Tagalos, under Aguinaldo, took up arms to kill their benefactors, who had never done them an injury, but who had periled their lives to release them from the cruelties of Spanish rule. At the demand of such an enemy—an enemy that knows no gratitude and whose barbarism holds prisoners of war for a money ransom—shall the flag of our fathers be lowered—a flag that never yet was lowered, save at the grave of the hero who died in its defense?

There is no justification for the American defenders of the Tagalo insurgents in anything contained in the Declaration of American Independence. The revolt of the American colonies began in a protest against unjust laws. Even after the few overzealous patriots had thrown the shipload of imported tea into the waters

of Massachusetts Bay, Washington, Franklin, Adams, and Hancock, and most of their copatriots, had no idea of establishing a government independent of that of Great Britain.

The Earl of Chatham, Burke, Barre, Wilkes, and other English statesmen in advocating the cause of the colonies were defending the constitutional rights of Englishmen. And none of them ever advocated the right of the colonies to set up for themselves an independent government.

At length, after the failure of petition and protest, fifty-six bold merchants, farmers, lawyers, and mechanics, representing the organized governments of thirteen colonies, on the 4th of July, 1776, declared that their allegiance to the Crown of Great Britain was at an end. In justification of their act in severing their allegiance to the mother country and in combating the dogma of the divine right of kingly rule they proclaimed certain self-evident truths, among which was that "The just powers of governments are derived from the consent of the governed."

Up to that time mankind had been regarded as composed of two classes—the one born to rule, the other to be ruled; the one possessing all rights in the State, the other possessing no rights save such as might be conferred by the ruling class. It was in combating this claim of the few and the old political dogma of the divine right of kingly rule that our fathers declared that governments derived their just powers from the consent of the governed. In theory, a self-evident truth; but in actual practice then and ever since governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, if the governed are fitted for self-government. Consent of the criminal classes or of the stupidly ignorant are not necessary for a just government, never has been, and never will be.

The self-evident truths of the Declaration of Independence proclaimed by our fathers in opposing the political dogmas of their times were ideals to be finally reached in the onward progress of the race to a higher and more perfect civilization, as the polar star, fixed in the heavens, is a guide for the mariner in his course to a haven of safety over tempest-tossed seas.

These ideals were not intended or expected by those who declared them to be reduced to immediate practice, for they did not themselves incorporate them into the framework of the new Government which they established. One-seventh of the entire population under their new Government were chattel-born slaves, bought and sold at the auction block, and continued such for almost a century after the adoption of the Declaration of Independence. The consent of women, one-half of the population to be governed, was not sought then nor since in order to give just powers to their Government.

The Saviour of mankind, when on earth, bade his disciples, "Be ye perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect." If this injunction is to be the practical test of Christian character, then there are no Christians in the world. But a time was promised in the long-coming future when this test applied to the pilgrims on earth would not be mere theory.

The ideals of the Declaration of Independence practically apply, and were intended only thus to apply, to a people fitted for self-government. It is an absurdity to apply them in practice to a people unfitted by general intelligence or experience to carry on a free and stable government by which alone these rights can be secured to the individual.

Lafayette, years after he tendered his life with his sword to the cause of American independence, advised the crowning of Louis Phillippe King of France instead of the establishment of a republic, for the reason, as he said, that the French people were not then fitted for self-government. It would be a gross calumny upon a great nation to say that the French people were not at that time as well-fitted for self-government as are the Tagalos now, or any other portion of the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands.

The American colonies had a practical experience in self-government under their respective charters from the Crown of Great Britain in township, county, and State administration for more than a hundred years, and yet not one of them adopted in practice then, nor have they since, the self-evident truth which they put in the Declaration of Independence, that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. Even Massachusetts, home of Edward Atkinson and other like kindred spirits, has no provision in her organic law for ascertaining the consent of even a majority of her adult population to the constitution under which they live, or their consent to the enactment of the laws which they must obey. The legal voters anywhere are not one-half of the adult population whose consent in theory is requisite for just government.

The defenders of the Tagalo insurgents, calling themselves anti-imperialists, insist that these ideals of our fathers, which have never yet been incorporated practically into any government, shall be made a part of the government to be established for the conglomerate of Malay and Mongolian population in the Philippine Islands, a population which have never had any experience in any kind of self-government and whose unfitness for such government at the present time is everywhere admitted.

But the population of these islands, under the controlling influence of the United States, with its free institutions, and their own better conditions after peace and order shall have been established, will no doubt in a short time become fitted for self-government. When that time shall come and the United States of America shall establish for these islands, with their eight or ten millions of people, a free and independent government, to be administered by themselves, it will be the gift of the great Republic to civilization of a colossal statute of liberty enlightening the world, throwing its refulgent rays from the mountain peaks overlooking the Bay of Manila, across the Chinese Sea, and over the Empire of oldest time, where dwells one-fourth of the present population of the globe.

Such is the mission, the manifest destiny, of this nation now, in behalf of liberty and humanity, the same as it was threescore years ago, before the pioneer settler scaled the snow-crowned summits of the Sierras or the flag of our fathers fluttered along the shores of the Pacific.

Henceforth, over whatever portion of the earth's surface the flag of the great Republic shall float, it will be the emblem of liberty, justice, and humanity, beckoning the race on to a higher and better civilization.

Westward the course of empire takes its way;
* * * * *
Time's noblest offspring is the last.

[Applause.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BELL] thirty minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, the President, in his message at the beginning of this Congress, said, first:

> The Fifty-sixth Congress convenes in its first regular session with the country in a condition of unusual prosperity.

Then on the second page of his message he says:

> It is further true that year by year, with a larger area of land cultivated, the increasing volume of agricultural products, corn and wheat, calls for a larger volume of money.

He shows that the supply of money as compared with our business is too narrow. Then he proceeds to show a manner in which we may obtain money. He says, "Give the banks more power, put less expense upon them, and they will furnish you the necessary funds."

Now, I want to say, in the first place, that from the time of the redemption of the first bank note to the present moment the financial history of the world has proven that every time the money in which a credit currency is to be redeemed shrinks in volume or confidence is lost your bank currency shrinks in the same proportion. The last few days have pricked the bubble of your exorbitant braggadocio and with it the prosperity that was built largely upon wind and the inflation of political hypocrisy.

Now, let us see how this great prosperity was built up of which the President speaks. It is true that it did not exist when he came into office. It did not exist until he began to fill the ranks of the Army with the unemployed, until he began to fill the shipyards with the unemployed, or until the syndicates and trusts, many of whom had their headquarters established in and near the Administration, began to inflate all values in this country. They began to build such trusts as had never been seen before in this land. They began to double the prices of trust products. They ran up wire, nails and necessaries of life to double the prices which obtained when the natural laws of trade were permitted to exist. Then what occurred? When the President delivered his message and said to Congress, "These trusts are an enemy to civilization, and those practicing them are criminals," from that moment the disturbance began in the trust centers. From morning to morning the newspapers of New York said, "The trust decision of the Supreme Court of the United States and the message of the President are responsible for the disturbance in industrial values."

In other words, these values were simply inflated wind values, gotten up through the organization of these gigantic trusts under the protection of this Administration, which permitted such a thing to be possible; and this prosperity of which we brag so much, and upon which the changes have been rung here so often that some of you really believe that you have had extraordinarily prosperous times—this has been pricked in the last four or five days. It is true you have had apparent extraordinary prosperity in certain circles, where prices were controlled by the trusts, but you have not had it elsewhere to any great extent.

Now, sir, I want to say, further, that if, instead of passing the financial bill, that is fathered by the banks, made by the banks, and for the banks alone, we had passed a free-coinage bill, or passed a bill to have the paper currency full legal tender and issued and controlled by the Government, every newspaper in the metropolitan East would have had flaring headlines this week and for the last week, stating that under the Democratic destruction policy the Congress of the United States has destroyed the value of property in the United States, and you would find the same taunt coming from every member on that side of the Chamber.

The difference is that the Democratic party is not in power, nor has it any power with the great press of this country. Yea, it is not in power among the rich in this country, because Bryan Democracy and great wealth do not thrive in the same climate. You may take it in your State, you may take it in mine, and when a man becomes very rich he leaves the Democratic party and goes into the Republican party. Take it in the State of Colorado, and the moment the great smelting trust was organized, and was putting forth for the purpose of controlling the smelting industry, there was at the head of it in Colorado a lifelong Democrat, one whom we had honored as one of the first Democratic governors of our State. When that great trust was organized, and shut down smelter after smelter and threatened to dismantle smelter after smelter, our legislature was in session.

The Democratic governor of Colorado sent a message to the legislature asking that the power of the smelter trust in Colorado be curtailed at once. Next morning that lifelong Democrat came out in a Republican newspaper with an interview saying:

I believe that the McKinley Administration ought to be maintained in Colorado and throughout the country, because it better protects property.

That is occurring in every part of the Union. It is so with your wealthy newspapers. You may take the great Democratic dailies. When they reach wealth, though under a Democratic name, they cry out for the Republican Administration and all of its principles.

Now, for fear you may think I am somewhat prejudiced, I want to introduce a little Republican evidence upon this charge. Senator THURSTON, of Nebraska, chairman of the national convention that nominated President McKinley, the right bower of the President, recently said, speaking to the Republican clubs in Baltimore:

Capital in every form, alarmed by the threatened disaster and danger of free and unlimited coinage of silver at the forced ratio of 16 to 1 by this nation alone, rushed to the support of the Republican party, and it so happened thereby that the financial jugglers and monopolies, great trusts, and combines that have always been with and of the Democratic party were forced in the last campaign into the Republican party.

Now, sir, what is occurring? I have made the point once before during this session that the banks of this country have the people now by the throat.

Mr. LINNEY. Will my friend allow me just a moment?

Mr. BELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. LINNEY. I received this morning an inquiry from a clear-minded Populist of my State:

I sometimes think: "Well, how can it be? Am I mistaken? Is the Republican party right on the money and all the other public questions, and we honest, horny-handed sons of the plow wrong?" Really it looks that way. Now, God grant that that prosperity which has come has come to stay. Whether brought about by your party or not, we needed help, we have it, and I am thankful.

[Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

What do you think of that sentence? [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. BELL. I think that in the State of North Carolina they have some real Populists, but more Republican-Populists than they have real Populists.

Mr. LINNEY. Let me ask my friend if the Populists of the State of North Carolina do not constitute a majority of the Populists of the United States? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BELL. I notice that a great many of the Populists of the State of North Carolina formed a combination with the McKinley Republican party last fall, and that they worked hand in hand with you.

Mr. LINNEY. Yes; to not let you Democrats steal away our homes, we did. [Renewed laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. BELL. Now I will proceed, with the gentleman's permission, since he has read his letter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I wish to say is this: That it was understood by the American people for nearly a century that the Treasury Department must be kept with the people of the United States and not with the national banks; and I wish to say, further, that at the time of the appointment of Mr. McCulloch, soon after the war, it created quite a discussion in the United States whether a national banker interested in circulating bank currency in opposition to national currency should have control of the national currency; and even when Mr. Gage was appointed, the present Secretary, Republican papers in the great East mentioned that such appointments had been unusual, and they pointed to Mr. McCulloch as the precedent for it.

Now, sir, what have they done? During the present Administration they have voted some twenty-odd million dollars into the hands of the banks; that can be demonstrated beyond peradventure. Under this Administration, when they voted two hundred millions of interest-bearing bonds to the market at par, called the popular loan, they voted into the hands of the banks not less than eleven or twelve million dollars. They said they should have these bonds at par and they were worth in the market not less than 105½ to 106. A few days ago they were standing at 109¾, which would give them about $19,500,000 as a gift. For the Cleveland bonds there was offered in this House (if made for gold coin) $16,000,000 more than we got in simple coin, and the same Administration says, "Oh, they bought them for the discount on the theory that they might not be paid in gold; but we will pay them in gold, though bought on silver basis." And so it has been from the beginning of this Administration.

Now, here is another unusual favor being extended to the banks. The Secretary of the Treasury said to the banks of the country today that from this time on he will put into their vaults about $30,000,000 that the Treasury can spare, and will give them a million dollars a day that is coming in from internal revenue. What for? That you may help the people. How are you going to help them? We are going to help them by charging the enormous rate of interest that went up yesterday to 125 per cent. Now, sir, the Treasury Department is going to give the banks the use of this money and they are advancing the interest payments on United States bonds before it is due. Why? So the banks can lend it to the people, and lend it at these high rates of interest. Now, who gets the benefit of that? The banks get all the profits and the interest on hundreds of millions now held by them, and get it for nothing, and the people get the money under this beneficent system by paying the banks an enormous rate for the use of their own money. Now, let us see whether the banks are not absolutely controlling this country. Let us see what they did yesterday. Let us see how this prosperity works that even a little prick in the bubble can scatter.

Russell Sage said yesterday——

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman allow me to ask if he is alluding to the stock market of yesterday?

Mr. BELL. Yes.

Mr. GAINES. One paper says that the rate of interest went as high as 186 per cent.

Mr. BELL. I know; but I am reading what Russell Sage said:

This is the worst panic New York has suffered in twenty years.

The stock-market reports said there were neither money nor confidence in sight and that money was lending for 125 per cent, and that those who held out in the morning finally had to go. It is stated that in a few articles $100,000,000 was the shrinkage in value, and it was all because of the tight money market and because the banks pulled in their loans.

Now, the Secretary of the Treasury proposes to fill the banks and make the panic profitable to them. They will have hundreds of millions of the free money of the people to lend to them at high rates. Do you wonder that the banks always make a large contribution to the Republican party? They should do so, as they are Republicans, and the party allows them to make back the contribution tenfold.

Now, where does the bank get the benefit? The banks themselves do not turn around and let the people have the money for nothing or for a low rate of interest, but it enables the bank to get enormous interest and to enrich itself at the expense of the American people. Now, sir, what has occurred under this grand permanent prosperity that has been so lauded upon this floor since we began this discussion? On the 15th of this month the failure of John P. Squire & Co., of Boston, for three millions. The Broadway National Bank, of Boston, failed on the same day. The Produce Exchange Trust Company, of New York, failed on the 18th, with $11,000,000 liabilities. Henry Allen & Co., bankers and brokers, failed in New York on the 18th, and yesterday, the day we passed this gold bill, will go down in history as one of the worst wreckages known in the stock market of New York.

Now, sir, what I want to illustrate from this is the theory of the minority. We have insisted from the beginning that you may have bank currency, you may have the gold standard, and in normal times it will be reasonably satisfactory; but the moment, under the gold standard or any limited standard, that a credit money issued upon that and controlled by any bank syndicate or bank association—the minute there is a little flurry and the legal-tender money is scarce, that moment your currency issued redeemable in legal-tender money begins to shrink with your real money, and it can not suffice for a panic; it can not answer the needs of trade when you are seeking to check up and settle.

Mr. LEVY. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Does he not consider that the enormous taxation of $60,000,000 a month which is now imposed on this country is a cause of this tight money?

Mr. BELL. No; that is a mere pretense of the banker to get more profit in the future than he has had in the past. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He has been encouraged in the past; he has a great majority in this House behind him, and he now thinks he is entitled to the whole country. That is about the banker's idea of it.

Mr. LEVY. Do you think that the monthly tax of $60,000,000 a month, internal revenue and customs—do you think that has no effect?

Mr. BELL. Oh, it may have a little effect on you fellows in New York.

Mr. LEVY. Does not anything which has an effect in New York have an effect on the entire country?

Mr. BELL. Not necessarily.

Mr. LEVY. You will find that out.

Mr. BELL. Not necessarily. If a few of your bubbles burst it may aid legitimate business.

Mr. LEVY. The country hears from it a week afterwards.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Speaker, does not the gentleman [Mr. LEVY] know that the boards of trade and the merchants of New York generally are losing their export trade, and it is going to southern ports, and that they are wondering why it is; and, in fact, have been holding quite a number of meetings in order to find out a cure for this loss of business? New York used to be the whole thing commercially and politically, but she is not any longer, and the masses South and West do not propose to be "held up" by her any longer in commerce or politics, if by honorable and patriotic resistance they can prevent it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Colorado yield to the several gentlemen who are addressing him?

Mr. BELL. No, sir. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I started to say when I was interrupted, my theory from the beginning has been this, and I have never agreed altogether with our statements of this proposition before the country, that it is a question of national currency, issued and controlled by the Government on one side, and bank currency, issued and controlled by the banks, on the other side. It is my judgment that that has been the real issue from the beginning, and we believe that you should have a currency, issued and controlled by the Government, commensurate with your property to be exchanged, so that there would at all times be an equilibrium between your ordinary transactions and the means with which to transact your business. That idea has been developed in England. It was partially developed in this country.

Mr. Calhoun very forcibly suggested to this House that we ought to have some means to determine how much money we should have, and he suggested that in his judgment probably we should have $1 in money to every $30 worth of property to be exchanged, and that then if you would keep up your equilibrium between property and money you could not have these panics. In England before the days of Rothschild every solvent note presented at the bank counter for a legitimate enterprise had to be discounted at a small rate of interest. If it was not so discounted, then the Government of England said it was a sign of a money famine and new notes must be issued. But after Mr. Rothschild became prominent he persuaded Sir Robert Peel, jr., then in charge of the finances of England, that the interest of the banker and the interest of the public was mutual; that the bank was always anxious to lend money, and that when it saw a scarcity it would issue money, because its interest was identical with that of the consumer of money; but the elder Robert Peel, who made the fortune of the family, when his son yielded to this view said to him, "My son, upon yesterday you doubled your fortune, but by doubling your fortune, my boy, you ruined your country."

Mr. HILL. I have just come into the Hall and have only caught two or three sentences of the gentleman's remarks. I understood the gentleman to say that the wise thing to do would be to have property and money graduated and kept at the ratio of $1 in money to every $30 of property.

Mr. BELL. No; I said that idea was developed by Calhoun early in the history of this Government.

Mr. HILL. As I understood it, that was a suggestion that you favored.

Mr. BELL. No, sir; I favored keeping the money commensurate with the business to be transacted, and to have the money issued, governed, and controlled by the United States instead of by the bankers of the country.

Mr. HILL. That is as I understood. Now if it will not interfere with the gentleman's remarks——

Mr. BELL. Not at all.

Mr. HILL. Will you kindly explain to the House by what process the Government is to do that—that is, keep the money commensurate—and how it is going to get it into circulation?

Mr. BELL. You gentlemen have been saying to us two or three years that you wanted this Government to go out of the banking business. I want to say to you that this morning you are inveigling it into the banking business, to fill your banks with free currency, so that they can loan it to the people at these exorbitant rates. We say, sir, that this Government ought to say, "We will coin all the gold and all the silver that can come to the mints until there is enough money to make the exchanges, and if there is not enough we will issue full legal-tender United States notes, redeemable only when the coin supply is sufficient to redeem them without contracting the currency."

Mr. HILL. That is precisely what I understood the gentleman's position to be.

Mr. BELL. Yes; that is my position.

Mr. HILL. Will you now kindly go on and explain how the Government is going to get that money out into circulation?

Mr. BELL. Oh, there is no trouble about the Government getting it into circulation. The Government has gotten its money into circulation from the outset of its affairs by paying it out on its obligations. When Thomas Jefferson attempted to issue Treasury notes you gentlemen in the banking business said that if he did not make the interest high they could not be circulated, but finally $25,000,000 of them got out into hands of the people with only 1 mill interest per annum, or no interest at all, and the banks boycotted them, and we had to impose a penalty against using them before we could get them away from the people. There is no trouble about getting the money into circulation with our increasing obligations.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] is recognized.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BELL. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not wonder that these gentlemen who study this question under the influences of banking profits can state that it is only the bank that can enable the country to do business. Now, suppose the banks should all burst; what on earth would become of the American people? Would it not be too bad if the people of the United States could not find some way to do their business without these banks? Now, if you are going to have a bank—and I am in favor of banks—I am not opposed to our having national banks. I am in favor of national banks; but I want to say to you that I would say to the national banks that they shall buy currency in the same way as any individual or a State bank buys its currency, and I would put these banks out of the governing business and would say to the national banks that are interested in issuing currency, "This is a Government function, and you shall not mix your private interests with the Government business of issuing currency."

Now, I understand, and I have seen it in print, that one of the Adamses, when he came to this House, owned some national-bank stock, and did not believe that he was even entitled to a seat in this House, owning bank stock, because he thought that was against a healthy public policy.

Mr. RICHARDSON. You mean United States Bank stock?

Mr. BELL. Yes; United States Bank stock; because he thought that his private business would conflict with his public duty, and that the public would not approve it. If things so continue, the banks will control everything and monopolize everything. They can make things prosperous in twenty-four hours and bring destruction to every industry in this country in twenty-four hours.

Mr. Garfield, when statesmanship in this country counted for something, said:

> Show me a set of men who control the currency, and I will show you a set of men who control the destiny of the country.

Now, that is just as true to-day as it was yesterday or at any former time. When the original discussion between Mr. Calhoun and others was going on, they said that "if the banks could control the currency of the country, they could organize, and whenever they wanted to buy property they could make money scarce and buy it low; that when they wanted to sell property, by harmonious action they could make money abundant and make it high, and in time they could get all the wealth of the country into their end of the box." Now, there is no doubt about that, and for that reason we are opposed to the financial bill; and I hope the minority will ever be in favor of real honest money, and that the money question will never be considered settled until the Government of the United States shall control all the money of this great country for the equal benefit of all the people. [Loud applause.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield six minutes, the remaining time, to my colleague.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania has returned to his seat, for I desire to take up his challenge given me when he delivered his speech in this House last Saturday. He said, refusing to be interrupted by me:

> If my statements of fact are incorrect, any gentleman can correct me.

I shall now do so, and I challenge him or anyone here or elsewhere to successfully refute either the facts I shall state or discredit the authorities I quote. Amongst other things, the honorable gentleman said:

> (1) Coin was put in opposition to paper, and the promise was given that they should not be paid in paper, but should be paid in coin, and coin from 1862 down to 1878 was understood to mean gold. (2) All the discussions in Congress on the issue of greenbacks show that the word "coin" was used generally interchangeably with the word "gold" on the part of everybody discussing the question.

That "coin was put in in opposition to paper" I agree. That "coin" was put in in opposition to silver I wholly dispute, because the facts—what has actually been done by Congress, and what Congress has positively refused to do, and the opinions of the Supreme

Court on the several acts of Congress passed between "1862 and 1878"—each and all clearly show I am correct; that is, that "coin" does not mean gold only or silver only.

This Government never issued a bond payable on its face or back in gold only. Previous to 1869 our civil-war bonds were payable in "lawful money"—that is, in legal-tender paper and coin. In 1869 Congress made them payable in coin—that is, in gold and silver, or either, at the option of the Government, and not at the option of the creditor.

"From 1862 to 1878" coin meant, as now, gold and silver or either, at the option of the Government, and I deny that it was "understood" between these years or at any time that the word "coin" meant gold only. I deny that the discussions in Congress show that the word "coin" was an interchangeable term with or meant gold only. I deny our "duties" were collected or collectible in gold only, though the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW] disputes this. I shall treat these propositions collectively, as my time is brief.

In 1869 the Senate, by a vote of 8 to 34, refused to make our bonds payable in gold only.

The amendment read as follows:

That it is hereby provided and declared that the faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to an early resumption of specie payments by the Government in order that conflicting questions touching the mode of discharging the public indebtedness may be settled and that the same may be paid in gold.

The vote was as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Cole, Davis, Henderson, Morton, Pomeroy, Robertson, Ross, Spencer—8.

Nays—Messrs. Anthony, Cattell, Conkling, Conness, Corbett, Cragin, Dixon, Edmunds, Ferry, Fessenden, Frelinghuysen, Grimes, Harlan, Harris, Howard, McDonald, Morgan, Morrill of Maine, Morrill of Vermont, Nye, Osborn, Patterson of New Hampshire, Sawyer, Sherman, Stewart, Sumner, Thayer, Tipton, Wade, Warner, Welch, Willey, Williams, Wilson—34.

If in 1869 coin meant gold only, why this amendment? Why this overwhelming defeat? And why did the same Congress at a later day turn our bonds from lawful money into "coin" bonds; and in so doing why did they use the term "coin," and not gold?

Then, at the very time we turned our war bonds from lawful money—paper and coin—into coin the Senate refused, by a vote of 8 to 34, to insert the word "gold" in the place of lawful money or coin, and yet this distinguished gentleman says all the discussions in Congress show that the word "coin" was used as generally interchangeable with the word "gold;" that coin meant gold only.

Again, between the years "1862 and 1878" the Supreme Court of the United States, in a clear and unanimous opinion, held that—

These bonds were engagements to pay dollars, and the dollars intended are coin dollars of the United States, of gold or silver of a certain weight and fineness.

I read from the case Bank *vs.* Supervisors, found in 7 Wallace page 30, decided in 1868, between "1862 to 1878," as follows:

But, on the other hand, it is equally clear that these notes are obligations of the United States. Their name imports obligation. Every one of them expresses on its face an engagement of the nation to pay to the bearer a certain sum. The dollar note is an engagement to pay a dollar, and the dollar intended is the coin dollar of the United States—a certain quantity in weight and fineness of gold or silver authenticated as such by the stamp of the Government. No other dollars had before been recognized by the legislation of the National Government as lawful money.

[Applause.]

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW] is a lawyer and has been since "April 19, 1847." He can fully appreciate the force of this great court's opinion—as fully as anyone—but he has simply overlooked it.

Note well, Mr. Speaker, the court uses the term "dollars" and not "dollar," the plural and not singular, clearly showing that we had two kinds of "dollars," gold and silver, and that "dollar" meant both or either. The court had previously said in the same case:

These notes [United States notes], made payable on demand and receivable for all public dues, including duties on imports, always payable in coin—

Not gold only, you see—

were practically equivalent to coin; and all public disbursements, until after date of the act last mentioned [February 12, 1862], were made in coin or these notes.

Here the court says these notes were "equivalent to coin," and that coin, as here used, was the equivalent of our gold or silver dollar. In this 7th Wallace case the court reviewed the acts of July 17, 1861, August 5, 1861, February 12, 1862, February 25, 1862, July 11, 1862, and March 3, 1863.

So that my distinguished friend must yield his position that Congress or the courts at any time, I may add, treated coin as gold only; for here the Supreme Court, reviewing the acts of Congress, finds and decides that my position is correct and he is in error.

Again, he says that our tariff duties were collected in coin and that the coin collected was gold only, and so collected to pay these bonds. In this he is in error.

In the case of Cheang Kee *vs.* United States, decided in 1865, between 1862 and 1878, reported in 3 Wallace, at page 326, in a unanimous opinion, the Supreme Court of the United States, affirming the lower court, held that our duties were payable in "gold and silver." The lower court at first entered a judgment for gold coin only, but (at the same term of court rightfully) changed the judgment and made it payable "in gold and silver coin of the United States, with the costs of this action."

The Chief Justice, speaking for the whole court, said:

The whole case shows that the judgment was for duties on imports, and nothing but gold and silver coin—

Not gold coin only, you see—

has been made a legal tender for this description of indebtedness to the Government. Affirmed with cost.

In 1865—between "1862 and 1878." Here, at least, is one case where the duty was collected in silver, whether in fact so collected or not.

This case has been reaffirmed by the same court.

Then the gentleman from Pennsylvania is again mistaken when he says that our duties were collected in gold coin only, or that they were payable in gold coin only, or that coin means gold only, for, although the statute which the gentleman quotes required that our duties should be collected in "coin," the Supreme Court in this case expressly held that the word "coin" means gold and silver coin. [Applause.]

But at that time and long after gold was cheaper than silver and it was easier for the importer to pay in the cheaper coin, gold, than in silver, and if the distinguished gentleman, who was a member of this House from 1850 to March, 1863, voted to pay our bonds in gold, in the language of to-day he was then a repudiator, because he forced the creditor to take the "cheaper" coin, gold, in payment of his obligations, which cost him, says Senator Morton, on an average of 60 cents, some as low as 36 cents [applause]; or if he voted for a law making the importer pay his duties in gold coin only, he forced upon the Government the cheaper coin, gold, when he could have made him pay silver or both. If he did not vote for the law, he now upholds and commends it.

The honorable gentleman was Speaker of this House from 1861 to March 4, 1863. By an act of Congress of February 25, 1862, our duties were made payable in "coin." He quotes this act in his speech. He as Speaker approved it. If "coin" meant gold only, why did he not say so in this law? It had meant silver before 1862; why not thereafter? He is a man of plain words. The Congress could have said gold as easily as coin, but failed, and repeatedly refused—in 1869, 1878, 1895, 1897—to insert gold in any of our public obligations.

In further evidence that the word "coin" was not treated by Congress between 1862 and 1878 as gold only I beg to read a letter containing the sentiments often expressed in Congress between "1862 and 1878" by the Hon. Benjamin F. Wade, of Ohio. He said:

VICE-PRESIDENT'S CHAMBER,
Washington, December 13, 1867.

Yours of the 8th instant is received, and I must cordially agree with every word and sentence of it. I am for the laboring portion of our people. The rich can take care of themselves. While I must scrupulously live up to all the contracts of the Government and fight repudiation to the death, I will fight the bondholder as resolutely when he undertakes to get more than the pound of flesh. We never agreed to pay the 5-20's in gold; no man can find it in the bond, and I never will consent to have one payment for the people. It would sink any party, and it ought to. To talk of specie payments or a return to specie under present circumstances is to talk like a fool. It would destroy the country as effectually as a fire. And any contraction of the currency at this time is about as bad. But I have not time to give my ideas in full.

Yours, truly, BENJAMIN F. WADE.

The interest on our five-twenties was payable in "coin." The bondholders wanted the principal and interest made payable in gold. This fight caused Senator Wade to thus speak in 1868:

If I knew that any party in this country would go for paying in coin that which is payable in money, thus enhancing it one-half—if I knew there was such a platform and such a determination this day on the part of any party, I would vote for the other side, Frank Blair and all. I would vote for no such swindle upon the taxpayers of this country. I would vote for no such speculation in favor of the large bondholders, the millionaires who took advantage of our folly in granting them coin payment of interest.

The fact is, Congress refused to make either principal or interest payable in gold only.

In 1869 Senator Garrett Davis offered the following amendment:

That the just and equitable measure of the obligations of the United States upon their outstanding bonds is the value in gold and silver coin of the paper currency advanced and paid to the Government on these bonds.

He did not say the proper measure would be the value in gold coin, but gold and silver.

Changing our bond contract from lawful money to coin was hard enough. It gave, as by slight of hand, to the bondholder $484,141,180, but to have changed it to one coin, gold, or to silver, and not to coin, as we did, would have been still worse.

In 1868, Senator Oliver P. Morton, of Indiana, said:

We would do foul injustice to the Government and to the people of the United States, after we sold those bonds on an average for not more than 60 cents on the dollar, now to propose to make a new contract for the benefit of the bondholder.

Yet the change was more, the sacrifice was surmounted, but we fail anywhere to find in the Congressional debates, or opinions of the Supreme Court, declaring that "coin" from 1862 to 1878 meant gold only. [Applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I find in looking over the resolution that it says, "So much as relates to quarantine regulations and foreign immigration be referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization."

That resolution follows precisely the resolution passed two years ago; but on looking further I find that that was a mistake. I do not think that what relates to quarantine regulations should go to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, but to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; therefore I move to strike out, in line 3, page 4, the words "quarantine regulations and;" so that it will read: "and so much as relates to foreign immigration shall be referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization."

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, to what committee does the gentleman say the quarantine regulations should be referred?

The SPEAKER. To the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I understand this was inadvertently changed at the last session of Congress.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not know how it was changed; but I understand the resolution so provided that was adopted at the last Congress. I am satisfied it was a mistake, and that the quarantine regulations do not belong to the Committee on Naturalization. I understand from the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that they took jurisdiction notwithstanding the resolution was in the form that it was.

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes, and the committee had many days of hearing, and no one apparently recognized the mistake that had been made. The procedure was as in the olden time.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentlemen and committee proceeded without authority.

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes; but we had ample authority under the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was again read.

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. PAYNE, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

DESIGNATION OF COMMITTEE CLERKS.

Mr. BULL. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report from the Committee on Accounts on House resolution 33.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Accounts, to whom was referred House resolution No. 33, authorizing and directing said committee to designate the committees of the House to which the clerks provided for by the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, should be allowed and assigned for the present Congress, and to report by resolution to the House for its action thereon, respectfully report that they have examined into and considered said matter, and report to the House and recommend the passage of the accompanying resolutions.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the resolutions.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the eighteen clerks to committees of the House during the session provided for by the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, be, and they are hereby, allowed and assigned for the present Congress to the following committees, namely:

To the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, a clerk.
To the Committee on Education, a clerk.
To the Committee on Enrolled Bills, a clerk.
To the Committee on Invalid Pensions, an assistant clerk.
To the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, a clerk.
To the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands, a clerk.
To the Committee on Labor, a clerk.
To the Committee on Library, a clerk.
To the Committee on Militia, a clerk.
To the Committee on Mines and Mining, a clerk.
To the Committee on Insular Affairs, a clerk.
To the Committee on Patents, a clerk.
To the Committee on Pensions, a clerk.
To the Committee on Private Land Claims, a clerk.
To the Committee on Printing, a clerk.
To the Committee on Railways and Canals, a clerk.
To the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, a clerk.
To the Committee on Territories, a clerk.

And resolved, That the pay of the clerks to committees of the House of Representatives, which have been or may be hereafter authorized by the House, who are paid during the session only, shall begin from the time such clerks entered upon the discharge of their duties, which shall be ascertained and evidenced by the certificate of the chairman of the several committees employing clerks for the session only.

The resolutions were agreed to.

On motion of Mr. BULL, a motion to reconsider the votes whereby the resolutions were agreed to was laid on the table.

DEATH OF SENATOR-ELECT HAYWARD.

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to lay before the House the following resolutions passed by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolutions.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep regret and profound sorrow of the death of Hon. MONROE L. HAYWARD, lately elected Senator from the State of Nebraska.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Speaker, later in the session the delegation from Nebraska in this House will ask that time be set apart for the purpose of paying fitting tribute to the memory of the lately elected Senator HAYWARD. For present purposes I offer the resolutions which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. MONROE L. HAYWARD, lately elected a Senator from the State of Nebraska.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolutions.

The resolutions were agreed to.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy at West Point—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the United States Board of Engineers on Deep Waterways, with a report on the regulation of the level of Lake Erie—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of the Willamette River at Willamette Falls, Clackamas County, Oreg.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimates of deficiencies in appropriations for the Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for prior years—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2913) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of William Lehman—Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 3090) to correct the military record of Henry Finnegars—Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RYAN of New York: A bill (H. R. 4718) to regulate the collection and disbursement of moneys arising from leases made by the Seneca Nation of New York Indians, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 4719) providing for the appointment of registers of deeds in the Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BELLAMY: A bill (H. R. 4720) to provide for a macadamized approach and roadway to the national cemetery at Wilmington, N. C.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIBLEY: A bill (H. R. 4721) to fix the rate of pension of sailors and soldiers in certain cases—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELLAMY: A bill (H. R. 4722) to provide for the improvement of Shallatte River, Brunswick County, N. C.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 4723) providing for the compulsory attendance of witnesses before registers and receivers of the land office—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 4724) to declare the true intent and meaning of portions of "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," approved June 13, 1898—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama (for Mr. WEEELER of Alabama): A bill (H. R. 4725) to require the first sergeant of each company of the Army of the United States to call the names of soldiers killed in battle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 4726) relating to the holding of courts of the United States in the western district of Wisconsin—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 4727) amendatory of sections 3339 and 3341 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relative to internal-revenue tax on fermented liquors—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 4728) providing for leaves of absence to certain employees of the Government—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BROSIUS (by request): A bill (H. R. 4729) to establish the Fredericksburg and Adjacent National Battlefields Memorial Park in the State of Virginia—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 4730) to grant land to the State of Florida for the use of the normal college for white pupils at De Funiak Springs and for the use of the normal college at Tallahassee for colored pupils—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4731) to authorize the establishment of a fish-cultural and biological station on the Gulf of Mexico within the limits of the State of Florida—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4732) making an appropriation for the purpose of constructing a sidewalk in front of the public building at Pensacola, Fla.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4733) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish States, for use of normal colleges, one set of standard weights and measures—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. LEVY: A bill (H. R. 4734) to amend section 5153 of the Revised Statutes, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4735) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Navy to contract for the purchase of a lot of land adjacent to the Gosport Navy-Yard—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 4736) to establish seed-control stations in connection with agricultural experiment stations for the inspection and testing of seeds of cereals, forage plants, vegetables, grasses, and clovers, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4737) to amend the law providing for a special tax upon banks, being amendatory to paragraph 1, section 2, chapter 448, of the Revised Statutes of 1898—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARSH: A bill (H. R. 4738) providing for the erection of an addition or extension to the post-office and court-house at Quincy, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 4739) to appropriate the sum of $100,000, in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, to construct a dredge for the improvement of Charleston Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 4740) authorizing the cession of certain Sioux Indian land—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. NEWLANDS: A bill (H. R. 4741) for the erection of a public building in Reno, Nev.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MARSH: A bill (H. R. 4742) to amend section 1225 of Revised Statutes so as to provide for detail of active or retired officers of the Army and Navy to assist in military instruction in public schools—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4743) to amend section 5278 of the Revised Statutes of the United States of America—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4744) to define trusts, provide for penalties and punishment of corporations, persons, firms, and associations of persons connected with them, and to promote free competition in the United States of America, and to repeal all laws and parts of laws in conflict with this act—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 4745) for the appropriation of $15,000 for the expenses of an exhibit of negro education at the Paris Exposition—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 4746) to authorize the Delaware Indians in the Cherokee Nation to bring suit in the Court of Claims against the United States, and the Mississippi Choctaws to sue the Choctaw Nation, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 4747) making an appropriation to enlarge the military post of Fort Boise, near the city of Boise, in the State of Idaho—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4748) to require preference to be given to citizens of the States and localities where the mails are to be carried in all mail lettings—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4749) for the establishment, control, operation, and maintenance of the Northwestern Branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers at Cœur d'Alene, in the State of Idaho—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 4750) to punish obstruction to mail trains and trains engaged in interstate commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEWLANDS: A bill (H. R. 4751) to promote the cause of irrigation in the State of Nevada by directing the Secretary of the Interior to make surveys for and determine and report on the cost of erecting reservoirs on certain rivers and their tributaries in the State of Nevada, and making appropriation therefor—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 4752) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Danbury, in the State of Connecticut—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 4753) granting a pension of $10 a month to every honorably discharged soldier, sailor, or marine who shall have served three months in the Union Army during civil war and who shall have attained the age of 60 years—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 86) to appropriate $75,000 to cut and dredge a ship channel across the outer bar below Fort Morgan, Mobile Harbor, Alabama—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 87) to create a commission to examine into the subject of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 88) to authorize the purchase of the painting, by Hans Balling, representing Gen. U. S. Grant in the trenches of Vicksburg—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 89) declaring the purpose of the United States concerning the Philippines—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER of Michigan: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 90) providing for the distribution of decisions of the Department of the Interior relative to pensions, and so forth—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HULL: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 92) authorizing the Secretary of War to report upon a certain site for headquarters of the Army transport service—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 7) relative to the views and purposes of Congress as to the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 8) providing for a survey of Ashley River, South Carolina, with a view to its improvement—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LACEY: A resolution (H. Res. 60) relative to the Committee on the Public Lands employing an additional clerk—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. GRAFF: A resolution (H. Res. 63) relative to the Committee on Claims employing an assistant clerk—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 4754) for the relief of Nicholas Lochboehler—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4755) for the benefit of William H. Miller—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4756) to correct the military record of Julius H. Rogge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4757) for the relief of Adolph Gichan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 4758) for the relief of Jacob F. Denneler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 4759) granting a pension to Herbert Lounsbury—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4760) granting a pension to Samuel G. Trine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 4761) for the relief of James

H. Knox, of Marshall County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4762) for the relief of estate of D. W. F. Peoples, deceased, late of Jonesboro, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4763) for the relief of Jethro Hill, of Hamblen County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4764) for the relief of John Ward—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4765) for the relief of Jacob Barker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4766) for the relief of Isaac Phipps—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4767) to correct the military record of Daniel Telley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4768) for the relief of Hester J. Mitchell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4769) for the relief of Peter Dougherty, of Johnson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 4770) for the relief of Anna S. Dunn, of Pueblo, Colo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: A bill (H. R. 4771) for the relief of the estate of Henry C. Toms, deceased, late of Monroe County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 4772) for the relief of the estate of Daniel H. Avery, of Tuscaloosa, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARMACK: A bill (H. R. 4773) for the relief of the estate of Wiley J. Davis, deceased, late of Hardeman County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4774) for the relief of the estate of Washington Bond, deceased, late of Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4775) for the relief of George W. Winford, of Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4776) for the relief of William Stidham, of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4777) for the relief of the Overton Hotel Company, of Memphis, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4778) for the relief of Dunscomb, Stratton & McDavit, of Memphis, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4779) for the relief of Charles C. Burke, administrator of Elizabeth Burke, deceased, late of Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4780) for the relief of Mrs. Clara E. Bryant, Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4781) for relief of Martha A. Booth, administratrix—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4782) for the relief of the Baptist Church at Grand Junction, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 4783) for the relief of J. S. Woody, Martins Mills, Wayne County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CUSACK: A bill (H. R. 4784) for the relief of A. Washington Kenney—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 4785) to increase the pension of Mark S. Clay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS: A bill (H. R. 4786) for the relief of the estate of Laura S. Cowles, deceased, late of Florida—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 4787) for the relief of R. A. Sisson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EPES: A bill (H. R. 4788) for the relief of W. E. Bailey, administrator of J. C. Bailey, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 4789) granting a pension to Mary M. Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 4790) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of Michael McCormick—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4791) granting a pension to Catharine A. Schwunger, of Berks County, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 4792) for the relief of Stanley J. Morrow—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4793) granting an increase of pension to John S. Harp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GORDON: A bill (H. R. 4794) for the relief of William W. Langley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4795) granting an increase of pension to John O'Connor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 4796) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. Gridley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4797) granting a pension to Celestia R. Barry—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4798) for the relief of W. B. Morrow—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4799) granting a pension to Mary J. Chaffin—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSTON: A bill (H. R. 4800) granting a pension to Joseph Crawford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 4801) for the payment to Joshua T. Roberts of balance due for surveying public lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 4802) for the relief of Charles M. Peirce—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 4803) to grant a pension to Peter Bush—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4804) to grant a pension to George Treat—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LINNEY: A bill (H. R. 4805) for the relief of Isaac Price—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 4806) for the relief of Ellen Tompkins—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 4807) granting a pension to Joseph K. Welt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4808) to restore the name of Rebecca T. Davis to the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4809) granting a pension to George M. Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4810) granting a pension to Charles Blitz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4811) granting a pension to Lucinda B. Hull, widow of James E. Darrow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4812) granting a pension to Martha L. Horton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4813) granting a pension to Taylor Hux—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4814) for the relief of the estate of H. Niswander—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4815) to increase the pension of William H. Morgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4816) to restore the name of M. J. Spencer (formerly M. J. English) to the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4817) granting a pension to Mary King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 4818) for the relief of Thomas B. Reed—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MADDOX: A bill (H. R. 4819) for the relief of the estate of William D. Wheeler, deceased, late of Bartow County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4820) for the relief of Sarah A. Burney, of Floyd County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4821) for the relief of George W. Demoney, of Floyd County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4822) for the relief of Patrick Jennings, of Gordon County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4823) for the relief of G. Moss, of Gordon County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4824) for the relief of Thornton Talley, of Floyd County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 4825) for the relief of the heirs of John Bowling—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 4826) granting a pension to Mrs. Amanda C. McNail—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEVILLE: A bill (H. R. 4827) granting a pension to Emily M. Gillespie—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NAPHEN: A bill (H. R. 4828) to place on the pension roll the name of Susie E. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4829) for the relief of Humboldt Female College—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PEARCE of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 4830) for the relief of Henry E. Eames, first lieutenant, Eleventh Infantry, United States Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4831) for the relief of Edward Cahalan—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PACKER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4832) granting a pension to Martha E. Graves—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4833) for the relief of Samuel Finch—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4834) authorizing the restoration of the name of Charles H. Veil, late a first lieutenant in First United States Cavalry, to the rolls of the Army, and providing that he be placed on the list of retired officers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4835) for the relief of Peter J. Hill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4836) for the relief of Wilbur F. Loveland, late of Company E, Seventh Pennsylvania Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4837) authorizing the restoration of the name of Henry L. Beck, late a captain, Twenty-second United States Infantry, to the rolls of the Army, and providing that he be placed on the list of retired officers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4838) for the relief of Frank J. Burrows—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. POLK: A bill (H. R. 4839) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Daniel Welsh, of Locustgap, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4840) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas Evans, of Milton, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4841) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Eugene Downing—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4842) to remove the charges from the military record of Frederick Salzman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4843) for the relief of William D. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 4844) for the relief of the owner or owners of the schooner *Bergen*—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. QUARLES: A bill (H. R. 4845) for the relief of George W. Craig—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RIXEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 4846) for the relief of Townsend D. Seaton, of Loudoun County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4847) for the relief of heirs of John T. Hicks of Culpeper County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RYAN of New York: A bill (H. R. 4848) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John T. Briggs—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHELDEN: A bill (H. R. 4849) for the relief of Mary Chambers, widow of Thomas Chambers—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 4850) to pay certain Treasury settlements—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 4851) to pension Susan Kent—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4852) for the relief of John Dunn—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4853) for the relief of the heirs at law of Edward N. Oldmixon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4854) to pension James L. Whidden—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4855) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of Robert M. Clark, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4856) for the relief of Cornelius G. Simmons—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4857) removing the charge of desertion against Patrick Lally—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4858) for the relief of Lawrence Palmer—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4859) for the relief of Sarah A. Marcus—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4860) granting a pension to Emily Hawkins—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4861) for the relief of Fernando J. Moreno, late marshal of the southern district of Florida—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4862) for the relief of William T. Bell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4863) for the relief of Chester P. Knapp, of Escambia County, Fla.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4864) to increase the pension of Sarah T. Hurst—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4865) for the relief of Sarah E. Caro and Henry O. Bassett—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4866) for the relief of the heirs of Manette Marsons, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4867) for the relief of Joseph Y. Porter, late captain and assistant surgeon, United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPIGHT: A bill (H. R. 4868) for the relief of J. N. McIntyre, of Tippah County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4869) for the relief of the estate of W. E. Tomlinson, deceased, late of Benton County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4870) for the relief of the estate of John Parham, deceased, late of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4871) for the relief of the estate of William M. Kimmons, deceased, late of Lafayette County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4872) for the relief of Samuel Scott, of Benton County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4873) for the relief of Martha T. Davis, of Marshall County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4874) for the relief of Jordan Broadway, of Marshall County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4875) for the relief of J. B. Fuller, of Benton County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4876) for the relief of M. A. Reinhart, of Benton County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4877) for the relief of Melchisedec Robinson, of Benton County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 4878) removing the charges of desertion against Edward McCloud—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 4879) granting an increase of pension to D. Cyrus Holdridge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 4880) for the relief of Samuel Tomlinson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4881) for the relief of Albert C. Brown—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4882) granting a pension to George W. Eveleth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4883) for the relief of John M. Odenheimer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4884) granting an increase of pension to John S. Stanger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4885) for the relief of Sarah R. Dresser—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4886) for the relief of John H. Moore—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THROPP: A bill (H. R. 4887) to increase pension of David R. Ellis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4888) for the relief of George Rushberger—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama (for Mr. WHEELER of Alabama): A bill (H. R. 4889) to increase the pension of Mrs. Isabel B. Hamilton—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also (for Mr. WHEELER of Alabama), a bill (H. R. 4890) to increase the pensions of Mrs. Margrett B. Shipp, widow of Lieut. William E. Shipp, who was killed at San Juan, and Mrs. Louse D. Smith, widow of Lieut. William H. Smith, who was killed at San Juan—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also (for Mr. WHEELER of Alabama), a bill (H. R. 4891) to increase the pension of Mrs. Virginia Forse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (for Mr. WHEELER of Alabama), a bill (H. R. 4892) to increase the pension of Pauline M. O'Neill—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4893) to increase the pension of Agnes K. Capron—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4894) to increase the pension of Lillian Capron—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also (for Mr. WHEELER of Alabama), a bill (H. R. 4895) recognizing the patriotic devotion and benevolence of Helen Miller Gould—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (for Mr. WHEELER of Alabama), a bill (H. R. 4896) to increase the pension of Mrs. Rida B. Haskell—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: A bill (H. R. 4897) for the relief of Benjamin D. Fortney, of Belpre, Washington County, Ohio—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4898) granting a pension to Frank A. W. Shaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4899) granting a pension to Mrs. Ella Cotton Conrad—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 4900) to enable the President to restore Sergt. Barney McKay, United States Army, rank and status in the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 4901) granting an increase of pension to Jane McMahon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4902) granting a pension to Thomas Pollock—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 4903) to correct the military record of Benjamin Gordon, alias Stephen S. Durfee, Company H, One hundred and seventh New York Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4904) for relief of Edward William Bailey—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4905) for the relief of James A. Johnston—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ZENOR: A bill (H. R. 4906) granting a pension to Mrs. Ellen Quinn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 91) for the relief of August Bolten, of New York City, and Gustav Richelieu, of Boston, Mass., American seamen—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of George W. Dunham and a number of other citizens of Iowa, in favor of an appropriation for improving the Hatchie River, in Tennessee—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 4654, granting a pension to Simon Vandervaart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 4650, granting a pension to Mrs. Sarah Parrish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 4653, granting a pension to August Zimmerman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 4651, granting a pension to Mrs. Emily Alder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, statement of Dr. H. McDittmer, to accompany House bill No. 4648, for the relief of William G. McLain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, statement of Col. L. B. Raymond, to accompany House bill No. 4649, in the pension case of William Bates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ADAMS: Petition of the Philadelphia (Pa.) Stock Exchange, urging a modification of the revenue law in relation to stock certificates—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Thirty-third National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, commending the work of the Gettysburg National Military Park Commission and asking for further appropriations to complete the work—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: Petition of John Fulmer, of Washington County, Tenn., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Petition of Gustav Richelieu, an American seaman, for relief—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill relating to the claim of August Bolton—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Virginia: Petition of the heirs of John R. Johnson, of Accomac County, Va., praying for reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LACEY: Paper to accompany House bill to place Mrs. M. J. Spencer on the pension rolls—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Petition of J. G. Carlisle and other members of the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States, for the improvement of the law library of Congress—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Resolution of De Long Post, No. 67, Grand Army of the Republic, of Auburn, Ind., asking that all ex-Union soldiers who desire appointment for a Federal office, and are not mentally or physically disqualified, be not subjected to civil-service competition—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMS: Petition of W. H. Carr, of Centerville, Tenn., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolution of the Medical Association of New Haven, Conn., relative to the ranking among officers of the higher grades in the medical corps, United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: Paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to Mrs. Ella Colton Conrad—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Frank A. W. Shaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Petitions, etc., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah were laid on the Clerk's desk, and severally referred to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case, as follows:

By Mr. BELL: Petitions of Josie Smith, L. M. Steen, Samuel Patterson, Mary T. Spencer, and other citizens of the Second Congressional district of Colorado.

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: Petition of J. D. Hinds and others, of Orrington, Me.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: Petition of F. Rhem and others, of Rhems, S. C., and vicinity.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of New York: Petitions of the First Presbyterian Church of Brooklyn, citizens of the Second Congressional district of New York, and Federation of Churches and Christian Workers of New York.

By Mr. FOSS: Petition of James P. Dickson and others, of Chicago, Ill.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Petition of citizens of the Fourth Congressional district of Indiana.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of citizens of the Third Congressional district of New Jersey.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of the Chicago Woman's Club.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petitions of E. A. Wright and 78 others, of the Seventh Congressional district of California; J. T. Cobb and others, of Elsmore; O. N. Brant and others, of Armada, Cal.

By Mr. PACKER of Pennsylvania: Petition of H. E. Raerly and others, of Wellsboro, Pa.

By Mr. SALMON: Petitions of voters and resolutions of societies in the Fourth Congressional district of New Jersey.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Petitions of A. S. Loving and others, of Sutton, Nebr., and John Longnecker and others, of Indianola, Nebr.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: Petition of Ebenezar Lane and 35 other citizens of Zanesville, Ohio.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *December 20, 1899.*

Prayer by Rev. LUCIEN CLARK, D. D., of the city of Washington.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. HALE, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

AGREEMENT WITH SEMINOLE INDIANS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of an agreement made by the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes in behalf of the United States with a commission duly appointed on the part of the Seminole tribe of Indians, in the Indian Territory, fixing a time after which no person shall be enrolled as a Seminole citizen, and providing for the distribution of the estates of the deceased Seminole citizens after December 31, 1899; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Select Committee on the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians, and ordered to be printed.

REGENT OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication from the Secretary of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; which was read:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, *Washington, December 20, 1899.*

SIR: I have the honor to present the form of a joint resolution to fill the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than members of Congress, occasioned by the death on July 16 last of the late Dr. William Preston Johnston, of Louisiana, and to respectfully state that so far as I have been able to learn the opinions of the Regents the vacancy in the board would be to them most acceptably filled by the appointment of Richard Olney, a resident of Massachusetts, as provided for in the draft inclosed.

This appointment would be conformable to section 5580 of the Revised Statutes (a copy of which is inclosed), which requires that four of the members of the Board of Regents "shall be inhabitants of some State, but no two of them of the same State."

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

S. P. LANGLEY, *Secretary.*

Hon. WILLIAM P. FRYE,
President pro tempore of the United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The communication transmits to the Senate a joint resolution. The Chair is informed that it is usual to have the joint resolution read twice and receive consideration by the unanimous consent of the Senate without reference to any committee.

Mr. HOAR. From what source does the communication come?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. From the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. HOAR. I do not think that it ever has occurred in the history of the Senate or the Institution that the regents undertook to propose to the Senate or the House how they should act in the duty imposed upon them by law in the selection of those regents. It is the first time. It is a very extraordinary communication, indeed. I am astonished that such a communication should have been made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair informs the Senator that Professor Langley stated that it was the usual course of the Institution.

Mr. HOAR. I am constrained to express a different opinion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What does the Senator propose with reference to the communication?

Mr. HOAR. Let it go on the table.

Mr. CULLOM. May I ask what is the question before the Senate? I just came in, at this moment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore.. It is a communication from the Smithsonian Institution as to a regent to be appointed in the place of one who has died.

Mr. HOAR. It seems to me that it would be as proper for the judges of the Supreme Court to address to the President a suggestion as to the nomination of one of their associates or to the Senate a suggestion as to his confirmation. There is no difference between the selection of this class of officers and any other class of officers provided by statute. I think the communication is an entire inadvertence. I have the highest respect for the gentleman whose name is signed to the communication. No man can have higher respect than I have for his personal and his public character as a scientific man. But I am sure that a communication like this is without precedent.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. What is the communication, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It relates to the appointment of a regent in the place of one who is deceased.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, I wish to say only one word in reference to the matter. I think the communication is perhaps a little unusual. The usual manner of dealing with such a question, I think, has been that the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution has conferred—and I am sure, as a matter of fact, that for several years the Secretary has conferred in the time of our distinguished friend, Senator Morrill—as to a good man to be put upon the board.

Mr. HOAR. At Mr. Morrill's invitation.

Mr. CULLOM. At Mr. Morrill's invitation; largely so. The Secretary has generally come here and conferred with him about it, and, I suppose, without any desire at all to dictate to the Senate or to Congress, the Secretary has made this communication to the President of the Senate. I am very certain that Professor Langley has no disposition whatever to interfere with the free exercise of the right of the Senate in the selection, whoever might be appointed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator suggest to what committee it should be referred?

Mr. CULLOM. There is no committee that really has charge of the matter. I think communications of that sort should go to the Committee on the Library or the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I came into the Senate while this discussion was going on, and did not hear the communication read. I would ask, if it be agreeable to other Senators, that the joint resolution, which is communicated in the Secretary's letter, may lie on the table for the present.

Mr. CULLOM. That will do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the communication will lie on the table, and the accompanying joint resolution with it.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut subsequently said: I ask that the communication from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, which was laid on the table at my request, be taken from the table and referred to the Committee on the Library.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut asks that the communication from the Smithsonian Institution be taken from the table and, with the accompanying joint resolution, be referred to the Committee on the Library. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 4152) to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts by bureaus and offices of the War Department, and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented a petition of the Christian Endeavor Union of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for the adoption of an antipolygamy constitutional amendment; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McMILLAN presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Adrian, Mich., and a petition of sundry American missionaries resident in Bulgaria and Turkey, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry American missionaries resident in Bulgaria and Turkey, praying for the enactment of legislation to suppress gambling and bookmaking in connection with racing in the District of Columbia and the Territories; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CARTER presented the petition of George W. Jenkins and sundry other citizens of Helena and Jefferson City, Mont., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of the Stock Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to amend and correct the war-revenue law relating to the tax on stocks, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of 54 citizens of Philadelphia, 50 citizens of Ulster, 5 citizens of York, 18 citizens of Port Allegheny, 34 citizens of Allegheny, 101 citizens of Montoursville, 66 citizens of Reading, 18 citizens of Washington County, 12 citizens of Meadville, 42 citizens of Deckhaven, 19 citizens of Carlisle, 7 citizens of Spring Church, 16 citizens of Wattsburg, of the congregation of the Mount Carmel Reformed Church, and of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Mount Carmel, of sundry members of the Sanitary League of Philadelphia, of 65 citizens of Verona, of 138 citizens of Linesville, of the Young Men's Christian Association of Wilkesbarre, of the general missionary committee of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Carlisle, of the congregations of sundry churches of Titusville, and of the northern conference of the Pittsburg Lutheran Synod, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., praying that in the construction of the new dry dock at Mare Island, Cal., concrete and stone be used instead of timber; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Los Angeles, Cal., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty with Jamaica; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation granting the Commercial Cable Company of Cuba the right to lay and operate a cable from the United States to Cuba; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., praying that all nursery stock imported into the United States shall be free from insect pests and disease, and that all fruits infested with insect pests shall be quarantined and not allowed to enter the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. LINDSAY presented the petition of C. L. Bradley and 17 other citizens of Ivins Store and Waterloo, in the State of Kentucky, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ALLISON presented a petition of the Farmers' National Congress, praying for a continuance of the appropriation providing for rural free mail delivery; for the enactment of legislation providing that no dairy or food product shall be falsely branded or labeled; for the extermination of the ravages of the gypsy moth; to prevent discrimination in freight rates against the producer and shipper of agricultural products; to extend such aid to American-built vessels as will enable them to successfully cope with foreign shippers in our marine traffic; that all products known as oleomargarine, butterine, etc., shall, upon arrival, become subject to the laws of such State or Territory; to increase the internal-revenue tax on oleomargarine to 10 cents per pound, etc.; and remonstrating against the appropriation of money by the Government to be expended for repairs and water storage to be applied to agricultural lands not previously cultivated; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented the petitions of L. Dennis and 27 other citizens of Milo, John Shadle and 34 other citizens of Sioux City, F. M. Beal and 37 other citizens of Shannon, and of T. F. Stauffer and 147 citizens of Sioux City, all in the State of Iowa, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present a petition of the Latin-American Club and Foreign Trade Association of St. Louis, Mo., praying Congress to subsidize vessels sailing under the flag of the United States, in order to build up a merchant marine and to facilitate the export trade. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. I also present supplementary resolutions

adopted at a mass meeting of citizens, held under the auspices of the Public Ownership Democratic League of St. Louis, December 2, 1899, reciting what the Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, colonial secretary of Great Britain, had announced in regard to an alliance between Great Britain and the United States, and denouncing that and any proposition for an alliance with Great Britain. I move that the resolutions be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE presented the petitions of W. Fred Wilson and 44 other citizens of North Abington, Rev. Charlton B. Bolles and 18 other citizens of Rockport, and of Carey W. Chamberlin and sundry other citizens of Boston, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MCCOMAS presented petitions of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Elkton, of W. R. Henner and 99 other citizens of Friendsville, of the congregation of St. Paul's Evangelical Lutheran Church of Baltimore, of Susan A. Spriggs and sundry other citizens of Baltimore, Edward F. Stands and 13 other citizens of Baltimore, Charles L. Pate and 18 other citizens of Baltimore, Henry M. Earp and 18 other citizens of Govanstown, James W. Campbell and 18 other citizens of Baltimore County, William C. Vogts and 41 other citizens of Fork, George W. Taylor and sundry other citizens of Zion, and of Fannie E. Pridham and sundry other citizens of Baltimore, all in the State of Maryland, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AFFAIRS IN CUBA.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Committee on Relations with Cuba to the following communication. I ask the attention of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maine desire to have the paper sent to the desk read?

Mr. HALE. Yes; let it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the paper will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

HABANA, *December 19.*

General Brooke will issue to-morrow the following proclamation:

"By direction of the President, I hereby transfer to my successor, Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood, the duties and responsibilities of the office of military governor, bespeaking for him that support and confidence which you have come to accord me. To those who have been associated with me in the performance of the difficult task of reorganizing and placing in operation the civil government of the island I hereby tender this expression of appreciation and thanks for their loyal and patriotic support and assistance.

"A year ago I found the country most thoroughly devastated, its resources and commerce destroyed, and its rural population gathered into towns, without food and without shelter, and dying of starvation and exposure. The Government of the United States immediately supplied work and food.

"In a short time this condition passed away, and now the country is rapidly pressing forward to a prosperity hitherto unknown in its history.

"Look about and see how true this is. The various steps that have led to the present condition are well known to you and need not be mentioned here. The change is truly marvelous. Without the semblance of civil government then, you have now a complete organization. Your municipal and provincial governments are all in the hands of your own citizens. The military control is purely advisory and supervisory. Many of your laws have been modified and changed to suit the times in which you live as well as interests of good government. Your courts have been reorganized and are in operation. Peace reigns. Law and order rule.

"By your own industry and by a careful observance of these conditions the full restoration of your social affairs and prosperity is assured. With the feeling that the future is in your hands, to make or to mar, and trusting that wise counsels may prevail among you, I say to you farewell."

General Wood's arrival is looked for to-morrow morning, etc.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I thought of introducing a resolution based upon this communication, to be referred to the Committee on Relations with Cuba, but did not deem that necessary, as the reading of General Brooke's proclamation must arrest the attention of the Senate, of the committee, and of the country. It is a most remarkable statement of the progress that has been made in Cuba in bringing about peace and order and a condition where the people, if General Brooke be right, must be ready at some near date to enter upon a government of their own.

General Brooke is to be congratulated upon accomplishing, with the assistance of his subordinates, so vast a work. It is more, Mr. President, than I supposed had been done in Cuba. I see in the light of this communication a nearer dawn of free government in Cuba, a government of the people there set up in their own way, a sister republic, undoubtedly, near to our doors, than I had been able to see before.

I do not know whether the Committee on Relations with Cuba propose any action during the recess, but I know that the chairman and other members of the committee will take notice of this much to be rejoiced at condition in Cuba and in the consideration of the subject, which they will soon take up, they will be sure that it has its full share in their deliberations.

I suppose General Brooke, having been displaced, may come north and be here in the United States. If he comes, I for one shall certainly be glad to hear personally what he has to say, and I have no doubt the committee will have the same desire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maine ask to have any reference made of the paper?

Mr. HALE. It will go naturally to the Committee on Relations with Cuba.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be so referred.

REMOVAL OF SEAT OF GOVERNMENT TO WASHINGTON CITY.

Mr. GALLINGER. I submit two brief papers relating to the removal of the seat of government to the District of Columbia and ask that they be printed as a document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1481) appropriating money to reimburse Capt. B. Tellefsen, reported it without amendment; which, together with the accompanying message from the President of the United States transmitting a report from the Secretary of State relating to the claim of Capt. B. Tellefsen, of the Norwegian steamer *Albert*, was placed on the Calendar.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 197) for the relief of Hattie A. Phillips, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 198) to reimburse the State of Wyoming for money expended by the Territory of Wyoming in protecting and preserving the Yellowstone National Park during the years 1884, 1885, and 1886, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1893) to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to complete the public building at Cheyenne, Wyo., reported it without amendment.

Mr. FRYE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the bill (S. 746) to authorize C. R. Dobbins to accept a gold watch awarded to him by the Government of the Dominion of Canada in recognition of his humane and gallant services to the shipwrecked crew of the British schooner *Ashton*, of Weymouth, Nova Scotia, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1740) to authorize C. E. Marr and E. H. Pierce to accept silver watches awarded to them by the Government of the Dominion of Canada in recognition of their services in rescuing British sailors, reported it without amendment.

Mr. CARTER, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 707) for the relief of Charles T. Rader, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MASON, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 602) to revive and amend an act to provide for the collection of abandoned property and the prevention of frauds in insurrectionary districts within the United States and acts amendatory thereof, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. ALLISON, from the Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (S. 641) to repeal certain provisos in an act of Congress entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for other purposes," approved June 7, 1897, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs; which was agreed to.

CAPT. N. M. BROOKS.

Mr. LODGE. I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 16) to authorize Capt. N. M. Brooks, Superintendent of Foreign Mails, Post-Office Department, to accept decorations from the Governments of Liberia and Venezuela, to report it favorably without amendment, and I ask for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REVISION OF CRIMINAL AND PENAL LAWS.

Mr. PLATT of New York, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution submitted by Mr. HOAR on the 14th instant, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 15,000 copies of the report of the Commission for the Revision

of the Criminal and Penal Laws of the United States, of which 5,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 10,000 for the use of the House of Representatives.

EMPLOYMENT OF STENOGRAPHER.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am directed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate to report back favorably resolution No. 35 and to ask for its present consideration.

The resolution submitted by Mr. FRYE on the 18th instant was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce be, and the same is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary, to report such hearings as may be had on bills pending before said committee, and to have the same printed for the use of the committee, and that such stenographer be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HOAR. I suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire that the resolution should not be confined to bills, but also other subjects before the committee. There are, or are likely to be, a good many resolves sent by the Senate. I know of one which is likely to be sent to that committee before long, and the resolution should read, "Such hearings as may be had on bills or other subjects pending before said committee."

Mr. GALLINGER. I have no objection to the resolution being so amended. I believe it was drafted by the chairman of the committee, and I presumed it was correct.

Mr. HOAR. I make the suggestion because I have in mind a subject, in regard to which the Committee on Commerce may likely send for persons and papers, which I expect to bring before them soon, and it will not be in the form of a bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

PAYMENT OF STENOGRAPHER.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. CHANDLER on the 18th instant, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the stenographer employed to report the arguments before the Committee on Privileges and Elections concerning the right of Matthew S. Quay to a seat in the Senate from the State of Pennsylvania be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

MARBLE PEDESTAL FOR BUST OF SUMNER.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the following resolution, submitted by Mr. HOAR on the 19th instant, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Architect of the Capitol be directed to procure a suitable marble pedestal for the bust of Charles Sumner near the entrance to the Senators' gallery, and that the sum of $250, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be appropriated therefor from the contingent fund of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 1923) for the relief of Henry Lane; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1924) for the relief of Emma R. Rusling; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PLATT of New York introduced a bill (S. 1925) for the relief of W. R. Austin & Co.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1926) granting a pension to George Vanslyke; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MCMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1927) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Ellen S. Larned; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1928) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of telegraphic cables between the United States of America and Hawaii, Guam, and Philippine Islands, and other countries, and to promote commerce; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1929) to provide for eliminating certain grade crossings on the line of the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company, in the city of Washington, D. C., and requiring said company to depress and elevate its tracks, and to enable it to relocate parts of its railroad therein, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MCCOMAS introduced a bill (S. 1930) for the relief of the legal representatives of John Boyle, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DAVIS (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1931) to provide for the erection of a bridge across Rainy River, in the State of Minnesota, between Rainy Lake and the mouth of Rainy River; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1932) to provide for the relinquishment by the Turtle Mountain band of the Pembina Chippewa Indians of their unceded lands, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 1933) to provide an American register for the steam whaler *Bowhead;* which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1934) for the relief of the Globe Works, of Boston, Mass.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 1935) for the relief of the Globe Works, of Boston, Mass.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 1936) granting a pension to Mamie Craig Lawton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 1937) to provide leaves of absence to certain employees of the Government; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. SHOUP introduced a bill (S. 1938) to place Henry Biederbick, Julius R. Frederick, Francis Long, and Maurice Connell on the retired list of enlisted men of the Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 1939) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint a commission to study and make full report upon the commercial and industrial conditions of China and Japan, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BUTLER introduced a bill (S. 1940) to prevent discrimination between various kinds of legal-tender money of the United States, and to maintain the equal debt-paying and purchasing power thereof, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TURNER introduced a bill (S. 1941) for the relief of the Lower band of the Chinook Indians of the State of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying petition, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 1942) to authorize the Secretary of War to cause to be investigated and to provide for the payment of all claims for the use and occupation of church and school buildings and grounds for Government purposes by the United States military authorities during the late war, and all claims for damages resulting from the appropriation to Government use of any of the furnishings or materials in said class of buildings; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1943) for the relief of the Methodist Protestant Church; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (S. 1944) to widen Fifteenth street, or Columbia avenue, in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. THURSTON introduced a bill (S. 1945) for the erection of a public building at Hastings, Nebr.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. FOSTER introduced a bill (S. 1946) for the erection of additional buildings, workshops, prison walls, and wharf at the United States penitentiary at McNeils Island, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1947) to provide for leasing the public grazing lands and to produce revenue for agricultural development; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1948) authorizing the appointment by the President of the United States of a commission of not less than five members to investigate the question of trade relations of the United States in the Orient, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BAKER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1949) granting a pension to Joshua Dye;

A bill (S. 1950) granting a pension to Lucinda M. Dean;
A bill (S. 1951) granting a pension to Matilda Jones;
A bill (S. 1952) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Jackson;
A bill (S. 1953) granting a pension to Samuel E. Frint (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1954) granting a pension to Edward L. Ruby (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1955) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Brady (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1956) granting a pension to John Keller (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 1957) granting an increase of pension to James McMorrow (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 1958) granting a pension to Susannah Kinkade (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1959) granting a pension to Violet T. Peck (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 1960) granting an increase of pension to Eli J. March (with accompanying papers).

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 1961) changing place for holding court in the central division of the Indian Territory from Cameron to Poteau, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1962) for the relief of Lucy A. Hopkins; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1963) for the relief of James Mills; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1964) for the relief of William Green; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 1965) to correct the military record of William M. Sibel, alias William Siple; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WARREN introduced a bill (S. 1966) granting an increase of pension to S. J. Brainard; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 1967) for the relief of Daniel W. Snider; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1968) granting pension for certain disabilities to Elisha L. Elam; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. To accompany the bill, I present a letter from the Commissioner of Pensions giving a full history of the case. I move that the bill and accompanying paper be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 1969) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of John W. Hancock; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1970) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of William A. Carr; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a bill (S. 1971) authorizing the recorder of deeds and the clerk of the supreme court of the District of Columbia to make abstracts of title and of the records of their respective offices, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. SULLIVAN introduced a bill (S. 1972) to prevent and make penal dealing in cotton "futures;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1973) to limit the class of persons who shall receive pensions; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1974) for the appointment of one representative from each State in the United States to attend the Paris Exposition in the interest of higher education; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Select Committee on International Expositions.

Mr. BUTLER introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 47) proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court by the qualified electors of the United States, and for the election of other Federal judges by the votes of the qualified electors of the respective judicial circuits and districts; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HOAR introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 48) directing the selection of a site for the erection of a bronze statue in Washington, D. C., in honor of the late Henry Wadsworth Longfellow; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

Mr. HARRIS was, on his own motion, excused from further service upon the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

On motion of Mr. COCKRELL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ALLEN was appointed to fill the vacancy upon the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Committee on Claims, the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game, the Committee on Interstate Commerce, the Committee on the Philippines, and the Committee on Pensions.

POLICY REGARDING NEW POSSESSIONS.

Mr. MORGAN. I submit an amendment to Senate joint resolution No. 45, and ask that it be read and printed and laid on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. Strike out all after the resolving clause in the joint resolution (S. R. 45) declaring the purpose of the United States with reference to the Philippine Islands, introduced by Mr. BACON on the 18th instant, and insert:

That in pursuance of section 4 of Article IV of the Constitution, the United States will guarantee to the people of Puerto Rico, Hawaii, the Philippine Islands, and all other States and peoples within its sovereign jurisdiction and control, a republican form of government, and will protect them against invasion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama asks that the amendment may be printed and lie on the table subject to his call. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DICEY BOBBITT.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask that the bill (S. 489) for the relief of Dicey Bobbitt, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions December 6, 1899, be recalled; that the Committee on Pensions be discharged from its further consideration, and then, when it is brought before the Senate, that it be indefinitely postponed, as the claimant is dead.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri asks unanimous consent for the reconsideration of the vote by which Senate bill No. 489 was referred to the Committee on Pensions. Is there objection? There is none. The vote is reconsidered and the bill is before the Senate. The Senator from Missouri moves its indefinite postponement. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

J. H. SANDERS.

Mr. COCKRELL. I make the same request with regard to the bill (S. 1334) for the relief of J. H. Sanders. By an oversight it was introduced by request and referred to the Committee on Claims, when I had previously introduced Senate bill 555 for the relief of the same party.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri asks that the vote by which Senate bill 1334 was referred to the Committee on Claims be reconsidered. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill is before the Senate. Shall it be indefinitely postponed?

The motion was agreed to.

COLLECTION OF REVENUE IN PUERTO RICO AND CUBA.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 335) for the collection of revenue within the island of Puerto Rico may be recalled from the Committee on Finance and referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Shall the vote by which the bill was referred to the Committee on Finance be reconsidered? The Chair hears no objection. The Senator from New Hampshire moves that the bill be referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask for a similar order with reference to a bill (S. 336) for the collection of revenue within the island of Cuba during its occupation by the military forces of the United States. I ask that that bill may be recalled and referred to the Committee on Relations with Cuba.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire requests a reconsideration of the vote by which Senate bill 336 was referred to the Committee on Finance. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Relations with Cuba.

OBLIGATIONS TO NEW POSSESSIONS.

Mr. HOAR. I present a resolution, which I ask may be read, printed, and lie on the table. I shall have occasion to speak to it at some future day.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas the American people and the several States in the Union have in times past, at important periods in their history, especially when declaring

their independence, establishing their constitutions, or undertaking new and great responsibilities, seen fit to declare the purposes for which the nation or State was founded and the important objects the people intend to pursue in their political action; and

Whereas the close of a great war, the liberation by the United States of the people of Cuba and Puerto Rico in the Western Hemisphere and of the Philippine Islands in the far east, and the reduction of those peoples to a condition of practical dependence upon the United States, constitute an occasion which makes such a declaration proper: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this Republic adheres to the doctrines which were in the past set forth in the Declaration of Independence and in its national and State constitutions.

That the purpose of its existence and the objects to which its political action ought to be directed are the ennobling of humanity, the raising from the dust of its humblest and coarsest members, and the enabling of persons coming lawfully under its power or influence to live in freedom and in honor, under governments whose forms they are to have a share in determining and in whose administration they have an equal voice. Its most important and pressing obligations are:

1. To solve the difficult problem presented by the presence of different races on our own soil with equal constitutional rights. To make the negro safe in his home, secure in his vote, equal in his opportunity for education and employment, and to bring the Indian to a civilization and culture in accordance with his need and capacity.

2. To enable great cities to govern themselves in freedom, in honor, and in purity.

3. To make the ballot box as pure as a sacramental vessel and the election return as perfectly in accord with the law and the truth as the judgment of the Supreme Court.

4. To banish illiteracy and ignorance from the land.

5. To secure for every workman and for every working woman wages enough to support a life of comfort and an old age of leisure and quiet, as befits those who have an equal share in a self-governing State.

6. To grow and expand over the continent and over the islands of the sea just so fast, and no faster, as we can bring into equality and self-government, under our Constitution, peoples and races who will share these ideals and help to make them realities.

7. To set a peaceful example of freedom which mankind will be glad to follow, but never to force even freedom upon unwilling nations at the point of the bayonet or at the cannon's mouth.

8. To abstain from interfering with the freedom and just rights of other nations or peoples, and to remember that the liberty to do right necessarily involves the liberty to do wrong, and that the American people has no right to take from any other people the birthright of freedom because of a fear that they will do wrong with it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will be received, and at the request of the Senator from Massachusetts it will lie on the table, subject to his call.

Mr. COCKRELL. And be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be printed.

PROPERTY EXEMPT FROM TAXATION IN THE DISTRICT.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate an itemized statement of all the real estate in the District of Columbia exempt from taxation and the authority for such exemption, excepting the property owned either by the United States or the District of Columbia.

Also an itemized statement of all the real property in the District of Columbia acquired by the United States and the District governments since the year 1893, inclusive.

By unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask the Senator from North Dakota whether he is not aware that this resolution will require a very bulky document to be sent to the Senate, and whether he desires to have all the particulars which are mentioned in the resolution reported to the Senate?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President, I have looked the matter over, and I do not think that the document forthcoming will be very bulky or voluminous.

Mr. CHANDLER. The resolution requires a description, I think, of all the different pieces of real estate which are assessed.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. On the last assessment roll there was about $402,000,000 worth of assessable property in the District of Columbia. Of that amount there was about $9,446,000 worth that was exempt from taxation. I understand that some of the persons who have charge of some portions of the property which is exempt from taxation have declined to construct sidewalks about their own property and that the District has been obliged to construct those sidewalks. The object of the resolution is to ascertain the property by description—I understand those descriptions are very brief and can be made in a very short time—to ascertain the number of pieces of property in the District that are exempt from taxation, so that we may locate this fault, if fault it be.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the resolution be again read, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will again read the resolution.

The resolution was again read.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. The resolution covers only about $9,000,000 worth of property in the District.

Mr. COCKRELL. Ought there not to be a clause there requiring the Commissioners to report the private property upon which the payment of taxes has been refused? I think it is exceedingly important that we should know those pieces of property upon which the payment of taxes has been refused by the owners and expect the public to pay for them.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I have no objection to the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri, and if he desires to add that to the resolution I will accept it.

Mr. COCKRELL. I will move to amend the resolution by inserting the words "also indicating the property upon which payment of taxes has been refused."

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota modifies the resolution by accepting the amendment suggested by the Senator from Missouri. The question is on the adoption of the resolution as modified.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL subsequently said: I desire to say as to the resolution which was just passed at the instance of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] that the amendment which I offered was not exactly in the proper language. I ask that the vote by which the resolution was passed may be reconsidered, so that the exact words which I desire to have inserted may be added to the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the vote by which the resolution was agreed to will be regarded as reconsidered, and the resolution is before the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. On my motion these words were inserted in the resolution: "Also indicating the property upon which payment of taxes has been refused." After the word "payment" I move to strike out the words "of taxes has been refused" and insert "for the construction and maintenance of sidewalks has been refused."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate an itemized statement of all the real estate in the District of Columbia exempt from taxation and the authority for such exemption, excepting the property owned either by the United States or the District of Columbia.

Also an itemized statement of all the real property in the District of Columbia acquired by the United States and the District governments since the year 1893, inclusive; also an itemized statement indicating the property upon which the payment for construction and maintenance of sidewalks has been refused.

IMPROVEMENT OF LEMON CREEK, NEW YORK.

Mr. PLATT of New York submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to submit a report of survey and estimate for the improvement of Lemon Creek, Richmond County (Staten Island), N. Y., in the construction of a training dike at the outlet into Princess Bay, and the extension of the present dredged channel a further distance of 1,000 feet.

EMPLOYMENT OF STENOGRAPHER.

Mr. FORAKER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico be, and the same is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary, to report such hearings and proceedings as may be had before said committee, and to have the same printed for the use of the committee, and that such stenographer be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported the foregoing resolution without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

PRINTING OF THE FINANCIAL BILL.

Mr. ALLISON submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That there be printed and delivered to the Senate document room, for the use of the Senate, 1,000 copies of House bill 1, as reported to the Senate from the Finance Committee, with amendments, December 19, 1899.

PRINTING FOR COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.

Mr. ALLISON submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be, and is hereby, authorized to have printed such papers and documents as may be ordered by the committee and necessary for the business of said committee during the Fifty-sixth Congress.

INTERCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. ALLISON submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be directed to communicate to the Senate a statement of number published and the number distributed of the official reports on the projected Intercontinental Railway through the three Americas, and also how many, if any, of said reports remain undistributed.

COAST SURVEYS.

Mr. FOSTER submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to submit to the Senate of the United States a report on—

1. The progress and present state of the survey of the coast of the United States, including Alaska.
2. The present condition and progress of surveys which may have been inaugurated on the islands now under the jurisdiction of the United States.
3. His recommendations as to further surveys in said islands.
4. The bearing of the recommendation contained in his last annual report on the use of the metric system of weights and measures in the proposed surveys of said islands.

CONDUCT OF THE WAR WITH SPAIN.

Mr. PETTIGREW submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, directed to send to the Senate a copy of all the testimony taken by the commission appointed to investigate the conduct of the war with Spain, together with a copy of the report of said commission.

Mr. HAWLEY subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago a resolution was passed that I should have asked some attention to if I had been watching. The resolution reads:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, directed to send to the Senate a copy of all the testimony taken by the commission appointed to investigate the conduct of the war with Spain, together with a copy of the report of said commission.

I believe that commission reported to the President. I really do not know how bulky the testimony may be or how valuable it may be; but I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was passed, with a view of committing the resolution to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut moves to reconsider the vote by which the resolution submitted by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW] was agreed to. The question is on that motion.

Mr. PETTIGREW. This is simply a resolution for information—to have sent to the Senate a copy of the evidence taken before the commission to investigate the conduct of the war. It seems to me that the Senate can be intrusted with this information, and it is very proper that it should be sent to the Senate. The question of printing the document is a question which will be considered by the Senate after we shall have received a copy of the testimony.

I certainly hope that this effort at inquiry for facts which the Senate should be in the possession of will not be smothered by a reference of all such resolutions to the Committee on Military Affairs or to any other committee of this body. I understand that there is much of the evidence taken by the commission bearing on many questions which ought to be in the possession of the Senate, and I very much hope that this resolution will not be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

It has been the custom of the Senate, when a Senator desired information from one of the Departments of the Government, to pass resolutions asking for such information. Is this a new departure instituted for the purpose of carrying out a studied policy? Is it along the line of the suppression of news of the operations of our Army in distant lands? Is it prompted from the same source which has suppressed information, not because it may go to the enemies of the country, but suppressed information for fear of its effect upon the American people themselves? A few days ago I offered a resolution asking for information with regard to the recognition of the Filipino republic, which was promptly laid upon the table. That resolution had laid upon the table for two days, and undoubtedly the majority of the Senate had sought to ascertain the facts and found that we had saluted the Filipino flag; that we had accompanied their vessels of war with our vessels of war and compelled the surrender of a Spanish garrison.

Therefore it was thought necessary to lay the resolution upon the table rather than seek the information. If the answer could have been that we had not recognized the Filipino flag, do you think the resolution would have been laid upon the table? No, Mr. President; the information would have been promptly furnished. The fact is that we did recognize the Filipino flag. The fact is that we accompanied a vessel commanded by the forces of Aguinaldo to Subig Bay, and the fact is that two vessels of our Navy compelled the surrender of a Spanish garrison and turned the prisoners over to the Filipino republic. Those are the facts, and yet we have been told so often by the Administration that these are not the facts, and now the Senate refuses to pass a resolution calling upon them for a report of the facts in this connection. When we ask, after the war is over, after peace is declared and a treaty ratified, for information with regard to the conduct of the war, the usual course is not pursued, but it is proposed to refer the resolution to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There are many things in connection with the conduct of this war with Spain that ought to be brought to the attention of the people of the United States. Not alone should the report of this commission be made public, but another commission ought to be appointed by the Congress of the United States in order to expose the corruption and mismanagement in connection with the war with Spain. The purchase of army transports and the renting of army transports ought to be looked into. Rumors come to our ears—information that is, I believe, from authentic sources—that in the employment of transports to take troops to the Philippine Islands we have paid, in many instances, two or three times more than the same vessels were offered for. We have purchased ships that were worthless, condemned, and unseaworthy at prices far greater than those at which ships that were valuable and seaworthy might have been bought.

Now, is the result of this investigation, are these facts to be communicated to the American people and to the Senate? Is the policy of a censored press in the suppression of news to be adopted by this body in the suppression of facts which might in any way injure the chances for a reelection of the present Administration? It seems to me that these questions are far more important than the triumph or success of any political party. I hope, Mr. President, that the Senate will not reconsider this resolution and refer it to the Committee on Military Affairs, but will continue the usual custom, which has been the passing of resolutions which simply ask for information.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, the Senator does not surprise me in being facile in discovering improper motives. He belongs to the class of original discoverers in that line. I do not think he is justified in talking about smothering. Nothing that I know of that was worth looking at has ever been smothered in the Military Committee.

I only wish to know whether the testimony given before the President's commission is worth publishing, and, if so, how bulky it is, to what extent it goes, and whether it dispenses with the necessity of a regular committee upon the conduct of the war, such as we had during the civil war, or whether there still ought to be that sort of a committee. If the Senate thinks it wise, I have not the slightest objection in the world to the appointment of a committee like that we had during the civil war for a thorough investigation of the whole conduct of the war.

The commission in this case was one appointed by the President to perform certain duties. It was the President's commission. It did conduct a more or less thorough examination. I do not know whether the testimony is all preserved, but I presume it is. The commission also made a report, which was given to the whole country. I am only exercising the ordinary precaution in a matter of this kind in asking time for a little inquiry regarding it. Nobody supposes that I would smother it or would shirk from an exposure of anything that has been going on.

I adhere to my motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was passed, Mr. President.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let me suggest to the Senator from South Dakota that, if I am not mistaken, the commission referred to in the resolution was chosen by the President——

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. COCKRELL. Without any legislative sanction, and the report was necessarily made to the President. I claim and believe that we have a perfect right to have that information. It would be only just and proper that the legislative body of this country, in legislating upon the same subject-matter, should have the information the President had, and which the public has paid for. I suggest that the resolution be changed so that the President be requested to send the testimony to the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. So far as, in his opinion, it be not incompatible with the public interests.

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes; let it be in the usual words. I hope that in that form the resolution will be passed, for I think it is right and proper we should have this information. When it comes to us, then the Senate will determine as to the propriety of publishing it and everything of that kind.

Mr. HAWLEY. I make no objection to the change suggested, and I would then agree to the proposition. We shall, however, have to reconsider the adoption of the resolution in order to make the change suggested by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. PETTIGREW. With that understanding, I have no objection to having the resolution as it was passed reconsidered and amended as suggested by the Senator from Missouri and again passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the vote by which the resolution was passed will be regarded as reconsidered; and the resolution is now before the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move to amend the resolution as I have suggested.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments suggested by the Senator from Missouri will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out of the resolution

the words "Secretary of War" and insert "President;" and, after the word "hereby," it is proposed to strike out "directed" and insert "requested, if, in his judgment, not incompatible with the public interests."

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I desire to say one word respecting the pending resolution before it is agreed to. I think it calls for very valuable information, and I believe the whole of the testimony taken by the commission, as well as its report, should be sent to the Senate. I have no doubt it will be found a bulky document, but, even though it be bulky and comprise several volumes, I think it is a valuable document that ought to be sent here and printed at the public expense. I desire to say for myself that I hope no objection will be made to its printing. I am sure those who made this investigation and the President of the United States will have no objection to the widest publication of the document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments which have been stated.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

INTEROCEANIC CANAL HEARINGS.

Mr. MORGAN. I move the printing, for the use of the Senate, of the usual number of copies of the hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives on the new Panama Canal Company, the Maritime Canal Company, and the Nicaragua Canal Company, held January 17 to 25, 1899. This document has passed out of print and was never printed for the use of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama asks unanimous consent for an order to print the document named by him. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and that order will be made.

AFFAIRS IN SAMOA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, with an accompanying paper, in response to the resolution of the Senate of December 15, 1899, requesting him, "if not inconsistent with the public interests, to send to the Senate the report made by Hon. Bartlett Tripp, the member of the Samoan Commission on behalf of the United States of America."

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, December 20, 1899.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. HOAR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After one hour and thirty-five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 2 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the concurrent resolution of the two Houses, until Wednesday, January 3, 1900, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 20, 1899.

POSTMASTERS.

Eugene L'Hote, to be postmaster at Milford, in the county of Iroquois and State of Illinois, in the place of Nettie Flack, whose commission expires January 23, 1900.

W. F. Himel, jr., to be postmaster at White Castle, in the county of Iberville and State of Louisiana, in the place of W. P. Ware, resigned.

Charles C. White, to be postmaster at Orono, in the county of Penobscot and State of Maine, in the place of W. S. Reed, whose commission expires January 9, 1900.

N. H. Ingersoll, to be postmaster at Brainerd, in the county of Crow Wing and State of Minnesota, in the place of C. D. Johnson, whose commission expires January 7, 1900.

Henry C. Mead, to be postmaster at Caldwell, in the county of Essex and State of New Jersey, in the place of Stephen Van Order, whose commission expired December 19, 1899.

Albert Weed, to be postmaster at Ticonderoga, in the county of Essex and State of New York, in the place of E. T. Wilcox, resigned.

SUPERVISORS OF CENSUS.

Andrew J. White, of Todd, Atchison County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Kansas. Appointed July 25, 1899, during the recess of the Senate.

Walker Wilkins, of Elkton, Todd County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Kentucky.

PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEON IN THE NAVY.

Asst. Surg. Middleton S. Elliott, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, from the 6th day of October, 1899, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade.

FIRST LIEUTENANT IN THE MARINE CORPS.

Robert Ethridge Carmody, to be a first lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps, from the 13th day of April, 1899, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 20, 1899.

ASSISTANT TREASURER.

Bernard G. Farrar, of Missouri, to be assistant treasurer of the United States at St. Louis, Mo.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Thomas H. Anderson, of the District of Columbia, to be attorney of the United States for the District of Columbia.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

David W. Eastman, of Emporia, Kans., to be receiver of public moneys at Enid, Okla.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Albert E. Rose, of Fargo, N. Dak., to be register of the land office at Peavy, Alaska.

Lee Stover, of Watertown, S. Dak., to be register of the land office at Watertown, S. Dak.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

GENERAL OFFICERS.

To be brigadier-generals.

James H. Wilson, late major-general, United States Volunteers, April 12, 1899.

Fitzhugh Lee, late major-general, United States Volunteers, April 12, 1899.

Joseph Wheeler, late major-general, United States Volunteers, April 12, 1899.

Lieut. Col. William Ludlow, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, late major-general, United States Volunteers, April 13, 1899.

Lieut. Col. Adna R. Chaffee, Third United States Cavalry (now colonel Eighth United States Cavalry), late major-general, United States Volunteers, April 13, 1899.

Capt. Leonard Wood, assistant surgeon, United States Army, late major-general, United States Volunteers, April 13, 1899.

Col. John C. Bates, Second United States Infantry, late major-general, United States Volunteers, April 13, 1899.

Col. Samuel B. M. Young, Third United States Cavalry, late major-general, United States Volunteers, April 13, 1899.

Lieut. Col. George W. Davis, Fourteenth United States Infantry, late brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, April 14, 1899.

Col. Theodore Schwan, assistant adjutant-general, United States Army, late brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, April 14, 1899.

Col. Robert H. Hall, Fourth United States Infantry, late brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, April 15, 1899.

Col. Loyd Wheaton, Twentieth United States Infantry, late brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, April 15, 1899.

Charles King, late brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, April 15, 1899.

Frederick D. Grant, late brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, April 15, 1899.

Col. Robert P. Hughes, inspector-general, United States Army, late brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, April 16, 1899.

Col. Samuel Ovenshine, Twenty-third United States Infantry, late brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, April 17, 1899.

Irving Hale, late brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, April 17, 1899.

Col. James F. Smith, First California Volunteers, April 24, 1899.

Col. Frederick Funston, Twentieth Kansas Volunteers, May 1, 1899.

TO BE ASSISTANT ADJUTANTS-GENERAL.

With the rank of lieutenant-colonel.

Capt. Hugh L. Scott, Seventh United States Cavalry, August 17, 1899.

With the rank of major.

First Lieut. J. Franklin Bell, Seventh United States Cavalry (now captain, Seventh United States Cavalry), April 17, 1899.

First Lieut. John J. Pershing, Tenth United States Cavalry, June 6, 1899.
First Lieut. Robert E. L. Michie, Second United States Cavalry, July 26, 1899.
Capt. James B. Hickey, Eighth United States Cavalry, September 5, 1899.
Capt. Edwin St. J. Greble, Second United States Artillery, September 5, 1899.
Capt. Robert H. Noble, Third United States Infantry, September 5, 1899.
Capt. Benjamin Alvord, Twentieth United States Infantry, October 18, 1899.

TO BE INSPECTORS-GENERAL.

With the rank of lieutenant-colonel.

Maj. Charles Heyl, inspector-general, United States Army, September 30, 1899.

With the rank of major.

Capt. Parker W. West, Eighth United States Cavalry, April 17, 1899.
Capt. Alfred C. Sharpe, Twenty-second United States Infantry, April 17, 1899.
Capt. William D. Beach, Third United States Cavalry, September 6, 1899.
First Lieut. Robert A. Brown, Fourth United States Cavalry, September 30, 1899.

TO BE JUDGE-ADVOCATES.

With the rank of major.

Capt. Edgar S. Dudley, assistant quartermaster, United States Army, April 17, 1899.
Capt. Charles McClure, Eighteenth United States Infantry, April 17, 1899.
First Lieut. Harvey C. Carbaugh, Fifth United States Artillery (now captain, Fourth United States Artillery), April 17, 1899.
John A. Hull, late judge-advocate with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, United States Volunteers, April 17, 1899.
George M. Dunn, of Colorado, April 17, 1899.

TO BE QUARTERMASTERS.

With the rank of major.

Capt. Guy Howard, assistant quartermaster, United States Army (since deceased), April 1, 1899.
Capt. James B. Aleshire, assistant quartermaster, United States Army, April 1, 1899.
Noble H. Creager, late chief quartermaster with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, United States Volunteers, April 1, 1899.
Capt. John T. Knight, assistant quartermaster, United States Army, July 6, 1899.
Capt. John T. French, jr., assistant quartermaster, United States Army, July 6, 1899.
Capt. George S. Cartwright, Twenty-fourth United States Infantry, July 11, 1899.
Capt. Abraham S. Bickham, assistant quartermaster, United States Volunteers, November 10, 1899.

TO BE ASSISTANT QUARTERMASTERS.

With the rank of captain.

First Lieut. Willard A. Holbrook, Seventh United States Cavalry, April 1, 1899.
Jacob C. R. Peabody, of Massachusetts, April 1, 1899.
William E. Horton, of the District of Columbia, April 1, 1899.
Louis F. Garrard, jr., of Georgia, April 1, 1899.
William C. Cannon, of Illinois, April 1, 1899.
Nathan P. Batchelder, of California, April 1, 1899.
Ira L. Fredendall, of Wyoming, April 10, 1899.
First. Lieut. John C. Gilmore, jr., Fourth United States Artillery, June 14, 1899.
Harry L. Pettus, of Alabama, June 14, 1899.
Henry J. May, of Ohio, June 14, 1899.
Patrick H. McCaull, of Virginia, June 21, 1899.
Sylvanus G. Orr, of Georgia, July 7, 1899.
First Lieut. George Le R. Irwin, Fifth United States Artillery, July 13, 1899.
Daniel W. Arnold, of Illinois, July 17, 1899.
First Lieut. Sydney A. Cloman, Fifteenth United States Infantry (now captain, Twenty-third United States Infantry), July 18, 1899.
Laurance C. Baker, of New York, July 25, 1899.
George W. Povey, of Oregon, August 28, 1899.
Benjamin Johnson, of California, August 28, 1899.
John Landstreet, jr., of Tennessee, September 9, 1899.
First Lieut. Henry L. Kinnison, Twenty-fifth United States Infantry, September 18, 1899.
First Lieut. William A. Burnside, Fourteenth United States Infantry, September 18, 1899.
Francis Lithgow Payson, of New York, September 18, 1899.
First Lieut. Perry L. Miles, Fourteenth United States Infantry, October 10, 1899.

TO BE COMMISSARIES OF SUBSISTENCE.

With the rank of major.

Capt. Oliver E. Wood, Fifth United States Artillery, April 17, 1899.
Capt. David L. Brainard, commissary of subsistence, United States Army, April 17, 1899.
Capt. George B. Davis, commissary of subsistence, United States Army, April 17, 1899.
Capt. George W. Ruthers, Twenty-fourth United States Infantry, July 8, 1899.

TO BE ASSISTANT COMMISSARIES OF SUBSISTENCE.

With the rank of captain.

First Lieut. Harry E. Wilkins, Second United States Infantry, April 17, 1899.
Philip Mothersill, of New Mexico, April 17, 1899.
Daniel Hogan, of Illinois, April 17, 1899.
William H. Anderson, of Ohio, June 19, 1899.
Capt. John Landstreet, jr., assistant quartermaster, United States Volunteers, with the rank of captain, September 18, 1899.

TO BE SURGEONS.

With the rank of major.

Franklin A. Meacham, of Utah, April 5, 1899.
Capt. Jefferson R. Kean, assistant surgeon, United States Army, April 17, 1899.
Charles M. Drake, of Georgia, July 5, 1899.
Capt. Frank R. Keefer, assistant surgeon, United States Army, October 1, 1899.
Capt. Henry C. Fisher, assistant surgeon, United States Army, October 1, 1899.
Capt. Charles B. Ewing, assistant surgeon, United States Army, November 1, 1899.
Capt. William B. Banister, assistant surgeon, United States Army, November 11, 1899.

TO BE ADDITIONAL PAYMASTER.

With the rank of major.

Hugh R. Belknap, of Illinois, March 11, 1899.

TO BE SIGNAL OFFICERS.

With the rank of major.

Capt. Richard E. Thompson, Signal Corps, United States Army, April 17, 1899.
Capt. William A. Glassford, Signal Corps, United States Army, April 17, 1899.
Capt. Joseph E. Maxfield, Signal Corps, United States Army, April 17, 1899.
Capt. George P. Scriven, Signal Corps, United States Army, April 17, 1899.

With the rank of captain.

First Lieut. George O. Squier, Signal Corps, United States Army, April 17, 1899.
First Lieut. Samuel Reber, Signal Corps, United States Army, April 17, 1899.
First Lieut. Gustave W. S. Stevens, Sixth United States Artillery, April 17, 1899.
Benjamin F. Montgomery, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, April 17, 1899.
Edward B. Ives, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, April 17, 1899.
Eugene O. Fechét, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of major, April 17, 1899.
Charles B. Hepburn, of the District of Columbia, April 26, 1899.
Daniel J. Carr, of Connecticut, June 2, 1899.

With the rank of first lieutenant.

Carl F. Hartmann, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of captain, April 17, 1899.
Frank E. Lyman, jr., late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of captain, April 17, 1899.
Ambrose Higgins, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of captain, April 17, 1899.
John J. Ryan, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of captain, April 17, 1899.
Leonard D. Wildman, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of captain, April 17, 1899.
Daniel J. Carr, of Connecticut, April 17, 1899.
Second Lieut. George C. Burnell, United States Volunteer Signal Corps, April 26, 1899.
William M. Talbott, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of second lieutenant, April 26, 1899.
Second Lieut. Walter L. Clarke, United States Volunteer Signal Corps, May 15, 1899.

Basil O. Lenoir, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of second lieutenant, June 2, 1899.

Second Lieut. William O. Bailey, United States Volunteer Signal Corps, August 16, 1899.

With the rank of second lieutenant.

Charles B. Hepburn, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of captain, April 17, 1899.

William Mitchell, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of first lieutenant, April 17, 1899.

Victor Shepherd, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of first lieutenant, April 17, 1899.

Walter L. Clarke, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of first lieutenant, April 17, 1899.

George C. Burnell, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of first lieutenant, April 17, 1899.

Charles B. Rogan, jr., late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of first lieutenant, April 17, 1899.

William O. Bailey, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of first lieutenant, April 26, 1899.

Richard O. Rickard, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of captain, April 26, 1899.

William E. Davies, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of first lieutenant, May 15, 1899.

Charles M. Duffy, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of first lieutenant, May 15, 1899.

William W. Colt, late signal officer, United States Volunteers, with the rank of first lieutenant, May 15, 1899.

Sergt. Alfred T. Clifton, Volunteer Signal Corps, March 15, 1899.

Sergt. Mack K. Cunningham, Volunteer Signal Corps, March 15, 1899.

First-class Sergt. Niels P. Yurgensen, Signal Corps, United States Army, August 16, 1899.

PUERTO RICO BATTALION.

To be majors,

Capt. Lorenzo P. Davison, Fifth United States Infantry, June 5, 1899 (since resigned).

Capt. Eben Swift, Fifth United States Cavalry, December 1, 1899.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Thomas F. Maginnis, Eleventh United States Infantry, May 13, 1899.

Osman Latrobe, late major, Fourth United States Volunteer Infantry, May 13, 1899.

Frederick M. Page, late assistant adjutant-general, United States Volunteers, with the rank of captain, May 13, 1899.

To be first lieutenants.

James T. Ord, late first lieutenant, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry, May 13, 1899.

Charles H. Hamilton, late first lieutenant, Third United States Volunteer Engineers, June 20, 1899.

Christian Briard, late first lieutenant, Fifth United States Volunteer Infantry, June 26, 1899.

Allen D. Raymond, late captain, First United States Volunteer Engineers, July 12, 1899.

To be second lieutenants.

Harry L. Cooper, of Pennsylvania, August 2, 1899.

Blas Nadal, of Puerto Rico, August 14, 1899.

First-class Sergt. William W. Bessell, Signal Corps, United States Army, November 13, 1899.

Hosp. Steward Jacob E. Wyke, United States Army, November 28, 1899.

TWENTY-SIXTH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenants.

Sergt. Maj. George R. D. McGregor, Twenty-sixth Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 13, 1899.

Com. Sergt. George Garity, Twenty-sixth Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 25, 1899.

TWENTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenants.

Sergt. Thomas MacA. Knox, Company D, Twenty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, August 12, 1899.

First Sergt. Matthew T. E. Ward, Company C, Twenty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 5, 1899.

First Sergt. Arthur L. McCoy, Company B, Twenty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 13, 1899.

Hosp. Steward Joseph W. Lacour, Twenty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 14, 1899.

First Sergt. Frederick B. Hennessy, Company D, Twenty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 14, 1899.

First Sergt. William H. Raymond, Company C, Twenty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 27, 1899.

Sergt. Alvin S. Perkins, Company E, Twenty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 27, 1899.

TWENTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenant.

Sergt. Maj. Frederick G. Turner, Twenty-eighth Infantry, United States Volunteers, October 13, 1899.

TWENTY-NINTH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenants.

Sergt. Maj. Charles M. Pendleton, Twenty-ninth Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 9, 1899.

Sergt. Maj. Judge L. Farwell, Twenty-ninth Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 18, 1899.

Battalion Sergt. Maj. Calvin F. Holmes, Twenty-ninth Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 18, 1899.

First Sergt. William B. Renziehausen, Company A, Twenty-ninth Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 18, 1899.

THIRTIETH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenant.

First Sergt. Robert E. Brooks, Company E, Thirtieth Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 16, 1899.

THIRTY-FIRST INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenants.

Sergt. Maj. Jennings B. Wilson, Thirty-first Infantry, United States Volunteers, August 30, 1899.

Q. M. Sergt. Richard M. Corwine, Thirty-first Infantry, United States Volunteers, October 25, 1899.

Sergt. Maj. Charles H. Danforth, Thirty-first Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 28, 1899.

THIRTY-SECOND INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenants.

Sergt. Maj. Henry E. Schack, Thirty-second Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 22, 1899.

Battalion Sergt. Maj. Frank Werner, Thirty-second Infantry, United States Volunteers, December 4, 1899.

THIRTY-THIRD INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenants.

William M. True, of Missouri, August 24, 1899.

Sergt. Maj. Wallace W. Goddard, Thirty-third Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 12, 1899.

First Sergt. John A. Jackson, Company I, Thirty-third Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 13, 1899.

Q. M. Sergt. John M. Flemister, Thirty-third Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 14, 1899.

Battalion Sergt. Maj. Etienne de P. Bujac, Thirty-third Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 25, 1899.

Sergt. Frederick E. Coe, Company I, Thirty-third Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 25, 1899.

THIRTY-FOURTH INFANTRY.

To be first lieutenant.

First Lieut. John W. Haussermann, Twentieth Kansas Volunteers, August 3, 1899.

To be second lieutenant.

First Sergt. Harry G. Peterson, Company D, Thirty-fourth Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 9, 1899.

THIRTY-FIFTH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenant.

Com. Sergt. Roger Duval, Thirty-fifth Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 23, 1899.

THIRTY-SIXTH INFANTRY.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. John J. Haisch, Twentieth Kansas Volunteers, July 26, 1899.

First Sergt. William C. Read, Battery C, Third United States Artillery, August 3, 1899.

THIRTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenant.

Sergt. Maj. John Storck, Thirty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, December 5, 1899.

THIRTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenant.

Com. Sergt. Albert J. Woude, Thirty-eighth Infantry, United States Volunteers, December 6, 1899.

THIRTY-NINTH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenant.

Q. M. Sergt. Marcus Covell, Thirty-ninth Infantry, United States Volunteers, October 13, 1899.

FORTY-FIRST INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenants.

Sergt. Ralph C. Caldwell, Company H, Forty-first Infantry, United States Volunteers, October 21, 1899.

First Sergt. Odus J. Reeder, Company D, Forty-first Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 13, 1899.

Sergt. Harvey J. Simmons, Company E, Forty-first Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 13, 1899.

Battalion Sergt. Maj. Henry Wessel, Forty-first Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 18, 1899.

FORTY-SECOND INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenant.

Sergt. Maj. Walker W. Hamner, Forty-second Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 20, 1899.

FORTY-THIRD INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenants.

Q. M. Sergt. James L. Elmer, Forty-third Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 13, 1899.

Private Charles C. Estes, Company G, Forty-third Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 13, 1899.

First Sergt. John N. Truden, Company A, Forty-third Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 30, 1899.

FORTY-FOURTH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenants.

Sergt. Maj. George Bennett, Forty-fourth Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 10, 1899.

Q. M. Sergt. Walter E. Van Houten, Forty-fourth Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 30, 1899.

FORTY-SIXTH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenant.

Private Sidney H. Hopson, Light Battery A, Second United States Artillery, September 16, 1899.

FORTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY.

To be major.

Capt. James A. Shipton, Forty-first Infantry, United States Volunteers, October 26, 1899.

To be second lieutenants.

Sergt. Maj. Joseph H. Dent, Forty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, October 30, 1899.

First Sergt. George A. Purington, Company C, Forty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 1, 1899.

First Sergt. Brice P. Disque, Company E, Forty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 13, 1899.

FORTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY.

To be first lieutenant.

Arthur L. Cabanne, of Missouri, October 26, 1899.

FORTY-NINTH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenant.

Sergt. Maj. James M. Dickerson, Forty-ninth Infantry, United States Volunteers, November 10, 1899.

SECOND UNITED STATES VOLUNTEER ENGINEERS.

To be captains.

First Lieut. William M. Venable, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

First Lieut. Christopher C. Fitzgerald, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

First Lieut. Eugene Klapp, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

First Lieut. Frederick J. Mills, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Lewis B. Hamilton, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

Second Lieut. George A. Purington, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

Second Lieut. Clarence F. Jackson, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

Second Lieut. David G. Anderson, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

Second Lieut. Thomas Cooney, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

Second Lieut. Charles J. Carlsen, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

Second Lieut. Anton Schneider, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

Second Lieut. Robert M. Fulweiler, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

Second Lieut. Orville Benson, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, March 5, 1899.

To be second lieutenants.

Sergt. Maj. William F. Sims, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

Battalion Sergt. Maj. William T. Carpenter, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

Sergt. Rolland Adelsperger, Company E, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

Sergt. William C. Bakhaus, Company G, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

Sergt. Fred B. McCrosky, Company C, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

Corpl. Charles W. Beaver, Company C, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, April 24, 1899.

Sergt. Charles N. Bellamy, Company A, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, March 5, 1899.

Sergt. Frank M. Levings, Company F, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, May 6, 1899.

THIRD UNITED STATES VOLUNTEER ENGINEERS.

To be captain.

First Lieut. Samuel F. Crecelius, Third United States Volunteer Engineers, April 15, 1899.

To be assistant surgeon with the rank of first lieutenant.

Acting Asst. Surg. Harry R. Lemen, United States Army, April 25, 1899.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Francis Wharton Griffin, Third United States Volunteer Engineers, April 15, 1899.

Second Lieut. Luther E. Smith, Third United States Volunteer Engineers, April 25, 1899.

To be second lieutenants.

First Sergt. William J. Fairback, Company D, Third United States Volunteer Engineers, April 15, 1899.

Sergt. Foster H. Hilliard, Company L, Third United States Volunteer Engineers, April 25, 1899.

William R. Maxwell, of Georgia, April 25, 1899.

SECOND UNITED STATES VOLUNTEER INFANTRY.

To be surgeon with the rank of major.

First Lieut. Edward J. Barrett, assistant surgeon, Second United States Volunteer Infantry, May 8, 1899.

To be captain.

First Lieut. John H. Gregory, jr., Second United States Volunteer Infantry, May 13, 1899.

To be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Lloyd Parkinson, Second United States Volunteer Infantry, May 13, 1899.

To be second lieutenants.

First Sergt. Lemar H. Hendricks, Company E, Second United States Volunteer Infantry, January 7, 1899.

First Sergt. Herbert H. Hoag, Company K, Second United States Volunteer Infantry, April 28, 1899.

First Sergt. Theodore Soelter, Company M, Second United States Volunteer Infantry, May 5, 1899.

First Sergt. George M. Apple, Company I, Second United States Volunteer Infantry, May 8, 1899.

Battalion Sergt. Maj. George A. Seyde, Second United States Volunteer Infantry, May 8, 1899.

Sergt. Charles C. Loomis, Company K, Second United States Volunteer Infantry, May 13, 1899.

THIRD UNITED STATES VOLUNTEER INFANTRY.

To be major.

Capt. Walter K. Wheatley, Third United States Volunteer Infantry, March 17, 1899.

To be captain.

Algernon Sartoris, of the District of Columbia, March 17, 1899.

FOURTH UNITED STATES VOLUNTEER INFANTRY.

To be major.

Capt. Henry A. Wise, Fourth United States Volunteer Infantry, May 22, 1899.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Wade L. Jolly, Fourth United States Volunteer Infantry, March 6, 1899.

First Lieut. George D. Barbour, Fourth United States Volunteer Infantry, May 22, 1899.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. John A. Thayer, Fourth United States Volunteer Infantry, March 6, 1899.

Second Lieut. Richard T. Ellis, Fourth United States Volunteer Infantry, May 1, 1899.

Second Lieut. John M. Baldwin, Fourth United States Volunteer Infantry, May 27, 1899.

To be second lieutenants.

First Sergt. Albert S. Johnson, Company K, Fourth United States Volunteer Infantry, March 6, 1899.

Sergt. Maj. Richard M. Corwine, Fourth United States Volunteer Infantry, May 1, 1899.

First Sergt. Robert T. Patterson, Company F, Fourth United States Volunteer Infantry, May 27, 1899.

FIFTH UNITED STATES VOLUNTEER INFANTRY.

To be assistant surgeon with the rank of first lieutenant.

John C. Greenewalt, of Pennsylvania, April 22, 1899.

To be second lieutenants.

First Sergt. James A. Campbell, Company B, Fifth United States Volunteer Infantry, April 11, 1899.

First Sergt. Corlis S. Ragland, Company K, Fifth United States Volunteer Infantry, April 11, 1899.

NINTH UNITED STATES VOLUNTEER INFANTRY.

To be assistant surgeon with the rank of first lieutenant.

William E. Apple, of Pennsylvania, March 5, 1899.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. William H. Robinson, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry, April 12, 1899.

Second Lieut. Joshua L. Jones, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry, May 17, 1899.

Second Lieut. Adolph J. Wakefield, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry, May 22, 1899.

To be second lieutenants.

Q. M. Sergt. Joshua L. Jones, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry, April 12, 1899.

Sergt. Maj. Poole S. Hall, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry, May 22, 1899.

Chief Musician James W. McNeal, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry, May 22, 1899.

First Sergt. James R. Longs, Company L, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry, May 23, 1899.

TO BE COLONEL TWENTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Maj. Edmund Rice, Third United States Infantry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL TWENTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. William P. Duvall, First United States Artillery.

TO BE MAJORS, TWENTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Joseph T. Dickman, Eighth United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. Edward D. Anderson, Tenth United States Cavalry.
Frank A. Cook, of Rhode Island.

TO BE CAPTAINS, TWENTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Second Lieut. Guy V. Henry, jr., First United States Cavalry.
Cornelius M. Brownell, of Vermont.
Frank H. Peck, of New York.
Alvin A. Barker, of Rhode Island.
John Bordman, jr., of Massachusetts.
William Tutherly, of New Hampshire.
Reuben A. Whipple, of Massachusetts.
Alexander Greig, jr., of Massachusetts.
John Hickey, of Connecticut.
William F. Meeks, of New York.
Thomas Talbot, of Massachusetts.
Harris Pendleton, of Connecticut.
George O. Hubbard, of Maine.
Fred McDonald, of Massachusetts.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, TWENTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Duncan Elliot, of New York.
Alfred M. Mason, of Vermont.
William H. Plummer, of Massachusetts.
Alfred Hasbrouck, of New York.
Granville R. Fortescue, of New York.
James R. Goodale, of New York.
William M. Connell, of New York.
Frank E. Edwards, of Massachusetts.
Henry G. Crockett, of Maine.
George D. Rice, of Massachusetts.
Solomon Avery, jr., of New York.
Philip Golderman, of New York.
Henry M. Fales, of New York.
William Sullivan, of New Hampshire.
Daniel J. Moynihan, of Massachusetts.
James P. Clare, of Massachusetts.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, TWENTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Sanford E. Worthington, of Vermont.
Homer B. Grant, of Massachusetts.
Robert H. Sillman, of New York.
Garrison Ball, of New York.
Timothy M. Coughlan, of New York.
John T. Ryan, of New York.
Hilden Olin, of New York.
John J. Byrne, of New York.
Max Wagner, of Massachusetts.
Roy L. Fernald, of Maine.
E. Alexis Jeunet, of Pennsylvania.
Harry E. Comstock, of Connecticut.

TO BE COLONEL TWENTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Maj. James M. Bell, First United States Cavalry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL TWENTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Albert S. Cummins, Fourth United States Artillery.

TO BE MAJORS, TWENTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

First Lieut. George L. Byram, First United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. Edward B. Cassatt, Fourth United States Cavalry.
Capt. Clyde D. V. Hunt, assistant quartermaster, United States Volunteers.

TO BE CAPTAINS, TWENTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

First Lieut. Louis C. Scherer, Fourth United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. George C. Langhorne, First United States Cavalry.
Frank L. Graham, of the District of Columbia.
Howard Atkinson, of West Virginia.
George W. Brandle, of Ohio.
Eastman G. Currey, of Tennessee.
William F. Judson, of New York.
William B. Gracie, of New York.
Walter F. Randall, of New York.
Delphey T. E. Casteel, of West Virginia.
Richard H. Savage, of New York.
Albert B. Sloan, of Missouri.
Charles Becht, of Ohio.
Dexter Sturges, of New York.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, TWENTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

J. Howard Griffiths, of the District of Columbia.
Zan F. Collett, of West Virginia.
Charles G. McDonald, of Maryland.
James D. Fauntleroy, of Virginia.
Edwin S. Hartshorne, of New York.
George B. Rodney, of Delaware.
Oscar D. Weed, of New York.
John J. Kennedy, of New York.
James G. Hannah, of New York.
Theodore B. Taylor, of New York.
Julien E. Gaujot, of West Virginia.
William J. Sewell, jr., of New Jersey.
Clayton J. Bailey, of New Jersey.
Dexter Sturges, of New York.
Thomas G. Bradley, late first lieutenant, First United States Volunteer Cavalry.
Edward O'Flaherty, late sergeant, Sixteenth United States Infantry.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, TWENTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Richard H. Brewer, of the District of Columbia.
Daniel Hyman, of New York.
John Oliver, of the District of Columbia.
George A. Vernon, of Nebraska.
Albert U. Faulkner, of New York.

Robert S. Knox, of Virginia.
Louie St. Clair Munford, of Virginia.
Francis W. Griffin, of Virginia.
Frederick H. Plummer, of Virginia.
John C. Cassels, of Pennsylvania.
David M. Gregg, of Pennsylvania.
George C. Shaw, late first lieutenant, First District of Columbia Volunteers.

TO BE COLONEL TWENTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. William E. Birkhimer, Third United States Artillery.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL TWENTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Robert W. Leonard, of New York.

TO BE MAJORS, TWENTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. George H. Morgan, Third United States Cavalry.
Capt. Elmore F. Taggart, Sixth United States Infantry.
John B. Porter, of Pennsylvania.

TO BE CAPTAINS, TWENTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

First Lieut. Charles R. Howland, Twentieth United States Infantry.
Charles G. Bickham, of Ohio.
Charles S. Campbell, of Pennsylvania.
Frank F. Crenshaw, of Georgia.
Claude S. Fries, of New Jersey.
Samuel D. Crawford, of Pennsylvania.
Peter Vredenburgh, of New Jersey.
Samuel A. Price, of Pennsylvania.
John D. Croasmun, of Pennsylvania.
Adam C. Carson, of Virginia.
William C. King, of Pennsylvania.
George W. Biegler, of Indiana.
Edward H. D. Couch, of Illinois.
John H. Dunn, of Massachusetts.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, TWENTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Leonard T. Waldron, of New York.
Edgar S. Stayer, of Pennsylvania.
John P. Teagarden, of Pennsylvania.
Alpha T. Easton, of Pennsylvania.
Samuel Willits, of Pennsylvania.
Charles C. Allen, of Pennsylvania.
Harry A. Porter, of Pennsylvania.
Charles W. Barber, of New Jersey.
John M. Dunn, of Delaware.
Frederick B. Neilson, of Pennsylvania.
Charles H. Boice, of New York.
Daniel H. Geinty, of New Hampshire.
George H. Wood, of Ohio.
Henry S. Terrell, of Connecticut.
Charles L. Beatty, of the District of Columbia.
Bradley J. Wootten, of North Carolina.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, TWENTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Robert D. Russell, of New York.
Hugh Carlyle Young, of Pennsylvania.
Marion B. Mabson, of Alabama.
Lewis M. Clark, of Pennsylvania.
Robert S. Hansbury, of Pennsylvania.
George T. Newhall, of Pennsylvania.
Ralph M. Mitchell, of Pennsylvania.
C. Rodman Jones, of Pennsylvania.
George W. Warner, of Pennsylvania.
Joseph C. Wilson, of Pennsylvania.
William H. Lyons, of West Virginia.
James D. Danner, of Pennsylvania.

TO BE COLONEL TWENTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Edward E. Hardin, Seventh United States Infantry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL TWENTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Herbert H. Sargent, Second United States Cavalry.

TO BE MAJORS, TWENTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Evan M. Johnson, jr., Nineteenth United States Infantry.
First Lieut. Harry L. Hawthorne, Sixth United States Artillery.
David B. Case, of Pennsylvania.

TO BE CAPTAINS, TWENTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

George E. Lovell, of Florida.
Cleveland Willcoxon, of Georgia.
Owen T. Kenan, of Georgia.
Harry T. Thompson, of South Carolina.
James M. Liddell, of Mississippi.
Devereux Shields, of Mississippi.
Philip H. Stern, of Alabama.
Charles G. McGhee, of Mississippi.
William A. Paul, of Maine.
Frank S. Whitman, of New York.
Holman G. Purinton, of Illinois.
Joseph H. Grant, of South Carolina.
William S. Faulkner, of Virginia.
Albert S. Williams, late sergeant, Second Alabama Volunteers.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, TWENTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Madison H. Wilson, of Florida.
Walter K. Wheatley, of Georgia.
Blanton Winship, of Georgia.
Edward H. Almand, of Georgia.
Robert J. Arnold, of Tennessee.
William P. Screws, of Alabama.
Thomas H. Underwood, of Louisiana.
Stephen O. Fuqua, of Louisiana.
James Longstreet, jr., of Georgia.
James H. Blount, jr., of Georgia.
James M. Kimbrough, jr., of Georgia.
William P. Clark, of Georgia.
Edward Hill, of North Carolina.
James R. Rash, of Kentucky.
Lawrence S. Carson, of South Carolina.
Robert E. Grinstead, late first lieutenant, Third Kentucky Volunteers.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, TWENTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Joseph W. Avery, of North Carolina.
John J. Miller, of Georgia.
Robert O. Patterson, of North Carolina.
Rowland S. Pike, of Florida.
George M. Holley, of Georgia.
William S. Wells, jr., of Alabama.
Holmes Conrad, jr., of North Carolina.
Vincent M. Elmore, jr., of Alabama.
Albert J. Dillon, of Florida.
Thomas S. Moorman, jr., of South Carolina.
Milton H. Hollingsworth, of Tennessee.
Sergt. Edward O. Perkins, United States Marine Corps.

TO BE COLONEL THIRTIETH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Cornelius Gardener, Nineteenth United States Infantry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL THIRTIETH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

James R. Campbell, of Illinois.

TO BE MAJORS, THIRTIETH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Matthew F. Steele, Sixth United States Cavalry.
Capt. Leonard A. Lovering, Fourth United States Infantry.
Thomas L. Hartigan, of Illinois.

TO BE CAPTAINS, THIRTIETH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Frank H. Burton, of Michigan.
Charles E. Reese, of Indiana.
Frank W. Latimer, of Illinois.
Gilmore G. Scranton, of Michigan.
Charles P. Newberry, of Michigan.
Frank D. Newberry, of Michigan.
Merrell E. Webb, of Michigan.
John F. Ryan, of Illinois.

Harrison S. Kerrick, of Illinois.
George F. Connolly, of Illinois.
Edward Y. Miller, of Illinois.
E. Ross Smith, of Indiana.
Edwin H. Fitzgerald, of Indiana.
Kenneth M. Burr, of Indiana.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, THIRTIETH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Frank D. Buckingham, of Michigan.
Harry D. Blasland, of Illinois.
Walter P. Corbett, of Georgia.
Joseph W. Porterfield, of Illinois.
Charles S. Tarlton, of Indiana.
Edmond R. Tompkins, of South Carolina.
Frederick J. Barrows, of Minnesota.
Kaolin L. Whitson, of Maryland.
Virden C. Peckenpaugh, of Illinois.
Harry R. Chadwick, of Ohio.
Albert C. McMillan, of New York.
Daniel Wells, of Michigan.
John McBride, jr., of Michigan.
Albert E. McCabe, of Michigan.
Edward H. Andres, of Michigan.
John J. Foley, of Wisconsin.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, THIRTIETH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

William F. Pack, of Michigan.
Charles U. Bear, of Illinois.
John W. C. Abbott, of Michigan.
A. Holt Bradford, of Illinois.
George W. Cochnower, of Illinois.
Guy A. Boyle, of Indiana.
John N. Wright, of South Dakota.
Guilford S. Garber, of Indiana.
Charles H. Errington, of Illinois.
Francis W. Ralston, jr., of Pennsylvania.
Robert H. Gulick, of Ohio.
Francis J. Ellison, of New York.

TO BE COLONEL THIRTY-FIRST INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. James S. Pettit, First United States Infantry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL THIRTY-FIRST INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Webb C. Hayes, of Ohio.

TO BE MAJORS, THIRTY-FIRST INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Hunter Liggett, Fifth United States Infantry.
Capt. Lloyd M. Brett, Second United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. John E. McMahon, Fourth United States Artillery.

TO BE CAPTAINS, THIRTY-FIRST INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

William E. Cabell, of Kentucky.
Paul C. Galleher, of Kentucky.
Lucius C. Bennett, of Ohio.
William H. Gillenwater, of Tennessee.
William M. Scofield, of Ohio.
Charles P. Stivers, of Ohio.
William J. White, of Ohio.
Arthur G. Sharpley, of Kentucky.
James L. Burchfield, of Kentucky.
Charles A. Reynolds, of Ohio.
Ellison L. Gilmer, of North Carolina.
John A. Wagner, of North Carolina.
James B. Adams, late first lieutenant, Fourth United States Volunteer Infantry.
John Van Ness Philip, late first lieutenant, Fourth United States Volunteer Infantry.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-FIRST INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Albert C. Thompson, jr., of Ohio.
Kent Browning, of Ohio.
William M. Meek, of Tennessee.
Benjamin Stark, jr., of Connecticut.
Arthur T. Balentine, of Ohio.
William O. Reed, of Kentucky.
Hugh C. Preston, of Virginia.
Frank S. Lowry, of Ohio.
William A. Castle, of Ohio.
Marion B. Wilhoit, of Kentucky.
Percy H. Hawkins, of Ohio.
De Witt W. Chamberlin, of Illinois.
Charles F. Richmond, of Illinois.
John B. Fonner, of Indiana.
Charles O. Thomas, jr., of Ohio.
Robert C. Payne, of Kentucky.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-FIRST INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Watson Lindsey, of Kentucky.
Walter O. Bowman, of Indiana.
Wilford Twyman, of Kentucky.
William H. Monroe, of West Virginia.
Henry Gibbins, of Tennessee.
John P. Spurr, of Tennessee.
James A. Simpson, of Kentucky.
William B. Eulass, of Ohio.
Answell E. Deitsch, of Ohio.
David A. Snyder, of Ohio.
Harry D. Mitchell, of Ohio.
Albert H. Stevens, late of the District of Columbia Volunteers.

TO BE COLONEL THIRTY-SECOND INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Louis A. Craig, Sixth United States Cavalry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL THIRTY-SECOND INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Lewis H. Strother, Twenty-second United States Infantry.

TO BE MAJORS, THIRTY-SECOND INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

First Lieut. Robert E. L. Spence, Sixteenth United States Infantry.
Charles E. Cabell, of Virginia.
Morton J. Henry, of Pennsylvania.

TO BE CAPTAINS, THIRTY-SECOND INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Second Lieut. George T. Summerlin, Eighth United States Cavalry.
Edwin J. Griffith, of Missouri.
Thomas R. Hayson, of Kansas.
Jacob H. Culver, of Nebraska.
Lanier Cravens, of Missouri.
John H. Goldman, of Missouri.
Frank M. Rumbold, of Missouri.
Granville Sevier, of Tennessee.
Frank W. Eckers, of Iowa.
Amos W. Brandt, of Iowa.
Henry A. Peed, of Missouri.
Charles D. Comfort, of Missouri.
John P. Grinstead, of Kansas.
Harry J. Collins, of Colorado.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-SECOND INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Grant Gillespie, of Missouri.
Charles A. Phillips, of Kansas.
Robert T. Crawford, of Iowa.
William S. Mapes, of Nebraska.
Henry M. Morrow, of Nebraska.
George P. Whitsett, of Missouri.
James C. Hixson, of Alabama.
James L. Long, of Arkansas.
George A. Densmore, of Iowa.
Arthur B. Shaeffer, of Kansas.
William S. Weaver, of Kansas.
John M. Shook, of Kansas.
George S. Ralston, of Nebraska.
George H. Caldwell, of Indiana.
Charles C. Smith, of Indiana.
Ambrose C. G. Williams-Foote, late first lieutenant, Eighth United States Volunteer Infantry.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-SECOND INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

William H. Clopton, jr., of Missouri.
George R. Crawford, of Kansas.
Henry K. Love, of Wisconsin.
Philip Mowry, of Pennsylvania.
Charles H. Wilson, of Nebraska.
Archie Miller, of Missouri.
Benjamin R. Wade, of Missouri.
George H. Armitage, of Iowa.
William A. James, of Illinois.
Charles R. W. Morison, of Maryland.
George E. Goodrich, of Indiana.
Roy T. Ballard, of Ohio.

TO BE COLONEL THIRTY-THIRD INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Luther R. Hare, Seventh United States Cavalry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL THIRTY-THIRD INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. John J. Brereton, Twenty-fourth United States Infantry (since deceased).

TO BE MAJORS, THIRTY-THIRD INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Marcus D. Cronin, Twenty-fifth United States Infantry.
First Lieut. Peyton C. March, Fifth United States Artillery.
John A. Logan, of Illinois (since killed in action).

TO BE CAPTAINS, THIRTY-THIRD INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Second Lieut. Edgar A. Sirmyer, Third United States Cavalry.
Second Lieut. Thomas Q. Ashburn, Seventh United States Artillery.
Edmund G. Shields, of Texas.
James S. Butler, of Mississippi.
Godfrey R. Fowler, of Texas.
James M. Burroughs, of Texas.
John A. Hulen, of Texas.
Charles W. Van Way, of Kansas.
Henry L. Jenkinson, of New Jersey.
Edward Davis, of Illinois.
Samuel W. Belford, of Colorado.
Edward H. Loffhagen, of Missouri.
John F. Green, of Texas.
Arthur L. B. Davies, of Colorado.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-THIRD INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Lindsey P. Rucker, of Texas.
Theodore Schultz, of Missouri.
Wilson B. Strong, of Massachusetts.
Solomon L. Jeffers, of Arkansas.
Henry Stroup, of Arkansas.
Edgar N. Coffey, of Mississippi.
Grant A. White, of Arkansas.
Carroll Power, of Kentucky.
Jesse L. Hall, of Texas.
Frank D. Tompkins, of Texas.
William S. Cunningham, of Texas.
William L. Lowe, of Texas.
John W. Ward, of Arkansas.
Tilman Campbell, of Arkansas.
Richard T. Ellis, late first lieutenant, Fourth United States Volunteer Infantry.
Corpl. Albert P. Morrow, Sixth United States Cavalry.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-THIRD INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Charles L. Willard, of Texas.
George L. Febiger, of Louisiana.
Arthur N. Pickel, of Tennessee.
Frank L. Case, of Tennessee.
Henry J. McKenney, of Maryland.
Donald C. McClelland, of New York.
Thomas L. Sherburne, of Louisiana.
Richard P. Cordill, of Louisiana.
Earle Edmundson, late captain, First Territorial Volunteer Infantry.
John W. Healey, late first lieutenant, Sixth Virginia Volunteers.
Hugh Williams, late an enlisted man, Texas Volunteers.
John J. Lipop, late second lieutenant, Fifth United States Volunteer Infantry.

TO BE COLONEL THIRTY-FOURTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Lyman W. V. Kennon, Sixth United States Infantry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL THIRTY-FOURTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

First Lieut. Robert L. Howze, Sixth United States Cavalry.

TO BE MAJORS, THIRTY-FOURTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Julius A. Penn, Seventh United States Infantry.
Capt. William A. Shunk, Eighth United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. Joseph Wheeler, jr., Fourth United States Artillery.

TO BE CAPTAINS, THIRTY-FOURTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

First Lieut. Charles Miller, Sixteenth United States Infantry.
First Lieut. Edward C. Carey, Sixteenth United States Infantry.
Second Lieut. Willard D. Newbill, Seventh United States Artillery.
William E. Dame, of New Mexico.
Frank G. Russell, of Arizona.
Frank A. Sullivan, of Wisconsin.
Charles A. Green, of Wisconsin.
Frank L. French, of Wisconsin.
Christopher J. Rollis, of Wisconsin.
Alfred S. Morgan, of Minnesota.
Robert Calverley, of Wyoming.
Clark M. Carr, of Missouri.
Frederick Goedecke, of Iowa.
William C. Wyman, of Iowa.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-FOURTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Maximiliano Luna, of New Mexico (since drowned).
Richard C. Day, of Indian Territory.
Greenville D. Montgomery, of New Mexico.
Stewart McC. Decker, of Minnesota.
Wilson G. Heaton, of Iowa.
John V. Green, of Wisconsin.
Harry W. Newton, of Wisconsin.
Charles J. Geishbush, of Wisconsin.
Cushman A. Rice, of Minnesota.
George E. Gibson, of Minnesota.
Robert B. Cramer, of Georgia.
Harry C. Barnes, of Oklahoma.
Leonard L. Deitrick, of Wyoming.
Joseph Matson, of Iowa.
Edwin J. Bracken, of Wisconsin.
Sherrard Coleman, late first lieutenant, First United States Volunteer Cavalry.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-FOURTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Robert C. Corliss, of Michigan.
Charles P. Hirst, of California.
Cleveland C. C. Lansing, of Maryland.
De Witt C. Lyles, of Maryland.
Samuel D. McAlister, of Tennessee.
Ord. Sergt. Thomas J. Shaw, United States Army.
Sergt. John H. Neff, First United States Artillery.
Arthur G. Duncan, late private, First United States Volunteer Cavalry.
John T. Dunn, late an enlisted man, Eighth United States Infantry.
Denny Verdi, late sergeant, Troop M, Eighth United States Cavalry.
Lafayette A. Dorrington, late second lieutenant, Second United States Volunteer Infantry.
Private Basil N. Rittenhouse, Company L, Twenty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers.

TO BE COLONEL THIRTY-FIFTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Maj. William A. Kobbé, Third United States Artillery.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL THIRTY-FIFTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Edward H. Plummer, Tenth United States Infantry.

TO BE MAJORS, THIRTY-FIFTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Robert D. Walsh, Ninth United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. Walter C. Short, Tenth United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. Albert Laws, Twenty-fourth United States Infantry.

TO BE CAPTAINS, THIRTY-FIFTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

First Lieut. William Brooke, Fourth United States Infantry.
First Lieut. Thomas W. Darrah, Twentieth United States Infantry.
First Lieut. Charles D. Roberts, Seventeenth United States Infantry.
Second Lieut. Earle W. Tanner, Seventeenth United States Infantry.
Second Lieut. Edward W. Robinson, Twenty-third United States Infantry.
Henry T. Matthews, of California.
William G. Schreiber, of California.
Samuel R. Langworthy, of California.
William L. Geary, of Washington.
Austin F. Prescott, of Oregon.
Albert J. Brazee, of Oregon.
Eugene P. Crowne, of Oregon.
James H. Aldrich, of California.
Arthur F. Halpin, of California.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-FIFTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

John L. Hughes, of California.
George I. Becker, of Minnesota.
John H. Lewis, of Wisconsin.
James M. McManus, of Iowa.
Bissell Thomas, of Illinois.
Alvin C. Voris, of Illinois.
Theophilus B. Steele, of New York.
James A. Ruggles, of Illinois.
Grover Flint, of New York.
William F. Godson, of Massachusetts.
Leonard T. Baker, of Texas.
Harry N. Cootes, of Virginia.
Asa F. Fisk, of Montana.
Jack E. Harding, of Washington.
Francis H. Cameron, late captain, Tenth United States Volunteer Infantry.
Sergt. Perry W. Vandervoort, Sixth United States Artillery.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-FIFTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Carl B. Hard, of Utah.
Clark R. Elliott, of Minnesota.
William C. Tremaine, of California.
Louis S. Chappelear, of California.
Samuel M. English, of California.
Robert W. Collins, of South Carolina.
Gordon N. Kimball, of Utah.
John F. McCarthy, of Iowa.
Post Q. M. Sergt. Benjamin Kossman, United States Army.
Corpl. John A. Degen, Company M, Seventh United States Infantry.
Corpl. John P. Hasson, Company C, Fourteenth United States Infantry.
Private Allan Lefort, Battery N, Third United States Artillery.

TO BE COLONEL THIRTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. J. Franklin Bell, Seventh United States Cavalry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL THIRTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Maj. William R. Grove, First Colorado Volunteers.

TO BE MAJORS, THIRTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Maj. William H. Bishop, Twentieth Kansas Volunteers.
First Lieut. John Q. A. Braden, First South Dakota Volunteers.
First Lieut. William L. Luhn, First Washington Volunteers.

TO BE CAPTAINS, THIRTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

First Lieut. Robert S. Abernethy, Sixth United States Artillery.
Capt. Ewing E. Booth, First Colorado Volunteers.
First Lieut. Charles W. Mead, First Montana Volunteers.
First Lieut. Charles French, First Montana Volunteers (since deceased).
Capt. Henry Steere, First California Artillery.
Capt. Daniel F. Craig, Twentieth Kansas Volunteers.
Capt. Harry A. Hegeman, First South Dakota Volunteers.
Capt. Warren H. Ickis, Fifty-first Iowa Volunteers.
Second Lieut. Carl L. Stone, Thirteenth Minnesota Volunteers.
Second Lieut. Frederick R. Dodge, Twentieth Kansas Volunteers.
Capt. Edgar A. Fry, Twentieth Kansas Volunteers.
Sergt. Maj. Harry Bell, Twentieth United States Infantry.
Corpl. Smith K. Fitzhugh, First Washington Volunteers.

To rank from July 26, 1899.

First Lieut. Will H. Point, Thirty-sixth Infantry, United States Volunteers.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

First Lieut. Will H. Point, Fifty-first Iowa Volunteers.
First Lieut. Cornealiaus F. O'Keefe, First Colorado Volunteers.
Second Lieut. Loren E. Cheever, Wyoming Battalion Volunteers.
Second Lieut. Fred E. Smith, First North Dakota Volunteers.
Second Lieut. Ben Lear, jr., First Colorado Volunteers.
First Lieut. Milo C. Corey, First Washington Volunteers.
First Sergt. Alexander H. Davidson, Troop E, Fourth United States Cavalry.
Post Q. M. Sergt. Alexander Goehr, United States Army.
Sergt. Winfield Harper, Battery L, Third United States Artillery.
First Sergt. Albert J. Erickson, First Montana Volunteers.
Sergt. Christian A. Bach, Thirteenth Minnesota Volunteers.
Sergt. Roscoe Treadwell, First Idaho Volunteers.
Corpl. Arthur M. Ferguson, Twentieth Kansas Volunteers.
Corpl. Thomas B. Crockett, First Washington Volunteers.
Corpl. Samuel W. Widdifield, First California Volunteers.
Sergt. Oscar A. McGee, First Washington Volunteers.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

William B. Graham, of Ohio.
Eugene G. Wing, of Alabama.
Julian L. Davis, of Arkansas (since killed in action).
James P. Toncray, of Tennessee.
William F. Gwynne, of Mississippi.
Edward McGowan, of Mississippi.
Frank T. McNarney, of Pennsylvania.
George T. Bowman, of New York.
James M. Petty, late corporal, First District of Columbia Volunteers.
Lyle H. Pedlar, late an enlisted man, Sixth United States Artillery.
Edwin E. Mann, late sergeant, First South Dakota Volunteers.
David H. Biddle, at large.

TO BE COLONEL THIRTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

First Lieut. Robert B. Wallace, Second United States Cavalry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL THIRTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Lieut. Col. Thomas R. Hamer, First Idaho Volunteers.

TO BE MAJORS, THIRTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Second Lieut. Charles T. Boyd, Fourth United States Cavalry.
Maj. Benjamin F. Cheatham, First Tennessee Volunteers.
Capt. Henry B. Orwig, Twentieth Kansas Volunteers.

TO BE CAPTAINS, THIRTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

First Lieut. David E. W. Lyle, Eighteenth United States Infantry.
First Lieut. Benjamin M. Koehler, Fourth United States Artillery.
Second Lieut. Ernest D. Scott, Sixth United States Artillery.
Capt. Nick K. Givens, First Tennessee Volunteers.
Capt. Sam Van Leer, First Tennessee Volunteers.
Capt. Henry R. Richmond, First Tennessee Volunteers.
Capt. Hu B. Myers, First Tennessee Volunteers.
First Lieut. William B. Hanna, First Montana Volunteers.
First Lieut. Leo F. Foster, First South Dakota Volunteers.
Capt. John E. Moran, First Montana Volunteers.
First Lieut. Charles M. Clark, Thirteenth Minnesota Volunteers.
First Sergt. Michael Flaherty, Company C, Eighteenth United States Infantry.
Sergt. Henry A. Hutchings, Company E, Fourteenth United States Infantry.

To rank from August 3, 1899.

First Lieut. Albert J. Erickson, Thirty-sixth Infantry, United States Volunteers.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

First Lieut. John C. Patton, First Tennessee Volunteers.
Second Lieut. Ernest Van D. Murphy, First Montana Volunteers.
First Lieut. Robert O. Ragsdale, First Tennessee Volunteers.
First Lieut. Albert J. Bright, First Tennessee Volunteers.
First Lieut. Granville Chapman, First Tennessee Volunteers.
Second Lieut. Charles M. McLester, First Tennessee Volunteers.
First Lieut. Charles H. Sleeper, First Colorado Volunteers.
Second Lieut. William T. Vaughan, First Tennessee Volunteers.
Sergt. Edward T. Balch, Troop L, Fourth United States Cavalry.
Corpl. Jesse G. Lowenberg, Battery D, Sixth United States Artillery.
Sergt. Maj. John S. E. Young, Twelfth United States Infantry.
Q. M. Sergt. Rufus B. Clark, First Washington Volunteers.
Private Daniel T. Bowman, First Montana Volunteers.
Sergt. John L. Russell, First South Dakota Volunteers.
Sergt. Ira Keithley, Twentieth Kansas Volunteers.
Sergt. Frank Auswald, Twentieth Kansas Volunteers.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Second Lieut. Joe B. Cocke, First Tennessee Volunteers.
Second Lieut. Alvin K. Baskette, First Tennessee Volunteers.
First Lieut. Winston Pilcher, First Tennessee Volunteers.
Robert M. Shearer, of Kentucky.
William G. Miles, of Indiana.
Harry J. O'Brien, of Illinois.
Samuel B. McIntyre, of Tennessee.
William B. Aiken, of Tennessee.
Lewis W. Cass, of Missouri.
Reuben V. Baskette, of Tennessee.
John T. Fuller, of Tennessee.
Thomas F. Peck, of Tennessee.

TO BE COLONEL THIRTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Maj. George S. Anderson, Sixth United States Cavalry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL THIRTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Charles J. Crane, Twenty-fourth United States Infantry.

TO BE MAJORS, THIRTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

First Lieut. Willard A. Holbrook, Seventh United States Cavalry (now captain, Fifth United States Cavalry).
Capt. Charles H. Muir, Second United States Infantry.
Lewis E. Goodier, of New York.

TO BE CAPTAINS, THIRTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

William H. Collier, of Kentucky.
Claude E. Sawyer, of South Carolina
John L. Jordan, of Tennessee.
William G. Fleischhauer, of Michigan.
John S. Powell, of Georgia.
Ross A. Nichols, of Iowa.
John E. Weber, of Missouri.
William J. Vaiden, of Alabama.
John W. Moore, of Texas.
Paul B. Lino, of Illinois.
David F. Allen, of Indiana.
Beverly A. Read, of Texas.
Robert M. Nolan, of Louisiana.
Clarence L. Grinstead, of Kentucky.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Thaddeus B. Seigle, of South Carolina.
Andrew J. Brown, jr., of Tennessee.
Frank S. Krebs, of Missouri.
William A. Covington, of Tennessee.
Douglas H. Jacobs, of Pennsylvania.
Louie D. Howard, of Missouri.
Fred A. Thompson, of Missouri.
Henry V. Stevens, of Tennessee.
Robert F. Woods, of South Carolina.
Amzi B. Kelly, of Texas.
Neil P. Pavey, of Illinois.
William G. Doane, of Nebraska.
Reuben D. Blanchard, of Wisconsin.
Ira I. Morrison, of Ohio.
John E. Morris, of Louisiana.
Joseph L. Kraemer, of Michigan.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

William O. Thornton, of Georgia.
John R Maxwell, of Mississippi.
Fred Bury, of Michigan.
Walter C. Hudson, of Arkansas.
Samuel G. Shartle, of Pennsylvania.
Frederick C. Husman, of Missouri.
Elisha G. Abbott, of Texas.
Daniel R. Johnson, of North Carolina.
Rowland B. Ellis, of California.
Daniel G. Mendel, of West Virginia.
Private Charles J. Weinheimer, Twenty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers.
Private Albert C. Allen, Company H, Twenty-first United States Infantry.

TO BE COLONEL THIRTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Robert L. Bullard, commissary of subsistence, United States Army.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL THIRTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Maj. Enoch H. Crowder, judge-advocate, United States Army.

TO BE MAJORS, THIRTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

First Lieut. George T. Langhorne, First United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. John H. Parker, Twenty-fifth United States Infantry.
Col. Harry B. Mulford, First Nebraska Volunteers.

TO BE CAPTAINS, THIRTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

First Lieut. William L. Murphy, Twenty-fourth United States Infantry.
Noel Gaines, of Kentucky.
Frank S. Long, of Iowa.
George W. Green, of Tennessee.
Mack Richardson, of Missouri.
Thomas Hardeman, of Alabama.
Augustus F. W. Macmanus, of Texas.
Joseph B. Caughey, of Illinois.
William T. Ranke, of Indiana.
Wallace C. Taylor, of Nebraska.
Edward A. Kreger, of Iowa.
Charles H. Hilton, jr., of Colorado.
John L. Thorburn, of Michigan.
Andrew J. Burt, of Utah.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Albert M. Petite, of Iowa.
Grant T. Trent, of Tennessee.
Frank Maloney, of Tennessee.
Robert S. Welsh, of Michigan.
Perrin L. Smith, of Minnesota.
Alexander B. Coxe, of Minnesota.
Ellis Cromwell, of Mississippi.
Albert J. Merklin, of Missouri.
Thomas M. Cobb, jr., of Missouri.
Hiram C. Baker, of Texas.
Frederick Boyer, of Illinois.
Laurin L. Lawson, of Washington.
George M. Apple, of Colorado.
Harry E. Courtney, of Arkansas.
Howard K. Bane, of Nevada.
George M. Lee, of Virginia.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, THIRTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Lewis W. Dillion, of Kentucky.
Charles R. Wood, of Indiana.
John R. Waugh, of Nebraska.
Nathan J. Shelton, of Nebraska.
Arthur W. Orton, of Michigan.
Gideon H. Williams, of Tennessee.
W. Frank Mohr, of Pennsylvania.
John H. Vickers, jr., of Texas.
Edward H. White, of Illinois.
Charles W. Bowdle, of Ohio.
Frank C. Burnett, of Iowa.
Sergt. Charles S. Frank, Third United States Cavalry.

TO BE COLONEL FORTIETH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Maj. Edward A. Godwin, Seventh United States Cavalry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL FORTIETH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Bernard A. Byrne, Sixth United States Infantry.

TO BE MAJORS, FORTIETH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. William E. Craighill, Corps of Engineers, United States Army.
First Lieut. Michael M. McNamee, Ninth United States Cavalry.
James F. Case, of Oregon.

TO BE CAPTAINS, FORTIETH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

William J. Kendrick, of Georgia.
Walter B. Elliott, of Missouri.
Charles M. Wing, of Arkansas.
James C. Franco, of Iowa.
James J. Mayes, of Missouri.
Paul Smith, of Hawaii.
William McK. Lambdin, of Texas.
Thomas L. McGirr, of Illinois.
Charles H. Marple, of Nebraska.
Thomas Millar, of Wyoming.
John W. Green, of New Mexico.
Albert W. Lilienthal, late captain, Seventh United States Volunteer Infantry.
Luther S. Kelly, late captain, Seventh United States Volunteer Infantry.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, FORTIETH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Richard K. Cravens, of Indian Territory.
John B. Galleher, of Kentucky.
Hal Sayre, jr., of Colorado.
William J. Watson, of Kansas.
Henry P. Fletcher, of Pennsylvania.
David M. Dodge, of Missouri.
Hamilton Bowie, of Alabama.
James M. Wheeler, of Oklahoma Territory.
William P. Crawford, of South Carolina.
John Crotty, of Texas.
Eugene E. Barton, of Illinois.
Quincy E. McDowell, of Indiana.
James R. Pourie, of Missouri.
Kenneth C. Masteller, of California.
Charles C. Pulis, of Nebraska.
First Sergt. Thomas Ryan, Troop K, First United States Cavalry.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, FORTIETH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Fred W. Bugbee, of Arizona.
Burton J. Mitchell, of Kansas.
Robert B. Mitchell, of Kansas.
John M. Kelso, jr., of Arkansas.
Joseph C. Righter, jr., of Pennsylvania.
Cullen C. Mitchell, of Mississippi.
William E. Utterback, of Mississippi.
William C. Fitzpatrick, of Texas.
Nathaniel M. Cartmell, jr., of Virginia.
James W. Le Crone, of Washington.
Sergt. Davis C. Anderson, Troop C, Fourth United States Cavalry.
Edmund T. Paterson, late sergeant, Battery K, Sixth United States Artillery.

TO BE COLONEL FORTY-FIRST INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Ephraim T. C. Richmond, Second United States Artillery.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL FORTY-FIRST INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. John S. Mallory, Second United States Infantry.

TO BE MAJORS, FORTY-FIRST INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Palmer G. Wood, Twelfth United States Infantry.
First Lieut. Guy H. Preston, Ninth United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. John H. Wholley, Twenty-fourth United States Infantry.

TO BE CAPTAINS, FORTY-FIRST INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

First Lieut. Francis P. Siviter, Eleventh United States Infantry.
First Lieut. James A. Shipton, First United States Artillery.
Charles W. Wadsworth, of Tennessee.
John C. Hegarty, of New York.
George L. Baker, jr., of New York.
Harry L. Bishop, of Pennsylvania.
James H. Martin, of West Virginia.
James Clark, of Illinois.
Charles W. Jackson, of Maryland.
Carl K. Mower, of Ohio.
Fred L. Davidson, of Ohio.
Clarence S. Nettles, of South Carolina.
Richard J. Fanning, of Ohio.
Robert Sewell, of New Jersey.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-FIRST INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

William R. Standiford, of West Virginia.
William M. Goodale, of Ohio.
John H. Boston, jr., of Georgia.
Arthur B. Christey, of New York.
Charles A. Cumings, of Pennsylvania.
Albert W. Foreman, of Delaware.
Louis T. Boiseau, of the District of Columbia.
Ernest A. Greenough, of New York.
Brady G. Ruttencutter, of West Virginia.
Clarence A. McIntosh, of Illinois.
John S. Johnston, of Indiana.
Walter Harvey, of Ohio.
Joshua Jagmetty, of New Jersey.
First Sergt. John E. Hemphill, Troop F, Seventh United States Cavalry.
Com. Sergt. John Kennedy, United States Army.
First Sergt. Frederick Koch, Military Academy Detachment of Cavalry.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-FIRST INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

William R. Taylor, of New York.
Benjamin L. Towson, of Tennessee.
Frank J. Miller, of New York.
Henry T. Mitchell, of New York.

Edwin J. Nowlen, of Pennsylvania.
Horace N. Claxton, of Pennsylvania.
Frank W. Glover, of Alabama.
Consuelo A. Seoane, of Virginia.
George F. Bailey, of Vermont.
Russell Beall, of Pennsylvania.
Lawrence P. Butler, late first lieutenant, Third United States Volunteer Engineers.
Private Howard L. Landers, Troop A, Fifth United States Cavalry.

TO BE COLONEL FORTY-SECOND INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Maj. J. Milton Thompson, Twenty-fourth United States Infantry (now lieutenant-colonel Fourteenth United States Infantry).

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL FORTY-SECOND INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. John H. Beacom, Sixth United States Infantry.

TO BE MAJORS, FORTY-SECOND INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. William C. Brown, First United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. Edward C. Carey, Sixteenth United States Infantry.
John R. Prime, of Iowa.

TO BE CAPTAINS, FORTY-SECOND INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

First Lieut. George De G. Catlin, Second United States Infantry.
Duncan Henderson, of Michigan.
Edmund Du Bois, of New Jersey.
Frank Keck, of New York.
Joseph V. Cunningham, of Pennsylvania.
Charles S. Burns, of New York.
James E. Hill, of Illinois.
Fred J. Herman, of Ohio.
James M. Shallenberger, of Ohio.
Peter T. Riley, of California.
Worthington Kautzman, of Ohio.
Louis M. Lang, of New York.
Alfred W. Bjornstad, of Minnesota.
Harry W. Hamilton, of Ohio.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-SECOND INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Arthur Poillon, of New York.
William R. Molinard, of New York.
George H. White, of Michigan.
Theodore C. Reiser, of New Jersey.
Fred W. Stopford, of Massachusetts.
Harry C. McCool, of Georgia.
James H. Little, of New York.
Charles H. Roessing, of Pennsylvania.
Charles T. Beale, of West Virginia.
Joseph R. McAndrews, of Illinois.
Henry F. McFeely, of Indiana.
Robert K. Spiller, of Virginia.
Francis H. Lomax, of New York.
Robert B. Hargis, of Florida.
Walter H. Johnson, of Minnesota.
Ord. Sergt. Philip Powers, United States Army.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-SECOND INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Edward F. Hackett, jr., of New York.
Louis P. Weber, of New York.
Bruce N. Judd, of Ohio.
Franklin P. Jackson, of New York.
Horace Webster, of New York.
Augustus P. Warfield, of New York.
Morris M. Keck, of Pennsylvania.
James E. Abbott, of Maryland.
Private Robert A. Caldwell, Troop C, Fourth United States Cavalry.
Sergt. Martin Novak, Battery C, Fifth United States Artillery.
William P. Kitts, late corporal, Company D, Twenty-second New York Volunteers.
R. Howard Williams, late second lieutenant, Fourth New Jersey Volunteers.

TO BE COLONEL FORTY-THIRD INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Arthur Murray, First United States Artillery.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL FORTY-THIRD INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Wilber E. Wilder, Fourth United States Cavalry.

TO BE MAJORS, FORTY-THIRD INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Henry T. Allen, Sixth United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. John C. Gilmore, jr., Fourth United States Artillery.
First Lieut. Lincoln C. Andrews, Third United States Cavalry.

TO BE CAPTAINS, FORTY-THIRD INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Linwood E. Hanson, of Massachusetts.
Michael J. Spellman, of New York.
John S. Fair, of Pennsylvania.
William R. Beavers, of North Carolina.
William B. Preston, of Virginia.
Washington L. Goldsborough, of New York.
Tiffin Gilmore, of Ohio.
John Cooke, of California.
George O. Duncan, of California.
William Elliott, of California.
Frank C. Prescott, of California.
Harry M. Dey, of New Jersey.
Lucius E. Polk, of Pennsylvania.
Ernest R. Tilton, late captain, Twelfth New York Volunteers.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS FORTY-THIRD INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Michael E. Morris, of Massachusetts.
Henry J. Stewart, of Georgia.
Edward T. Donnelly, of New York.
William S. Conrow, of New York.
Edward O. Power, of New York.
Claudius M. Seaman, of Pennsylvania.
James W. Dutton, of Maine.
Delbert R. Jones, of Connecticut.
Robert Le Masurier, of Virginia.
Lorenzo D. Gasser, of Ohio.
Albert E. Phillips, of Louisiana.
William C. Dow, of Massachusetts.
Corpl. Lewis H. Forsyth, Eighth United States Cavalry.
Sergt. Maj. Jonathan Cilley, Seventh United States Infantry.
Sergt. John H. Evens, Battalion of Engineers, United States Army.
Frank Gordon, late major, Third United States Volunteer Infantry.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-THIRD INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Gordon Johnston, of New York.
William H. Wilson, of New York.
Henry A. Thayer, of Massachusetts.
Harold S. Swann, of New Jersey.
Joseph T. Sweeney, of New York.
Morton L. Avery, of Pennsylvania.
Louis H. Leaf, of Pennsylvania.
Walter S. Price, of Pennsylvania.
William H. Burt, of Vermont.
Robert Sterrett, of the District of Columbia.
Q. M. Sergt. Fred W. Mills, jr., Battery O, Seventh United States Artillery.
Sergt. Charles F. Andrews, Fourth United States Artillery.

TO BE COLONEL FORTY-FOURTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Edward J. McClernand, Second United States Cavalry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL FORTY-FOURTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. William S. Scott, First United States Cavalry.

TO BE MAJORS, FORTY-FOURTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Harry C. Hale, Twentieth United States Infantry.
First Lieut. Charles C. Walcutt, jr., Eighth United States Cavalry.
Henry B. McCoy, of Colorado.

TO BE CAPTAINS, FORTY-FOURTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

George D. Lee, of Kentucky.
Frank R. Curtis, of New York.
Orlando F. Guthrie, of Missouri.
Samuel C. Samuels, of Alabama.
Edward A. Stuart, of Texas.
James L. Malley, of Illinois.
James L. Anderson, of Indiana.
John L. Ketcham, jr., of Indiana.
Dana R. Weller, of California.
Eugene V. N. Bissell, of New York.
Amasa S. Crossfield, of Minnesota.
James K. Wiggins, of Illinois.
Thomas Leonard, of Minnesota.
First Sergt. Kirwin T. Smith, Company L, Tenth United States Infantry.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-FOURTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Fred L. Wilson, of Kentucky.
Clyde B. Parker, of Kansas.
Stephen H. Mould, of New York.
Lewis H. Levens, of Missouri.
Ralph Ingalls, of Missouri.
Richard B. Going, of Alabama.
Frederick S. Young, of Texas.
Marion C. Raysor, of Texas.
Orville R. Perry, of Nebraska.
Alfred V. Brown, of North Carolina.
Herbert L. Evans, of Ohio.
Richard W. Buchanan, of Indiana.
William J. White, of West Virginia.
Frank E. Lynch, of Alabama.
John B. Heyburn, of Washington.
Q. M. Sergt. Michael H. Barry, First United States Cavalry.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-FOURTH INFANTRY, UNITED VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

William A. Haycraft, of Kentucky.
Howard M. Koontz, of Kansas.
Arthur J. Cadden, of Kansas.
Theodore Levack, of Arkansas.
Leo L. Thomas, of Michigan.
Gustav F. Schlachter, of Pennsylvania.
Benjamin R. Hall, of Illinois.
Richard H. Sutherland, of Illinois.
William E. Parsons, of Indiana.
William S. Blair, of Iowa.
Alton B. Cusick, of Ohio.
Frederick E. Dengler, late first lieutenant, First Arkansas Volunteers.

TO BE COLONEL FORTY-FIFTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Maj. Joseph H. Dorst, Second United States Cavalry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL FORTY-FIFTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. James Parker, Fourth United States Cavalry.

TO BE MAJORS, FORTY-FIFTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Daniel A. Frederick, Seventh United States Infantry.
Capt. Edwin T. Cole, Eleventh United States Infantry.
Theodore K. Birkhaeuser, of Wisconsin.

TO BE CAPTAINS, FORTY-FIFTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Percy Willis, of Oregon.
Elmer O. Worrick, of Oregon.
Nathan F. Simpson, of Michigan.
Albert Steinhauser, of Minnesota.
Eugene C. Montfort, of Minnesota.
W. Lee Capps, of Illinois.
Benjamin F. Patrick, of Illinois.
Orison P. Lee, of Indiana.
Thomas J. Rogers, of Wisconsin.
Adelbert W. Cogswell, of North Dakota.
Daniel W. Hand, of Minnesota.
George W. Rickeman, of Wisconsin.
John N. Loye, of Minnesota.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-FIFTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

William Brown, of Montana.
George E. Kumpe, of Montana.
Milosh R. Hilgard, of Illinois.
Fred W. Morrison, of Michigan.
William A. Edwards, of Minnesota.
Willard M. Flynn, of Iowa.
George P. Tyner, of Illinois.
Alfred L. Castle, of Illinois.
David I. McCormick, of Indiana.
Lewis S. Ryan, of Nebraska.
Frederick P. Cook, of Wisconsin.
Arthur S. Tibbitts, of Wisconsin.
Charles G. Lawrence, of Ohio.
Temple H. Owens, of Indiana.
Allan G. Blaker, of Minnesota.
First-Class Sergt. James D. Watson, Signal Corps, United States Army.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-FIFTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Arthur R. Jones, of Illinois.
William E. W. MacKinlay, of Illinois.
Roy I. Taylor, of Michigan.
Charles E. N. Howard, of Minnesota.
Edwin C. Long, of Pennsylvania.
Edgar W. Mumford, of Illinois.
John B. Shuman, of Wisconsin.
Edward P. Barber, of Ohio.
First Sergt. Michael J. Mender, Company F, Eleventh United States Infantry.
Private Grier P. Mobley, Company A, Twenty-second United States Infantry.
Frederic G. Kellond, late corporal, Company E, First Kentucky Volunteers.
Albert S. Odell, late battalion sergeant-major, Third United States Volunteer Engineers.

TO BE COLONEL FORTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Maj. Walter S. Schuyler, Second United States Cavalry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL FORTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Maj. Edward B. Pratt, Twenty-third United States Infantry.

TO BE MAJORS, FORTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Samuel W. Miller, Fifth United States Infantry.
Capt. William H. Johnston, Sixteenth United States Infantry.
First Lieut. William Brooke, Fourth United States Infantry.

TO BE CAPTAINS, FORTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

First Lieut. Joseph W. Glidden, Fourth United States Infantry.
First Lieut. Frank B. McKenna, Fifteenth United States Infantry.
Second Lieut. John McClintock, Fifth United States Cavalry.
Samuel S. O'Connor, of New York.
Robert J. Reaney, of Pennsylvania.
Isaiah H. Baker, of Maine.
Lewis Patstone, of Rhode Island.
Thomas L. Mair, of Illinois.
David Conner, of Connecticut.
George T. McConnell, of Ohio.
Joseph S. Hardin, of South Carolina.
John H. Baker, of Wisconsin.
William B. Thomas, late captain, Third United States Volunteer Engineers.
Archibald F. Commiskey, late private, Troop C, New York Volunteer Cavalry.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Frank E. Hopkins, of Rhode Island.
Fred T. Austin, of Massachusetts.
Harry A. Ely, of New Jersey.

Terence E. Murphy, of New Jersey.
Charles F. Wonson, of Massachusetts.
James B. Webb, of New York.
Leopold Thun, of Austria.
John G. Constable, of Maryland.
Henry H. Sheen, of Virginia.
Edward E. Philbrook, of Maine.
William F. Herringshaw, of Ohio.
Benjamin P. Lukens, of Ohio.
Wallace N. Batchelder, of Vermont.
Charles D. Wood, late captain, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry.
Sergt. Philip K. Sweet, Troop K, First United States Cavalry.
Sergt. Maj. Conant S. Buttrick, Eighth United States Infantry.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-SIXTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Carlos W. Pierce, of Vermont.
Richard B. Kavanagh, of Illinois.
William A. Austin, of Ohio.
Edward D. Powers, of Massachusetts.
Hugh J. B. McElgin, of New York.
George W. Earl, of Pennsylvania.
Frank S. Leisenring, of Pennsylvania.
Theodore Gruener, of Connecticut.
Solomon B. West, of New Hampshire.
James H. Johnston, of New Hampshire.
Moses R. Ross, of Pennsylvania.
Troup Whitehead, of Georgia.

TO BE COLONEL FORTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Walter Howe, Fourth United States Artillery.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL FORTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Clarence R. Edwards, Tenth United States Infantry.

TO BE MAJORS, FORTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. Henry W. Hubbell, First United States Artillery.
First Lieut. Hugh D. Wise, Ninth United States Infantry.
Keller Anderson, of Tennessee.

TO BE CAPTAINS, FORTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Harry Walsh, of the District of Columbia.
Charles C. McLain, of Pennsylvania.
Lester H. Simons, of Pennsylvania.
Samuel S. Houston, of Illinois.
Stephen O. Smith, of North Carolina.
George H. Bentley, of Virginia.
Arlington U. Betts, of Ohio.
Augustus C. Hart, of Florida.
George W. Bristol, of Illinois.
Edward W. Terry, of Louisiana.
John M. Field, of Connecticut.
Charles H. Gordon, late first lieutenant, Volunteer Signal Corps.
Robert B. Huston, late additional paymaster, United States Volunteers.
John G. Livingston, late captain, First United States Volunteer Infantry.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Oscar Bishop, of Kentucky.
Hugh H. Pitcairn, of Pennsylvania.
William T. Bishop, of New Jersey.
A. La Rue Christie, of New Jersey.
Lorenzo D. Dyer, of New Jersey.
Harry T. Gray, of Massachusetts.
Casper W. Cole, of New York.
Jesse S. Garwood, of Illinois.
Samuel Riggs, of Maryland.
John W. Gulick, of North Carolina.
Edward N. Meekins, of Virginia.
Philip Yost, of Ohio.
Leonard S. Goddard, of Tennessee.
Sergt. Jens E. Stedje, Troop A, Second United States Cavalry.
George W. England, late captain, First District of Columbia Volunteers.
Thomas R. J. Campbell, late first lieutenant, Volunteer Signal Corps.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Charles H. Morrow, of Kentucky.
Walter T. Slack, of Kentucky.
Charles L. Lanham, of Maryland.
William R. Harrison, of the District of Columbia.
Paul W. Harrison, of Georgia.
Harvey Garrison, of New York.
Thomas P. Murphy, of Pennsylvania.
George L. Jackson, of Pennsylvania.
Henry F. Egle, of Pennsylvania.
Rudolph E. Smyser, of Pennsylvania.
Patrick H. Devine, of New Jersey.
Allan L. Briggs, late an enlisted man, First United States Cavalry.

TO BE COLONEL FORTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

Capt. William P. Duvall, First United States Artillery.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL FORTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

Capt. Thaddeus W. Jones, Tenth United States Cavalry.

TO BE MAJORS, FORTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

First Lieut. Sedgwick Rice, Seventh United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. Alexander L. Dade, Third United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. John Howard, Nineteenth United States Infantry.

TO BE CAPTAINS, FORTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

Robert R. Rudd, of Ohio.
James E. Hamlin, of North Carolina.
William A. Hankins, of Virginia.
Leon W. Denison, of Illinois.
James W. Smith, of Ohio.
William H. Jackson, of Massachusetts.
Aaron D. Bright, of Tennessee.
Thomas Grant, late first lieutenant, Tenth United States Volunteer Infantry.
Stephen Starr, late second lieutenant, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry.
Alexander V. Richardson, late first lieutenant, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry.
John J. Oliver, late second lieutenant, Tenth United States Volunteer Infantry.
First Sergt. John Buck, Troop B, Tenth United States Cavalry.
Sergt. Maj. William H. Brown, Ninth United States Cavalry.
Post Q. M. Sergt. Frederick A. Clayton, United States Army.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

Jerry M. White, of Kansas.
James F. Powell, of Indiana.
Harrison B. Brown, of North Carolina.
Hammond J. Parker, of Georgia.
Charles C. Caldwell, of Ohio.
Walter G. Gatchell, of Rhode Island.
Frank W. Cheek, of Michigan.
Jacob C. Smith, late second lieutenant, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry.
John W. Brown, late second lieutenant, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry.
Hugh Thomason, late sergeant, Sixth United States Cavalry.
First Sergt. Lewis M. Smith, Troop M, Tenth United States Cavalry.
Sergt. William A. Allen, Troop A, Ninth United States Cavalry.
Squadron Sergt. Maj. John H. Anderson, Ninth United States Cavalry.
First Sergt. Peter McCown, Troop E, Tenth United States Cavalry.
Com. Sergt. George Webber, United States Army (retired).

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

Joseph Moore, of Ohio.
James B. Coleman, of Missouri.
David B. Jeffers, of Ohio.
Wilson Ballard, of Ohio.
Joseph C. Andrews, of Massachusetts.
Frank R. Chisholm, of Massachusetts.

John K. Rice, of Virginia.
George W. Taylor, of North Carolina.
Green F. Marion, of Alabama.
First Sergt. Walter Green, Troop K, Tenth United States Cavalry.
Com. Sergt. Charles B. Turner, Tenth United States Cavalry.
Sergt. Maj. Lincoln Washington, Ninth United States Cavalry.

TO BE COLONEL FORTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

Capt. William H. Beck, Tenth United States Cavalry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL FORTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

Capt. Arthur C. Ducat, Twenty-fourth United States Infantry.

TO BE MAJORS, FORTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

Capt. George W. Kirkman, Twenty-third United States Infantry.
Capt. Carter P. Johnson, Tenth United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. Ernest Hinds, Second United States Artillery.

TO BE CAPTAINS, FORTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

Emmanuel D. Bass, of Ohio.
William M. Hawkins, of Kansas.
Robert Gage, of Alabama.
Gilbert C. Smith, of Missouri.
Thomas Campbell, of Missouri.
Floyd H. Crumbly, late first lieutenant, Tenth United States Volunteer Infantry.
John C. Proctor, late first lieutenant, Eighth United States Volunteer Infantry.
Frank R. Steward, late second lieutenant, Eighth United States Volunteer Infantry.
Robert G. Woods, late second lieutenant, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry.
Sergt. William D. Edwards, Tenth United States Cavalry.
First Sergt. Charles W. Jefferson, Troop B, Ninth United States Cavalry.
Sergt. Maj. Edward L. Baker, jr., Tenth United States Cavalry.
Sergt. Maj. William R. Staff, Twenty-fourth United States Infantry.
First Sergt. Lewis W. McNabb, Company D, Twenty-fourth United States Infantry (since deceased).

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

James H. Thomas, of Indiana.
David J. Gilmer, of North Carolina.
Robert Blakeman, of Illinois.
Hamilton H. Blunt, of Louisiana.
Robert C. Gregg, of Pennsylvania.
William D. Pritchard, of North Carolina.
Isaac W. Moloney, of Ohio.
William H. Butler, of Missouri.
Leon H. Jordan, late first lieutenant, Seventh United States Volunteer Infantry.
Thomas C. Butler, late second lieutenant, Ninth United States Volunteer Infantry.
Macon Russell, late second lieutenant, Eighth United States Volunteer Infantry.
Lafayette A. Tillman, late quartermaster-sergeant, Seventh United States Volunteer Infantry.
First Sergt. Charles Perry, Troop L, Tenth United States Cavalry.
Sergt. Charles Spurlock, Troop E, Ninth United States Cavalry.
Sergt. Ebbert W. Maden, Troop E, Ninth United States Cavalry.
Com. Sergt. Fred Dobler, United States Army.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, FORTY-NINTH INFANTRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

Horace F. Wheaton, of Massachusetts.
George E. Payne, of Kansas.
Leander W. Hayes, of North Carolina.
Guilford E. Campbell, of Illinois.
Wyatt Huffman, late second lieutenant, Eighth United States Volunteer Infantry.
Beverly Perea, late first lieutenant, Seventh United States Volunteer Infantry.
William Blaney, late second lieutenant, Tenth United States Volunteer Infantry.
Sergt. Alfred M. Ray, Troop F, Tenth United States Cavalry.
Corpl. Robert L. Gough, Company D, Twenty-fourth United States Infantry.
Com. Sergt. Henry F. Walls, Ninth United States Cavalry.
Sergt. Edward B. Johnson, Tenth United States Cavalry.
Sergt. Maj. William McBryar, Twenty-fifth United States Infantry.

TO BE COLONEL ELEVENTH CAVALRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 10, 1899.

Capt. James Lockett, Fourth United States Cavalry.

TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONEL ELEVENTH CAVALRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 10, 1899.

Capt. Charles G. Starr, First United States Infantry.

TO BE MAJORS, ELEVENTH CAVALRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 12, 1899.

First Lieut. Thomas G. Carson, Fourth United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. Dennis E. Nolan, Thirteenth United States Infantry.
Maj. Hugh T. Sime, First California Volunteers.

TO BE CAPTAINS, ELEVENTH CAVALRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 10, 1899.

Capt. Edward L. Glasgow, Twentieth Kansas Volunteers.
Capt. Joseph T. Davidson, Fifty-first Iowa Volunteers.
Lieut. Evan E. Young, First South Dakota Volunteers.
Post Q. M. Sergt. Alvin Arndt, United States Army.

To rank from August 11, 1899.

Capt. Edward A. Sturges, First Washington Volunteers.
Second Lieut. Edward L. King, Eighth United States Cavalry.
Lieut. Samuel G. Larson, First South Dakota Volunteers.
Lieut. Russell T. Hazzard, First Washington Volunteers.
Lieut. William A. Green, Twentieth Kansas Volunteers.
Capt. Frank E. Green, First Montana Volunteers.
Ernest H. Agnew, late Twentieth Kansas Volunteers.

To rank from August 12, 1899.

First Lieut. Lloyd England, Third United States Artillery.
First Lieut. William J. Kipp, First Idaho Volunteers.
Lieut. James O. Ross, Fifty-first Iowa Volunteers.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, ELEVENTH CAVALRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 10, 1899.

Private George W. Winterburn, Eleventh Cavalry, United States Volunteers.

To rank from August 11, 1899.

Lieut. James O. Ross, Fifty-first Iowa Volunteers.
Lieut. Frederick E. Gignoux, Nevada Volunteer Cavalry.
Lieut. Morrow C. Gustin, First Washington Volunteers.
Lieut. Charles R. Trowbridge, Thirteenth Minnesota Volunteers.
Lieut. Fred H. Parks, First South Dakota Volunteers.
Second Lieut. Walter V. Cotchett, First Washington Volunteers.
Second Lieut. Charles C. Winnia, First Tennessee Volunteers.
Sergt. Lindzy E. Cheatham, Battery K, Third United States Artillery.
Private George M. Wray, Eleventh Cavalry, United States Volunteers.
Sergt. Francis H. Lincoln, Company A, Fifty-first Iowa Volunteers.
Private Joseph W. Morris, Eleventh Cavalry, United States Volunteers.
Private Raymond S. Enslow, Eleventh Cavalry, United States Volunteers.
Corpl. Oliver P. M. Hazzard, Company M, First Washington Volunteers.
Sergt. Holly V. Hill, Company H, First Washington Volunteers.
Sergt. Lewis Foerster, Troop K, Fourth United States Cavalry.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, ELEVENTH CAVALRY, UNITED STATES VOLUNTEERS.

To rank from August 11, 1899.

First Sergt. John Holtman, Troop G, Fourth United States Cavalry.
Private Leo M. Cutts, Thirteenth Minnesota Volunteers.
Private Charles H. Burritt, Eleventh Cavalry, United States Volunteers.
Private Emory S. West, Company G, First South Dakota Volunteers.
Sergt. Maj. Dennis P. Quinlan, Eleventh Cavalry, United States Volunteers.
Private Otto W. Rethorst, Eleventh Cavalry, United States Volunteers.

Hugh Kirkman, at large.
Alexander C. McKelvey, of Massachusetts.
George Curry, of New Mexico.
Charles L. Ballard, of New Mexico
Henry C. White, jr., of Ohio.
James D. Keene, of the District of Columbia.

TO BE SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF MAJOR.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

Capt. Charles F. Mason, assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Capt. Ogden Rafferty, assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Capt. Paul F. Straub, assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Charles L. G. Anderson, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
John R. McDill, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
James E. Shallenberger, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Francis A. Winter, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Thomas C. Chalmers, of New York.
Frank C. Armstrong, of Kansas.
B. Albert Lieberman, of Missouri.
Joseph N. Henry, of Pennsylvania.
Julius A. Schuelke, of Wyoming (since honorably discharged).

To rank from August 10, 1899.

Capt. George D. De Shon, assistant surgeon, United States Army.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Capt. James D. Glennan, assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Capt. Philip G. Wales, assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Capt. Thomas U. Raymond, assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Capt. Allen M. Smith, assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Capt. Walter D. McCaw, assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Capt. Henry D. Snyder, assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Capt. William F. Lippitt, jr., assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Capt. Merritte W. Ireland, assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Capt. Joseph T. Clarke, assistant surgeon, United States Army.
William Cogswell, of Massachusetts.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

Capt. Charles F. Kieffer, assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Thomas E. Evins, of Alabama.

To rank from November 11, 1899.

Capt. Eugene L. Swift, assistant surgeon, United States Army.

TO BE ASSISTANT SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF CAPTAIN.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

John R. Hereford, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Frank W. Foxworthy, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Luther B. Grandy, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
George W. Matthews, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Thomas B. Anderson, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Frederic A. Washburn, jr., of Massachusetts.
William Bowen, of Tennessee.
S. Chase de Krafft, of Maryland.
James C. Minor, of Arkansas.
James J. Erwin, of Ohio.
Abram L. Haines, of New York.
Frederick Hadru, of Texas.

To rank from August 10, 1899.

Alexander D. Ghiselin, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

Frederick S. Dewey, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Seaton Norman, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Edward A. Romig, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Thomas R. Marshall, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Charles L. Furbush, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Frank E. Artaud, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Robert P. Robins, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
William D. Bell, of New York.
Walter D. Webb, of New York.
Henry H. Lee, of Vermont.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

Robert Burns, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Howard A. Grube, of Michigan.

TO BE ASSISTANT SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF FIRST LIEUTENANT.

To rank from July 5, 1899.

William H. Cook, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
John A. Metzger, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Isaac W. Brewer, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Edward D. Sinks, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Lomax S. Anderson, late assistant surgeon, Fifth United States Volunteer Infantry (since honorably discharged).
Richard S. Griswold, of Connecticut.
Leonard K. Graves, of New York.
George P. Peed, of Virginia.
Albert H. Eber, of Michigan.
Ralph S. Porter, of Illinois.
John C. Greenewalt, of Pennsylvania.
Frank Donaldson, of New York (since honorably discharged).
Patrick J. McKenna, of Utah (since honorably discharged).

To rank from August 10, 1899.

Shadworth O. Beasley, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.

To rank from August 15, 1899.

Joseph L. Sanford, of Virginia.

To rank from August 17, 1899.

George L. Hicks, jr., acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.
Edward G. Beeson, of Iowa.
Easton Burchard, of Missouri.
Edward J. Barrett, of the District of Columbia.
Lewie A. Griffith, of South Carolina.
Dudley W. Welch, of Ohio.
Thomas T. Jackson, of Texas.
Robert W. Andrews, of New York.
Charles M. Galbraith, of Illinois.

To rank from September 8, 1899.

Joseph L. Bell, of Illinois.

To rank from September 9, 1899.

William W. Purnell, of the District of Columbia.
William C. Warmsley, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army.

To rank from October 17, 1899.

William C. Berlin, of Ohio.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

To be assistant surgeons with the rank of first lieutenant.

Otway W. Rash, of Kentucky, June 14, 1899.
Benjamin J. Edger, jr., of Pennsylvania, June 14, 1899.

To be chaplains.

The Rev. John A. Randolph, of Massachusetts, March 6, 1899.
The Rev. William D. McKinnon, of California, October 27, 1899.
The Rev. Rowland Stuart Nichols, of Massachusetts, November 27, 1899.

THIRTIETH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenant.

First Sergt. John Campbell, Company M, Thirtieth Infantry, United States Volunteers, December 11, 1899.

FORTIETH INFANTRY.

Private William J. Whitthorne, jr., Troop —, Eleventh Cavalry, United States Volunteers, to be second lieutenant, December 13, 1899.

TO BE ASSISTANT SURGEON WITH THE RANK OF FIRST LIEUTENANT.

Frank W. Dudley, of California, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, December 13, 1899.

TO BE SIGNAL OFFICER WITH THE RANK OF MAJOR.

Capt. Frank Greene, Signal Corps, United States Army, December 6, 1899.

TRANSFERS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

Second Lieut. Robert C. Foy, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, December 15, 1899.
Second Lieut. Reginald E. McNally, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, December 15, 1899.

PUERTO RICO BATTALION.

To be captain.

First Lieut. Allen D. Raymond, Puerto Rico Battalion, United States Volunteers, December 7, 1899.

PROMOTIONS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

TO BE SURGEON WITH THE RANK OF MAJOR.

Capt. John R. Hereford, assistant surgeon, Thirty-second Infantry, United States Volunteers, December 4, 1899.

TO BE ASSISTANT SURGEON WITH THE RANK OF CAPTAIN.

First Lieut. William H. Cook, assistant surgeon, Thirty-second Infantry, United States Volunteers, December 4, 1899.

FORTIETH INFANTRY.

First Lieut. Eugene E. Barton, Fortieth Infantry, United States Volunteers, to be captain, December 13, 1899.

Second Lieut. Cullen C. Mitchell, Fortieth Infantry, United States Volunteers, to be first lieutenant, December 13, 1899.

ELEVENTH CAVALRY.

Second Lieut. Charles H. Burritt, to be first lieutenant, September 5, 1899.

TWENTY-SIXTH INFANTRY.

Maj. Joseph T. Dickman, to be lieutenant-colonel, September 13, 1899.

Capt. Guy V. Henry, jr., to be major, September 13, 1899.

First Lieut. William M. Connell, to be captain, September 13, 1899.

Second Lieut. Harry E. Comstock, to be first lieutenant, September 13, 1899.

TWENTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Theodore B. Taylor, October 21, 1899.
First Lieut. Julien E. Gaujot, November 2, 1899.
First Lieut. James D. Fauntleroy, December 1, 1899.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Francis W. Griffin, September 5, 1899.
Second Lieut. Frederick H. Plummer, September 8, 1899.
Second Lieut. Robert S. Knox, September 12, 1899.
Second Lieut. George C. Shaw, September 12, 1899.
Second Lieut. Louie St. Clair Munford, October 21, 1899.
Second Lieut. Albert U. Faulkner, November 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. John C. Cassels, December 1, 1899.

TWENTY-NINTH INFANTRY.

First Lieut. James R. Rash, to be captain, July 29, 1899.

Second Lieut. William S. Wells, jr., to be first lieutenant, July 29, 1899.

THIRTIETH INFANTRY.

First Lieut. Joseph W. Porterfield, to be captain, August 22, 1899.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. John N. Wright (since discharged), August 22, 1899.

Second Lieut. John W. C. Abbott, October 29, 1899.

THIRTY-FIRST INFANTRY.

First Lieut. Robert C. Payne, to be captain, August 30, 1899.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. William H. Monroe, August 30, 1899.
Second Lieut. Watson Lindsey, November 20, 1899.

THIRTY-SECOND INFANTRY.

Second Lieut. George E. Goodrich, to be first lieutenant, October 25, 1899.

THIRTY-THIRD INFANTRY.

Capt. Edgar A. Sirmyer, to be major, November 12, 1899.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Richard T. Ellis, September 12, 1899.
First Lieut. Theodore Schultz, September 13, 1899.
First Lieut. William S. Cunningham, November 12, 1899.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. George L. Febiger, August 24, 1899.
Second Lieut. Frank L. Case, September 12, 1899.
Second Lieut. Earle Edmundson, September 13, 1899.
Second Lieut. Thomas L. Sherburne, September 13, 1899.
Second Lieut. John J. Lipop, October 31, 1899.
Second Lieut. John W. Healey, November 12, 1899.

THIRTY-FOURTH INFANTRY.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Cushman A. Rice, September 8, 1899.
First Lieut. George E. Gibson, September 24, 1899.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Lafayette A. Dorrington, September 8, 1899.
Second Lieut. Samuel D. McAlister, September 24, 1899.
Second Lieut. Arthur G. Duncan, November 15, 1899.

THIRTY-FIFTH INFANTRY.

First Lieut. George I. Becker, to be captain, September 22, 1899.

Second Lieut. Robert W. Collins, to be first lieutenant, September 22, 1899.

THIRTY-SIXTH INFANTRY.

First Lieut. Cornealians F. O'Keefe, to be captain, October 31, 1899.

Second Lieut. James P. Toncray, to be first lieutenant, October 31, 1899.

THIRTY-NINTH INFANTRY.

First Lieut. Hiram C. Baker, to be captain, October 13, 1899.

Second Lieut. Arthur W. Orton, to be first lieutenant, October 11, 1899.

FORTIETH INFANTRY.

First Lieut. William J. Watson, to be captain, November 13, 1899.

Second Lieut. William C. Fitzpatrick, to be first lieutenant, November 11, 1899.

FORTY-FIRST INFANTRY.

To be captains.

First Lieut. William R. Standiford, September 1, 1899.
First Lieut. Ernest A. Greenough, October 28, 1899.
First Lieut. Brady G. Ruttencutter, November 2, 1899.
First Lieut. Albert W. Foreman, November 18, 1899.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Lawrence P. Butler, September 1, 1899.
Second Lieut. Frank W. Glover, October 28, 1899.
Second Lieut. Frank J. Miller, November 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. Edwin J. Nowlen, November 18, 1899.

FORTY-SECOND INFANTRY.

First Lieut. Fred W. Stopford, to be captain, October 24, 1899.

Second Lieut. Horace Webster, to be first lieutenant, October 24, 1899.

FORTY-THIRD INFANTRY.

First Lieut. William C. Dow, to be captain, November 8, 1899.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Joseph T. Sweeney, October 26, 1899.
Second Lieut. Henry A. Thayer, November 8, 1899.
Second Lieut. Harold S. Swann, November 30, 1899.

FORTY-FOURTH INFANTRY.

First Lieut. Marion C. Raysor, to be captain, November 30, 1899.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Theodore Levack, November 10, 1899.
Second Lieut. Benjamin R. Hall, November 30, 1899.

FORTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Oscar Bishop, October 30, 1899.
First Lieut. Jesse S. Garwood, November 1, 1899.
First Lieut. John W. Gulick, November 9, 1899.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Thomas P. Murphy, October 30, 1899.
Second Lieut. Charles H. Morrow, November 1, 1899.
Second Lieut. Harvey Garrison, November 9, 1899.

FORTY-NINTH INFANTRY.

First Lieut. Hamilton H. Blunt, to be captain, November 7, 1899.

Second Lieut. William Blaney, to be first lieutenant, November 7, 1899.

THIRTY-THIRD INFANTRY.

Maj. Marcus D. Cronin, to be lieutenant-colonel, December 2, 1899.

Capt. Thomas Q. Ashburn, to be major, December 2, 1899.

First Lieut. Lindsey P. Rucker, to be captain, December 2, 1899.

Second Lieut. Charles L. Willard, to be first lieutenant, December 2, 1899.

THIRTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY.

First Lieut. Neil P. Pavey, to be captain, December 1, 1899.

Second Lieut. Daniel R. Johnson, to be first lieutenant, December 1, 1899.

FORTY-FOURTH INFANTRY.

Second Lieut. Howard M. Koontz, to be first lieutenant, November 29, 1899.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

ARTILLERY ARM.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. John F. B. Mitchell, jr., Twelfth Infantry, September 20, 1899.

Second Lieut. James P. Drouillard, Sixth Infantry, September 30, 1899.

Second Lieut. Martin L. Crimmins, Eighteenth Infantry, October 1, 1899.

Second Lieut. Marion M. Weeks, Twenty-first Infantry, October 2, 1899.
Second Lieut. James M. Love, jr., Twenty-first Infantry, October 8, 1899.
Second Lieut. Paul H. McCook, Fifth Infantry, October 10, 1899.
Second Lieut. Frederick W. Coleman, jr., Thirteenth Infantry, October 11, 1899.

POSTMASTERS.

Robert S. Bowman, to be postmaster at Berwick, in the county of Columbia and State of Pennsylvania.
Perry A. Sandborn, to be postmaster at North East, in the county of Erie and State of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *December 20, 1899.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.
Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.
The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE TO PRINT ON THE FINANCIAL BILL.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry.
The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.
Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday there was an agreement by unanimous consent that gentlemen who had addressed the Committee of the Whole on the financial question should have five legislative days within which to print their speeches after the disposition of that bill. Now, some gentlemen around me have raised the question as to whether those five legislative days will carry the leave to print over until the reassembling of Congress after the holidays? I think myself they would, but it is desired that there shall be no mistake about it.
The SPEAKER. The Chair would say to the gentleman from Texas that that proposition was resisted by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], as the Chair remembers, and a different conclusion was reached. Members who had addressed the committee were to have five days within which to file their remarks with the Public Printer, as the Chair recalls.
Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I did not understand that that request was resisted.
Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman is mistaken. We had quite a little conversation over it, and at the conclusion of it the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] again submitted his request, substantially in the same language as at first. I again objected, and then he submitted a request for five days, and that was the order made by the House.
Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I see, by referring to the RECORD, the gentleman is correct about that. The suggestion was made to me here, and I had read only the part of it which referred to the legislative days. I delivered a speech on that bill, and, supposing that I would have until after the holidays closed, I had not even examined the stenographic report. I shall have to ask the leave of the House to print my speech.
Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman understands, of course, that he has until Saturday under the previous order.
Mr. BAILEY of Texas. But no RECORD will be issued after to-morrow, and therefore the privilege until Saturday would be a barren one.
The SPEAKER. The order, as the Chair recollects it, was that gentlemen may file remarks with the Public Printer within that time, without any question as to when the next RECORD will appear. What is the gentleman's request?
Mr. BAILEY of Texas. None at all, if I can have until Saturday.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. STALLINGS appeared and took the oath of office prescribed by law.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:
S. 1476. An act creating a commission to revise and codify the pension laws of the United States; and
S. 718. An act to authorize the President of the United States to cause certain lands heretofore withdrawn from market for reservoir purposes to be restored to the public domain, subject to entry under the homestead law with certain restrictions.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same.

H. R. 4152. An act to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts by bureaus and offices of the War Department.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:
S. 718. An act to authorize the President of the United States to cause certain lands heretofore withdrawn from market for reservoir purposes to be restored to the public domain, subject to entry under the homestead law with certain restrictions—to the Committee on Public Lands.
S. 1476. An act creating a commission to revise and codify the pension laws of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the House do now adjourn, Mr. Speaker.
Mr. BROWN. I hope the gentleman will withdraw that for a moment.
Mr. PAYNE. For what purposes?
Mr. BROWN. I have a resolution I desire to offer.
Mr. GROW. I ask the gentleman from New York to yield one moment; not more than a minute.
Mr. PAYNE. I will withdraw the motion and yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.
Mr. GROW. I do not see my friend from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] in his seat. He made some corrections, and in the confusion of yesterday I did not know that he was speaking about my statement; but as he is not in his seat I will leave it until after the recess.
Mr. GAINES. I am in the House.
Mr. GROW. If the gentleman from New York will allow me, it will not take but a few minutes.
Mr. PAYNE. I yielded to the gentleman for a moment.
Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker——
The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has the floor on a motion to adjourn.
Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn.
The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.
[Cries of "Division!"]
The House divided; and there were—ayes 54, noes 79.
Mr. PAYNE. I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.
The yeas and nays were ordered.
The question was taken; and there were—yeas 81, nays 106, answered "present" 7, not voting 160; as follows:

YEAS—81.

Alexander,	Foss,	Linney,	Smith, H. C.
Allen, Mo.	Freer,	Littlefield,	Southard,
Babcock,	Gardner, Mich.	Long,	Spalding,
Barham,	Gibson,	Loudenslager,	Sperry,
Boreing,	Graff,	McCall,	Sprague,
Brick,	Grout,	McCleary,	Steele,
Brownlow,	Hamilton,	Marsh,	Stevens, Minn.
Bull,	Hedge,	Mercer,	Stewart, Wis.
Burke, S. Dak.	Henry, Conn.	Metcalf,	Tayler, Ohio
Burkett,	Hepburn,	Miller,	Thomas, Iowa
Burton,	Hill,	Morgan,	Tongue,
Capron,	Hitt,	Needham,	Van Voorhis,
Cooper, Wis.	Hoffecker,	Packer, Pa.	Vreeland,
Corliss,	Hull,	Payne,	Wachter,
Cousins,	Jenkins,	Prince,	Wadsworth,
Crawford,	Jones, Wash.	Ray,	Warner,
Curtis,	Kahn,	Rodenberg,	Weeks,
Cushman,	Kleberg,	Russell,	White.
Dalzell,	Lacey,	Shattuc,	
Dovener,	Landis,	Shelden,	
Fletcher,	Lawrence,	Slayden,	

NAYS—106.

Acheson,	Davis,	Little,	Ruppert,
Bailey, Kans.	De Armond,	Livingston,	Salmon,
Bailey, Tex.	De Graffenreid,	Lloyd,	Scudder,
Baker,	Denny,	McClellan,	Shackleford,
Bartholdt,	Dinsmore,	McCulloch,	Shafroth,
Bartlett,	Dougherty,	McLain,	Sheppard,
Bell,	Epes,	McPherson,	Sims,
Bellamy,	Finley,	McRae,	Small,
Berry,	Fitzgerald, N. Y.	May,	Smith, Ky.
Bishop,	Fleming,	Meekison,	Smith, Samuel W.
Brown,	Gaston,	Moon,	Snodgrass,
Brundidge,	Gilbert,	Mudd,	Stallings,
Burleson,	Glynn,	Neville,	Stark,
Burnett,	Gordon,	Newlands,	Stephens, Tex.
Butler,	Green, Pa.	Otey,	Sutherland,
Calderhead,	Grow,	Pierce, Tenn.	Terry,
Caldwell,	Hay,	Phillips,	Thomas, N. C.
Carmack,	Henry, Miss.	Quarles,	Thropp,
Clark, Mo.	Henry, Tex.	Reeder,	Underwood,
Clayton, Ala.	Jack,	Rhea, Ky.	Weaver,
Clayton, N. Y.	Jones, Va.	Rhea, Va.	Wheeler, Ky.
Cochran, Mo.	Kluttz,	Richardson,	Williams, J. R.
Cooney,	Lamb,	Ridgely,	Williams, Miss.
Cooper, Tex.	Lanham,	Riordon,	Wilson, N. Y.
Cox,	Latimer,	Rixey,	Zenor.
Cummings,	Lester,	Robinson, Ind.	
Davenport, S. W.	Levy,	Rucker,	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7.

Boutell, Ill.	Gaines,	Griffith,	Swanson.
De Vries,	Gillett, Mass.	Miers, Ind.	

NOT VOTING—160.

Adams,	Davey,	Kitchin,	Robbins,
Adamson,	Davidson,	Knox,	Roberts, Mass.
Allen, Ky.	Dayton,	Lane,	Robertson, La.
Allen, Miss.	Dick,	Lentz,	Robinson, Nebr.
Atwater,	Dolliver,	Lewis,	Ryan, N. Y.
Ball,	Driggs,	Littauer,	Ryan, Pa.
Bankhead,	Driscoll,	Lorimer,	Sherman,
Barber,	Eddy,	Loud,	Showalter,
Barney,	Elliott,	Lovering,	Sibley,
Benton,	Emerson,	Lybrand,	Smith, Ill.
Bingham,	Esch,	McAleer,	Smith, Md.
Boutelle, Me.	Faris,	McDowell,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Bowersock,	Fitzgerald, Mass.	Maddox,	Sparkman,
Bradley,	Fitzpatrick,	Mahon,	Spight,
Brantley,	Fordney,	Mann,	Stewart, N. J.
Breazeale,	Foster,	Mesick,	Stewart, N. Y.
Brenner,	Fowler,	Meyer, La.	Stokes,
Brewer,	Fox,	Minor,	Sulloway,
Bromwell,	Gamble,	Mondell,	Sulzer,
Brosius,	Gardner, N. J.	Moody, Mass.	Talbert,
Broussard,	Gill,	Moody, Oreg.	Tate,
Burke, Tex.	Gillet, N. Y.	Morris,	Tawney,
Burleigh,	Graham,	Muller,	Taylor, Ala.
Campbell,	Greene, Mass.	Naphen,	Thayer,
Cannon,	Griggs,	Noonan,	Tompkins,
Catchings,	Grosvenor,	Norton, Ohio	Turner,
Chanler,	Hall,	Norton, S. C.	Underhill,
Chickering,	Harmer,	O'Grady,	Vandiver,
Clarke, N. H.	Haugen,	Olmsted,	Wanger,
Cochrane, N. Y.	Hawley,	Otjen,	Waters,
Connell,	Heatwole,	Overstreet,	Watson,
Cowherd,	Henenway,	Parker, N. J.	Weymouth,
Cromer,	Hopkins,	Pearce, Mo.	Wheeler, Ala.
Crowley,	Howard,	Pearre,	Williams, W. E.
Crump,	Howell,	Polk,	Wilson, Idaho
Crumpacker,	Jett,	Powers,	Wilson, S. C.
Cusack,	Johnston,	Pugh,	Wright.
Dahle, Wis.	Joy,	Ransdell,	Young, Pa.
Daly, N. J.	Kerr,	Reeves,	Young, Va.
Davenport, S. A.	Ketcham,	Robb,	Ziegler.

So the motion to adjourn was not agreed to.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask to be recorded.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and did not hear his name called?

Mr. FOSS. I was, and did not hear my name called.

The name of Mr. Foss was called, and he voted "yea."

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. FOWLER. I ask to withdraw my vote and be marked "present."

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. LORIMER. I voted inadvertently. I desire to withdraw my vote.

Mr. DE VRIES. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. HEATWOLE. I desire to withdraw my vote.

Mr. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote. I was out at the time and did not hear my name.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present?

Mr. WATERS. No, sir; I was just outside.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not be recorded.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask if the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MCCALL, has voted?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is present and voted.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. CROMER. I voted in the negative, and desire to withdraw my vote.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea." I am paired with the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. GRIGGS, and desire to withdraw my vote.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. THAYER. I desire to withdraw my vote.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. LOVERING with Mr. NAPHEN.

Mr. WANGER with Mr. ADAMSON.

Mr. DAYTON with Mr. MEYER of Louisiana.

Mr. SHERMAN with Mr. DRIGGS.

Mr. BROMWELL with Mr. MCDOWELL.

Mr. MANN with Mr. JETT.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine with Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana.

Mr. REEVES with Mr. SPARKMAN.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts with Mr. BRANTLEY.

Mr. HEATWOLE with Mr. DE VRIES.

Mr. HARMER with Mr. BROUSSARD.

Mr. BARNEY with Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi.

Mr. OVERSTREET with Mr. GRIFFITH.

Mr. VREELAND with Mr. DAVEY.

Mr. CROMER with Mr. MIERS of Indiana.

Mr. LORIMER with Mr. SWANSON.

Mr. WRIGHT with Mr. HALL.

Mr. MESICK with Mr. BURKE of Texas.

Mr. CORLISS with Mr. LENTZ.

Mr. BISHOP with Mr. CAMPBELL.

For this day:

Mr. GILL with Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts.

Mr. TAWNEY with Mr. RANSDELL.

Mr. SHOWALTER with Mr. BANKHEAD.

Mr. OTJEN with Mr. POLK.

Mr. MAHON with Mr. SULZER.

Mr. FOWLER with Mr. GAINES.

Mr. CHICKERING with Mr. LEWIS.

Mr. CRUMP with Mr. STOKES.

Mr. CRUMPACKER with Mr. ZIEGLER.

Mr. LYBRAND with Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Mr. EDDY with Mr. ALLEN of Kentucky.

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey with Mr. TALBERT.

Mr. ADAMS with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. CANNON with Mr. MULLER.

Mr. BURLEIGH with Mr. MADDOX.

Mr. BOWERSOCK with Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. BINGHAM with Mr. BARBOUR.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts with Mr. THAYER.

Mr. S. A. DAVENPORT with Mr. BRENNER.

Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania with Mr. COWHERD.

Mr. DICK with Mr. CROWLEY.

Mr. GROSVENOR with Mr. ELLIOTT.

Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. BREAZEALE.

Mr. PEARRE with Mr. ATWATER.

Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. RYAN of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BROSIUS with Mr. NORTON of Ohio.

Mr. LITTAUER with Mr. BRADLEY.

Mr. SULLOWAY with Mr. TATE.

Mr. MINOR with Mr. BREWER.

Mr. BALL with Mr. MORRIS.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH with Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, for the first session of the Fifty-sixth Congress.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama.

Mr. HOWELL with Mr. JOHNSTON.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. GROW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask unanimous consent for a few minutes to make some corrections as to the facts of history.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded, which is the call of committees.

Mr. GROW. Is not a request for unanimous consent in order before that motion?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is unable to hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROW. Is not a request for unanimous consent in order before such a motion is put, or before the regular order is proceeded with?

The SPEAKER. If the call for the regular order is insisted on, it is impossible to recognize the gentleman for unanimous consent now.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask if it is not in order to move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, in order that discussion may be had? If that motion is in order, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The regular order being demanded and insisted upon, the Chair thinks that it will not be in order.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does not a motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union take precedence of the regular order?

The SPEAKER. After the regular order is demanded and insisted upon, it will not be in order until one hour is consumed in the consideration of some bill. The Clerk will proceed with the call.

The Clerk called Committee on Elections No. 1.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. GROW. That is clearly a dilatory motion, Mr. Speaker.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it. [Cries of "Division!"]

The SPEAKER. Who demands a division?

Mr. GROW. I call for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 79, noes 80.

Mr. PAYNE. I demand the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken: and there were—yeas 77, nays 94, answered "present" 6, noted by the Speaker as present 3, not voting 177; as follows:

YEAS—77.

Alexander,	Boreing,	Burkett,	Corliss,
Babcock,	Brick,	Burton,	Cousins,
Barham,	Brownlow,	Calderhead,	Curtis,
Bartholdt,	Bull,	Capron,	Cushman,
Bishop,	Burke, S. Dak.	Cooper, Wis.	Dalzell,

Dovener,	Hitt,	Metcalf,	Steele,
Fletcher,	Hoffecker,	Needham,	Stewart, Wis.
Foss,	Hull,	Payne,	Tayler, Ohio
Freer,	Jenkins,	Prince,	Thomas, Iowa
Gardner, Mich.	Jones, Wash.	Ray,	Van Voorhis,
Gardner, N. J.	Lacey,	Rodenberg,	Vreeland,
Gibson,	Landis,	Russell,	Wachter,
Gillett, Mass.	Lawrence,	Shattuc,	Wadsworth,
Graff,	Linney,	Shelden,	Warner,
Grout,	Littlefield,	Sibley,	Waters,
Hamilton,	Long,	Slayden,	Weaver,
Haugen,	McCall,	Smith, H. C.	Weeks.
Henry, Conn.	McCleary,	Southard,	
Hepburn,	Marsh,	Spalding,	
Hill,	Mercer,	Sprague,	

NAYS—94.

Acheson,	De Graffenreid,	Livingston,	Rucker,
Allen, Me.	Denny,	Lloyd,	Salmon,
Baker,	Dinsmore,	McClellan,	Scudder,
Ball,	Dougherty,	McCulloch,	Shafroth,
Bartlett,	Epes,	McLain,	Sheppard,
Berry,	Fitzgerald, N. Y.	McPherson,	Sims,
Brewer,	Fitzpatrick,	McRae,	Small,
Brown,	Fleming,	May,	Smith, Ky.
Brundidge,	Gaston,	Meekison,	Snodgrass,
Burleson,	Glynn,	Moon,	Stallings,
Burnett,	Gordon,	Mudd,	Stark,
Butler,	Grow,	Neville,	Stephens, Tex.
Caldwell,	Hay,	Otey,	Sutherland,
Carmack,	Henry, Miss.	Packer, Pa.	Terry,
Clark, Mo.	Henry, Tex.	Pierce, Tenn.	Thomas, N. C.
Clayton, Ala.	Jack,	Phillips,	Thropp,
Clayton, N. Y.	Jones, Va.	Quarles,	Underwood,
Cooney,	Kleberg,	Rhea, Ky.	Wheeler, Ky.
Cooper, Tex.	Kluttz,	Rhea, Va.	Williams, J. R.
Cox,	Lanham,	Richardson,	Williams, Miss.
Cummings,	Latimer,	Ridgely,	Wilson, N. Y.
Davenport, S. A.	Lester,	Riordon,	Zenor.
Davis,	Levy,	Rixey,	
De Armond,	Little,	Robinson, Ind.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6.

De Vries,	Griffith,	Wanger,	White.
Gaines,	Miers, Ind.		

NOT VOTING—177.

Adams,	Davey,	Lane,	Robertson, La.
Adamson,	Davidson,	Lentz,	Robinson, Nebr.
Allen, Ky.	Dayton,	Lewis,	Ruppert,
Allen, Miss.	Dick,	Littauer,	Ryan, N. Y.
Atwater,	Dolliver,	Lorimer,	Ryan, Pa.
Bailey, Kans.	Driggs,	Loud,	Shakleford,
Bailey, Tex.	Driscoll,	Loudenslager,	Sherman,
Bankhead,	Eddy,	Lovering,	Showalter,
Barber,	Elliott,	Lybrand,	Smith, Ill.
Barney,	Emerson,	McAleer,	Smith, Md.
Bell,	Esch,	McDowell,	Smith, S. W.
Bellamy,	Faris,	Maddox,	Smith, Wm. Alden.
Benton,	Finley,	Mahon,	Sparkman,
Bingham,	Fitzgerald, Mass.	Mann,	Sperry,
Boutell, Ill.	Fordney,	Mesick,	Spight,
Boutelle, Me.	Foster,	Meyer, La.	Stevens, Minn.
Bowersock,	Fowler,	Miller,	Stewart, N. J.
Bradley,	Fox,	Minor,	Stewart, N. Y.
Brantley,	Gamble,	Mondell,	Stokes,
Breazeale,	Gilbert,	Moody, Mass.	Sulloway,
Brenner,	Gill,	Moody, Oreg.	Sulzer,
Bromwell,	Gillet, N. Y.	Morgan,	Swanson,
Brosius,	Graham,	Morris,	Talbert,
Broussard,	Green, Pa.	Muller,	Tate,
Burke, Tex.	Greene, Mass.	Naphen,	Tawney,
Burleigh,	Griggs,	Newlands,	Taylor, Ala.
Campbell,	Grosvenor,	Noonan,	Thayer,
Cannon,	Hall,	Norton, Ohio	Tompkins,
Catchings,	Harmer,	Norton, S. C.	Tongue,
Chanler,	Hawley,	O'Grady,	Turner,
Chickering,	Heatwole,	Olmsted,	Underhill,
Clarke, N. H.	Hedge,	Otjen,	Vandiver,
Cochran, Mo.	Hemenway,	Overstreet,	Watson,
Cochrane, N. Y.	Hopkins,	Parker, N. J.	Weymouth,
Connell,	Howard,	Pearce, Mo.	Wheeler, Ala.
Cowherd,	Howell,	Pearre,	Williams, W. E.
Crawford,	Jett,	Polk,	Wilson, Idaho.
Cromer,	Johnston,	Powers,	Wilson, S. C.
Crowley,	Joy,	Pugh,	Wright,
Crump,	Kahn,	Ransdell,	Young, Pa.
Crumpacker,	Kerr,	Reeder,	Young, Va.
Cusack,	Ketcham,	Reeves,	Ziegler.
Dahle, Wis.	Kitchin,	Robb,	
Daly, N. J.	Knox,	Robbins,	
Davenport, S. W.	Lamb,	Roberts, Mass.	

So the motion to adjourn was not agreed to.

The following additional pair was announced:

On this vote:

Mr. SMITH of Illinois with Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Speaker, I am paired, and I desire to withdraw my vote. I voted in the negative.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am paired, and I desire to be noted as "present."

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the demand for the regular order having been passed, I yield the floor to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW].

Mr. PAYNE. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that there is no question before the House.

Mr. GROW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask unanimous consent to occupy not exceeding five minutes' time in making some corrections of statements in the remarks made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES].

Mr. PAYNE. I object.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. As I understand it, under all the rules and precedents of the House, when a motion is made by a member in charge of a measure and it is antagonized and that motion is lost, the floor, as a matter of course, reverts to the opposite side.

Now, when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW] rose, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] moved to adjourn, as against the gentleman from Pennsylvania. When his motion failed, I say that under all the rules and under all the precedents and customs of this House the floor reverts to the gentleman who was seeking it when the motion was made to cut him off. I sympathize profoundly with the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] in his ineffectual efforts to lead the House to a successful adjournment. [Applause and laughter.] But, notwithstanding that, my point of order is that the floor reverts, as a matter of right, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW].

Mr. STEELE. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has had the floor and made his request, and it has been objected to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee, as the Chair is not clear on the question, what the gentleman from Tennessee thinks of it, under the circumstance, where there is nothing before the House for debate—no question up?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not know what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW] desires, whether he has made a motion or not, but as I understand it, the floor reverts to the gentleman who was seeking the floor, in order that he may make known what he desires, whether it is a motion or a resolution or a bill he is offering, or whatever it may be. I have never known that rule to be applied in any other way than that the floor was to be yielded to the other side. I have seen it done in a Democratic House, Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Carlisle was occupying the chair. When a motion on this side failed (Mr. Carlisle being the Speaker), he always yielded the floor to the other side, and so with Mr. Speaker Reed. I think that has been the rule of every Speaker, so far as I know, and I speak candidly and sincerely when I say it has always been the rule to award the floor immediately to the side contending for it when the adverse vote was taken.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman from Tennessee fails to comprehend the question of the Chair.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I beg pardon.

The SPEAKER. There would be little doubt about the question if there were some matter up for debate—something before the House; but where there is no question before the House for debate, the Chair would like to hear the views of the gentleman from Tennessee under those circumstances.

Mr. RICHARDSON. As I remarked, I do not know what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW] is seeking the floor for. It may be to make some motion or it may be to make a speech.

The SPEAKER. It was to ask unanimous consent. That has been manifest.

Mr. GROW. Mr. Speaker, I will rise, then, to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think the gentleman has the right, under the rules of the House, to state what he desires, at any rate, and that the House by the adverse vote on the motion to adjourn meant to express the desire that he be heard.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee will suspend. The gentleman from Pennsylvania rises to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. GROW. I think it has been held to be a matter of personal privilege for a gentleman to correct his statements in the House, if they have been misrepresented by a member. That is a personal question. That is what I rise to, and I desire not to exceed five minutes' time to make that correction.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that, subject to the right to stop him if it proves to be otherwise than a question of personal privilege, the Chair would like to have the gentleman from Pennsylvania proceed and will hear what he has to say. [Applause.]

Mr. GROW. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] on yesterday, while making his speech, stated that what I presented to the House concerning the legislation of the country on the financial question was incorrect. Owing to the noise and confusion on that side of the House, I was not aware that the gentleman was controverting any of my positions; therefore it passed by without my notice. I desire at this time to make that correction. My statement as to facts in the legislative history of the country from 1862 to 1878 was a correct statement. It is for that kind of a personal explanation that I ask the consent of the House for five minutes' time.

Mr. PAYNE. Of course, Mr. Speaker, this presents no question of personal privilege.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW] alludes to a reply to this speech that I made yesterday, and I tried to make the gentleman hear me. I hope the House will give him a chance to explain the mistake that he made a few days ago; in that speech I think I demonstrated yesterday there were mistakes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will once more submit the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW] that he have unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

Mr. GAINES. I hope that opportunity will be granted him to correct his own mistake.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW] is recognized for five minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. GROW. Now, Mr. Speaker, I certainly should have given the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] my attention if I had understood that he was discussing the points of a speech that I made on Friday last. The point is simply this, that at the time Congress authorized the issue of greenbacks, and the first $500,000,000 loan, in all the discussions in the House at that time the word "coin" was used alternatively and indiscriminately with the word "gold." Mr. Spaulding, who was chairman of the subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee that reported the legal-tender bill, and Mr. Stevens, who was chairman of the committee, made this kind of argument, that if we did not collect the duties in coin it would be impossible to get the gold to pay the interest on the bonds without selling bonds for it. They used the word "coin" in one place and "gold" in the other.

The exception as to the legal-tender quality of the greenbacks was as to customs dues. They were not to be received at the custom-house, and have never been since, and the statement I made was that the pledge of the Government in the act of the 25th of February, 1862—which was the beginning of the indebtedness which my friend from Tennessee calls the war bonds—the pledge was that we would collect the duties on imports in coin, and I said that coin was regarded in the discussion as gold. And for the years after 1862 to 1878 the duties collected were in gold.

We collected in reality gold and nothing else. This was the practice of the custom-house with the importer. In my statement I excepted amounts under $5, for I supposed then such amounts were paid in subsidiary silver coin. But I find that the actual practice at the custom-house during that time was for the importer to pay the amount in gold, and if his payment exceeded the amount of the duties the Government paid him back the change in subsidiary silver coin, and the money that went into the Treasury was thus entirely gold from 1862 to 1878, and the pledge of the act of February 25, 1862, was to pay the bonds in the coin so collected. The coin collected was set apart as a special fund to be used, first, to pay the interest on the bonds and the notes of the United States, and, next, to redeem 1 per cent of the entire debt after the 1st day of July, 1862. That pledge of the Government stands to-day.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] read decisions of the courts of the country, a great number of cases, that coin meant both gold and silver. Granted. I never claimed that the statutes which used the word coin did not include both gold and silver in the word coin, but that the Government in its transactions had never paid any of its bonds or notes (that is, greenbacks) created during the specified time and previous in anything but gold, and that it was gold collected at the custom-houses in actual business. And that was understood by the legislators of the country for the period I have named, from 1862 to 1870; and in talking about coin it was always used in contradistinction to paper.

In paying the bonds of the United States, whenever they were paid at maturity, they were not paid in anything except gold, and no duties were collected during that period but gold, and we pledged that the coin so collected should be set apart as a special fund for the purpose of payment of bonds and notes.

That is what I claimed would be fair and common honesty between man and man in the transaction of business. The understanding then was that it was to be gold. How did it ever come to be changed? The insisting that silver could be used in good faith to pay these bonds is what shook the credit of the Government. There was nothing but subsidiary silver coin at that time of any great amount, and who would ever think of paying $1,000,000 in half dollars, quarters, and 10-cent pieces?

The whole understanding during that time, when paper money only was in circulation, was that coin legally included both gold and silver, but coin in any large amount to be used by the Government was considered to be gold and nothing else; and the decision of the courts as to the legal meaning of the word "coin" has nothing to do with the good faith of the Government in paying its debts contracted under a special arrangement. In the collection of custom dues during that period none of any consequence was collected in anything except gold, and the plighted faith of the Government was to set apart for a specific purpose—that is, to pay the bonds and notes—the money so collected at the custom-house.

When the idea started that greenbacks could be used to pay bonds was the commencement of shaking the credit of the country, so that when we came to make a loan under President Cleveland's Administration it cost the country $16,000,000 for the amount loaned by reason of the discredit that had come to it. I voted against putting "gold" in those bonds, for I never will vote to give any human being a better security than was given to the men who lent this nation their money in the crisis hour of its peril, or one that, by putting gold in, implied that all others could be paid in silver.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROW. I hope our filibuster leader will now take the floor. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state——

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Speaker, I hope I may be allowed five minutes, inasmuch as the gentleman has referred to me.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state that on the last roll call the Chair stated that the ayes were 78, the noes 94, and 6 present. There were three others present, Mr. GILL, Mr. MESICK, and Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, who were noted, but not announced by the Clerk, as should have been done, to show the quorum. The Chair calls attention to it now, so that the Journal may stand correct.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes in which to reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that he may have five minutes to respond to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to learn from his own lips that my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW] has at one time in his life voted on the side of the plain people. [Laughter.] Although he has frequently made speeches on the floor of this House at the present session, he has not at a single time admitted or stated to the House or in the press that he ever voted against the payment of our bonds in gold. After the infamous measure has passed which he voted for on Monday last, in which we placed, without consideration, the word "gold," not only in our past bonds, which he refused to do thirty years ago, he now comes up and admits, as a saving clause before his constituents, that at one time in his life, thirty years ago, he voted not to place the word "gold" in these war bonds.

I have not misled the gentleman. I have not misstated the history of my country. I stated that it was not true, though the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW] differed with me, that Congress held, "between 1862 and 1878," that "coin" in our bonds meant gold only, and I stick to it. And I am supported by the acts of Congress and the opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States, which I cited—7 Wallace, page 26, decided in 1868, and 3 Wallace, page 326, decided in 1865.

The gentleman said, furthermore, Mr. Speaker, that our "duties" were collected in gold because the word "coin" meant gold only, and went so far as to quote the act itself in which the word "coin" appears, which I will read from his own speech, as follows: "And all duties on imported goods shall be paid in coin." Mr. Speaker, neither the gentleman nor any of his friends can say that I misrepresented him, and I am somewhat surprised that the distinguished gentleman, for whom I have always borne so much respect, should say, in the House of Congress, that I have misrepresented him. I have not, but, on the contrary, sir, he has misrepresented the deliberations of Congress and the opinions of the highest courts in the land, and I shall prove it.

I read, Mr. Speaker, from 3 Wallace, page 326. Here was a case where the importer refused to pay his imports, and judgment was had in the Federal courts for "gold and silver coin." The Supreme Court of the United States, affirming that decision, used this potential language:

> The whole case shows that the judgment was for duties on imports, and nothing but gold and silver coin has been made legal tender for this description of indebtedness to the Government.

"Nothing," Mr. Speaker, "but gold and silver coin"—not gold alone, but "gold and silver coin"—could pay our duties, says the court. And with such particularity did the lower court construe the word "coin" that the first decree for "gold coin" only was (at the same term of court) changed, and judgment was entered for "gold and silver coin for duties." This was made a ground of exception, but the Supreme Court of the United States in this case (3 Wallace, 326) overruled it and affirmed the judgment making the duties payable in "gold and silver coin," the court being unanimous in this opinion. The case was decided in 1865—between '1862 and 1878"—a period during which the gentleman says our lawmakers treated the word "coin" in our tariff laws and bonds as not meaning "anything but gold."

Again, Mr. Speaker, in 1869 it was undertaken, as I said in my speech yesterday—that the gentleman has evidently read this morning—to put the word "gold" in our bonds, and the gentleman now confesses that he voted against it, as did his Senators in

1878. If coin then meant gold only, why did you not put gold in the bonds then? [Applause on the Democratic side and in the galleries.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I hope both sides of the House will join with the gentleman in his motion.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until 12 o'clock m., January 3, 1900.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Breton Bay, Maryland—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Chief of Engineers relating to an appropriation for repairing damages to Fort Caswell, N. C.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of deficiency in appropriation for town-site commissioners, Indian Territory—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a communication from the Chief of Engineers relative to Memphis Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of an agreement between the commissioners of the Five Civilized Tribes and the commissioners of the Seminole Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of W. T. Ratliff, administrator of the estate of Alphonso Corson—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of supplemental conclusions of fact and law in the case of the brig *Sally* against the United States—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of John W. Johnston, administrator of the estate of James Johnston, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. GROW, from the Committee on Education, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9) to aid in establishing homes in the States and Territories for teaching articulate speech and vocal language to deaf children before they are of school age, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 4907) requiring the Director of the Census to furnish Congress with statistical information to be used in apportioning Representatives under the Twelfth Census—to the Committee on the Census.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4908) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Hammond, in the State of Indiana—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 4909) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint a commission to study and make full report upon the commercial and industrial conditions of China and Japan, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 4910) to establish a lobster hatchery in the State of Maine—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 4911) to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 4912) providing for a corps of paymasters' clerks in the Navy of the United States—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GAINES: A bill (H. R. 4913) to complete the construction of the locks and dams on the Cumberland River and open the same to deep-water navigation, and making the appropriations therefor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 4914) for the erection of a public building at Wausau, Wis.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 4915) to amend the seventh section of the act entitled "An act to establish circuit courts of appeals, and to define and regulate in certain cases the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4916) to regulate the trial of contempts of courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 4917) granting pensions to insane, idiotic, and helpless children of deceased officers and enlisted men who served in the late war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 4918) to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of site and the erection of a public building at Newport, Vt.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 4919) to provide an American register for the steam whaler *Bowhead*—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WARNER: A bill (H. R. 4920) to revise and codify the laws other than criminal of the district of Alaska and to provide a code of civil procedure thereunder—to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 4921) to authorize the Falls Church and Potomac Railway Company, of Virginia, to extend its line into and within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 4922) relative to the civil service and appointments thereunder—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. FLETCHER (by request): A bill (H. R. 4923) to provide for the restatement, readjustment, settlement, and payment of dues to Army officers in certain cases—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 4924) to authorize the readjustment of the accounts of certain Army officers—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 93) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIXEY: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 94) asking for estimates for the improvement of the Potomac River for a ferry from the foot of King street, in Alexandria, Va., to the Maryland or District of Columbia shore—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 95) asking for estimates for the improvement of Great Hunting Creek, Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A resolution (H. Res. 64) authorizing the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary to appoint an assistant clerk for said committee—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A resolution (H. Res. 65) providing that all contested-election case hearings be printed in long primer type, etc.—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BROWN: A resolution (H. Res. 66) to employ messengers for House Postmaster—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 4925) to correct the military record of Francis D. Morrison—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 4926) for the relief of Adolph Kausgen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKETT: A bill (H. R. 4927) granting a pension to Amos E. Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4928) granting a pension to Samuel H. Dunkelberger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 4929) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Logan, of Leavenworth, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 4930) for the relief of G. W. Clark & Son, a firm composed of G. W. Clark and J. H. Clark, of Spalding County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4931) for the relief of Mary A. Redding and Lucy A. Gibson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4932) to grant a pension to Ovid G. Sparks—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4933) for the relief of I. T. Thrash, of Spalding County, Ga.—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4934) for the relief of William T. Trammell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4935) for the relief of Alice Baldy and the children of W. H. Baldy, deceased—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 4936) granting a pension to Frances M. Schaffer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAWFORD: A bill (H. R. 4937) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Jane L. Fagg, widow of Col. John A. Fagg—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4938) for the relief of Enoch Voyles—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4939) for the relief of Adolphus Ervin Wells—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 4940) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Elias B. Bell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRUMP: A bill (H. R. 4941) for the relief of Jeremiah Preston, who served in Company H, Seventh Regiment Michigan Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 4942) granting a pension to Lydia A. Stockwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4943) for the relief of Nahum C. Baker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4944) for the relief of Ezekiel Skinner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 4945) granting a pension to Catharine O'Donnell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4946) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of James McGowan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 4947) for the relief of the legal representatives of Wiley Line, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HENRY of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 4948) for the relief of the estate of William M. Bowles, deceased, late of Mississippi—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4949) for the relief of the estate of W. W. Dunton, deceased, late of Hinds County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4950) for the relief of A. J. and Martha S. Ward, of Hinds County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 4951) for the relief of R. A. Bickers, of Page County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4952) for the relief of Henry Doll, of Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 4953) granting an increase of pension to John F. Riegel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4954) to establish a record of service of Charles J. Werner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4955) granting an increase of pension to C. W. Fuller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACK: A bill (H. R. 4956) to correct the military record of George H. Warren, of Smicksburg, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOY: A bill (H. R. 4957) for the relief of Richard C. Silence—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 4958) for the relief of Michael H. Farrell—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4959) granting a pension to F. C. Plunkett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 4960) granting a pension to Sitha J. Sholly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4961) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Gangloff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOVERING: A bill (H. R. 4962) granting a pension to James E. Bates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4963) granting an increase of pension to Capt. Charles E. Churchill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4964) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Timothy Reed—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4965) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Sanford K. Knox—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 4966) granting a pension to Edward L. Ruby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4967) for the relief of William H. H. Center—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LANDIS: A bill (H. R. 4968) to correct the military record of Archibald Chittick—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4969) to correct the military record of John Cambridge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4970) granting a pension to James M. Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4971) for the relief of Capt. Robert E. Bryant—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4972) granting a pension to Randolph F. Williamson, of Darlington, Montgomery County, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4973) granting a pension to John E. Kirkham—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4974) granting a pension to Merrick J. Buck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4975) granting a pension to Robert B. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4976) for the relief of Joseph H. Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4977) for the relief of William J. Kline—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4978) to grant a pension to Mamie Craig Lawton—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 4979) for the relief of the estate of Samuel J. Jones, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4980) for the relief of Willis Benefield—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4981) granting an increase of pension to Barton P. Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4982) for the relief of Abraham Hawkins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McLAIN: A bill (H. R. 4983) for the relief of the Protestant Orphan Asylum at Natchez, in the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 4984) granting a pension to D. W. Marshall, of Eldorado, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4985) granting a pension to Cora I. Dexter, of Yates Center, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 4986) for the increase of pension of William P. Aylesworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4987) to correct the military record of R. C. Ness—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4988) for the increase of pension of A. J. Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4989) for increase of pension of Henry P. Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 4990) for the relief of Thomas Caldwell, of Bradley County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 4991) granting a pension to Maria V. Sperry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OTEY: A bill (H. R. 4992) for the relief of Mrs. Susan Buntine—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4993) for relief of heirs of E. O. Watkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 4994) for the relief of the legal representatives of Thomas Jett, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4995) to place on the pension roll the name of John E. Jefferies—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 4996) for the relief of John L. Smithmeyer and Paul J. Pelz—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 4997) to increase the pension of Rufus H. Trumbull—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4998) to correct the military record of Thomas R. Woodruff—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4999) to increase the pension of Maj. William H. Mc. Lyman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5000) to increase the pension of Jerome B. Duggins, of Kentucky—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5001) to increase the pension of Ideral Vanfleet, of Kentucky—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5002) to increase the pension of John C. Vanfleet, of Kentucky—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5003) granting a pension to James Bird, of Kentucky—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5004) granting a pension to Edward F. Gilky, of Kentucky—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5005) granting a pension to J. S. Whitlege, of Kentucky—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TATE: A bill (H. R. 5006) for relief of John D. Lowry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: A bill (H. R. 5007) granting a pension to Smith Miner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5008) granting increase of pension to Mrs. Emma M. Reeves—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VREELAND: A bill (H. R. 5009) granting a pension to George Vanslyke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: A bill (H. R. 5010) granting a pension to Egbert A. Stricksma—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5011) for the relief of Frank H. Stinchfield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5012) to increase the pension of Charles F. Curtis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATERS: A bill (H. R. 5013) to increase the pension of John H. Volckmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5014) granting a pension to Henry H. Snow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 5015) for the relief of Hi. Eastland, administrator of James J. Ritch, deceased, late of Scott County, State of Mississippi, being for supplies and stores taken by the military forces of the United States for their use during the war of the rebellion, as found by the Court of Claims of the United States under the provisions of the Bowman Act—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Papers to accompany House bill No. 4648, granting a pension to William G. McLain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Memorial of the Fredericksburg and Adjacent National Battlefields Memorial Park Association of Virginia, to establish a national battlefields memorial park at and near Fredericksburg, Va., to include the battlefields of Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville, the Wilderness, and Spottsylvania Court-House and adjacent battle grounds—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DE VRIES: Petition of W. H. Cox, of San Joaquin County, Cal., praying for reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GIBSON: Petition of Frank A. R. Scott, of Knox County, Tenn., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GROUT: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Nahum C. Baker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Henry H. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Emily Burke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of A. J. Walls—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Jacob McMillen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Willis Benefield—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to Mahala Alexander—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, statement to accompany House bill in the pension case of Solomon C. Payne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill to correct the military record of Abraham Hawkins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OTEY: Petition of the George D. Will Shoe Company and other business firms of Lynchburg, Va., for the repeal of the duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of H. C. Moderwell, secretary of the local Freight Agents' Association of Fort Wayne, Ind., asking that the city of Fort Wayne be designated as a port of entry under the amendment made to the "immediate-transportation act"—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Petition of W. R. Champion and others, of Lyme, Conn., for a constitutional amendment making polygamy a crime against the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: Paper to accompany House bill to grant a pension to Smith Miner, of Marietta, Ohio—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Emma M. Reeves—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: Papers to accompany House bill No. 2897 for the removal of the charge of desertion against Stedman W. Piper—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Petitions, etc., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah were laid on the Clerk's desk and severally referred to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case, as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT: Petitions of Rev. M. D. Spencer and 16 other citizens of Macon, Ga., and R. P. Morton and 18 others, of Milner, Ga.

By Mr. BURKETT: Petitions of H. Steckelber, George G. Wait, and others, of Lincoln, Nebr.

By Mr. BURLESON: Petition of W. H. Thatcher and 150 citizens of Smithville, Tex.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petitions of the Free Methodist Church of Evansville, C. C. Gittings and others, of Racine, William Moore and others, of Clinton, and Young People's Christian Union, of Rock Prairie, Wis.

By Mr. GIBSON: Resolutions of the Synod of Tennessee of the Presbyterian Church.

By Mr. GROUT: Petition of citizens of the Second Congressional district of Vermont.

By Mr. HOFFECKER: Resolutions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Newark, Del.

By Mr. JACK: Petitions of citizens of Apollo, Sigel, Cowansville, Black Lick Township, and others, of the Twenty-first Congressional district of Pennsylvania.

By Mr. MERCER: Petition of voters in the Second Congressional district of Nebraska.

By Mr. MILLER: Petitions of the Baptist, Second Methodist Episcopal, First Presbyterian, and First Methodist Episcopal churches, of Burlingame, Kans.; Women's Missionary societies of Emporia, Presbytery assembled at Newton, Home and Foreign Missionary Society of the Presbyterian Church, Peabody; citizens of Woodson County, and others, in the State of Kansas.

By Mr. STARK: Petitions of the First Presbyterian Church, First German Methodist Episcopal Church, Second Presbyterian Church, First Baptist Church, Trinity Lutheran Church, First Congregational Church, and La Salle Street Methodist Episcopal Church, all of Beatrice, Nebr., and 344 voters of Beatrice, Nebr.

By Mr. TAYLER of Ohio: Petitions of 19 Presbyterian churches of the Presbytery of Washington City, representing more than 7,000 communicants; resolutions of the District of Columbia Christian Endeavor Union; petitions of Mrs. Loraine Immen and others, Epworth League, of Baltimore, Md., and 19 other petitions from various parts of the country.

By Mr. VANDIVER: Petition of 67 citizens of Jackson, Mo.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: Petition of sundry citizens of Weston, Mass.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *January 3, 1900.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, December 20, 1899, when, on motion of Mr. HALE, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand approved.

FRENCH SPOLIATION CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claim relating to the ship *Columbia*, Samuel Lathrop, master; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the supplemental conclusions of fact and of law filed December 11, 1899, under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claim relating to the brig *Sally*, John Cruft, master; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

AGREEMENT WITH CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW NATIONS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of an agreement concluded by the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes, on behalf of the Government of the United States, with a commission representing the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations, on September 5, 1899, and recommending that the agreement be confirmed by appropriate legislation; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Select Committee on the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians, and ordered to be printed.

BRUNSWICK, GA., HARBOR IMPROVEMENT.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of February 7, 1899, a report of H. L. Marinden, an officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, appointed by the Secretary of War, under the provisions of the river and harbor act of 1896, on the improvement of the outer bar at Brunswick, Ga., and "the amount of work done, its cost and its value to the Government," etc., which, with the accompanying report,

will be referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

The communication is accompanied by charts. In the opinion of the Chair the charts should not be printed. If there is no objection, they will be referred to the committee without printing.

REPORT OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report from Dr. Henry S. Pritchett, Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

THE HAWAIIAN ISLANDS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting copies of dispatches from the special agent of the United States at Honolulu, inclosing reports of decisions of the supreme court of Hawaii in the cases of Peacock & Co. *vs.* The Republic of Hawaii, Lovejoy & Co. *vs.* The Republic of Hawaii, The Republic of Hawaii *vs.* Edwards, and The Hawaiian Star Newspaper's Association *vs.* Saylor; all relating to the application of the Constitution of the United States to the Hawaiian Islands.

The letter and accompanying papers will be referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico. Without objection, the decisions of the court will be printed. The reports accompanying the decisions will not be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Kansas City, Mo., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the interstate-commerce law relating to the duty of Congress to regulate and govern railway and other traffic between and through the various States; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented the petition of Ella F. Russell, State superintendent of Peace and Arbitration of the Women's Christian Temperance Union of Everton, Mo., praying for the ratification of the provisions of The Hague convention; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Dr. J. H. McLean Medicine Company, of Missouri, and a petition of the Peacock Chemical Company, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MARTIN presented the petitions of J. C. Gorsuch and 147 citizens of Norfolk, John L. White and 53 other citizens of Wakefield, W. R. Berry and 45 other citizens of Singers Glenn, J. B. Kirster and 37 other citizens of Dell, R. S. Barne and 38 other citizens of Floyd, C. P. Swain and 90 other citizens of Tangier, and of N. H. Robertson and 19 other citizens of Franktown, all in the State of Virginia, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ALLEN presented a petition of the Nebraska Dairymen's Association, of Fremont, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation taxing all oleomargarine colored in semblance to butter 10 cents per pound; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented the petition of Rev. N. H. Blackmer, of Alford, Nebr., praying for the enactment of a free-homestead law; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of members of Camp No. 17, Indian War Veterans, of Albany, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation securing to those who served in any war against the Indians on the Pacific coast between the years 1846 and 1857 such pensions as are allowed to the veterans of the Mexican war; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HARRIS presented the petition of S. Emma Rhodes and 24 other citizens of Tampa, Kans., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NELSON presented the petition of James E. Froseith, of St. Paul, Minn., praying that he be granted compensation for overtime as a letter carrier; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the affidavit of Marie J. Blaisdell, of Washington, D. C., relative to her claim for pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented the petition of Carrie E. Buck, of Coomer, N. Y., praying that she be granted a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petitions of E. O. Osterheld and 16 other citizens of Brooklyn, of the League for Social Service of New York City, and of James M. Boyd and 117 other citizens of New York City, all in the State of New York, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SEWELL presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Asbury Park, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the California Water and Forest Association, of San Francisco, Cal., praying that an appropriation be made to continue the work of irrigation investigation by the Agricultural Department and the hydrographic work of the Geological Survey; which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Santa Barbara, Cal., and a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of San Diego, Cal., remonstrating against the ratification of the so-called Jamaica treaty; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the boards of trade and sundry fruit exchanges and banks of San Jose, Cal., remonstrating against the ratification of the so-called French treaty; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of California, praying that such action be taken by Congress calling the attention of the representative of Great Britain accredited to this Government to the deep interest which the people of the United States take in the cessation of hostilities between the Government of Great Britain and the Boers, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the California Water and Forest Association, of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting sheep to enter upon the national parks and forest reserves in that State at any season of the year, and to provide proper penalty for trespassing thereon, and to promote the acquisition of reservoir sites within the national parks in that State under similar conditions now imposed by the Interior Department in locating reservoir sites within forest reserves, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a memorial of the Manufacturers and Producers' Association of California, remonstrating against requiring samples of all teas entering the port of San Francisco from foreign countries to be submitted to the tea examiner in New York; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Manufacturers and Producers' Association of California, praying that the recent order making all foreign shipments of merchandise in bond through the United States subject to inspection by United States customs officials be reconsidered; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the directors of the Sierra Deciduous Fruit Association, of Lamanda Park, Cal., praying for the construction of a canal by the Government across the Isthmus of Panama; which was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

He also presented petitions of the Board of Trade of Vallejo, of the Manufacturers and Producers' Association of San Francisco, and of the Board of Trade of San Francisco, all in the State of California, praying that the material to be used in the construction of the new dry dock at the Mare Island Navy-Yard be changed from timber to concrete and stone; which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the San Francisco Labor Union, of San Francisco, Cal., and a petition of the Labor Council and Building Trades Council of San Francisco, Cal., praying that an investigation be made by Congress into the labor troubles in Wardner, Idaho; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented the petition of William Ashmead, of Los Angeles County, Cal., praying that he be granted a pension of $24 per month; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CAFFERY presented a petition of sundry members of the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States, praying that additional quarters be provided for the Law Library of Congress; which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also presented sundry papers relative to the case of Capt. M. F. Jamar; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, to accompany the bill (S. 1668) for the relief of Mitchell F. Jamar.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of Naval Command No. 1, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that reimbursement be made to enlisted men and chief petty officers of the Navy who served in the recent war against Spain for the cost of their uniforms and equipments; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented the petition of William L. Ellsworth, of Washington, D. C., praying that he be reimbursed for loss and injury occasioned by an act of the Forty-fifth Congress, whereby Letters Patent No. 130626, granted to him August 20, 1872, for improvements in fire extinguishers was injured and interfered with to such an extent as to prevent him from disposing of his patent to parties desiring to purchase such, in which the sum of $500,000 was involved; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also presented petitions of sundry druggists of Harrisburg

and Philadelphia, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of Northumberland, Pa., and a petition of sundry citizens of Carlisle, Pa., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry railway mail clerks of Lebanon, Indiana, Media, Lockhaven, and Allentown, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the reclassification of first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. LODGE presented the petition of Thomas S. Hathaway and 9 other citizens of Massachusetts, praying for the adoption of certain reforms in regard to the banking laws; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry railway mail clerks of Northampton, Taunton, and West Medford, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of C. Herbert Webster and sundry other druggists of Lowell, Mass., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the revenue law relating to the stamp tax on medicines; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HOAR presented the petitions of James N. Keefe and sundry other railway mail clerks of Athol, George P. Crosby and sundry other railway mail clerks of Fitchburg, Clarence Rogers and sundry other railway mail clerks of Holyoke, and Frederick T. Almy and sundry other citizens of New Bedford, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the reclassification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of Rev. Owen Meredith Waller and 63 other members of the St. Luke's Protestant Episcopal Church of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent lynching; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the memorials of Nathaniel T. Allen and 33 other citizens of Massachusetts, Rev. William M. Brown and 145 other citizens of the United States, B. K. Smith and 52 other citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, Rev. Marion Murdock and 2,000 other citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, and of Mrs. Ora E. Hill and 1,800 other citizens of the United States, remonstrating against any extension of the sovereignty of the United States over the Philippine Islands in any event, and over any other foreign territory without the free consent of the people thereof; which were referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut presented the petition of George H. Spencer and sundry other citizens of Willimantic, Conn., and J. P. T. Elliott, of Middletown, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of railway mail clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I present the memorial of sundry tobacco growers of Suffield, Hartford County, Conn., in mass meeting assembled, remonstrating against the reduction of the tariff in relation to the importation of tobacco from Puerto Rico, or, later on, from the Philippine Islands. I move that the memorial be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MASON presented the petition of W. J. Boissenine and sundry other railway mail clerks of Ottawa, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the reclassification of first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Turn Verein Lincoln, of Lakeview, Ill., remonstrating against a continuance of the war in the Philippines; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

LEVI C. FAUGHT.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present the affidavits of Hon. C. C. Kerr, Dr. J. Ginger, and G. W. Nokes, relative to the pension claim of Levi C. Faught. I move that the affidavits be referred to the Committee on Pensions, to accompany the bill (S. 477) granting a pension to Levi C. Faught.

The motion was agreed to.

ARGUMENT FOR RAILWAY NATIONALIZATION.

Mr. PETTIGREW. On the 18th of December I introduced Senate bill 1770, to provide for the purchase and operation of railroads by the United States. I now wish to have an argument in favor of the passage of the bill printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. The argument was prepared by David J. Lewis, of Cumberland, Md., and I think it is the best compilation which has been made on the subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota asks to have printed as a document an argument touching the purchase of railroads by the Government. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. He asks that it be referred to the Interstate Commerce Committee. It will be so referred, if there be no objection.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, who were instructed by a resolution of the Senate of December 18, 1899, submitted by Mr. HOAR, to inquire and report in regard to claims of citizens of the United States against the Government of Spain, submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FAIRBANKS, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 301) to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Indianapolis, Ind., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS.

Mr. PLATT of New York, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. WETMORE December 13, 1899, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed and bound in cloth 2,500 copies of the Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress, 1899, 500 for the use of the Senate and 2,000 for the use of the Librarian of Congress.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1975) granting a pension to Annie D. M. Wood;

A bill (S. 1976) granting an increase of pension to Alexander P. Baugher (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1977) to increase the pension of Levi Moser; and

A bill (S. 1978) granting an increase of pension to Ellis P. Phipps.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 1979) to correct the military record of John Keys; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1980) to correct the military record of William B. Stone; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1981) for the relief of Abram G. Hoyt; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1982) for the erection of a public building at Allentown, Pa.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. RAWLINS introduced a bill (S. 1983) ratifying settlements made with clerks of the third district court of Utah Territory, and releasing them and their bondsmen from further liability; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1984) granting a pension to Rebecca Harvey; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 1985) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Foster; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. To accompany the bill I present the petition of Mrs. Elizabeth Foster, widow of Robert D. Foster, Captain Smith's company, Virginia Militia, together with the affidavits of Dr. W. M. Smith and Ellen M. J. Stone. I move that the bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1986) granting a pension to Fanny Healy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CAFFERY (by request) introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1987) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Shannon;

A bill (S. 1988) for the relief of the estate of Joseph Mensman, deceased;

A bill (S. 1989) for the relief of Mrs. Hermina Martel; and

A bill (S. 1990) for the relief of Paul Pecot, administrator of the successions of Adrien Frere and Joseph A. Frere, deceased.

Mr. McLAURIN introduced a bill (S. 1991) for the relief of Michael B. Ryan, son and administrator de bonis non of John S. Ryan, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BEVERIDGE introduced a bill (S. 1992) for the payment of Porter, Harrison & Fishback, for legal services; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MONEY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1993) for the relief of Jacob Walker, or his legal representatives;

A bill (S. 1994) for the relief of the estate of Josiah Walker, or his legal representatives; and

A bill (S. 1995) for the relief of Thomas W. Walker, or his legal representatives.

Mr. MONEY introduced a bill (S. 1996) revoking and annulling the subdivision of Pencote Heights, in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. STEWART introduced a bill (S. 1997) to provide for the repayment of unexpended moneys deposited to cover costs of surveys and of platting and office work in connection with mining claims; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. PROCTOR introduced a bill (S. 1998) to regulate the coming of Chinese persons into the United States, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HOAR. I introduce by request a bill for reference to the Committee on Military Affairs. I ask leave to say that I present this bill substantially in the nature of a petition. It is a bill drawn up by the person interested, or by some person in his behalf, setting forth the remedy which he desires; and it is a convenient method of petition.

The bill (S. 1999) to enable the President to restore Sergt. Barney McKay, United States Army, rank and status in the United States Army was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ROSS introduced a bill (S. 2000) regulating appointments to and removals from civil offices in outlying dependencies of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee to Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service.

Mr. WOLCOTT introduced a bill (S. 2001) granting a pension to John M. Essington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 2002) for the extension of Bacon street; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2003) granting a pension to Andrew J. West; which was read twice by its title, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 2004) authorizing an investigation into the economic resources and other cognate questions in the Chinese Empire and adjacent countries of eastern Asia, with special reference to the trade of the United States in such parts of the world and the possibility of its enlargement; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2005) granting a pension to Eunice Russ Ames Davis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PLATT of New York introduced a bill (S. 2006) fixing the compensation of customs inspectors at the port of New York in lieu of extra compensation for night services hereafter to be rendered in the examination of baggage, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2007) for the relief of Dr. Albert S. Ashmead; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FOSTER introduced a bill (S. 2008) granting a pension to Flavel H. Van Eaton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 2009) to authorize the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to confer certain degrees, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee to Establish the University of the United States.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

A bill (S. 2010) to amend section 11 of the act approved March 3, 1877, regulating the taxation of corporations in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 2011) to amend the act entitled "An act to better define and regulate the rights of aliens to hold and own real estate in the Territories," approved March 2, 1897;

A bill (S. 2012) to open Cathedral avenue, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 2013) authorizing and requiring the Metropolitan Railroad Company to extend its lines on old Sixteenth street; and

A bill (S. 2014) to provide for improvements in the tax departments of the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 2015) for the relief of I. Winslow Ayer; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 2016) to provide a government for the island of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico.

Mr. McCOMAS introduced a bill (S. 2017) for the relief of Herbert O. Dunn; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2018) to establish the department of commerce and industries; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 2019) reorganizing the Naval Observatory and providing for a board of visitors; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 2020) granting a pension to Sarah E. Fortier; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2021) for the restoration of annuities to the Sisseton and Wahpeton bands of Dakota or Sioux Indians, and the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota (Santee) Sioux Indians, declared forfeited by the act of February 16, 1863; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2022) to authorize Rear-Admiral William T. Sampson, United States Navy; Capt. Henry C. Taylor, United States Navy; Capt. Francis A. Cook, United States Navy; Capt. Charles D. Sigsbee, United States Navy; Capt. French E. Chadwick, United States Navy; Capt. Caspar F. Goodrich, United States Navy; Commander William W. Mead, United States Navy; Commander James H. Dayton, United States Navy; Commander Frederick M. Symonds, United States Navy; and Commander Chapman C. Todd, United States Navy, to accept orders and decorations tendered to them by the Government of Venezuela; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 2023) to define felony and misdemeanor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2024) granting a pension to Horace L. Brown;

A bill (S. 2025) granting a pension to Nelson W. Wade;

A bill (S. 2026) granting a pension to Mark Wells; and

A bill (S. 2027) granting a pension to Thomas Hannah.

Mr. NELSON (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2028) for the relief of Marie J. Blaisdell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2029) for the relief of James E. Froiseth; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2030) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota," approved January 14, 1889; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2031) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1899; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 2032) to reclassify railway postal clerks and prescribe their salaries; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2033) for the relief of Elias Breese; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 2034) providing for the repairing of and again placing in commission the United States frigate *Constitution;* which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, with an accompanying letter from the Secretary of the Navy, which was ordered to be printed.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2035) providing for the use by the United States of devices invented by its naval officers while engaged in its service and covered by letters patent; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, with an accompanying letter from the Secretary of the Navy, which was ordered to be printed.

Mr. TELLER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2036) granting an increase of pension to Jasper Pitts;

A bill (S. 2037) granting a pension to George F. Burrage; and
A bill (S. 2038) granting a pension to Mary P. Scovel (with accompanying papers).

Mr. TELLER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2039) for the relief of the estate of George M. Chilcott;
A bill (S. 2040) for the relief of James Cassidy;
A bill (S. 2041) for the relief of Strange Brooks; and
A bill (S. 2042) for the relief of Capt. James Holland.

Mr. TELLER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 2043) to correct the military record of Charles A. Wahl;
A bill (S. 2044) for the relief of Hiram C. Walker (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 2045) granting an honorable discharge to George W. Casey (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 2046) for the relief of Mrs. Arivella D. Meeker; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2047) for the relief of Edward Mitchell; which was read twice by its title, and, with an accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 2048) to amend an act defining cheese, and also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of filled cheese; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2049) to amend an act entitled "An act defining butter, also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of oleomargarine;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2050) for preventing the adulteration, misbranding, and imitation of foods, beverages, candies, drugs, and condiments in the District of Columbia and the Territories, and for regulating interstate traffic therein, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2051) granting an increase of pension to Granville R. Turner; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2052) granting a pension to Mary Stotsenberg; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2053) to remove the charge of desertion from the name of Joseph McGraw; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2054) for the relief of Nicholas Lochboehler; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MARTIN introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

A bill (S. 2055) for the promotion and retirement of P. A. Surg. John F. Bransford, of the United States Navy;
A bill (S. 2056) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Navy to contract for the purchase of a lot of land adjacent to the Gosport Navy-Yard; and
A bill (S. 2057) for the relief of Louis Weber.

Mr. MARTIN introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2058) for the relief of J. V. Davis;
A bill (S. 2059) for the relief of the estate of Maria Gibson, deceased;
A bill (S. 2060) for the relief of certain citizens of Virginia;
A bill (S. 2061) for the relief of the heirs of Catharine Crittenden, deceased;
A bill (S. 2062) for the relief of Richmond College, located at Richmond, Va.;
A bill (S. 2063) for the relief of the estate of Silas Burke;
A bill (S. 2064) for the relief of Mrs. C. N. Graves;
A bill (S. 2065) for the relief of R. T. Priddy, executor of John D. Priddy, deceased;
A bill (S. 2066) for the relief of Martha H. Shultz;
A bill (S. 2067) for the relief of the estate of William H. Harris, deceased;
A bill (S. 2068) for the relief of James D. Hankins;
A bill (S. 2069) for the relief of George W. Rosenberger;
A bill (S. 2070) for the relief of Richard H. Marshall, only heir and legatee of Louisa Summers, deceased;
A bill (S. 2071) for the relief of David Rudy; and
A bill (S. 2072) for the relief of George W. Rosenberger.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 2073) for the relief of Lucy L. Bane; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 2074) for the relief of the Mechanics' Institute of San Francisco; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2075) providing for the retirement of certain officers and men in the Light-House Department, in the Life-Saving Service, and in the Revenue-Cutter Service, to pay such retired persons certain moneys, and providing a fund for payment thereof, and for pensioning certain relatives of such officers and men; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2076) granting a pension to Charles Edwin Colton;
A bill (S. 2077) granting a pension to George W. Frasher;
A bill (S. 2078) granting a pension to Annie C. Fletcher; and
A bill (S. 2079) granting a pension to William Ashmead.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 2080) in reference to the civil service and appointment thereunder; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2081) to provide relief for employees in the civil service of the United States, or in any of its departments; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Mr. MASON introduced a bill (S. 2082) for the relief of the children of Matthew J. J. Cagle; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2083) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John B. Ackerson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2084)) to correct the military record of Samuel F. Hall; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2085) for the correction of the military record of Francis A. E. Briot; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2086) granting a pension to Emily A. Mather; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 2087) for the relief of George L. Merrill; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2088) granting a pension to John Holland; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BUTLER introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 49) to amend the Constitution of the United States, giving Congress the power to lay and collect income taxes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 50) for the relief of Charles W. Hazeltine; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. ALLEN submitted an amendment providing for the payment of $5,000 to Jennie Pelton Hayward, widow of the late Hon. Monroe L. Hayward, Senator-elect from the State of Nebraska, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CHANDLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. PERKINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1676) for the payment of certain claims; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1706) for the reference of certain claims against the Government of the United States to the Court of Claims; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

INDIAN LANDS IN MINNESOTA.

Mr. NELSON submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, directed to transmit to the Senate, at as early a day as practicable, a full copy of the report of R. H. Rosa, superintendent of logging on the Chippewa ceded lands in Minnesota, made to the Commissioner of the General Land Office and dated December 18, 1899.

NEW YORK BANK TRANSACTIONS.

Mr. ALLEN. I submit a resolution, for which I ask present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate complete and literal copies of all letters, communications, agreements, papers, and documents between the Treasury Department of the Government of the United States and the National City Bank and the Hanover National Bank, of the city of New York, or either or both of them, since the 4th day of March, A. D. 1897, in any manner respecting the deposit of public funds, bonds, and revenues of the Government of the United States with said bank or banks, and inform the Senate respecting any other relation or relations now or heretofore existing between the Government of the United States and the said bank or banks, and the amount of money, bonds, public funds, and revenues, respectively, deposited in said bank or banks by the Government of the United States, the reasons therefor, and whether said bank or banks have paid the Government of the United States any interest on said deposit or deposits, and if so, how much interest, and the length of time the money, public funds, bonds, and revenues of the Government of the United States were held on deposit by said bank or banks, and whether said money, public funds, bonds, and revenues, or any portion thereof, were loaned to other banks, corporations, or persons, giving their names and addresses, respectively, and if so, the amount and dates thereof, respectively.

And the Secretary of the Treasury is further directed to inform the Senate what compensation has been paid to said bank or banks, directly or indirectly, by the Government of the United States for the custody, handling, and disbursement of said money, public funds, bonds, and revenues of the Government of the United States, and give to the Senate all other information in any manner pertaining to said transaction or transactions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. ALDRICH. Let the resolution go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will go over, and be printed.

CAPE NOME DISTRICT, ALASKA.

Mr. PERKINS. I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent that it be considered immediately.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for information.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to submit to the Senate of the United States a report on any investigations that may have been made by the Geological Survey in the Cape Nome district of Alaska.

Mr. ALLISON. Let the resolution be read again.

The resolution was again read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not object to its consideration.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CARTER. I suggest to the Senator from California that he likewise add "any investigations made by the agents of the General Land Office." I understand that the Commissioner of the General Land Office has sent certain special agents to the Cape Nome country, and it would be quite as well to procure at the same time the information collected through that arm of the Government. I merely make the suggestion.

Mr. PERKINS. I would have no objection to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana, but I think it should come in the form of a separate resolution. This data has already been prepared by the engineers who were sent to Alaska last year under the supervision of the Geological Survey, and it can be immediately transmitted to the Senate.

Mr. CARTER. I do not object to the resolution, nor do I insist upon my suggestion of amendment.

The resolution was agreed to.

AFFAIRS IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate whether General Torres, one of the officers of the Philippine army, came to General Otis with a flag of truce on February 5, 1899, the day after the fighting commenced between our forces and those of the Filipinos, and stated to General Otis that General Aguinaldo declared that fighting had been begun accidentally and was not authorized by him, and that Aguinaldo wished to have it stopped, and that to bring about a conclusion of hostilities he proposed the establishment of a neutral zone between the two armies of a width that would be agreeable to General Otis, so that during the peace negotiations there might be no further danger of conflict between the two armies, and whether General Otis replied that fighting having once begun must go on to the grim end. Was General Otis directed by the Secretary of War to make such an answer? Did General Otis telegraph the Secretary of War on February 9, 1899, as follows: "Aguinaldo now applies for a cessation of hostilities and conference. Have declined to answer." And did General Otis afterwards reply? Was he directed by the Secretary of War to reply; and what answer, if any, did he or the Secretary of War make to the application to cease fighting?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CHANDLER. I object.

Mr. LODGE. Let it go over.

Mr. HAWLEY. Let that resolution go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will go over under the rule.

Mr. SEWELL. Would it not be better to have the resolution referred to the Committee on Military Affairs? I make that motion, if the Senator from Connecticut will consent.

Mr. HAWLEY. I did not hear the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. SEWELL. I move to refer the resolution to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HAWLEY. Well, I agree to that course. Let it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that it may go over until to-morrow, so that we can have an opportunity to see it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution goes over under the rule.

REPORT ON AFFAIRS IN CUBA.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 7,000 copies of so much of the civil report of Maj. Gen. John R. Brooke, military governor of the island of Cuba, made to the Adjutant-General of the United States Army, with accompanying papers and documents, as is in the English language, together with a prepared index; of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 4,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 1,000 copies for the use of the War Department.

PRINTING FOR COMMITTEE ON RELATIONS WITH CUBA.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on Relations with Cuba be, and is hereby, authorized to have printed such papers and documents as may be ordered by the committee and necessary for the business of said committee during the Fifty-sixth Congress.

MELISSA DOOLEY.

Mr. COCKRELL. The bill (S. 490) granting a pension to Melissa Dooley is now pending before the Committee on Pensions. I move that the Committee on Pensions be discharged from its further consideration, so that the bill may be brought before the Senate and indefinitely postponed, because the beneficiary has died and no right accrues to her heirs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. I now move that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE VICE-PRESIDENT.

Mr. SEWELL. I desire to announce that, with the permission of the Senate, I shall call up on Wednesday, the 10th instant, immediately after the morning business, the resolutions offered by me December 4, 1899, in relation to the death of the Vice-President of the United States.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Committee on Finance propose to modify, with the consent of the Senate, the substitute reported from that committee on the 19th of December, 1899, for the bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes. In order that the proposed amendments may be printed for the information of the Senate, I now offer them and ask that they may be printed separately, and that the substitute be printed as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island, from the Committee on Finance, reports certain amendments to House bill No. 1, and asks that the same may be printed separately, and that the amendment in the nature of a substitute hitherto reported may be printed with the amendments now reported.

Mr. ALDRICH. That the substitute heretofore reported may be printed as now modified.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As modified. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ALDRICH. I wish to say further that, in accordance with previous notice, I shall call up the bill to-morrow at 2 o'clock.

Mr. STEWART. Call up the House bill?

Mr. ALDRICH. Call up the House bill with the substitute. I heretofore gave notice that I would call it up at 2 o'clock to-morrow. At that time I shall, for the committee, make an explanation of the provisions of the bill.

Senators about me suggest that the bill might be called up to-morrow immediately after the morning business. I have no preference about it, but, in accordance with that request, I give notice that I shall call up the bill immediately after the routine morning business to-morrow, if there be no objection.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I shall object to that, for one.

Mr. COCKRELL. And I, for two.

Mr. ALDRICH. Very well. Then I withdraw the suggestion.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I should like to be allowed to observe that if there is to be an absolute suppression of all the information desired by members of the Senate in regard to the important duties we have growing out of our new relations it is well to

understand it. A Senator this morning introduced a resolution inquiring of the War Department as to the facts in regard to the outbreak of hostilities in the Philippines, how it came about, and how that terrible and deplorable condition of things which has been going on there for the last six months was begun. It has been the universal custom of the Senate from the beginning, so far as I know, to grant to any one Senator information of that kind—there being no possible harm to the public service—if he desired it for his guidance in the discharge of his public duties, and yet four Senators jumped to their feet at once to object to that simple inquiry. If that is to be done, and if the United States Senate is to be abolished, I want, for one, to understand it.

Mr. CHANDLER. What question is before the Senate, Mr. President? If there is any, I desire to speak to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Calendar under Rule VIII is before the Senate.

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope the Senator from Massachusetts did not understand that I was trying to suppress him or any other Senator, or that I was trying to interfere with that Senator's judgment as to what measures should have preference before the Senate, either now or at any other time. I certainly withdraw the suggestion I made to take up the financial bill in the morning hour to-morrow, and ask that it be taken up at 2 o'clock.

Mr. HOAR. I understood the Senator's suggestion to be to take the bill up after the routine morning business to-morrow, which seemed to be a proposition to cut off from consideration the resolution of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW].

Mr. ALDRICH. I said if there was no objection to that course I would make that request.

Mr. CHANDLER. Does not "routine morning business" include resolutions coming over from a previous day?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It does.

Mr. HOAR. Never.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator chooses to differ with the President of the Senate; but no matter. The only thing that took place was an objection under the rule to a resolution offered this morning for which immediate consideration was asked. Objection was made, which took it over to the next legislative day; and I object to being criticised for making that objection.

Mr. HAWLEY. I object to one word in the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR]. All I asked was that that resolution should lie over. My colleague on the Committee on Military Affairs [Mr. SEWELL] suggested that it be referred to a committee. The final result is that the resolution simply lies upon the table until to-morrow.

My friend from Massachusetts used the word "suppression." There has been nothing done but simply an ordinary protest. I could not distinctly understand the bearing of the resolution offered by the Senator from South Dakota as it was read at the desk in the usual way, and we want to have time to read it in print before we take it up for action.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I do not understand when a Senator makes a respectful request for information to instruct him in the discharge of his public duties that it is the ordinary usage of the Senate to object to it. I understand the custom to be otherwise.

Mr. HALE. If an era of peace is restored I will offer a resolution as morning business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Concurrent and other resolutions are in order.

STENOGRAPHER TO COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. HALE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs is hereby authorized to employ a stenographer in hearings before such committee, the expense of the same to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

OCEAN MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. MASON submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads:

Resolved, That the Postmaster-General be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate of the rate of compensation paid for ocean mail service, said service being performed by first-class ship, and, further, whether the said service is paid by statute mile or nautical mile.

PENSION BILLS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Calendar under Rule VIII is now in order. The Secretary will state the first bill on the Calendar.

The bill (S. 1477) in amendment of sections 2 and 3 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890, was announced as first in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] has requested that pension bills may be passed over this morning, as he is necessarily detained from the Senate and desires to submit some amendments to them. Without objection, such bills will be passed over.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. ALLISON. There seems to be no pressing bill on the Calendar, and therefore I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After fifteen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 4, 1900, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 3, 1900.

CONSULS.

George L. Darte, of Pennsylvania, now consul at Martinique, to be consul of the United States at Patras, Greece, vice Alonzo C. Yates, nominated to be consul at Martinique.

Thomas J. Prentis, of Massachusetts, to be consul of the United States at Rouen, France, vice Horatio R. Bigelow, resigned.

Alonzo C. Yates, of Virginia, now consul at Patras, to be consul of the United States at Martinique, West Indies, vice George L. Darte, nominated to be consul at Patras.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

James E. Hewey, of Maine, to be appraiser of merchandise in the district of Portland and Falmouth, in the State of Maine, to succeed Charles M. Moses, appointed collector of customs for that district.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Edward H. Banks, of Maine, to be collector of customs for the district of York, in the State of Maine, to correct error in the name of Mr. Banks, who was nominated and confirmed by the Senate December 19, 1899, as Edward Banks.

JUSTICE OF THE PEACE.

Thomas H. Callan, of the District of Columbia, to be justice of the peace in and for the District of Columbia (assigned to the city of Washington), vice Edmund W. Van Dyke, resigned.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

GENERAL OFFICERS.

To be brigadier-generals.

Col. Samuel B. M. Young, Third United States Cavalry (brigadier-general, United States Volunteers), January 2, 1900, vice Kellogg, retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. Arthur MacArthur, assistant adjutant-general, United States Army (major-general, United States Volunteers), January 2, 1900, vice Carpenter, retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. William Ludlow, Corps of Engineers, United States Army (brigadier-general, United States Volunteers), January 2, 1900, vice Anderson, to be retired from active service that date under the requirements of the act of Congress approved June 30, 1882.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

INSPECTOR-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

To be inspector-general with the rank of colonel.

Lieut. Col. Peter D. Vroom, inspector-general, December 19, 1899, vice Lawton, killed in action.

With the rank of lieutenant-colonel.

Maj. Charles H. Heyl, inspector-general, December 19, 1899, vice Vroom, promoted.

INFANTRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. James M. J. Sanno, Fourth United States Infantry, to be colonel, December 18, 1899, vice Carpenter, Eighteenth United States Infantry, appointed brigadier-general.

Maj. Frank D. Baldwin, Third United States Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel, December 18, 1899, vice Sanno, Fourth United States Infantry, promoted.

Lieut. Col. Charles W. Miner, Sixth Infantry, to be colonel, vice Kellogg, Sixth Infantry, appointed brigadier-general, United States Army.

Maj. Charles L. Davis, Eleventh Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel, vice Miner, Sixth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Englebert G. Ovenshine, Sixteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, March 2, 1899, vice Cabaniss, Twenty-fourth Infantry, promoted. This officer was nominated to the Senate December 6, 1899, as Englebert B. Ovenshine and was confirmed

December 15, 1899. This message is to correct error in name of nominee.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS.

Cavalry arm.

Louis Rice Ball, of Colorado, December 1, 1899.

Infantry arm.

Corpl. Henry Wiegenstein, Company C, Twentieth United States Infantry, October 1, 1899.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS, TO DATE DECEMBER 1, 1899.

Cavalry arm.

William Lee Karnes, of Virginia.
Ashton H. Potter, of New York.

Infantry arm.

Alden Trotter, of Mississippi.
Arthur Winston Brown, of Utah.
Abraham U. Loeb, of Indiana.
Charles J. Nelson, of Alabama.
William B. Baker, of New York.
Clarence K. La Motte, of Delaware.
Frank A. Awl, of Pennsylvania.
James M. Loud, of District of Columbia.
Edmund S. Sayer, jr., of New York.
J. De Camp Hall, of District of Columbia.
Robert G. Rutherford, jr., of District of Columbia.
Edgar H. Yule, of Iowa.
Constant Cordier, of Arizona.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

GENERAL OFFICER.

To be major-general.

Brig. Gen. John C. Bates, United States Volunteers, January 2, 1900, vice Lawton, killed in action.

APPOINTMENTS, BY BREVET, IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

TO BE MAJOR-GENERAL BY BREVET, TO RANK FROM JUNE 19, 1899.

Brig. Gen. Lloyd Wheaton, United States Volunteers, for conspicuous gallantry in action against insurgent forces near Imus, Philippine Islands, June 19, 1899.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

TO BE ASSISTANT COMMISSARY OF SUBSISTENCE WITH THE RANK OF CAPTAIN.

Ralph Ingalls, of Kansas (late first lieutenant, Forty-fourth Infantry, United States Volunteers), January 2, 1900, vice Landstreet, resigned.

TO BE ASSISTANT QUARTERMASTER WITH THE RANK OF CAPTAIN.

Archibald W. Butt, of Georgia, January 2, 1900, vice Butler, discharged.

FORTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenant.

Sergt. Maj. Herbert E. Gee, Forty-eighth Infantry, United States Volunteers, December 20, 1899, vice Coleman, promoted.

FORTY-FOURTH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenant.

First Sergt. Pliny R. Strange, Company F, Forty-fourth Infantry, United States Volunteers, December 18, 1899, vice Koontz, promoted.

PROMOTIONS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

THIRTY-FIFTH INFANTRY.

To be colonel.

Lieut. Col. Edward H. Plummer, Thirty-fifth Infantry, December 16, 1899, vice Kobbé, who vacates by appointment as brigadier-general.

To be lieutenant-colonel.

Maj. Robert D. Walsh, Thirty-fifth Infantry, December 16, 1899, vice Plummer, promoted.

To be major.

Capt. William L. Geary, quartermaster, Thirty-fifth Infantry, December 16, 1899, vice Walsh, promoted.

To be captain.

First Lieut. James A. Ruggles, Thirty-fifth Infantry, December 16, 1899, vice Geary, promoted.

To be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Clark R. Elliott, Thirty-fifth Infantry, December 16, 1899, vice Ruggles, promoted.

THIRTY-SIXTH INFANTRY.

To be colonel.

Lieut. Col. William R. Grove, Thirty-sixth Infantry, December 24, 1899, vice Bell, who vacates by appointment as brigadier-general.

To be lieutenant-colonel.

Maj. William L. Luhn, Thirty-sixth Infantry, December 24, 1899, vice Grove, promoted.

To be major.

Capt. Robert S. Abernethy, Thirty-sixth Infantry, December 24, 1899, vice Luhn, promoted.

To be captain.

First Lieut. Loren E. Cheever, Thirty-sixth Infantry, December 24, 1899, vice Abernethy, promoted.

To be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. George T. Bowman, Thirty-sixth Infantry, December 24, 1899, vice Cheever, promoted.

FORTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY.

To be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. James B. Coleman, Forty-eighth Infantry, United States Volunteers, December 13, 1899, vice Brown, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 3, 1900.

CHIEF OF BUREAU OF STEAM ENGINEERING.

Capt. George W. Melville, United States Navy, to be Engineer in Chief and Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear-admiral, from the 16th day of January, 1900.

PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

P. A. Surg. Joseph J. Kinyoun, of Missouri, to be a surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Asst. Surg. Henry W. Wicks, of Missouri, to be a past assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hopsital Service of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Robert L. Wilson, of Texas, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

William A. Korn, of New Jersey, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Charles W. Vogel, of Maryland, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Donald H. Currie, of Missouri, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Second Lieut. James M. Moore, of Maryland, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. William V. E. Jacobs, of Maryland, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Third Lieut. James C. Hooker, of Mississippi, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Alfred Cypreansen, of Eau Claire, Wis., to be register of the land office at Eau Claire, Wis.

MARSHAL.

George M. Buchanan, of Mississippi, to be marshal of the United States for the northern district of Mississippi.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Roland Billingham, of New Jersey, to be collector of customs for the district of Burlington, in the State of New Jersey.

POSTMASTERS.

William A. Albright, to be postmaster at Kirkwood, in the county of St. Louis and State of Missouri.

David G. Dunlap, to be postmaster at Sardis, in the county of Panola and State of Mississippi.

George W. Evans, to be postmaster at Aberdeen, in the county of Harford and State of Maryland.

William J. Watson, to be postmaster at Marianna, in the county of Jackson and State of Florida.

Oscar C. Truax, to be postmaster at Tekoa, in the county of Whitman and State of Washington.

Lewellen P. Robinson, to be postmaster at Breckenridge, in the county of Caldwell and State of Missouri.

Eugene B. Pegram, to be postmaster at Montgomery City, in the county of Montgomery and State of Missouri.

George H. Seymour, to be postmaster at Monson, in the county of Hampden and State of Massachusetts.

George L. Minott, to be postmaster at Gardner, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts.

Alexander Watt, to be postmaster at Cheney, in the county of Spokane and State of Washington.

Ernst G. Winter, to be postmaster at Jefferson Barracks, in the county of St. Louis and State of Missouri.

Edgar B. Gregory, to be postmaster at Jonesville, in the county of Hillsdale and State of Michigan.

Agnes J. Smith, to be postmaster at Stockbridge, in the county of Berkshire and State of Massachusetts.

Frederick G. Withoft, to be postmaster at Dayton, in the county of Montgomery and State of Ohio.

Harlow N. Aldrich, to be postmaster at Elmore, in the county of Ottawa and State of Ohio.

William G. Simpson, to be postmaster at High Bridge, in the county of Hunterdon and State of New Jersey.

John F. Lyons, to be postmaster at Murray, in the county of Clarke and State of Iowa.

Richard M. Boyd, to be postmaster at Sanborn, in the county of O'Brien and State of Iowa.

William R. Baker, to be postmaster at Colville, in the county of Stevens and State of Washington.

Charles T. Knight, to be postmaster at Monroe, in the county of Orange and State of New York.

W. R. Edwards, to be postmaster at Tracy, in the county of Lyon and State of Minnesota.

Matthew Richmond, to be postmaster at Armstrong, in the county of Emmet and State of Iowa.

Thomas E. Burgoyne, to be postmaster at Melrose Park, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois.

Michael J. Madden, to be postmaster at Cudahy, in the county of Milwaukee and State of Wisconsin.

Charles N. Cooper, to be postmaster at Huron, in the county of Beadle and State of South Dakota.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *January 3, 1900.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the last session was read and approved.

PRINTING FOR COMMITTEE ON THE POST-OFFICE AND POST-ROADS.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads be authorized to have printed and bound such papers and documents for use of said committee as it may deem necessary in connection with subjects considered or to be considered by said committee during the Fifty-sixth Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution just reported. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege, and base it upon a certain publication which I send to the Clerk's desk, asking that it be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A story is told of Representative JOHN W. GAINES—

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I should like to know what this is.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman states that he rises to a question of personal privilege. The matter will be read, to ascertain whether it is or not. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A story is told of Representative JOHN W. GAINES of Tennessee, which may explain the rapid somersaults made by a good many members on the Roberts case. Before the House met Mr. GAINES declared emphatically that he would vote to admit Roberts. His case could then be referred, after he was seated, to the Judiciary Committee for investigation, and if he were found ineligible he could be expelled. This, Mr. GAINES said, was the only legal course to pursue.

However, when the test came, Mr. GAINES voted against Roberts. Asked for an explanation, Mr. GAINES said:

"I still think that Roberts has the law on his side; but self-preservation is the first law of nature. My duty is to look after my own seat and let Roberts look after his."

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Speaker, I would not reply to this foul assault upon the position that I took in that matter if the New York World, the paper containing it, did not circulate amongst an intelligent people who do not know me personally. The people who send me here, and I dare say the people who know me in this House, have never accused the Representative from the Hermitage district of Tennessee of ever taking a cowardly or unpatriotic position in this House or out of it.

Mr. Speaker, I denounce the publication as wholly without foundation and absolutely false, and thank the House for this opportunity to state as much. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Concurrent resolution No. 5.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 15,000 copies of the report of the Commission for the Revision of the Criminal and Penal Laws of the United States, of which 5,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 10,000 for the use of the House of Representatives.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following joint resolution; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Joint resolution (S. R. 16) to authorize Capt. N. M. Brooks, Superintendent of Foreign Mails, Post-Office Department, to accept decorations from the Governments of Liberia and Venezuela.

SENATE RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following Senate resolutions were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

Concurrent resolution No. 5.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 15,000 copies of the report of the Commission for the Revision of the Criminal and Penal Laws of the United States, of which 5,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 10,000 for the use of the House of Representatives—

to the Committee on Printing.

Joint resolution (S. R. 16) to authorize Capt. N. M. Brooks, Superintendent of Foreign Mails, Post-Office Department, to accept decorations from the Governments of Liberia and Venezuela—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY REGARDING NATIONAL BANKS.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution and ask to have it read.

The SPEAKER. Let the resolution be read for information, and we will see whether it is privileged or not.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, directed to furnish the House of Representatives as soon as possible with the following information:

1. All letters, agreements, papers, or documents between the Treasury Department of the United States or any person connected therewith, and the National City Bank and the Hanover National Bank, of the city of New York, or any person acting for them or either of them, since the 4th day of March, 1897, relating to the depositing of public funds, bonds, or revenues in said bank or banks, or any other relations or business transactions now existing or heretofore had between the Government and the said banks or either of them.

2. The amount of public money, bonds, or revenue deposited with said banks or either of them by the Government, for what length of time, and the reasons therefor, and whether said banks or either of them have paid the Government any interest on said deposits, and if so, how much, and all other information concerning the same or in any way relating thereto.

The SPEAKER. This is in no sense a resolution of privilege, but must go to the Speaker, to be referred to the appropriate committee, under Rule XXII.

The Chair calls attention to paragraph 3 of Rule XXII. After referring in paragraph 1 to private resolutions, it says:

3. All other bills, memorials, and resolutions may in like manner be delivered, indorsed with the names of members introducing them, to the Speaker, to be by him referred—

The titles, etc., to be indorsed thereon.

Paragraph 5 of Rule XXII provides that—

All resolutions of inquiry addressed to the heads of Executive Departments shall be reported to the House within one week after presentation.

The rules are not only distinct and explicit in saying what shall be done with these resolutions of inquiry, but the practice as long and well settled must certainly be known to the gentleman from New York. The rules are so explicit also that no harm can come, as the committee is bound under the rules to report within one

week. The Chair therefore rules the matter to be not privileged, and not in order for immediate consideration.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, then I understand if the committee does not report this resolution within a week it becomes a matter of privilege?

The SPEAKER. Then it becomes a matter of privilege, as laid down by the rule.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution just read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution just read. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, that resolution ought to go to a committee, of course, in order that the committee may perfect the resolution if it needs it. I hope there will be a speedy report.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made, and the resolution will follow the course laid down by the rule.

Mr. SULZER. Does the gentleman from New York object?

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The matter will be referred as required by the rule.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BRICK, until Friday next, on account of the death of a friend.

To Mr. FITZPATRICK (on the request of Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky), indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. BABCOCK obtained leave, by unanimous consent, to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Henry Fenner, House bill 3404, Fifty-fifth Congress, first session, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting copies of dispatches from the special agent of the United States at Honolulu, inclosing reports of decision of the supreme court of Hawaii in certain cases involving the application of the Constitution of the United States to the Hawaiian Islands—to the Committee on the Territories, and ordered to be printed with all inclosures.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting the report of the annual inspection of the several branches of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Manitowoc Harbor, Wisconsin—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Green Bay Harbor, Wisconsin—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Raccoon Creek, New Jersey—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of James River, at Richmond, Va.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of deterioration of river and harbor works—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of New Rochelle Harbor and Echo Bay, New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a report of the Quartermaster-General on the claim of William Wolfe and returning to the files of the House the original papers in the case—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed, except the original papers in the case.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Supervising Architect submitting an estimate of appropriation for rental of temporary quarters for public offices at Los Angeles, Cal.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for the payment of certain fees in the General Land Office—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a favorable recommendation, the draft of a bill directing the issue of a duplicate lost check drawn by Maj. C. C. Sniffen in favor of the Fourth National Bank of New York, N. Y.—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of an agreement with a commission of the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, with a favorable recommendation, an estimate of appropriation to reimburse W. S. Cox—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the case of the ship *Columbia*, Samuel Lathrop, master, against the United States—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Woodford White against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Arrington Purify, administrator of estate of Thomas Purify, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, recommending the reimbursement of the light-station keepers of Sapelo and Wolf Island range lights, in Georgia, for losses of personal property—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey relating to repairs on the steamers *Blake* and *Patterson*—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Supervising Architect submitting an estimate of appropriation for the public building at Cheyenne, Wyo.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting estimates of appropriations for the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for carrying into effect the provisions of an act for the protection of the people of the Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting estimates of urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the Indian service—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a list of judgments from the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting an estimate of appropriation for the survey of public lands within forest reserves—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Director of the Mint relating to an appropriation for improvements at the assay office at Boise—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an additional estimate of appropriation for furnishing the new post-office building at Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting urgent estimates of deficiencies for the service of the Post-Office Department—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 5016) providing for the repair

and renovation of the substantial buildings on Fort Omaha Reservation, Omaha, Nebr., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: A bill (H. R. 5017) fixing the compensation of customs inspectors at the port of New York in lieu of extra compensation for night services hereafter to be rendered in the examination of baggage, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROSIUS: A bill (H. R. 5018) to establish the Fredericksburg and Adjacent National Battlefields Memorial Park in the State of Virginia—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GAINES: A bill (H. R. 5019) further regulating the class of matter denied admission to the mail—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5020) to exempt newspapers and paper used in printing from tariff duties and to amend the tariff laws—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5021) to provide for the payment to ex-Confederate soldiers the value of horses and other personal property taken from them in violation of the terms of surrender—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 5022) for the reclamation of arid lands, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5023) to provide for the improvement of Rough River, in Kentucky—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 5024) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Comanche, Kiowa, and Apache tribes of Indians in Oklahoma Territory, and to open their reservation for settlement—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 5025) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to improve the Missouri River at and near the city of Atchison, Kans., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 5026) to extend the privileges of section 4216 of the Revised Statutes to the yacht *Andria*—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BARHAM: A bill (H. R. 5027) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Eureka, in the State of California—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5028) to connect by telephone Humboldt Bay life-saving station with Eureka, Cal.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 5029) to put wood pulp and printing paper on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARHAM: A bill (H. R. 5030) to create an executive department of mines and mining—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 5031) to provide for the erection of a public building at Eagle Pass, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 5032) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate with certain Indian tribes in Oklahoma for the cession of the "neutral strip"—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 5033) amending section 6 of the act of March 3, 1891, entitled "An act to establish circuit courts of appeals and to define and regulate in certain cases the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5034) providing for the attendance of witnesses in matters pertaining to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 5035) to provide for the free and unlimited coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. COONEY: A bill (H. R. 5036) establishing the Wilson Creek National Military Park—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5037) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Columbia, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JOHNSTON: A bill (H. R. 5038) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Bluefield, in the State of West Virginia—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5039) to provide for appeal from order of circuit court, or a judge thereof in vacation, appointing a receiver—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5040) providing for the holding of terms of circuit and district courts of the United States at Bluefield, in the district of West Virginia—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPRAGUE (by request): A bill (H. R. 5041) for the extension of Seventeenth street to the Walbridge subdivision of Ingleside—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 5042) to provide for improvements in the tax departments of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 5043) to transfer certain old records of the city of Washington from the custody of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to that of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5044) to establish the Fredericksburg and Adjacent National Battlefields Memorial Park in the State of Virginia—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5045) to amend the charters of the Washington Gaslight Company and the Georgetown Gaslight Company, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5046) authorizing the purchase of sites for buildings for the accommodation of the Interior, Treasury, and War Departments of the United States, and for other public purposes, in connection with removing the Botanical Garden fence and improving the grounds, together with the development and encouragement of ramie fiber, silk, and flax preparation and manufacture and their production and profitable home market in the United States, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PEREA: A bill (H. R. 5047) for the relief of woolgrowers and stockmen in New Mexico—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5048) to confirm to the city of Albuquerque, in the county of Bernalillo and Territory of New Mexico, the Villa de Albuquerque land grant, and providing for the settlement of titles therein, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5049) to settle the title to real estate in the city of Santa Fe, N. Mex.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5050) to subject the Atlantic and Pacific Railroad, now the Santa Fe-Pacific Railroad, passing through New Mexico, to taxation—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 5051) to repeal the stamp tax—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENTON: A bill (H. R. 5052) for the erection of a public building at Nevada, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5053) for the erection of a public building at Carthage, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 5054) to amend section 2239 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5055) to enlarge the powers of the Department of Agriculture, prohibit the transportation by interstate commerce of game killed in violation of local laws, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BELLAMY: A bill (H. R. 5056) to authorize the Carolina Northern Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Lumber River in or near the town of Lumberton, Robeson County, N. C.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEVILLE: A bill (H. R. 5057) to provide for the purchase of a site for a public building in the city of Chadron, in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 5058) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Hutchinson, in the State of Kansas—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 5059) to provide for interest on Government deposits, distribution of same, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 5060) to abolish all laws of the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee, Creek, or Seminole nations of Indians imposing privilege taxes against noncitizens residing therein—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 5061) providing for the lease of the public grazing lands in the arid States and Territories of the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5062) to subject the mineral lands on the Indian reservations in the United States and Territories to location, operation, development, and entry, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GROSVENOR (by request): A bill (H. R. 5063) relating to lights on steam pilot vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5064) providing for the collection of fees for

furnishing certificates of title to vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5065) to extend the laws relating to commerce, navigation, and merchant seamen over the Hawaii Islands ceded to the United States—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5066) to amend section 4290 of the Revised Statutes, relating to log entry of collisions—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5067) concerning the boarding of vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURKETT (by request): A bill (H. R. 5068) to amend sections 5214, 5235, 5236 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 5069) relating to claims against the United States for indemnity by subjects or citizens of a foreign state—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5070) to provide for the punishment of violations of treaty rights of aliens—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 5071) to increase subtreasury facilities of the Northwest, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MESICK: A bill (H. R. 5072) granting pensions to the survivors of the war of 1861 and 1865 who have reached the age of 60 years and over—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 5073) to extend the laws relating to commerce, navigation, and merchant seamen over the island of Puerto Rico ceded to the United States—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5074) relating to Cuban vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MEEKISON (by request): A bill (H. R. 5075) to incorporate the National Central Railway—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM: A bill (H. R. 5076) to amend the first section of an act to change the time and places for the district and circuit courts of the northern district of Texas, approved June 11, 1896—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 5077) authorizing the adjustment of the rights of settlers on the Navajo Indian Reservation, Territory of Arizona—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) proposing to return to Mexico the cannon, flags, and banners which were captured by the United States in the conflict between this Republic and Mexico—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McRAE: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 97) declaring the purpose of the United States with respect to the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COONEY: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 98) proposing an amendment to the Constitution respecting the admission of new States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNODGRASS: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 99) proposing amendment to the Constitution in relation to the income tax—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROMWELL: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 100) providing for the submission of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing Congress to define trusts and to provide for their regulation, control, or prohibition—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HITT: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 101) authorizing the publication of an edition of A Digest of International Law—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. TAYLER of Ohio: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 9) providing for the reprinting of Senate Miscellaneous Document No. 278, second session Fifty-third Congress, 3,000 copies—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. SULZER: A resolution (H. Res. 68) requesting the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish certain information relating to national banks in the city of New York, and other matters touching deposits therein—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Colorado, favoring the return to the Republic of Mexico of captured cannon, flags, and banners—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 5078) for the relief of Margaret Eckstein, widow of Martin Eckstein, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5079) for the relief of Susan A. Brand—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BARHAM: A bill (H. R. 5080) to appropriate money to pay settlers for improvements on Round Valley Indian Reservation—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5081) for the relief of Archibald P. Marble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5082) removing the charge of desertion from the record of David P. McKewan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5083) granting a pension to C. B. Gallagher—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5084) granting a pension to Robert S. Logan—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5085) granting a pension to Patrick H. Hurley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5086) granting a pension to Nancy Hall—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5087) granting a pension to Hercules H. Price—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURKETT: A bill (H. R. 5088) granting a pension to William G. Willoughby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 5089) to remove the charge of desertion against the naval record of Patrick O'Brien—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5090) for the relief of John Corwine—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 5091) for the relief of the legal representatives of John Roach, deceased, of the Etna Works—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COONEY: A bill (H. R. 5092) granting a pension to John H. Jenkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5093) granting a pension to Calvin Duckworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5094) to pension William L. Kithcart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5095) to pension Mary Brady—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5096) to pension Elizabeth Grissam—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5097) to pension James M. Jacks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5098) to pension Thomas A. Butler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5099) to pension Alexander H. Paisley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5100) to pension William C. Best—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5101) to pension Mary A. Gurley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5102) to correct the service record of Henry Huff—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5103) for the relief of James T. Anderson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5104) for the relief of T. S. Sneed—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CAPRON: A bill (H. R. 5105) granting a pension to Louisa Stafford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 5106) for the relief of Anna Pratt, dependent mother of William T. Pratt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENNY: A bill (H. R. 5107) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Anton Ernst—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5108) for the relief of Herbert O. Dunn—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5109) to remove the charge of desertion against John Brady, of United States steamship *Savannah*, and to grant to him an honorable discharge from the Navy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 5110) to increase the pension of Edward T. Kennedy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5111) to increase the pension of James T. Quick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5112) for the relief of George W. Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5113) to increase the pension of Thomas M. Owens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 5114) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against Lieut. A. F. Washburn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5115) for the relief of John J. Hughes—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5116) granting pension to Mary Dozha—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5117) for the relief of Roland Burnett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5118) authorizing the Secretary of War to

grant an honorable discharge to Lyman N. Mansfield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GORDON: A bill (H. R. 5119) for the relief of John Howell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 5120) granting a pension to John S. Coggeshall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5121) granting an increase of pension to Frank W. Paige—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAINES: A bill (H. R. 5122) for the relief of Tusculum Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5123) for the allowance of the claim of Watson J. Wade, administrator, and so forth, for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 5124) to correct the military record of James A. Staubus—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5125) granting a pension to Elizabeth Murray and Clara E. Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5126) granting an increase of pension to James J. McMains—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5127) granting a pension to John Lafollett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5128) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Benner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GORDON: A bill (H. R. 5129) for the relief of John A. Emison—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 5130) to remove the charge of desertion from John Dickson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5131) granting an increase of pension to Theodore Byard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 5132) to authorize Rear-Admiral William T. Sampson, Capt. Henry C. Taylor, Capt. Francis A. Cook, Capt. Charles D. Sigsbee, Capt. French E. Chadwick, Capt. Caspar F. Goodrich, Commander William W. Mead, Commander James H. Dayton, Commander Frederick M. Symonds, and Commander Chapman C. Todd, United States Navy, to accept testimonials from the Government of Venezuela—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5133) to authorize C. R. Dobbins, keeper of the Moose Peak (Maine) light station, to accept a gold watch from the government of the Dominion of Canada—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5134) granting an increase of pension to J. F. Allison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 5135) for the relief of the estate of Samuel R. Atwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5136) for the relief of the trustees of the Round Hill Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 5137) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain lot in the District of Columbia to John H. Gause and others—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5138) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Samuel Johns and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5139) for the relief of Joseph Bacigaluppi—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5140) to confirm title to lot 1, square 1113, in Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JACK: A bill (H. R. 5141) for the relief of Esther K. Marshall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5142) granting a pension to Mrs. Sarah J. Stewart—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5143) for the relief of John Mervine—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5144) to correct the military record of David Wurtz—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5145) to increase the pension of Mrs. Sybilla R. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5146) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of W. B. Wesner, of Parkers Landing, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5147) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John A. White and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5148) for the relief of William B. Sutter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5149) granting an increase of pension to Nelson M. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5150) granting a pension to William Love—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5151) for the relief of Jane Daugherty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 5152) granting a pension to Ethel M. Clough, helpless child of the late Marshall Clough—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5153) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Aldrich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5154) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against Peter Holden, alias Peter Holt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5155) to increase the pension of James Noonan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 5156) granting an increase of pension to Frances C. Kirby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LESTER: A bill (H. R. 5157) for the relief of the Propeller Towboat Company, of Savannah—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5158) for the relief of Mrs. Mary E. Morrison, of Savannah—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 5159) granting an increase of pension to Henry Prosser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5160) for the relief of L. W. Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5161) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Nossaman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5162) granting a pension to Joshua Dye—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5163) granting an increase of pension to Oscar Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5164) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Deffenbaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5165) granting an increase of pension to Justin M. Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5166) for the relief of James McManemin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5167) granting a pension to Vinton Myrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 5168) to correct the military record of Capt. Hermon von Werthern—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: A bill (H. R. 5169) granting an increase of pension to Charles Weed—to the Committe on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 5170) granting a pension to Cyrus Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5171) to increase the pension of William R. Wallace—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5172) to increase the pension of Gillman Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5173) granting a pension to Effie Sullivan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 5174) for the relief of the Boston Molasses Company—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 5175) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Addie Burns—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5176) granting a pension to Annie Beach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5177) for the relief of James Price—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5178) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James H. Harle, of Memphis, Mo.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANHAM: A bill (H. R. 5179) for the relief of the estate of David C. Haynes, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5180) to increase the pension of Thomas Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5181) to increase the pension of John M. Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LORIMER: A bill (H. R. 5182) to increase the pension of Mary S. Callan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 5183) to authorize the Secretary of War to remove the charge of desertion as to Warren W. Wilkinson, late of Company A, Second United States Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5184) to compensate E. C. Sturges for property lost during the Spanish-American war—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 5185) for the increase of pension of John Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5186) for the increase of pension of Zadok C. Perkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5187) to correct the military record of Henry Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS: A bill (H. R. 5188) granting a pension to David C. Dane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEVILLE: A bill (H. R. 5189) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Boltin, of Kearney, in the State of Nebraska—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5190) granting an increase of pension to

Franklin C. Plantz, of Hay Springs, in the State of Nebraska—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 5191) to correct the military record of John H. Moody—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5192) granting a pension to Mrs. Louise Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5193) to increase the pension of George C. Dean—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5194) to remove charge of desertion against the military record of Peleg T. Griffith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5195) to increase the pension of Jacob W. Kouts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OTEY: A bill (H. R. 5196) for the relief of Claude A. Swanson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PEREA: A bill (H. R. 5197) for the relief of W. A. Walker, of Albuquerque, N. Mex.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 5198) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Stafford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5199) granting an increase of pension to Giles W. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5200) granting a pension to Phebe Anna Crosby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5201) for the relief of Elmer Stickle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5202) for the relief of Sidney Offord—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5203) granting a pension to Vilatie J. Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 5204) for the relief of Mrs. Annie J. Bassett—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5205) to give the Court of Claims of the United States jurisdiction of the claims of the Alexandria and Washington Railroad Company and others against the United States for compensation for the use and occupation of the railroad of said company by the United States or the military authorities thereof—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5206) to grant a pension to Mamie Craig Lawton—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 5207) granting a pension to Lydia L. Gates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5208) granting a pension to Mary E. Dickey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5209) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Greeley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5210) for the relief of Daniel B. Roberts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5211) granting a pension to Lizzie M. Dixon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 5212) for the relief of Mary M. and William J., children of the late William V. Horsfall, first lieutenant and quartermaster, Eighteenth Regiment New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5213) to remove the charge of desertion now existing on the records of the War Department against George Bacon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5214) to remove the charge of desertion now existing on the records of the War Department against Jacob Dengel, alias John Dengel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5215) to remove the charge of desertion now existing on the records of the War Department against John Fitzpatrick—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5216) granting a pension to Lydia Ann Huskin Cole—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5217) for the relief of Alexander Stoddart, of New York—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 5218) to grant a pension to Levin P. Causey, United States Navy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 5219) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Luther Sargent, of Eagle Pass, Tex., for cattle taken by the Comanche Indians—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 5220) for the relief of Charles M. Kennerly—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SNODGRASS (by request): A bill (H. R. 5221) for relief of Capt. David Beaty's officers and men in war between the States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5222) for relief of Armanda Wright, widow of Mitchell Wright, late a private soldier, Company C, Seventh Regiment Tennessee Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5223) for the relief of David Young, of Wilson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5224) for relief of Daniel Smith, of Fentress County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5225) for relief of the heirs of J. C. Buntin, deceased, of Tennessee—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 5226) to increase the pension of John W. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5227) granting a pension to Sarah Springer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5228) granting a pension to Therina C. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5229) granting a pension to Sarah Potter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5230) granting an increase of pension to Daniel S. Mevis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5231) granting an increase of pension to Abel B. Macy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5232) granting a pension to Harvey D. Lindley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5233) granting an increase of pension to Andrew F. Dinsmore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5234) to correct the military record of Lewis F. Morgan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5235) to correct the military record of Frank Martin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5236) to correct the military record of Franklin E. Roberts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5237) to correct the military record of Shibley Shepherd—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5238) to correct the military record of Charles E. Potter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 5239) granting an increase of pension to William D. Tanner—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5240) granting a pension to Enmor R. Gregg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5241) for the relief of Newton Power—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5242) granting a pension to Lewis Sluthower—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5243) granting an increase of pension to John M. Ebrite—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5244) for the relief of Augustus M. Dickson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5245) granting a pension to William E. Matthews—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5246) granting a pension to Madison M. Burnett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5247) for the relief of Dennis Sexton—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5248) granting a pension to Allen Popham, of Kentucky—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5249) granting a pension to Margaret A. Osborne, of Kentucky—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5250) for the relief of Fannie Crump, of Kentucky—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5251) to correct the military record of Franklin Nix and grant him a discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5252) for the relief of Charles H. Adams—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5253) for the relief of J. S. Neal—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5254) granting a pension to Elizabeth Morris, of Kentucky—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5255) for the relief of G. W. Ebert—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5256) to correct the military record of Alexander Nugent and grant him a discharge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5257) to increase the pension of Stephen L. Richardson, of Kentucky—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5258) granting a pension to Thomas J. Sparkman, of Kentucky—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATERS: A bill (H. R. 5259) granting a pension to Edwin R. Tingley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5260) to increase the pension of Albert E. Meigs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5261) to remove charge of desertion against James Dorsey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5262) to correct the military record of Peter L. Moore—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5263) for the relief of William Ashmead—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOY: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 102) to provide for payment to the legal representatives of James B. Eads of $500,000

retained by the United States until twenty years' maintenance of channel in South Pass, and so forth—to the Committee on Appropriations.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Resolutions of the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., relative to the laying of competing cable lines to Cuba—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, appeal of the National Live Stock Exchange of Chicago, Ill., protesting against House bill No. 6, an act defining butter, etc.—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of the municipal assembly, borough of Manhattan, New York, in favor of a new post-office building in New York City—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ADAMS: Petition of W. R. Warner & Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., relating to the stamp tax on medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring a competing submarine cable line between Cuba and the United States—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BULL: Papers to accompany House bill to correct the military record of James P. Manton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, affidavits of John Vars, J. P. Sanborn, and T. M. Seabury, to accompany House bill No. 232, granting a pension to John Vars—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKETT: Petition of Fred A. Casey and others, of Nebraska City, Nebr., for the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the reclassification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of the Nebraska Beet Sugar Association, in behalf of the beet-sugar industry of the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON: Petition of Holland-American citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, on behalf of Boers in South Africa—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of the legal representatives of John Roach, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petitions of A. C. Bishop and others, of Phœnixville, and J. P. Leedom and others, of Media, Pa., for the reclassification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CANNON: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Anna Pratt, dependent mother of William T. Pratt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Resolutions of the municipal assembly of the city of New York, favoring the construction of a new post-office building in New York—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DE ARMOND (by request): Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of George W. Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Owens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLYNN: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Stephen Helton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Photographs to accompany House bill for an increase of pension to Theodore Byard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of F. L. Lee and others, of Galveston, Tex., together with other papers, asking for a marine hospital in Galveston—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of the National Association of Letter Carriers, Branch 245, of Rockford, Ill., for the passage of a bill for the equalization of the salaries of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, papers to accompany House bill to correct the military record of Thomas G. Dreuning—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JACK: Petition of post-office clerks at Indiana, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the reclassification of postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. JENKINS: Protest of M. W. Heller Post, No. 166, Grand Army of the Republic, Rice Lake, Wis., against biennial examinations of pensioners—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOY: Petition of John Blattner, of St. Louis, Mo., for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: Resolutions of the Iowa State Horticultural Society for the enactment of a law for protection against the San Jose scale, and to prevent the shipment of infested fruits and plants—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, paper to accompany House bill granting to Effie Sullivan a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers in support of House bill to increase the pension of Samuel Moffatt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Cyrus Johnson, late of Company H, One hundred and fifty-fourth Ohio Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers in behalf of J. L. Hubbell and others, settlers in the Navajo Reservation—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONG: Petition of Ira E. Rohlfing and 36 others of Chase, Kans., for the anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOVERING: Petition of Horace D. Prentiss and other post-office clerks in Holyoke, Mass., favoring the passage of the bill to equalize the salary of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MANN: Papers to accompany House bill to compensate E. C. Sturges for property lost during the Spanish-American war—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill relative to the removal of the charge of desertion from the military record of Warren W. Wilkinson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MERCER: Resolution of the Nebraska Beet Sugar Association, in regard to the importation of foreign sugar, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAY of New York: Petition of Joseph H. Leach and other citizens of Norwich, N. Y., for the reclassification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of the Board of Trade of Binghamton, N. Y., asking for the establishment of a parcels-post system—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, affidavits in relation to the application of Susan M. Button for widow's pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the widow of Capt. William M. Crosby for pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the removal of the charge of desertion against Sidney Offord—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill to remove the charge of desertion against Elmer Stickle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Margaret A. Osborn, widow of Charles E. Osborn—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to Allen Popham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to Fannie Crump—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNODGRASS: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of the heirs of J. C. Buntin, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Daniel Smith for a pension for the loss of an eye—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOMPKINS (by request): Petition of Theo. Merritt's Sons and other business firms of Newburgh, N. Y., relating to the stamp tax on medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Petitions, etc., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah were laid on the Clerk's desk, and severally referred to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case, as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Christian Endeavor Society of Boulder, Colo.; also petition of Timothy Bryant and others, of Chateaugay, N. Y.; also petition of Miss Hilmer Helmer and others, of Chicago, Ill.; also petition of Lillian J. Duncan, of Salt Lake City, Utah; also petition of Michael Fahey, of South Bound Brook, N. J.; also resolution adopted at a mass meeting of the Woman's National Organization of New York City, N. Y.; also protest of Peter G. Polk, of Cincinnati, Ohio.

By Mr. BELL: Petition of C. E. Webb and other citizens of the State of Colorado; also petition of citizens of Canon City, Colo.

By Mr. CAPRON: Petitions of C. H. Smith and others, of Phenix, R. I., and James T. Andrews and others, of Stillwater, R. I., and vicinity.

By Mr. DAVIS: Petition of the Florida Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church South.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of A. W. Stark and 2 others, of Freeport, Ill.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Petitions of Mrs. M. G. Holmes and 240 citizens of Rondout, N. Y., and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

By Mr. NEVILLE: Petitions of R. A. Ball and others, of Atkinson, Nebr., and H. M. Triplett and others, of Ainsworth, Nebr.

By Mr. SPRAGUE: Petition of the League of Social Union, of Massachusetts.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *January 4, 1900.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SEWELL presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Camden, N. J., and a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Passaic, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Scranton, Pa., and a petition of the Board of Trade of Harrisburg, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase American shipping; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Beaverfalls, Philipsburg, and Tyrone, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Reading, Pa., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Kittanning and Neal, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ALLISON presented the petitions of F. B. Quinlan and 249 other citizens of Greene County, A. D. Lawrence and 96 other citizens of Maquoketa, D. M. Howe and 82 other citizens of Marble Rock, W. G. Power and 101 other citizens of Mount Vernon, G. W. Logan and 20 other citizens of Elwood, J. H. Douglass and 21 other citizens of Raymond, T. H. Sheckler and 21 other citizens of Nora Springs, W. F. Giddings and 30 other citizens of Jones County, A. B. Curran and 30 other citizens of Quasqueton, and of F. H. Linn and 266 other citizens of Lime Springs, all in the State of Iowa, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of Edward S. Wilson and 25 other citizens of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation increasing the circulation of national-bank notes; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ELKINS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Newburg, Fairview, New Cumberland, Lockhart, West Union, Greenwood, Middlebourne, Bruceton Mill, Ophelia, Snow Hill, Evansville, South Parkersburg, Wellsburg, Elk Knob, Judson, Petroleum, Albion, Zela, Kenova, Cranesville, Hazleton, Terra Alta, Harrisville, Pullman, Baden, Sistersville, Huntington, Reid, Coxs Landing, Elmwood, Waterloo, Pennsboro, Fairmont, Verandor, Southside, and French Creek, all in the State of West Virginia, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MARTIN presented a petition of the legislature of Virginia, praying for the establishment of a national battlefields memorial park at or near Fredericksburg, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MCBRIDE presented a petition of the Kathlamet band of Chinook Indians, of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation referring their claim to the Court of Claims to hear and determine their rights and those of the United States and to render a judgment with the right of appeal, as in other cases; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. SPOONER presented a memorial of M. W. Heller Post, No. 166, Grand Army of the Republic, of Rice Lake, Wis., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the pension law providing for biennial examinations; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Portage, Wis., and a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Watertown, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of A. A. Pardee and 12 other druggists of Madison, Wis., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PROCTOR presented sundry petitions of citizens of Woodstock, Pomfret, Springfield, Shoreham, Morrisville, and Enosburg, all in the State of Vermont, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ROSS presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Brattleboro, Vt., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. THURSTON presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Kearney, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Fredericksburg and Adjacent National Battlefields Park Association of Virginia, praying for the establishment of a national battlefields memorial park at or near Fredericksburg, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present a petition signed by three persons of Chillicothe, Mo., praying for the passage of House bill 4351, for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices in the United States. It is a stereotyped petition in printed form. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present a resolution in regard to combinations and trusts, which was prepared by Mr. Charles Parsons, president of the State Bank of St. Louis, and one of the most eminent, patriotic, and philanthropic citizens of the State of Missouri. I move that the resolution be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PRITCHARD. I present a petition of the Appalachian National Park Association, praying for the establishment of a national park at some place in the southern Appalachian region. I move that the petition be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FRYE presented a memorial of the Hatters' Fur Industry of New York City, remonstrating against the ratification of the reciprocity treaty with France; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 421) for the relief of Napoleon B. Giddings;

A bill (S. 422) for the relief of George A. Orr;

A bill (S. 423) for the relief of Joseph W. Carmack;

A bill (S. 424) for the relief of John S. Neet, jr.;

A bill (S. 425) for the relief of John M. Davis;

A bill (S. 426) for the relief of Ezra S. Havens;

A bill (S. 427) for the relief of A. F. Fleet, superintendent of the Missouri Military Academy, Mexico, Mo.;

A bill (S. 428) for the relief of Laura S. Gillingwaters, widow of J. E. Gillingwaters;

A bill (S. 432) for the relief of James W. Howell, late of Company H, Fifty-fourth Regiment Illinois Infantry Volunteers;

A bill (S. 433) for the relief of Richard C. Silence;

A bill (S. 436) to correct the military record of Perry J. Knoles;

A bill (S. 437) for the relief of Isaac McConnaughay, private, Company H, Fortieth Iowa Infantry Volunteers;

A bill (S. 438) for the correction of the military record of James M. Crabtree; and

A bill (S. 439) for the correction of the military record of John R. Leonard.

Mr. MCBRIDE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 359) to extend the privilege of immediate transportation of dutiable goods to the port of Astoria, Oreg., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MCMILLAN, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom the subject was referred, submitted a report, accompanied by a joint resolution (S. R. 51) recognizing the gallantry of Frank H. Newcomb, commanding the revenue cutter *Hudson*, of his officers and men; also retiring Capt. Daniel B. Hodgsdon, of the Revenue-Cutter Service, for efficient and meritorious services in command of the cutter *Hugh McCulloch* at Manila; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. ELKINS, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 730) to extend the laws relating to commerce, navigation, and merchant seamen over the island of Puerto Rico ceded to the United States, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 729) to extend the laws relating to commerce, navigation, and merchant seamen over the Hawaiian Islands ceded to the United States, reported it without amendment.

Mr. ELKINS. I wish to state that these reports were made

after conference with members of the Committee on Relations with Cuba and the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. TURNER, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 24) recognizing the able and gallant services of Capt. Francis Tuttle, Revenue-Cutter Service, his officers and men of the *Bear;* also the heroic services of Lieuts. David H. Jarvis, Ellsworth P. Bertholf, and Dr. Samuel J. Call, composing the overland expedition to Point Barrow, Arctic Ocean, for the relief of imperiled whalers, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CULLOM. I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the bill (S. 222) to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii, to report it with amendments.

I desire to give notice that at the very first opportunity I can get I wish to call up the bill for consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. MASON, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 733) concerning the boarding of vessels, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HAWLEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 6) for the relief of James H. Latham, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

REGENT OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

Mr. WETMORE, from the Committee on the Library, to whom the subject was referred, reported a joint resolution (S. R. 52) to fill a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; which was read the first time by its title.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Let the joint resolution be read at length.

The joint resolution was read the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than members of Congress, caused by the death of William Preston Johnston, of Louisiana, shall be filled by the appointment of Richard Olney, a resident of Massachusetts.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. As there is to be a meeting soon of the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, if there is no objection I should like to have the joint resolution put on its passage, in order that the Regent appointed may be present at the annual meeting.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IMPROVEMENT OF LEMON CREEK, NEW YORK.

Mr. DEPEW, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution submitted by Mr. PLATT of New York December 20, 1899, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to submit a report of the survey and estimate for the improvement of Lemon Creek, Richmond County (Staten Island), N. Y., in the construction of a training dike at the outlet into Princess Bay, and the extension of the present dredged channel a farther distance of 1,000 feet.

INTEROCEANIC CANALS.

Mr. MORGAN. From the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, which was instructed by a resolution of the Senate, December 18, 1899, to report to the Senate the sources of information in print in regard to the Nicaragua and other interoceanic canals, I submit a statement and the literature that was called for by the resolution.

I move that the report and the memorandum be printed together and that 200 copies in addition to the usual number for the Senate be printed and bound in paper for the use of the Congressional Library. The 200 copies will not cost $20 and are therefore within the rule, so that the motion will not have to go to the Committee on Printing.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 2089) to correct the military record of Henry Dimler;

A bill (S. 2090) to correct the military record of David Sides;

A bill (S. 2091) to correct the military record of John Brinninger;

A bill (S. 2092) to correct the military record of Josiah T. Postelthwait;

A bill (S. 2093) to correct the military record of John P. Leitzel;

A bill (S. 2094) to correct the military record of Isaac A. Kase;

A bill (S. 2095) to correct the military record of Jacob Olmstead;

A bill (S. 2096) to correct the military record of William E. Russell (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 2097) directing the muster of David S. Sink as a private of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Virginia (West Virginia) Infantry Volunteers.

Mr. McMILLAN (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2098) to prevent cruelty to certain animals in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 2099) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a Court of Private Land Claims, and to provide for the settlement of private land claims in certain States and Territories;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CLAY introduced a bill (S. 2100) granting a pension to Annie E. Brumby; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ALLISON introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2101) granting an increase of pension to George E. Scott;

A bill (S. 2102) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Reed;

A bill (S. 2103) granting an increase of pension to Charles G. Lewis;

A bill (S. 2104) granting an increase of pension to William L. Aten;

A bill (S. 2105) granting a pension to Amos O. Rowley;

A bill (S. 2106) granting a pension to Mrs. Anna Stella Long;

A bill (S. 2107) granting a pension to James Brown;

A bill (S. 2108) granting an increase of pension to Robert Balsking;

A bill (S. 2109) granting an increase of pension to C. W. Fuller; and

A bill (S. 2110) to restore John R. McCoy to the pension roll.

Mr. PLATT of New York introduced a bill (S. 2111) for the relief of Ira Doane; which was read twice by its title, and, with an accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FOSTER introduced a bill (S. 2112) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to fix the salaries of the deputy collectors of customs at the subports Tacoma and Seattle, in the State of Washington, and repealing all laws inconsistent therewith; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 2113) for the relief of Samuel Tomlinson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 2114) to constitute Manchester, Conn., a port of delivery; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. ELKINS introduced a bill (S. 2115) to divide the State of West Virginia into two judicial districts; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2116) to provide for the keeping of indexes of petitions in bankruptcy, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2117) to authorize the purchase of certain lands in the district of Alaska; which was read twice by its title, and, with an accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2118) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Hinton, in the State of West Virginia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2119) for the relief of Robert W. Renick;

A bill (S. 2120) for the relief of James W. Johnstone, administrator of Samuel McClung, deceased, late of Greenbrier County, W. Va., or his legal representative;

A bill (S. 2121) for the relief of Elizabeth Muhleman, widow, and the heirs at law of Samuel A. Muhleman, deceased;

A bill (S. 2122) for the relief of William J. Knott, executor of estate of Samuel Knott, deceased;

A bill (S. 2123) for the relief of John Viands;

A bill (S. 2124) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Martinsburg, W. Va.;

A bill (S. 2125) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Webster, W. Va.

A bill (S. 2126) for the relief of the trustees of Trinity Episcopal Church, of Martinsburg, W. Va.;

A bill (S. 2127) for the relief of the trustees of Tuscarora Lodge, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Martinsburg, W. Va.;

A bill (S. 2128) for the relief of the trustees of the Baptist Church of Guyandotte, W. Va.;

A bill (S. 2129) for the relief of John P. Fox;

A bill (S. 2130) for the relief of the heirs of John W. Warwick;

A bill (S. 2131) for the relief of John Burns; and

A bill (S. 2132) for the relief of William J. White.

Mr. ELKINS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2133) granting a pension to George W. Johnson;

A bill (S. 2134) granting a pension to Isaac D. Winters;

A bill (S. 2135) granting a pension to D. B. Clark;

A bill (S. 2136) granting a pension to I. W. Allen; and

A bill (S. 2137) granting a pension to Adolphus P. Clark.

Mr. ELKINS introduced a bill (S. 2138) to prescribe the number of chaplains in the Regular and Volunteer Army and to fix their pay and allowances; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2139) to restore Maj. Stephen R. Stafford to the active list of the Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McBRIDE introduced a bill (S. 2140) for the relief of the Kathlamet band of the Chinook Indians, of the State of Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2141) granting an increase of pension to Jesse W. Rigby; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WELLINGTON introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2142) for the relief of Anna Whitney Tarbell;

A bill (S. 2143) for the relief of William A. Wroe;

A bill (S. 2144) for the relief of Mrs. Julia Barnett;

A bill (S. 2145) for the relief of Joseph Prather;

A bill (S. 2146) for the relief of Jacob Bool, administrator of the estate of Mary C. Kleindienst, deceased (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 2147) for the relief of Mrs. Celia Ford.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2148) granting a pension to Robert H. Brown;

A bill (S. 2149) granting a pension to Isaac A. Chandler;

A bill (S. 2150) granting an increase of pension to James A. Ludington; and

A bill (S. 2151) granting an increase of pension to Hugh L. English.

Mr. SPOONER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2152) granting a pension to Olive W. Lay;

A bill (S. 2153) granting an increase of pension to Jesse N. Dawley (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 2154) granting an increase of pension to William A. Owens.

Mr. SPOONER introduced a bill (S. 2155) authorizing the purchase of a site for a building for the accommodation of the Supreme Court of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. WOLCOTT introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2156) granting an increase of pension to Christian White;

A bill (S. 2157) granting an increase of pension to Robert J. Miller;

A bill (S. 2158) granting a pension to Joseph B. Presdee; and

A bill (S. 2159) granting an increase of pension to Ernst Pitschner.

Mr. WOLCOTT introduced a bill (S. 2160) to amend sections 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, and 2352 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. THURSTON introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2161) granting a pension to Eli F. Chittenden (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2162) granting a pension to Rev. Warren Cochran;

A bill (S. 2163) granting a pension to Franklin Kersting;

A bill (S. 2164) granting a pension to Silas Garber;

A bill (S. 2165) granting a pension to William H. Moody;

A bill (S. 2166) granting a pension to Charles A. D. Wiswell; and

A bill (S. 2167) granting an increase of pension to Franklin C. Plantz.

Mr. THURSTON introduced a bill (S. 2168) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George W. Witting; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2169) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joshua B. Webster; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2170) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the record of Thomas Blackburn; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2171) to establish a branch mint of the United States at Omaha, in the State of Nebraska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 2172) authorizing the appointment of Allen V. Reed, now a captain on the retired list of the Navy, as a commodore on the retired list of the Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (S. 2173) establishing the boundaries of the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, Montana, and making appropriations for purchasing improvements thereon and certain lands situated therein, for purchasing cattle, fencing the reservation, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 2174) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ellen Lauriat; which was read twice by its title, and, with an accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Commerce;

A bill (S. 2175) to restore Lieut. Samuel Howard to his proper rank (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2176) to amend an act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1899;

A bill (S. 2177) to extend the privileges of section 4216 of the Revised Statutes to the yacht *Andria* (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 2178) to restore Henry D. Hall to the Revenue-Cutter Service (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. THURSTON introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 54) donating a condemned captured cannon to the Commandery in Chief of the Sons of Veterans, United States of America; which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

POLICY REGARDING THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. BEVERIDGE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 53) defining the policy of the United States relative to the Philippine Islands; which was read the first time by its title.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Let the joint resolution be read.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask for the reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was read the second time at length, as follows:

Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Philippine Islands are territory belonging to the United States; that it is the intention of the United States to retain them as such and to establish and maintain such governmental control throughout the archipelago as the situation may demand.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I desire that the joint resolution shall lie on the table until next Tuesday, at the expiration of the morning hour, at which time I should like to submit some remarks upon it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will lie on the table.

AMENDMENT TO URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MASON submitted an amendment, proposing to appropriate $4,000 for the improvement of the Johnson School building, Mount Pleasant, D. C., intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. WELLINGTON, it was

Ordered, That the papers in the private claim of James S. Crawford (S. 2882), Fifty-fifth Congress, second session, be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made in the case.

AFFAIRS IN SAMOA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Printing:

To the Senate:

In connection with Senate Document No. 51, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, with copies of the accompaniments of the report of Hon. Bartlett Tripp, a member of the Samoan Commission on behalf of the United States of America, requested by the Senate resolution of December 15, 1899.

WILLIAM McKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *January 4, 1900.*

CONDUCT OF THE WAR WITH SPAIN.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Printing:

To the Senate of the United States:

In compliance with a resolution of the Senate of December 20, 1899, I transmit herewith a copy of the report of the commission appointed by the President to investigate the conduct of the War Department in the war with Spain, together with a copy of all the testimony taken by said commission.

WILLIAM McKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *January 4, 1900.*

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. CHANDLER. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

MRS. B. C. LOWE.

Mr. COCKRELL. I find that the bill (S. 536) to grant a pension to Mrs. B. C. Lowe has been referred to the Committee on Pensions. I move that the Committee on Pensions be discharged from the further consideration of the bill in order that it may be indefinitely postponed, as a similar bill became a law at the last session.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

GEORGE W. COTNER.

Mr. COCKRELL. I make a similar motion in regard to the bill (S. 535) for the relief of George W. Cotner, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions. I am advised that Mr. Cotner is now dead, and as no right descends to his heirs I move that the Committee on Pensions be discharged from the further consideration of the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

On motion of Mr. COCKRELL, and by unanimous consent, the vacancy upon the Committee on the Census was filled by the appointment of Mr. CULBERSON.

Mr. HOAR was, on his own motion, relieved from further service on the Select Committee to provide for the Celebration of the Centennial Anniversary of Washington, D. C.

ADMIRAL DEWEY'S REPORT.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, directed to send to the Senate a copy of Admiral Dewey's report of April 13, 1898, or about that date, in which the Admiral says he can take Manila at any time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SPOONER. Let it go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made, and the resolution goes over under the rule.

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution I send to the desk.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, did you say that the resolution I offered went over under objection?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It went over under objection.

Mr. PETTIGREW. By whom was the objection made? I did not hear any Senator address the Chair and make an objection to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator from South Dakota can hear the objection now, if he wishes to make a technical point upon the matter.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I simply wanted the record kept straight; that was all.

INDIAN TRUST FUND HELD BY SOUTH CAROLINA.

Mr. TILLMAN submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the Senate of the United States the amount that will be due the United States on June 30, 1901, by the State of South Carolina upon the coupon bonds of said State held by him as the custodian of the Indian trust fund under an act entitled "An act transferring the custody of certain Indian trust funds," and approved June 10, 1876, and what steps have been taken to have the State pay the same.

SOUTH CAROLINA STATE CLAIMS.

Mr. TILLMAN submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to examine the account between the United States and the State of South Carolina, growing out of the claim for moneys expended by said State for military purposes in the war of 1812 with Great Britain, applying upon such examination, in the computation of interest and settlement, the provisions and principles of the twelfth section of the act of March 3, 1857, entitled "An act making appropriations for certain civil expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1858," and to report to the Senate of the United States the amount, if any, that will be due the State of South Carolina on June 30, 1901, after the account has been adjusted on such basis of settlement.

STATISTICS RELATIVE TO CRIME.

Mr. HOAR (by request) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 4,500 copies of the report transmitted by the Secretary of State of the Commissioner for the United States on the International Prison Commission on "Crimes, misdemeanors, and penalties" in the United States, of which 1,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 1,500 for distribution by the Department of State.

PAYMENT OF WITNESSES.

Mr. HOAR. I submit a resolution, for which I ask immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the rule for paying witnesses summoned to appear before the Senate or any of its committees shall be as follows: For each day a witness shall attend, $3, and $3 for each day spent in traveling to or from the place of examination by the usual route. A witness shall also be entitled to be reimbursed his necessary expenses for traveling to and from the place of examination, in no case to exceed the sum of 7 cents a mile for the distance by him actually traveled for the purpose of appearing as a witness.

Mr. HOAR. That is rather an important resolution, and I would not ordinarily ask for its passage without reference to a committee, but it is quite material, in view of some investigations which are to be begun very soon, that this change should be made; and I think if I may be allowed to make a brief statement every Senator will see the propriety of it.

At present the rule allows to witnesses $3 a day while they are in attendance and 7 cents a mile each way. In point of fact, when coming from distant parts of the country it gives a great profit to the witnesses. There are many cases where a witness's whole traveling expenses would not amount to more than $75 or $100, and the witness gets $250 or $275.

I suppose the ground on which the Senate acts, as all other legislative bodies, in prescribing these rules is that the witness shall not make a profit out of the matter, but shall be paid his actual expense. The duty of traveling and appearing is a duty which, like jury duty, every citizen owes at some time, and he is not to be paid a profitable salary for it.

This proposed rule gives the witness $3 a day, which is supposed to be an ordinary and average price for board, during the whole time he is traveling and the whole time he is attending here. Then it allows (which of course would be certified by the President of the Senate if the proceeding is before the Senate or by the chairman of the committee where it is before a committee) his actual necessary traveling expenses, whatever they are, not to exceed 7 cents a mile.

I hope the resolution may be adopted without a reference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution proposes to amend a rule, an order of the Senate, does it not?

Mr. HOAR. I beg the Chair's pardon; it is a standing order. In the edition of the rules prepared by the learned occupant of the chair it appears under the caption "Standing orders of the Senate not embraced in the rules," and it has never been considered that an amendment of the standing orders has to be adopted like an amendment of the rules.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE.

Mr. MCMILLAN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $1,440 per annum during the Fifty-sixth Congress.

REPORT ON REINDEER IN ALASKA.

Mr. TELLER submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be directed to transmit to the Senate the report of Dr. Sheldon Jackson upon "The introduction of domestic reindeer into the district of Alaska" for 1899.

NEW YORK BANK TRANSACTIONS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further concurrent or other resolutions, the Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. ALLEN, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate complete and literal copies of all letters, communications, agreements, papers, and documents between the Treasury Department of the Government of the United States and the National City Bank and the Hanover National Bank, of the city of New York, or either or both of them, since the 4th day of March, A. D. 1897, in any manner respecting the deposit of public funds, bonds, and revenues of the Government of the United States with said bank or banks, and inform the Senate respecting any other relation or relations now or heretofore existing between the Government of the United States and the said bank or banks, and the amount of money, bonds, public funds, and revenues, respectively, deposited in said bank or banks by the Government of the United States, the reasons therefor, and whether said bank or banks have paid the Government of the United States any interest on said deposit or deposits, and if so, how much interest, and the length of time the money, public funds, bonds, and revenues of the Government of the United States were held on deposit by said bank or banks, and whether said money, public funds, bonds, and revenues, or any portion thereof, were loaned to other banks, corporations, or persons, giving their names and addresses, respectively, and if so, the amount and dates thereof, respectively.

And the Secretary of the Treasury is further directed to inform the Senate what compensation has been paid to said bank or banks, directly or indirectly, by the Government of the United States for the custody, handling, and disbursement of said money, public funds, bonds, and revenues of the Government of the United States, and give to the Senate all other information in any manner pertaining to said transaction or transactions.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, in deference to the suggestions of several Senators, I desire to modify the resolution by striking out the words "complete and literal," before the word "copies," in line 3; so as to read:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate copies of all letters, communications, etc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska modifies the resolution heretofore submitted by him. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

AFFAIRS IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day; which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. PETTIGREW, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate whether General Torres, one of the officers of the Philippine army, came to General Otis with a flag of truce on February 5, 1899, the day after the fighting commenced between our forces and those of the Filipinos, and stated to General Otis that General Aguinaldo declared that fighting had been begun accidentally and was not authorized by him, and that Aguinaldo wished to have it stopped, and that to bring about a conclusion of hostilities he proposed the establishment of a neutral zone between the two armies of a width that would be agreeable to General Otis, so that during the peace negotiations there might be no further danger of conflict between the two armies, and whether General Otis replied that fighting having once begun must go on to the grim end. Was General Otis directed by the Secretary of War to make such an answer? Did General Otis telegraph the Secretary of War on February 9, 1899, as follows: "Aguinaldo now applies for a cessation of hostilities and conference. Have declined to answer." And did General Otis afterwards reply? Was he directed by the Secretary of War to reply; and what answer, if any, did he or the Secretary of War make to the application to cease fighting?

Mr. PETTIGREW. One or two Senators have expressed a desire to speak upon the resolution, and, as it is to be discussed, I ask that it lie over, without prejudice, until the next meeting of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without going to the Calendar?

Mr. PETTIGREW. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota asks that the resolution may lie over until the next day's session of the Senate, retaining its place. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I ask the leave of the Senate to make a brief statement, not exactly a personal explanation, but in the nature of a personal explanation. It will take but two or three minutes, and I think it will be a matter which will probably relieve all Senators.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and the Senator will proceed.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I receive in my mail daily a good many letters—and I dare say the same is true of all members of the Senate—appealing to me with great earnestness to vote to deny a seat in the Senate to a gentleman from Pennsylvania who claims a seat by reason of an appointment made in the recess of the legislature by the governor of that State. Some of the writers of these letters are Quakers, members of the Society of Friends; others are evidently very philanthropic persons; and I am to assume that they are very good judges of character, because their letters are full of personal compliments to myself [laughter], and I dare say the same is true of the letters received by other Senators. The proposition, however, is that I must vote—and they are surprised at my having any doubt about it—to deny a seat in this body to the gentleman who claims it under an appointment on the ground of certain charges that they make against him in regard to his personal character and fitness for the office.

A good many years ago I investigated the question of the right of the governor of a State to appoint, and I suppose I have made eight or ten elaborate speeches during the last fifteen years in favor of the proposition that whenever during the recess of the legislature of a State, there was a vacant seat in the representation of that State in the Senate, the governor had the right to fill it, and I have made three or four reports in favor of that proposition.

The Senate is the body, the court, the judge of the election of Senators. I am one of the sworn judges, and what these worthy gentlemen are asking me to do is, in substance, to stuff the ballot box and make a false return in my capacity as a sworn judge of elections because they think the governor of a State ought to have appointed somebody else.

That is the attitude which these worthy gentlemen are taking, and I see that some newspapers of wide circulation in my own State and a good many in the State affected take the same view of the case. Of course the same principle would require Senators, if the legislature should elect this gentleman or some other against whom such charges can be maintained, to deny him a seat when the legislature has elected him. If the governor has no right to appoint or the legislature has no right to elect, then of course we do not admit the claimant. But if the governor have the right to appoint or the legislature have the right to elect, and we declare that they have not appointed him or have not elected him when they have, we are doing exactly what is done by ballot-box stuffers and election judges who make false returns.

I hope this little statement of mine regarding such communications—in which I am sure every member of this body without exception will concur—will answer as a reply to the great batch of letters I am getting on this subject.

PROPOSED PRINTING OF AN ADDRESS.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, I wish to have the paper which I send to the desk printed as a document, and I ask unanimous consent that that may be done. It is a speech delivered by the Hon. Carl Schurz on October 17, 1899, on the policy of imperialism.

Mr. HAWLEY. There was so much confusion in the Chamber that I could not hear the request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota asks that the speech which he has sent to the desk may be printed as a document.

Mr. CHANDLER. Let the title of it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the title.

The SECRETARY. "Address by the Hon. Carl Schurz, delivered October 17, 1899, on the subject of the policy of imperialism."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota for printing the address as a document?

Mr. CARTER. I object to the printing of this class of matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is objection.

SECOND HOMESTEAD ENTRIES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Calendar under Rule VIII is now in order.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 762) granting settlers the right to make second homestead entries.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota asks unanimous consent for the consideration at this time of the bill named by him. Is there objection?

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the bill be read at length for information subject to objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any person who, prior to the passage of this act having made a homestead entry, but for any cause lost or forfeited the same or for any reason failed to perfect or secure title in fee simple to the land embraced therein, or who, having perfected or secured such title, did so by what is known as the commutation of his homestead entry under section 2301, United States Revised Statutes, may make a homestead entry of not exceeding one quarter section of any of the public lands in any State or Territory subject to such entry.

SEC. 2. That any person desiring to make another entry under this act will be required to make affidavit, to be transmitted with the other filing papers now required by law, giving the description of the tract formerly entered, date and number of entry, and name of the land office where made, or other sufficient data to admit of readily identifying it on the official records.

SEC. 3. That on the proper showing being made by any qualified applicant under this act, to the satisfaction of the register and receiver, that his former entry has been lost or forfeited for any cause, and that he has not perfected or secured title thereto under the homestead law, or who, having perfected title thereto, did so under section 2301 of the United States Revised Statutes, and having all other proper qualifications of a homestead entryman, the register and receiver will, without further showing, on payment of the usual fees and commissions, allow his said application and make his entry of record.

Mr. COCKRELL. When was the bill introduced?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will say, if the Senator will listen to me a moment, that the bill was introduced at the present session of Congress and has been reported back unanimously from the Committee on Public Lands. It is identically the same bill which was reported and passed last year.

Mr. COCKRELL. When was it reported?

Mr. PETTIGREW. Several days ago.

Mr. COCKRELL. I can not find it on the Calendar.

Mr. PETTIGREW. It was reported December 18 and is No. 7 on the first page of the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COCKRELL. I reserve the right to object until I hear an explanation.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Where persons have lost their homestead rights the bill simply permits the taking of a second entry. It was unanimously reported last year and passed the Senate without objection. This year the bill has the unanimous support of the Committee on Public Lands. I think it is carefully guarded in every particular.

Mr. COCKRELL. What action has been taken by the Interior Department regarding the bill?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I can not tell the Senator. I do not remember whether or not the bill was referred to the Interior Department. It simply allows, where a man has not secured title to a homestead without paying for it, the right to take another 160 acres—nothing more.

Mr. COCKRELL. In the report made by the Senator from South Dakota I find a communication from the Secretary of the Interior and one from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, which I supposed the Senator had read.

Mr. PETTIGREW. That was in last year's report, and I had forgotten that those officers had made a report on the subject.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let those communications be read.

Mr. SPOONER. Were the reports unfavorable?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I do not know.

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not know. I have not had time to examine them. They are not very long, and I ask that they may be read.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Those communications were on the bill reported last year, and not on the one reported this year.

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not know whether those communications were made last year or not. The report was made last year, but it was at this session of Congress. The bill was reported December 18, 1899.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Yes; adopting last year's report. I have not this year read the letters from the Interior Department, and do not know what they contain. I know, however, that the committee was unanimous in regard to the bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the communications to which I have referred be read for information.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The communications referred to by the Senator from Missouri will be read, if there be no objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, April 9, 1897.

SIR: I have the honor to hand you herewith the report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office on S. B. 364, "granting settlers the right to make second homestead entries."

The objections made by the Commissioner to the bill are that it allows a second entry where the first entry was lost or forfeited for any cause, and that such a provision would open the door for speculative entries and subvert the purpose of the homestead law; also, that the bill should be made to operate prospectively as well as retrospectively, and that persons who, in the future, through adverse or uncontrollable circumstances and through no fault of their own, are compelled to abandon their entries, should be allowed to make a second entry as well as those who, prior to the passage of said bill, for similar reasons, were compelled to abandon their homestead entries.

I concur in the Commissioner's conclusions.

Very respectfully,

C. N. BLISS, *Secretary.*

Hon. R. F. PETTIGREW,
Chairman Senate Committee on Public Lands.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., April 3, 1897.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt, by Departmental reference, under date of March 30, 1897, for report in duplicate and return of papers of Senate bill No. 364, granting settlers the right to make second homestead entries, which has been referred to the Department by the Senate Committee on Public Lands, with request for its views thereon.

The purpose of this bill is to remove the disqualification of persons who, prior to the passage of the act, had made a homestead entry, but who, for any cause, lost or forfeited the same or for any reason failed to perfect or secure title in fee simple to the land embraced in their entry, except by purchasing the same under what is known as the commutation provision of the homestead law.

The act is practically an extension of the privilege conferred by the second section of the act of March 2, 1889 (25 Stat. L., 854), except as to that provision of the bill now under consideration which makes subject to its provisions all homestead entries which have been perfected under the commutation clause of the homestead law.

Such a provision, however, was embodied in the act of March 2, 1889 (25 Stat. L., 1004), providing for the disposal of the Seminole lands in the Territory of Oklahoma; also in the act of February 13, 1891 (26 Stat. L., 759), providing for the disposal of lands in Oklahoma acquired by agreement with the Sac and Fox Indians; also in the act of March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. L., 1043), providing for the disposal of the lands in Montana ceded by the Crow Indians; and in the act of March 3, 1893, providing for the disposal of the Kickapoo lands in Oklahoma—all of which provided that any person who having attempted to, but from any cause failed to, acquire a title in fee under the homestead law, or who made entry under what is known as the commutation provision of the homestead law, shall be qualified to make homestead entry of said land.

The act of September 29, 1890 (26 Stat. L., 496), restoring to settlement forfeited railroad lands, also contained the provision that "any person who has not heretofore had the benefit of the homestead or preemption laws, or who has from any cause failed to perfect the title to a tract of land heretofore entered by him under either of said laws, may make a second homestead entry under the provisions of this act."

The act of December 20, 1894 (28 Stat. L., 599), amending section 3 of the act of March 2, 1889 (25 Stat. L., 854), permitted any settler who had theretofore forfeited his or her entry by reason of being unable from a total or partial destruction of crops, sickness, or other unavoidable casualty to secure a support for himself, herself, or those dependent upon him or her, to make entry of not to exceed a quarter section on any public lands subject to entry under the homestead law and to perfect title to the same under the same conditions in every respect as if he had not made a former entry.

It will be thus seen that Congress has from time to time passed special laws relieving against the disqualification of homestead settlers who had failed to perfect their entries, but all of said laws either have reference to a particular locality or are intended to operate retrospectively and not prospectively.

If the act of March 2, 1889 (25 Stat. L., 854), as amended by the act of December 29, 1894 (28 Stat L., 599), was so amended as to be general in its application and to operate prospectively, it would, in my judgment, be sufficient to grant relief in all meritorious cases, inasmuch as it would be left largely to the discretion of the Department to determine whether the causes of abandonment were sufficient to enable the entryman to make a second entry and thus to prevent voluntary abandonment prompted by purely speculative motives.

The bill under consideration is, in my opinion, objectionable for the reason that by allowing a second entry where the first entry was lost or forfeited for any cause would open the door to speculative entries and subvert the purpose of the homestead law.

If it is deemed advisable by Congress that the bill should become a law, I would suggest that it be made to operate prospectively as well as retroactively, as no reason appears why those who in the future may, from similar causes, fail to perfect entry to their homesteads should not receive the same relief as those who have in the past forfeited their entries.

Very respectfully,

BINGER HERMANN,
Commissioner.

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. It seems the matter has received attention. The criticism made by the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of the General Land Office was as to the possibility of speculative entries. I confess very frankly that I can not well see how such speculative entries can be made. Neither the Secretary of the Interior nor the Commissioner of the General Land Office in the communications which have been read explains how advantage can be taken of the provisions of this bill by speculative entries or how they can result in speculative entries.

The bill should be amended in one particular—that is, it should be made to apply to the future as well as to the past, thus making a general rule. That was recommended, but I do not see that it is in the bill.

Mr. PETTIGREW. The committee discussed that matter and thought it unwise to have the provisions of the bill relate to cases in the future. We could see no chance to practice fraud as to those cases already in existence, but we feared that there might be some advantage taken if parties could contemplate the taking of an entry, its abandonment, and then the taking of another entry. Therefore we did not frame the bill so as to comply with the recommendation of the Department, and I think for the reason I have stated.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VOID PUBLIC-LAND ENTRIES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Calendar under Rule VIII is in order. The first bill on the Calendar will be stated.

The bill (S. 386) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers on public lands and to provide for the repayment of certain fees, purchase money, and commissions paid on void entries of public lands" was announced as first in order.

Mr. BERRY. I was absent from the Chamber for a moment and did not catch exactly what that bill is. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCBRIDE] if that is the bill which came from the Committee on Public Lands in regard to refunding money to those who paid $2.50 an acre for lands where a railroad was not built?

Mr. MCBRIDE. That is the bill, Mr. President.

Mr. BERRY. Is the Senator trying to have that bill passed this morning?

Mr. MCBRIDE. I did not call up the bill, but it came up regularly this morning on the Calendar. I should, however, be very glad if the Senate would consider it and pass it this morning.

Mr. BERRY. I do not think it is a bill that should pass very quickly. It will require some discussion. I did not expect it to come up this morning, and I would rather it should go over, if the Senator is willing.

Mr. MCBRIDE. I have no objection to the bill going over, if it is understood that it shall retain its place on the Calendar.

Mr. BERRY. I have no objection to that understanding.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill goes over, retaining its place.

ACCOUNTS WITH PUBLIC-LAND STATES.

The bill (S. 764) fixing times when, regulating the manner in which, and declaring the character of the accounts between the United States and the several public-land States relative to the net proceeds of the sales and other disposition of the public lands made and to be made therein by the United States, which shall hereafter be stated and certified to the Treasury Department for payment, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, in line 20, section 2, after the word "cash," to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That where the Government has once paid the 5 per cent on lands within the Indian allotments or Indian reservations, that no further or other payment shall be made or liability exist from the United States in case said lands thereafter become a part of the public domain.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator having the bill in charge why California is specified and other States are not specified?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that I think California was excluded from the existing law, which applies to all the other States. That is the reason why California is specially designated. The bill as it stands now applies to all public-land States. I understand that the existing law in regard to the 5 per cent does not apply to California. The State has never had the benefit of it. This makes the existing law apply to California as it applies to all the other States. There was some clause in regard to the admission of California which left out that provision.

Mr. ALLEN. Is any other State in that position?

Mr. PETTIGREW. No, sir; California is the only State.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota what amount is involved in the bill. The page in charge of my records here has not put this bill in with the others and therefore it has now come into my hands for the first time. As I understand the bill, it will give to the land States, or the particular States designated, 5 per cent not only upon the lands that were sold for cash, but also upon all lands that were disposed of by bounty land laws, warrant applications, and also grants to railroads, grants to canals, and the Indian reservations. In other words, it will practically make the United States pay 5 per cent of the net proceeds, estimated at $1.25, upon all the lands in the respective States named. Now, is not that the effect of the bill?

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, a portion of the statement of the Senator from Missouri is correct and a portion is not correct. The bill provides that 5 per cent shall be paid upon existing Indian reservations and Indian allotments and bounty land warrants, but not on land grants to any corporation whatever. It does not embrace land grants to any railroad, canal, or other corporation. The bill simply extends to the public-land States the provisions of the law passed, I think, in 1854 in regard to Mississippi, which provides that the Government shall pay the 5 per cent upon permanent Indian reservations and also upon lands entered by military bounty land warrants. That law applied to all the public-land States then in the Union. But it has been held by the Department—and I think it is questionable whether their holding is or is not correct—that it did not apply to States admitted thereafter, and this bill extends the provisions of that law to the States admitted after that time.

This is a just measure. It has been reported to the Senate by the Committee on Public Lands many times, and from the best estimate I can make there will be taken about $12,000,000 out of the Treasury under its operations, but the amount will be distributed over several years of time. Some persons have made the amount more than that, but from the best estimate I can make I do not think the sum will be over $12,000,000, and only a small portion of that amount the first year.

Mr. COCKRELL. I find that probably, although I am not certain, the provisions of the pending bill are not quite so comprehensive as I supposed. Section 2 says:

That said accounts so stated shall include, embrace, and apply to all of said lands heretofore or which hereafter may be sold, located, or disposed of by the United States for cash or bounty land warrants, or land scrip, or certificates of any kind, or agricultural college scrip, and to all lands allotted to Indians in severalty, except from taxation.

That evidently ought to be "exempt," although it does not amount to anything. I call the attention of the Senator from South Dakota to that point. On page 2, line 14, where the word "except" appears, should it not be "exempt?"

Mr. PETTIGREW. It should be "exempt."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It should be "exempt."

Mr. COCKRELL. The section continues:

And shall include all former and existing Indian, military, or other reservations in said States.

Evidently the word "except" there ought to be "exempt," and I move——

Mr. PETTIGREW. It should be corrected so as to read "exempt."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that will be corrected by the clerks.

Mr. COCKRELL. The first section says that the Department shall submit—

Statements of the accounts between the United States and each of the several public-land States, including California, for 5 per cent of the net proceeds of the sales of the public lands in each of said States which have been heretofore or may hereafter be made by the United States and not already paid by the United States to said States, and upon such statements of accounts by the Secretary of the Interior he shall thereupon supervise, correct, and certify such statements of accounts to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment.

The only clause that would embrace lands granted to corporations and all that would be "or bounty land warrants, or land scrip, or certificates of any kind." I do not presume that certificates have ever been issued in former times to any of the railroad corporations to which grants have been made or to any of the canals.

Mr. PETTIGREW. No, I think we issued the patents direct; but I shall not object at all to an amendment which shall provide that the provisions of the bill shall not apply to lands granted in aid of the construction of railroads, wagon roads, or canals.

Mr. CARTER. No certificate has ever been issued in any land-grant case. The proceeding consists in the filing of certain lists of selections made by the land-grant company. These lists or selections when made become the basis upon which patents subsequently issue from the Government to the land-grant company. In the meantime no certificate or other evidence of title is issued by the General Government, except the patent itself.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, this is a very important bill; it involves a large amount of money. If I remember correctly, an estimate was made by Commissioner Lamoreux during the Fifty-fourth Congress that it would cost not less than twelve or fourteen million dollars. I do not think that will cover the cost of it. I think it will amount to eighteen or twenty million dollars; perhaps more than that, if the bill becomes a law.

The proposition to pay 5 per cent on lands which were disposed of by military land warrants and bounties has been pending in Congress for a great many years. It had been discussed and I think a bill for that purpose had been defeated in the Senate before I became a member of it. This bill goes far beyond that. It proposes not only to give 5 per cent on all the lands disposed of by military land warrants, but to give 5 per cent upon all Indian reservations, those which have been disposed of as well as those Indian reservations still existing. I think, Mr. President, that the bill ought not to pass.

Unless the bill has been amended since it was before the committee, it provides for 5 per cent upon existing Indian reservations; and when the Indian title may be extinguished those lands will become subject to homestead entry and the Government will receive from them no money whatever. If you pay 5 per cent on that class of lands, then I can see no reason why 5 per cent should not be paid upon all lands which have been taken by homestead entry, and that, instead of twenty millions, would cost hundreds of millions. Without at length debating this bill, it seems to me for the Government now to undertake to give 5 per cent

to those States on all Indian reservations—those heretofore disposed of and the lands not disposed of—and on all military land entries would be an injustice, and it would take money from the Treasury which the Government ought not to put out.

These are my views in regard to the bill. I stated them to the committee before the bill was reported and gave notice to the Senator from South Dakota that I could not support it. That I believe is about all that I care to state in regard to it. I think the bill ought not to pass.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move to insert after the word "States," in line 16, section 2:

But shall not include any land granted, donated, or in any manner transferred to any railroad, wagon road, or canal, or to any State, corporation, or association.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "States," in line 16, section 2, it is proposed to insert:

But shall not include any land granted, donated, or in any manner transferred to any railroad, wagon road, or canal, or to any State, corporation, or association.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BERRY. In line 15, section 2, I move to strike out:

And shall include all former and existing Indian, military, or other reservations in said States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "taxation," in line 15, section 2, it is proposed to strike out:

And shall include all former and existing Indian, military, or other reservations in said States.

The amendment was rejected.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I desire again in the Senate, as I did as in Committee of the Whole, to move to strike out the words which I indicated in lines 15 and 16.

I simply wish to say to the Senate, as I have said before, that the Government heretofore has never paid 5 per cent upon any lands which were disposed of by homestead or preemption where no money was paid. It has only paid 5 per cent upon the amount of the sales of lands. Now it is proposed in this bill to make the Government pay 5 per cent upon all lands which heretofore have been included in Indian reservations, or which to-day are in Indian, military, or other kinds of reservations. The very moment the Indian title is extinguished, as I stated, those lands become, under the general land law, subject to entry under the homestead law, and the Government will never receive one dollar for them, because they will be homesteaded by citizens of the different States; and yet the Government will be paying 5 per cent on those lands, estimated at $1.25 an acre.

Can the Senator tell the Senate why, if we pay 5 per cent upon those Indian lands which are taken up by citizens under homestead, we should not pay 5 per cent upon all homestead lands in all the States of the Union? Many of the States have no Indian reservations. Their public lands have been disposed of by homestead entry. No 5 per cent is paid to those States, because the law does not provide for it; neither does this measure. Yet it is proposed, so far as concerns those which have Indian reservations, while the lands hereafter, when the Indian title is extinguished, will be disposed of under the homestead law and the Government will receive no money, to take out of the Treasury and pay to the States 5 per cent upon $1.25 an acre for those lands, whether the Government gets any money or not. It seems to me that the amendment ought to be adopted.

I know the temper of a good portion of the people of the country now—at least of the members of the Senate and of the other House—to vote any and all appropriations that may be proposed; but it seems to me that this is a waste of public money; that it is unfair and unjust to those States in which lands have been disposed of in a different way and which got no 5 per cent on the $1.25 an acre, and I do not think it ought to be paid on Indian and military reservations. I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, just a word in reply to the Senator from Arkansas. The Indian reservations which have been opened to settlement during the last few years have not been thrown open to settlement under the homestead law, but we have inserted a provision which requires the settler to buy the land in every case.

Mr. BERRY. Not in all cases, Mr. President.

Mr. PETTIGREW. It has become the settled policy of the Government to require the settler to pay for the land, even though he enters it under the homestead law.

If hereafter the Congress of the United States should pass a free-homestead bill, as we ought to do, and open up these lands to homestead entry without requiring payment for them—for under the existing law in some instances the settler is required to pay $3.60 an acre—then a provision can be inserted in that law which will exempt the Government from the liability to pay 5 per cent upon the land so disposed of. But until that is done this bill is just, and the 5 per cent ought to be paid.

The theory of the Government is that the 5 per cent is in lieu of taxes: and if within the borders of a State there is an Indian reservation occupied by an undesirable population from which no taxes can be collected to support the State government, there certainly is no case so strong as that why the Government should pay 5 per cent. Heretofore when the Government received $1.25 an acre for preemption entry, 5 per cent went to the State, and the land immediately became taxable and helped to support the burdens of the local government. But an Indian reservation, never taxable, sparsely settled, a place which breeds crime and causes expense, contributes nothing to the State government or to the maintenance of order along the borders of the reservation. This bill simply provides that the State shall receive the 5 per cent, and no stronger case can possibly be stated than can be made in favor of that special provision of the bill.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the Senator from Arkansas proceeding?

Mr. BERRY. I shall occupy only a few moments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection, and the Senator from Arkansas will proceed.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, in the first place the Senator from South Dakota is not correct when he says that all Indian lands are to be disposed of by being paid for. But this Government has never heretofore paid one dollar on any lands that were not already disposed of and paid for by the purchaser to the Government. This bill proposes to take out of the Treasury 5 per cent on $1.25 an acre for all these Indian and military reservations, whether they are sold or unsold and regardless of what disposition may be made of them hereafter. Is that just and fair to the States having no military reservations? Where the lands are disposed of by homestead entry and no money comes to the Government, the Government has never paid any 5 per cent, and it ought not to pay it. Then why should you take these military and Indian reservations not yet disposed of, including millions of acres of land, and pay to those States now, before the disposition of the lands and before the Government receives one dollar, from the Treasury of the United States, 5 per cent, estimating the value thereof at $1.25 an acre? You may pass the bill; you may vote down the amendment, but it is unjust to the other States, it is unfair, and it is a bill that ought not to pass.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask the Senator from South Dakota to explain, if he will, the theory upon which the military reservations are included in the bill.

Mr. BERRY. Yes; the military reservations are included.

Mr. SPOONER. I asked the Senator to explain the theory upon which they are included, if he will.

Mr. PETTIGREW. In some instances there are permanent military reservations. The same reason, it seems to me, applies that applies to an Indian reservation. However, an amendment has been recommended by the committee and adopted by the Senate which provides that if the reservations are afterwards disposed of the 5 per cent shall not be again collected. I know an instance of a military reservation embracing several townships of land which otherwise would be subject to entry and which would be occupied by people who would pay taxes and help to support the State government and local government. This reservation is situated near a town, its dimensions are very large, and its whole area is exempt from all the burdens of government in that locality. The reservation tends to increase the number of crimes and offenses.

Mr. SPOONER. A military reservation?

Mr. PETTIGREW. Yes, sir; the soldiers go to the town and become intoxicated, and there is a population of that sort which has to be taken care of. Those burdens are all borne by the people who live about there, and on the frontier this is well known, of course, to be the fact.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to give particular attention to the pending bill, but I am not able to see from the explanation made by the Senator from South Dakota any possible reason why the military reservations should be included in it, whatever may be said about the Indian reservations. It is proposed by the Senator, as I understand, or by the bill, that when the military reservation is sold——

Mr. PETTIGREW. Move to strike it out.

Mr. SPOONER. It is proposed that when the military reservation is sold there shall not be another payment of 5 per cent. In other words, then, so far as the military reservation is concerned, this is an advance of 5 per cent by the Government to the State in contemplation of the possible sale of the military reservation at some future time.

Mr. BERRY. And Indian reservations also, if the Senator will permit.

Mr. SPOONER. I understand a military reservation is largely for the protection of the citizens of the State, and you find them very often in the vicinity of Indian reservations, with a view to protecting the people of the locality. It is not a mere luxury on the part of the Federal Government in the benefit of which the people of the State do not participate. In a large sense it is to provide for the public defense; it is in the interest of the general welfare, but it is of local value peculiarly. We find very often—it has so happened many times since I have been a member of this body and that is not long——

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will accept an amendment to strike out "military reservations."

Mr. SPOONER. We very often find gentlemen from Dakota and Wyoming and other Western States, called frontier States, begging the Government of the United States, in the interest of the safety of their people, to establish and maintain military reservations.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will accept an amendment to strike out "military reservations."

Mr. SPOONER. And the notion that the Government, using its own domain for a purely and necessary governmental purpose, shall advance to the State on account of it 5 per cent as upon a sale seems to me to be the height of absurdity. Will this include the Yellowstone Park? Will it include the park in the State of Washington?

Mr. BERRY. Absolutely.

Mr. SPOONER. Parks; Government lands set aside——

Mr. PETTIGREW. It does not include parks.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not see why they were omitted, in view of other provisions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY], on which he demands the yeas and nays.

Mr. ALLISON. Let it be reported.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will again be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 15, section 2, it is proposed to strike out:

And shall include all former and existing Indian, military, or other reservations in said States.

Mr. BERRY. I have moved to strike out those words. The Senator from South Dakota says the bill does not include parks. Let us see what it does.

Mr. SPOONER. It does.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It does.

Mr. BERRY. I have moved to strike out "and shall include all former and existing Indian, military, or other reservations in said States." That is the language of the bill. It seems to me it would include every kind of a reservation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It does include them.

Mr. BERRY. Of course it does.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY], on which he demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McLAURIN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. PRITCHARD]. I do not know how he would vote. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. PLATT of New York (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEITFELD]. Has he voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. PLATT of New York. Then I shall withhold my vote.

Mr. PROCTOR (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. SPOONER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. TURLEY], who seems to be absent. I do not know how he would vote. I therefore withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. THURSTON]. In his absence, not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote, but if I were at liberty, I should vote "yea."

Mr. WELLINGTON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER]. I should like to inquire whether he has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. WELLINGTON. Then I refrain from voting.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CLAY. I desire to ask if the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. CLAY. I am paired with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. HARRIS. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. I should like to know whether he has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. HARRIS. I withhold my vote.

Mr. NELSON (after having voted in the negative). I voted through inadvertence. I wish to withdraw my vote. I am paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST].

Mr. CLARK of Montana. I am paired with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 4; as follows:

YEAS—42.

Aldrich,	Culberson,	Jones, Ark.	Platt, Conn.
Allison,	Cullom,	Kean,	Quarles,
Bacon,	Deboe,	Kenney,	Rawlins,
Baker,	Fairbanks,	Kyle,	Ross.
Bate,	Foraker,	McComas,	Sewell,
Berry,	Foster,	McMillan,	Stewart,
Burrows,	Frye,	Martin,	Turner,
Caffery,	Hale,	Morgan,	Wetmore,
Chandler,	Hanna,	Penrose,	Wolcott.
Chilton,	Hawley,	Perkins,	
Cockrell,	Hoar,	Pettus,	

NAYS—4.

Carter,	Davis,	Pettigrew,	Teller.

NOT VOTING—40.

Allen,	Gear,	McLaurin,	Simon,
Beveridge,	Hansbrough,	Mallory,	Spooner,
Butler,	Harris,	Mason,	Sullivan,
Clark, Mont.	Heitfeld,	Money,	Taliaferro,
Clark, Wyo.	Jones, Nev.	Nelson,	Thurston,
Clay,	Lindsay,	Platt, N. Y	Tillman,
Daniel,	Lodge,	Pritchard,	Turley,
Depew,	McBride,	Proctor,	Vest,
Elkins,	McCumber,	Scott.	Warren,
Gallinger,	McEnery,	Shoup,	Wellington.

So Mr. BERRY's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TELLER. I move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Public Lands.

The motion was agreed to.

RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE IN NORTH CAROLINA.

Mr. MORGAN. I desire to give notice that on Monday, at the conclusion of the routine morning business, I will, with the consent of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. PRITCHARD], which I have obtained, call up the resolution which he has on the table, declaring certain proposed amendments to the constitution of North Carolina in contravention of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States, with a view of submitting some remarks on it. I expect to go away from the city next week some time, and I shall ask that indulgence of the Senate on Monday.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next bill on the Calendar will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that that bill may be now taken up and proceeded with. It is almost 2 o'clock.

Mr. ALLISON. That it be taken up as though it were 2 o'clock?

Mr. ALDRICH. As though it were 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island asks that the bill be now taken up as if the hour of 2 o'clock had arrived.

Mr. COCKRELL. And that it be continued when that hour comes?

Mr. ALDRICH. And that it be continued as the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole. The Secretary will read the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance.

The SECRETARY. The Committee on Finance report as an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill and to insert:

That the dollar consisting of 25.8 grains of gold nine-tenths fine shall, as established by section 3511 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, continue to be the standard unit of value, and all forms of money issued or coined by the United States shall be maintained at a parity of value with this standard; and United States notes, and Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890, when presented to the Treasury for redemption shall be redeemed in gold coin of such standard.

SEC. 2. That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury, in order to secure the prompt and certain redemption of United States notes and Treasury notes as hereinbefore provided, to set apart in the Treasury a reserve fund of $150,000,000 in gold coin, which fund shall be used for such redemption purposes only, and whenever and as often as any of said notes

shall be redeemed from said fund it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to use said notes so redeemed to restore and maintain such reserve fund in the manner following, to wit: First, by exchanging the notes so redeemed for any gold coin in the general fund of the Treasury; second, by accepting deposits of gold coin at the Treasury or at any subtreasury in exchange for the United States notes so redeemed; third, by procuring gold coin by the use of said notes, in accordance with the provisions of section 3700 of the Revised Statutes of the United States——

Mr. ALDRICH. As the amendments to the substitute are reached I ask that the Senate may adopt them by general consent. They are simply modifications of the substitute reported by the committee. They are in effect committee amendments, and I ask that they may be adopted.

Mr. ALLISON. And be made a part of the substitute?

Mr. ALDRICH. And be made a part of the substitute.

Mr. ALLISON. Let that be the understanding.

Mr. TELLER. Then I understand that if the amendments to the amendment are adopted, the bill will stand as the committee want it—as a substitute for the House bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is it exactly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT of Connecticut in the chair). The Chair will inquire whether that action was not taken yesterday?

Mr. ALDRICH. I did not understand that it was, and that is the reason why I make the suggestion now.

Mr. ALLISON. I understand that it was, but the amended bill was printed in its present form to show the changes made. However, it is immaterial.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is immaterial, and it may be done now.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be done now, and then let the bill be reprinted.

Mr. ALDRICH. As the substitute will be amended?

Mr. TELLER. As it will be amended, so that we shall know just what the committee proposes.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the first amendment to the amendment, it having been reached in the reading of the proposed substitute.

The SECRETARY. In section 2, page 11, line 19, after the word "restore," strike out "and maintain the same" and insert "the same to the maximum sum of $150,000,000," so as to read:

If the Secretary of the Treasury is unable to restore and maintain the gold coin in the reserve fund by the foregoing methods, and the amount of such gold coin in said fund shall at any time fall below $100,000,000, then it shall be his duty to restore the same to the maximum sum of $150,000,000 by borrowing money on the credit of the United States, and for the debt thus incurred to issue and sell coupon or registered bonds of the United States in such form as he may prescribe, in denominations of $50 or any multiple thereof, bearing interest at the rate of not exceeding 3 per centum per annum, payable quarterly, such bonds to be payable at the pleasure of the United States after one year from the date of their issue, and to be payable, principal and interest, in gold coin of the present standard value, and to be exempt from the payment of all taxes or duties of the United States, as well as from taxation in any form by or under State, municipal, or local authority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be agreed to if there is no objection. It is agreed to.

The SECRETARY. In section 2, page 12, line 7, after the word "authority," the committee report to amend the amendment by striking out—

And the gold coin received from the sale of said bonds shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury and exchanged for notes which have been redeemed in the manner hereinbefore provided, and the amount of gold coin and notes in the reserve fund shall at no time exceed the maximum sum of $150,000,000—

And inserting—

And the gold coin received from the sale of said bonds shall first be covered into the general fund of the Treasury and then exchanged, in the manner hereinbefore provided, for an equal amount of the notes redeemed and held for exchange, and the United States notes exchanged in accordance with the provisions of this section shall, when covered into the Treasury, be reissued as now provided for by law, and the gold coin in the reserve fund, together with the redeemed notes held for use as provided in this section, shall at no time exceed the maximum sum of $150,000,000.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the substitute was proceeded with, as follows:

SEC. 3. That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury as fast as standard silver dollars are coined under the provisions of the acts of July 14, 1890, and June 13, 1898, from bullion purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, to retire and cancel an equal amount of Treasury notes whenever received into the Treasury, either by exchange in accordance with the provisions of this act or in the ordinary course of business, and upon the cancellation of Treasury notes silver certificates shall be issued against the silver dollars so coined.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to receive deposits of gold coin with the Treasurer or any assistant treasurer of the United States in sums of not less than $20, and to issue gold certificates therefor in denominations of not less than $20, and the coin so deposited shall be retained in the Treasury and held for the payment of such certificates on demand and used for no other purpose. Such certificates shall be receivable for customs, taxes, and all public dues, and when so received may be reissued, and when held by any national banking association may be counted as a part of its lawful reserve: *Provided*, That whenever and so long as the gold coin held in the reserve fund in the Treasury for the redemption of United States notes and Treasury notes shall fall and remain below $100,000,000 the authority to issue certificates as herein provided shall be suspended: *And provided further*, That of the amount of such outstanding certificates one-fourth at least shall be in denominations of $50 or less: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury may, in his discretion, issue such certificates in denominations of $10,000, payable to order. And section 5193 of the Revised Statutes of the United States is hereby repealed.

SEC. 5. That from and after the passage of this act no United States notes or Treasury notes shall be issued or reissued of denominations less than $10, and all such outstanding notes of a lower denomination shall, whenever received at the Treasury or redeemed, be canceled and notes of denominations of $10 or upward shall be substituted therefor. No silver certificates shall be hereafter issued of a higher denomination than $10, and all such outstanding certificates of a higher denomination shall, whenever received at the Treasury or redeemed, be retired and canceled and notes of denominations of $10 or less shall be substituted therefor.

The SECRETARY. The Committee on Finance report to strike out of the substitute section 6, in the following words:

SEC. 6. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to receive at the Treasury any of the outstanding bonds of the United States bearing interest at 5 per cent per annum, payable February 1, 1904, and any of the bonds of the United States bearing interest at 4 per cent per annum, payable July 1, 1907, and any bonds of the United States bearing interest at 3 per cent per annum, payable August 1, 1908, and to issue in exchange therefor coupon or registered bonds of the United States in such form as he may prescribe, in denominations of $50 or any multiple thereof, bearing interest at the rate of 2 per cent per annum, payable quarterly, such bonds to be payable at the pleasure of the United States after thirty years from the date of their issue, and said bonds to be payable, principal and interest, in gold coin of the present standard value, and to be exempt from the payment of all taxes or duties of the United States, as well as from taxation in any form by or under State, municipal, or local authority: *Provided*, That none of such outstanding bonds shall be received in such exchange at a valuation greater than their present worth to yield an income of 2½ per cent per annum, and said bonds shall be issued at not less than par: *And provided further*, That such bonds when issued shall be numbered consecutively in the order of their issue, and when payment is made the last numbers issued shall be first paid, and this order shall be followed until all the bonds are paid; and whenever any of the outstanding bonds are called for payment, interest thereon shall cease three months after such call: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury may, in his discretion, pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the difference between the present worth, computed as aforesaid, of the outstanding bonds surrendered in accordance with the provisions of this act and their par value.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 6. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to receive at the Treasury any of the outstanding bonds of the United States bearing interest at 5 per cent per annum, payable February 1, 1904, and any bonds of the United States bearing interest at 4 per cent per annum, payable July 1, 1907, and any bonds of the United States bearing interest at 3 per cent per annum, payable August 1, 1908, and to issue in exchange therefor an equal amount of coupon or registered bonds of the United States in such form as he may prescribe, in denominations of $50 or any multiple thereof, bearing interest at the rate of 2 per cent per annum, payable quarterly, such bonds to be payable at the pleasure of the United States after thirty years from the date of their issue, and said bonds to be payable, principal and interest, in gold coin of the present standard value, and to be exempt from the payment of all taxes or duties of the United States, as well as from taxation in any form by or under State, municipal, or local authority.

Provided, That such outstanding bonds may be received in exchange at a valuation not greater than their present worth to yield an income of 2½ per cent per annum; and in consideration of the reduction of interest effected, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay to the holders of the outstanding bonds surrendered for exchange, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum not greater than the difference between their present worth, computed as aforesaid, and their par value, and the payments to be made hereunder shall be held to be payments on account of the sinking fund created by section 3694 of the Revised Statutes: *And provided further*, That the 2 per cent bonds to be issued under the provisions of this act shall be issued at not less than par, and they shall be numbered consecutively in the order of their issue, and when payment is made the last numbers issued shall be first paid, and this order shall be followed until all the bonds are paid, and whenever any of the outstanding bonds are called for payment interest thereon shall cease three months after such call.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the substitute, as follows:

SEC. 7. That upon the deposit with the Treasurer of the United States, by any national banking association, of any bonds of the United States in the manner provided by existing law, such association shall be entitled to receive from the Comptroller of the Currency circulating notes in blank, registered and countersigned as provided by law, equal in amount to the par value of the bonds so deposited; and any national banking association now having bonds on deposit for the security of circulating notes, and upon which an amount of circulating notes has been issued less than the par value of the bonds, shall be entitled, upon due application to the Comptroller of the Currency, to receive additional circulating notes in blank to an amount which will increase the circulating notes held by such association to the par value of the bonds deposited, such additional notes to be held and treated in the same way as circulating notes of national banking associations heretofore issued, and subject to all the provisions of existing law affecting such notes: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to modify or repeal the provisions of sections 5167 and 5171 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, authorizing the Comptroller of the Currency to require additional deposits of bonds or of lawful money in case the market value of the bonds held to secure the circulating notes shall fall below the par value of the circulating notes outstanding for which such bonds may be deposited as security: *And provided further*, That the circulating notes furnished to national banking associations under the provisions of this act shall be of the denominations prescribed by law, except that no national banking association shall, after the passage of this act, be entitled to receive or to issue or reissue or place in circulation any circulating notes of a less denomination than $10: *And provided further*, That at no time shall the total amount of such notes issued to any such association exceed the amount at such time of its capital stock actually paid in. And all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this section are hereby repealed.

SEC. 8. That every national banking association having on deposit, as provided by law, bonds of the United States bearing interest at the rate of 2 per cent per annum to secure its circulating notes shall pay to the Treasurer of the United States in the months of January and July a tax of one-fourth of 1 per cent each half year upon the average amount of such of its circulating notes as are based upon the deposit of said 2 per cent bonds, and such taxes shall be in lieu of existing taxes on its circulating notes imposed by section 5214 of the Revised Statutes.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to affirm the existing standard of

value, to maintain the parity in value of all forms of money, to refund the public debt, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the amendment as amended, striking out the House bill after the enacting clause and substituting the bill proposed by the Committee on Finance.

Mr. COCKRELL. It will be printed in that form?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As it has been modified by amendments to the amendment.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the bill may be printed in that form, as suggested by the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be so ordered.

Mr. ALDRICH. I further ask that in the consideration of this bill the substitute be considered as the original bill, which will make it open to amendment in the second degree. That has been the custom.

Mr. COCKRELL. What is the request?

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that in the consideration of the bill the substitute may be considered as the original bill, so that it may be open to amendment in the second degree.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island asks that the substitute may be treated, for purposes of amendment, as an original bill, so that it will be amendable in the first and second degree. Is there objection? If not, that will be the order of the Senate.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I propose to submit at this time a brief explanation of the substitute offered to House bill No. 1 and to state some of the reasons which led a majority of the Committee on Finance to recommend its adoption by the Senate.

The general purpose of the bill is to declare anew that gold is the monetary standard of the United States; to establish confidence in the intention and ability of our Government to give the greatest possible measure of stability in value to its currency and to provide the means for securing for it at all times an equal purchasing power with gold; to lighten in every possible way the burdens imposed upon the taxpayer by existing public obligations, and to strengthen the public credit.

The first section contains a clear and definite declaration that the gold dollar is and shall continue to be the standard unit of value; a new and more emphatic pledge on the part of the United States that all forms of money it may issue or coin shall be at all times maintained at an equality of value with the gold coin adopted as the standard, and a specific provision that United States notes and Treasury notes shall, upon presentation at the Treasury, be redeemed in standard gold coin.

These several declarations embody in new and more positive terms the law and the practice in this respect as interpreted and carried out in the administration of the Treasury Department since the resumption of specie payments. The act of February 12, 1873, made the gold dollar the sole unit of value, and no serious attempt has been made in the twenty-seven years which have elapsed since that act was passed to take away from our gold coinage this important function.

It is true that the acts of February 28, 1878, and of July 14, 1890, respectively, made silver dollars and United States Treasury notes legal tender for all debts, public and private, except where otherwise expressly stipulated in the contract, but these provisions in no way affected the monetary unit of value adopted in 1873. The acts of July 14, 1890, and of November 1, 1893, both contain substantial assurances of the purpose of the United States to maintain a parity of value between its gold and silver coins. Although United States notes and Treasury notes are by law redeemable in coin, the invariable practice of the Treasury Department since 1879 has been to redeem them in gold coin.

I have recited the provisions of these several acts that it may appear that no departure is intended by this bill from the public policy which was adopted years ago and has been consistently adhered to through successive Administrations.

If the official interpretation given to the acts I have referred to had met with general acquiescence and approval, there would have been no reason for the enactment of the legislation here proposed. Unfortunately, the men who have recently taken possession of the organization of one of the great political parties persistently deny that these various laws have the force and effect which have been repeatedly given to them by Democratic and Republican Administrations alike. It is to allay the doubts which have been raised and to dispel the fears which have been aroused by the persistent antagonism of the friends of the free coinage of silver and the advocates of a silver standard to all sound monetary principles that this legislation is necessary.

In the consideration of this section I do not overlook the fact that before this discussion is over we are sure to be confronted with the charge made by Senators on the other side of the Chamber that by our reaffirmation of the gold standard we have deliberately abandoned the position which the Republican party and the country have heretofore taken in favor of international bimetallism. This charge is not in accordance with the facts.

It is true that the Republican party, through its official platform utterances, and the United States, through legislative action, have from time to time been committed to the policy of promoting an international agreement to secure the coinage of both silver and gold at a fixed ratio; but this has always been with an understanding that until such an agreement was reached the existing gold standard must be preserved. It is not necessary, and may not be profitable, to discuss at this time whether under existing conditions an international agreement of the character I have alluded to can be secured.

This question, however, is not at issue in the action which we propose. The bill now before the Senate contains no disavowal of the position heretofore taken upon the question of international bimetallism and places no obstacles in the way of its accomplishment in the future. If it is possible to secure permanence of relative value to gold and silver coins with the free coinage of both metals at a fixed ratio, this permanence can only be secured by concurrent action of all the leading commercial nations.

I regret that it seems necessary to discuss this vital question of the retention or adoption of a monetary standard from a partisan standpoint, but we are forced into that position by the attitude of the Democratic opponents of this measure. Masquerading as the friends of bimetallism, claiming to be in favor of the monetary use of both gold and silver, they have for the past four years been engaged in a crusade in behalf of the single standard of silver, in a serious attempt to place the money and business of the country upon a silver basis. It is this dangerous and continuous attack upon the public credit, constituting, as it does, a serious menace to all the great interests of the country, which demands from us an accurate restatement in the form of public law of the financial policy which has prevailed since 1879 and which met with popular approval in the elections of 1896.

We are constantly assured by the leaders of the Democratic party that the principal issue in the approaching Presidential campaign will be the question of the opening of our mints to the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, without the concurrent action of other nations. The following statement was made a few days ago in another place by a distinguished member of the party:

> The free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the historical ratio of 16 to 1, without waiting for the consent of any other nation on earth, will be the supreme issue in 1900, as it was in 1896. Upon that platform we will place Bryan and elect him. Self-seeking politicians, timorous souls, may fall away from us, but the paramount issue and the peerless candidate will remain.

There was no dissent from this statement, which was made in the presence of a number of prominent Democratic leaders, and we are sure to hear it echoed on this floor in the course of this debate.

No sane man can be found, outside of the ranks of the small band of bold, able, and aggressive leaders who at present dominate the policy of the Democratic party, who believes for an instant that the opening of our mints to the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 will raise the value of silver bullion from its current commercial price to its mint price measured with relation to gold. Outside of this Chamber there is no political economist of reputation, no writer upon the subject of money whose opinion is of value, who does not believe that the free coinage of silver by the United States at the ratio of 16 to 1, without concurrent action on the part of the great commercial nations, would be equivalent to an adoption of the silver standard for all our transactions, public and private.

The Democratic advocates of free coinage are not in any sense bimetallists, but silver monometallists of the most pronounced type. They reject all the theories upon which bimetallism can be intelligently defended, and persistently advocate a course which is sure to result in the use of silver alone as the standard of value.

It is not necessary for me to enlarge upon the evils, the loss, discredit, and disaster which are sure to follow the adoption of a silver standard by this country. If, as now seems certain, we are to have another contest between the friends of sound currency and the advocates of free silver coinage, it is fortunate for those who favor the existing status that they will be able to enter the campaign with the consciousness that all the pledges made by them in 1896 have been fully redeemed and that the monetary issues between the parties are at last clearly defined.

The second section provides for a reserve fund of $150,000,000 in gold to secure the prompt and certain redemption of outstanding United States and Treasury notes. This fund is increased fifty millions over that which is now held by the Treasury for redemption purposes. The reason for this is found in the rapidly increasing amount of notes and certificates which, under existing pledges for the maintenance of the parity of value, are directly or indirectly a burden upon the fund.

In 1882, the year in which the amount of the reserve fund was fixed by implication at $100,000,000, the amount of United States notes, silver certificates, and currency certificates in circulation was $380,000,000, and the reserve fund 26 per cent of this amount. On November 1, 1899, the amount of United States notes, Treasury

notes, and certificates outstanding was $815,000,000, and a reserve fund of $150,000,000 would be but 18 per cent of this amount. In 1882 the total amount of notes and certificates, including national-bank notes, outstanding was $782,000,000, and the reserve fund was 13½ per cent of this total amount. On November 1, 1899, the total amount of notes and certificates, including national-bank notes, outstanding was $1,054,000,000, and a reserve fund of $150,000,000 would be 14 per cent of this amount. It will be seen by these figures that it is proposed to increase the amount of the reserve fund only in proportion to the increase in outstanding notes and certificates, and it is believed by the committee that the amount named is not greater than that required for redemption purposes.

That this amount of $150,000,000 can be held without embarrassment to the Treasury will be evident when we consider that the total amount of gold in the Treasury on the 1st of November, 1899, exclusive of the amount held to pay gold certificates, was $252,000,000, and the available cash balance, including the gold reserve, was $289,000,000.

This section makes it the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to replenish the reserve fund from time to time by the use of the notes redeemed. This he may do by exchanging the notes for any gold in the general fund of the Treasury, or any which may be deposited at the Treasury or at any subtreasury; or he may use the notes for securing gold coin under the provisions of section 3700 of the Revised Statutes.

In case all of these methods shall fail and the gold in the fund shall fall below one hundred millions, then it becomes his duty to sell United States bonds, the proceeds to be used to restore the fund to the maximum amount by paying the gold so obtained into the general fund of the Treasury and then exchanging for it an equal amount of notes which have been redeemed from the reserve fund.

The committee, having in view the rapid increase in the gold production of the world and the equally rapid increase in the available stock of gold in this country, are of the opinion that it will not be at any time necessary to sell bonds under the provisions of this section. Conditions have entirely changed since the bond issues of 1894–95 were made necessary by deficiencies in the revenues and an artificially stimulated demand upon the Treasury gold.

The gold production of the world in 1894 was $181,175,600; that of 1898 was $287,428,600. The gold coin in circulation in the United States at the close of the fiscal year 1896, as estimated by the Director of the Mint, was $454,905,064, while at the close of the fiscal year 1898 it was $657,950,463, or an increase in two years of more than $200,000,000. In the five years from 1893 to 1898 European holdings of gold in banks and treasuries increased more than $600,000,000, and at the present moment the only considerable demand for gold for monetary use comes from India.

It must be evident from these statements, and the further fact that the world's production of gold is certain to increase even more rapidly in the future than it has in the recent past, that there will be no difficulty in securing by use of notes the gold which will be necessary to maintain the fund at its maximum amount, which amount the committee are clearly of the opinion is not larger than is necessary to command public confidence in the unquestioned ability of the Government to maintain the parity of value of all forms of money in circulation.

It is true we do not propose to make all outstanding notes and certificates a direct burden upon the gold reserve. National-bank notes, through the method of their redemption in lawful money, are indirectly a burden upon the fund, and so, in a certain sense, are silver certificates and silver dollars.

In considering questions affecting the adequacy and use of the gold reserve, we are bound to inquire into the ability of the Treasury to maintain an equality of value between the silver dollar and silver certificate and the gold dollar without provision for direct exchangeability. Our own experience and that of other countries, notably France and Germany, clearly prove that it is possible to keep in circulation at a parity of value with gold a large but limited amount of legal-tender silver or notes based upon such silver without any provision for a compulsory redemption in gold.

The amount of silver certificates in circulation on the 1st of December, 1899, was $394,292,800 and of standard silver dollars $78,232,454, a total of $472,525,254. This amount will be gradually increased by the silver coinage which will take place under the provisions of the act of June 13, 1898. Both silver dollars and silver certificates are by law receivable for all public dues, and as long as the ordinary receipts of the Government are more than $600,000,000 per annum it is very evident that silver certificates are not likely to go to a discount. The Government itself, in the absence of a positive injunction, would be bound to maintain the value of this form of currency through the ordinary business channels of exchange for self-protection.

By the provisions of the pending substitute all outstanding notes and certificates of a less denomination than $10 are to be withdrawn from circulation and silver certificates issued in their place. The amount of paper currency of denominations of $1, $2, and $5 in circulation on the 30th of November, 1899, was $391,340,138. It will be seen that these denominations practically absorb the entire amount of outstanding silver certificates and will give to silver notes a secure place in our currency system.

The committee believe that under these conditions, or, in fact, under any which are likely to arise, there will be no difficulty in maintaining a parity without directing the Secretary to exchange silver dollars for gold at the demand of the holder of the silver. They believe, in fact, that no public interests will be served by the adoption of a legislative provision for such an exchange. To make all our silver currency a direct charge upon the gold reserve might imperil at a critical time the sufficiency of that fund. We fear it would serve as an invitation for unfriendly drafts upon the Treasury resources.

The committee do not suggest any changes in the status of the silver dollar or the silver certificate. We do not propose to take away from silver any of the monetary privileges or prerogatives which it now enjoys. In fact, we believe that the legislation suggested will greatly strengthen its position in our monetary system.

The third section makes it the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury, as fast as standard silver dollars are coined, as required by law, from the bullion purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, to retire and cancel an equal amount of Treasury notes, and provides that upon the cancellation of the notes silver certificates shall be issued against the silver dollars so coined.

In the absence of a provision of this kind a large amount of silver dollars are held in the Treasury, nominally for the redemption of Treasury notes. As these notes are not presented to the Treasury for such redemption, there is no method by which they can be promptly retired and silver certificates issued in their place. This section makes it the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to retire and cancel the notes received into the Treasury in the ordinary course of business as well as those presented for redemption.

The fourth section authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to receive deposits of gold coin and to issue gold certificates therefor in denominations of not less than $20. The provisions of this section are in most respects the same as those contained in the twelfth section of the act of July 12, 1882. The differences are as follows:

First. The section suggested makes a more specific pledge that the coin deposited shall be held for the payment of such certificates on demand. It also provides that it shall be used for no other purpose.

Second. It provides more clearly that the suspension of the authority to issue such certificates shall continue only during the time that the gold reserve remains below $100,000,000.

Third. It provides that of the amount of certificates outstanding at any time one-fourth at least shall be of denominations of $50 or less.

Fourth. It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury in his discretion to issue gold certificates in denominations of $10,000, payable to order. These certificates are intended to take the place of currency certificates now issued in accordance with the terms of section 5193 of the Revised Statutes, and this section is to be repealed. The Secretary of the Treasury called the attention of the committee to the fact that the currency against which currency certificates are issued is held at the various subtreasuries at considerable risk to the Government. The issuance of these certificates was authorized principally for the convenience of banks, and these institutions would be equally well served by the issue of gold certificates as recommended.

The purpose of the section as a whole is to give certain and active monetary use to the large and rapidly increasing amount of gold in the country. With the habits of our people and their preference for the use of paper currency wherever possible instead of gold and silver coin, this seems to be the most effective means of keeping in active circulation the gold coinage, which is certain in the future to be a more and more important element of our currency.

The fifth section provides that no United States notes or Treasury notes shall hereafter be issued or reissued in denominations of less than $10, and all such notes of a smaller denomination, whenever redeemed, shall be canceled and notes of $10 or upward substituted therefor. It also provides that no silver certificates of a higher denomination than $10 shall be issued.

Taken in connection with the last part of the seventh section, the effect of the legislation suggested would be to withdraw from circulation all outstanding notes and all certificates (except silver) of denominations less than $10 and to issue in their place silver certificates. I have already stated, in my explanation of the provisions of the second section, the reasons which led the committee to suggest this course.

The sixth section gives to the Secretary of the Treasury authority to convert a portion of the national debt into bonds bearing 2 per cent interest. The proposition contemplates a profitable

anticipation of interest payments and consequent reduction of the public debt. The transaction may be considered first as a mathematical question of profits, and second as a question of policy affecting the public credit.

The total interest-bearing debt of the United States on the 1st of December, 1899, was $1,037,012,420, with an annual interest charge of $39,960,442.60. Of this amount $97,402,300 were of 5 per cent bonds, payable February 1, 1904; $553,251,500 of 4 per cent bonds, payable July 1, 1907; $198,678,720 of 3 per cent bonds, payable August 1, 1908; $162,315,400 of 4 per cent bonds, payable February 1, 1925, and $25,364,500 of extended 2 per cent bonds, payable at the option of the United States.

The proposition recommended by the committee is to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to convert the 5 per cent bonds due in 1904, the 4 per cent bonds due in 1907, and the 3 per cent bonds due in 1908, amounting in the aggregate to $849,332,520, into 2 per cent bonds, payable at the pleasure of the United States after thirty years. On these three classes of bonds there is at present an annual interest charge of $32,960,536.60.

If the entire amount should be converted into the new 2 percents, the annual interest charge would be $16,986,650.40, showing an annual saving by conversion of $15,973,886.20. The Government will be obliged to pay on the three classes of bonds mentioned in interest up to the maturity of the bonds at existing rates $237,021,423. After conversion the amount required to pay interest up to maturity at the proposed rate of 2 per cent would be $125,048,760, showing a total reduction of interest by the conversion of $111,972,663.

In order to induce the holders of the outstanding bonds to consent to the conversion proposed, and in consideration of the reduction of interest effected thereby, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay to them in exchange a sum not greater than the present worth of such bonds, computed to yield an income of 2½ per cent per annum and their par value.

The maximum rate which the Secretary would be authorized to pay for the exchange on each of the classes of bonds, respectively, on the 1st of January, 1899, would be, on the 4 percents, due in 1907, 12.046 per cent; on the 5 percents, due in 1904, 10.700 per cent, and on the 3 percents, due in 1908, 5.839 per cent. The aggregate amount which would be paid under these provisions in case the entire amount of bonds was converted would be, upon the 4 percents, due in 1907, $66,645,782; on the 5 percents, due in 1904, $10,421,923, and on the 3 percents, due in 1908, $11,601,248, or a total possible payment upon all classes of bonds of $88,668,953.

If this entire sum should be paid and be deducted from the saving in interest as shown above, there would still be a net profit to the Government, by the conversion, of $23,303,710. Considered, then, simply from the standpoint of a profit to the Government, the desirability of the exchange is established beyond question.

The surplus in the Treasury over and above the amount required for an adequate working balance and for the reserve fund created by this bill would allow the Secretary to pay without difficulty the $88,000,000 which would be required to effect this reduction of interest.

In fact, under present conditions and with the necessity confronting us of more promptly turning current receipts back into the channels of business, the payments suggested would afford welcome relief from dangerous congestion.

With a transaction that promises such satisfactory results so far as profits are concerned, we are bound to inquire closely whether there is anything in its details or conditions that conflicts with the traditional policy of the country in its treatment of the public debt.

The people of the United States for a century have been unwilling to consent to anything which looked like a perpetuation of the national debt. Wise public policy dictates that we should always, as far as possible, keep the payment of our obligations within our own control in order that we may be able to economically apply any surplus revenues we may have from time to time to the reduction of the debt, looking forward to its ultimate extinction.

It is true that the proposition contained in this section postpones the date at which the Government may exercise its option to redeem the bonds, but this will not, in the opinion of the committee, have the effect of placing this portion of the national debt beyond the control of the Government. The bonds are to be issued at par, and it is impossible for us to foresee any circumstances or conditions which will cause a 2 per cent bond to be sold at any considerable premium.

It seems clear to us that a bond which will remain substantially at par throughout its existence is more desirable than any other, not only to the Government, but to a large class of investors. The question of premiums is always a difficult one to deal with. A debt can only be reduced by the application of surplus revenues and these can be used just as economically in the purchase of a bond in the open market at par as by a redemption of the same amount of indebtedness at maturity.

From this standpoint the rate of interest which the bonds shall bear, supposing it to be low enough to prevent the bonds from largely appreciating in value, is more important than the length of time which the bonds have to run. Considerations of this nature have led other countries to issue securities in the form of perpetual annuities, with no time fixed for their redemption. In cases of this kind where the annual payments are low the securities were originally issued at less than par, and sell in the market at a considerable discount. Even the British 3 per cent consols reached par but four times in the century from 1789 to 1889.

While there is universal assent to the proposition that the debt-paying policy of the United States is a wise one and should be persisted in, it is impossible to state with any degree of accuracy how rapidly it will be possible for us to reduce our indebtedness. The sinking fund requires the payment of about $50,000,000 per annum, and it is not at all likely that in the near future we shall be able to reduce the debt more rapidly than this. All of us were impressed with the idea in 1892–93 that the national debt was soon to be extinguished; but by processes and for reasons which it is not necessary for me to enlarge upon, it unexpectedly increased from $585,037,100 in 1893 to $1,037,012,420 on the 1st of December, 1899.

We trust that our expenditures will soon be on a peace footing, but we must realize that we shall have large disbursements for some time to come, which it may not be possible to pay from the current revenues. For instance, there is a general belief that we are soon to build an interoceanic canal, which will involve an expenditure of, say, $150,000,000. In the development of the vast resources of our country, meaning to include in this phrase our new possessions, it may not be unreasonable to suppose that payments will be necessary for public purposes in excess of our present estimates. Coincident with this natural tendency to an increase of expenses we shall have to meet an emphatic demand for a reduction or repeal of some of the more onerous of our war taxes.

In considering the possibilities of the future we can not overlook the fact that the national debts of the world have increased at an astonishing rate. In 1862 the aggregate of the national debts of the world was about thirteen thousand million dollars and in 1892 thirty-one thousand millions. Notwithstanding all these uncertainties, we are bound, however, as prudent legislators to so arrange our affairs that we can apply our surplus revenues at any time promptly and economically to the reduction of our outstanding obligations, and this can be done under the terms of the pending measure.

In the minds of the committee the serious question is not whether the conversion authorized by this section would prove a profitable transaction to the Government—on this point they apprehend there is no doubt—but whether the holders of the outstanding bonds would be willing to make the exchange upon the terms authorized. We could not expect to dispose of a 2 per cent bond at par under usual conditions. We can not expect an investor to give up a security paying a given rate of interest and accept one paying a much lower rate unless he had some controlling motive to induce him to make the exchange. We offer the holder of outstanding bonds the inducement of an obligation payable, principal and interest, specifically in gold coin and a security for a long term in place of one maturing in a short time.

This extension gives an important element of value to the new security. It has been found desirable—in fact, necessary—in all the great refunding operations of the past to give to new securities a longer and more certain tenure than those which have been refunded. For instance, by far the most important refunding operation of recent times was the conversion of British 3 per cent consols in 1888. These securities amounted, in round numbers, to more than two thousand five hundred million dollars; they were redeemable at the pleasure of the Government after one year's notice. In issuing the new consols the Government was obliged to relinquish the right of redemption for a period of thirty-five years and to agree to pay 2½ per cent for fifteen years up to 1903 and then 2½ per cent for twenty years up to 1923.

There are a variety of circumstances which make the present an auspicious time to refund the public debt. In recent years there has been a gradual appreciation in the prices of high-class securities throughout the world. This movement has been more marked in the United States than elsewhere. The increasing demand for our bonds has given to these securities an exceptionally strong position in the world's market. Take the fours of 1907 as an example. The prices at which they have sold in the past five months have realized to investors the following rates: August, 2.195 per cent; September, 2.222 per cent; October, 2.255 per cent; November, 2.206 per cent; December, 2.005 per cent. It is evident from these quotations that the credit of the United States is even now approximating a 2 per cent basis.

We believe it is impossible to overestimate the advantage which would accrue to the United States from placing its national debt upon a 2 per cent basis and keeping its obligations, issued at this rate, at par in the markets of the world. If all the bonds which

have been issued since 1893 had been sold at par on the basis proposed in this bill the sum saved in interest to the maturity of the bonds would have been nearly $150,000,000. The public securities of Great Britain, the creditor nation of the world, are selling to-day practically on a 2½ per cent basis. The obligations of all the other nations, which are in any sense commercial or industrial rivals of the United States, sell at prices which realize much higher rates. The following are the quotations of the securities of the principal European nations in London on December 9, 1899:

Austrian gold fours	97 to 99
Dutch two-and-a-halfs	80 to 82
French rentes, threes	98 to 100
German imperial loan, threes	88 to 89
Prussian consols, three-and-a-halfs	97 to 99
Italian fives	93½ to 94½
Swedish threes	88 to 92
Russian threes	85 to 87
British consols, 2½ to 1903, then 2¼ to 1923	101½ to 102½
British two-and-a-halfs, 1905	99 to 100

By the provisions of this bill we remove all possible doubts and apprehensions as to the character of our monetary standard and make it clear to the world that we intend under all circumstances to keep all forms of our currency equal in value with gold, and it would be a source of national pride if we could, in addition to this great achievement, place the credit of the United States on a higher plane than is occupied by that of any other country.

One of the most potent influences for securing the successful consummation of the plan proposed will, we anticipate, be found in the active cooperation of the national banks. The demand from the banks will establish a market for the bonds and fix a price at not less than par for other purchasers. It may not be possible to measure the effect which the constant demand of the banks for our securities in the past has exerted in sustaining their prices, but it must be quite evident that without this influence our bonds would have sold at lower rates.

One of the reasons which led the committee to recommend this plan of conversion was that the bonds suggested would be much more desirable as a basis for national-bank note circulation than the outstanding securities. The high premium at which outstanding bonds are held renders their use as a basis for bank circulation unprofitable. When we consider that we have more than $600,000,000 of capital in the national banks and but little more than $200,000,000 of note circulation, and this with a strong demand for an increase of currency, we are led to the conclusion that some action should be taken to allow the national banks to increase their note circulation.

With high-priced bonds and the amount of issue limited to 90 per cent of their par value, note circulation can not be profitable, and it is likely to be unprofitable whenever there is an unusual demand for money and in localities where the rate of interest is above the normal average. If a bank can buy a 2 per cent bond at par and issue an amount of currency equal to the purchase price of the bonds, it is very evident that, without reference to the rate at which it may loan its money, it can make a profit upon circulation of 2 per cent per annum, less the amount of taxes and the expenses incident to the redemption of its notes.

According to the Treasury Department's estimate, with taxes and expenses deducted, the net profit on circulation under this bill with 2 per cent bonds for security would be 1.437 per cent per annum. If we contrast this with the uncertain profit of one-fourth of 1 per cent per annum now realized on circulation based on 4 per cent bonds, we can feel sure that the banks will take a conservative view of their own interests and give the Government their active cooperation in the work of exchange. In the light of experience, the profit which would accrue under the new bonds is not excessive.

With the profits on circulation small or uncertain, we have had a constantly diminishing amount of note issues. The banks have been unable to respond to increasing demands for currency, as they should be able to do under normal conditions and as I believe they will be able to do if this bill becomes a law. A very wide divergence of opinion has been developed recently as to the terms and conditions under which banks should be permitted to issue circulating notes. This divergence has been so wide that there is general acquiescence in the conviction that it will not now be possible to secure the adoption of any plan of currency reform which involves a change in the basis of bank circulation.

Under these circumstances it is the duty of Congress, in the public interest, to so modify the national banking act as to give to banking associations an opportunity to issue currency with a reasonable profit. If the provisions of this bill are enacted into law, we may expect a considerable increase in the national-bank note circulation in the near future, and there is no reason, if the business of the country demands it, why in time the outstanding circulation should not equal the capitalization of the banks.

The seventh section provides that upon the deposit of United States bonds by any national banking association in the manner provided by law such association shall be entitled to receive circulating notes equal to the par value of the bonds deposited. It also provides that any national banking association now having bonds on deposit shall be entitled to the same privilege. The Senate has upon several occasions passed bills for this purpose practically without opposition, and I shall assume that it is not necessary to restate the obvious reasons which have led the committee to renew their recommendation.

The eighth section provides that any national banking association having on deposit as security for its circulating notes bonds of the United States bearing interest at 2 per cent per annum shall pay a tax upon such circulating notes of one-half of 1 per cent annually instead of the tax of 1 per cent now imposed by law. We believe this reduction in taxation is necessary to encourage national banks to increase their circulation, and it will undoubtedly have the effect of promoting the conversion of bonds provided for in the sixth section.

By the enactment of the provisions of this bill into law the solemn pledge which was the moving force in a great political campaign is redeemed. In the light of the promises of certainty and security, which this bill will fulfill, we have already entered upon an era of unexampled industrial and commercial growth and prosperity. Its final adoption will give new activity to the enterprise of our people and broaden and deepen the currents of our national life. It will dispel all fears of possible disturbance of our currency system through antagonistic administrative action. It will give added value to our securities of all kinds in foreign or domestic markets. It will have an important influence in the further development of our rapidly increasing foreign trade, as it will enable us to enter the contest for the world's markets on more favorable terms.

That the policy of this bill will meet with popular approval there can be no doubt. The cause of sound money is vastly stronger now than it was in 1896. Every contention then made by our opponents in regard to the effect of the retention of the gold standard or the continued rejection of the silver standard has been proved by the logic of events to be unfounded. If Democratic leaders and their allies, old or new, see fit to make the free coinage of silver and antagonism to the policy embodied in this bill the issue of another political contest and renew their destructive attacks upon public interests, they will find that their defeat of 1896 will but faintly suggest the character of the disaster which will overtake them in 1900.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. HAWLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After thirty minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 3 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 8, 1900, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 4, 1900.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Frank Simmons, of Alabama, to be marshal of the United States for the southern district of Alabama, to which position he was temporarily appointed September 16, 1897, during a recess of the Senate, and nominated to the same position on December 18, 1897; but Congress having adjourned without taking action as to his confirmation, he was again appointed July 9, 1898, during a recess of the Senate. On December 13, 1898, Mr. Simmons was again nominated to the position above named, and, failing of confirmation, was again temporarily appointed on March 4, 1899, during a recess of the Senate.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

W. Frank Kinney, of Connecticut, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Connecticut, to succeed Thomas A. Lake, resigned.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE ARMY.

Second Lieut. Llewellyn W. Oliver, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, January 3, 1900, with rank from February 16, 1899.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 4, 1900.

SECRETARY OF LEGATION.

Edwin V. Morgan, of New York, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at Seoul, Korea.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Elmer R. Edson, of Indiana, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Thomas F. Richardson, of Louisiana, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

P. A. Surg. Louis L. Williams, of South Carolina, to be a surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

P. A. Surg. William J. Pettus, of Virginia, to be a surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Asst. Surg. Hugh S. Cumming, of Virginia, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Asst. Surg. Joseph B. Greene, of Alabama, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

First Lieut. Owen S. Willey, of Louisiana, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Benjamin L. Brockway, of Alabama, to be a third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

General officers.

TO BE BRIGADIER-GENERALS.

Col. Samuel B. M. Young, Third United States Cavalry (brigadier-general, United States Volunteers), January 2, 1900.

Lieut. Col. Arthur MacArthur, assistant adjutant-general, United States Army (major-general, United States Volunteers), January 2, 1900.

Lieut. Col. William Ludlow, Corps of Engineers, United States Army (brigadier-general, United States Volunteers), January 21, 1900.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

To be major-general by brevet, to rank from June 19, 1899.

Brig. Gen. Lloyd Wheaton, United States Volunteers, for conspicuous gallantry in action against insurgent forces near Imus, Philippine Islands, June 19, 1899.

General officer.

TO BE MAJOR-GENERAL.

Brig. Gen. John C. Bates, United States Volunteers, January 2, 1900.

NAVAL OFFICER OF CUSTOMS.

John Webre, of Louisiana, to be naval officer of customs for the port of New Orleans, in the State of Louisiana.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Charles J. Robb, of Indiana, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Michigan City, in the State of Indiana.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

John A. Thornton, of Louisiana, to be collector of customs for the district of Teche, in the State of Louisiana.

POSTMASTERS.

Albert Weed, to be postmaster at Ticonderoga, in the county of Essex and State of New York.

N. H. Ingersoll, to be postmaster at Brainerd, in the county of Crow Wing and State of Minnesota.

Charles C. White, to be postmaster at Orono, in the county of Penobscot and State of Maine.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *January 4, 1900.*

The House met at 12 o'clock. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. GILLET of New York appeared and took the oath of office required by law.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY REGARDING NATIONAL BANKS.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present the following report from the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York presents the following privileged report from the Committee on Ways and Means, which the Clerk will read.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for order, please.

The SPEAKER. The point is well taken, and the House will be in order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, directed to furnish the House of Representatives as soon as possible with the following information:

1. All letters, agreements, papers, or documents between the Treasury Department of the United States, or any person connected therewith, and the National City Bank and the Hanover National Bank, of the city of New York, or any person acting for them or either of them, since the 4th day of March, 1897, relating to the depositing of public funds, bonds, or revenues in said bank or banks, or any other relations or business transactions now existing or heretofore had between the Government and the said banks or either of them.

2. The amount of public money, bonds, or revenue deposited with said banks or either of them by the Government, for what length of time, and the reasons therefor, and whether said banks or either of them have paid the Government any interest on said deposits, and if so, how much, and all other information concerning the same or in any way relating thereto.

With the following amendments, and with the recommendation that the resolution as amended be adopted.

1. After the word "Resolved," in line 1, strike out the words "by the House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled."
2. In line 2, page 1, strike out "directed" and insert "requested."
3. In line 3, page 1, strike out the words "as soon as possible with."
4. In line 4, page 1, insert, after the word "first," the words "Copies of."
5. In line 15, page 1, after the word "them," insert the words "or with any national bank."
6. In line 1, page 2, after the word "Government," insert the words "upon what security."
7. In line 2, page 2, strike out "either" and insert "any."

Add at the end of the resolution:

"3. And also the date of the sale of the customs-house property of the United States in New York City to said National City Bank, the date of the execution of the deed thereto, the date and manner of payment of the purchase money therefor, the disposition of the proceeds of said sale, and whether or not the Government has paid any rents for said property or any portion thereof for any purpose since the day of sale, and if so, to whom, and all facts relating to said transaction."

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Clerk will read the resolution as it will read when amended.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks for the reading of the resolution as amended.

Mr. PAYNE. I think the paper I send to the desk will help the Clerk, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution as it will be when amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, requested to furnish the House of Representatives the following information:

First. Copies of all letters, agreements, papers, or documents between the Treasury Department of the United States, or any person connected therewith, and the National City Bank and the Hanover National Bank, of the city of New York, or any person acting for them, or either of them, since the 4th day of March, 1897, relating to the depositing of public funds, bonds, or revenues in said bank or banks, or any other relations or business transactions now existing or heretofore had between the Government and the said banks, or either of them.

Second. The amount of public money, bonds, or revenue deposited with said banks, or either of them, or with any national bank, by the Government, upon what security, for what length of time, and the reasons therefor, and whether said banks, or any of them, have paid the Government any interest on said deposits, and if so, how much, and all other information concerning the same or in any way relating thereto.

Third. And also the date of the sale of the customs-house property of the United States in New York City to said National City Bank, the date of the execution of the deed thereto, the date and manner of payment of the purchase money therefor, the disposition of the proceeds of said sale, and whether or not the Government has paid any rents for said property or any portion thereof for any purpose since the day of sale; and, if so, to whom, and all facts relating to said transaction.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentlemen from New York has the floor.

Mr. PAYNE. Does my colleague desire any time?

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, as the introducer of the original resolution I accept the amendments. I do not desire to debate the matter now. I am anxious the resolution should pass so that we can speedily get all the facts.

Mr. PAYNE. Well.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. PAYNE. There is a clerical error in the third part of the resolution. It reads "customs-house." The letter "s" should be stricken out.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction will be made. There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I hope the gentleman will yield me five minutes. I want to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PAYNE. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. LEVY. Allow me to offer the following amendment, which I think will be germane:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the House of Representatives his reasons for the delay in making such deposits in the national banks until a financial panic had been reached.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, that perhaps may be in order when this resolution is passed, after we get the information from the Secretary of the Treasury, but not until then. I shall not yield for an amendment of that kind.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman wants five minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. I yield five minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Speaker, in the month of September the reserve of the banks in the city of New York ran down. I warned the Secretary of the Treasury at that time. He failed to heed my warning until after this panic took place. The cause of all this depression in the city of New York and the United States has

been taxation and the absorption by the Treasury of the United States of the internal-revenue collections. If the Secretary of the Treasury had come to the relief of the banks in the month of September or October instead of buying bonds, there would have been no panic in this country. That is why I offer this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say to the gentleman from New York that he can not offer this amendment on yielded time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and amendments.

The previous question was ordered.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Did I understand the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] to yield to his colleague [Mr. LEVY] for the purpose of offering an amendment?

Mr. PAYNE. No; I did not.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. PAYNE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations I report the following resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations, or such of the subcommittee as they may designate, shall have leave to sit during the session of the House during the Fifty-sixth Congress and during the recess.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois what recess he refers to?

Mr. CANNON. The ordinary recess that Congress agrees to through the session. In the short session it is necessary for the committee to sit through the recess.

The resolution was agreed to.

PRINTING IN THE RECORD.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from the National Brewers' Association, and ask unanimous consent to have it read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri presents a petition from the National Brewers' Association and asks that it be read and printed in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I object. I do not want to lumber up the RECORD.

REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following appointments as Regents of the Smithsonian Institution: ROBERT R. HITT of Illinois; ROBERT ADAMS, JR., of Pennsylvania; HUGH A. DINSMORE of Arkansas.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Leave of absence was granted to Mr. FARIS for three days, on account of important business.

And then (at 12 o'clock and 17 minutes), on motion of Mr. PAYNE, the House, in accordance with its previous order, adjourned until Monday, January 8, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a statement of the delinquencies and indebtedness of sundry officers of the Government in reports and accounts, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 909) conferring on the Court of Claims jurisdiction with respect to certain claims, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 159) for the relief of the estate of George W. Lawrence, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 7); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2156) for the relief of Oliver M. Blair, administrator of Thomas P. Blair, deceased, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 8); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. OTJEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3020) for the relief of Rev. William T. McElroy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 9); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HENRY of Mississippi, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4844) for the relief of the owner or owners of the schooner *Bergen*, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 10); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 231) for the relief of John Dailey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 11); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred House Document No. 183, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 5264) for the relief of the estate of Maj. Guy Howard, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 12); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3599) for the relief of Lewis M. Millard, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 13); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WEAVER, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 321) for the relief of legal representatives of Samuel Tewksbury, deceased, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 14); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1860) for the relief of the trustees of Carson-Newman College, at Mossycreek, Tenn., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 15); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2356) for the relief of Hiram Johnson and others, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 16); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SPALDING, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1959) for the relief of the heirs of George W. Saulpaw, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 17); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 427) for the relief of heirs of Mrs. Tellisse W. Wilson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 18); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills and petitions; which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4021) to correct the military record of Albert Boker—Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 4116) to correct the military record of Joachim Buenz—Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 4119) to correct the military record of Miles Durkee—Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 146) for the relief of Warren A. Woodson—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 199) for the relief of Mrs. Katherine Ratchford—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 282) for the relief of Harriet V. Gridley—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 348) for the relief of Peter C. Lawyer—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 392) to pension Mrs. Walter E. Spicer, widow of Walter E. Spicer, late in the postal service of the United States at Guantanamo, Cuba—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 413) for the relief of Arulus C. Parkhurst—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 553) to increase the pension of Fannie A. Marable—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 693) to grant a pension to John M. Calloway and correct his military record—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 732) granting a pension to Henry Ramey—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1146) amending the military record of Albert E. Pringle and granting his aged and dependent mother a pension—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 1434) to correct the military records of W. J. Whitson and Sidney Whitson and grant their dependent father, Isaac Whitson, a pension—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 1633) for the relief of Nancy A. E. Hoffman—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1761) for the relief of Alexander Lucas, of Siola, Marshall County, W. Va.—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 1804) for the relief of Charles Howard—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 1818) for the relief of Allen Greenleaf—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 2131) granting a pension of $12 per month to Matilda Witt, widow of J. Burgess Witt—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2143) for the relief of Thomas Hardin, late of Company F, Fifth Tennessee Volunteers, Mexican war—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2671) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary A. Lipps—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 2734) granting an increase of pension to Dolly L. Harrall, of Hinds County, Miss.—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2904) to correct the military record of Jesse Brenner—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 3132) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John H. Lash—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 3281) to remove the charge of desertion against Edward Hughes and place his name on the pension roll at the rate of $25 per month—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 3569) granting a pension to Mary Idle—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3613) for the relief of Dobson Johnson, of Dekalb County, Tenn.—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 3766) granting a pension to Leo Frey—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4053) for the relief of Mrs. S. E. Edwards—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4229) to grant an honorable discharge to Lewis Goodrich—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 4368) for the relief of Flora B. Hinds—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4517) for the relief of Abel Patrick—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 4558) for the relief of Emma Howell—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4695) granting a pension to Alice Harrison—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4891) to increase the pension of Mrs. Virginia Forse—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4984) granting a pension to D. W. Marshall, of Eldorado, Kans.—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4995) to place on the pension roll the name of John E. Jefferies—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 144) granting a pension to Mrs. Elcy R. Kelly—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 193) granting an increase of pension to Hester S. Crane—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 394) granting a pension to George W. Vaughn—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 395) for the amendment of the record of James Johnson, late an enlisted man in the United States Navy—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 396) for amendment of the record of Felix Sellim, late an enlisted man in the United States Navy—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 406) granting a pension to Emma H. Higley—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 588) granting a pension to John Eckland—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 838) to pension Hix Patterson—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1496) granting an increase of pension to Alvin F. Kimball—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1846) granting a pension to Andrew L. Anderson—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1974) granting a pension to Hannah M. Cheney, of Springfield, Vt.—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2115) granting a pension to Thomas L. Cate, of Cleveland, Bradley County, Tenn.—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2481) for the relief of John R. Watson—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2517) for the relief of George Heishman—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2611) granting arrears of pension to Pauline M. Beach, widow of Henry S. Beach, deceased, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment Michigan Infantry Volunteers, and First Regiment Michigan Heavy Artillery Volunteers—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2997) granting a pension to Elam Kirk—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3412) for the relief of John E. Barrett—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 3415) for the relief of Samuel Grunlee—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3437) granting a pension to Elam Kirk—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3522) for the relief of Lucy S. Bane—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3706) for the relief of Jerry S. Fish, of Cameron, Marshall County, W. Va—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3987) to pension Melvina J. Swigers, widow of Solomon J. Swigers—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4179) granting a pension to Henry B. Lambe—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4225) for the relief of Rosa L. Couch—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4369) to grant pensions to the East Tennessee bridge burners—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4370) to increase the pension of Annie B. Goodrich—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2356) for the relief of Hiram Johnson and others—

Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

Petitions of the survivors of the One hundred and sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry; Post 638, Grand Army of the Republic, and of the Ninth Ohio Volunteer Infantry Association—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 5265) to amend section 715, Revised Statutes of the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5266) to appropriate the sum of $55,000 for the repair of the Army and Navy General Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 5267) to amend the provisions of an act entitled "An act making provisions for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for other purposes," providing for the selection of lands in lieu of relinquished claims in forest reservations—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5268) to amend an act entitled "An act to set aside a portion of certain lands in the State of Washington, now known as the Pacific Forest Reserve, as a public park, to be known as the Mount Rainier National Park"—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5269) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide additional regulations for homestead and preemption entries for public lands," approved March 3, 1879—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5270) providing for the erection of a convalescent military hospital at Vancouver Barracks, Wash.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5271) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to fix the salaries of the deputy collectors of customs at the subports of Tacoma and Seattle, in the State of Washington, and repealing all laws inconsistent therewith—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARHAM: A bill (H. R. 5272) to restore to the public domain excluded portions of Round Valley Indian Reservation—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 5273) to require street railway companies operating electric cars, cable, or other cars propelled by steam, cable, or electricity, in the District of Columbia to protect certain of their employees from the inclemency of the weather during certain months of the year, and providing punishment for violations thereof—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 5274) fixing the per diem of members of the legislative assembly of the Territory of Arizona at $8 per day—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5275) for the relief of the occupants of the lands included within the boundaries of what is known as the Algodones grant, in Yuma County, Ariz.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 5276) to establish a light-house on Ohio Reef, in the East Passage of Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 5277) for the relief of settlers and purchasers of public lands in the State of California, and to provide for the repayment of purchase money thereof—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5278) to detach certain counties from the United States judicial district of northern California and to annex such counties to the United States judicial district of southern California; to divide said southern district of California into two divisions and to provide for the holding of terms of court at the city of Fresno and city of Los Angeles—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 5279) to divide the State of Washington into two judicial districts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 5280) to continue the publication of the Supplement to the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5281) to provide for a third edition of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACK: A bill (H. R. 5282) to exempt the power of attorney in so-called judgment notes from the operation of the war-revenue act of June 13, 1898—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 5283) granting settlers the right to make second homestead entries—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 5284) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to improve the Missouri River at and near the city of Leavenworth, Kans., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5285) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to improve the Missouri River on the Kansas side in Doniphan County, Kans., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5286) for the allotment of unallotted lands belonging to the Seneca and other tribes of Indians in the Quapaw Agency, Ind. T., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 5287) to refund the outstanding United States and Treasury notes with bonds bearing interest at the rate of 2 per cent, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5288) relating to lights on steam pilot vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TONGUE: A bill (H. R. 5289) to provide for the construction of a public building at Oregon City, Oreg.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 5290) to provide for free homes on lands purchased from Indian tribes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DENNY (by request): A bill (H. R. 5291) to validate deeds in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 5292) to prescribe a new form of the 3-cent piece—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. DALY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 5293) for the protection of the public against the operation of trusts, combinations, associations, and agreements to unduly enhance or diminish the value of articles of commerce—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 5294) to establish a high court of patents, trade-marks, and copyrights—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: A bill (H. R. 5295) to repeal an act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States, approved July 1, 1898—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 5296) establishing terms of the United States circuit court at Newbern and Elizabeth City, N. C.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 5297) to amend the act entitled "An act to better define and regulate the rights of aliens to hold and own real estate in the Territories," approved March 2, 1897—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 103) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of United States Senators by popular vote—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 104) for preliminary survey for construction of a portage railway at The Dalles, on the Columbia River, between Oregon and Washington—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 105) for the improvement of Grays Harbor, Washington, and the repair of Government dikes in that vicinity—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 106) extending the thanks of Congress to Rear-Admiral Sampson and Commodore Schley and the men under them for the destruction of the Spanish fleet at Santiago—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Idaho: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 107) to amend the Constitution of the United States relating to uniform marriage and divorce laws and the enforcement thereof by adequate penalties—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALL: A resolution (H. Res. 69) that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia furnish the House of Representatives full, specific, and definite information as to the right of the Pennsylvania and other railroad corporations to occupy and use the Government grounds, etc.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LENTZ: A resolution (H. Res. 70) relative to the appointment of a committee to investigate a matter existing between the United States Treasury and the National City Bank of New York City—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUARLES: A resolution (H. Res. 71) expressing sympathy with South African republics—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Idaho: A memorial of the legislature of the

State of Idaho, favoring the passage of a law by Congress creating the Tenth judicial circuit, having jurisdiction in the States of Montana, Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and Idaho—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5298) to remove charge of desertion against Benjamin A. Helm—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 5299) increasing the pension of Joseph McCune—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5300) granting a pension to Ida M. Kinney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5301) granting an honorable discharge to Ezra Abbott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKETT: A bill (H. R. 5302) granting a pension to James D. McCann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5303) granting a pension to Julia A. Prouty, late an army nurse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5304) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Benjamin Wilks—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5305) granting a pension to John S. G. Sperry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARHAM: A bill (H. R. 5306) removing the charge of desertion from the record of Louis W. Mayer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5307) granting a pension to William J. Abbott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5308) granting a pension to William Conover—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5309) granting a pension to Cyrus G. Dorris—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5310) granting a pension to John Babtisto Truvido—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5311) for the relief of A. Berding, or A. Berding & Co., of California—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5312) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Jacob Rothenbuecher—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5313) granting a pension to Hazel Cramer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5314) granting a pension to John York—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5315) granting a pension to John J. Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5316) granting a pension to E. T. M. Hurlbert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 5317) to correct the date of muster of Company F, Pacific Battalion Missouri Home Guards—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5318) for the relief of the heirs or legal representatives of James D. Sullivan, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 5319) for the relief of William B. Reaney, surviving partner of the firm of Reaney, Son & Archbold—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5320) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Young Egbert, widow of Harry C. Egbert, late colonel of the Twenty-second United States Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5321) to remove the charge of desertion from the naval record of William McGuire—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 5322) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Nathan Loeb, alias Nathan Lyons, late a private of Company A, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5323) to amend the military record of Thomas M. Elliott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROSIUS: A bill (H. R. 5324) for the relief of the employees of William M. Jacobs—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHICKERING: A bill (H. R. 5325) for the relief of Ira Doane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 5326) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus W. Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5327) granting an increase of pension to James Byrne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5328) to pension Ida N. Hubbard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5329) for the relief of Robert Whish—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5330) granting a pension to Uri S. Keith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5331) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William Wax—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5332) to increase the pension of Sarah R. Trimble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5333) granting a pension to James L. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5334) for the relief of D. W. Boutwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5335) for the relief of Charles E. Collins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5336) granting an increase of pension to William S. Swaney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5337) for the relief of certain officers and enlisted men of the First Kansas Colored Volunteers, and for other purposes—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5338) granting an increase of pension to Madison Snapp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5339) for the relief of Franklin D. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5340) granting an increase of pension to John Brown—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5341) granting an increase of pension to George E. Dunn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5342) granting an honorable discharge to James Coughlin, of North Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5343) granting an increase of pension to Philip H. Clear—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5344) for the relief of J. B. McCall—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5345) for the relief of Solomon F. Brown, of Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5346) granting a pension to Elizabeth B. Norris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5347) granting a pension to Mrs. E. E. Bay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENNY: A bill (H. R. 5348) for the relief of the estate of Richard Lawson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DE VRIES: A bill (H. R. 5349) to correct the military record of Homer L. Wells—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5350) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against Frank S. Zeller and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5351) to increase the pension of Mrs. Mary Sprague—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5352) for the relief of the heirs of M. H. Wells, deceased, late of Yankee Hill, Butte County, State of California—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5353) for the relief of the heirs of Robert Richardson, deceased, late of Noxubee County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GILBERT: A bill (H. R. 5354) for the benefit of Thomas W. Caldwell, of Jessamine County, Ky.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 5355) for the relief of John D. Hale, of Tilford, Meade County, S. Dak.—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5356) granting a pension to Joshua B. Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5357) for the relief of William H. H. Lee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5358) granting the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 30, township 17 north, range 3 east, Black Hills meridian, to the Nashville Presbyterian Church, of Nashville, S. Dak.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HEDGE: A bill (H. R. 5359) granting a pension to Henry J. Alvis—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL (by request): A bill (H. R. 5360) for the relief of the legal administrators of Daniel McLeod, deceased, of the South Brooklyn Works—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HEPBURN (by request): A bill (H. R. 5361) authorizing the appointment of Allen V. Reed, now a captain on the retired list of the Navy, as a commodore on the retired list of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 5362) for the relief of Daniel Baker, of Frederick County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5363) for the relief of Paul C. Bowman, administrator of Anna C. Bowman, deceased, of Rockingham County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5364) for the relief of Mrs. Vienna Roy, Warren County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5365) for the relief of the estate of Isaac Hurn, of Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5366) for the relief of Jonathan Holler, of Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5367) for the relief of Catharine Flick, of Rockingham County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5368) for the relief of the estate of Benjamin Hoover, deceased, Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5369) for the relief of George W. Thompson, Clarke County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5370) for the relief of the estate of Joseph D. Crabill, deceased, Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5371) for the relief of Samuel H. Sowner, of Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5372) for the relief of Abraham Andes, Rockingham County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5373) for the relief of the estate of Jacob Hammon, deceased, Rockingham County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5374) for the relief of Morris Lutz, of Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5375) for the relief of Jacob Dolman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5376) for the relief of Mrs. Amelia Downey, of Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5377) for the relief of Joseph Blosser, of Page County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5378) for the relief of the estate of Mary E. Milley, of Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5379) for the relief of David Swartz, of Rockingham County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5380) for the relief of the estate of Gideon Tobin, deceased, of Page County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5381) for the relief of David Ritenour, of Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5382) for relief of John Fox, of Peter, Page County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5383) for the relief of the estate of Samuel Sheetz, deceased, Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JACK: A bill (H. R. 5384) granting increase of pension to Capt. Daniel W. Dougherty, of Saltsburg, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 5385) referring to the Court of Claims a certain claim for the use of hook attachments for firearms—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5386) granting a pension to Emelia H. Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 5387) for the relief of Martha J. England—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5388) for the relief of Benjamin Williams—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 5389) for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Bland—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 5390) granting a pension to Mrs. Maria E. Mailley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 5391) granting increase of pension to John S. Miles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 5392) for the relief of Salem Vigeant—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 5393) granting a pension to Capt. James W. Haney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. QUARLES: A bill (H. R. 5394) for the relief of William Crosby, of Augusta County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5395) for the relief of Amanda Lam, administratrix of the estate of James Lam, deceased, of Rockbridge County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5396) for the relief of James A. Snyder, executor of Jacob Snyder, deceased, of Augusta County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5397) for the relief of Mrs. S. M. Cale, of Augusta County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5398) for the relief of David W. Speck, of Augusta County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5399) for the relief of Mrs. Maria D. La Rue, Augusta County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5400) for the relief of James W. Smith, of Augusta County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5401) for the relief of the estate of Robert J. Hope, deceased, of Staunton, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 5402) granting an increase of pension to Robert Moran—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 5403) for the relief of William Whittaker, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5404) for the relief of H. S. Simmons's estate—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5405) for the relief of Mrs. Catherine O'Dea, of Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5406) to increase the pension of Mrs. N. R. Cooper—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 5407) granting an increase of pension to Harriet V. Gridley, widow of the late Charles V. Gridley, captain, United States Navy—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5408) for the relief of Peter Fisher—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5409) for relief of Matthew T. Lewis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5410) to remove the charge of desertion from record of Robert Mallion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5411) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Martin Barley and to place said name upon the pension roll—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5412) to remove the charge of desertion from record of Anthony Remley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5413) to pension Julia B. Hubble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5414) to pension Milo Osterhout, Company H, First Regiment Michigan Sharpshooters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5415) granting a pension to Arminda Marble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5416) for the relief of Melinda Weisser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5417) to increase the pension of C. H. Gates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCUDDER: A bill (H. R. 5418) for the relief of Gattleib Schlecht and Maurice D. Higgins, and for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of William Bindhammer and Valentine Brasch—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5419) for the relief of certain parties by the refund of moneys paid as customs duties on goods destroyed by fire in a United States bonded warehouse, and to refer said claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 5420) for the relief of P. E. Parker—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5421) granting a pension to Barney McKay—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 5422) granting an increase of pension to Richard A. Cornell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5423) granting a pension to Caroline L. Wade—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNODGRASS: A bill (H. R. 5424) for the relief of George W. Conatzer—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5425) for relief of Ann Bart, widow of William G. Bart, deceased, a soldier in the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5426) for the relief of Wesley W. Elam, of Overton County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5427) for the relief of John M. B. Walker, of Cumberland County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5428) for the relief of John M. B. Walker, administrator of the estate of James Walker, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TERRY: A bill (H. R. 5429) for the relief of Elvy Brewer, of Saline County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WANGER: A bill (H. R. 5430) for the relief of the legal representatives of Chalkley Good, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ZIEGLER: A bill (H. R. 5431) to increase the pension of Reuben H. Lynch, of Company G, One hundred and twenty-sixth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5432) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joseph Tuckey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5433) to remove the charge of desertion from

the military record of William R. Cox—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5434) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William B. Stone—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5435) to increase the pension of Alexander P. Baugher, of Company G, Two hundred and ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5436) to increase the pension of Joseph K. Armstrong, of Company D, Twenty-first Pennsylvania Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5437) to increase the pension of Capt. Hiram S. McNair, Third Maryland Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 5438) to refer the claim of Joseph W. Parish to the Secretary of the Treasury for examination and payment of any balance found due—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEEKISON: A bill (H. R. 5439) granting a pension to Thomas B. Holland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5440) granting a pension to Smith Jewell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5441) granting a pension to Hugh Thompson, Company H, Fifteenth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 5442) for the relief of Edward R. Vance—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 5443) granting a pension to Mrs. Elizabeth Edwards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5444) to increase the pension of Albert W. Brush—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5445) to increase the pension of Joseph Stanclift—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 108) for the relief of Thomas Hoyne—to the Committee on Appropriations.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of the United States Brewers' Association, praying for the repeal of the extra tax on beer—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of a modification of the pension laws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, protest of General Madison Miller Post, No. 444, Department of Missouri, Grand Army of the Republic, against proposed legislation to pension deserters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Moffitt-West Drug Company, of St. Louis, Mo., urging the repeal of the internal-revenue tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Board of Trade of Kansas City, Mo., in favor of certain amendments to the interstate commerce law—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Petition of druggists in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., relating to the stamp tax on medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, in favor of the passage of Senate bill No. 732, in relation to lights on steam pilot vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Petition of 29 clerks employed in the post-office of the city of New York, praying for the passage of the bill providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DE VRIES: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of the heirs of M. H. Wells, deceased, late of Yankee Hill, Cal.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DRIGGS: Protests of citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., the "Citizens' Committee," and various business firms of the city of Brooklyn, against making the Brooklyn post-office a station under the control of the New York post-office—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Duquesne Distributing Company, of Pittsburg, Pa., relating to the stamp tax on medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALL: Petition of A. B. Hurd and Frank B. Wythe, favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the classification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of clerks in the post-offices of Long Branch and Asbury Park, N. J., for the classification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LLOYD: Petition of B. R. Dysart and other citizens of Macon, Mo., asking that the pension of John S. Miles be increased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LYBRAND: Memorial of the Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of establishing national battlefield parks at and near Fredericksburg, Va.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Petition of Pond's Extract Company, of New York, asking for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of clerks employed in the New York City post-office, asking for the passage of the bill No. 4351, for the classification of clerks in the first and second class post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petition of Oliver G. Haskett and others, of San Diego, Cal., in support of a bill for the relief of the grade known as "pay clerks in the United States Navy"—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. OTEY: Petition of clerks employed in the post-office at Roanoke, Va., for the classification of clerks in post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RUCKER: Four petitions of citizens of Grundy County, Mo., asking that the names of soldiers who served in the Missouri State Militia be placed on the pension rolls—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of clerks in the post-offices at Moberly and Chillicothe, Mo., asking for the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the classification of clerks in the first and second class post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SHATTUC: Petition of the Grand Army of the Republic of Ohio, in favor of adequate provisions for monuments on the national military park at Vicksburg—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNODGRASS: Papers to accompany House bills for the relief of John M. B. Walker, administrator of the estate of James Walker, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEELE (by request): Petition of Lizzie Culbertson, of Marion, Ind., for widow's pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of J. W. Sumpton and 4 others, of Kokomo, Ind., asking that the pay of post-office clerks be readjusted—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Petition of Rev. F. D. Swindell and others, of Goldsboro, N. C., for the anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Idaho: Resolutions of the city councils of Lewiston, Payette, Nampa, Idaho, board of county commissioners of Latah, Idaho, and of the Lewiston Commercial Club, favoring the construction of a free portage railroad by the Government—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Petitions, etc., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah were laid on the Clerk's desk, and severally referred to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case, as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. I. W. Douglas and others, of Salem, Ind.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: Protests of H. D. Brown, D. R. Cooper, J. F. Seibert, B. H. Moore, representing various churches and societies; also protest of D. A. Cooper and others, of the Fifth Congressional district of Kansas.

By Mr. CURTIS: Petition of W. M. Swickard and other citizens of Topeka, Kans.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Robert H. Leitch and other citizens of the Second Ward, Allegheny, Pa.

By Mr. HALL: Petition of F. M. Small and other citizens of Rimersburg, Pa.

By Mr. HOFFECKER: Resolutions of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Presbyterian Church of Newark, Del., Woman's Home Missionary Society of Grace Methodist Episcopal Church of Wilmington, Del., Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Wilmington Annual Conference; also petitions of voters in the State of Delaware, and Z. J. Belt and others, of Wilmington, Del.

By Mr. JACK: Petition of D. E. Ackard and other citizens of Kittanning, Pa.

By Mr. LITTAUER: Petition of 40 citizens of Gloversville, N. Y., and vicinity.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Petitions of T. J. Stricklin and others, J. B. Eshman and others, W. S. Crawford and others, F. R. Miller and others, of the Fifth Congressional district of Tennessee.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Fremont, Ind.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Nebraska: Three protests of citizens of the Third Congressional district of Nebraska.

By Mr. WILSON of Idaho: Protests of 104 citizens of the State of Idaho, and D. O. Ghormley and others, of the State of Utah.

By Mr. ZIEGLER: Petitions of citizens of the Nineteenth Congressional district of Pennsylvania.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *January 8, 1900.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last, when, on motion of Mr. CARTER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

LEGATION BUILDING AT BANGKOK.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting certain information relative to an appropriation for a legation building at Bangkok, Siam, and the acceptance of a lot of ground at that place for the legation building; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

TRANSFER OF OBSOLETE RIFLES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting certain information relative to the transfer from the War Department to the Navy Department of such worn-out rifles and rifles of obsolete patterns as may be no longer needed for army purposes, for use in Indian schools in the training of pupils in the manual of arms; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. HARRIS presented the petition of Peter Carroll and sundry other citizens of Leavenworth, Kans., praying that an appropriation be made to reimburse them for extra time while employed at Fort Leavenworth subsequent to the year 1869 and up to September 30, 1872; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. TURNER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Skamania County, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to change the forest-reserve boundary; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. ALLEN presented a memorial of the Medical Society of South Omaha, Nebr., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide for the further prevention of cruelty to animals in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Nebraska City, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PROCTOR presented a petition of the Dr. J. B. Kendall Company, of Enosburg Falls, Vt., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of Daniel M. Walsh and sundry other railway mail clerks, of Rutland, Vt., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. VEST presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Moberly, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Labordine Pharmacal Company, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the State Teachers' Association of Missouri, praying for the establishment in the Indian Territory of free public schools; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Kansas City, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate and govern railway and other traffic between and through the various States, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of Ransom Post, No. 131, Department of Missouri, Grand Army of the Republic, of St. Louis, Mo., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the removal of all the disabilities incurred by desertion from the Army and Navy of the United States during the war of the rebellion; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of the John Madison Miller Post, No. 444, Department of Missouri, Grand Army of the Republic, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for relief from disabilities of all soldiers who have been convicted of or charged with desertion, or who have been carried on the rolls as being absent or unaccounted for; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the Society of California Pioneers of New England, praying that authority be granted to the sixty Chinese who were engaged in the battle of Manila Bay to enter the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Massachusetts Dental Society, praying for the employment of dental surgeons in the Army of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry railway mail clerks of North Adams, Hyde Park, Fall River, Malden, Lowell, Middleboro, Everett, and Natick, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of Joseph Finberg & Co., of Attleboro, Mass., and of the Lydia E. Pinkham Medicine Company, of Massachusetts, praying for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Wilkesbarre, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation granting to the Commercial Cable Company permission to lay a new submarine line to Cuba; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Wilkesbarre, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to encourage American shipping; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of sundry railway mail clerks of Scranton, Meadville, Waynesboro, Pittston, and Phœnixville, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the legislature of California, praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of a fair portion of the vessels in the navy-yards of the country, and that at least one of them be constructed at the Mare Island Navy-Yard; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Senate joint resolution introduced by Senator Luchsinger January 11, 1899. Adopted by California legislature January 26, 1899.]

"Senate joint resolution No. 6, relative to the construction of navy-yards and shipbuilding.

"Whereas the United States has expended for plants and sites for navy-yards and stations more than $100,000,000. The expenditure of this vast amount of public money was made that the nation might have under its immediate control a number of navy-yards and stations conveniently located and properly equipped, where it could build, repair, and equip its ships of war. We now have at least three navy-yards that are equal to any demand which may be made upon them. One of these is located in California, namely, Mare Island Navy-Yard. Notwithstanding that the nation has its own navy-yards fully equipped, the policy pursued by those in charge of the Navy Department has been to give the building of the Navy to private establishments. Such a policy is neither wise nor economical, and is directly opposite that followed by all of the great naval powers of the world. England and France never lose sight of the interest of the dockyards of the nation; they keep the dockyards always full of work, even if the private establishments of the country be forced to remain idle. We believe that it is both wise and patriotic to assist the development of private enterprise to the fullest possible degree, having a due regard to the public good. We condemn any policy that will favor private enterprise to the total neglect of the public dockyards of the country, as we would equally oppose the total neglect or discouragement of private enterprise by having all work required for our Navy done in the navy-yard. We believe that both should be encouraged and assisted, so that in time of great emergency the country would find it possible to have its work done in either or both places with dispatch. We favor the encouragement and building up of our navy-yards because it is the best possible safeguard the country can have against the formation of trusts or combines in shipbuilding. It also will be the means of securing under the control of the Navy Department a trained corps of mechanics who can be relied upon at all times. England, the greatest naval power in existence, almost entirely relies on her dockyards for the construction of her ships of war. To such a state of perfection has the dockyard system of England been brought that the Board of Admiralty can estimate almost to a dollar the cost of the heaviest battle ship, and to a day as to the time needed for its construction. She has demonstrated beyond a doubt that the cheapest and quickest and most economical place to have her war ships constructed is in her dockyards. We believe that what England has been able to do in this line we can do, if the proper encouragement be given: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring)*, That our Senators in Congress be instructed and our Representatives therein be requested and urged to have inserted in the present naval appropriation bill a provision providing that a fair proportion of the vessels provided for in that bill shall be constructed in the navy-yards of the country and that at least one of them be constructed at Mare Island Navy-Yard. We also call their attention to the fact that all the ships provided for in the naval appropriation bill for the fiscal year of 1897 and 1898 have not been contracted for nor assigned, and we hope that they may use their influence with the Navy Department to have some portion of them built at Mare Island.

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate be requested to immediately transmit to each of said Senators and Representatives a copy of these resolutions."

The above resolution was unanimously adopted January 26, 1899, and the Vallejo Board of Trade would respectfully ask our Representatives in Congress to do all in their power to bring about the recommendations therein contained.

Respectfully, yours, W. T. KELLEY,
President Vallejo Board of Trade.

Mr. PERKINS presented a memorial of the Fruit Growers, Shippers, and Buyers' Association of Southern California, remonstrating against the ratification of the so-called Jamaica treaty; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Diego, Cal., and a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Santa Barbara, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation providing strict quarantine against the importation of all nursery stock, plants, or fruit infected with insect pests or disease; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. KYLE presented the petition of P. S. Campbell and sundry other railway mail clerks of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the

Mr. HOAR presented the petition of F. E. and J. H. Green, representing the Green Nervura Company, praying for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CLAY presented a petition of the board of commissioners of Bibb County, Ga., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of a public building at the city of Macon, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Atlanta, Ga., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. NELSON presented petitions of sundry druggists of Alexandria and Wells, in the State of Minnesota, praying for the repeal of the tax on proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of St. Cloud, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Manufacturers' Association of St. Paul, Minn., praying that an appropriation be made to complete the valuable collection of foreign trade samples, etc., shown at the Philadelphia Commercial Museum; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MASON presented a petition of the Bar Association of Chicago, Ill., praying for the appointment of an additional United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of F. E. Marsh & Co., of Illinois, and a petition of sundry citizens of Danville, Ill., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax on medicine, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Aurora, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Turnverein of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the continuance of the war in the Philippines; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn and New York, in the State of New York, praying for the mediation of the United States in the deplorable war in South Africa; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Bourbon, Ind., praying for the recognition of the right of belligerency of the people of the republic in the Transvaal, Africa; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Emmet Club, of Gardner, Mass., praying that Congress extend sympathy to the Boers; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CULLOM presented the petition of R. C. Willis and 15 other citizens of Toledo, Ill., praying that the national-bank act be amended so as to give the national banks the privilege of issuing circulating notes equal in face value to the par value of the United States bonds deposited with the Treasurer of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petitions of Louis F. Stuche, of Danville, E. C. De Witt, of Chicago, and of the Klink Medicine Company, of Chicago, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of Henry Eames, of Watertown, Ill., George F. Eames, of Roxie, Miss., and Jeanette McMaster, of Rock Island, Ill., praying that relief be granted them by the Government for the destruction of certain personal property belonging to Thomas Eames, deceased, by soldiers during the war of 1812; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also presented petitions of sundry railway mail clerks of Springfield, Dixon, Pekin, Monmouth, Sterling, and Moline, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Dover, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of L. B. Downing, of Hanover, N. H., and the petition of T. E. Lovell and 2 other citizens of Newport, N. H., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of J. O. Burton and 2 other citizens of Flora, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation increasing the pensions of soldiers who lost an arm or a leg during the war of the rebellion; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BERRY presented a memorial of the Consumers' Cotton Oil Company, of Little Rock, Ark., remonstrating against the existing tax of 2 cents per pound on butterine, and praying for its abrogation and repeal; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry railway mail clerks of Fort Smith and Pine Bluff, in the State of Arkansas, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of the council of the University of the State of Missouri, the board of curators of the University of Missouri, and the State Teachers' Association of Missouri, praying for the establishment of free public schools for the whites in the Indian Territory until real estate and personal property can be taxed for their support; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Labordine Pharmacal Company, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of a committee appointed by a commission of farmers from all portions of the Chickasaw Nation, held at Ardmore, Ind. T., praying that the rights and interests of the farmers in their unexpired leaseholds be fully considered, and remonstrating against the enactment of any provision terminating their leases on the 1st day of January, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of Ransom Post, No. 131, Department of Missouri, Grand Army of the Republic, of St. Louis, Mo., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the removal of all disabilities incurred by desertion from the Army and Navy during the war of the rebellion; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Brunswick, Me., and a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Lewiston, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the memorial of Benjamin S. Gratz, of Jacksonville, N. J., remonstrating against the seating of Hon. Matthew S. Quay; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

POSTAL TELEGRAPH SYSTEM.

Mr. BUTLER. I present a paper containing arguments on the subject of a postal telegraph to be operated by the Post-Office Department, which I desire to have printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to accompany Senate bill 1472, which is now before that committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina asks unanimous consent for the printing of a paper touching the postal telegraph system.

Mr. CHANDLER. By whom were those statements prepared, I will ask the Senator?

Mr. BUTLER. They were prepared by Judge Walter Clark, of my State, and by Professor Frank Parsons.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The order to print will be made, and the paper will be referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 160) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Red River of the North at Drayton, N. Dak., reported it with amendments.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 561) extending the time for the commencement and completion of the railroad bridge across the Illinois River near Grafton, Ill., by the St. Louis, Perry and Chicago Railroad, reported it with amendments.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1617) to authorize the Southeastern Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Lumber River within the boundary lines of Robeson County, N. C., reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 282) extending the time for the completion of the bridge across the East River between the city of New York and Long Island, now in course of construction, as authorized by the act of Congress approved March 3, 1887, reported it without amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom was referred the bill (S. 146) for the relief of Thomas Chambers, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1543) for the relief of M. D. Crow, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MASON, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1807) fixing the salary of the postmaster at Washington, D. C., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, to whom was referred the bill (S. 334) prohibiting the appointment or employment of Senators and Representatives to perform executive functions, reported it with amendments.

Mr. CARTER, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1224) for the relief of W. H. L. Pepperell, of Concordia, Kans., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

TWELFTH AND SUBSEQUENT CENSUSES.

Mr. CARTER. By direction of the Committee on the Census I report a bill and ask for its present consideration.

The bill (S. 2179) relating to the Twelfth and subsequent censuses, and giving to the Director thereof additional power and authority in certain cases, and for other purposes, was read the first time by its title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana asks for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be read for information.

The bill was read the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in addition to the power and authority conferred upon the Director of the Census by an act entitled "An act to provide for taking the Twelfth and subsequent censuses," approved March 3, 1899, said Director of the Census shall have power and is hereby authorized to appoint and employ, as the necessity therefor may arise, 1 purchasing agent, at an annual salary of $2,500; 2 chiefs of division, at an annual salary of $2,000 each; five clerks of class 4; six clerks of class 3, and eight clerks of class 2; to employ such number of special agents, not exceeding 35 in all, as may be proper and necessary for the purpose of gathering any information or data in relation to, or required by, the agricultural schedules; to employ special agents to assist the supervisors in large cities, whenever he may deem it proper, in connection with the work of preparation for, or during the progress of, the enumeration, or in connection with the reenumeration of any district or a part thereof; to employ as special agents such of the supervisors of census as he may deem wise and proper, at the compensation provided for in section 17 of said act, the intent and purpose being that the supervisors of census may be appointed special agents at the time they are acting as supervisors and receive the compensation to which they are entitled as supervisors and also as special agents; and the Director of the Census is hereby specifically authorized to pay such supervisors for their services as special agents the compensation which he may authorize out of any general or special appropriation which may be made for the payment of special agents, and to allow any supervisor of census, in addition to the contingencies provided for in section 11 of said act, actual and necessary traveling expenses and an allowance in lieu of subsistence not exceeding $3 per day during his necessary absence from his usual place of residence in connection with the work of preparation for the enumeration; to allow, in fixing the compensation of enumerators, not more than 5 cents for each death reported; to purchase any and all law books, books of reference, and periodicals which may be required from time to time in the Census Office, and pay for the same out of the sum appropriated by the said act of March 3, 1899, or any other appropriation hereafter made for the census work, whether there be a specific authorization for such purposes or not: *Provided*, That the aggregate amount of such purchases shall not exceed the sum of $2,000.

SEC. 2. That in addition to the other statistics required to be collected by section 7 of said act, approved March 3, 1899, there shall be collected on the agricultural schedules information concerning the number and kinds of live stock not on farms, and the Director of the Census shall have power to pay the enumerators for collecting such information, in his discretion, not less than 5 nor more than 10 cents for each barn or inclosure visited in which such live stock may be found: *Provided, however*, That the Director of the Census may appoint special agents to gather the information required by this section whenever he may deem it proper.

Mr. COCKRELL. There are a good many important provisions in that bill, and we have had no opportunity to compare it with the existing law. So far as I can judge, a good many of the provisions are wise and prudent, but I ask that the bill may be placed on the Calendar and printed. I will assist the Senator, as soon as I have had time to investigate it, in having it called up and passed at an early day.

Mr. CARTER. I will later in the day file a report to accompany the bill, the report giving an explanation of the necessity of each provision referred to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. COCKRELL. The report has been presented?

Mr. CARTER. The report will be filed later.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I should like to ask if there is any provision in the bill for ascertaining the distribution of wealth, or if there is such a provision in any of the census acts which we have passed.

Mr. CARTER. There is no method provided for ascertaining the distribution of wealth, save and except such information as would be collected in connection with the agricultural and manufacturing schedules.

I will say to the Senator, in that behalf, that the committee has recently been strongly importuned to depart from a policy established in connection with the legislation passed last spring. It will be borne in mind that the reports of the Eleventh Census were not published until from three to eight years after the enumeration had taken place. It is universally conceded that in this rapid-moving age statistical matter eight years old is of very little practical value.

We undertook in the act under which the present census will be taken to confine inquiries to four essential propositions, essential because requiring a house-to-house canvass by the enumerators in order to get all the necessary facts. Those four headings are population, agriculture, manufacturing, vital statistics and mortality.

We were urged at the time the bill was under consideration in the committee, and have been since most strenuously urged, to import into the work of the census which is to commence on the 1st day of next June inquiries concerning a large number of facts and circumstances varying in importance because of the special interest that particular persons take in them.

The inquiry referred to by the Senator from South Dakota, relative to the distribution of wealth, would be of very great gratification to many and of value to all persons. But if that particular feature were imported into the work of the census, other features, apparently of quite as great significance, could with equal force be urged upon the enumerators.

Within the past week the committee has been urged and importuned by most estimable citizens of high standing in this District and throughout the country to extend the enumeration inquiries on the schedules to the feeble-minded, the dumb, the deaf, the blind, the criminal classes; and imperialists I suppose the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] would suggest as an additional inquiry. But the committee has, notwithstanding, declined to embark upon this wide and shoreless sea.

I make this explanation for the benefit of the Senator from South Dakota and others who may think it necessary to add to the census work.

Mr. HOAR. I wish to give notice of an amendment. I suppose from what has been said that the bill will not be voted upon to-day.

Mr. CARTER. It will go over until to-morrow.

Mr. HOAR. I wish to give notice now of an amendment which I shall offer when the bill comes up for consideration.

I see the very great force and wisdom of the reasons which have been stated by the Senator from Montana. I have no desire to contravene the policy of the committee, but there is one particular on which I think Senators from all parts of the country will agree. It is really but an extension of the clause in regard to manufactures. I should like to have it a little more specifically stated, so as to have some official who shall tabulate and put in scientific form statistics in regard to the water power of the country.

It is well known that the manufacturing of the country is moving from its old home in the Northeast and spreading itself all over the United States. Although I myself represent a community which is almost entirely given to manufacturing and to such branches of business as are attendant upon manufacturing in supplying the wants of persons engaged in manufacturing, yet

I heartily welcome, and I believe my constituents heartily welcome, that change. They expect to engage cheerfully and hopefully in the emulation and competition which this new condition of things will produce; and if they can not hold their own, what is now their own will pass to somebody else without a murmur on our part.

I have had occasion to make a very careful examination of some questions connected with this matter, and it is very important indeed to the persons who are proposing to institute new manufacturing or to continue old manufacturing all over the country that the knowledge in regard to the water power of the country shall be made public, and be made public now. I have been amazed to find how little information there is on this subject in the old census. There is one tabulation of a portion of the statistics.

It will not be a very expensive or extensive inquiry. I presume that an official with a salary of $5,000, with the instrumentalities already provided, would be enough to give this important information. I hope the committee will regard it as rather belonging to the statistics in regard to manufacturing, which they do provide for, than as an introduction of a new policy. At any rate, I shall move that amendment to-morrow.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The discussion is proceeding by unanimous consent. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I do not wish to discuss the measure; but I desire to give notice that I shall offer an amendment for the purpose of gathering statistics with regard to the distribution of wealth. I do not think that ought to delay the report. I will try to so frame the amendment that the work, simply by the addition of more force and a larger appropriation, can be gotten out at the earliest possible day. It seems to me that there can be no more important subject discussed and investigated than the question, Who reaps the benefit of the toil of the laborers of this country?

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the whole question is precisely as stated by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Montana. What the committee has tried to do is to avoid the blunders of the old censuses. We have tried to get what I may call a quick census, an enumeration covering, as the Senator has said, population, manufacturing, agriculture, and vital statistics. All the great domain lying outside of these the committee kept out of the first immediate census, but have provided that the Census Office, which is to be a continuing one, shall go on with special agents appointed by the Director and get at the facts on these other questions.

Now, if you add anything, if you disturb the schedules which are already made and which are confined to the subjects covered by the original bill, you open the door wide. The committee in their sessions at this Congress have felt like appealing to the Senate to stand by them on their proposition to have a quick census.

So far as the Senate goes, I had charge of this matter both for 1890 and the previous census, and it became very burdensome and irksome work to me to continually ask that the time of the census should be extended and that the expense of the census should be added to. At last, with a great cumbrous work covering twenty-two or twenty-three volumes, which it took eight or nine years to collect and get published, everybody lost all interest in the census of 1890. The same was true in regard to the census of 1880. Now we are trying to cure that, and we are beset by everybody who wants special information in which he is interested. I should like to see information concerning water power put in. My State is full of it.

Mr. TELLER. To what does the Senator refer?

Mr. HALE. To the statistics as to water power, as to the streams, as to the extent of the power to carry machinery, the places upon which mills can be builded. No one is more interested in that question than I and my colleague, representing the State of Maine. But it will not be so small a work as the Senator from Massachusetts thinks if it is embodied in the first census. If all that the Senator desires is that the Census Bureau shall take up this subject and by special agents see that the work is done, and report as early as possible, to that I have no objection.

Mr. HOAR. That is all.

Mr. HALE. That we provide for in section 8.

Mr. HOAR. I do not think you do.

Mr. HALE. If we do not, it can easily be put in the bill. That there is no objection to whatever.

Mr. HOAR. It would be all right then.

Mr. HALE. But if you clog and lumber the immediate first census with subjects such as that indicated by the Senator from South Dakota, if you do not end the work when it ought to be ended, if you do not end the publication when it ought to be ended and begin to extend in the future as we have done in the past, men will forget before the volumes come out that there has been a census taken.

When the bill comes up to-morrow, as I understand the chairman is to call it up, I hope the Senate will stand by the committee in trying to make this a great, rapid, immediate work, where the results for the public will be rapid and immediate.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Maine, who has had connection with this matter, a question for information. What particular subjects are to be presented first? What are regarded as the most important that are to come out early?

Mr. HALE. Those that relate nearest to what was the object of the very first census in the history of mankind, simply the taking of the heads.

Mr. TELLER. Population?

Mr. HALE. Population. That is first. Then manufactures; then agriculture; then the vital and mortality statistics. All those four can be comprehended in four or five volumes, and all can be got out within two years from the time when the work commences. Those volumes will answer the questions of nine hundred and ninety-nine out of a thousand of the people in the United States who want information. Then, by section 8 we provide that the Census Office shall go on and with its special agents make inquiries into these other subjects-matter, and from time to time report to Congress.

Mr. TELLER. I only want to say that I hope the committee will not abandon the general character of the census heretofore.

Mr. HALE. No; it does not.

Mr. TELLER. But I think there is great necessity of haste in bringing out those important features. When they are once before the public other information can be brought out which it is quite immaterial as to whether it comes out a year earlier or a year later. They are things that are relative, and it does not make any difference whether we get the information this year or five years afterwards, because we know what the relation is of one to another, and we know that that relation will probably continue. But the statistics of population, manufactures, etc., everybody would like to get at the earliest possible date, and if the Census Department will give their attention to those first and let these other matters lie for the present there will be no difficulty in getting out the census report in a reasonable time.

Mr. HALE. That is just what the bill provides for. The committee had precisely that in mind and stipulates in the bill that the Director shall not give his attention to the other subjects-matter until he has completed the actual census.

Mr. TELLER. I have not read the bill, but I am glad to know that that is the character of it. I had some little to do with the closing up of one census, and I found the great trouble had been that all these things had been going on at once, instead of the most important being selected and the others deferred. I think, if the committee have presented a bill of that kind, it is meritorious.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. ALLISON. I believe this matter has passed from the consideration of the Senate.

Mr. TILLMAN. I wish to make a single remark.

Mr. ALLISON. On this subject?

Mr. TILLMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALLISON. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina will proceed.

Mr. TILLMAN. I want to ask the chairman or the Senator from Maine if it is not a fact brought out before the Census Committee when the recent law was being framed that the schedules first taken in the last census were so multifarious and covered so many subjects that the Census Office was in the seventh or eighth year still trying to tackle it and condense it for use and publication, and had at last to throw away a large mass of material that had cost perhaps half a million or a million dollars in the effort to get facts that were of no value after they were obtained? If we are now to cover all the earth in the effort to get statistics, the material will grow very stale and old before it can be tabulated.

Mr. CARTER. And Senators as well, possibly, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The introduction of bills is in order.

Mr. CARTER subsequently submitted a report to accompany the bill.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2180) granting a pension to Susan Baker;

A bill (S. 2181) granting a pension to Matilda Dickinson;

A bill (S. 2182) granting pensions to Levina Pendock and Melisa Pendock; and

A bill (S. 2183) granting a pension to Israel P. Hill.

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2184) granting a pension to Eliza J. Noble;

A bill (S. 2185) granting an increase of pension to James Jackson Purman; and

A bill (S. 2186) granting an increase of pension to Horace B. Durant.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 2187) to correct the military record of Charles R. Keck; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2188) to correct the military record of George F. Peall; which was read twice by its title, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2189) for the relief of William H. Anthony; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut introduced a bill (S. 2190) granting a pension to Emma J. Bidwell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. STEWART introduced a bill (S. 2191) for the relief of Robert D. McAfee and John Chiatovich; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 2192) to establish postal savings departments, to encourage savings among the people, to furnish them a safe and reliable place to deposit their idle funds, and to put into actual use the money of the country; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2193) to remove the charge of desertion from the name of Frederick W. Joslin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2194) to encourage the employment of the American merchant marine and to regulate the international carrying trade of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2195) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Hogoborne;

A bill (S. 2196) granting an increase of pension to Stephen D. Avery; and

A bill (S. 2197) granting an increase of pension to Granville R. Turner.

Mr. RAWLINS introduced a bill (S. 2198) increasing the limit of the cost of the public building at Salt Lake City, Utah; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. TURNER introduced a bill (S. 2199) for the relief of volunteer officers and soldiers who served in the Philippine Islands beyond the period of their enlistment; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. KENNEY introduced a bill (S. 2200) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth W. Murphey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 2201) granting an increase of pension to Gurden L. Wight; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2202) granting an increase of pension to Alvin N. Sabin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 2203) granting an increase of pension to William Taylor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 2204) for the relief of Francis H. McLaughlin;

A bill (S. 2205) for the relief of Stephen Murphy;

A bill (S. 2206) for the relief of Samuel Slack;

A bill (S. 2207) for the relief of John W. Johnston; and

A bill (S. 2208) for the relief of George J. Collins, alias William Seymour.

Mr. QUARLES introduced a bill (S. 2209) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Higgins; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SIMON introduced a bill (S. 2210) to provide for the sale of the unsold portion of the Umatilla Indian Reservation; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2211) confirming the title of mixed-blood Indians to certain lands, and providing the manner for selling, conveying, and encumbering the same; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MASON introduced a bill (S. 2212) granting a pension to Georgia R. Demarest; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2213) granting an increase of pension to Susan C. Gilbreath; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2214) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas H. Thorp and William Mullally; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WOLCOTT introduced a bill (S. 2215) granting an increase of pension to Robert J. Koonce; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FOSTER introduced a bill (S. 2216) for the relief of Mary C. Mayers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ALDRICH introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2217) granting a pension to Louise O'Leary;

A bill (S. 2218) granting a pension to Mary R. Dean;

A bill (S. 2219) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Hopkins; and

A bill (S. 2220) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. E. S. Kelly.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a bill (S. 2221) to prevent the desecration of the American flag; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2222) for preventing the adulteration, misbranding, and imitation of foods, beverages, candies, drugs, and condiments in the District of Columbia and the Territories, and for regulating interstate traffic therein, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 2223) granting an increase of pension to John M. Morse; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ALLISON introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2224) granting an increase of pension to John F. Riegel;

A bill (S. 2225) granting an increase of pension to George F. White;

A bill (S. 2226) granting an increase of pension to Henry Muhs;

A bill (S. 2227) granting an increase of pension to Uriah Clark; and

A bill (S. 2228) granting an increase of pension to Oliver W. Miller.

Mr. ALLISON introduced a bill (S. 2229) for the relief of Catharine Brown; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (S. 2230) requiring street railways operated in the District of Columbia to provide protection for motormen and car drivers from the inclemencies of the weather between November 1 and April 1 of each year; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2231) granting a pension to Robert D. West; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2232) granting a pension to Frederick Sien; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2233) to provide for the retirement of certain Army officers, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 2234) for the relief of certain claimants having suits pending against the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 2235) to extend the uses of the mail service; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 2236) to amend the pension laws by providing a uniform rate for the loss of an arm or a leg above the elbow or knee; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2237) setting apart certain public grounds in the city of Washington for the use of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the erection of a memorial building; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. McENERY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2238) for the relief of Villeneuve Le Blanc;

A bill (S. 2239) for the relief of Mary J. Barrow; and
A bill (S. 2240) for the relief of Mary E. Barrow.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 2241) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Portsmouth, in the State of Virginia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. BERRY introduced a bill (S. 2242) for the relief of the estate of Henry C. Thoms, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. WELLINGTON introduced a bill (S. 2243) to establish the University of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee to Establish the University of the United States.

Mr. FRYE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 55) authorizing the President to appoint one woman commissioner to represent the United States and the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution at the unveiling of the statue of Lafayette at the Exposition in Paris, France, in 1900; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Select Committee on Industrial Expositions.

MEDIATION IN TRANSVAAL WAR.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I introduce a joint resolution, which I ask to have read at length and lie upon the table, as I wish to call it up at some future day and to make some remarks in regard to it.

The joint resolution (S. R. 56) authorizing the United States Government to offer its services as a mediator between Great Britain and the South African Republic was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas the International Peace Conference recently held at The Hague declared, and to the declaration is attached the signatures of the plenipotentiaries of the United States and Great Britain, that: "With a view to obviating, as far as possible, recourse to force in the relations between the states, the signatory powers agree to use their best efforts to insure the pacific settlement of international differences.

"In case of serious disagreement or conflict, before an appeal to arms, the signatory powers agree to have recourse, as far as circumstances will allow, to the good offices or mediation of one or more friendly powers.

"Independently of this recourse, the signatory powers recommend that one or more powers, strangers to the dispute, should, on their own initiative, and as far as circumstances may allow, offer their good offices or mediation to the states at variance.

"Powers, strangers to the dispute, have the right to offer good offices or mediation, even during the course of hostilities.

"The exercise of this right can never be regarded by one or the other of the parties in conflict as an unfriendly act:" Therefore

Resolved, That the United States of America offers its good offices as a mediator in an endeavor to reconcile the opposing claims and appease the feelings of resentment which have arisen between the Empire of Great Britain and the South African Republic and the Orange Free State, with a view to securing a conclusion of the war now existing between those two nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota asks that the joint resolution lie upon the table subject to his call. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

STATE BANK TAX.

Mr. McLAURIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1) to affirm the existing standard of value, to maintain the parity in value of all forms of money, to refund the public debt, and for other purposes; which was read, as follows:

To the said bill add the following:

"SEC. 9. That sections 3412 and 3413 and all other acts and parts of acts which impose any tax upon the circulation of State banks or State banking associations be, and the same are hereby, repealed."

Mr. McLAURIN. I ask that the amendment be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. HOAR, it was

Ordered, That the papers in the case of Abram D. Newman, S. 2731, Fifty-fifth Congress, second session, be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, copies of the same being first left on file, the claim having been reported adversely.

INTERCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Railroads, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

In response to the resolution of the Senate of December 20, 1899, asking for information respecting the edition and distribution of the report of the Intercontinental Railway Commission, I transmit herewith a detailed statement from the Secretary of State.

WILLIAM McKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, January 8, 1900.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT OF MARCH 9, 1898.

Mr. ALLEN. I submit the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Attorney-General, and the Postmaster-General, and each of them, be, and they are hereby, respectively directed to inform the Senate what portion of the $50,000,000 appropriated by Congress under the act approved March 9, 1898, entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for prior years, and for other purposes," was assigned to and expended by, or under the direction of, said respective Departments, and they are further respectively hereby directed to furnish the Senate an itemized statement of the amount of said sum thus expended by them.

Mr. HALE. There is no objection to the passage of that resolution that I can conceive of, but the information has already been before the Senate and can very readily be furnished to the Senator without sending to the Departments. We have had it here; we have discussed it, and it has been stated upon the floor how the $50,000,000 was divided; but if the Senator desires the information to be put in the form of a reply from the Departments I do not object.

Mr. ALLEN. I desire to have it in the form of a public document.

Mr. HALE. I do not object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

HARBOR OF WILMINGTON, N. C.

Mr. BUTLER submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause a survey and estimate to be made for the dredging of a basin in the harbor of Wilmington, N. C., of sufficient dimension to allow a vessel of large tonnage to turn or swing around in said harbor.

ADMIRAL DEWEY'S REPORT.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further concurrent or other resolutions, the Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from the preceding day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. PETTIGREW January 4, 1900, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, directed to send to the Senate a copy of Admiral Dewey's report of April 13, 1898, or about that date, in which the Admiral says he can take Manila at any time.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the information the Senator seeks for can be very easily obtained by any individual Senator asking for it. I have the report to which I think the Senator refers; but he has got the date somewhat wrong.

I do not think, however, that it has been the practice of the Senate to stifle resolutions of inquiry. When they are couched in proper form and where they seek to bring to the Senate information upon public business, the rule of the Senate has been to pass them. I think it was so stated the other day by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR]. I agreed with him at that time, and I think that that is so now. Resolutions are presented sometimes in such form that they cease to be mere resolutions of inquiry, and they should either be referred to a committee or amended and put in proper shape. I do not see that this resolution of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW] is subject to any objection of that kind. If the Senator desires that it shall go as the request of the Senate and that the reply be sent to the body, as no doubt it will be forthwith, he will get the same information that he would have obtained if he had sent a telephonic message to the Secretary of the Navy, or had himself called and said he wanted the information, or had pursued any other method which Senators usually pursue; but if the Senator has chosen this way and prefers this, as his resolution is simple in form and only requires information, I will not object to it.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, I suppose all resolutions of inquiry of the Executive Departments of the Government could be done away with by writing letters on the part of individual Senators; but such information comes to a Senator, where, however, a resolution is passed by the Senate the information goes to the Senate and to the public. Therefore, if any resolution of inquiry is justified, it seems to me this resolution is, and of course I desire its passage.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate agree to the resolution?

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask to have the resolution again read, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will again be read.

The Secretary again read the resolution.

Mr. ALLISON. Is April 13, 1898, the date given in the resolution, the date of the report called for?

Mr. PETTIGREW. At or about that date. For the purpose of more definitely indicating the report I wanted, I added the language which I understand the paper contains.

Mr. ALLISON. Where could that have been made—at what place?

Mr. HALE. On the flagship *Olympia*, at Hongkong, March 31, 1898.

Mr. CHANDLER. Has the Senator from South Dakota any knowledge that there is such a letter? If so, I shall not object to the resolution.

Mr. President, the question before the Senate the other day when some criticism was made of other Senators by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] was that four Senators had objected to a resolution, which caused it to go over to the next day, when one of them might more properly, I suppose the Senator thought, have done it. Then the Senator from Massachusetts said that if that sort of thing was to go on the Senate would be abolished. This put those four Senators in a very awkward position, myself among the number, because I have too much regard for the Senate, and shall have so long as I remain here, to wish to be a party to abolishing it; and I was not aware that I was doing that thing until the objection was made.

Mr. President, the rules which require the unanimous consent of Senators are supposed to be wisely framed. If they are not wise, they can easily be altered upon a report made from the Committee on Rules, of which the senior Senator from Massachusetts is a member; but so long as those rules stand here, giving the right to any Senator who either objects to the language of a resolution or who wishes to ascertain more definitely what information is called for, it is the privilege of any Senator to invoke the rule and ask to have a resolution go over, and, so far as I know, it is the privilege of four Senators to do it at once, or to do it singly, or they may do it in platoons, or they may do it all together, if they see fit. They are entitled to be relieved from criticism for exercising the rights which belong to them as members of the Senate, and for one I stand here to say that it is in bad taste to object to any Senator who invokes a rule requiring unanimous consent and declines to yield to an appeal to withdraw his objection. I do not like it myself, and I do not intend to withdraw an objection that I may deliberately make by reason of any such appeal, unless I see fit to do so, and I hope other Senators, notwithstanding the admonition they received the other day, will make objection to resolutions which they wish to examine before they are acted upon. That was all that took place the other day.

To the resolution as now before the Senate I have no objection, and I shall vote against almost no resolution the Senator from South Dakota can contrive which shall ask merely for information from the Executive Departments of the Government. If he puts statements into a resolution which I do not know to be true and do not propose to assert as facts by voting for the resolution, or if he puts a stump speech into a resolution—and I do not think the Senate ought to make a stump speech in a resolution of inquiry—I shall either vote against the resolution or move to lay it on the table. I am just as willing as the Senator from South Dakota and the senior Senator from Massachusetts to have all facts relating to public affairs in the possession of the executive department come before Congress for its consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

AFFAIRS IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under unanimous consent of the Senate, given at the last sitting, the Chair lays before the Senate a resolution offered by the Senator from South Dakota, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. PETTIGREW January 3, 1900, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate whether General Torres, one of the officers of the Philippine army, came to General Otis with a flag of truce on February 5, 1899, the day after the fighting commenced between our forces and those of the Filipinos, and stated to General Otis that General Aguinaldo declared that fighting had been begun accidentally and was not authorized by him, and that Aguinaldo wished to have it stopped, and that to bring about a conclusion of hostilities he proposed the establishment of a neutral zone between the two armies of a width that would be agreeable to General Otis, so that during the peace negotiations there might be no further danger of conflict between the two armies, and whether General Otis replied that fighting having once begun must go on to the grim end. Was General Otis directed by the Secretary of War to make such an answer? Did General Otis telegraph the Secretary of War on February 9, 1899, as follows: "Aguinaldo now applies for a cessation of hostilities and conference. Have declined to answer." And did General Otis afterwards reply? Was he directed by the Secretary of War to reply; and what answer, if any, did he or the Secretary of War make to the application to cease fighting?

Mr. LODGE. I suppose, Mr. President, the subject-matter of that resolution comes within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Philippines. I was one of those who asked to have the resolution go over the other day, and I supposed then, and still believe, that I was acting within my right under the rules to have so complicated a resolution as that printed and laid before us, so that we could read it with more care.

I am quite certain that it has been the habit in this body to send resolutions over when there are objections, and that it is not the universal practice to pass them the day they are offered. I know that older and wiser Senators than I have sent over some resolutions of inquiry which I have offered, and it seemed to me proper that this resolution should go over until we could consider it more fully.

Now, Mr. President, I see no objection whatever to giving all possible information in regard to every transaction in the Philippines. I certainly, for one, have no desire to see anything whatsoever suppressed, and I do not believe there is any desire anywhere to have anything suppressed. But I do think that the resolutions of inquiry offered by the Senator should be put in a proper form. It seems to me that a resolution like this, which is rather in the nature of filing interrogatories and cross-questioning the Secretary of War as to one particular incident, is a process which would involve similar resolutions day after day and day after day, in order to get at the information which is obviously desired.

It seems to me that the proper scope of a resolution of inquiry and the proper form in which to put it is a general form asking for everything relating to a certain subject; and I would offer as a substitute for the resolution presented by the Senator from South Dakota the following:

Resolved, That the President be requested to send to the Senate, if not inconsistent with the public interest, all reports and dispatches relating to the insurrection in the Philippines, and especially any information as to communications or correspondence with the insurgents, from the 1st of January, 1898, on the part of any officer in the military, naval, consular, or diplomatic service of the United States.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that substitute covers everything that can possibly be desired. It covers the scope of the question of the Senator from South Dakota and every other of a similar character; and it seems to me that that is the better form in which to put the resolution.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. LODGE. I do.

Mr. TILLMAN. I wish to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question as to the scope of the substitute which he has just offered. I ask at what date the Senator regards the Philippine people as having become insurgents? Do the communications referred to embrace communications which were sent to our officers prior to the ratification of the treaty with Spain as well as those sent after that time?

Mr. LODGE. I take it they do, of course. They go back and cover the whole period.

Mr. TILLMAN. But the language used by the Senator in the substitute would limit the call to communications with the insurgents; and I want to know when they became insurgents, according to the Senator's idea.

Mr. LODGE. I suppose the language employed would cover the day or the night of the insurrection—beginning on the night they attacked our troops at Manila.

Mr. TILLMAN. Then the resolution would limit the sending in of communications to those which had been made after that time rather than before?

Mr. LODGE. At that time the treaty had not been ratified, it is true, but I think the language of the substitute would cover everything relating to our communications with the Filipinos.

Mr. TILLMAN. What about the limit?

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator wishes to make the substitute more explicit and to cover more time, let him go back to the beginning of the war with Spain.

Mr. TILLMAN. Then let the Senator put that in the resolution, and we will get the information which the Senator from South Dakota was denied the other day.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I would suggest that the substitute offered by the Senator from Massachusetts be printed, and that the subject go over until to-morrow without losing its place.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW] asks unanimous consent that the substitute offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] be printed, and that the subject-matter go over until to-morrow without prejudice.

Mr. ALLISON. I suggest to the Senator to say Wednesday.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I have no objection to that.

Mr. President, the reason I desire the substitute offered by the Senator from Massachusetts to go over is that I think it can be so

framed as to satisfy me with regard to this inquiry. I simply wish to get at the facts. I wish to speak upon the subject. It is the duty of Congress to legislate. A war is going on which was not declared by Congress, and before we can legislate we must have this information in order to intelligently represent the American people upon this great subject. I think perhaps the substitute of the Senator from Massachusetts can be so amended that it will be satisfactory.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator from South Dakota. I inquire if Congress is not already committed to the war in the Philippines by having sent large armies there? Have not 60,000 men been sent there by authority of Congress? It seems late to investigate the cause of the war after the United States, under the authority of Congress and the Executive, has been engaged in it for eleven months.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will answer the Senator when he is through.

Mr. STEWART. I am through.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Congres did pass a law allowing the Executive to enlarge the Army, but Congress did not declare war and took no step in that direction. During the recess of Congress it was repeatedly said that the President could not do otherwise than he was doing, because Congress had not required him to do otherwise. The excuse was that Congress had not acted upon this matter. The Administration undertook to escape the responsibility of this war by shifting it upon Congress and then refusing to call Congress together. Months elapsed after we had adjourned before the Army was enlarged, and then it was done by an act of the Executive, and this war was commenced by him; it was declared by proclamation from him before the treaty with Spain was ratified, and has been prosecuted by him in violation, as I believe, of every principle of this Government. Congress has now convened, the duty is upon us, and we can not escape it unless we are ready to abdicate our functions as the governing body of this country and to establish the supreme authority of the President himself.

This information, then, is necessary. If we have attacked an ally who was acting with us, representing a government based upon the principles of the Constitution of the United States, it is quite important that the representatives of the people of this country should know the facts, and know them at once. I believe we have attacked an ally; I believe we have been guilty of the grossest treachery; I believe that we have gone further in dishonor toward an ally fighting with us than any nation ever went in all history.

Mr. President, I did not wish to address the Senate to-day upon this subject; neither do I intend to do so. I simply want this information before I do address the Senate upon this subject, and I know of very many people in this country who also desire it.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The subject has gone over at the request of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. STEWART. Inasmuch as the Senator and I differ as to what has occurred, I wish to say a word.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the Senator from Nevada proceeding? The Chair hears none.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from South Dakota to some of the provisions of the act of March 2, 1899, which read as follows:

SEC. 12. That to meet the present exigencies of the military service the President is hereby authorized to maintain the Regular Army at a strength of not exceeding 65,000 enlisted men, to be distributed among the several branches of the service, including the Signal Corps, according to the needs of each, and raise a force of not more than 35,000 volunteers, to be recruited as he may determine from the country at large or from the localities where their services are needed, without restriction as to citizenship or educational qualifications, and to organize the same into not more than 27 regiments, organized as are infantry regiments of war strength in the Regular Army, and 3 regiments to be composed of men of special qualifications in horsemanship and marksmanship, to be organized as cavalry for service mounted or dismounted.

Section 15 contains the following clause:

And provided further, That the President is authorized to enlist temporarily in service for absolutely necessary purposes in the Philippine Islands volunteers, officers, and men, individually or by organization, now in those islands and about to be discharged, provided their retention shall not extend beyond the time necessary to replace them by troops authorized to be maintained under the provisions of this act and not beyond a period of six months.

The act provides in detail how the exigencies of the Army existing on the 2d of March, 1899, shall be met, and expressly provides for recruiting three regiments in the Philippine Islands, where the war was raging. The United States had no other war on hand at the time, and no other emergencies existed. The legislation increasing the Regular Army to 65,000 and authorizing a volunteer force of 35,000 men and three regiments to be organized in the Philippine Islands was for the express purpose of prosecuting the war and of suppressing the insurrection in those islands. The war, under the authority of Congress, has been carried on for about eleven months, until it is too late to inquire how the United States became involved in it. If the inquiry had been made in February last, it might have been pertinent, but now, after my country is engaged in war under the authority of the legislative and executive departments of this Government, and after thousands of precious lives have been sacrificed and millions expended under the authority of the war-making power, it is my country's war, and the origin or motive of the war can not now be questioned. The lives sacrificed and the money expended in a war authorized by Congress should preclude any effort on the part of patriotic citizens to prove that the war was wicked in its origin.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The subject is not before the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. I do not understand that any disposition has been made of the subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. By agreement it has gone over.

Mr. LODGE. I did not hear any question put and I did not hear the consent of the Senate asked. It was my substitute about which the question was made.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW] asked that the substitute be printed and go over.

Mr. LODGE. I heard the Senator from South Dakota make the request, but I did not know that the request had been submitted to the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that he put the request to the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. It is my fault, then, if I did not hear it. I merely wish to say that, while I do not think this is the time to discuss this question, I do not wish to allow statements made by the Senator from South Dakota to go out with the impression that Senators here all admit by silence their truth. I do not believe that we have attacked an ally. I am certain we never recognized that so-called Filipino government. The Filipinos had no government except the government of a dictator, set up by himself to impose his authority on other tribes. They attacked us; we did not attack them. The President has acted in absolute conformity with law from the beginning to the end, and they who are fighting us are insurgents against the rightful authority of the United States.

As the Senator from South Dakota has laid down the propositions which he hopes to discuss further, and I trust he will when he gets the information, I merely wanted to say that these are some of the propositions which some of us also hope to discuss when the matter comes up. I have no objection to having the resolution go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the resolution going over with the amendment? The Chair hears none, and it will go over until Wednesday.

RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE IN NORTH CAROLINA.

Mr. PRITCHARD. I desire to call up Senate resolution No. 25 for the purpose of enabling the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] to submit some remarks on the same.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina calls up a resolution, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. PRITCHARD December 12, 1899, as follows:

Whereas the legislature of the State of North Carolina, at its session of 1896, submitted to the people of that State, for ratification or rejection, a proposed amendment to the constitution of said State, as follows:

"SEC. 4. Every person presenting himself for registration shall be able to read and write any section of the Constitution in the English language; and before he shall be entitled to vote shall have paid, on or before the 1st day of March of the year in which he proposes to vote, his poll tax as prescribed by law for the previous year. Poll taxes shall be a lien only on assessed property, and no process shall issue to enforce the collection of the same except against assessed property.

"SEC. 5. No male person who was on January 1, 1867, entitled to vote under the laws of any State in the United States wherein he then resided, and no lineal descendant of any such person, shall be denied the right to register and vote at any election in the State by reason of his failure to possess the educational qualifications prescribed in section 4 of this article: *Provided*, He shall have registered in accordance with the terms of this section prior to December 1, 1908. The general assembly shall provide for a permanent record of all persons who register under this section on or before November 1, 1908, and all such persons shall be entitled to register and vote at all elections by the people in this State, unless disqualified under section 2 of this article: *Provided*, Such persons shall have paid their poll taxes as required by law."

And whereas section 5 of the proposed amendment undertakes to confer the right of suffrage on one class of citizens of that State and to exclude another class of citizens from the enjoyment of said privilege:

Resolved, That section 5 of the proposed amendment is in contravention of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States, and that any State that adopts said provision as a part of its organic law does not possess a republican form of government as contemplated by the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. PRITCHARD. I ask leave to withdraw the pending resolution and offer a substitute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has a right to do that. The proposed substitute will be read to the Senate.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That an enactment, by constitution or otherwise, by any State which confers the right to vote upon any of its citizens because of their descent from certain persons or classes of persons, and excludes other citizens because they are not descended from such persons or classes of persons having all other qualifications prescribed by law, in the opinion of the Senate, is in violation of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States and of a fundamental principle of our republican form of government—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the original resolution will be regarded as withdrawn and the resolution just read will be substituted for it.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, the resolution read at the desk reveals the fact that we have reached a danger point in the history of the Republic which we can not avoid or neglect.

It has not been suddenly or designedly sprung upon the country by any recent event or by any recent political movement.

The immediate cause of this dangerous condition originated more than a third of a century ago, a time that antedates the birth of this generation of Americans. The trouble has lingered like a smoldering fire, burning into the vitals of the country and creating discord and irritation, political and social, and now it has reached the open and demands our best efforts to control it.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. PRITCHARD] has wisely discerned that this serious and unavoidable question is now before the country for solution by popular suffrage. With equal forecast, and, doubtless, a desire for the peace of the country, he asks for its consideration before the great event of a Presidential election, the first in the new century, has resulted in a vote of the electors for President and Vice-President and before February, 1901, when the election will be ascertained and declared in the two Houses of Congress. In view of that certain event, it is not possible that this question can be repressed or evaded, either in the Presidential election or in the elections for all the members of the House of Representatives and one-third of the Senate in this year of 1900.

The next apportionment of representation in the House enjoined by the Constitution must be made by this or the Fifty-seventh Congress, and the principles on which that apportionment will be made will be a question of the gravest importance in the elections that must be held in November of the present year.

To refuse now to consider this question, in advance of these elections, is to draw the country into the vortex of angry and dangerous excitement such as seriously threatened the safety of the Republic in 1876 and 1877.

Whichever of the great national parties is successful in the November elections, this question will be raised in the count of the votes for President and Vice-President.

It is a very high and solemn duty, that should be performed before the elections are held and at a time when the decision will not be so likely to refer to the success of either party in that event which determines the succession to the Presidency and is the most momentous political contest that occurs in any nation of the world.

In the light of our experience in 1877, which created a feeling of unrest that has not yet ceased, we can not afford to permit an unsettled question that we know can not be avoided to engender another controversy such as arose in the Hayes-Tilden election. The people should decide it in the elections of A. D. 1900 upon propositions submitted to them in some form.

I am convinced that no other tribunal except the people voting in the elections has the right or the power to finally settle this question here presented in the resolution offered by the Senator from North Carolina, and I will endeavor to sustain this view of the matter in my further remarks to the Senate.

The resolution as amended and also in its original form is not intended to have the force of law, as it should have, if the Senator from North Carolina really desires such action as will settle the question he forces upon the attention of the country. It is only an expression as to what he thinks the law ought to be. It is not an enactment, but is the expression of a view or opinion. If such a resolution is not obeyed, there are no penalties for its violation, either by individuals or by the State. No results follow its violation in any legal sense. A departure from the principle stated in the resolution as a correct principle of government involves only a difference of opinion between those who adhere to it and those who choose to reject it.

The resolution, in its original form and as it is modified, if it is adopted, would not control this or a subsequent Congress either as to the form or the substance of any enactment that Congress may make for the enforcement of the fifteenth amendment of the Constitution.

If we should adopt the resolution it would be brutum fulmen that this Congress or a subsequent Congress would follow or reject at will.

The honorable Senator would doubtless have presented a bill that would reach and prevent the alleged wrong or evil he intends to suppress or prevent if he could have devised a scheme by which he could coerce a State to amend its constitution under the penalty of being driven from the Union or of being refused representation in Congress or in the electoral college.

It is too plain for argument that such a measure would abolish the State as to all its rightful sovereign powers, and would remand it to the condition of our organized Territories, all of whose laws may be repealed by Congress and all of whose officials may be placed under the power of appointment and removal by the President.

In his original resolution the honorable Senator distinctly took this ground as to the duty and power of Congress in dealing with any State whose constitution violates the fifteenth amendment when he asserted that such a State has not a republican form of government. On further reflection he endeavors to get away from this dangerous ground and to retreat to a position that is apparently less strenuous, somewhat less heroic, and less dangerous to the State and the Federal Union. It is evidently intended by this substitute to declare in another form of words the same principle and the same appeal to the power of Congress to deal with a State, as such, that is only more distinctly expressed in the Senator's original resolution.

The substitute is as follows:

Resolved, That an enactment by constitution or otherwise by any State which confers the right to vote upon any of its citizens because of their descent from certain persons or classes of persons and excludes other citizens because they are not descended from such persons or classes of persons, having all other qualifications prescribed by law, in the opinion of the Senate is in violation of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States, and of a fundamental principle of our republican form of government.

A particular state of facts is here presented, which is declared as violative of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution and as being also violative of "a fundamental principle of our republican form of government."

The allusion here is distinctly made to the fourth section of the fourth article of the Constitution, which is that "the United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion," etc.

I suppose the Senator will admit that this is the section and article to which he refers when he speaks of "a fundamental principle of our republican form of government." The point in both forms of the resolution is that Congress can deal directly with North Carolina and inflict penalties on her as a State, and as a State standing by itself, if she amends her constitution in the manner described in the preamble to the resolution.

The substituted resolution I have just read is not true in point of law. It is not a discrimination on account of race, color, or previous condition of slavery, unless the act excludes them by its terms, or by necessary intendment from its terms, for such causes. The exclusion of certain persons or classes of persons or their descendants can be lawfully made in many cases and for many reasons that have no relation to race or color or previous condition of servitude.

The resolution begs the question when it admits the right to exclude those who have not all the other "qualifications prescribed by law" from the right to vote.

Chinamen, Japanese, and Indians, who are citizens of the United States, may be lawfully excluded from the right to vote for any reason, even for their race or color, simply because the States prefer to refuse them that privilege; yet in all other respects they may have the qualifications prescribed by law.

Many white persons who were engaged in rebellion against the United States were excluded from the right to vote by acts of Congress passed after the alleged ratification of the fourteenth amendment. They possessed all the other qualifications, but imputed crime disqualified all of certain classes of white persons from voting and still excludes all of them from holding office whose disabilities have not been removed by a vote of two-thirds of each House of Congress.

It has been settled in various cases by the Supreme Court that the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments apply exclusively to the negro race.

These decisions are far short of the full meaning of the text of these amendments, although they agree with the common understanding of the purpose of their ordination. An Indian or negro State could constitutionally exclude white men from voting on account of race or color under these decisions, but it is held that no State can lawfully exclude negroes from the ballot box for the same reasons.

In his effort to obtain a vote of the Senate denouncing a proposed constitutional amendment, now pending before the people of that State, the Senator from North Carolina has stepped over the lines of protection created by the sovereignty of the State as to defining the right or privilege of suffrage, and denies to North

Carolina the right to confer upon its citizens the right to vote because they are descended from certain persons or classes of persons and exclude other citizens who are not descended from such persons or classes of persons.

Many free negroes fought for the Whigs in North Carolina in the war of the Revolution, and all free negroes having certain property qualifications were qualified voters under her first constitution. If those who fought with the Whigs had been admitted as qualified voters, while all other free negroes were excluded, that would not have been a discrimination on account of race, color, or previous condition of slavery; yet it would have applied to race and color and to a special cause of qualification that the negroes who fought with the Tories did not possess.

If such a qualification could then be applied to free negroes who fought for the United States in aid of the revolution that succeeded in that struggle, without creating a discrimination as to race, color, or previous condition of slavery, it would equally apply to the class of negroes who aided the United States in putting down the revolution of 1861–65.

There is no more reason under the Constitution for refusing to extend these privileges to the children of negroes who were soldiers in either war than there would be for refusing to extend their pensions to their descendants.

In North Carolina the question before the people as to the purpose of the proposed amendment of the constitution is the same in substance if it is not identical with that which is embodied in the constitution of Louisiana.

In Louisiana the constitution adopted May 12, 1898, is an entire and complete body of organic law, inseparable in its integrity and incapable of being so dealt with as to take from it the provisions relating to the qualifications of electors and to registration of voters and as to elections, without destroying the plan of government. If such provisions are eliminated from the constitution there are none to be substituted for them so as to patch up a constitution formed in part of the present constitution and in part of the former constitution, which it has substituted and repealed.

It must be the purpose of the resolution before the Senate to draw into question the validity of these features of the constitution of Louisiana as a test of the constitutional validity of the proposed amendments to the constitution of North Carolina.

I will therefore treat the resolution in that light.

On examining the full text of the Louisiana constitution bearing on the question of negro suffrage, I am satisfied, contrary to my first impression, that its legal interpretation discloses no purpose to discriminate against any person claiming the right to vote at any election on the ground of his or her race, color, or previous condition of slavery.

The general belief as to the purpose of those who ordained this constitution is that it was intended to disfranchise a large number of negroes as to their right to vote in Louisiana. It is possible that Congress may reach that conclusion, and will proceed, with such powers as they possess, to the effort to annul the constitution of Louisiana by replacing it with laws that will repeal those parts relating to suffrage and institute other provisions in their stead. It is also possible that Congress will adopt the plan proposed in the original resolution of the Senator from North Carolina and declare that Louisiana has no government that is republican in form.

The necessary consequence of such a declaration would be that the State would be reduced to a Territorial government, or will be placed under military supervision, as Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, Texas, and other States were held under the reconstruction laws of 1867, and held in that grasp of power until the people have formed such a constitution as will meet the approval of Congress; yet it is far from being probable that Congress will venture so rashly. The die is cast in Louisiana, and Congress must decide upon their own judgment and responsibility to the people, whether that State has violated the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments of the Constitution of the United States, and, if they so decide whether any and what measures will be taken to haud the State in order.

I need not say one word to impress the Senate and the people with the dread significance of this situation. I can only appeal to the forbearance, the wisdom, and patriotism of Congress and the people for a dispassionate consideration of the subject. It is clear, I think, to everybody that when any remedy or penalty is to be enforced against a State, under either of these amendments, Congress has the sole and exclusive power to deal with the subject by appropriate legislation, but it must do this within the clear limitations of its authority. If the rights of any person are alleged to be denied by any other person or by a State, the jurisdiction that can give a remedy is in the judicial department, when Congress has conferred that jurisdiction.

The judgment of a court, operating in personam, can enforce the personal rights of the injured party under the fourteenth amendment when Congress has provided such a remedy. No such jurisdiction or remedy is provided under the fifteenth amendment. The exclusive power given in the fifteenth amendment is that of appropriate legislation by Congress. That power touches the States and the United States as governments; and if it is ever extended so as to affect the rights and remedies of persons, that can only be done by appropriate legislation.

Until it is so expressly provided by law neither the courts nor the Chief Executive can take any action against a State or a person to enforce the fifteenth amendment.

Any question of coercion, therefore, that arises under the fifteenth amendment as against a State or its officers is legislative—which means political—and is neither judicial nor executive until it is made such by act of Congress. All the relations between Congress and the States are political.

The obedience that the States, as such, are required to observe toward the United States, where the laws of the United States are supreme, is political in its character and can not be enforced by the decrees of the courts.

The Supreme Court follows the lead of Congress in such questions. Whatever law of Congress or act of Government that relates to the relations of the States and fixes them, like the relations with foreign governments, is political, and the Supreme Court has uniformly refused to take jurisdiction of them.

The Supreme Court, in a number of cases, have considered the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments separately and in connection, and no suggestion of any conflict between them has been made.

According to accepted rules of construction, that apply with peculiar force to organic laws, each ordinance and every part of each must stand in full effect, if that is possible, and each will be operative in the field of action that is open to it.

Yet the whole body of the organic law must be construed together as one complete system.

The deductions to be made from the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments of the Constitution in their relation to negro suffrage, as the same are construed by the Supreme Court, are:

First. That so far as they relate to suffrage they affect only the negro race who are citizens of the United States.

Second. That they protect negro suffrage only against the operation of laws that exclude them from voting, by provisions that discriminate against them on the ground of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Third. That the power to extend this protection is legislative and is vested in Congress, to be exercised by appropriate legislation.

Fourth. That when Congress exercises this power directly against a State it is expressly limited to the right to reduce the basis of apportionment of such State in the proportion that the number of negroes that are excluded from voting by the State laws bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State.

Fifth. Whether the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments repeal or modify the fourth section of Article I of the original Constitution as to the legislation that Congress may provide for the especial protection of negro suffrage is a question that does not concern what Congress may do in the enforcement of those amendments.

Sixth. But in all the provisions of the Constitution touching the subject of elections none of them are self-executing as against the States concerned. As to the States, and as to any penalties or remedies that can be enforced against them, no power exists in any department of the Government, except Congress, through appropriate legislation.

If Congress refuses to act, neither the courts, through any writ or decree, nor the executive, through any force confided to it, can take a single step toward compelling the obedience of a State to the fourteenth or fifteenth amendments.

If acts of Congress enforce these amendments and individuals are affected by them or by State laws which they contravene, they operate, as do all other provisions of the Constitution, to test the validity of such acts, and the courts can decide as to their validity and enforce it where they have jurisdiction of the parties. To this extent and in this way all the provisions of the Constitution are self-executing.

It is quite a different question when the courts or the Executive undertake to enforce the Constitution against a State, in any form of procedure, when Congress has not defined the offense or provided a penalty. That is simply impossible. And Congress can inflict no penalty on a State for refusing suffrage to negroes except that which is provided in the fourteenth amendment.

That amendment, by a necessary implication, prevents Congress from driving a State out of the Union or from remanding it to a Territorial condition for refusing suffrage to negroes. And by clause 3 of section 2 of the Constitution, which provides that "each State shall have at least one Representative" in the House; and by the provision in Article V—which can not be amended—"that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived

of its equal suffrage in the Senate," no State can be destroyed or expelled from the Union by act of Congress.

While Congress can, in certain cases provided for in the Constitution, enact laws that are supreme within a State, it can not create or adopt a constitution for a State.

The following questions bearing directly on this discussion are settled: In Minor *vs.* Happersett (21 Wallace, 192) it is decided that citizenship of the United States does not carry with it the right of suffrage and that the Constitution of the United States does not confer the right of suffrage upon anyone. That power belongs to the constitution and laws of the States.

In the case of United States *vs.* Reese (92 U. S., 204) it is held that the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States does not confer the right of suffrage, but it invests citizens of the United States with the right of exemption from discrimination in the exercise of the elective franchise on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude and empowers Congress to enforce it by appropriate legislation.

The power of Congress to legislate at all upon the subject of voting at State elections rests upon this amendment and can be exercised by providing a punishment only when the wrongful refusal to receive the vote of a qualified elector is because of his race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

In United States *vs.* Cruikshank (92, U. S., 542) it is held that the Government of the United States, although it is, within the scope of its powers, supreme and beyond the States, can neither grant nor secure to its citizens rights or privileges which are not expressly or by implication placed under its jurisdiction. All that can not be so granted or secured are left to the exclusive protection of the States.

The duty of protecting all its citizens in the enjoyment of an equality of rights was originally assumed by the States, and it still remains there. The only obligation resting upon the United States is to see that the States do not deny the right. In Ex parte Yarbrough (110 U. S., page 665) the Supreme Court say:

> This new constitutional right was mainly designed for citizens of African descent. The principle, however, that the protection of the exercise of this right is within the power of Congress is as necessary to the right of other citizens to vote as to the colored citizen and to the right to vote in general as to the right to be protected against discrimination.

In Williams *vs.* Mississippi (170 U. S., 213) the Supreme Court hold that "the discrimination that is violative of the Constitution as amended must appear on the face of the State law or by a necessary intendment from it and not from the manner in which the State law is administered."

In all these decisions we find that Congress alone can exercise the power to protect the negro against discrimination in respect of the right to vote, and that its power under the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments is confined to this sole purpose.

It must also be such a discrimination as appears on the face of the law that is complained of, and must relate alone to race, color, or previous condition of servitude. It is not enough to invoke the interference of Congress that such discrimination is possible, or even probable, under the administration of the law. It must be found in the legal construction of the law and in its legal effect. In this view of the law that governs in these matters the decision in the Mississippi case is conclusive to show that the text of the Louisiana constitution is not a legal discrimination against the negro on account of his race, color, or his previous condition of servitude, and the act is valid against the power of Congress to interfere with it.

The necessity for interference by Congress does not appear on the face of the Louisiana constitution, and Congress can not create that condition precedent to its action by a mere declaration, such as is called for in the resolution of the Senator from North Carolina. The contemplated action of North Carolina being the same in substance with that already taken by Louisiana, it is unjust to those people, and it will be in vain, that we fulminate resolutions of the Senate against them to alarm them into the further surrender of their rightful sovereign powers.

I assume, therefore, that no right to vote is vested in or confirmed to any person by the fifteenth amendment, except in the special instances mentioned in Yarbrough's case, and Congress can refuse to ride down a provision in a State constitution which denies to a negro the right of suffrage to the same extent that they could refuse to interfere if suffrage was denied to a white man because he is white; and such refusal puts it beyond the power of any other tribunal to interfere. Congress represents the will of the people and its majority vote is conclusive, as the verdict of the people, while it stands unreversed.

It is by no means a forced inference or conclusion drawn from the text of the fifteenth amendment of the Constitution, or from its close correspondence with the like provision in the fourteenth amendment, or from the circumstances attending its adoption in Congress and its ratification by the requisite number of States, that it was intended to take the entire subject of negro suffrage from under a fixed rule of a constitutional guaranty and to leave it on the footing of a political question, to be determined by the votes of the people as experience and a wise public policy may require.

It was a mistake that has so far been destructive of our national harmony and has afflicted the people with incalculable evils, when we put the recognition and guaranty of slavery in the Constitution of the United States. It should have been left in the control of the lawmaking power of each State where it existed to continue it or abolish it, and within the power of Congress to admit or abolish it in the Territories.

A like mistake in regard to an established church was made in the constitution of the Latin States of America.

These two organic troubles fixed in the constitutional laws have kept this hemisphere beset with revolutions and almost unceasing warfare for nearly a century. Neither of them would have caused any serious trouble if these Republics, based on the freedom of man in his person and his religion, had left the restraints on those liberties which existed when the Republics were formed, to be relaxed or removed in obedience to public opinion, which, after all, is the controlling power in free governments.

If the mind that conceived and formulated the fifteenth amendment was directed to the purpose of bringing the whole subject of negro suffrage again within the control of the people, through their Representatives in Congress, acting within ordinary and appropriate powers of legislation and without the necessity of again amending the Constitution, it was as wise and benignant a thought as ever entered the brain of a statesman or found a response in the heart of a patriot. Whatever was the purpose, I am satisfied that this result has been reached, and that it now rests with Congress exclusively to say when and how far negro suffrage shall be modified or how far it shall be sustained.

The people through the fifteenth amendment have reserved the power to themselves to say in acts of appropriate legislation what disposition shall be made of negro suffrage in the States. This Legislative power is, of course, regulated by other limitations in our constitutional system of government, and is subordinate to the preservation of the Union and the integrity of every State that is a member of the Union. A State can not be relegated to a Territorial form of government or otherwise entirely deprived of its representation in the Senate or House of Representatives or in the electoral colleges because it has abolished negro suffrage in whole or in part. If its representation can be reduced for that cause, the fourteenth amendment furnishes the rule and prescribes the limit of such reduction.

The question of the protection of the suffrage of the negro against discrimination under the laws is the only one in reference to which the Constitution gives specific plenary and discretionary power to Congress, to be exercised by appropriate legislation or to be declined if Congress refuses to exercise the power. It is not mandatory, and no man can be conscience bound to exercise the power if he feels that it would imperil the country. In the fourteenth amendment the power to reject the negro vote is admitted, in favor of the States, and this right is nowhere taken away.

If the right thus given to the States is taken away by the fifteenth amendment, as I do not believe it is, the power of Congress over the subject is again repeated separately in that amendment, and it stands as the sole authority to deal with the subject, to be exercised at the discretion of Congress. It may be that a power is given to Congress to deprive the State of the right reserved in the fourteenth amendment, but, if so, it is only a power and Congress is not bound to use it.

Unquestionably this legislative power is political and is not judicial, and it conveys no vested right in the negro race to vote that can stand against the power of Congress to permit a State to disqualify them by refusing to proceed to enforce their demand for the ballot.

If Congress can enforce the demand of the negro for protection against discrimination in the ballot, by appropriate legislation, they can in their discretion, refuse or omit to enforce that demand. The grant of power to Congress to enforce the fifteenth amendment necessarily implies a discretion in its use. The Supreme Court has declared, in several cases, that neither the fourteenth nor the fifteenth amendments give the negro any vested right to the ballot. It is not, therefore, a right, but a policy, that is established and Congress is the sole judge as to the time and the occasion for enforcing that policy.

It was an auspicious day in the history of this grand Republic when the rules of constitutional restraint or mandate were so far relaxed as to allow the people to deal with this race question according to their just judgment concerning the safety of that race and the rightful supremacy of the white race.

If the new constitution of Louisiana and the proposed amendments to the constitution of North Carolina are in conflict with the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments of the Constitution of the United States, the whole subject of discrimination against

negro suffrage is now presented to Congress and the people, to be settled by appropriate legislation, suited to the present situation, as duty and the general welfare shall hereafter require, and we are not forced to the difficult process of amendment to save the peace of the country. What, then, is the present duty of the American people on this subject, and what is the present requirement of the general welfare as to negro voters and the negro in politics?

More than half, probably three-fifths, of the voters of the United States, to whom these questions now address themselves, had no part in conferring suffrage upon negroes, and they are free from responsibility and largely from prejudice in the matter.

The fifteenth amendment was proclaimed on the 30th of March, 1870, as part of the Constitution, and no man born later than March 30, 1849, could have had a part in its adoption or ratification. Those who participated in it are 50 years old and upward. A new generation, in which every lawful voter has the right to be heard on this subject, as if it were for the first time presented, must be permitted to express its free and untrammeled opinion on this question, "Shall Congress proceed to deal with Louisiana for the course she has taken in amending her constitution in respect of the right of suffrage, or shall she be let alone?"

If the people say she shall be let alone, she will not be disturbed. This new generation of Americans are freethinkers and bold actors, within the limits of their rightful authority, on all matters that concern them and their posterity, and questions will be answered by them according to their merits and not according to the passions or prejudices of the former times in which they originated.

They now see that the Louisiana question must be disposed of, and that the Senator from North Carolina has raised it on the resolution now under discussion, and the Hon. Mr. CRUMPACKER has raised it in the other House on a bill to amend the census laws, and it must be decided.

They see that after the lapse of more than thirty years since negro suffrage was inaugurated, and in a time of political tranquillity, a State that still dares to claim the proud title and heritage of a sovereign State of the American Union has deliberately and carefully completed the work of reconstructing her organic law and has included in her new constitution certain restrictions upon the qualifications of voters.

These new restrictions are condemned in the resolution now under discussion as being in violation of the provisions of the fifteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States, which forbids any State from denying to any citizen of the United States the right to vote because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

The great body of the voters in Louisiana who have ordained this constitution are men under 50 years of age and were never slaveholders. They are not affected by the relations that existed between former slaves and their masters, but are confronted with a race question that is maintained by both races with constantly increasing vigor and is already a settled aversion, attended with ill-concealed bitterness, jealousy, and hatred.

There is no possible relief from this condition except to draw the lines of political separation as clear and as deep as is the line of racial distinction between them. It is the blood of the races that can not lawfully mix, and no marriage tie is possible to create a lawful or tolerable union between them.

The separation is for the good of both races and is irrevocable. Being the work of divine wisdom, it is right and is not discreditable to either race.

In physical, mental, social, inventive, religious, and ruling power the African race holds the lowest place, as it has since the world has had a history, and it is no idle boast that the white race holds the highest place. To force this lowest stratum into a position of political equality with the highest is only to clog the progress of all mankind in its march, ever strenuous and in proper order, toward the highest planes of human aspiration.

Whoever has supposed or has endeavored to realize that free republican government has for its task the undoing of what the Creator has done in classifying and grading the races according to His will overestimates both the powers and the duties of its grand mission.

It is a vain effort and is fatal to the spirit and success of free government to attempt to use its true principles as a means of disturbance of the natural conditions of the races of the human family and to reestablish them on the merely theoretical basis, which is not true, that, in political power, all men must be equal in order to secure the greatest happiness to the greatest number.

The true, distinctive feature of republican government, based on the sovereignty of the people as the source of power, is that it is in every feature representative. In this it differs essentially from every form of government that looks up to some alleged superior power as having the right to govern the people.

The representative, when chosen, embodies the will of the people, and the majority rules in a republic.

If the republic includes two distinct races—the highest and the lowest in the scale of intelligence and capacity for wise and good government—their respective representatives can not be equal in ability and influence; and this fact destroys the possibility of equality in political power. One class of representatives will dominate the other so completely that the idea of free and equal government will be banished, and the results will establish the race that is dominant over the other as a subordinate, thereby converting the republic into a practical autocracy.

If the races are nearly equally divided in numbers, continual warfare will be the result.

The history of the Republic of Santo Domingo, where the contest is between the negro and the mulatto, will become the history of our Southern States if the basis of voting remains as it is, and the finale will be the expulsion of the negro or his extermination.

In our Republic, State and Federal, an arbitrary rule of law is adopted for the first organization and for all subsequent steps in government, which excludes four persons in each group of five from any right to a voice in government.

This selection relates only to age and sex. It excludes all who are not over 21 years old and selects the fifth person—a male—as the representative of himself and the four other persons, without reference to race, except as to Indians, who are entirely excluded. In a mixed community of whites and negroes the negro representative selected under this unnatural and purely arbitrary rule represents, in fact, the nonvoters of both races, while in his actions and votes he represents the clannish, exclusive, and embittered prejudices of the negro race, or else the personal influence of some white political master, who uses him to multiply his power. This is not an accidental or temporary condition that can be changed. It is a permanent and fixed condition that is inherent in the nature of these races, who are separated by as wide a distance as the Divine Creator could demark in assigning to each a separate and useful sphere of duty in the world.

The voter is a distinctively representative man, not chosen by his constituents and having no responsibilities toward them; and the choice of a negro, by an arbitrary law, to such an office is a political marriage and miscegenation. It can not be extended into the social relations of the races without depraving the white man or woman to the social and racial level of the negro, and therefore it breaks the interdependence of the social and political relations of the people of the Republic, which constitute the true life and strength of our form of government.

A line of social cleavage, defined by race antipathies, that separates vast masses of our people into antagonistic or competitive bodies can not be closed or obliterated by any contrivance of political union between them. The division will only be made more distinct and more permanent by such efforts. Political dissension added to race antagonism can never produce harmony in this Republic. And when our political action is separated by law from the social instincts and sentiments of the white people of this great Republic, its end can not be far distant.

The people of Louisiana, after nearly forty years of terrible experience, have taken the only peaceful methods left open to them to rid themselves of this fatal evil and injustice, for which they were never in any sense responsible; and the honorable Senator from North Carolina is here endeavoring to rivet the chains upon her and, in turn, to paralyze the effort of the people of North Carolina to escape from the same horrible condition.

Several of the other Southern States, urged by the younger men, born since 1847, and many older men, are moving, under the same impulse, in the same direction. They have not yet despaired.

It is the experiences of the younger men, arising out of the effort to work negro suffrage into our political system as a harmonious element, and not the prejudices or resentments of the former slaveholders, that have prompted this strong and decisive movement in the Southern States. It will never cease unless it is held down by military power. It is a social evil as well as political, and the cost of its suppression will not be counted by this and succeeding generations in connection with questions of material prosperity.

No great body of white people in the world could be expected to quietly accept a situation so distressing and demoralizing as is created by negro suffrage in the South. It is a thorn in the flesh and will irritate and rankle in the body politic until it is removed as a factor in government. It is not necessary to go into the details of history to establish the great fact that negro suffrage in Louisiana and the other Southern States has been one unbroken line of political, social, and industrial obstruction to progress, and a constant disturbance of the peace in a vast region of the United States.

No historian will ever be able to collect a hundredth part of the facts of that distressing history.

Few men and few families, white or black, have escaped its baneful effects.

Nothing could have been more unfortunate for the negro race or more disturbing or demoralizing to the white race.

Armed with the ballot, on the pretext that it was necessary for the protection of their rights and as the complement of their manhood, it has afflicted them with social aspirations that are impossible of realization, and in their disappointment they have constantly persisted in seizing by force the privileges that they vainly strive to attain to, as grotesque decorations of their liberties. Under the license which they include in their notions of liberty, desperate crime has been very often resorted to as their means of success, until there is no real safety for women and children exposed to their brutality even in the suburbs of Washington.

The ballot which was given them as a weapon of defense has been used by their white allies and leaders to fight their own battles for political offices and power, and this unscrupulous league of politicians have been always present in Congress, demanding seats in the Houses and looting the Treasury in the expenses of contests, all based on alleged frauds in counting the votes cast by negroes or in refusing to count votes that they did not cast.

In many places in the South the negroes have come to realize that there is an increment of value in the ballot, and many thousands of them are being sold, with little concealment, in doubtful counties, at $1 a vote.

It is not disputed or doubtful history nor concealed facts that I am quoting. I speak only of what is known almost of all men.

Neither is it to me a pleasant task. It is most disagreeable to every honorable man in the South to listen from year to year to accusations against our Southern people of frauds in the elections.

Nor is it any relief to know that equal or more dangerous frauds are practiced on white men in the Northern States.

If Southern white men have falsified election returns, they have the stronger, if not the better, reason that they are acting upon the same law of self-defense that insulted and outraged human nature resorts to for the protection of homes and families, women and children, from a race that sets at defiance all moral restraints upon their brutal desires and fills the country with horrors that defy description and a retaliatory vengeance that infuriates its inflictors with a spirit of uncontrollable rage. This generation and those who preceded them and were born in the nineteenth century were not responsible for the origin of this evil in America. It came here with the importation of negro slaves, who were in Africa the slaves of their own kindred.

It will be greatly modified when the white race are emancipated from the low standard of political equality with the negro race. It will end only when we, in obedience to a high obligation of national duty, have provided a home for the negro race that is suited to their traits, abundant in productions for their comfortable existence, and encouraging to their growth and full development—a country where the skies above them are not of brass, as they are here; a national home, in which there is full opportunity for their growth in body, mind, and spirit to the full stature of which they are capable and in the full enjoyment of religious and political liberty.

I owe them nothing but good will, but I can not include in that debt the sacrifice of the honor of the white race or the destruction of its prestige and hard-earned institutions of government, either to flatter their vanity or to reward those with power who have cursed this country with their enforced presence, or those who employ that race for the oppression of my native Southland. I was a soldier of the Confederacy, and, while I have always regretted the necessity that put me under arms in open hostility to the flag of our common country, I feel, as every Confederate soldier feels, that it is a peculiar honor that we were the only white men ever called upon, as soldiers, to defend the white race against a fanatical attack of so-called reformers and the deliberate organization of ambitious politicians, who forced us into war by their cruel design to put negro slaves on a political and social footing of equality with us.

So long as men are held responsible for the natural consequences of their acts we must feel that the events that led to that war anticipated, and that the consequences that resulted from it were intended to humiliate the Southern people to a social and political level with the negro race.

That feeling is now operating on the people of the later generation in creating a resentment that seems to increase, as it is constantly being more clearly developed, that the repose of the country is impossible while the present condition continues.

There are some propositions that are undeniable, which prove that perfect accord between the former warring sections of the Union can never be attained so long as the negroes are forced upon the white people of the Southern States as full and equal participants in the ballot box.

It was the presence of the negro in the United States that caused the civil war. If he had never been brought here there would have been no cause for that terrible conflict.

It is his voting power, in the control of white men, that caused the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments of the Constitution and the acts of reconstruction, which sunk the States affected by them to a lower condition in the rights of self-government than that of the Territorial governments. It was the presence of the negro that called the Army into the control of State governments and placed the legislatures and the courts under military guard.

The negro voter and the alleged civil rights of that race led to the effort to impeach a President of the United States and caused the perilous contest over the election of another President and Vice-President.

Many contests for seats in the House of Representatives and three contests in the Senate have been based upon alleged frauds that deprived negroes of their right to vote.

Many good and honorable white men have been sent to the penitentiaries for alleged interferences with negro votes and voters. In all the Southern States, and in a large number of counties and municipalities negro voting has caused tumult and violence, and over the entire South the depression of values and the interruption of industries for this cause has cost the people heavy losses.

Unrest, heated resentments, and personal violence have disturbed the people and have caused them to distrust the Government and sometimes to resist its authority. Judges and other State officers have been fined and locked up in prisons for alleged violations of laws enacted for the especial benefit of the negro race.

The catalogue of such events would be long and dark if it could be written so as to include them all. All this has been done to force the negro into political and social equality with the white man, and it has resulted in utter failure to lift that race into this artificial relation with the white race.

Nature is against it, and the real sentiment of the white people of the United States is averse to the continuance of this dangerous condition.

Louisiana has suffered from this cause as few other peoples have. The history of the conflicts and sufferings of her people in more than a third of the nineteenth century, if it could be written, would give support to her appeal to the people of the United States for deliverance that ought to reach the heart of every patriot in the land.

The appeal of North Carolina for the peaceful allowance of the restoration of her people to their former right of controlling their own affairs, without negro interference, will soon be announced by her people.

In the spirit of her Mecklenburg declaration of independence, but in loyal obedience to the laws and the will of the people of the United States, North Carolina declares the rights of her people, and will proceed to their protection unawed by any resolution the Senate may adopt with a view to rivet the chains upon their arms.

If the people of the United States shall vote, in the election of members of Congress in 1900, that Louisiana and North Carolina shall be let alone, they will not be disturbed for having done what every State would do, if this were a new question, now for the first time submitted to those States.

The Democratic party of the United States has always been a white man's party, and when the appeal of the people of Louisiana and North Carolina, supported by the Democrats in all the Southern States, is made to them they and a vast body of white men all over the country who have not acted with them in the past will unite in a demand that these sovereign States shall not be destroyed for taking care of the lives and happiness of their people.

If negroes had been admitted to the right of suffrage by the States as foreign-born persons are admitted to citizenship and suffrage—man by man, on an examination of their knowledge of our institutions and as to their personal qualifications to understand and honestly to exercise the privilege of voting—this dangerous evil would, probably, have been so far controlled, at least, as to have secured the peace of the country. Or if in the Philippine Archipelago a happy home is found for the African race, to which they would flock with rejoicings and grow into power beneath our flag, and among a people many of whom are their near kindred, there would be few to regret that our free Republic, with its free religion, had expanded to open this door to humanity.

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution lie on the table for the present. I desire to give notice that on the 22d of this month I shall call it up for the purpose of submitting some remarks on it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the resolution lie upon the table, subject to his call. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

During Mr. MORGAN's speech,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Alabama suspend for one moment?

Mr. MORGAN. Certainly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 2 o'clock having

arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have no disposition to delay the remarks of the Senator from Alabama, but I should like to say that I would be glad to reach some understanding, if I can, as to the progress of the debate. I suppose some Senator in opposition to the bill may be ready to speak after the Senator from Alabama has concluded, or I should like to inquire what is the desire of Senators on the other side of the Chamber in regard to it.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. There is no desire on this side to delay the discussion of the bill. During the Christmas holidays, however, most Senators have been absent from the city, and I doubt if any Senator is ready to proceed to-day with the discussion of the bill. I would prefer that there should be no pressing action taken at present for the reason that there is no disposition to delay. We recognize the fact that you have a majority and that you can pass the bill without very much delay. We only want time enough to allow Senators to be prepared to make such arguments as they choose to make against it.

Mr. ALDRICH. My only disposition is to press the bill as rapidly as I can, consulting always the convenience of Senators. I understand perfectly the position that the Senator from Arkansas and other opponents of the bill take on this matter. It has been done in the Senate in the orderly disposition of business for many years. I did not make the suggestion at this time with any idea to inconvenience anyone, but that we might understand as far as possible just how the discussion would proceed.

Mr. STEWART. If it is agreeable, I should like to address the Senate on Thursday upon this bill.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I am satisfied that no Senator desires to go on to-day, and I would prefer that the matter should go over. The Senator from Nevada has just given notice that he would like to address the Senate on Thursday. Of course there will be no objection to that. I assure the Senator from Rhode Island that the Senators on this side will, as early as they can, be ready to discuss the bill, and that it will not be unnecessarily delayed.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the bill may be laid aside temporarily, not losing its place as the unfinished business, so that the Senator from Alabama may proceed. Let it be laid aside for the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island asks that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senator from Alabama be allowed to proceed with his speech. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Does the Senator ask that it be laid aside for the day?

Mr. ALDRICH. For the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. For the day. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF DEPENDENT PENSION ACT.

After the conclusion of Mr. MORGAN'S speech,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Calendar under Rule IX is before the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. I trust the first bill on the Calendar may be taken up. It is a bill in which the Grand Army of the Republic is greatly interested. I should like to have it passed, if there be no objection, and I think there will not be any serious objection to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is on the Calender under Rule VIII?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes, under Rule VIII.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire asks that the Calendar under Rule VIII may be proceeded with. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and that order is made.

Mr. GALLINGER. I now ask the Senate to proceed with the consideration of the bill (S. 1477) in amendment of sections 2 and 3 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This bill was considered by the Senate as in Committee of the Whole on a former day, and no amendments were recommended. The bill is still open to amendment.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to have an explanation of the bill, Mr. President.

Mr. GALLINGER. Perhaps I can state to the Senator briefly the purport of the amendments which this bill proposes to sections 2 and 3 of the act of June 27, 1890. They are two in number. They both have been not only recommended but urged by the Grand Army of the Republic, and the President of the United States in his last annual message recommended that one of the amendments should be incorporated into that act; that is, where section 3 provides that a widow without means of support other than her daily labor shall become pensionable, the Pension Bureau has ruled—it is an arbitrary ruling—that if she has an income independent of her daily labor to an amount equal to the pension she would receive—that is, $96 per year—she is not pensionable under this act. The Grand Army have asked that the act should be amended so that if the widow shall have an income not exceeding $250 per year in addition to the proceeds of her daily labor, and the President has likewise so recommended in his recent message, she may be pensionable under the act, and the amendment to the act proposes that that change shall be made.

The other amendment urged by the Grand Army, which seems to be fair, is that in estimating disabilities the Pension Bureau shall aggregate minor disabilities so as to give a soldier under that act a pensionable status. The Commissioner of Pensions says that that is the practice of the Bureau at the present time. I have taken occasion in the report I made on this subject to say that if that be so, then there can be no objection to enacting it into law. The proposition is—the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] asks me to repeat it—that in estimating the disability of a soldier, if he have three or four or five minor disabilities, they shall be aggregated; that is, if one disability entitles him to $2 per month, another to $2, and another to $2, those three disabilities may be aggregated so as to give him the minimum under this law, which is $6 per month.

It has been urged very earnestly and persistently by the members of the Grand Army and others that that was not the practice of the Bureau, but that the Bureau had decided over and over again that, unless a soldier had some one disability which entitled him to that rating under this act, he would not be granted a pension. As I said a moment ago, the Commissioner of Pensions says that the present practice of the Bureau is to aggregate these disabilities, and the proposed change in the law is to specifically state that that shall be done.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask the Senator from New Hampshire for information what has been the theory, the legal construction, upon which the Pension Commissioner has held that under the law a widow receiving $96 a year independent of her pension should not be entitled to a pension?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not know that there has been any legal construction on that point. In the investigation which was made on this subject I remember putting that question directly to the Commissioner of Pensions—that is to say, I propounded this interrogatory to him: "Is it not a fact that under the law as it stands to-day a widow who had any income, whether $1, or $100, or $500, independent of the proceeds of her daily labor, is not pensionable under this act?" He replied that that would be the proper technical construction, but the Bureau, or more properly the Secretary of the Interior, in, I think, a spirit of liberal construction, had placed the amount at a sum equal to the pension the widow would receive. I will read the law on that point so that there may be no misunderstanding about it, and I think Senators will agree with me that a strict technical construction would exclude pensions to widows who had any income whatever outside of the proceeds of daily labor. Section 3 reads:

> That if any officer or enlisted man who served ninety days or more in the Army or Navy of the United States during the late war of the rebellion, and who has had an honorable discharge, has died or shall hereafter die leaving a widow without other means of support than her daily labor—

Mr. President, it is my judgment as a layman that a strict technical construction of that language would exclude a widow who had any support whatever outside of her daily labor. I think the Pension Bureau and the Interior Department have dealt liberally with that class of pensioners or beneficiaries under the law in even granting that they might be pensionable if they had an income equivalent to the annual amount they would receive in pensions.

Mr. ALLEN. Suppose they were incapable of earning anything, what would be their status then?

Mr. GALLINGER. I think substantially the same. I have an impression that they would not be pensionable under the act as it stands to-day.

Mr. ALLEN. In that case a great majority of these widows—95 per cent of them—would be women so far advanced in life that they would be incapable of labor to any great extent outside of the discharge of the mere perfunctory duties of the household.

Mr. GALLINGER. Beyond a question, if the Senator will permit me, that hardship exists to-day as to a very large proportion of those widows.

Mr. ALLEN. Would it not be wise, under those circumstances, to strike out that clause, or at least to cover the feature of the case to which I have referred, and increase their allowances from $250 to $300 a year, according to the circumstances of each case?

Mr. GALLINGER. I beg the Senator not to embarrass the

consideration of this measure by changing its present purpose. The President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Pensions, and the First Deputy Commissioner of Pensions have all agreed that the proper thing to do at the present time is to make those widows pensionable if they have not an income outside of their daily labor in excess of $250 a year.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator will permit me, this bill is to correct a defect in the existing law, is it not?

Mr. GALLINGER. Precisely.

Mr. SPOONER. Not to correct any erroneous administration of the law by the Pension Bureau?

Mr. GALLINGER. Precisely. I will say to the Senator, further, that the Grand Army have agreed upon that amount, and a committee of the Grand Army have been here urging it upon the President, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Commissioner of Pensions.

Mr. ALLEN. I was just going to ask the Senator if the President, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Commissioner of Pensions have agreed upon this sum?

Mr. GALLINGER. I would say to the Senator that such is the fact.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator will understand that I have no desire to embarrass the bill. I would gladly vote or do anything within my power to increase the amount, so as to place these unfortunate women in circumstances where they can be properly cared for. I do think it is almost inexcusable that a great Government like this should permit the remnants of the great army of thirty-five years ago to become practically mendicants and supplicants at the door of Congress for relief.

Respecting the other proposition, I want the Senator to understand, as he does understand, that I am not as fully informed about this matter as he is, and as I hope to be in the future; but it has been my understanding, since we voted some years ago that the minimum pension should be $6 a month, that the Pension Bureau, where the rating did not under the former law entitle the applicants to $6 a month, has dropped such pensioners out; that the four-dollar men and the two-dollar men have entirely disappeared from the pension rolls. That was not the purpose of the law.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. ALLEN. Excuse me a moment. The view at that time presented to the Senate, I distinctly remember, was that as to persons who were drawing pensions at all the amount allowed them should be brought up to $6 per month, and not that any person drawing under that sum should be discharged from the pension rolls.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, I certainly think he is misinformed on that point. The Pension Bureau beyond a question did increase the pensions of the two and four dollar a month pensioners to the amount of $6 when we passed the statute to which reference has been made. That was my understanding.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question, as I perhaps did not understand him. Does the Senator mean to say that in the administration of this law if a soldier is found to be pensionable at the rate of $2 he does not get anything at all?

Mr. ALLEN. I do not know whether that is true or not, but I have been told by several pensioners who had been drawing less than $6 per month that when that law went into force they were dropped from the pension rolls.

Mr. TELLER. If that is so, it is a matter which I think Congress ought to take up, for we certainly did not intend anything of that kind. We intended to say that every soldier who was pensionable at any degree below $6 should be put up to $6 per month, and the discussion shows that.

Mr. ALLEN. Yes. I want to be understood. I do not mean to say that the statement is true; I do not know whether it is true or not, and therefore I do not want to put the Commissioner of Pensions in a wrong light; but that is the information I have had from several pensioners who had been drawing less than $6 per month.

If the Senator from New Hampshire will permit me, I wish to ask one other question. I am seeking information upon this subject, and I stand sadly in need of it. It has been my understanding—I do not know where I got it from—that the rule in the Pension Office heretofore was that a pensioner would not be pensioned in any sum unless some one isolated disability entitled him to a specific rating; that is, you could not take one partial disability, another partial disability, and another partial disability, aggregate those disabilities, and permit him to draw a pension, but there must be some one single disability entitling him to a pension. I say, if that is true, it ought, in my judgment, to be corrected by this bill or some other bill as quickly as possible.

Mr. GALLINGER. In answer to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], whom I, as chairman of the Committee on Pensions, welcome to that committee, because I think he is going to be a very valuable addition to the committee—he has converted me from some of the error of my ways on pension legislation—in answer to the point he has made, I will say that he is mistaken, I feel sure, in the view that when we made $6 the minimum pension those drawing less than that amount were dropped from the roll. They were simply advanced to the $6 rate. There is no question about that.

I think, however, the question raised by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] deserves a frank answer. I hope I am correct in the statement I will make, which is that the Pension Bureau has not construed our action to mean that a soldier having any disability—I mean now a new applicant for a pension—would be put on the roll at $6 per month if the disability only amounted to that for which $2 or $4 had been provided; that he must now prove a disability which would have amounted to the $6 rate; and the very point that this bill proposes is that these minor disabilities shall be aggregated so as to make a great many of those soldiers pensionable upon the aggregate of their disabilities, in place of their being rejected by the Pension Bureau, which contends that they should have one single disability to entitle them to that rating. The point the Senator raised I confess never occurred to me. I am not quite sure that we did mean that hereafter those who could prove a $2 rating should receive $6 a month pension. It would seem that was our purpose.

Mr. TELLER. Congress certainly did not intend to do such an atrocious thing as to say that a man who had a two-dollar disability should get nothing. That is very clear. We meant to say that if any soldier had a disability which would have theretofore entitled him to a two-dollar rating his pension should be raised to $6.

Mr. CULLOM. That was certainly my understanding.

Mr. TELLER. We never thought of saying, "Here is a man entitled to a pension of $2 a month, and because he is not entitled to more he can not have a pension of $2." That is absurd.

Mr. CULLOM. It never occurred to me that we were knocking out a large number of pensioners.

Mr. TELLER. Oh, no. That legislation was meant to be in the interest of the soldiers. It may be—I am not going to criticise the Department—that they have properly construed the law; but if they have, we ought to change it, and change it instanter. I wish the chairman of the Committee on Pensions would ascertain about that, so that if necessary we may change it, because we have a contract with every soldier when he enters the Army—for it is really a part of his contract—that if a certain disability arises he shall have a corresponding pension. We can not take that away from him, and if we have done it inadvertently we should retrace our steps very rapidly.

Mr. ALLEN. I remember very distinctly when that amendment was under consideration. It was an amendment to an appropriation bill. When it was before the Senate it was distinctly understood that $6 per month was to be the minimum pension.

Mr. CULLOM. I so understood.

Mr. ALLEN. It was universally conceded that all smaller pensions would be brought to that amount.

Mr. TELLER. That is, if a man had any pensionable disability whatever, his pension should not be less than $6.

Mr. CULLOM. That certainly was my understanding.

Mr. TELLER. I recall it very well, Mr. President. We have not attempted to do so wicked a thing as that; and if we have done it, we have done it inadvertently. I do not say that the law can not be construed in that way; I do not want to make any reflection upon an officer who executes the law as he understands it, because that is his business; but if there is a fault, we should correct it.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator from New Hampshire allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. GALLINGER. With pleasure.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am new to pension legislation, because there has been very little of it passed since I have been a member of this body, and therefore I do not understand the words some Senators use. I understand the general meaning of "disability," but I do not understand the technical meaning and application of it. Here, for instance, Senators speak of "a two-dollar disability, a four-dollar disability, and a six-dollar disability."

I should like to have a little light as to how these disabilities are graded, as to what constitutes a two, a four, or a six dollar disability, and so on.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator, in reply, that that is largely an arbitrary matter on the part of the Pension Bureau. Some of the minor ratings are fixed by law.

Mr. TILLMAN. For instance, what would be the rate of pension allowed for the loss of an arm?

Mr. GALLINGER. In the first place the applicant is rated by the medical board under existing law, but that rating is not binding upon the medical officers of the Pension Bureau. They may

ignore the rating entirely. They may and very properly do ignore it in some cases, because the ratings of the medical boards are sometimes absurd. I myself saw a rating made by a local medical board which gave a soldier, under the act of June 27, 1890, $144 a month, and yet the pension under the law is only $12 a month. That was an absurd rating, and of course the officers of the Pension Bureau put it aside as being unworthy of consideration. Minor disabilities, such as the loss of a finger, are pensionable at the rate of $2, according to my recollection, and the rates of pension for certain other disabilities minor in their nature are fixed by law.

Now, it has been asserted and contended with great earnestness that the Bureau in fixing a rating has ignored these minor disabilities—that is, so far as compounding them is concerned—and insisted that the soldier should have one single disability that should entitle him to a rating equivalent to the minimum under the law, which is $6 a month.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have in my mind (and it was because of that instance that I have participated in this debate at all) the case of a soldier of the Mexican war who lost an arm in one of the battles—I think Cherubusco or Chapultepec—and who drew a pension before the war from the time when Mexican war veterans were allowed pensions of some amount, I do not know what. When the war broke out of course the pension dropped, and he did not get on the pension roll again until the general law was passed under which Mexican war veterans were pensioned. He has applied for an increase and has been turned down. His pension today is $8 a month. He got no back pension for the time between the beginning of the war and the time when the pension was renewed, and the Bureau has refused to allow him an increase.

Mr. TELLER. That was a specific pension for the loss of an arm.

Mr. TILLMAN. I want to know what that pension is. You all talk about disability being rated so much, a finger so much, a hand so much, and so forth. I want to know what an arm is in the case of a man who is 72 years of age.

Mr. TELLER. I will say to the Senator that that depends upon where the arm is off, whether above the elbow or below, but the rate is fixed by statute. I do not see why the soldier is not getting not $8, but the specific provision of the statute. I do not understand how that can be.

Mr. TILLMAN. He is just getting the general run of pension for no disability whatever.

Mr. TELLER. Was he in the Confederate army?

Mr. TILLMAN. No; he did not serve in the Confederate army, I think, because he lost an arm. He may have temporarily been in the Confederate army in some quartermaster's position or something like that. I am not certain on those points. I am getting ready to introduce a bill here to give him an increase of pension by special act, and I wanted to find out some of the methods that govern in these cases.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, there is a schedule of rates which I thought I had in my desk, but I do not place my hand on it just now. I will say to the Senator that I think that for the loss of an arm at the shoulder the pension is something like $35 a month. I am not quite sure as to that. I do not carry those figures in my mind. I wish I might. I can not quite understand, unless there is some special reason, some overwhelming reason——

Mr. TILLMAN. I have the report of the Pension Bureau on this man's case, in which I am informed that his application for increase was turned down because his circumstances did not seem to imply that he was in the poorhouse, or something like that, and he was not considered as worthy of the Government's bounty.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course we can not discuss the question of the loss of this man's arm. It seems to me incredible that if he lost an arm in the service he is not pensioned for that disability, which would be more than $8 a month. Under the Mexican war pension act, which is a service-pension act, the ex-soldiers are pensioned at $8 a month.

Mr. TILLMAN. Without regard to any special disability.

Mr. GALLINGER. Without regard absolutely to any disability at all. That act was subsequently amended so as to give them $12 a month if they could show that they were in extreme poverty or physical distress. So under the Mexican war pension act the maximum is $12 a month, but the original law granted a service pension of $8 a month. I think I am correct. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] will remember.

Mr. COCKRELL. I was just going to suggest that the gentleman to whom the Senator from South Carolina refers is evidently pensioned under the general act of 1887, which grants $8 a month.

Mr. GALLINGER. A service pension.

Mr. COCKRELL. It grants $8 a month to all soldiers of the Mexican war, regardless of their disabilities. It is what we call a service pension, and not a disability pension. When the Mexican war was in progress, or very soon afterwards, a law was enacted granting pensions to the soldiers of the Mexican war for disabilities incurred in the service in the line of duty.

Mr. TILLMAN. This man lost an arm in battle.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is entirely distinct from the other class of pensions. Take the law of 1890. There a certain pension is granted, but the maximum is $12 a month, and it is immaterial whether the disabilities were contracted in the service in the line of duty or not, so that they were not due to vicious habits. But under the law of July 14, 1862, pensions are granted for disabilities contracted in the service in the line of duty, and there the limit is $72, according to the degree of disability incurred in the service in the line of duty.

Evidently your friend was pensioned under the act of 1887, giving a pension simply for service, and the maximum there is $8. In 1893, as the Senator from New Hampshire has said, it was increased to a maximum of $12 where they were dependent and unable to do any manual labor. There is where they have refused him an increase. Under that law they could not give it. It makes no difference what the physical condition was, they could not give over $12 a month under the law of June 27, 1890. It makes no difference what the physical condition of a man may be, they can not give him over $12 a month under that act.

Mr. TILLMAN. Am I to understand from the Senator from Missouri that there has been a discrimination against Mexican war veterans?

Mr. COCKRELL. Not at all.

Mr. TILLMAN. How is it that a Union soldier who fought in the civil war gets discriminating pensions? A man is pensioned by reason of special physical disabilities, for the loss of limbs, or something of that sort, whereas a Mexican war veteran in exactly the same condition, who fought for the flag, is discriminated against, and not even allowed an increase when he applies for it, merely because he is not in the poorhouse.

Mr. COCKRELL. There are two classes of pensions which have been recognized in the Government. One is a pension for service—a service pension.

Mr. TILLMAN. This man is entitled to both. He is entitled to a pension for service and to a pension for disability, too.

Mr. COCKRELL. There is always a maximum for that; and it is immaterial in a great many cases whether the disabilities, if any, originated in the service in the line of duty or not. The Mexican war pension act of 1887 grants a pension of $8 for service for a certain length of time. It does not make any difference as to what his condition was. He might have been worth a million dollars. I believe the first pension granted under the law of 1887 was granted to a United States Senator.

Mr. TILLMAN. Let me ask the Senator right there, if he will permit me——

Mr. COCKRELL. It made no difference what the disability was, you could not increase the pension beyond $8 a month until the law of 1893 was passed, and that then gave $12. June 27, 1890, what is called the dependent-pension bill was passed in regard to the Union soldiers, and that granted a pension for all disabilities not due to vicious habits to a maximum of $12, rating the pensions, I believe, at that time from about $6 or $4. Now, that is the maximum under that law. Under the dependent-pension law of June 27, 1890, no matter what the disabilities were, they can not go over $12 a month. But now under the law of July 14, 1862, pensions are granted to ex-soldiers for disabilities contracted in the service in the line of duty. The maximum limit is $72 for a private soldier who is totally disabled for all manual labor, and so utterly helpless that he must have the personal presence and attendance of a helper all the time. He must require that all the time to get the highest rate.

Now, then, under that law there are allowances for certain characters of disabilities. There are allowances for the loss of a hand and the loss of a foot and the loss of an arm below the elbow or above it. I sent for the pension laws for the purpose of explaining that point. Unless a pension is granted for disabilities contracted in the service you can not go above the maximum allowed.

Mr. TILLMAN. What I am after, if the Senator will permit me, is this: I want to find out whether there exists a discrimination in favor of soldiers who fought in the civil war which the soldiers who fought in the Mexican war do not enjoy?

Mr. COCKRELL. There is a little discrimination, a very slight discrimination, in the language used in the law of June 27, 1890, and in the act of 1893, which was put on here in the Senate. The amendment was moved by the then Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. Vilas, increasing the pension to $12. There is very little discrimination. I am not certain—it has been such a long while since I looked at it—whether the law granting to soldiers of the Mexican war pensions for disabilities contracted in the service in the line of duty ever at any time made provision for an increase to the extent that the law of July 14, 1862, and subsequent laws have made. I have not compared it.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the laws governing our pensions are so old that Senators who have been here as long as the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from New Hampshire can not tell us exactly the pensionable status of a man, I think it is time we

should have some revision and understanding as to just what claims a Mexican veteran has.

Mr. GALLINGER. Now, Mr. President——

Mr. TILLMAN. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri, or the Senator from New Hampshire either, to tell me if he knows any case in which a Union veteran who is pensionable by special provision as to certain disabilities has ever had his financial status inquired into and has had his application for an increase of pension turned down by reason of the fact that he might have had an income from other sources?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not understand that that is the rule. It is a very rare circumstance for us to pass a special act for a man who has property sufficient to take care of himself. Under the act of June 27, 1890, especially the part applying to widows, that is absolutely enforced in all cases.

I think, Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will permit me, that there is no discrimination against the soldiers who fought in the war with Mexico. On the contrary, they have an advantage over the soldiers of the so-called civil war.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will accept the Senator's amendment; I will say war of the rebellion, if my words give any offense.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have not referred to that at all. I do not deal in slurs or innuendos in debate, and it is immaterial to me what that war is called. I usually refer to it as the civil war. I have done so in my reports, and I have no disposition to offend anybody.

I was about to say, Mr. President, that the Mexican war soldiers were granted a service pension, the very thing the soldiers of the late civil war are contending that we ought to grant them; but we have not got to it yet. I believe that a service-pension bill was passed applying to soldiers of the Revolution—I think so.

Mr. TELLER. Yes, it was.

Mr. GALLINGER. Such was the fact, the Senator from Colorado says, and a service-pension bill was passed applying to the soldiers who participated in the war with Mexico. Our friends who served from 1861 to 1865 are now demanding very strenuously, and have been for a great many years, that the time has come to pass a service-pension bill putting all the remaining soldiers of the late civil war on the pension rolls who are not there now. I have not yet come to the conclusion that that time has arrived, and for that reason I have not favored it. I feel very sure, Mr. President, that there are some peculiarities connected with the case the Senator from South Carolina referred to. If he lost——

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator will permit me right there, the peculiarity consists in this, that here is a man who was on the pension rolls prior to 1860 because he had lost an arm in battle. Then he was dropped by reason of the Confederate war coming on. He did not get on the pension rolls until some time about ten or eleven years ago. I do not recollect the exact year, but it was after the passage of the Mexican service-pension act. He has tried to get a back pension covering the period between the time when his pension stopped and the time when it recommenced, and he has failed. He has tried to get an increase and has failed. I simply ask, as you are amending the pension laws, that the discrimination, if any exists, against Mexican war veterans shall be obliterated from the statute books.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I feel sure that no such discrimination exists. The Senator has stated the case, it seems to me, a little more specifically now than he did in the first place. As I now understand him, this soldier who fought against Mexico lost an arm and was pensioned for that disability.

Mr. TILLMAN. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. He afterwards participated in the civil war against the Union and his pension ceased.

Mr. TILLMAN. He could not have participated much, because the loss of his arm did not allow him to act in any military capacity. He does not pretend to say that he was not in sympathy with the Confederacy and would have fought if he had had his arm. They sent him some statement from the Pension Bureau to sign, and he simply said, "I will not tell a lie to get all the money up there." I have his letter stating that. But he has asked for an increase, and they have turned him down on the ground that he is not in the poorhouse or that his income is sufficient for him and he does not need an increase of pension.

I feel that if he had been a Union soldier he would have got his increase; and as he did fight for the flag once, although he sympathized in the war on it from 1861 to 1865, I think it is time for us to stop the discrimination. He has got but a few years to live, anyway. He is 72 now.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think I understand——

Mr. TILLMAN. And I am going to appeal to the Senator. I am going to bring in a special bill. I can not get a general law unless he will agree to amend the general law, now that he is proposing to amend it. If he will look into the case I have presented and provide some little amendment that will cover these points, so as to allow the Bureau to take them up rather than have special bills passed, I will be satisfied. But I contend that it is time for the discriminations that existed, if any do exist, against Mexican war veterans to be obliterated from the statute books, and that the few remaining veterans should have the same opportunity to draw Uncle Sam's money and suck the sweet milk of the Treasury as any other ex-soldiers have.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator knows he has never come to my desk——

Mr. TILLMAN. I am not complaining of the Senator. I trust the Senator will allow me to certify, or rather to bear testimony, to the willingness he has always shown to assist me in any legitimate object I have had before me. There are so few people down our way who ever ask for a pension or for an increase of pension that I have had business before his committee but twice in the four years I have been here.

Mr. GALLINGER. It has been a delight to me to have the Senator make a request, and I always respond with alacrity, as I think.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am sure you will in this case.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will, if the case warrants it. This man evidently forfeited his pension under the law. He subsequently, I take it, applied for a pension under the act pensioning the Mexican war soldiers, the so-called service act, which granted $8 a month, and he has now applied, under the amended pension act, for a pension of $12 a month, which specifies that an ex-soldier shall not be entitled to it unless he is unable——

Mr. TILLMAN. On the question of special disabilities to which the Senator has drawn attention——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair calls the attention of Senators to the rule.

Mr. TILLMAN. I beg the Chair's pardon that I did not address the Chair first. I sometimes am not as observant of the rules as I ought to be.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am always willing to yield cheerfully to the Senator from South Carolina, but I should like to complete that sentence, because it will not read well unless I do so.

Mr. TILLMAN. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was about to say, if I can gather the thread of the narrative, that doubtless this ex-soldier applied under the amended Mexican war pension act for an increase to $12 a month, and his case did not meet the requirements of the amended act, which I think the Senator from Missouri has in his hands, and which I would be very glad to have him read for the information of the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is as follows:

CHAP. 18.—An act granting increase of pension to soldiers of the Mexican war in certain cases.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to increase the pension of every pensioner who is now on the rolls at $8 per month on account of services in the Mexican war, and who is wholly disabled for manual labor, and is in such destitute circumstances that $8 per month are insufficient to provide him the necessaries of life, to $12 per month.

Approved, January 5, 1893.

Mr. TILLMAN. Then, Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from New Hampshire, I will recur to the discrimination which must exist, because here is a one-armed soldier, and under your general provisions in regard to Union soldiers that man must have been entitled to more than this service pension of $8 a month, which is given to a man who has both arms and is simply getting it because he had gone under the flag to fight. As the question of pensions was being discussed, I wanted to call attention to this matter and find out if a discrimination exists, and to ask the chairman of the Committee on Pensions to amend the law while he is amending it so as to do away with it.

Mr. BATE. I should like to know of the Senator from New Hampshire if there is any distinction made in the pension law equivalent to that which is made against the Mexican war soldiers? Does the pauper act just read by the Senator from Missouri apply to any Federal soldier who gets a pension of $6 a month? That is the direct point.

Mr. GALLINGER. Did the Senator propound his inquiry to me?

Mr. BATE. Yes, sir.

Mr. GALLINGER. I would say that in the nature of things it could not well be so, for the reason that the Mexican war pension act is a service-pension act, and we have no other service-pension act on the statute book, unless it be the one that applies to soldiers of the Revolutionary war.

Mr. BATE. He gets only $8 a month, instead of $12. Why should this pauper act apply to the widow of the Mexican war soldier any more than to a Federal soldier's widow? That is the way it stands now. A man has to go and humble himself and say he is a pauper and utterly dependent before he can get an increase of pension from the Government. Is there any instance known under the pension laws where a Federal pensioner has to do that? Is not that a marked distinction between the Federal pension law and

the Mexican war pension law, and does the fact of its being a service-pension law justify that?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I am not at all responsible, of course, for the passage of the Mexican war pension law, because I was not in public service at the time it was enacted, and hence I can not speak, perhaps, with definiteness about it, though I might be expected to do so. I can not conceive that in legislating Congress had the least intention of making any discrimination in the act of June 27, 1890, which is not quite a service pension, but which has been called a dependent pension law, and which applies to the soldiers and widows of soldiers of the late civil war. They are required to conform substantially to the same requirements that the Mexican war soldiers are required to conform to under the Mexican war pension law.

It has been charged in a great many places that we have humiliated and insulted the Union soldier by passing that act and making him appear as a pauper in his appeals to this great and rich Government, but I think Congress has meant to be generous always. I think Congress was generous when it passed the service-pension act applying to the Mexican war soldiers. Perhaps the time has come to increase the rate. I am not going to argue that at all. If the proposition is made, I certainly, as a member of this body, will give it sympathetic consideration. It is argued in some quarters that the rate ought to be increased; that the Mexican war pensioners are old, and that the act ought to be amended so as to give them more than $8 a month. But that can only be done by an amendment to that statute. It could not be done to-day.

Mr. BATE. Perhaps the Senator would likewise be in favor of the repeal of that objectionable feature in that law. I know personally several who were Mexican war soldiers; there are two men in the Senate who were Mexican war soldiers and who are importuned constantly by friends making statements of the kind I have suggested, that they do not want to be mortified by pleading the pauper act in order to get an increase of pension. They think they are entitled to it or that they are not. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will favor something that will repeal that part of the law which is objectionable.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think it could only be repealed by increasing the rate from $8 to $12 to all Mexican war soldiers. That, of course, would obliterate the feature of the law which does——

Mr. BATE. There are only a few thousand of them left. There are less than 2,000 or 3,000 of the old soldiers, and there are some widows of the old soldiers. The act itself, if I remember, was passed on the 3d of March, 1887, about twelve years ago. I think this remedy ought to be applied.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think if the proposition to increase the pension of the Mexican war soldiers from $8 to $12 per month should be proposed it might receive the favorable consideration of Congress. I do not know how that may be. Personally, I should be strongly inclined to vote for such an amendment. That would get rid of the objectionable feature to which the Senator from Tennessee calls attention. I certainly do not believe that Congress has ever intended to discriminate against the soldiers of the Mexican war in its legislation for the soldiers of the civil war, and certainly I should not be in favor of any such discrimination.

Mr. BATE. It practically applies, I will say to the Senator——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. GALLINGER. Always.

Mr. BATE. Just a word. I say it practically applies to a great many worthy persons who are needy, and I would like to see it done.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Hampshire will excuse me—I am not at all trying to obstruct him in anything—but will he state again what the bill that he has in his hand proposes, or what he is trying to do?

Mr. GALLINGER. I am trying to do two things, and I hope I shall succeed before I get through. The Grand Army of the Republic have asked for two changes in the act of June 27, 1890, which has frequently been denominated the dependent-pension act. They have asked that a widow who is in possession of an income not exceeding $250 in addition to the proceeds of her daily labor, whatever that may be, may become pensionable under this proposed act. They have asked that in making a rating for an ex-soldier under this proposed act minor disabilities shall be aggregated; that if the soldier has lost a finger, that shall be taken into account; that if he has incurred a disability which perhaps affects his chest, it shall be taken into account, and that a rating shall be made upon his combined disabilities. Of course in no case could the pension exceed $12 a month, the maximum allowed under the law. As I stated before, the President of the United States in his last message recommended the matter regarding the widows, and thought it would be a proper thing for us to amend the law in that particular.

Now, Mr. President, that is all the amendments to the act contemplate as the bill is now before the Senate. I hope it will be allowed to pass, and that if there are wrongs in pension legislation we will take them up at some future time upon the suggestion of Senators or upon amendments offered here or bills presented, and that the defects may be cured.

Mr. TILLMAN. Is the bill subject to amendment now?

Mr. GALLINGER. It is.

Mr. TILLMAN. Would the Senator mind incorporating an amendment in it by which the discrimination in favor of the Federal soldiers as against the Mexican war soldiers would be removed? I do not believe any discrimination against the Mexican war soldiers was intended, but still there is a discrimination undoubtedly in regard to these disabilities. Would the Senator mind incorporating a provision that the general practice or law now in regard to disabilities shall apply to all soldiers of the Mexican war as well as to Federal or Union soldiers?

Mr. GALLINGER. I think an amendment of that kind would not be germane to this bill. This bill is dealing with one particular statute, and that statute is the act of June 27, 1890. It has no reference to the Mexican war, and it has reference only to a certain class of beneficiaries.

Mr. TILLMAN. It deals with disabilities, however.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, if the Senator wishes to offer an amendment, I have no objection to his doing it, but I should not know how to amend this bill in the direction the Senator from South Carolina suggests.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator from New Hampshire permit me?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I am in hearty sympathy with the purpose of the Senator from South Carolina, but it is going to lead to a pretty general discussion and to quite a radical amendment of the pending bill.

The case referred to by the Senator from South Carolina is not an isolated case by any means. I can recall two cases in my own State of Union soldiers, old men, who have been unable to get out of their chairs for ten or twelve years, unable to get their hands to their mouths, unable to move except as they are assisted by some other person; those men have good records as soldiers; there is not a spot or blemish upon their service, and yet they are not getting to exceed $8 a month. They have appealed again and again in vain to the Pension Office for an increase of their pension. They are, in consequence of their unfortunate condition, practically mendicants and are supported largely at the public expense.

Mr. COCKRELL. They are pensioned under what law?

Mr. ALLEN. I do not know what law they are pensioned under. I can not state as to that. These are two cases that have come under my personal observation. I have been able to see those men myself; I have talked with them and observed their conditions. All over the country there are cases of that kind.

One of the great faults of the pension system of the United States is its eternal delay. It is like the case of Jarndyce vs. Jarndyce, that perpetually and perennially rolls its slow length along until every litigant and every counsel and every witness is dead.

I would not speak in harsh terms of the Pension Office. I do not want to do that, and I shall not do it; but, Mr. President, is there not clerical force enough in the Pension Office, or can it not be put there, to take these cases up speedily and determine whether they shall be allowed or not, and not permit a great army of dependent men or needy men and needy women and children to die of starvation and of delay? If it is the policy of the Government under this or any other Administration to keep the pension roll at its present figure, let the Administration say so. Do not constantly hold out hope and expectation to these crippled, dependent people that they will receive pensions when there is no purpose to pension them. Let it be said frankly and honestly to them and honestly to the country that they have received all the Government will pay them, and that it is useless to appeal to the Government for any further assistance. I believe a government whose citizens voluntarily come to its rescue in the hour of peril ought to pay them when they are crippled or their health is injured in consequence of their service.

I was thinking a moment ago, when the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire referred to a finger being worth $2, how much a man's whole body would be worth estimated on that basis of calculation. When men left home and went in defense of the flag of their country and its institutions, as these men did in the Mexican war and in other wars, if their health was impaired or if their bodies were wracked with disease or if they lost limbs or were injured, let the Government make them good and whole as far as possible. They are entitled to nothing less; they are entitled to that.

But, Mr. President, above all and beyond all let the Government move speedily in this matter before these people are extinct. It is the delay, the endless, eternal delay, that is the crying evil in the administration of the Pension Bureau of the United States.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I want to say a word, that the

Senator from South Carolina may understand the effect of this bill. It seems to me it is a very meritorious bill. I am anxious to see it passed, and I do not mean to talk long enough to prevent its speedy passage.

We have three classes of pensioners. We have those who get their pension because they are entitled under the law existing when they went into the Army, and they get it because they show disabilities incurred in the service. That is one class. Then some years ago there was an appeal for a service pension for the Mexican war veterans. The bill had been before Congress a good many years.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator from Colorado allow me to interrupt him there?

Mr. TELLER. I ask the Senator to let me make my statement. Then I shall be glad to hear him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado declines to yield.

Mr. TELLER. I want to make a statement so that it may be consecutive. I shall be glad to hear the Senator when I get through.

Congress then enacted a service-pension law for the Mexican war veterans. Now, that fixed a particular sum, not dependent upon the disabilities of the ex-soldier, and it was nowise under the control of the Department, either to raise or to lower it, no matter what his disabilities might be.

Then, later, there was a great effort—I do not mean here, but outside—for a service pension for the ex-soldiers of the civil war. They came here with a great many petitions, and there was an appeal made. It was said that many of them were in distress, and that was undoubtedly true. Congress, not being willing to grant a general service pension to all the survivors of that war, provided that such of them as were dependent upon their own labor and had disabilities, whether incurred in the war or not, should have a pension. That we have usually, in speaking, called the dependent act of 1890, if I recollect the year aright.

Mr. COCKRELL. The act of June 27, 1890.

Mr. TELLER. The act of June 27, 1890. Now, for the dependents Congress fixed a positive and stated sum, and the Department can not vary it at all; that is, they can not raise it. If the disabilities are not sufficient to come up to $8, they have claimed the right, of course, to fix a lower rate; but they can not make it $50 or $60 or $72, as can be done for complete disability under the law.

Mr. GALLINGER. Twelve dollars a month is the maximum.

Mr. TELLER. Twelve dollars a month is now the maximum; and although he may have incurred these disabilities in the Army, he can get but $12 as a dependent. Now, then, the Mexican war soldier is in the same fix precisely.

Mr. President, I think the criticisms, perhaps, that are made here on the Department are somewhat unjust, because these questions are pretty difficult to deal with. There is a vast army of men applying for pensions, and, in my judgment, the most of them ought to have pensions. I think perhaps the day is not far distant when we shall say to every man who served in the civil war that he shall have a service pension. We are, perhaps, not ready, as the Senator from New Hampshire says, just yet to do it; but that time will ultimately come.

But, as far as I am concerned, I should like to say that I am not alarmed if the Interior Department will allow men to get on the pension roll who do not belong there. I know something from actual experience of the way the work is done in the Department. It was my duty at one time to consider the charges frequently made in this Chamber and other places that the pension roll was stuffed with people who had no right there. After the most careful and exhaustive effort, with all the appliances that the Department could use, without any limit or stint anywhere, we found that there was not one man in two hundred who was there that there was even a suspicion of. I know from my own observation and from the letters I have received for many years and the men with whom I have come in personal contact that there are infinitely more men off the roll who ought to be on than there are men on who ought to be off.

Mr. President, neither am I one of those who are frightened at the fact that we are paying $140,000,000 a year. We had the greatest war of modern times. We had the greatest army of any modern time, and we had the greatest battles. We talk about the battles in South Africa and in other places. Why, Mr. President, look at those who went down in one single engagement. What would be a great army in almost any other part of the world were left dead on the field.

There was no army in the world that ever gave four years of such service as our men gave. There was no other army in the world that ever met such opponents as our men met. There was no army in modern times where the cold steel of the bayonet was used as it was used in the late civil war.

Can men go through those things without lowering their vitality? And when old age comes on them, when the men who ought to be stalwart and strong because they did their service to their country find themselves weak and aged, with a country the richest on the face of the earth, with more untouched measures for taxation and revenue than any other people in the world, with a people that is spending more money than any other people in the world, we ought not to be afraid of doing what we contracted to do when we took these men into our Army.

It is true, Mr. President, you paid a great sum of money, $2,500,000,000, in pensions. You paid it to maintain the honor and the decent character of the nation. You paid $500,000,000 more, or nearly that, in the way of interest to maintain your credit. You paid nearly $500,000,000 more to the public creditors in the way of interest than you have paid to the soldiers who made it possible for these men to get their interest and ultimately their principal. From every section of the country whence comes a complaint, so far as I am concerned, I am prepared to treat it with contempt.

The American people contracted to take care of these men and to compensate them for the disabilities that everybody knew they must incur in a great war of that kind. We will continue to pay it, and no political party can afford for a moment to stand hesitating to do what is justice to those men. Whenever a soldier, I do not care whether he can prove that he incurred his disabilities in the Army or not, is suffering from disabilities, he is entitled to a pension from this great Government of ours.

Mr. President, I believe that there is a disposition in some sections of the country to restrict and to complain that we are putting upon the pension rolls too many men. I believe the time will come when every man who was in the Army who survives to that period will be either on the pension roll or have a service pension, and justice requires that that should be done.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I wish to disclaim absolutely any desire to criticise the Pension Bureau. I have found nothing but courtesy and prompt replies to any inquiries I have made in that Department. I have been led into this debate by reason of the word "disability," which has been brought here to explain why certain legislation is requested. I have endeavored to discover whether there is any discrimination against the Mexican war veteran, or, to change it, whether there is discrimination in favor of the Union veteran and the others are left out. It seems that there is.

The Senator from Colorado says that there are three classes of pensions, if I understood him correctly.

Mr. TELLER. Yes.

Mr. TILLMAN. There are pensions for disabilities, pensions for service simply, and dependent pensions. Now, this gentleman in whom I am interested is certainly suffering a disability, because he lost his arm in battle. He is receiving a service pension and has been denied an increase under the dependent pension rules, because we seem to have legislation here which has provided for pensioning the veterans of the different wars by special acts and there is no general act applying to all classes.

In other words, if there are dependent pensioners under the Mexican war, as I know of one instance, they can not get the provisions applied to their cases that apply to the dependents who fought in the Union Army in the recent civil war. I recall the case of a man in my little town, a Mexican war veteran, who was a paralytic, who was practically dependent on the charity of his neighbors because his pension could not go beyond $12 a month, and those good people nursed him, they clothed him, the physicians attended to him, they buried him, and they never got anything for it except the $12 a month; and it did not cover one-fourth of the expenses per month that that man was to that family and to the neighbors around him.

Now, Mr. President, all I ask is that the chairman of the Committee on Pensions and others here who seem interested in this matter shall remove this discrimination. I do not charge any Senator here with any desire to discriminate, but it has been rather a matter of neglect because nobody has taken it up. I ask that we shall have a general provision in regard to dependent pensions which will apply to all ex-soldiers who are pensionable at all, and that disability pensions shall apply to all ex-soldiers without regard to the war in which they served. That is all I am trying to secure, so that this Government will not by its legislation discriminate against Mexican war veterans, without intending to do it, simply because nobody has thought proper to put it on the statute books that such pensioners shall receive the same treatment and have their pensions regulated by the same laws which govern those who fought in the civil war.

Mr. TELLER. I understand that the Mexican war veteran who received his disabilities in the war can get a pension just as a man who received his disabilities in the late war, although I may be wrong on that point. It can only be upon the theory that he has done something which forfeited that right, for the statute certainly gave it to him when he went into the Mexican war.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will, then, simply ask the Senator this question: If by reason of any sympathy with the rebellion, if you prefer that word—if by reason of any service in the rebellion, if you prefer that—can a man who fought for the flag in the Mexican war now come forward and get the same treatment that others get?

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator will allow me, I will say that as far as I am concerned I would not make any discrimination. I do not care now at this late hour whether a man served in the war of the rebellion against us or not; if he served in the Mexican war and was disabled in that war, I would still give him a pension.

Mr. TILLMAN. This gentleman did not serve in that war. He was not disabled in that war. He was disabled in the Mexican war, and because of his sympathies, because he would not sign the required papers by which he disclaimed any sympathy for the Confederacy, he has been debarred. But I say it is not right or proper or just or decent that he should be so debarred.

Mr. TELLER. I said if he served in the Mexican war he was entitled to it.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, I have an amendment to offer.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have one likewise, Mr. President, but before the Senator offers his amendment I wish to make a single observation.

Mr. COCKRELL. I think the Senator will accept my amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from South Carolina—if the Senator will give me his kind attention—raised the question as to the rate for certain disabilities. I could not answer him offhand, but I have here a table which I prepared some years ago. Amputation at or above elbow or knee is $36; that is, the loss of an arm or leg; but amputation at shoulder or hip joint, or so near joint as to prevent use of artificial limb, is $45. This is a table of rates fixed by law for major disabilities and a table of rates fixed by the Commissioner of Pensions for certain disabilites not specified by law. For the information of the Senate I ask that the table shall be incorporated as a part of my remarks, so that Senators can refer to it when they want to get information on the subject.

The table is as follows:

Table of rates fixed by law for officers for disabilities which would entitle a private or other enlisted man to $8.

ARMY.

	Per month.
Lieutenant-colonel and all officers of higher rank	$30
Major, surgeon, and paymaster	25
Captain, provost-marshal, and chaplain	20
First lieutenant, assistant surgeon, deputy provost-marshal, and quartermaster	17
Second lieutenant and enrolling officer	15
All enlisted men	8

NAVY AND MARINE CORPS.

Captain and all officers of higher rank, commander, lieutenant commanding, and master commanding, surgeon, paymaster, and chief engineer ranking with commander by law, lieutenant-colonel, and all of higher rank in Marine Corps	30
Lieutenant, passed assistant surgeon, surgeon, paymaster, and chief engineer ranking with lieutenant by law, and major in Marine Corps	25
Master, professor of mathematics, assistant surgeon, paymaster, and chaplain, and captain in Marine Corps	20
First lieutenant in Marine Corps	17
First assistant engineer, ensign, and pilot, and second lieutenant in Marine Corps	15
Cadet midshipmen, passed midshipmen, midshipmen, clerks of admirals, of paymasters, and of officers commanding vessels, second and third assistant engineers, master's mate, and warrant officers	10
All enlisted men except warrant officers	8

RATES AND DISABILITIES SPECIFIED BY LAW.

Loss of both hands	100
Total disability in both hands	72
Loss of both feet	72
Loss of both eyes	72
Loss of an eye, the other lost before enlistment	72
Regular aid and attendance (first grade)	72
Frequent aid and attendance	50
Amputation at shoulder or hip joint, or so near joint as to prevent use of artificial limb	45
Total disability of arm or leg	36
Total disability in one hand and one foot	36
Loss of one hand and one foot	36
Amputation at or above elbow or knee	36
Loss of one hand or foot	30
Inability to perform manual labor (second grade)	30
Total deafness	30
Disability equivalent to loss of hand or foot (third grade)	24

Table of rates fixed by the Commissioner of Pensions for certain disabilities not specified by law.

	Per month.
Anchylosis of shoulder	$12
Anchylosis of elbow	10
Anchylosis of knee	10
Anchylosis of ankle	8
Anchylosis of wrist	8
Loss of sight of one eye	12
Loss of one eye	17
Nearly total deafness of one ear	6
Total deafness of one ear	10
Slight deafness of both ears	6
Severe deafness of one ear and slight of the other	10
Nearly total deafness of one ear and slight of the other	15
Total deafness of one ear and slight of the other	20
Severe deafness of both ears	22
Total deafness of one ear and severe of the other	25
Deafness of both ears existing in a degree nearly total	27
Loss of palm of hand and all the fingers, the thumb remaining	17
Loss of thumb, index, middle, and ring fingers	17
Loss of thumb, index, and middle fingers	16
Loss of thumb and index finger	12

Table of rates fixed by the Commissioner of Pensions, etc.—Continued.

	Per month.
Loss of thumb and little finger	$10
Loss of thumb, index, and little fingers	16
Loss of thumb	8
Loss of thumb and metacarpal bone	12
Loss of all the fingers, thumb and palm remaining	16
Loss of index, middle, and ring fingers	16
Loss of middle, ring, and little fingers	14
Loss of index and middle fingers	8
Loss of little and middle fingers	8
Loss of little and ring fingers	6
Loss of ring and middle fingers	6
Loss of index and little fingers	6
Loss of index finger	4
Loss of any other finger without complications	3
Loss of all the toes of one foot	10
Loss of great, second, and third toes	8
Loss of great toe and metatarsal	8
Loss of great and second toes	8
Loss of great toe	6
Loss of any other toe and metatarsal	6
Loss of any other toe	2
Chopart's amputation of foot, with good results	14
Pirogoff's modification of Syme's	17
Small varicocele	2
Well-marked varicocele	4
Inguinal hernia which passes through the external ring	10
Inguinal hernia which does not pass through the external ring	6
Double inguinal hernia each of which passes through the external ring	14
Double inguinal hernia one of which passes through the external ring and the other does not	12
Double inguinal hernia neither of which passes through the external ring	8
Femoral hernia	10

Mr. TILLMAN. Now, will the Senator give me some more information? Do those rates apply to Mexican veterans?

Mr. GALLINGER. They do, absolutely so, just as much as to those who were disabled in the civil war.

Mr. TILLMAN. Then this man I am interested in can go up here and claim back pay?

Mr. GALLINGER. He can, if he is entitled to it. I do not know the circumstances.

Mr. TILLMAN. According to your statement he is certainly entitled to it, unless there is some statute which prohibits it.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not admit anything of the kind. The Senator must not put arguments in my mouth. If his friend, whoever he may be, forfeited his pension by any voluntary act of his, he is not entitled to a pension for the time it was under forfeiture. If a widow who is receiving a pension remarries, she forfeits her pension by law, and it would be absurd to say that she could claim that pension which by her voluntary act she forfeited. I take it that there is a legal reason why this man does not get his back pension.

Mr. TILLMAN. The statement which comes to me officially from the Pension Bureau is that his circumstances were not such when he applied for it as would warrant the increase to $12 a month. But that does not apply to the disability feature at all. He never has been pensioned since the renewal of his pension because of any disability. He has been pensioned simply for service. What I desired to learn from the Senator was whether under the statute which he has just read this man can go to the Pension Bureau and demand that he shall get a pension for disability which his loss of an arm entitled him to, or whether only the Union soldiers can get it.

Mr. GALLINGER. The man has the same rights under the law that any Union soldier has. I am not prepared to say to-day what his rights may be.

Now, Mr. President, one single further observation and I am done, and I hope the bill may pass with such amendments as may commend themselves to the Senate.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] criticised the slowness with which the work of the Pension Bureau is being performed. Why, Mr. President, there are on file to-day in the Pension Bureau 477,239 applications for increase—for increase alone—and a flood of those applications is going off in every mail. In addition to that, every Senator and every member of the House is sending almost every hour of every day calls on the Pension Bureau for information concerning the status of claims. I sent one the other day and I found that my colleague had sent one and each of the two members of the House from my State had sent calls the same day. The ex-soldier had applied to us all. The result was that four clerks were detailed to look up that case. A very large portion of the force is on work of that kind every day of every year.

I think the Pension Bureau is doing the best it can under the circumstances. I do not think there is a member of this body who would like to be in the position the Commissioner of Pensions is in, or who could do any better than the Commissioner of Pensions is doing in the laborious and irksome and thankless task that he has imposed upon him. I presume they are making mistakes, very likely they are making decisions upon technical grounds, and they ought to be broader in their interpretation of the laws, but——

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. GALLINGER. In just one moment. But my knowledge of that Bureau leads me to the conclusion that on the whole, by and large, the Commissioner of Pensions and his subordinates are doing most excellent work, and are doing work that ought to commend itself to Congress rather than to secure for them the condemnation of any Senator.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I trust the Senator from New Hampshire will not understand that I am saying anything or alleging anything against the Commissioner of Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER. I did not so understand it.

Mr. ALLEN. What I said was, or at least what I meant to say was, that if the clerical force in the Pension Bureau is not large enough, let us increase it promptly, so that the cases can be speedily taken up and determined. Then, if the applicant is entitled to a pension, he may derive some benefit from it this side of eternity, and if he is not entitled to it, he will cease expecting and hoping for it.

Mr. GALLINGER. There is just one difficulty there with which perhaps the Senator from Nebraska is not conversant. I saw the other day an illustration of that where a soldier was granted an increase of pension. I was notified of the fact by the Commissioner of Pensions, and the attorney in the case was likewise notified. The attorney transmitted the fact to the pensioner that he had been granted an increase, and with that he put in a blank form of application for another increase. That is what is going on all over the country to-day. The Commissioner of Pensions has before him to-day a conundrum which I certainly would not want, with twice the help he has in that Bureau, to undertake to solve. It is a very serious proposition. I believe these officers are doing the very best they can under the circumstances, with the amount of money they have at their command.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator allow me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly; and neither am I going to talk any more.

Mr. ALLEN. I merely want to suggest to the Senator this thought, that if, instead of increasing the pensions to applicants a dollar or two dollars a month, the Pension Office should take that case up as a court of equity would take up a case pending before it, examine it thoroughly, examine all the evidence, all the facts, ascertain what the applicant is entitled to at best under the most favorable circumstances, and make the allowance comply with this finding, these repeated applications would not appear so frequently in the Pension Office.

Mr. President, one thought has impressed itself upon my mind in connection with the administration of the Pension Office—I am not speaking now of the present Commissioner, for I think he is doing his duty, as he understands it, faithfully and well—that is what may be called the constant determination or policy of doing nothing.

Mr. President, to dole out pensions in small quantities to applicants who are entitled to recognition at the hands of the Government is not good policy; it is not justice. If a man has been disabled in consequence of his service to the country, let that disability be ascertained to its full extent, and promptly recognize it by allowing him compensation adequate, so far as money can compensate him, for the injury; not start a man who is entitled to twenty-five or thirty dollars a month at seven or eight dollars a month, and then increase two or three dollars from time to time, so as to invite repeated applications from the same person for an increase, but let it come all at once.

These men are growing old. The youngest of them has passed 50 years at this time. If they are ever going to receive relief at the hands of the Government, it is time that relief was extended to them. Their wives are growing to be old women; they are incapacitated to a large extent from performing any duties except the most perfunctory duties of the house. Why keep them hoping and waiting for an increase of their pensions? Why not increase the clerical force in the Pension Office, take up all these cases, and fix the final sum, and fix that sum speedily; or, if they are not entitled to anything, promptly say so to them and put an end to their expectations? It is the delay—that is the thing that is complained of most—it is the endless and ceaseless delay in granting pensions or in determining pension cases that is the evil most complained of by applicants.

The true theory of the law pensioning soldiers and their dependents is that the pension is some slight compensation for injuries sustained in the service of the Government. I know there are those who look upon a pension as a gratuity; but, Mr. President, no government is worthy of a volunteer soldiery that will not compensate the soldier who is wounded or injured in its service, or compensate his widow and children if he loses his life in its service, with some degree of adequacy for the loss they have sustained.

Mr. GALLINGER. I desire to offer an amendment to the bill by striking out in lines 10 and 11 of section 3, on page 3, the words "and an income not exceeding $250 per year," and inserting the words "and having resources from which an income not exceeding $250 per year is derived or derivable."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire will be stated.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the language be read as it will stand if the amendment be adopted.

The SECRETARY. In section 3, on page 3, after the word "labor," at the end of line 9, it is proposed to strike out "and an income not exceeding $250 per year," and insert in lieu thereof the words "and having resources from which an income not exceeding $250 per year is derived or derivable," so as to read:

SEC. 3. That if any officer or enlisted man who served ninety days or more in the Army or Navy of the United States during the late war of the rebellion, and who was honorably discharged has died, or shall hereafter die, leaving a widow without means of support other than her daily labor, and having resources from which an income not exceeding $250 per year is derived or derivable, or minor children under the age of 16 years, such widow shall, upon due proof of her husband's death, without proving his death to be the result of his army service, be placed on the pension roll from the date of the application therefor under this act at the rate of $8 per month during her widowhood, and shall also be paid $2 per month for each child of such officer or enlisted man under 16 years of age; and in case of the death or remarriage of the widow, leaving a child or children of such officer or enlisted man under the age of 16 years, such pension shall be paid such child or children until the age of 16.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move to amend in section 3, on page 4, line 5, after the words "passage of," by striking out the word "this," before the word "act," and inserting the words "the said," and then after the word "act," by inserting "of June 27, 1890;" so as to read:

And provided further, That said widow shall have married said soldier prior to the passage of the said act of June 27, 1890.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think that amendment ought to be made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COMMENCEMENT OF WIDOWS' PENSIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1478) to repeal so much of the act of June 7, 1888, making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes, as relates to the commencement of pension to widows under the acts of July 14, 1862, and March 3, 1873. It provides that all pensions which may be granted under the acts of July 14, 1862, and March 3, 1873, to widows in consequence of death occurring from a cause which originated in the service of the United States since March 4, 1861, shall commence from the date of the filing of the declarations then on file or which may hereafter be filed.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] has asked me what will be the effect of this bill. I will read the reason for it from a report which I made from the Committee on Pensions on the 13th day of December:

The Commissioner of Pensions called the attention of the committee to his recommendation on page 21 of his last annual report, from which it appears that while pensions to soldiers commence from the date of filing the claim, pensions to widows date from the death of the husband. The law as to widows was changed in the appropriation act of June 27, 1888, which act removed all limitations as to the date of filing claims. The Commissioner recommends that that provision of the act of June 27, 1888, be repealed, in which recommendation your committee cordially concurs.

That provision in that appropriation act gave widows an advantage over soldiers. The man who fought makes application for a pension. If he gets his pension, he gets it from the date upon which he made the application. The widow makes application; and if her application is allowed, the pension dates back to the death of the husband. It seems to be an injustice. It does not occur to me that a widow should receive a pension beyond the time she applied for it. This amendment is proposed to correct that incongruity in the existing statute.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSTRUCTION OF DEPENDENT PENSION ACT.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. R. 8) construing the act approved June 27, 1890, entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents." It provides that the act approved June 27, 1890, entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," shall be construed and held to include all persons who served for ninety days in the military or naval service of the United

States during the late war of the rebellion, and who have been honorably discharged therefrom, but shall not apply to those who served in the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Regiments United States Volunteer Infantry who had a prior service in the Confederate army or navy.

Mr. COCKRELL. What is the object of that joint resolution?

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. PRITCHARD] reported it, and I have just sent to his committee room for him. As I understand it, under the general law—and I am correct in that—a man who had served in the Confederate army and afterwards accepted service in the Union army and was honorably discharged is pensionable, but under the act of June 27, 1890, there is no provision making that class of soldiers pensionable. This joint resolution simply proposes to extend the provisions of the general law in that regard to the act of June 27, 1890. That is the purport of it, and all there is to it, as I understand it.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VOID ENTRIES OF PUBLIC LANDS.

The bill (S. 386) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers on public lands and to provide for the repayment of certain fees, purchase money, and commissions paid on void entries of public lands," was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill has been read in full as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator who introduced the bill is not present, and I ask that it go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over without prejudice.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. SPOONER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After one hour spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 9, 1900, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 8, 1900.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

William H. Jordan, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for the district of Gloucester, in the State of Massachusetts, to succeed Frank C. Richardson, whose term of office will expire by limitation February 19, 1900.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY—CAVALRY ARM.

E. Holland Rubottom, of California, to be second lieutenant, June 1, 1899.

[NOTE.—The person herein named was nominated to the Senate December 6, 1899, as Eurubian H. Rubotton, and was confirmed December 18, 1899. This message is to correct an error in the name of the nominee.]

PROMOTIONS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY—FORTY-FOURTH INFANTRY.

Second Lieut. Benjamin R. Hall, Forty-fourth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, November 29, 1899, vice Brown, discharged.

Second Lieut. Howard M. Koontz, Forty-fourth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, November 30, 1899, vice Raysor, promoted.

[NOTE.—These officers were nominated to the Senate December 7, 1899, for promotion to first lieutenant, and were confirmed December 20, 1899. This message is to correct an error in the dates of their respective promotions.]

APPOINTMENT IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

To be surgeon with the rank of major.

Frank H. Titus, of California, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, January 4, 1900, vice Morris, resigned.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Pay Inspector Henry T. Wright, to be a pay director in the Navy, from the 23d day of December, 1899, vice Pay Director George A. Lyon, retired.

Paymaster Samuel R. Colhoun, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 23d day of December, 1899, vice Pay Inspector Henry T. Wright, promoted.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Joseph J. Cheatham, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 23d day of December, 1899, vice Paymaster Samuel R. Colhoun, promoted.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Martin McM. Ramsay, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 12th day of November, 1899, vice Paymaster Lawrence G. Boggs, promoted.

Joseph Anthony Murphy, a citizen of Pennsylvania, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy, from the 3d day of January, 1900, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade.

Raymond E. Sawyer, a citizen of New York, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, from the 2d day of January, 1900, to fill a vacancy existing in that Corps.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 8, 1900.

CONSUL-GENERAL.

Julius G. Lay, of the District of Columbia, to be consul-general of the United States at Barcelona, Spain.

CONSULS.

William P. Atwell, of the District of Columbia, to be consul of the United States at Roubaix, France.

Henry W. Diederich, of the District of Columbia, to be consul of the United States at Bremen, Germany.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Alexander Bruce, of Ohio, to be appraiser of merchandise in the district of Cuyahoga, in the State of Ohio.

SUPERVISORS OF THE TWELFTH CENSUS.

Walker Wilkins, of Elkton, Todd County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Kentucky.

Andrew J. White, of Todd, Atchison County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Kansas.

James K. Flood, of Hart, Oceana County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of Michigan.

Daniel F. Healy, of Manchester, Hillsboro County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of New Hampshire.

PROMOTION IN THE MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

P. A. Surg. William P. McIntosh, of Maryland, to be a surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

Asst. Surg. Middleton S. Elliott, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, from the 6th day of October, 1899.

APPOINTMENT IN THE MARINE CORPS.

Robert Ethridge Carmody, to be a first lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps from the 13th day of April, 1899.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

William Lee Karnes, of Virginia.
Ashton H. Potter, of New York.

INFANTRY ARM.

Alden Trotter, of Mississippi.
Arthur Winston Brown, of Utah.
Abraham U. Loeb, of Indiana.
Charles J. Nelson, of Alabama.
William B. Baker, of New York.
Clarence K. La Motte, of Delaware.
Frank A. Awl, of Pennsylvania.
James M. Loud, of District of Columbia.
Edmund S. Sayer, jr., of New York.
J. De Camp Hall, of District of Columbia.
Robert G. Rutherford, jr., of District of Columbia.
Edgar H. Yule, of Iowa.
Constant Cordier, of Arizona.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS.

Cavalry arm.

Louis Rice Ball, of Colorado, December 1, 1899.

Infantry arm.

Corpl. Henry Wiegenstein, Company C, Twentieth United States Infantry, October 1, 1899.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

INSPECTOR-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

To be inspectors-general with the rank of colonel.

Lieut. Col. Peter D. Vroom, inspector-general, December 19, 1899.

With the rank of lieutenant-colonel.

Maj. Charles H. Heyl, inspector-general, December 19, 1899.

INFANTRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. James M. J. Sanno, Fourth United States Infantry, to be colonel, December 18, 1899.

Maj. Frank D. Baldwin, Third United States Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel, December 18, 1899.

Lieut. Col. Charles W. Miner, Sixth Infantry, to be colonel.

Maj. Charles L. Davis, Eleventh Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel.

Second Lieut. Englebert G. Ovenshine, Sixteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, March 2, 1899.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

TO BE ASSISTANT COMMISSARY OF SUBSISTENCE WITH THE RANK OF CAPTAIN.

Ralph Ingalls, of Kansas (late first lieutenant, Forty-fourth Infantry, United States Volunteers), January 2, 1900.

TO BE ASSISTANT QUARTERMASTER WITH THE RANK OF CAPTAIN.

Archibald W. Butt, of Georgia, January 2, 1900.

FORTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenant.

Sergt. Maj. Herbert E. Gee, Forty-eighth Infantry, United States Volunteers, December 20, 1899.

FORTY-FOURTH INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenant.

First Sergt. Pliny R. Strange, Company F, Forty-fourth Infantry, United States Volunteers, December 18, 1899.

PROMOTIONS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

THIRTY-FIFTH INFANTRY.

To be colonel.

Lieut. Col. Edward H. Plummer, Thirty-fifth Infantry, December 16, 1899.

To be lieutenant-colonel.

Maj. Robert D. Walsh, Thirty-fifth Infantry, December 16, 1899

To be major.

Capt. William L. Geary, quartermaster, Thirty-fifth Infantry, December 16, 1899.

To be captain.

First Lieut. James A. Ruggles, Thirty-fifth Infantry, December 16, 1899.

To be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Clark R. Elliott, Thirty-fifth Infantry, December 16, 1899.

THIRTY-SIXTH INFANTRY.

To be colonel.

Lieut. Col. William R. Grove, Thirty-sixth Infantry, December 24, 1899.

To be lieutenant-colonel.

Maj. William L. Luhn, Thirty-sixth Infantry, December 24, 1899.

To be major.

Capt. Robert S. Abernethy, Thirty-sixth Infantry, December 24, 1899.

To be captain.

First Lieut. Loren E. Cheever, Thirty-sixth Infantry, December 24, 1899.

To be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. George T. Bowman, Thirty-sixth Infantry, December 24, 1899.

FORTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY.

To be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. James B. Coleman, Forty-eighth Infantry, United States Volunteers, December 13, 1899.

POSTMASTERS.

Eugene R. Phillips, to be postmaster at Phillipsdale, in the county of Providence and State of Rhode Island.

Leon C. Olmstead, to be postmaster at Bigtimber, in the county of Sweet Grass and State of Montana.

Albert A. Atterholt, to be postmaster at Rochester, in the county of Beaver and State of Pennsylvania.

W. F. Himel, jr., to be postmaster at White Castle, in the county of Iberville and State of Louisiana.

REJECTION.

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate January 8, 1900.

SUPERVISOR OF TWELFTH CENSUS.

Richard S. Berlin, of Omaha, Douglas County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Nebraska.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, *January 8, 1900.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Senate concurrent resolution No. 10.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to submit a report of the survey and estimate for the improvement of Lemon Creek, Richmond County (Staten Island), N. Y., in the construction of a training dike at the outlet into Princess Bay and the extension of the present dredged channel a farther distance of 1,000 feet.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill and joint resolution of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 762. An act granting settlers the right to make second homestead entries; and

S. R. 52. Joint resolution to fill a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill and resolutions of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 762. An act granting settlers the right to make second homestead entries—to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. R. 52. Joint resolution to fill a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution—to the Committee on the Library.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 10.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to submit a report of the survey and estimate for the improvement of Lemon Creek, Richmond County (Staten Island), N. Y., in the construction of a training dike at the outlet into Princess Bay and the extension of the present dredged channel a farther distance of 1,000 feet—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

BUSINESS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, this day, I believe, is set aside, under the rules, for the consideration of business reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia. I would ask unanimous consent that next Monday be substituted for to-day for the consideration of that business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin, that next Monday be substituted for to-day for the consideration of District business?

There was no objection.

ALLEGED POLYGAMOUS OFFICEHOLDERS, UTAH.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit at this time a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The report will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas it is charged and generally believed that John C. Graham, postmaster at Provo City, Utah, a Presidential appointee, is ineligible to hold a Federal office for the same reason that it is alleged Brigham H. Roberts is ineligible to a seat in the House of Representatives; and

Whereas it is charged and generally believed that Orson Smith, postmaster

at Logan, Utah, a Presidential appointee, is ineligible to hold a Federal office for the same reason that it is alleged Brigham H. Roberts is ineligible to a seat in the House of Representatives: Therefore,

Resolved, That said committee of nine members heretofore appointed to inquire into the alleged polygamy of said Brigham H. Roberts shall have power and be directed to send for persons and papers and examine witnesses on oath in relation to said Federal appointees, John C. Graham and Orson Smith, and that after said examination said committee shall report to this House of Representatives whether it is true, as frequently alleged, that said John C. Graham and Orson Smith, Presidential postmasters, respectively, at Provo City, Utah, and Logan, Utah, are now and for some months have been under indictments as polygamists, and whether it is true that at the time of their appointment, more than two years ago, said two postmasters were open and notorious polygamists, and whether or not at the time of their appointment or prior thereto affidavits and papers evidencing such polygamy of both or either one of them were on file.

The Committee on Rules, to whom was referred the resolution of the House No. 35, have considered the same, and hereby report it with the recommendation that it be amended as follows:

Page 1, lines 1 and 3, strike out the words "said committee of nine members heretofore appointed to inquire into the alleged polygamy of said Brigham H. Roberts" and insert the words "the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads."

And that as amended the resolution do pass.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, the only difference, it will be observed, between the resolution as originally presented and the substitute of the Committee on Rules consists of a change of the original resolution which calls for the appointment of a special committee or the reference of the matter to the committee already appointed inquiring into the alleged polygamy of Mr. Roberts. The resolution as amended by the Committee on Rules refers the subject-matter to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, where, under the rule, it properly belongs now. The purpose sought to be secured by the introduction of the resolution will be accomplished, in the opinion of the committee, by this committee more readily and satisfactorily than by a special committee.

Mr. LANHAM. As I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania, this is not to be referred to the Special Committee on the Roberts Case?

Mr. DALZELL. No; but to the House Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if the offices referred to in the resolution just read are not Presidential offices?

Mr. DALZELL. They are.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. And can not the Executive himself investigate the matter involved in the resolution without the aid of the House of Representatives?

Mr. DALZELL. I should probably agree with the gentleman from Kentucky on that point; but the resolution was introduced calling for the information.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. It was introduced by this side of the House?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. And adopted by a vote of this side of the House?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes. The resolution was introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ].

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I can only say that resolutions of this character seem to me to be only political buncombe and should not have consideration by the House of Representatives. The President is quite competent to act in matters of this kind; and I do not think the House should be burdened with such questions.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will pardon me a moment, I see that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ] who introduced the resolution is not in his seat. But, speaking for myself, I am not able to see any objection to referring in the manner suggested by the Committee on Rules. I think it better that the matter go to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, if there is to be an investigation at all.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. DALZELL, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the preamble of the resolution will be agreed to.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

ROOMS FORMERLY OCCUPIED BY LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania presents another privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (S. R. 28) relating to the use of the rooms lately occupied by the Congressional Library in the Capitol.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That that portion of the rooms and space recently occupied by the Library of Congress in the Capitol building north of a line drawn east and west through the center of the Rotunda shall be used for such purpose as may hereafter be designated by the Senate of the United States, and that portion of such rooms and space south of said line shall be used for such purpose as may hereafter be designated by the House of Representatives.

The Committee on Rules, to whom was referred S. R. 28, "relating to the use of the rooms lately occupied by the Congressional Library in the Capitol," have considered the same and report it with the recommendation that it be amended as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

"That the rooms and space recently occupied by the Library of Congress in the Capitol building shall be occupied and used hereafter for the purpose of a reference library for the use of the Senate and House of Representatives."

And that as amended the resolution do pass.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, in connection with that report I desire to have read a letter addressed to the Speaker of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, THE LIBRARIAN'S OFFICE,
Washington, December 13, 1899.

SIR: In considering the removal of the main portion of the Library of Congress to the new building, it has always, I believe, been assumed that there would remain, or be replaced, in the Capitol certain books of reference. Indeed, the present appropriation act provides for certain attendants for a "Congressional reference library at the Capitol." The purpose of such reference books would be to give immediate response to such inquiries as, to be answered effectively, must be answered immediately; and second, to aid to the use of the main collection by suggesting authorities in the literature of any given subject.

No Congressional reference library at the Capitol now exists. The Library of Congress is represented there merely by the terminal of the pneumatic tube and book railway. Any books desired from it for the use of members, even for the simplest inquiry, must traverse a distance which, with the request, represents half a mile and a delay of from twenty to thirty minutes.

During the past few months the authorities of the Library have been getting together certain books to form the basis of a reference collection at the Capitol. These are partly duplicates culled from the main collection, and partly the result of purchases which, under the circumstances, I have felt justified in making to the extent of nearly $2,000 from our general appropriation for books. These amount to over 2,000 volumes—encyclopedias, dictionaries, atlases, gazetteers, manuals, and standard reference books, particularly in history and statistics; the best collected editions of the writings of the fathers of the Republic, and miscellaneous material in government, political and economic science. With the above are certain books upon topics likely to be under discussion during the present session, e. g. finance, subsidies, interoceanic canals, colonial administration. These latter constitute a special deposit, which may be changed from time to time as occasion may require.

Together with the above material would be placed the best bibliographic aids that could be furnished, supplying information (1) as to what the Library of Congress contains; (2) as to what is contained in the other libraries of the District; (3) as to what is in print upon any given subject.

In charge of this material would be placed attendants who would offer competent personal assistance to its use and would make requisition upon the main collection for such further material as may currently be required to answer particular inquiries.

Within three weeks the first installment of the above collection will be ready for use. But space for it in the Capitol has yet to be assigned. It will require shelving and space for consultation and administration. The shelving should be open and well lighted, so that members may handle books directly, so far as they care to do so, without the intervention of an attendant. The space assigned should, of course, be convenient to both Houses of Congress.

Details as to the amount of space and facilities requisite I defer until these shall be specifically requested.

A duplicate of this communication has been forwarded to the President pro tempore of the Senate.

Respectfully submitted.

HERBERT PUTNAM,
Librarian of Congress.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have order. This is a matter in which the House is interested.

The SPEAKER. The Chair must ask the House to be in order. This is a matter affecting each one of the members.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, as is well known, the space formerly occupied by the Congressional Library is not now used for any purpose. The Senate have sent over to the House a joint resolution which proposes that this space shall be divided into two equal parts, one part to be assigned to the Senate and the other to the House, and to be disposed of as the respective Houses may see fit.

There has been a great deal of difference of opinion as to what was the most advisable method of disposing of this space, and the Committee on Rules have therefore reported a resolution devoting it to the purposes of a reference library; not so much perhaps with a view to committing the House to that idea, as for the purpose of getting the whole matter into conference, where it may be finally determined in accordance with the views of a majority of both Houses. If the matter should be disposed of in accordance with the report, the question then would go to a committee of conference of the two Houses, who, under the rules of the House and Senate and the terms of the report, would have jurisdiction of the whole matter, to dispose of it as they might see fit.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. HOPKINS. I would like to know if the Architect of the Capitol has made any estimate of the cost of carrying out the purpose as expressed in the resolution of the Senate.

Mr. DALZELL. In reply, I would say that the Architect of the Capitol has made a plan and an estimate of the cost, as I understand, of carrying out the plan of the Senate, and if the space were divided into committee rooms it would cost $125,000.

Mr. FARIS. Mr. Speaker, we can not hear. I desire to call attention to the fact that we are unable to hear what is being said down there in front.

The SPEAKER. The Chair must again request the House to be in order, so that gentlemen may hear the discussion.

Mr. DALZELL. In reply to the gentleman I will state an inquiry was made as to whether or not any estimate was made by the Architect of the cost of carrying out the Senate proposition. As I understand, the Architect has made a plan and has furnished an approximate estimate, and the cost, as he fixes it, would be $125,000. This is a matter, Mr. Speaker, in which the House is quite as much interested as the Senate, if not more interested, and it seems to me that it would not be inadvisable that we should have some expression of opinion.

Mr. HOPKINS. As I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania the House resolution provides that the space formerly occupied by the Congressional Library shall continue in the form that it is now, and then have a few books placed there for a reference library for the benefit of both the Senate and House.

Mr. DALZELL. Yes; I would say to the gentleman that the House resolution simply provides for a reference library. It must be borne in mind, however, that over 800,000 books have been taken out of that old Congressional Library, and a reference library would not probably contain more than 2,000 to 2,500 books.

Mr. HOPKINS. The purpose of the resolution is to devote the entire space formerly occupied by this public library to the proposed reference library now?

Mr. DALZELL. The purpose of the resolution is rather to send the matter to conference in such a shape that the conference committee will have jurisdiction of the whole subject, so as to report not simply in accordance with the Senate resolution nor yet in accordance with the House resolution, but upon some plan that will dispose of the space in the spirit of both resolutions.

Mr. FARIS. We could not hear back here, and I will ask the gentleman what committee reports this resolution?

Mr. DALZELL. The Committee on Rules.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I should like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if it is proposed to connect the reference library and the Congressional Library by means of a pneumatic tube, so that, by visiting the old library, within four or five minutes we could have any book that we felt disposed to order as we did when the Congressional Library was in the old place?

Mr. DALZELL. I do not know whether that is contemplated; I have not gone into the detail of the Architect's plan; but will say to the gentleman from New York that we have that now. We have an office in Statuary Hall and a pneumatic tube connection, so that you can now have any book you send for.

Mr. CUMMINGS. The reason I ask this is because we have a library upstairs and another library in here, and if we are to have another reference library, in the old Congressional Library and the Government Library in the new building, it would seem to me we would have a very scattered library? I could understand it if these rooms are required for the use of members of Congress. Frequently a man here needs books of reference very quickly; and if these apartments were set aside for such purpose, it would be possible for a member while debate was running in the House to secure his reference in time to participate in debate. As it is now it seems to me it would be impossible. I remember at one time here, in a discussion concerning the sinking of the *Tallapoosa*, it was necessary that I should have the files of the New York papers to sustain a statement I had made. Those files were taken from the Congressional Library and placed upon my desk in the House within six minutes from the time they were ordered. Now, if the library of reference should be as useful as the old Congressional Library was, I should be heartily in favor of it; if not, not.

Mr. BABCOCK. I should like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if it is proposed by this resolution to devote all this space to a reference library?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. For a library of 2,000 volumes?

Mr. DALZELL. I would repeat what I said before. The purpose of this resolution is hardly to advocate any particular plan, but to put the House in such a situation that the whole subject may go before a committee of conference, so that the committee may have jurisdiction of the whole subject and make a report upon what may ultimately be satisfactory to both bodies.

Mr. BABCOCK. I understand that this entire reference library is already selected and ready to be sent to the Capitol, and it will not occupy more room than the smallest committee room would accommodate. If that be true, it would not want 25 per cent of the space for this purpose, and we do want it for more committee rooms.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I would like to know if there is any suggestion of making a reading room in connection with this reference library?

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Speaker, we can not hear.

The SPEAKER. The House must be in order.

Mr. DALZELL. I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCLEARY. As I understand the purpose of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, the outcome of it may be this, that we shall have a part of that space set aside for a reference library and the rest devoted to committee rooms. Am I correct?

Mr. DALZELL. That is right. I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas for a question.

Mr. RIDGELY. I have been informed, whether correctly or not, that there are some general changes of the building in contemplation by reason of the removal of the library from this building and other facts, and I would ask if the committee in recommending this matter be referred to the conference committee have that in view?

Mr. DALZELL. That would be the result if the House adopts the resolution.

Mr. RIDGELY. Has the committee consulted with the Architect and other authorities, and have they considered this whole matter in connection with the entire changes of the building?

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. We want to hear what is going on.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Georgia that the House is in better order than usual. [Laughter.] And yet it is exceedingly essential that all members should hear this discussion about the disposition of the old library room, as it touches the interest of every member; and the Chair trusts that gentlemen will observe order, so that all may hear what is being said.

Mr. DALZELL. In answer to the gentleman from Kansas, I will say that I know of no contemplated changes in the structure of the building outside of what is proposed as to the library space. As far as that is concerned, we have seen the Architect's plans and know his estimates.

Mr. BARTHOLDT rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. DALZELL. I do.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Pennsylvania says that no changes are contemplated in the structure of the building. How does he account for the enormous amount of money asked for in this resolution? I understand the resolution calls for an expenditure of $130,000.

Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman is mistaken; the resolution does not call for anything.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. The gentleman from Pennsylvania in his statement explaining his resolution said that that expenditure would be necessary. As a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I have looked into this matter, and have found from investigation and from conversation with the Architect and his assistants that if this space should be devoted to library purposes alone no expenditure of money would be necessary at all.

Mr. DALZELL. That is right.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. On the other hand, the question arises whether it would not be more profitable and economical for the House to acquire property outside, the same as the Senate has done. I believe that we can acquire property outside the Capitol, in the immediate neighborhood, much more cheaply than to go to work and spend $160,000 for fitting up committee rooms. I believe this space ought to be devoted exclusively to library purposes, and perhaps for the purposes of the folding room or the House document room, which now have very unsatisfactory quarters. I will say that at least twenty committees of this House have quarters to-day that are not fit to be occupied as committee rooms. If it is necessary to acquire more committee rooms, I say that the House ought to do what the Senate has already done and acquire property outside the Capitol.

Mr. SHAFROTH rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. DALZELL. I do.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether under this resolution the request of

the Supreme Court to permit the Supreme Court library to be located in that room can be considered?

Mr. DALZELL. I understand that if the House adopts this resolution, the result will be to throw the whole matter into conference in such a shape that the conference committee may report on any scheme.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The gentleman thinks that the request of the Supreme Court can be considered under this resolution?

Mr. DALZELL. I think so.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I wish to say that I for one think the Supreme Court library should be located in that room. I think the court is entitled to good space in the Capitol building, at least until a new court building is erected; and inasmuch as the Supreme Court library is consulted by Members and Senators very often, its convenience to the two Houses is greatly to be desired. We make great use of that library in contested-election cases and in other controversies which frequently arise in the House as to legal points. In addition to that, it seems to me we ought to take into consideration the convenience of the Supreme Court itself. That body is a coordinate branch of the Government and is entitled to large space in this building, and I for one believe that, together with a reference library for Congress, is the disposition which should be made of this library room. I understand there is space enough for both the reference library and the library for the Supreme Court.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY]?

Mr. DALZELL. I do.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I hope that the committee of conference will do nothing which will devote the space now under consideration to committee rooms alone. I think the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] is entirely correct when he says, as he does in effect, that if there is to be any relief for the growing demand for committee rooms, that relief must be found outside of this building. The two or three or four or five rooms that we can get in the space recently occupied by the Congressional Library will only meet the requirements of the day and will not meet even those fully—far less those of the future.

I believe with the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] that the Law Library should be placed in that part of this building. I do not understand that it is the library of the Supreme Court alone, although its most important use is by that court. I understand that this branch of the Congressional Library is used constantly by almost every member of this House, whether he is a member of the bar or not. It ought to be somewhere else than in the dog kennel to which we have relegated it for these many years.

I believe that we ought not to be content with a reference library of two thousand or twenty-five hundred volumes. That is a very small library—covers very little ground. If we get that reference library started, we shall find that it will become not a mere reference library, but a working library, with rooms which can be utilized as reading and writing rooms; and in this way that space will be of great benefit to this House and to the Senate and to the country. I hope that not an inch of this space will be given to private purposes, but that the whole of it will be held for the benefit of the whole House in such a way as appears best for the interests of the country.

Mr. RICHARDSON rose.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] twenty minutes, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I only want a moment or two in which to state what I understand to be the status of this question. To gentlemen who have not investigated the matter I will say that the Senate has passed a joint resolution which divides equally between the Senate and the House the space recently occupied by the old library. The Committee on Rules has reported a substitute for that resolution, providing that this space—all of it—shall be used for a reference library. As stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], it may be that we shall not pass the resolution as we have reported it. The understanding is that in all probability the matter will go to conference, and then after an expression of gentlemen on both sides of this Chamber and after hearing from gentlemen who occupy seats in the other legislative body, Congress will be ready to adopt some plan which will best utilize that old space.

Some gentlemen advocate putting the reference library there with comparatively a small number of books, in order that members may go there and have ready reference to such matters as we need to refer to while measures are pending here and in the other branch. Some gentlemen have favored—and I understand the Supreme Court is very anxious that this proposition shall be carried out—a transfer of the Law Library to that space.

Some gentleman has referred to the fact that our books are very much scattered—that is to say, we have that immense library of over 800,000 volumes across the way, the Congressional Library. We have also the House library up there, with a small portion of these books downstairs. The Senate has also its separate library just as we have. And then there is the Law Library downstairs. So that we have, in fact, three or four separate libraries in this building.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we make another reference library it seems to me it will not be long before we shall have half of the Congressional Library back in this building. There will be a greater and greater demand for books, because when you begin to make references one reference calls for another—a reference in one book requires you to follow that reference up in another book—so that in a short time, as I have just said, we shall have half of the Congressional Library back in this building.

Now, that space has been arranged expressly for library purposes, and it seems to me best that we shall keep it for such purposes. But the object in passing this resolution will be to bring the matter hereafter before us, so that upon the report of the conference committee the question will be presented in such a condition that Congress may make the best disposition of this space.

Some gentlemen think this space should be devoted to a restaurant.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will hear the gentleman.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Tennessee points out the fact that in the utilization of this space for library purposes we shall move back as we want them a large number of books from the Congressional Library to this building. Well, sir, what is the harm? If we need the books, why not have them here?

Mr. RICHARDSON. We have already gone to an enormous expense in making a tunnel from this building to the main library, and in four or five minutes we can get from there any book we wish.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Oh, it takes a great deal longer than that—sometimes nearly half an hour.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have made the experiment, and am able to say that in seven minutes I have had books brought to me from the Congressional Library. Thus we now have access to that entire library, and it seems to me that this is better than undertaking to have another library started in the space where the old Congressional Library was.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if there is not, in his opinion, space enough in the room already provided upstairs for the reference library of the House?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think there is. It is already shelved and ready for the purpose, and we have quite a large number of books up there now.

Mr. GAINES. I would like to ask my colleague from Tennessee a question. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] speaks of some architect making an estimate. Now, what architect has made such an estimate?

Mr. RICHARDSON. The Architect of the Capitol.

Mr. GAINES. An employee of the Government at this time?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes, sir; not an outsider, but one employed by the Government.

Mr. GAINES. Gentlemen have spoken also of building an establishment for the use of the Supreme Court of the United States. I would like to ask my colleague what plans, if any, have been devised for that purpose?

Mr. RICHARDSON. A number of bills have been introduced and are pending for the purpose of condemning property and erecting a building for the use of the Supreme Court.

Mr. GAINES. And they would also want a library?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Undoubtedly; if these plans should be adopted, the court would want a library in that building.

Mr. GAINES. Then if we move the reference library of the court to the new location, and subsequently erect a building for the Supreme Court, we would have to make another move in the future?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think so.

Mr. LLOYD. I would like to ask the gentleman with reference to the pending resolution: If this matter is submitted on the conference report of the two Houses, is it not a fact that we would be required, under the rule, either to accept or reject that proposition as an entirety? In other words, it could not be amended.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Certainly; but of course they could vote the whole proposition down.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, if I should be on such a committee I should be willing to place the matter in such shape as to have the fullest expression of sentiment on the part of the House in dealing with the final issue. It is a matter of great importance and of vast interest to all the members, and ought to have full consideration.

Mr. LLOYD. Is it not true, also, that this special library plan—or reference library plan—if adopted would require additional employees of the Government to take control of it?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Unmistakably; that would be the result. Now, a word about the space to which reference is made in the resolution. If used for committee rooms, it would give 14 working rooms to the House and 14 to the Senate, making 28 in all. I believe it is a matter of fact that a number of the committees of the House are now meeting two, and possibly three, in the same room. This, I believe, we might obviate by taking the 14 new rooms which this old library space will enable us to acquire. But these are all matters for the House and individual members to consider and submit such ideas as they may entertain in regard to the best way to deal with the question.

I yield to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], who wants four or five minutes.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. Speaker, I quite agree in the view submitted here that this resolution should go to the conference committee for the purpose of having a proper plan prepared and digested for the utilization of the space in question. I do not think, for my part, that we should devote that space to committee rooms. I think there are more important objects to be gained. The expenditure of $150,000 or $175,000 required to make the changes would go far toward securing a space or at least to prepare a building for the committee purposes for the House—a space sufficient for the use of the House and for the Senate.

I am in hopes that the conference committee on this resolution, when appointed, will consider carefully the various suggestions made by the members of the House and the Senate. I believe that this space should be devoted to the general use of the House and the Senate; that it should be used for a reference library, for reading rooms, and for assembly rooms, where members of the House and the Senate can meet and talk together over matters of public interest of both Houses.

We know that during the last year a plan was suggested for dividing this space into three large rooms for the use of the House of Representatives, and the room on each side was to be devoted to the uses of the two parties. I was in favor of that proposition at the time, and I think it was the sentiment of the House, largely because it gives a concentrated space for debate that would not be devoted, as it now is, to conversation, but to debate, and at the same time give ample space to the two parties in the assembly rooms on each side to engage in conversation and to talk of matters of mutual interest. Now we have to adjourn for this purpose to the stuffy cloakrooms of the House in order to avoid disturbing the House when engaged in deliberation. It seems to me that this space should be devoted exclusively to the uses of the House and Senate for the purpose indicated; that it should be used jointly by the two Houses, and very little change in the architectural conditions would be required, and that it should be thus devoted not simply for a reference library alone, but for reading rooms, writing rooms, and conversation rooms, and for the general purposes that the members of the House and the Senate may find desirable.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Tennessee controls an hour and the gentleman from Pennsylvania an hour, as the Chair finds that the previous question was not asked for.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Is an amendment in order at this time?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield for that purpose?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield for any debate the gentleman desires, but I do not think that I have the right to yield for an amendment.

The SPEAKER. Without the consent of the gentleman from Tennessee the gentleman from Colorado could not offer an amendment at the present time.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Well, I wish to offer the amendment at the proper time; that is all.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado to allow him to address the House.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Speaker, the amendment which I have offered, or which I wish to offer when the proper time comes, adds to the resolution as it now is the words:

And for that part of the National Library known as the Supreme Court library.

Upon examining the resolution, I have grave doubts, if it goes to conference, whether the conferees would have jurisdiction to include a project to have the Supreme Court library located in that space, and on that account I would like to offer this amendment at the proper time. Inasmuch as the Supreme Court library is now located in a very dark part of the Capitol, almost a dungeon, some of the windows being under the portico, which extends far out, and it being difficult to get light there by which to read, it seems to me that we ought to give them adequate space; that we ought to give them this room for their library, and retain a portion for a small reference library for Congress. I do not believe that the space would make enough committee rooms to do much good, at least not that part of it which would be devoted to the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will say to the gentleman that it will give fourteen large committee rooms, I think.

Mr. SHAFROTH. On both sides?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Fourteen rooms on each side.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes, but it will cost $140,000 to have the architectural changes made.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes, that is true; and, as I understand it, the change for the Supreme Court library would only cost the amount necessary to move the books and minor improvements.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. That is all.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That would be very small, indeed; whereas dividing it into fourteen rooms would cost, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] has indicated, something like $140,000.

Mr. DALZELL. One hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It seems to me we ought to give the space to the Supreme Court library, or at least the larger part of it, because that library is constantly used as a reference library by Senators and Members of Congress.

Mr. RICHARDSON. What will you do, then, with the space now occupied by the Supreme Court library? There would be an expense connected with the fitting up of that.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That space is not large. It might be devoted to committee rooms, but it would not make more than three or four committee rooms, and the expense of cutting it into such committee rooms would not exceed probably $5,000. We are continually consulting that library, and it seems to me that to devote that space to the Supreme Court library and a reference library would be a wise disposition of the same.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask my friend from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] to let me use a little time now. I desire to yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

The SPEAKER. One moment. The Chair desires to know from the gentleman from Tennessee whether he has given his consent that the amendment sent up by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] may be considered as pending?

Mr. RICHARDSON. No; I was not asked to do so. As I understand it, the gentleman desires to offer his amendment simply to give the conferees, if the matter should go to conference, jurisdiction over the subject.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That is all. My amendment does not require the conferees to make that disposition of the space.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I feel quite sure that the conferees would have jurisdiction of the whole question as to the disposition of that space if it should go to conference, and therefore the amendment would not be necessary.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I have looked at the proposition and I do not think so. For that reason I should like to give them jurisdiction.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It relates to the disposition of the space.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; but it confines them, as I understand it, to a reference library.

Mr. RICHARDSON. No; I think not.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that consent to have the amendment pending has not been given by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. No; I have not seen the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL].

Mr. DALZELL. I desire to yield a few moments to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have not had the pleasure of hearing what has been said by gentlemen touching this matter. I understand, however, that there is under consideration a proposition touching the disposal of the space formerly occupied by the Library of Congress, and that this is a proposition to send the Senate joint resolution to conference. I think it ought to go into conference with plenary power on the part of the House conferees to act with the Senate conferees touching the final disposition of this space; and I believe that is all I want to say about it—that this space ought to be utilized for a reference library for the use of the House and the Senate.

Mr. TAWNEY. And the Law Library.

Mr. CANNON. And the gentleman from Minnesota says "the Law Library." I have no objection even to include that, provided the Law Library is a part of the reference library and second thereto. I can only speak of my own experience touching the want of a reference library in this building. When the Library of Congress occupied these rooms they were convenient to all of us, and the Librarian in charge and his assistants were in a position, on a minute's notice, to give information to Members and Senators. It may be said that we have gotten a tunnel from here to the Library

building, across some little distance from the Capitol. That is true. But it is a tunnel that I have never been able to use successfully. I am not able to go through it myself; and I had just as well be frank about it, and call myself something near an average member. I know what I want when I want something.

Now, I might sit down and make my memorandum and send it speeding through the tunnel to some gentleman clerk at the other end of the tunnel that I have never seen. He finds something that he suspects will answer my query, and back it comes through the tunnel. It is not what I want at all. I want somebody that I can go to in charge of a reference library. If I want one item of information, he knows exactly where to find it, even when I do not know where to find it, and that book, containing that information, will be returned in a few minutes dog-eared for my use. Somebody will say, "You ought to know where to find the information." I am speaking as an average of the membership of the House touching these matters.

Mr. BINGHAM. The gentleman is flattering himself. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. I must claim that much, I think, as a right. [Renewed laughter.] Now, these rooms, I understand, are thoroughly furnished. I suppose it would cost $100,000 or $200,000 to take these rooms and take the library furniture out of them; and if the rooms are used for anything else than a library this furniture must be taken out and thrown away. If you were to convert them into committee rooms I have no doubt that the necessity for a reference library within ready call of the House and Senate would be so speedily recognized that within a year or two, or a very short time in the future, both branches would go back to the use of that space for a reference library. Now, that is about all I want to say, and I say it for the purpose of indicating my own views and not with a view of fettering by direct resolution or action of the House the discretion of the House conferees. I suppose from what little I have heard that this was in the nature of an experience meeting at which each brother might state what was his view touching this matter. You may have a whole world of information in the mind of somebody that can give it in a short space of time, and it does not benefit this body or the other or any individual who may want it, unless you get what you want at the proper time.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee has consented to the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would like to hear it reported. I think it only broadens the scope of the resolution.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I ask for the reading of the original resolution.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would like to hear it read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the committee amendment so that it will read as follows:

"That the rooms and space recently occupied by the Library of Congress in the Capitol building shall be occupied and used hereafter for the purpose of a reference library for the use of the Senate and House of Representatives, and for that part of the national library known as the Supreme Court library."

Mr. RICHARDSON. That is all right.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado to the amendment recommended by the committee.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio for a few moments.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I hope this resolution will be adopted, and trust that the adjustment reached by the committee of conference will be such that the whole space formerly occupied by the Congressional Library will still be reserved for library purposes. It is very evident to those who have any experience in the matter that the books in this building and in the Library are not as valuable to members as they should be. In order to make good use of a library it is not only necessary that there should be books, but that they should be promptly available. Now, what I should like to see would be an arrangement whereby the whole of this space formerly occupied by the Congressional Library would be occupied by the Senate library, which is large and valuable; by the library of the House of Representatives, the Supreme Court library, and a general reference library. Each would have to have its own separate librarian. I am informed that the Librarian has already selected 8,000 or 10,000 volumes for a reference library. There is no probability that any considerable share of the Congressional Library would be brought over here. Most of the books there are not such as would be required in a reference or working library. I think it perfectly safe to say that 10,000 to 12,000 volumes from the Congressional Library—many of them duplicates—would be ample to afford members an opportunity to give prompt consideration to the subjects arising here. It is not sufficient to have books to be reached at the end of a tunnel in five, ten, or fifteen minutes. It is very desirable to have a reference library in this building and a librarian who is posted as to the subjects we are called upon to consider.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio a question. You think, then, that 12,000 books would be as many as needed?

Mr. BURTON. I think that number would be enough for a reference library.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman must remember that there is space there for 700,000 books. The old Congressional Library numbered about 700,000 volumes. Now, there is space enough there for that number, because they were there before they were moved. If you only put in ten or twelve thousand books, you would have a great deal of space that was not utilized.

Mr. BURTON. But the Senate library is a large library, and the Supreme Court library is also a large one.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman means that those books would be in addition to the ten or twelve thousand?

Mr. BURTON. Yes; the books belonging to the Congressional Library, the gentleman from Tennessee will remember, were many of them piled up in their former quarters like so much old lumber, so the number of volumes there was not a fair test of the capacity of the room for library purposes.

Mr. RICHARDSON. That is true.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio whether in the number of ten or twelve thousand he includes the Executive documents, which are quite necessary for reference?

Mr. BURTON. That would be an additional number.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Would it not be well also to have the House library, which now occupies so much space, moved down there, so as to afford additional room on the next floor.

Mr. BURTON. Yes; for committee rooms upstairs. I think that could be done and retain where it now is the small library adjacent to this room.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS].

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have already alluded to the fact that when the old library was in this building I got three copies of different New York newspapers within six minutes, giving a detailed account of the sinking of the *Tallapoosa*. Twenty-five minutes ago the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] wrote asking for a copy of the second volume of Henry Adams's History of the United States. I would like to hear a report from the gentleman from Massachusetts as to his success in obtaining it.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I just heard a moment ago that the book was out. That was the first recognition of my request.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be various ideas as to utilizing this space. One view is that it should be used for committee rooms. I do not concur in that view, because I think it is pretty evident that after we have utilized the portion of that space allotted to the House for committee rooms we shall inevitably have to provide additional committee rooms somewhere else. It is estimated that it will cost $125,000 to prepare this space for committee rooms. If we must incur such an enormous expense, we had better go at once and purchase a building, as has been done by the Senate. Now, it is proposed also to use it as a reference library; and, by the way, I wish to suggest to those who do not concur that that is the proper use to make of it that if the Senate concurs in the amendment proposed by the House, that ends the question, and it will be used for the purpose of a reference library.

But I am not in favor of devoting it to a library. I believe that it facilitates matters to have the library practically all in one place, reasonably accessible to this body. I believe in the main that when members desire the use of any volume they can secure it more readily by the use of the pneumatic tube arrangement that we have than they could if we should locate a reference library in this space formerly occupied by the Congressional Library.

Now, there is a use to which this space can be very well put. I happened to be in the last Congress upon the committee whose attention was called as to the rearrangement of the space now used as the hall and cloak rooms. There was a pressing demand for some space in which each side of the Chamber might hold conferences, and it seems to me that this space might be very well used for that purpose. That side of the House finds itself constantly in need of some place where they may meet in party conference, and this side finds the same condition.

Now, it seems to me that the wise thing to be done with this space is to set it apart, or so much of it as may be necessary, for this particular purpose. I am not in favor of using it for a law library, for I believe that within five years we shall have a new judiciary building, and it would be unnecessary work to move the law library into this space and within five years move it into a new building.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we ought to use this space for the purpose,

first, of providing consultation rooms for committees of conference of the two Houses.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] to the substitute recommended by the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Without objection, I would like to hear the amendment read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the substitute reported by the committee so as to read as follows:

"That the rooms and space recently occupied by the Library of Congress in the Capitol building shall be occupied and used hereafter for the purpose of a reference library, for the use of the Senate and House of Representatives, and for that part of the National Library known as the Supreme Court library."

The question being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

The substitute of the committee as amended was agreed to, and the resolution of the Senate as amended was adopted.

On motion of Mr. DALZELL, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INSULAR AFFAIRS.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin, by unanimous consent, offered the following resolution; which was read, considered, and adopted:

Resolved, That the Committee on Insular Affairs be authorized to have printed and bound such documents for the use of said committee as it may deem necessary in connection with the subjects considered or to be considered by the said committee during the Fifty-sixth Congress.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin also offered, by unanimous consent, the following resolution; which was read, considered, and adopted:

Resolved, That the Committee on Insular Affairs or any subcommittee thereof be authorized to sit during the sessions of the House of Representatives and during any recess thereof.

UNITED STATES ARMY IN IDAHO.

Mr. GROSVENOR, from the Committee on rules, reported back with amendment the following resolution introduced December 8, 1899, by Mr. LENTZ:

Whereas it is a matter of general information given out by the public press, and charged by the industrial organization known as the Western Federation of Miners, that United States troops have been sent into the State of Idaho in defiance of and contrary to the provisions of Article IV, section 4, of the Constitution of the United States, in that it was done at the individual request of the governor of Idaho, without the authority of the legislature, and at a time when there was no condition of insurrection or riot, and when the legislature could have been called together without danger or delay from any source whatever, and, further, without even consultation by the governor with the sheriff of Shoshone County, where it was desired that the troops should be and actually were sent; and

Whereas in defiance of section 9, Article I, of the Constitution martial law was declared and the writ of habeas corpus suspended in said county in a time of profound peace, when there was no condition of rebellion or invasion or any menace to the public safety; and

Whereas it is charged that Brig. Gen. H. C. Merriam, commanding the troops in Shoshone County, arbitrarily, and without warrant of law, without informing the accused of the charge upon which they were arrested, and in defiance of the sixth amendment to the Constitution, arrested and imprisoned hundreds of citizens of the United States and of the State of Idaho, and held them prisoners under the most brutal and tyrannical conditions, denying to them their constitutional right to speedy trial by an impartial jury of the State, which right the Constitution clearly guarantees; and

Whereas it is charged that the said Brig. Gen. H. C. Merriam did, in defiance of and contrary to the provisions of the fourth amendment of the Constitution, subject the persons, houses, papers, and effects of citizens to unreasonable and arbitrary search and seizure; and

Whereas it is charged that the said military commander arbitrarily, and in defiance of the civil law, ordered the arrest of the sheriff of the county and the board of county commissioners, and subsequently deposed them from office on the unproved pretext of neglect of duty; and

Whereas it is charged that the said Brigadier-General Merriam, immediately upon the arrival of the troops, ordered the arrest of every man who was a member of the miners' union, and also of all citizens who were supposed to sympathize with the cause of organized labor; and

Whereas it is charged that those citizens were imprisoned in what was known as the "bull pen," a place unfit for human habitation, and that so brutal and degrading was the treatment inflicted on these prisoners by Brigadier-General Merriam and the United States troops under his orders that one unfortunate man became insane, and upon being taken to the county jail he broke from his guards and jumped into the river, and a negro soldier, at the command of the Bunker Hill Mining Company's doctor, fired three shots at him and he was dragged from the river dead, and that another unfortunate prisoner, dying in the "bull pen," begged for a priest and his dying request was denied; and

Whereas the imprisoned citizens were denied opportunity to confer with their counsel or members of their families and were denied the right of speedy and impartial trial; were held in this vile and inhuman imprisonment for several months without charge or indictment against them, although two sessions of the grand jury were held in the meantime, and during their confinement were treated by the officers and soldiers of the United States Army as convicted felons and compelled to work at penal employment; were subjected to cruel and degrading punishments, such as being compelled to sleep on bare boards, placed on a diet of bread and water for ten days, and compelled to stand erect seven hours each day in the hot sun under penalty of death if they attempted to move or sit down. These two latter unlawful punishments were inflicted upon them by the orders of Captain Edwards, United States Army, who amused himself by calling the prisoners "cowardly curs;" and

Whereas it is charged that by the use of the military power the writ of habeas corpus was suspended for months in Shoshone County, and the right of free speech, free press, and peaceable assemblages were denied to the peaceable citizens of that community without any excuse or justification whatever; and

Whereas when the Industrial Commission sat in Wallace all union men who had been long residents of the county were in the "bull pen" and had no opportunity to appear before the commission; others were arrested while on their way to Wallace to appear before the commission and thrown into the "bull pen" until after the commission adjourned; and

Whereas it is charged that the following proclamation, in gross violation of the Constitution of the United States and of the constitution and statutes of the State of Idaho, was issued and enforced by Brigadier-General Merriam, to wit:

"PROCLAMATION.

"Whereas the following notice has been served upon the mine owners of Shoshone County by the duly constituted State authorities, by whom martial law has been declared, to wit:

"'To the mine owners of Shoshone County:

"'Certain organizations or combinations existing in Shoshone County have shown themselves to be criminal in purpose, inciting and, as organizations, procuring property to be destroyed and murders to be committed, by reason whereof it has been twice necessary to declare martial law in Shoshone County.

"'You are therefore notified that the employment of men belonging to said or other criminal organizations during the continuance of martial law must cease. In case this direction is not observed your mines will be closed.'

"Therefore, in order to carry into effect the spirit of the foregoing notice and restore the industries of the district as far as possible, it becomes necessary to establish a system by which miners who have not participated in the recent acts of violence and who are law-abiding people may obtain work, and, that order and peace may be established, the following is promulgated for the guidance of all mine owners and employees in the affected district:

"All parties applying for underground work in any of the following mines will be required to obtain from Dr. Hugh France, the duly appointed and authorized agent for the State of Idaho for this purpose, or his deputy, at Wardner or at Wallace, a permit authorizing said person to seek employment in any of the following mines: Bunker Hill and Sullivan, Last Chance, Empire State-Idaho, Consolidated Tiger and Poorman, Hecla, Mammoth, Standard, Helena-Frisco, Gem, Morning, Hunter, and such others as may be hereafter included in the above list. Parties applying for such permits must be prepared: First, to deny all participation in the riots of April 29, 1899, in Shoshone County, and, second, to deny or renounce membership in any society which has incited, encouraged, or approved of said riots or other violation of public law.

"Mine owners must refuse employment to all applicants for under-ground work who do not present a duly signed permit authorizing the same. Such permit will be deposited in mine owners' office, subject to periodical inspection.

"All parties now under employment by any of the mines above named will be required to procure, within ten days from this date, the permits above referred to as a condition to their remaining in the service of their respective companies.

"By order of the governor and commander in chief:

"BARTLETT SINCLAIR,
"*State Auditor.*

"Examined and approved:

"H. C. MERRIAM,
"*Brigadier-General, United States Army.*

"Dated May 8, 1899.

"The application for permits to seek employment which union men must sign is as follows:

"'Applications for leave to seek employment in the mines of Shoshone County.

"'To Dr. HUGH FRANCE, *State Representative.*

"'SIR: I hereby make application for issuance to me of a permit allowing me to seek employment in the mines of Shoshone County. I am a —— by occupation. I am a native of —— and am a —— citizen of the United States. I last worked at the —— mine in ——. My shift boss was ——. Heretofore I have been a member of —— Miners' Union. I did not participate actively or otherwise in the riots which took place at Wardner on the 29th of April, 1899. Believing that the crimes committed at Wardner on said date were actively incited, encouraged, and perpetrated through and by means of the influence and direction of the miners' unions of the Coeur d'Alenes, I hereby express my unqualified disapproval of said acts, and hereby renounce and forever abjure all allegiance to the said miners' union, of which I was a former member, and I solemnly pledge myself to obey the law and not to again seek membership in any society which will encourage or tolerate any violation of law.

"'—— ——.

"'Dated this —— day of ——, 1899.'

"The application which nonunion men must sign is as follows:

"'Application for leave to seek employment in the mines of Shoshone County.

"'To Dr. HUGH FRANCE, *State Representative.*

"'SIR: I hereby make application for issuance to me of a permit allowing me to seek employment in the mines of Shoshone County. I am a —— by occupation. I am a native of ——, and am a —— citizen of the United States. I last worked at the —— mine in ——. My shift boss was ——. I have not been for —— years a member of any miners' union. I took no part, either actively or passively, in aiding, assisting, or encouraging the perpetration of the crimes committed at Wardner on the 29th of April, 1899.

"'I solemnly pledge myself to obey the law.

—— ——.

"'Dated this —— day of ——, 1899.'

"At this writing no union men are permitted to work in the county; the meetings of the miners' unions are prohibited;" and

Whereas it is charged that during the months when a great portion of the male citizens of Shoshone County were thus unlawfully held in imprisonment by the United States troops the wives and families of the said citizens were subjected to insult and outrages by the soldiers of the United States stationed in that county; and

Whereas it is charged that the outrageous misuse of the military power of the United States, hereinbefore mentioned, was brought about at the instigation and in the interest of the owners of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan mines, who, it is also charged, are the owners and manipulators of other similar trusts; and

Whereas said outrages above described, as perpetrated by the United States Army and its officers, are an intolerable abuse of the rights of citizens and a dire menace to the perpetuity of free institutions and the liberty of citizens: Therefore,

Resolved, That the charges herein preferred be referred to a special nonpartisan committee of nine members of the House, to be appointed by the Speaker, for a thorough and complete investigation to determine their truth or falsity; and said committee shall have the power to send for persons and papers and examine witnesses on oath in relation to the subject-matter of this resolution.

The recommendation of the Committee on Rules was read, as follows:

On page 8, in lines 2 and 3, strike out the words "a special nonpartisan committee of nine members of the House, to be appointed by the Speaker" and

insert the words "the Committee on Military Affairs;" and the committee recommend that as amended the resolution do pass.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I move the previous question on the adoption of the report of the committee.

The previous question was ordered; and under the operation thereof the amendment reported by the Committee on Rules was agreed to, and the resolution as amended was adopted.

On motion of Mr. GROSVENOR, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

PRINTING FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Mr. HITT. I desire to submit for present consideration a resolution giving to the Committee on Foreign Affairs authority to have printing done.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs be authorized to have such printing as may be necessary for the business of the committee done at the Government Printing Office.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think the gentleman from Illinois should put his resolution in the same shape in which similar resolutions have been framed.

Mr. HITT. The resolution reads "such printing as may be necessary for the business of the committee." That is all.

Mr. RICHARDSON. We did not so understand it.

Mr. HITT. Let the resolution be read again.

The resolution was again read.

Mr. HITT. We want this information in the preparation of the appropriation bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The usual language is "considered or to be considered."

Mr. HITT. I have no objection to the insertion of those words. I accept that amendment.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the language as suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] will be added to the resolution.

There was no objection.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I wish to ask whether under the present régime and policy the Foreign Affairs Committee has jurisdiction of matters in Cuba.

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TERRY. It is a very pertinent one, however.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to consider the resolution as modified; which was adopted.

EULOGIES ON HON. LORENZO DANFORD.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I ask unanimous consent that Thursday next, from the hour of 1 o'clock in the afternoon, be set apart for eulogies on the life and character of Hon. LORENZO DANFORD, late a member of this House from Ohio.

There being no objection, the motion was agreed to.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE WILLIAM L. GREENE.

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Wednesday next, after the hour of 1 o'clock, be set aside for the purpose of paying fitting tributes of respect to the memory of my late colleague, the Hon. WILLIAM L. GREENE, of Nebraska.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE VICE-PRESIDENT HOBART.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Friday, the 26th day of January, from the hour of 2 o'clock, be set apart as the time to pay fitting tribute to the memory of the late lamented Vice-President of the United States, GARRET A. HOBART.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce a change of reference of the bill (H. R. 2205) providing procedure in certain pension cases from the Committee on Pensions to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GRIGGS, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. SPIGHT, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. STARK, for twelve days, on account of death in his family.

To Mr. CUSHMAN (on request of his colleague, Mr. JONES of Washington), indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

ADJOURNMENT OVER.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns to-day it be to meet on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to.

And then, on motion of Mr. PAYNE (at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Postmaster-General, transmitting a report of the finances of the Department, balances due, accrued postage, engagements and liabilities, comparative amounts paid for carrying the mails, and detailed expenditures of the Department—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Daniel B. Ladd against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for the transportation of the Army and its supplies—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Postmaster-General submitting an estimate of appropriation for the employment of a temporary force in the office of the First Assistant Postmaster-General—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimates of deficiencies in the appropriation for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Supervising Architect submitting an estimate of appropriation for placing a new elevator in the custom-house at Detroit, Mich.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for public use of inventions and defending suits in the Pension Office—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Supervising Surgeon-General of the Marine-Hospital Service submitting an estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for quarantine service—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Treasurer of the United States requesting an appropriation for four additional clerks in his office—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of certain papers from the Light-House Board, with the recommendation that the accounting officers of the Treasury Department be authorized to credit to the account of Lieut. Col. William A. Jones the expenses of the repairs to the schooner *Harriet C. Kerlin*—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of State, recommending an appropriation for securing a legation at Bangkok, Siam—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of State submitting an additional estimate of appropriation for the legation to Mexico—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a statement of leases granted during the calendar year 1899—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for the Vicksburg National Park—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Isle of Shoals (Gosport Harbor), New Hampshire (Maine)—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting copies of correspondence in relation to the claim of Lieut. Joseph S. Gillow—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior relating to the transfer to the Interior Department of certain rifles for the use of Indian schools—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered

to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred House bill 5430, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 72) for the relief of the legal representatives of Chalkley Good, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 20); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HENRY of Mississippi, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred House bill 2730, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 73) for the relief of Mary E. Gray, of Canton, Madison County, Miss., accompanied by a report (No. 21); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills; which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2305) providing procedure in certain pension cases—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5438) to refer the claim of Joseph W. Parish to the Secretary of the Treasury for examination and payment of any balance found due—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 4061) for the relief of Hannah E. Boardman, administratrix of William Boardman, deceased, surviving partner of the firm of Boardman, Holbrook & Co., of the Neptune Works—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 4878) removing the charges of desertion against Edward McCloud—Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 4525) for the relief of W. S. Hammaker, of Findlay, Ohio—Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 3203) for the relief of Richard King—Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 2098) for the relief of Hattie A. Phillips—Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 5446) relating to mailing second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 5447) to amend section 3287 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, authorizing in certain cases the storage of distilled spirits in metal tanks in distillery warehouses—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: A bill (H. R. 5448) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Portland, in the State of Maine—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 5449) providing for the repair and renovation of the substantial buildings on the Fort Omaha Reservation, Omaha, Nebr., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COCHRANE of New York: A bill (H. R. 5450) to protect free labor from prison competition—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 5451) to make Port Arthur, Tex., a subport of entry and delivery in the customs district of Galveston—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5452) to place wood pulp, printing paper, and so forth, on free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 5453) providing that the statute of limitation shall not be interposed in any suit brought by any laborer, workman, or mechanic in the Court of Claims against the United States to recover wages claimed to be due him under the national eight-hour law—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5454) to purchase a painting of the several ships of the United States Navy, known as the "Squadron of Evolution," and entitled "Peace"—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LYBRAND: A bill (H. R. 5455) granting a service pension to officers and enlisted men who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States during the war of the rebellion, and to their widows and minor children—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 5456) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Pierre, in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SPALDING: A bill (H. R. 5457) to prohibit the sale of malt, vinous, and spirituous liquors in Army posts, encampments, forts, and premises used for military purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 5458) for the relief of the guards at the Federal prison in Leavenworth, State of Kansas, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 5459) for the investigations of the chemical composition and economic use of cotton seed and its products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSTON: A bill (H. R. 5460) to amend and reenact section 7 of the act of March 3, 1891, as amended by chapter 86 of the act of February 18, 1895, concerning the appointment of receivers—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 5461) to amend an act to extend S street, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1899—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DALY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 5462) regulating pilots—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 5463) reorganizing the Naval Observatory and providing for a board of visitors—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KLEBERG: A bill (H. R. 5464) for the improvement of the harbor of Brazos Santiago, State of Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SPRAGUE (by request): A bill (H. R. 5465) to amend an act to provide for the establishment of a retired list for the enlisted men of the United States Army, approved February 14, 1885—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 5466) to provide a civil government for the district of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 5467) to codify the laws relating to pensions—to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. JACK: A bill (H. R. 5468) to provide for the erection of a public building at Indiana, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5469) to provide for the erection of a public building at Greensburg, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 5470) making an appropriation of $5,000,000 for the building of public roads in the several States in the United States of America—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 5471) for the establishment of a light and fog signal on or near Sabine Bank, Texas—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5472) to establish a marine hospital at Sabine Pass, Tex.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5473) granting to the Alabama tribe of Indians in the State of Texas 25,000 acres of land—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5474) designating who may be lawful contractors for carrying the mail on star routes in the United States—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WANGER: A bill (H. R. 5475) for a public building at Norristown, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 5476) to establish a division in the Treasury Department for the regulation of insurance among the several States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 5477) to regulate fares upon street cars in the city of Washington, D. C., and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 5478) granting to the State of Wyoming 50,000 acres of land to aid in the continuation, enlargement, and maintenance of the Wyoming State Soldiers and Sailors' Home—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5479) for an adjustment with the public-land States for lands in sections 16 and 36, sold as coal lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5480) to reimburse the State of Wyoming for money expended by the Territory of Wyoming in protecting and preserving the Yellowstone National Park during the years 1884, 1885, and 1886—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5481) to provide for the reclamation and leasing of a portion of the public domain—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5482) providing that entrymen under the homestead laws who have served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps during the Spanish war or the Philippine insurrection shall

have the time of such service deducted from the time required to perfect title under the homestead laws—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5483) to amend section 2294 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5484) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Evanston, in the State of Wyoming—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5485) providing that the State of Wyoming be permitted to relinquish to the United States certain lands heretofore selected and to select other lands from the public domain in lieu thereof—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 5486) relating to the Twelfth and subsequent censuses, and giving to the Director thereof additional power and authority in certain cases, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. TERRY (by request): A bill (H. R. 5487) authorizing the construction by the Texarkana, Shreveport and Natchez Railway Company of a bridge across Twelve-mile Bayou, near Shreveport, La.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 5488) to provide for the sale of the lands of the Southern Ute Indians of Colorado, taken in severalty, reinvestment of the purchase money, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. NEVILLE: A bill (H. R. 5489) to provide for the purchase of site for a public building in the city of North Platte, in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5490) to provide for the purchase of a site for a public building in the city of Brokenbow, in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 5491) to amend section 4843 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 5492) for the extension of Bacon street—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 5493) for the relief of claimants having suits against the United States pending in the circuit and district courts of the United States affected by the act of June 27, 1898, amending the act of March 3, 1887—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 5494) to pension certain irregular soldiers and nonenlisted men who served in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 5495) providing for leaves of absence to the employees of the Watervliet Arsenal and other United States Army arsenals—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 5496) to appropriate $100,000 for sinking artesian wells in the eastern portion of the State of Colorado—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. HENRY of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 5497) for the continued improvement of the Homochitto River, Mississippi—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DENNY: A bill (H. R. 5498) to provide for a complete system of filtration of the water supply of the United States Capitol—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 5499) to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5500) declaring Cuivre River to be not a navigable stream—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 5501) for the extension of Vermont avenue—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 5502) to purchase of James B. Lyon the United States Red Book, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 5754) amending the act of August 4, 1886, granting an increase of pension to soldiers and sailors who shall have lost an arm or leg in the service—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON (by request): A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 109) to investigate charges of fraud in procuring passage of special act for relief of William Robinson, approved February 26, 1885—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 110) directing the Secretary of War to cause the necessary examination to be made of the San Joaquin River, California, above the mouth of the Stanislaus River, with a view to closing the mouth of certain blind sloughs so as to aid navigation and prevent floods, and to submit an estimate of the cost of the same—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to authorize the President to appoint to the Military Academy as additional cadets at large, in time to take the entrance examinations for the year 1900, all those commissioned officers of the volunteer forces of the United States who served during the war with Spain, and who were honorably discharged and who are within age limit for admission to said Academy as required by existing law—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 112) proposing an amendment to the Constitution to disqualify persons found guilty of polygamy or polygamous cohabitation from holding office—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELLAMY: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 10) to secure an estimate for dredging a basin in the harbor of Wilmington, N. C.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A resolution (H. Res. 77) of inquiry relating to the shipment of oleomargarine and the number of persons engaged in the manufacture thereof—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS: A resolution (H. Res. 78) for the appointment of a select committee of five members of the House to investigate the methods of transacting business in the Bureau of Pensions, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GROW: A resolution (H. Res. 79) to amend the rules of the House—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 80) to amend the rules of the House—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LACEY: A resolution (H. Res. 81) providing for the continuing of the alphabetical list of private claims—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. WARNER: A resolution (H. Res. 82) to provide for a clerk to the Committee on Revision of the Laws—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. COCHRANE of New York: A resolution (H. Res. 83) providing for the payment of $457.50 to H. A. Dumont, for services as folder in folding room—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A resolution (H. Res. 84) providing for an assistant clerk for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. ESCH: A memorial of the legislature of Wisconsin, favoring an amendment to the Constitution giving Congress concurrent jurisdiction with the several States for the suppression of trusts and combinations—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEEKS: A concurrent resolution of the legislature of the State of Michigan, favoring the appointment of Lewis M. Miller as a member of the Commission for the Revision of the Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A resolution of the general assembly of the State of Connecticut, concerning the disqualification of polygamists for membership in the House of Representatives—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: A bill (H. R. 5503) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Hanson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5504) for the relief of Lincoln W. Tibbetts—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 5505) to remove the record of dishonorable discharge from the military record of Henry Metzger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5506) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Ashley V. Newton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5507) to remove the record of dishonorable dismissal from the military record of John Flinn, alias Flynn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ADAMS: A bill (H. R. 5508) granting an increase of pension to Jennie C. Taylor—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 5509) to pension Malinda Jones—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5510) for the relief of John M. Holt—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5511) for the relief of Thomas Saylor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5512) granting a pension to William Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5513) for the relief of Arthur Y. Green—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5514) to correct the military record of Robert Henson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5515) to grant a pension to Thomas Dalton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5516) for the relief of the heirs of M. J. Parrott—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5517) for the relief of F. M. Hilton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5518) to correct the military record of Warren Wells—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5519) for the relief of Pleasant C. Jones—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5520) to correct the military record of Joseph W. Marley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5521) for the relief of Samuel A. Lady—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5522) to pension J. W. Hughes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5523) for the relief of Alfred Green—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5524) to pension R. P. Mitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5525) for the relief of Henry Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5526) to pension Pleasant C. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5527) to pension William Riddle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5528) for the relief of Alfred Sellers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5529) for the relief of Lewis H. Lee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5530) for the relief of George Bailey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5531) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jasper L. Bailey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5532) to pension Leonard B. Merritt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5533) for the relief of James Nicholes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BREAZEALE: A bill (H. R. 5534) for the relief of the estate of John N. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5535) for the relief of Thomas Kergon, of Rapides Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5536) for the relief of F. Flovival Metoyer, of Natchitoches Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5537) for the relief of the estate of Edward Eley, deceased, late of Natchitoches Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5538) for the relief of estate of Phillip Poete, deceased, late of Natchitoches Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5539) for the relief of estate of Joseph Martin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 5540) granting a pension to G. N. Warfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRENNER: A bill (H. R. 5541) granting pension to Ozro F. Cheney, late Company K, First Vermont Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5542) granting pension to Martin L. Winzloff, late Company A, Seventy-fourth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5543) granting a pension to Michael Shaughnessy, late of Company D, Second New York Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRICK: A bill (H. R. 5544) granting a pension to Lona A. Morgan, dependent son of Alfer V. Morgan, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5545) granting a pension to Thomas McDonald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5546) granting a pension to George White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5547) for the relief of A. F. Fleet, superintendent of the Missouri Military Academy, Mexico, Mo.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 5548) authorizing the restoration of the name of Isaac R. Dunkelberger, late a captain in First United States Cavalry and a brevet lieutenant-colonel, United States Army, to the rolls of the Army and providing that he be placed on the list of retired officers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 5549) granting an increase of pension to David H. Ingerson, of Providence, R. I.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COWHERD: A bill (H. R. 5550) granting a pension to Fanny Healy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5551) for the relief of Frank B. Case—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5552) for the relief of Northrup & Chick, and also of Thomas N. Stinson—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 5553) to correct the military record of William T. Pratt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5554) to correct the military record of Michael McGee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COCHRANE of New York: A bill (H. R. 5555) granting pension to Virginia Hull—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROWLEY: A bill (H. R. 5556) granting a pension to Matthias Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5557) granting an increase of pension to William O. Martin, of Brocton, Ill.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5558) to pay Harriet Terrell, widow of William Terrell, of Company C, Fiftieth Ohio Volunteers, pay and bounty—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5559) to grant a pension to David P. Mering—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5560) to increase pension of Samuel C. Snapp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5561) to correct the military record of William Myers, Company F, Eighty-fifth Indiana, and pay him $376.36—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5562) to restore to the pension roll Lycurgus Q. Parkhurst—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5563) to pay Jesse P. York and Tabitha Hanks, only surviving children of Shubal York, late surgeon of the Fifty-fourth Illinois Volunteers, the sum of $377.50—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5564) granting increase of pension to Jane Lister—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5565) for relief of heirs of Alpha A. Leach for accrued pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5566) to pension Robert B. Deem—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5567) to pension Riley Shrigley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5568) to grant a pension to Howard Franklin, son of Benjamin Franklin, Company E, Fifty-second Indiana Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 5569) for the relief of certain Government employees at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and for other purposes—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 5570) for the relief of W. T. Scott and others—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5571) for the relief of Mrs. Anna Franks, of Marshall, Tex.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5572) for the relief of A. B. Pedigo—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5573) to confirm certain Rio Hondo claims unto Pedro Flores, Elizabeth Lafitte, Maria Cordova, Louis Lafitte, Antoine Dubois, and Vital Flores—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5574) to pension William H. Dyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5575) granting a pension to William Callaway—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5576) granting a pension to Samuel Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5577) granting a pension to Jeremiah Romans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5578) granting a pension to Charles B. Stough—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5579) granting a pension to William Dixon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 5580) granting a pension to Sallie J. D. Grubb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5581) for the relief of Goff A. Hall—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5582) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Protestant Church of Middleway, Jefferson County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5583) authorizing the President to appoint and retire George W. Harrison with the rank and grade of captain and assistant quartermaster—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 5584) for the relief of Benjamin C. Lowery, late private of Company C, Twelfth Regiment of West Virginia Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5585) for the relief of August S. Shaver, administrator of James M. Mathews, deceased, late of Greenbrier County, State of West Virginia, being for supplies and stores taken from decedent by the military forces of the United States for their use during the war for the suppression of the rebellion, as found by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the Bowman Act—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5586) for the relief of the heirs of Benjamin Wilson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5587) granting a pension to A. E. Rohrbough, late private of Company B, Fifteenth Regiment of West Virginia Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: A bill (H. R. 5588) to correct the military record of Solomon A. Snow—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS: A bill (H. R. 5589) for the relief of Henry Kizer—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 5590) for the relief of Fanny F. Robertson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5591) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of William H. Condron—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 5592) for the relief of John W. McCann—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5593) to correct military record of Charles H. Callender, private, Company C, Ninth Illinois Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 5594) for removal of the charge of desertion against Anthony Grayson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FREER: A bill (H. R. 5595) for the relief of Jacob Whipkey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5596) for the relief of Cumberland Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5597) to authorize the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of the heirs of Dudley D. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5598) to pension William J. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of New York: A bill (H. R. 5599) to correct the military record of James L. Proctor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5600) to correct the military record of Andrew H. Johnson and grant him a discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5601) to grant a pension to Annie F. Wilson, widow of James E. Wilson, late first lieutenant, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5602) to correct the military record of Thomas Burns and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5603) for the relief of James C. Slaght—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5604) to increase the pension of Sadie M. Ellis, widow of George Henry Ellis, late chief yeoman of the United States cruiser *Brooklyn*—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 5605) for the relief of William Duncan—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 5606) granting an increase of pension to Belle McCaw Alston, widow of J. K. Alston, late colonel of the First South Carolina Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 5607) for the relief of David F. Hood—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5608) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Dutton L. Thompson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 5609) for the relief of the estate of S. N. Clark, deceased, late of Hinds County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HEDGE: A bill (H. R. 5610) granting a pension to Mrs. Elizabeth B. McClellan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 5611) for the relief of Mary E. McDonald, widow of Marshall McDonald, and Stephen C. Brown—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 5612) for the relief of William Dugdale, postmaster at Noroton Heights, Conn.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: A bill (H. R. 5613) to increase the pension of Louis Nessell, a survivor of the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MESICK: A bill (H. R. 5614) granting a pension to Virginia R. Friedeborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 5615) for the relief of Margaret A. Stuart, of Mount Vernon, Tenn.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5616) for the relief of Mary Sharp College, of Winchester, Tenn.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5617) for the relief of T. T. Ricketts and L. C. Ricketts, of Hamilton County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 5618) to amend the naval record of William Anderson—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5619) to amend the military record of Thomas Morgan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5620) granting an increase in the pension of Levi Mick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5621) granting a pension to Mary Jane Crane—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5622) granting a pension to Maria Toler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5623) granting a pension to Thomas W. Hufficker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5624) granting an increase of pension to William H. Morgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5625) granting an increase in the pension of George L. Brookman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACK: A bill (H. R. 5626) for the relief of Lucinda A. Sirwell, invalid daughter of Col. William Graham Sirwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5627) for the relief of John A. Demorest—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5628) to correct the military record of Aaron Loughner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5629) granting a pension to Agnes H. Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 5630) for the relief of J. W. Patterson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5631) for the relief of Stalnaker Marteney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5632) for the relief of Lycurgus W. Eastman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5633) granting an increase of pension to John M. Blanpied—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5634) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Hadley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5635) granting a pension to James S. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5636) to correct the military record of Richard Sickner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5637) for the relief of Thomas Guthrie—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5638) granting a pension to Elizabeth Wiatt—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANHAM (by request): A bill (H. R. 5639) for the relief of Harlin Keeling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 5640) granting a pension to George W. Fraker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 5641) granting a pension to Cynthia Jones—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5642) for the relief of Joseph Morris, a citizen of Americus, Sumter County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LANE: A bill (H. R. 5643) granting a pension to Elizabeth Beesley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 5644) to increase the pension of Charles Alfred De Arnaud—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GASTON: A bill (H. R. 5645) to increase the pension of W. H. H. Bonslough—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5646) granting a pension to H. S. McGowan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5647) granting a pension to Miss Amanda Hurd—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5648) to grant a pension to Mrs. Mary B. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 5649) for the relief of the legal representatives of P. M. Craigmiles, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5650) for the relief of William Mellicott, alias William Reed—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5651) for the relief of the legal representatives of P. M. Craigmiles, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 5652) for the relief of John V. Behan, administrator—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5653) to pension Mary Elizabeth Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5654) for the relief of Lawrence Collins and Edward J. Flanigan—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 5655) granting a pension to Lurinda Laughlin, of Aurora, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5656) granting a pension to Rosina Wettrick, of Madison, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5657) granting an increase of pension to William T. McGowan, of North Vernon, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5658) for the relief of John Johnson, of Jennings County, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5659) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas G. W. Harper—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 5660) granting a pension to Isaac Sheeder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5661) granting an increase of pension to William Ross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5662) granting a pension to William P. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5663) to grant a pension to Marion Southern—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5664) granting a pension to John W. Morgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5665) granting a pension to Richard Hazel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5666) granting a pension to Ann McDonald—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5667) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Douglas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5668) granting a pension to George Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5669) granting a pension to Hiram Runyan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5670) for the relief of William H. McCormick—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5671) granting an increase of pension to Michael Fogerty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5672) for the relief of Henry Hays—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS: A bill (H. R. 5673) to increase the pension of Allen Spalding—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5674) for the relief of the minor children of Paul Carr, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 5675) granting a pension to Josephine I. Offley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5676) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Carroll—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5677) for the relief of Edward Tweed—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5678) for the relief of William A. Richards, late surveyor-general of Wyoming—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5679) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia De Peyster Black—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEEKISON: A bill (H. R. 5680) granting increase of pension to Joseph Burger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5681) granting a pension to Price W. Harney—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5682) granting a pension to Joseph Wagstaf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5683) granting a pension to William R. Cosgrove—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5684) granting a pension to Adaline Kauffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 5685) to remove the charge of desertion against the military record of C. F. Hertweck—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5686) to increase the pension of James J. Marcher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5687) to increase the pension of Patrick O'Neal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5688) to increase the pension of Thomas H. H. Gibbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5689) granting a pension to Daniel Webster, National City, Cal.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5690) granting a pension to Jennie Blackburn Johnston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEREA: A bill (H. R. 5691) for the relief of the Sisters of Loretto, of Bernalillo, N. Mex.—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. QUARLES: A bill (H. R. 5692) for relief of T. H. McGinnis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5693) for the relief of Mrs. Martha H. Schultz, of Scottsville, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5694) to remove the charge of desertion against John Dean—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 5695) granting a pension to Matilda Reeves—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 5696) compensating Nelson Layonard for injuries received as an employee of the Government—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POLK: A bill (H. R. 5697) to establish the military record of Robert D. Magill, of Danville, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5698) for the relief of John B. Otto, of Trevorton, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5699) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Fenstemaker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5700) for the relief of William D. Moyer, Bloomsburg, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5701) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Wood—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5702) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Sebastian Delseit—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 5703) granting a pension to William W. Whitney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5704) granting an increase of pension to James Nutt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 5705) for the relief of Alonzo L. Boyer, Avoyelles Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5706) for the relief of the legal representatives of Alfred Duplantier, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 5707) to correct the naval record of Daniel W. Andrews—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 5708) to correct the naval record of Thomas Mahoney—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 5709) for the relief of A. T. Sands—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5710) to increase the pension of Charles W. Jerome—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5711) extending the term of patent No. 287230—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. ROBB: A bill (H. R. 5712) for the relief of Charles Maschmeyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5713) for the relief of Francis O'Bannon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5714) for the relief of L. W. Pritchett—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5715) granting a pension to John G. Hunt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5716) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James Dunlap—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5717) granting a pension to Col. John F. McMahan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 5718) granting a pension to Joseph Whitmore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5719) granting an increase of pension to R. S. Reeves—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPRAGUE: A bill (H. R. 5720) granting a pension to David Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 5721) for the relief of Rufus Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 5722) for the relief of Mary Nolan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5723) granting a pension to Joseph Schlatter—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 5724) to pension Lydia Brigham, widow of William Brigham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 5725) granting an increase of pension to Louisa M. Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 5726) for the relief of T. A. Vernon, of Laclede County, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5727) to limit the operation of an act granting a pension to Emma A. Porch, approved July 3, 1884—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5728) granting a pension to William F. Tingley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5729) to correct the military record of William Carter, and so forth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5730) to correct the name of Jasper N. Norman on the military rolls—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5731) to correct the military record of Frank Pinet, and so forth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5732) to increase the pension of William H. Riggin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THROPP: A bill (H. R. 5733) granting a pension to William S. Sutters, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5734) to correct the military record of Samuel Irwin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5735) to rectify and complete the military record of John Houpt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5736) to correct military record of Joseph Hartman, alias John Wolf—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5737) granting a pension to Frederick Hillegas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 5738) for the relief of the widow of Capt. John R. Mathews, deceased, United States Navy—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5739) for the relief of Gus A. Nowak—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5740) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Terrance Lynch—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 5741) for the relief of Edward Tearney, of Jefferson County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 5742) for the relief of C. G. Holt, administrator of Wiley Holt, deceased, of Wayne County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WATERS: A bill (H. R. 5743) for the relief of James W. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5744) granting a pension to John Kirk, alias Charles Byrne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5745) for the relief of Morgan Everts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5746) to increase the pension of George W. Palmer—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRICK: A bill (H. R. 5747) for the relief of Holy Cross College—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DAVEY: A bill (H. R. 5748) for the relief of the estate of Joseph Brugire, deceased, late of New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5749) for the relief of the estate of Phillip McGuire and Catherine McGuire, of New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5750) for the relief of P. B. S. Pinchback—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5751) for the relief of the estate of Joseph Brugire, deceased, late of New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 5752) granting a pension to James V. Burch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5753) for the relief of Warren Wright—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of F. M. Stevens and R. H. Snowden, of Cedar Falls, Iowa, for the passage of the bill to reclassify the salaries of clerks in first and second class post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ADAMS: Resolution of the monthly meeting of the Shoe Manufacturers' Association of Philadelphia, asking for the removal of the present duty on raw hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN of Kentucky: Petition of the clerks of the city post-office of Henderson, Ky., urging the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: Petition of W. T. Wells and 159 citizens of Wells and vicinity, York County, Me., for breakwater at Fish Cove, Wells Beach, Me.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of the State Teachers' Association of Missouri, in favor of establishing a system of free public schools in Indian Territory—to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Ransom Post, No. 131, Grand Army of the Republic, of St. Louis, Mo., against the bill to remove disabilities incurred by desertion from the Army and Navy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELLAMY: Petitions of J. Fisher Correll and H. S. Meredith and others, for the reclassification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Petitions of Board of Trade, of Philadelphia, and the Maritime Exchange, urging appropriation for a dry dock at League Island Navy-Yard—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petitions of Philadelphia Maritime Exchange and the maritime commercial and trade organizations, of Philadelphia, for the extension of the Weather Bureau—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: Papers relating to the claim of John B. Klepper, of Washington County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BULL: Papers in support of House bill to increase the pension of David H. Ingerson, of Providence, R. I.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON: Petition of citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, and vicinity, favoring an increase of rate of wages of surfmen—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Lawrence-Williams Company, of Cleveland, Ohio, for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON: Petition of P. C. Hoyt, of Watseka, Ill., and others, asking that a pension be granted to Mrs. Sarah J. Peddycourt, widow of Levi Peddycourt, late of the One hundred and thirteenth Illinois Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill to correct the military record of Michael McGee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: Memorial of the faculty and board of the University of Missouri as to education in Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CONNELL: Petition of Barber & Townsend and other druggists of Scranton, Pa., asking for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CROWLEY: Papers to accompany House bill No. 4021, for the relief of Albert Boker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill No. 3765, for the relief of John R. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill No. 3758, for the relief of Joshua Ricketts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 4191, for the relief of Sarah E. Hayes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 4193, granting a pension to Levi C. Mann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to David P. Mering—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. Snapp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Petition of 46 clerks in the New York post-office, praying for the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the drug trade section of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, praying the repeal or modification of the internal-revenue act, especially as it relates to drugs and proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAYTON: Petition of Sallie J. D. Grubb, of Jefferson County, W. Va., for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: Paper to accompany House bill No. 1788, granting to Nicholas C. Wilson a pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: Paper to accompany House bill for the removal of the charge of desertion from the military record of Anthony Grayson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FREER: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of W. J. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBLE: Petition of R. S. Campbell and others, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GASTON: Petition of 429 persons, asking for the abolishment of capital punishment in the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of clerks in the Meadville, Pa., post-office, for the reclassification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of H. G. S. Fink, of Springdale, Allegheny, Pa., asking for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Petitions of clerks employed in the Fall River and New Bedford, Mass., post-offices, asking for the passage of the bill No. 4351, for the classification of clerks in the first and second class post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Papers in support of granting a pension to Lurinda Laughlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Bartholomew County, Ind., Druggists' Association, relating to the stamp tax on medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, testimony in support of bill to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas G. W. Harper—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of George Flood and others, of Paris, Tex., in relation to the sale of homestead land—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAY: Petition of Robert G. Gibbens and others, of Winchester, Va., for the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the reclassification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HEDGE: Petitions of post-office clerks of Fairfield and Keokuk, Iowa, praying for the passage of the bill providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of G. L. Goodall and others in behalf of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of soldiers' widows of Hartford, Conn., asking for modification of the pension laws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEPBURN: Petition of W. R. Martin and 7 other citizens of Farragut, Iowa, asking an amendment to the Constitution defining legal marriage and making polygamy a crime—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of George H. Feris and 35 other citizens of Page County, Iowa, asking for the removal of the charge of desertion from the military record of William Anderson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of C. W. Steele and 6 others, to accompany House bill granting a pension to Mrs. Maria Toler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of G. L. Brookman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition to accompany House bill to increase the pension of William H. Morgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of W. Dugdale, late postmaster at Noroton Heights, Conn.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petitions of Benjamin Root and others, C. E. Mason and others, F. C. Whitelaw and others, State of Connecticut, favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the classification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of clerks of the post-office at Perth Amboy, N. J., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the classification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. JACK: Petition of post-office clerks at Kittanning, Pa., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. KLEBERG: Petition of postal clerks of Laredo, Tex., praying for the passage of the bill providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. KNOX: Petition of 15 railway postal clerks of the Fifth Congressional district of Massachusetts, urging the passage of the bill relative to the railway mail service and the clerks therein—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of 21 clerks employed in the post-office at Lowell, Mass., urging the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the classification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, memorial of people of Alaska, for better government for the district of Alaska—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of Rev. George W. Fraker, and papers to accompany House bill to grant him a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of clerks employed in the post-offices at Oskaloosa and Ottumwa, Iowa, favoring House bill No. 4351, for the classification of clerks in post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of the city council of Pella, Iowa, in sympathy with the Boers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of substitute letter carriers of Des Moines, Iowa, favoring the passage of House bill No. 1051, to establish the grade of substitute letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LEWIS: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Cynthia Jones—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Joseph Morris—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Charles A. De Armond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Haltwanger-Taylor Drug Company, for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of post-office clerks at Atlanta, Ga., favoring the passage of the bill to equalize the salary of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LONG: Petition of J. G. Hedrick and 3 others, asking for the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. McCALL: Resolutions adopted at a meeting of citizens in Berkeley Temple, Boston, December 10, 1899, for the anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of clerks of the post-office at West Medford, Mass., favoring the passage of the bill to equalize the salary of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 2542, for the construction of a bridge across the Charles River, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MEYER of Louisiana: Paper to accompany House bill No. 44 and Senate bill No. 595, for the construction of a wide, deep channel from deep water of the Gulf of Mexico by way of Southwest Pass—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief Ann McDonald—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Benjamin F. Douglass—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of George Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Hiram Runyan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Michel J. Fogerty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of W. H. McCormick—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany House bill to correct the military record of Henry Hays—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill granting William Ross a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of W. C. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Marion Southern—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of John W. Morgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Richard Hazel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON: Petition of citizens of Warren and adjoining counties in Tennessee, to modify the existing internal-revenue law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petitions, letters, and affidavits to accompany joint resolution to investigate charge of fraud in promising the passage of a special act for the relief of William Robinson, approved February 26, 1885—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of T. T. Ricketts and L. C. Ricketts—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORRIS: Petition of clerks employed in the post-offices at St. Cloud and Duluth, Minn., for the classification of clerks in post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. NEVILLE: Petition of post-office clerks of Kearney, Nebr., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. OLMSTED: Petition of 24 druggists of Harrisburg, Pa., relating to the stamp tax on medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of clerks in the post-office of Lebanon, Pa., for the classification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. POLK: Petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, to reclassify railway postal clerks and prescribe their salaries—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. POWERS: Petitions of Henry Johnson & Lord, of Burlington, Vt., the Dr. B. J. Kendall Company, of Enosburg Falls, Vt., relating to the stamp tax on medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of clerks in the post-office at Rutland, Vt., asking for the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the classification of clerks in the first and second class post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, papers to accompany House bill to compensate Nelson Laganard for injuries received as an employee of the Government—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRINCE: Petition of employees of the Rock Island Arsenal, in opposition to any change from the present rules and system in their department—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of fourth-class postmasters in Whiteside County, Ill., urging the passage of House bill No. 4931, for increase of compensation, etc.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RAY of New York: Petition of post-office clerks at Ithaca, N. Y., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, papers in support of House bill No. 4689, granting a pension to James Nutt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of William W. Whitney, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of post-office clerks at Waverly, N. Y., in favor of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Circular of J. H. Burnham, of Fayetteville, Tenn., in relation to a patent "two-room-heating fire brick and frame"—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. ROBB: Papers to accompany House bill No. 2813, granting a pension to George W. Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 2812, granting a pension to George W. McCinston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers in support of House bill for the relief of Charles Maschmeyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers in support of House bill for the relief of John G. Hunt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers in support of House bill to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James Dunlap—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Petitions of clerks in the post-offices at Everett and Malden, Mass., asking for the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Lydia E. Pinkham Medicine Company, of Lynn, Mass., relating to the stamp tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Petition of post-office clerks at Willimantic, Conn., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the reclassification of postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of the Presbytery of Westchester, N. Y., for the anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of druggists of New London, Conn., urging the repeal of the internal-revenue tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of Norwich, Conn., concerning constitutional rights of citizens and punishment of mob violence or interference with such rights—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of tobacco growers of Hartford County, Conn., against any reduction of duty on importations of tobacco from Puerto Rico and the Philippines—to the Commitee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: Petition of citizens of Laclede County, Mo., to accompany House bill to correct the military record of W. F. Carter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMS: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Chattanooga, Tenn., favoring the passage of a bill granting a competing submarine cable line between the United States and Cuba—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Druggists' Association and others, of the State of Tennessee, urging the repeal of the internal-revenue tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of Lincoln Command, No. 1, Union Veterans' Union, of Meriden, Conn., and A. H. Terry Command, No. 3, Union Veterans' Union, of New Haven, Conn., protesting against the passage of House bill No. 3988—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of post-office clerks of Middletown, Conn., and of Derby, Conn., for the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SPRAGUE: Petition of clerks at Hyde Park, Mass., post-office, asking that the pay of post-office clerks be readjusted—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: Resolutions of the Bar Association of Eau Claire County, Wis., against a division of the western district of Wisconsin—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of M. W. Heller Post, No. 166, Grand Army of the Republic, of Rice Lake, Wis., protesting against any amendment to the pension laws providing for biennial examination of pensioners—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Literary Association of Wisconsin, urging legislation giving authors' manuscripts the same rates of postage as is given to third-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. THROPP: Petition of William S. Sutters, to accompany House bill for his relief—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the removal of the charge of desertion against Joseph Hartman, alias John Wolf—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill to remove the charge of desertion against John Houpt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Martha Irwin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Frederick Hillegass—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of post-office clerks of Tyrone, Pa., for the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the classification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of 36 farmers of Niagara County, N. Y., to amend the act to regulate commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of George N. Stoddard, to repeal the stamp tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of post-office clerks at Niagara Falls, Batavia, Albion, and Medina, N. Y., asking for the passage of the bill No. 4351, for the classification of clerks in the first and second class post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of 20 bee keepers, farmers, and fruit growers, of Genesee County, N. Y., asking specific appropriation in agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of the city council of Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, for the passage of a general railroad law for Puerto Rico—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ZENOR: Papers to accompany House bill No. 4906, for the relief of Ellen Quinn, hospital nurse during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Petitions, etc., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah were laid on the Clerk's desk, and severally referred to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case, as follows:

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petitions of George W. Dorr, E. A. Dinslow, and others, of the Third Congressional district of Maine.

By Mr. BURTON: Petitions of the Calvary Baptist Christian Endeavor Society, Brooklyn Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church, East Madison Avenue Congregational Church, and numerous societies and citizens of Cleveland, Ohio.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: Protest of a Sunday school rally at Middletown, Mo.

By Mr. DAYTON: Petitions of C. W. Cox and others, of Evansville, W. Va., and vicinity, and F. M. Huffman, J. R. Idleman, and others, of West Virginia.

By Mr. GASTON: Petitions of citizens of Erie, Pa., and vicinity.

By Mr. HEPBURN: Petitions of Bishop John F. Hurst, Bishop Henry W. Warren, Bishop John F. Goucher, committee; G. W. Westfall and 50 others, and F. M. Beall and 79 citizens of Shannon City, Iowa.

By Mr. POWERS: Remonstrances of the Friends' Church of Monktonridge, Vt., and citizens of Eden and North Hyde Park, Vt.

By Mr. RAY of New York: Petition of citizens of Binghamton, N. Y.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Resolutions of the Windham County, Conn., Association of Congregational Ministers.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petitions of the Methodist Episcopal Church of East Pearl Street and of the Congregational Club, of New Haven, Conn.

By Mr. TAYLER of Ohio: Petitions of W. R. Hearst and numerous other citizens.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *January 9, 1900.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. TELLER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand approved, without objection.

THE NICARAGUA CANAL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith the report of the Nicaragua Canal Commission, provided for in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1897, entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for other purposes."

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, January 9, 1900.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report is voluminous; and it will be referred to the Committee on Printing, under the rule.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. HANNA presented resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of sundry Holland-American citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, expressing sympathy with the people of the Transvaal and praying for Congressional action; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petitions of Thomas C. Pollock and 28 other citizens of Cambridge, D. B. Weiss and 75 other citizens of Chatham, Charles S. Mills and 39 other citizens of Cleveland, James W. Rain and 15 other citizens of Dayton, and of A. K. Thompson and 15 other citizens of Salineville, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BUTLER presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Wilmington, N. C., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. MCMILLAN presented a memorial of sundry members of the Medina Farmers' Club, of Michigan, remonstrating against

any polygamist holding office in the United States; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Sulphydrol Pharmacal Company, of Detroit, Mich., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry railway mail clerks of Adrian, Pontiac, Iron Mountain, Calumet, Saginaw, and Mount Clemens, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. ALLEN presented a memorial of the Nebraska Improvement Live Stock Breeders' Association, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for the prevention of cruelty to animals in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of the Shoe Manufacturers' Association of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the removal of the present duty on raw hides; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of 51 citizens of Kittanning, Pa., and a petition of sundry citizens of Neal, Pa., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Towanda, Wilkesbarre, and Kittanning, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, of the Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, and of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying that the proposed dry dock at the League Island Navy-Yard be constructed of stone and concrete instead of timber; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. THURSTON presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of South Omaha, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Nebraska Improved Live Stock Breeders' Association, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide for the further prevention of cruelty to animals in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Kansas City, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. CHILTON presented the petition of W. B. Dohoney and sundry other citizens of Paris, Tex., and the petition of A. C. Hall and sundry other citizens of Corsicana, Tex., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of Rev. R. M. Loughbridge and 55 other citizens of Waco, Tex., and the petition of R. D. Carter and sundry other citizens of Cottonwood, Tex., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. TELLER, from the Committee on Claims, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 468) for the relief of the Catholic Church at Macon City, Mo., and

A bill (S. 446) for the relief of St. Charles College.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1329) granting a pension to Mary Jackman;

A bill (S. 1796) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca P. Quint; and

A bill (S. 35) granting a pension to Louise Donath.

STATISTICS RELATING TO THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on the Philippines, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by himself December 19, 1899, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be compiled under the direction of the Committee on the Philippines, for the use of the Senate, the best statistics available in regard to the area, population, agricultural and mineral resources, export and import trade of the Philippine Islands, together with such other information on the subject as the committee may deem desirable.

REPORT ON AFFAIRS IN CUBA.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] on the 3d instant, to report it without amendment, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The concurrent resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 7,000 copies of so much of the civil report of Maj. Gen. John R. Brooke, military governor of the island of Cuba, made to the Adjutant-General of the United States Army, with accompanying papers and documents, as is in the English language, together with a prepared index; of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 4,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 1,000 copies for the use of the War Department.

Mr. CULLOM. I should like to ask the Senator from New York whether this is simply the last report or all the reports made by Major-General Brooke?

Mr. PLATT of New York. It is the last report.

Mr. CULLOM. I have no objection to the resolution.

The concurrent resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

STATISTICS RELATIVE TO CRIME.

Mr. PLATT of New York, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution submitted by Mr. HOAR on the 4th instant, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 4,500 copies of the report transmitted by the Secretary of State of the Commissioner for the United States on the International Prison Commission on "Crimes, misdemeanors, and penalties" in the United States; of which 1,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 1,500 for distribution by the Department of State.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 2244) to extend the immigration, contract-labor, and Chinese exclusion laws of the United States to the Hawaiian Islands; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2245) directing the issue of a duplicate of a lost check, drawn by William H. Comegys, major and paymaster, United States Army, in favor of George P. White; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2246) to correct the military record of Lake B. Morrison; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. RAWLINS introduced a bill (S. 2247) to reimburse George W. Young, postmaster at Wanship, Utah, for loss of postage stamps; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. HANNA introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 2248) to correct the military record of Thomas Toomey;

A bill (S. 2249) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles A. Bell (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2250) to correct the military record of John Hill (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 2251) to amend the muster roll of Company F, Forty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, so as to place thereon the name of William Donely.

Mr. HANNA introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2252) granting a pension to Peter D. Smith (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2253) granting an increase of pension to William Dunn (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 2254) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Schroder (with accompanying papers).

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 2255) appropriating $5,000,000 for the building of public roads in the several States of the United States of America; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2256) for the relief of John W. Gummo; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2257) for the relief of Robert Brigham; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2258) to authorize the Union Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Monongahela River; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PLATT of New York introduced a bill (S. 2259) for the relief of Jeronemus S. Underhill; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 2260) to refer the claim of

Joseph W. Parish to the Secretary of the Treasury for examination and payment of any balance found due; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2261) granting a pension to Mahala Bliss; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McBRIDE introduced a bill (S. 2262) granting a pension to Mrs. C. A. Lester; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2263) for the relief of E. A. Seeley; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 2264) to provide a government for the island of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 2265) for the extension of Vermont avenue; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BATE introduced a bill (S. 2266) for the relief of the heirs of James W. Fennell, deceased, and to give the Court of Claims jurisdiction, and to remove the bar of statute of limitations; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2267) for the relief of the heirs of Susan N. Moore, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. TURLEY introduced a bill (S. 2268) to carry into effect a finding of the Court of Claims in favor of Pamella B. Finney, administratrix of T. C. Finney, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BUTLER introduced a bill (S. 2269) for the relief of O. F. Adams; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2270) appropriating $10,000 to inclose and beautify the monument on the Moores Creek battlefield, North Carolina; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. FOSTER introduced a bill (S. 2271) for the relief of John T. Heffernan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2272) for the relief of Mathias A. Young; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. THURSTON introduced a bill (S. 2273) for the relief of Charles L. Wood; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2274) granting a pension to Michael Curtin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WOLCOTT introduced a bill (S. 2275) for the relief of T. J. Cranford; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2276) granting an increase of pension to George W. Ragland; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. STEWART introduced a bill (S. 2277) for the relief of George W. Chedic; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. QUARLES introduced a bill (S. 2278) to prevent the desecration of the American flag; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 2279) declaring Cuivre River to be not a navigable stream; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2280) granting a pension to Horatio N. Cornell; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present, to accompany the bill, the petition of the claimant, with the affidavits of Dr. Jacob Geiger, Robert H. Wade, Fred P. Halsey, and Thomas H. Asbrook, with naval record, three letters from the Commissioner of Pensions, and one petition with seven signers. I move that the bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 2281) for the relief of Charles Stierlin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 2282) to purchase a painting of the several ships of the United States Navy, known as the "Squadron of Evolution," and entitled "Peace;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut introduced a bill (S. 2283) relating to section 61 of the revenue act of August 28, 1894; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 2284) extending the time for the completion of a wagon and motor bridge across the Missouri River at St. Charles, Mo., as provided by an act approved June 3, 1896; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BUTLER introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 57) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of Senators by the votes of the qualified electors of the States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

FRANK J. BURROWS.

Mr. PENROSE. A bill introduced by me (S. 1845) for the relief of Frank J. Burrows was referred inadvertently to the Committee on Claims. It should be referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads. I ask unanimous consent that the reference be changed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIMINAL PROCEDURE.

Mr. PETTUS submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia be requested to inquire into the manner in which preliminary examinations in criminal cases are conducted by courts or magistrates in the District of Columbia, and whether in such preliminary examinations evidence for the defense is not allowed. And the said committee will consider and report what remedy, if any, should be provided by Congress.

ISLAND SURVEYS.

Mr. PERKINS submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to submit to the Senate of the United States a report on—

First. The present condition and progress of the topographical and geological surveys, if any, which may have been inaugurated on the islands now under the jurisdiction of the United States.

Second. His recommendation as to further topographical and geological surveys on said islands.

TRANSPORT SHIPS.

Mr. ALLEN submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, directed to furnish to the Senate a list of all transport ships and other vessels purchased or chartered by the War Department since March 4, 1897; their names respectively, if named; the name of the person, persons, company, or companies from whom purchased or chartered; the value of each transport ship or other vessel, whether purchased or chartered, as estimated by Lloyd's Register at the time of the purchase or charter thereof; the price paid for each transport ship or other vessel, and, where acquired under the terms of a charter party, the amount paid the owner, owners, or agents of the transport ship or other vessel so acquired while under charter; the amounts expended by the War Department in fitting up and repairing said transport ships and other vessels, whether chartered or owned by the United States during the period they have been used by the War Department; also the number and names of transport ships or other vessels sold by the War Department, the name of the person or persons or company or companies to whom sold, the price for which each transport ship or other vessel was sold, and why the same was sold.

INQUIRIES RELATIVE TO THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. HOAR. I offer a resolution for which I ask immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the President be requested, if in his judgment not incompatable with the public interest, to communicate to the Senate all communications which have been received by him, or by any department or officer, civil or military, from Aguinaldo or any other person undertaking to represent the people in arms against the United States in the Philippine Islands, or any alleged government or public authority of said people; and all replies to such communications.

Also the proclamation sent by him to be issued to the people of the Philippine Islands, as actually directed by him to be issued, and the same as actually proclaimed by General Otis if in any respect it was altered or any part of it was omitted.

Also to inform the Senate whether any approval or disapproval was expressed by his authority, or that of the War Department, of such change, if any.

Also all constitutions, forms of government or proclamations issued by Aguinaldo, or any congress or legislative assembly, or body claiming to be such, or convention of the people of the Philippine Islands or any part thereof, or claiming to represent them or any part thereof, of which information may have come to him, or to any department of the Government.

And that the President be further requested to communicate without delay so much of said information as is now in his possession or in that of any department at Washington, without waiting to obtain so much of said information as may require considerable delay or communication with the Philippine Islands; and to communicate the remainder of the information as soon thereafter as it can be obtained.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to state, if I may, before unanimous consent is asked, that this resolution proposes that we shall have by itself in a distinct shape the State papers, the proclamations, constitutions, and other documents of that kind in which the Philippine Islanders have undertaken to establish and proclaim a government, and the communications they have made or sought to make to the United States Government declaring their purposes and the replies. A great deal of the information which I ask is to be found scattered already in military reports and in other documents, but it will be convenient to all of us to have it in one shape by itself. Probably there may be some little matters which they would have to send out to the Philippine Islands for, but with that exception it can all, I presume, be sent to the Senate within a few days.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SPOONER. I believe we are to consider to-morrow a resolution which has gone over until that day which involves in some of its phases the general subject of inquiry by the Senate into matters relating to the Philippines; and I think the resolution had better be printed and go over until to-morrow.

Mr. HOAR. Well, unless the Senator sees for himself on the statement made that it is one of those things which, according to the unbroken usage of the Senate, is granted on the request of any Senator. I think it is. If the Senator objects, the resolution goes over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution goes over under the rule.

Mr. PETTIGREW. To-morrow is to be devoted, after the routine morning business, to eulogies on the late Vice-President of the United States, and therefore it seems to me proper that the resolution of inquiry which I offered, together with the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], be put over until the next day and that in the meantime it shall lie on the table. I therefore ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LODGE. I hope that request will be granted, Mr. President. I think it better that all the resolutions of inquiry relating to the Philippines should go over until Thursday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There being no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOAR. What is the order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is ordered, by unanimous consent, that the resolution of the Senator from South Dakota, with the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], which was assigned for consideration after the routine business for to-morrow morning, be postponed until Thursday.

Mr. HOAR. Very well. My colleague stated that it was his desire that all such resolutions of inquiry should stand over in the same way; and the Chair announced that that was the consent given. I wish to know whether the consent embraces all such resolutions or only the one just stated by the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It did not, as the Chair put it; but the Chair will put it in the other form, that the consideration of all the resolutions will be postponed until Thursday, if there be no objection.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I was intending to ask in addition that the same order may be made as to all other resolutions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be so ordered, if there be no objection.

GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. RAWLINS submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines, and ordered to be printed:

Be it resolved by the Senate, That the Committee on the Philippines is hereby instructed to inquire into and report to the Senate:

1. What, if any, form of government, insurgent or revolutionary, or in the form of a dictatorship, other than the Kingdom of Spain, existed in the Philippine Islands on and prior to December 10, 1898; and to what extent did such government have and exercise dominion, control, or influence in said islands, and to what extent the Kingdom of Spain had actual possession or control therein at and prior to said date.

2. Can sovereign power be justly and in accordance with international law claimed in the absence of actual power of control?

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Philippines be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $1,800 per annum until otherwise provided by law.

HENRY W. LEE.

Mr. NELSON submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, directed to report to the Senate what action has been taken by him under the act of Congress of August 23, 1894 (28 Stats., 1013), for the relief of Henry W. Lee, with copies of all the papers in the case.

INDIAN LANDS IN MINNESOTA.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut submitted the following reslution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and hereby is, directed to furnish to the Senate the reports made to his Department under authority of statute, approved March 1, 1899, providing for an investigation of affairs connected with the estimating and sale of the pine timber and lands of the Chippewa tribe of Indians in the State of Minnesota, and other data bearing upon the same subject, together with any orders or directions issued by him relating to the estimating or sale of such timber and lands, and the future management thereof.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

On motion of Mr. ALDRICH, it was

Ordered, That there be printed for the use of the Senate and delivered to the Senate document room 1,000 copies of H. R. 1, with amendments as proposed January 4, 1900.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF RAILROADS.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, some days ago I introduced a bill for the Government ownership of the railroads of the United States. I now present an article on public ownership by Prof. Frank Parsons, which I wish to have printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce to accompany the bill which I introduced.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota asks that a statement submitted by him may be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. Is there objection?

Mr. SEWELL. Before that order is made, I should like to have some knowledge as to what it is. The practice of printing at the public expense the ideas of some cranks in the country is getting to be a little too common. I object to the printing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey objects.

Mr. SEWELL. I have no objection to the reference of the paper without printing.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I do not ask for its reference without printing. It is simply an essay upon the subject of the Government ownership of public utilities in the United States by Prof. Frank Parsons. He is one of the ablest writers in this country and one of the soundest, and he does not belong to the list of cranks under any circumstances. Further than that, there can be cranks on both sides of this question and quite often there are, and they are as liable to represent the great corporations of the country as not to represent them.

Mr. SEWELL. I object, Mr. President, anyway, to the printing of articles by individuals.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I wish to make a personal appeal to the Senator from New Jersey not to object. I am in receipt from time to time of letters from young men connected with our colleges who are debating this question, or who desire to debate it, asking me for data, which I have found it very difficult to supply. One document, I think, that emanated from the Interstate Commerce Commission contains some information on the subject, but it is rather difficult to obtain it.

While I do not know precisely what this professor, who is vouched for by the Senator from South Dakota, may have contributed to this subject, and while I have heretofore been opposed to the Government going into the business of buying railroads and telephones and telegraphs, yet it is a great public question; one that has formerly concerned other countries. There has been some legislation on the subject abroad, and I think we are entitled to all the information we can obtain. In view of the fact that we have been printing almost anything and everything Senators have heretofore asked for, I think it is in the line of the public interests that this document should be printed and become available for distribution.

I hope the Senator from New Jersey will withdraw his objection.

Mr. SEWELL. Mr. President, I am not disposed to do so at the present time. If these articles have anything to commend themselves to the people of the United States, they will appear in public prints and in the magazines. The owners of the magazines are very anxious to print able articles on any subject. I do not think we ought to order such printing to be done at the public expense, because then the matter is distributed with a frank. The Senator from South Dakota has made two or three of these requests in the last few days, and I think it is about time that we stopped the practice.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, there are many public questions that are of great interest to the entire people. The opinions of members of the House and Senate are printed as documents and go in the RECORD and can be franked to the people of the country. There are men outside of Congress just as competent to discuss these questions as the men inside, and for one, when a member of the Senate believes that an expression given to the public by any citizen is worthy of especial attention and care, I can see no reason why it should not be printed and distributed through the mails and read by the people. It seems to me that only a fear of having the people educated on these great questions can inspire a disposition to suppress this sort of information. I have seen a number of instances of refusal here, especially refusals to the Senator from South Dakota, to have papers printed which were of unusual interest and deserved to be printed as public documents. For one I do not understand the spirit with which this crusade is made against the printing of such information. I should like to see the old order of things, that has stood here for years without doing anybody any harm, restored, so that whenever any Senator has a paper which he believes to be of such importance as to justify its printing as a document he may ask unanimous consent to have it so printed, and it may be done.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, is it in order to move to

print the paper as a document? I move that it be printed for the use of the Senate.

Mr. SEWELL. I object to its consideration.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to be allowed, as other Senators have been, to make one suggestion to the Senator from New Jersey. I agree with him entirely that the practice of printing articles composed by persons outside of the Senate ought to be very carefully watched and guarded, but while it is being carefully watched and guarded it is a great advantage to the Senate occasionally, because with our rule of unlimited debate every Senator has a right to address the Chair and incorporate any such article in his remarks, and public business has to stop, no other public business, at any rate, can be transacted, while that is being done.

Every one of the ninety Senators has a right under our rules to do this, and I take it for granted that no Senator will needlessly ask the Senate to print a document in this way, a document which, if it could not be printed in this way under his responsibility as a Senator, he can incorporate in his remarks and have printed in the RECORD at much larger expense, and the power of sending it by mail under frank would still exist. So this practice has grown up, not only out of respect to the character of the Senators and the presumption that no Senator would ask for such information except in a grave and serious case, but also to protect the Senate against what must be an enormous prolongation of our debates.

I hope that these views may impress themselves on the Senator from New Jersey, before the question comes up again, as worthy, at any rate, of his consideration. I do not wish to interfere, of course, with his discretion in the matter and his right to object to the printing. It seems to me that we would find the other rule very awkward and inconvenient.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Of course, under the practice of the Senate, I have a right to ask unanimous consent to have a paper printed as a document. Any Senator has a right to object. Therefore I have no criticism to make of any Senator if he exercises that right. The Senator from New Jersey has chosen to object. It is proper that he should object if he wishes to do so. But the paper which I presented is somewhat outside of the usual rule. I introduced a bill, quite an elaborate bill, which provides for the Government ownership of the railroads of the United States. That bill was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. I think it is the first that has been introduced in this body upon that subject; and yet it is a great question, one that is meeting the consideration of the people throughout the world. Most of the governments of the world own the whole or a part of their railroads. Outside of the United States more miles of railroad, many thousand miles more, are owned by the governments of the world than are owned by private corporations.

For the purpose of getting these facts before the Committee on Interstate Commerce, some days ago I introduced and asked to have printed as a document a very elaborate compilation upon this subject, and a very earnest argument in favor of the passage of the bill. I also introduced and asked to have printed as a document the speech of Judge Clark, of North Carolina, before the convention of railroad commissioners at Denver last summer. It was an excellent document, full of valuable information, and this morning I have offered an essay written by Prof. Frank Parsons, who is one of the most distinguished students in America upon this subject and is well known as a writer to almost every one who has studied economic questions. It is full of valuable information; it ought to be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce for their information upon this subject. If it can not be printed in the usual way, I shall try to get it before the Senate in the other proper method, and I shall incorporate it in some remarks which I shall make upon the subject, which will enable me not only to frank it through the mails, but make it part of the records of the Government.

Mr. SEWELL. Mr. President, I objected——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This discussion is proceeding by unanimous consent. Is there objection to the Senator from New Jersey proceeding? The Chair hears none, and the Senator will proceed.

Mr. SEWELL. I objected to the printing of the paper as a document without any reference to what may be its value, or anything of that kind. I object to printing such papers as public documents so that they may be sent free through the mails. I have no objection generally to the question being taken up tomorrow, if the Senate wish it done.

The Government ownership of railroads is a subject which involves twelve or fifteen billions of dollars, and is something that we are not likely to arrive at for a good many years from this time. But that has nothing to do with the question. The main objection I have to the matter is the idea of offering, as the Senator from South Dakota has on two or three occasions lately, papers written outside and asking to have them printed at the public expense, thereby getting the benefit of the franking privilege.

Mr. CULLOM. The regular order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] can not be considered at the present time.

Mr. CULLOM. I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is now completed.

POLICY REGARDING THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I ask for the reading of the joint resolution introduced by me on Thursday last.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Indiana, which was laid on the table subject to his call. The joint resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the joint resolution (S. R. 53) defining the policy of the United States relative to the Philippine Islands, as follows:

Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Philippine Islands are territory belonging to the United States; that it is the intention of the United States to retain them as such and to establish and maintain such governmental control throughout the archipelago as the situation may demand.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, I address the Senate at this time because Senators and Members of the House on both sides have asked that I give to Congress and the country my observations in the Philippines and the far East, and the conclusions which those observations compel; and because of hurtful resolutions introduced and utterances made in the Senate, every word of which will cost and is costing the lives of American soldiers.

Mr. President, the times call for candor. The Philippines are ours forever, "territory belonging to the United States," as the Constitution calls them. And just beyond the Philippines are China's illimitable markets. We will not retreat from either. We will not repudiate our duty in the archipelago. We will not abandon our opportunity in the Orient. We will not renounce our part in the mission of our race, trustee, under God, of the civilization of the world. And we will move forward to our work, not howling out regrets like slaves whipped to their burdens, but with gratitude for a task worthy of our strength, and thanksgiving to Almighty God that He has marked us as His chosen people, henceforth to lead in the regeneration of the world.

PHILIPPINES COMMAND THE PACIFIC.

This island empire is the last land left in all the oceans. If it should prove a mistake to abandon it, the blunder once made would be irretrievable. If it proves a mistake to hold it, the error can be corrected when we will. Every other progressive nation stands ready to relieve us.

But to hold it will be no mistake. Our largest trade henceforth must be with Asia. The Pacific is our ocean. More and more Europe will manufacture the most it needs, secure from its colonies the most it consumes. Where shall we turn for consumers of our surplus? Geography answers the question. China is our natural customer. She is nearer to us than to England, Germany, or Russia, the commercial powers of the present and the future. They have moved nearer to China by securing permanent bases on her borders. The Philippines give us a base at the door of all the East.

Lines of navigation from our ports to the Orient and Australia; from the Isthmian Canal to Asia; from all Oriental ports to Australia, converge at and separate from the Philippines. They are a self-supporting, dividend-paying fleet, permanently anchored at a spot selected by the strategy of Providence, commanding the Pacific. And the Pacific is the ocean of the commerce of the future. Most future wars will be conflicts for commerce. The power that rules the Pacific, therefore, is the power that rules the world. And, with the Philippines, that power is and will forever be the American Republic.

VALUE OF CHINA'S TRADE.

China's trade is the mightiest commercial fact in our future. Her foreign commerce was $285,738,300 in 1897, of which we, her neighbor, had less than 9 per cent, of which only a little more than half was merchandise sold to China by us. We ought to have 50 per cent, and we will. And China's foreign commerce is only beginning. Her resources, her possibilities, her wants, all are undeveloped. She has only 340 miles of railway. I have seen trains loaded with natives and all the activities of modern life already appearing along the line. But she needs, and in fifty years will have, 20,000 miles of railway.

Who can estimate her commerce, then? That statesman commits a crime against American trade—against the American grower of cotton and wheat and tobacco, the American manufacturer of machinery and clothing—who fails to put America where she may command that trade. Germany's Chinese trade is increasing like magic. She has established ship lines and secured a tangible foothold on China's very soil. Russia's Chinese trade is growing beyond belief. She is spending the revenues of the Empire to finish her railroad into Pekin itself, and she is in physical possession of the imperial province of Manchuria. Japan's

Chinese trade is multiplying in volume and value. She is bending her energy to her merchant marine, and is located along China's very coast; but Manila is nearer China than Yokohama is. The Philippines command the commercial situation of the entire East. Can America best trade with China from San Francisco or New York? From San Francisco, of course. But if San Francisco were closer to China than New York is to Pittsburg, what then? And Manila is nearer Hongkong than Habana is to Washington. And yet American statesmen plan to surrender this commercial throne of the Orient where Providence and our soldiers' lives have placed us. When history comes to write the story of that suggested treason to American supremacy and therefore to the spread of American civilization, let her in mercy write that those who so proposed were merely blind and nothing more.

RESOURCES AND IMMENSE SIZE OF THE ISLANDS.

But if they did not command China, India, the Orient, the whole Pacific for purposes of offense, defense, and trade, the Philippines are so valuable in themselves that we should hold them. I have cruised more than 2,000 miles through the archipelago, every moment a surprise at its loveliness and wealth. I have ridden hundreds of miles on the islands, every foot of the way a revelation of vegetable and mineral riches.

No land in America surpasses in fertility the plains and valleys of Luzon. Rice and coffee, sugar and cocoanuts, hemp and tobacco, and many products of the temperate as well as the tropic zone grow in various sections of the archipelago. I have seen hundreds of bushels of Indian corn lying in a road fringed with banana trees. The forests of Negros, Mindanao, Mindora, Paluan, and parts of Luzon are invaluable and intact. The wood of the Philippines can supply the furniture of the world for a century to come. At Cebu the best informed man in the island told me that 40 miles of Cebu's mountain chain are practically mountains of coal. Pablo Majia, one of the most reliable men on the islands, confirmed the statement. Some declare that the coal is only lignite; but ship captains who have used it told me that it is better steamer fuel than the best coal of Japan.

I have a nugget of pure gold picked up in its present form on the banks of a Philippine creek. I have gold dust washed out by crude processes of careless natives from the sands of a Philippine stream. Both indicate great deposits at the source from which they come. In one of the islands great deposits of copper exist untouched. The mineral wealth of this empire of the ocean will one day surprise the world. I base this statement partly on personal observation, but chiefly on the testimony of foreign merchants in the Philippines, who have practically investigated the subject, and upon the unanimous opinion of natives and priests. And the mineral wealth is but a small fraction of the agricultural wealth of these islands.

And the wood, hemp, copra, and other products of the Philippines supply what we need and can not ourselves produce. And the markets they will themselves afford will be immense. Spain's export and import trade, with the islands undeveloped, was $11,534,731 annually. Our trade with the islands developed will be $125,000,000 annually, for who believes that we can not do ten times as well as Spain? Consider their imperial dimensions. Luzon is larger and richer than New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, or Ohio. Mindanao is larger and richer than all New England, exclusive of Maine. Manila, as a port of call and exchange, will, in the time of men now living, far surpass Liverpool. Behold the exhaustless markets they command. It is as if a half dozen of our States were set down between Oceania and the Orient, and those States themselves undeveloped and unspoiled of their primitive wealth and resources.

Nothing is so natural as trade with one's neighbors. The Philippines make us the nearest neighbors of all the East. Nothing is more natural than to trade with those you know. This is the philosophy of all advertising. The Philippines bring us permanently face to face with the most sought-for customers of the world. National prestige, national propinquity, these and commercial activity are the elements of commercial success. The Philippines give the first; the character of the American people supply the last. It is a providential conjunction of all the elements of trade, of duty, and of power. If we are willing to go to war rather than let England have a few feet of frozen Alaska, which affords no market and commands none, what should we not do rather than let England, Germany, Russia, or Japan have all the Philippines? And no man on the spot can fail to see that this would be their fate if we retired.

PHILIPPINE CLIMATE.

The climate is the best tropic climate in the world. This is the belief of those who have lived in many tropic countries, with scores of whom I have talked on this point. My own experience with tropical conditions has not been exhaustive; yet, speaking from that experience, I testify that the climate of Iloilo, Sulu, Cebu, and even of Manila, greatly surpasses that of Hongkong. And yet on the bare and burning rock of Hongkong our constructing race has builded one of the noblest cities of all the world, and made the harbor it commands the focus of the commerce of the East. And the glory of that achievement illumines with a rarer splendor than that of Waterloo the flag that floats above it, for from Hongkong's heights civilization is irradiating all the Orient. If this be imperialism, its final end will be the empire of the Son of Man.

Yet fifty years ago this English outpost of empire was a smooth and treeless mountain, blazing like a ball of fire beneath the tropic suns. The Philippines are beautiful and rich, with the healing seas pouring round and through them and fanned by a thousand winds. Even in the hottest season, under severest conditions, I found the weather tolerable and often delightful; and in Luzon, Panay, Cebu, Negros, and Sulu I have been in the sun and rain without protection from either for hours at a time, traveling from place to place on horseback, on foot, or in a boat, rising at dawn, retiring at midnight, week after week, without injury to health.

General MacArthur, commanding a force which had been fighting continuously for three months and which was under fire practically every hour, was in excellent health every time I saw him at San Fernando, our extreme front. General Lawton, that perfect soldier, whom I have seen ride, order, plan, and execute all day, and then ride, order, plan, and execute all night, until the Tagals named him "the soldier of the night," told me that his health was perfect. General Otis, that devoted servant of the Republic, who toils ceaselessly, does not fall ill, nor grow weary, nor complain. I could give the names of scores of our officers and describe their feats of endurance witnessed by me that would have taxed their strength even in America. Yet they do not succumb. I have seen correspondents exert themselves in all kinds of weather without food or sleep in a way that would prostrate them in the hottest days of our summer in Chicago or New York. Major Hoyt, chief medical officer with MacArthur, told me that San Fernando is as healthy as the average American town. The European business men of Cebu, Iloilo, and Manila work as hard and as many hours a day as those of New York, and a finer body of physical manhood can not be gathered at random in America. This proves that this garden of the seas is not the sweltering, steaming, miasmatic swamp it has been described.

CHARACTER OF THE PEOPLE—AGUINALDO.

It will be hard for Americans who have not studied them to understand the people. They are a barbarous race, modified by three centuries of contact with a decadent race. The Filipino is the South Sea Malay, put through a process of three hundred years of superstition in religion, dishonesty in dealing, disorder in habits of industry, and cruelty, caprice, and corruption in government. It is barely possible that 1,000 men in all the archipelago are capable of self-government in the Anglo-Saxon sense.

My own belief is that there are not 100 men among them who comprehend what Anglo-Saxon self-government even means, and there are over 5,000,000 people to be governed. I know many clever and highly educated men among them, but there are only three commanding intellects and characters—Arellani, Mabini, and Aguinaldo. Arellano, the chief justice of our supreme court, is a profound lawyer and a brave and incorruptible man. Mabini, who, before his capture, was the literary and diplomatic associate of Aguinaldo, is the highest type of subtlety and the most constructive mind that race has yet produced. Aguinaldo is a clever, popular leader, able, brave, resourceful, cunning, ambitious, unscrupulous, and masterful. He is full of decision, initiative, and authority, and had the confidence of the masses. He is a natural dictator. His ideas of government are absolute orders, implicit obedience, or immediate death. He understands the character of his countrymen. He is a Malay Sylla; not a Filipino Washington.

These conclusions were forced upon me by observing the people in all walks of life in the different islands, and by conversations with foreign merchants, priests, mestizos, pure Filipinos, and every variety of mind, character, and opinion from San Fernando, in Luzon, on down through the entire archipelago to the interior of Sulu. These conversations were had informally at dinner tables, on journeys, and the like, and always under conditions favorable to entire frankness and unreserve. Their chief value is that they are the real opinions of their authors and not prepared and guarded statements. I will read to the Senate salient points from a few of my notes of these conversations, reserving the names of the persons interviewed, except that of Pablo Majia, of Cebu, who was assassinated a week after I met him, and whose fate I will not risk bringing down on others. Their names and residences are here in this book, and will be gladly given to any Senator or to the Senate in executive session. The conversations themselves, of course, are many of them quite extended. I give here only the brief extracts, which may be helpful to a correct understanding of the subject immediately in hand.

One of the principal merchants of the Philippines and the far East said, among many other things:

The whole country is incalculably rich. With only ordinary good government commerce would be immense. Spanish rule was corrupt, but commerce

accustomed itself to the conditions and flourished in spite of them. So rich is the country that commerce will survive any situation, however bad, if it is only fixed and certain. The people are incapable of self-government. The few exceptions are no examples of the masses. For years to come a very strong government will be necessary. The climate is very good. I have lived here eighteen years, and my health was never better.

One of the principal business men of the Philippines and the far East said:

I have no fault to find with the climate. My health is very fine. Business here, large as it is, is only a hint of what will be under a good government. I think it folly to talk of giving the natives any part in the government. They are incapable. Of course there are, possibly, half a dozen who might be capable, but I doubt the result of such an experiment, even with the best. Anything but a strong government at first will result in disaster. Do not put courts into their hands at all, except the minor and village courts, of course. You might give them municipal self-government in the smaller municipalities, but even then only under careful supervision.

The most eminent educator in the Philippines, of very wide information about the people and the country, said:

It is a marvelous country. The climate is the ideal tropical climate of the world. Also, it presents every variety of climate. Only a moderate distance from Manila, in the province of Benguet, there are oaks, pines, frost, and you must use blankets at night. It is the richest and most variegated portion of the earth's surface. My health has always been good. You must introduce a strong, decisive, and pure government. The natives might possibly be permitted to take a practical part in municipal affairs.

Self-government is out of the question. I fear the insurrection will last for months. The natives are like buffalo bulls—they get mad and then want to fight, no matter whether right or wrong. You can not successfully deal with them by gentle means; they absolutely misunderstand such treatment. While in arms they must be fought, fought ceaselessly and remorselessly. Otherwise they will keep it up forever.

The most eminent scientist of the far East, better informed on the Philippines and their people and more experienced in the whole situation than any man now living, said:

The climate is the best tropical climate in the world. My health is excellent and has been for years. Nearly everything can be raised in the islands. Also nearly any climate can be had in the various altitudes practically accessible. It will take a long time to prepare the people for self-government. Certainly they are not so now. I think everything must for years be firmly controlled by the Americans.

A gentleman connected with the railroad service and thoroughly acquainted with the people said:

The climate of these islands is perfect for the Tropics. I have been here altogether for six years and never enjoyed better health. I think these fellows will keep on fighting for months. They are utterly incapable of self-government as Americans or English understand it. They might, under very careful and firm direction, be allowed to take a little part in municipal government, but not much even there. If they were given self-government, business would almost disappear, until some European power took the matter in hand.

One of the large planters and business men of the interior of Luzon, a pure Filipino, with intimate relations with the insurgents:

It is hard to say how long the contest will last. The very common people care little about the matter, but have been told and believe many bad things about the Americans. What Filipinos want is to govern themselves. No, of course, they do not know anything about government except that Spain gave them, which was most corrupt. If you gave those islands a government where justice would be administered freely and without price, property protected, and free speech secured, you ask me if the common people would be satisfied. I do not know.

The common people do not know what they want. Are they capable of self-government—of voting intelligently? What difference does that make? They would vote just exactly as the better classes say. I employ several hundred men. Well, I expect and would see to it that they have the same opinions I have. Humph! it would be impossible otherwise. What the Filipino leaders talk about and insist on is a guaranty. By this they mean Filipinos to have exclusive government of the islands, the United States to keep a fleet here to protect that government and the islands generally in every possible situation, and this agreement witnessed by a third nation, strong enough to compel the United States to carry out its contract. The people are not capable of self-government, but the leaders are, or would be after some practice; so it is just the same thing.

A pure Filipino, a physician, a man of wealth, in the interior of Luzon—one of the most intelligent men of the many I met and talked to:

It is hard to say how long this struggle will continue. The leaders say they want independence; the common people probably want socialism. To be definite and particular, they probably do not know what they want. No, they are not capable of self-government. If you give them pure government, free speech, and all that, they would not understand and appreciate it at first; would not believe it, as it were.

But when, after awhile, three or four years, say, they come to understand your good intentions and actually experience good government, there will be no trouble. Oh, yes; the islands are marvelously rich. After good government is once in operation, they will pay their way many times over. My people are not a bad people; they don't understand; they are children yet.

The principal British merchant of Iloilo said:

The climate is simply splendid, even here on the sea. A very short distance inland you must have fire every night. I have been here more than twenty years, and my health is and always has been most excellent. The only time I ever felt heat badly was in New York last September. It goes without saying that the country is enormously rich. Its resources have not yet even begun to be developed. Vast as commerce is or was, it is only a suggestion to what may be. The natives are a kind, affectionate people when properly treated. They are suspicious, though, and once aroused, very obstinate. Surely they are capable of self-government in municipal matters. Further than that I think it not safe to go at present. The common people probably do not understand the meaning of self-government as we do.

There is no doubt that they would be completely dominated by their leaders. I should think it a very risky business to put the courts in the hands of the natives, even if you allowed them a large measure of self-government otherwise. You see; they do not understand the just and pure administration of law through courts. How should they? The whole secret of your success will be to adopt some definite plan, stick to it, govern justly and firmly, be patient, do not expect everything in a day, and very gradually and wisely introduce them into the government. But all will fail if you send any but pure and incorruptible men here.

Another British merchant of Iloilo said:

My health was never better. The weather here is a hundred times more agreeable than some of the summer weather in Chicago. Of course the natives are not capable of self-government. You must establish a strong, honest, firm rule throughout the islands—the same laws, rights, and forms everywhere. Don't indulge in any nonsense about self-government. It is out of the question, at present at least. Don't moralize and theorize. Do. Fix your plan. Let all know definitely just what it is, and then execute it firmly, vigorously. The natives understand strength and justice or injustice. That is as far as they have gotten. Don't palaver with them. Treating with them they construe as fear. Don't be academic.

A highly educated and bright Spanish mestizo, claiming to be pure Filipino, employed in Iloilo, said:

No one can tell when the fighting will cease. It all depends upon what Aguinaldo says. The common people have absolute faith in him. His order among those now in rebellion in this island would be promptly obeyed. The common people say they are fighting for their independence. They mean by this the right to manage their own government; make and execute their own laws. Their ideas of a proper relation between the Philippine Islands and people of the United States is that of a protectorate. The leaders absolutely control the people. A man of property expects his working people to have the same opinion as he has. I do myself.

It is, perhaps, true that the masses do not understand what self-government means. I think that there are enough capable and educated men among our people to control government, but I do not believe that the great mass of the people are at all fitted for self-government now and will not be for a long time. You should have uniform laws over the entire archipelago. If you have one thing at one place and another at another place, each will think and say that the other is better treated, and you will have constant and serious disturbance. Already the people of this island are very angry because Negros is given a United States constitution. That is a profound mistake. Don't experiment. Select your plan and execute it. English ought to be made the one language of the island.

A rich planter of Panay, pure Filipino, but moderate in views, said:

The common people have no opinions and are not capable of voting. If the Filipinos established a government, of course the property and educated class would, beyond doubt, run such government. Not more than 25 per cent of the people are fitted to take part in the selection of public officers. The people are at present incapable of self-government, though they might be intrusted with purely municipal affairs. Establish precisely the same laws through the archipelago. English should be universally taught. The common people know and care nothing about self-government or any other government. They are principally interested in simply living. Self-government can only mean government by the upper classes.

A prominent but very conservative business man of Panay:

You may be a long time subduing this insurrection. The people are not yet capable of self-government in the archipelago. It is well, though, to trust them with municipal administration, provided everything is under your final supervision. The proposition to have the same commercial laws everywhere is too plain for argument. The climate is not bad at all. You see that for yourself. It is very cool here, you see, this evening. My own health has been excellent, and is now. There is very little sickness among the English here.

A leading mestizo of Negros:

The island of Negros is far ahead of any other island in the culture of its people. Our chief desire now is to get utterly away from Spanish customs, laws, and traditions. I think we are quite capable of self-government under American protection. If the Philippine Islands are made into a Federal system we would expect to be one of the States. Certainly we can manage the local affairs of the island. Exclusive of the savages of the mountains, I should say that 4 or 5 per cent of the people are now capable of intelligently voting.

I think the voting should be by those who own property, can read and write, or are established householders and heads of families, with definite residences. I would find out who should vote by having a committee in each town make out a list and then notify the ones chosen. Certainly I would expect the common people to follow the advice of the leaders and vote for whom the leaders said. I should think my own employees would take my view of a situation. If you give us a government where justice is administered without corruption or delay, property protected without a fee, free speech insured, commercial language provided, the people will be satisfied.

Spain did none of this, but the reverse. That is, and was, our complaint. English should be immediately made the language of the whole archipelago. I do not think the same political laws should prevail throughout the islands. One place should have laws adapted to it; another, laws adapted to it. The reason for this is that the people of the various islands are of different degrees of culture. Of course, though, I think the whole archipelago a commercial unit.

Pure Filipino and large planter of Negros:

I have working for me about 400 men. They are good, average examples of the common people of the island. I should say that not over 3 or 4 per cent of them are capable of self-government or in any true sense understand the term. If the ballot were given them, or even if it were restricted to those 3 or 4 per cent, I should expect them to vote as the leaders might indicate. I think the English language should be immediately adopted throughout the entire archipelago. It would simplify matters incalculably. No, I do not believe the same laws should prevail everywhere. We of Negros are more cultivated than in Panay. We deserve better laws.

Very large planter and influential man of Negros, claiming to be pure Filipino, but with some Chinese blood:

The climate is most excellent. The wealth of these islands is beyond imagination. We have only begun to develop our resources. For example, we have not touched our minerals, practically. Lands you see yonder are really better for agricultural purposes than this low, flat coast land. No; it is not yet occupied, and the title to it is still in the government.

I have several American plows. They do good work. We do not use more because they are not brought to us. The native plow has served our purpose and our inertia makes it inconvenient to change, if effort is necessary. Yes; enterprising agency would sell many plows. I have several carriages made in America. I have from 1,000 to 1,500 men working for me. Of these

practically all are capable of self-government. Would they vote as I wished? Most assuredly they would. By all means make English the language of these islands as speedily as possible. It will increase commerce and get us farther away from the old and hated régime.

I regard these islands as a commercial unit, and think uniform laws should prevail throughout the archipelago. Your young men could come here and buy land and soon get enormously rich. You need not fear that we leaders would be able to control elections. The government itself would nominate all the officers or candidates; so you see the people would have to vote for good men. What would I do if any man spoke against or criticised the government? Why, anyone rising against the government would be tried and shot if condemned.

Prominent Filipino of Cebu:

The island of Cebu can yield greatly more than it has. The people are disturbed by what they have been through and what they fear. Very few are capable of self-government now. My brother employs a large number of men. If given the ballot, they would most certainly vote as he said. I am sure the better classes would control the voting of the poorer classes. We should expect to hold positions under any government you establish.

A foreign planter of Panay, then in Cebu:

No, the people are not capable of self-government. You had better beware of giving them too much than too little. If you give them more than in their hearts they expect, you lay the foundation of trouble. No matter what plan you adopt, it all depends on the men you send here to execute it. If they are made political billets, you are irretrievably lost. Your governor-general must be absolutely honest, brave, tactful, broad-minded, and able. Pay him well. He will earn it, if he ought to have the place at all. The strictest supervision should be exercised by him. An impure man could do more damage and more disgrace to the name of America than a hundred men could remedy. Govern firmly and justly and nonpolitically.

Pablo Majia, pure Filipino, rich, able, honest, and moderate. He was stabbed to death in Cebu, and this is why I withhold the names of the others:

I do not think anyone could ask for a better climate than this. It is much better than Hongkong. The resources of this island have not begun to be developed. Our coal is very good, much better than Japan coal. There is copper, too, on this island, not yet worked. I am sorry to say that very few of our population are capable of self-government.

Of course the wealthy and educated classes are entirely competent to run the government. I do not expect nor desire any government except one founded on and directed by America. Oh, yes; to such extent as the ballot may be given, there is no doubt that we of the upper class can control. I employ 100 men now—in good times more. All these would vote as I say.

An educator of Cebu, who has lived among the Filipinos for twenty-five years, and one of the ablest men I ever met:

For general health and for all human conditions I consider this climate unexcelled in the world. When I left Europe twenty-five years ago and came here my health was wretched. Here I am never ill. The resources of these islands are simply marvelous. Think of the agricultural richness of Negros! Think of the mineral wealth of Cebu! For 40 miles this chain of mountains back of us is one continuous coal mine. The coal is excellent. It is far better than the Japan coal. And there are very rich copper deposits over yonder; nobody ever worked them yet. There is gold here, too.

Here, I will make you a present of this gold dust; it was scooped up from one of our streams here. It proves the existence of very heavy deposits at the point from which these fragments were washed down. In another island there are very rich gold deposits. Let me present you with this nugget. It was picked up just as you see it. I have seen nuggets from there as large as your thumb—pure, solid gold. Why are they not worked? Oh, we have been so far out of the world, you know, the world has forgotten us. And, then, the strange apathy of the Spanish Government and people. But that is all good luck for you. These people are not capable of self-government. That ought to be apparent to any thoughtful person. They are strangelg childish. They do not themselves understand clearly what they are fightiny for. Independence to the common people means anarchy, or, rather, socialism.

To the upper classes it means rule and dominion. If the ballot were placed in the hands of the people, they would vote as their leaders said. It would be well to make English the language of all the islands—but, dear me, what a fearful time you will have teaching it. Why, my dear friend, we have been teaching them Spanish for three hundred years—working hard, too—and yet they speak it very badly even now. They are not bright; really, they are stupid. They resemble very much the caribou. They learn with great difficulty. Come into the islands with practical common sense, not scholastically, theoretically, or experimentally. The islands can be made a great blessing to you, and you to them, and they also can be made a great curse.

A gentleman living in Sulu and who has spent his entire life in various tropical countries said:

The resources of these islands are not even guessed. This land we stand on grows cocoa, sugar, rice, coffee, and hemp, and all of the finest quality. As to the health, the conditions are perfect. I am thoroughly acquainted with Asiatic and Pacific Tropics, and I consider this climate the ideal climate of them all. I hope you are not contemplating such a thing as self-government for the archipelago. It would be a hideous mistake. They are utterly incapable of participating in government.

May be in some places municipal government might, to a limited extent, be put in the hands of the more competent natives, but even then, I fear, it would work badly. But government of the archipelago by natives would mean continuous civil war. I want you people to succeed, but you will ignominiously and frightfully fail if you put up a weak or a half-hearted government here. I have spent my life here, in Borneo, Java, Straits Settlements, and other such places, and I know this people thoroughly. You have a glorious opportunity here and you must not ruin it.

I will close these few extracts, which are a fair sample of a great number of others, all of which I am willing to submit to the Senate at any time, by reading a few suggestions made to me by the first statesman of the far East, who has had practical experience with similar problems. In the course of a long interview he said:

You must establish government over the islands, because it is incalculably to your interest in the future, and because, if you do not, another power will undoubtedly take them, involving the world in a war for which you will be responsible.

As to the form of government, you should have a governor-general of great ability, firmness, and purity; under him suboficers of districts, and under them still lower officials for the municipalities, all appointed by their superiors and not chosen by the people. You should employ the ablest natives in the Government service in some way so as to enlist them on your side. The courts are the most important consideration of all. Don't put the natives in charge of them whatever else you do. In the armed forces, don't give any native superior positions for a long time. Don't do too much for them in the beginning. Do it gradually, as the years go by. I think your course is clear. Don't treat with them until you defeat them. You must do that. You can not treat and fight.

Make English the language of the courts, schools, and everything else. Let me impress on you the necessity of conferring your benefits on them quite gradually. If you give them too much they can not appreciate nor understand nor rightly use it, and it will thus be thrown away; but if you give them the blessing of free institutions gradually, you furnish a source of constant gratitude. In the other way you exhaust yourself at the beginning, and besides fail in your good intentions.

WE WILL HOLD IT FAST, AND HOLD IT FOREVER.

Here, then, Senators, is the situation. Two years ago there was no land in all the world which we could occupy for any purpose. Our commerce was daily turning toward the Orient, and geography and trade developments made necessary our commercial empire over the Pacific. And in that ocean we had no commercial, naval, or military base. To-day we have one of the three great ocean possessions of the globe, located at the most commanding commercial, naval, and military points in the eastern seas, within hail of India, shoulder to shoulder with China, richer in its own resources than any equal body of land on the entire globe, and peopled by a race which civilization demands shall be improved. Shall we abandon it? That man little knows the common people of the Republic, little understands the instincts of our race, who thinks we will not hold it fast and hold it forever, administering just government by simplest methods. We may trick up devices to shift our burden and lessen our opportunity; they will avail us nothing but delay. We may tangle conditions by applying academic arrangements of self-government to a crude situation; their failure will drive us to our duty in the end.

MILITARY SITUATION—OTIS DEFENDED.

The military situation, past, present, and prospective, is no reason for abandonment. Our campaign has been as perfect as possible with the force at hand. We have been delayed, first, by a failure to comprehend the immensity of our acquisition; and, second, by insufficient force; and, third, by our efforts for peace. In February, after the treaty of peace, General Otis had only 3,722 officers and men whom he had a legal right to order into battle. The terms of enlistment of the rest of his troops had expired, and they fought voluntarily and not on legal military compulsion. It was one of the noblest examples of patriotic devotion to duty in the history of the world.

Those who complain do so in ignorance of the real situation. We attempted a great task with insufficient means; we became impatient that it was not finished before it could fairly be commenced; and I pray we may not add that other element of disaster, pausing in the work before it is thoroughly and forever done. That is the gravest mistake we could possibly make, and that is the only danger before us. Our Indian wars would have been shortened, the lives of soldiers and settlers saved, and the Indians themselves benefited had we made continuous and decisive war; and any other kind of war is criminal because ineffective. We acted toward the Indians as though we feared them, loved them, hated them—a mingling of foolish sentiment, inaccurate thought, and paralytic purpose. Let us now be instructed by our own experience.

This, too, has been Spain's course in the Philippines. I have studied Spain's painful military history in these islands. Never sufficient troops; never vigorous action, pushed to conclusive results and a permanent peace; always treating with the rebels while they fought them; always cruel and corrupt when a spurious peace was arranged. This has been Spain's way for three hundred years, until insurrection has become a Filipino habit. Never since Magellan landed did Spain put enough troops in the islands for complete and final action in war; never did she intelligently, justly, firmly, administer government in peace.

At the outbreak of the last insurrection, in August, 1896, Spain had only 1,500 Spanish soldiers in all the Philippines, and 700 of these were in Manila. In November of that year she had only 10,000 men. The generals in command of these were criticised and assailed in Spain. It is characteristic of Spain that the people at home do not support, but criticise their generals in the field. The Spanish method has always been a mixed policy of peace and war, a contradiction of terms, an impossible combination, rendering war ineffective and peace impossible. This was Compo's plan. It was Blanco's plan. Those who would make it our plan will inherit Blanco's fate and failure.

TRUE MILITARY POLICY.

Mr. President, that must not be our plan. This war is like all other wars. It needs to be finished before it is stopped. I am prepared to vote either to make our work thorough or even now to abandon it. A lasting peace can be secured only by overwhelming forces in ceaseless action until universal and absolutely final defeat is inflicted on the enemy. To halt before every armed

force, every guerrilla band, opposing us is dispersed or exterminated will prolong hostilities and leave alive the seeds of perpetual insurrection.

Even then we should not treat. To treat at all is to admit that we are wrong. And any quiet so secured will be delusive and fleeting. And a false peace will betray us; a sham truce will curse us. It is not to serve the purposes of the hour, it is not to salve a present situation, that peace should be established. It is for the tranquillity of the archipelago forever. It is for an orderly government for the Filipinos for all the future. It is to give this problem to posterity solved and settled; not vexed and involved. It is to establish the supremacy of the American Republic over the Pacific and throughout the East till the end of time.

It has been charged that our conduct of the war has been cruel. Senators, it has been the reverse. I have been in our hospitals and seen the Filipino wounded as carefully, tenderly cared for as our own. Within our lines they may plow and sow and reap and go about the affairs of peace with absolute liberty. And yet all this kindness was misunderstood, or rather not understood. Senators must remember that we are not dealing with Americans or Europeans. We are dealing with Orientals. We are dealing with Orientals who are Malays. We are dealing with Malays instructed in Spanish methods. They mistake kindness for weakness, forbearance for fear. It could not be otherwise unless you could erase hundreds of years of savagery, other hundreds of years of orientalism, and still other hundreds of years of Spanish character and custom.

OUR EFFORTS TO SECURE PEACE.

Our mistake has not been cruelty; it has been kindness. It has been the application to Spanish Malays of methods appropriate to New England. Every device of mercy, every method of conciliation, has been employed by the peace-loving President of the American Republic, to the amazement of nations experienced in oriental revolt. Before the outbreak our general in command appointed a commission to make some arrangement with the natives mutually agreeable. I know the members of the commission well—General Hughes, Colonel Crowder, and General Smith—moderate, kindly, tactful men of the world; an ideal body for such negotiation. It was treated with contempt.

We smiled at intolerable insult and insolence until the lips of every native in Manila were curling in ridicule for the cowardly Americans. We refrained from all violence until their armed bravos crossed the lines in violation of agreement. Then our sentry shot the offender, and he should have been court-martialed had he failed to shoot. That shot was the most fortunate of the war. For there is every reason to believe that Aguinaldo had planned the attack upon us for some nights later. Our sentry's shot brought this attack prematurely on. He arranged for an uprising in Manila to massacre all Americans, the plans for which, in a responsible officer's handwriting, are in our possession. This shot and its results made that awful scheme impossible. We did not strike till they attacked us in force, without provocation. This left us no alternative but war or evacuation.

WORK OF THE COMMISSION.

The patience of our peace-loving President was not even then exhausted. A civil commission was sent to Manila, composed of the president of one of our great universities, a distinguished diplomat and an eminent college professor who had special knowledge of the country and people and also General Otis and Admiral Dewey. These men exhausted the expedients of peace, and always were met with the Malay's ready evasion, the Spaniard's habitual delay. I am personal witness that no effort was neglected by our commission to assure the Filipino people of our good intentions and beneficent purposes. The commission entertained the mestizos of Manila in a way that would have honored the Senate of the United States; the brown faces of the common people sneered. The commission treated natives, accustomed to blows, with kindest consideration; the agents of Aguinaldo told tales of our pusillanimity to the ignorant rural masses. This remarkable man sent so-called commissions, ostensibly to treat, but really to play with ours. His commissions were composed of generals in uniform. The populace gaped in open admiration when they appeared in Manila. Our representatives of peace talked to them, argued with them, entertained them; the people were impressed with their importance. President Schurman even rode with them through the city. The masses were confirmed in their reverence for their brothers who were thus honored and distinguished. Then the bespangled representatives of the Malay dictator return to their lord, and the sole effect of these pacific efforts was to make 250,000 natives in Manila think that the only way to win the respect of the American Republic is to fight it.

No, Senators, the friendly methods of peace have been thoroughly tried only to make peace more difficult. The Oriental does not understand our attempt to conciliate. Every effort of our commission which did its work at Manila so earnestly, so honestly, so thoroughly, and which, with Americans or Europeans, would have so brilliantly succeeded, only delayed the peace it attempted to hasten. There is not now and never was any possible course but ceaseless operations in the field and loyal support of the war at home.

The news that 60,000 American soldiers have crossed the Pacific; that, if necessary, the American Congress will make it 100,000 or 200,000 men; that, at any cost, we will establish peace and govern the islands, will do more to end the war than the soldiers themselves. But the report that we even discuss the withdrawal of a single soldier at the present time and that we even debate the possibility of not administering government throughout the archipelago ourselves will be misunderstood and misrepresented and will blow into a flame once more the fires our soldiers' blood has almost quenched.

"THE BLOOD OF OUR SOLDIERS."

Mr. President, reluctantly and only from a sense of duty am I forced to say that American opposition to the war has been the chief factor in prolonging it. Had Aguinaldo not understood that in America, even in the American Congress, even here in the Senate, he and his cause were supported; had he not known that it was proclaimed on the stump and in the press of a faction in the United States that every shot his misguided followers fired into the breasts of American soldiers was like the volleys fired by Washington's men against the soldiers of King George his insurrection would have dissolved before it entirely crystallized.

The utterances of American opponents of the war are read to the ignorant soldiers of Aguinaldo and repeated in exaggerated form among the common people. Attempts have been made by wretches claiming American citizenship to ship arms and ammunition from Asiatic ports to the Filipinos, and these acts of infamy were coupled by the Malays with American assaults on our Government at home. The Filipinos do not understand free speech, and therefore our tolerance of American assaults on the American President and the American Government means to them that our President is in the minority or he would not permit what appears to them such treasonable criticism. It is believed and stated in Luzon, Panay, and Cebu that the Filipinos have only to fight, harass, retreat, break up into small parties, if necessary, as they are doing now, but by any means hold out until the next Presidential election, and our forces will be withdrawn.

All this has aided the enemy more than climate, arms, and battle. Senators, I have heard these reports myself; I have talked with the people; I have seen our mangled boys in the hospital and field; I have stood on the firing line and beheld our dead soldiers, their faces turned to the pitiless southern sky, and in sorrow rather than anger I say to those whose voices in America have cheered those misguided natives on to shoot our soldiers down, that the blood of those dead and wounded boys of ours is on their hands, and the flood of all the years can never wash that stain away. In sorrow rather than anger I say these words, for I earnestly believe that our brothers knew not what they did.

THE FILIPINOS ARE CHILDREN, UTTERLY INCAPABLE OF SELF-GOVERNMENT.

But, Senators, it would be better to abandon this combined garden and Gibraltar of the Pacific, and count our blood and treasure already spent a profitable loss, than to apply any academic arrangement of self-government to these children. They are not capable of self-government. How could they be? They are not of a self-governing race. They are Orientals, Malays, instructed by Spaniards in the latter's worst estate.

They know nothing of practical government except as they have witnessed the weak, corrupt, cruel, and capricious rule of Spain. What magic will anyone employ to dissolve in their minds and characters those impressions of governors and governed which three centuries of misrule has created? What alchemy will change the oriental quality of their blood and set the self-governing currents of the American pouring through their Malay veins? How shall they, in the twinkling of an eye, be exalted to the heights of self-governing peoples which required a thousand years for us to reach, Anglo-Saxon though we are?

Let men beware how they employ the term "self-government." It is a sacred term. It is the watchword at the door of the inner temple of liberty, for liberty does not always mean self-government. Self-government is a method of liberty—the highest, simplest, best—and it is acquired only after centuries of study and struggle and experiment and instruction and all the elements of the progress of man. Self-government is no base and common thing, to be bestowed on the merely audacious. It is the degree which crowns the graduate of liberty, not the name of liberty's infant class, who have not yet mastered the alphabet of freedom. Savage blood, oriental blood, Malay blood, Spanish example—are these the elements of self-government?

We must act on the situation as it exists, not as we would wish it. I have talked with hundreds of these people, getting their views as to the practical workings of self-government. The great majority simply do not understand any participation in any government whatever. The most enlightened among them declare

that self-government will succeed because the employers of labor will compel their employees to vote as their employer wills and that this will insure intelligent voting. I was assured that we could depend upon good men always being in office because the officials who constitute the government will nominate their successors, choose those among the people who will do the voting, and determine how and where elections will be held.

The most ardent advocate of self-government that I met was anxious that I should know that such a government would be tranquil because, as he said, if anyone criticised it, the government would shoot the offender. A few of them have a sort of verbal understanding of the democratic theory, but the above are the examples of the ideas of the practical workings of self-government entertained by the aristocracy, the rich planters and traders, and heavy employers of labor, the men who would run the government.

PEOPLE INDOLENT—NO COMPETITION WITH OUR LABOR.

Example for decades will be necessary to instruct them in American ideas and methods of administration. Example, example; always example—this alone will teach them. As a race, their general ability is not excellent. Educators, both men and women, to whom I have talked in Cebu and Luzon, were unanimous in the opinion that in all solid and useful education they are, as a people, dull and stupid. In showy things, like carving and painting or embroidery or music, they have apparent aptitude, but even this is superficial and never thorough. They have facility of speech, too.

The three best educators on the island at different times made to me the same comparison, that the common people in their stupidity are like their caribou bulls. They are not even good agriculturists. Their waste of cane is inexcusable. Their destruction of hemp fiber is childish. They are incurably indolent. They have no continuity or thoroughness of industry. They will quit work without notice and amuse themselves until the money they have earned is spent. They are like children playing at men's work.

No one need fear their competition with our labor. No reward could beguile, no force compel, these children of indolence to leave their trifling lives for the fierce and fervid industry of high-wrought America. The very reverse is the fact. One great problem is the necessary labor to develop these islands—to build the roads, open the mines, clear the wilderness, drain the swamps, dredge the harbors. The natives will not supply it. A lingering prejudice against the Chinese may prevent us from letting them supply it. Ultimately, when the real truth of the climate and human conditions is known, it is barely possible that our labor will go there. Even now young men with the right moral fiber and a little capital can make fortunes there as planters.

But the natives will not come here. Let all men dismiss that fear. The Dutch have Java, and its population, under Holland's rule, has increased from 2,000,000 to more than 20,000,000 people; yet the Java laborer has never competed with the laborer of Holland. And this is true of England and Germany, of every colonizing, administering power. The native has produced luxuries for the laborer of the governing country and afforded a market for what the laborer of the governing country in turn produced.

In Paluan the natives are primitive. In Sulu and Mindanao the Moros are vigorous and warlike, but have not the most elementary notions of civilization. For example, they do not understand the utility of roads. Nothing exists but paths through the jungle. I have ridden for hours in Sulu over the most primitive paths, barely discernible in the rank grass. They have not grasped the idea of private and permanent property in land, and yet there is no lovelier spot, no richer land, no better military and naval base than the Sulu group. In Paluan, Sulu, and Mindanao the strictest military government is necessary indefinitely. The inhabitants can never be made to work, can never be civilized. Their destiny can not be foretold. But whether they will withstand civilization or disappear before it, our duty is plain.

OUTLINE OF PLAN OF GOVERNMENT NEEDED IN THE PHILIPPINES: "SIMPLE AND STRONG."

In all other islands our government must be simple and strong. It must be a uniform government. Different forms for different islands will produce perpetual disturbance, because the people of each island would think that the people of the other islands are more favored than they. In Panay I heard murmurings that we were giving Negros an American constitution. This is a human quality, found even in America, and we must never forget that in dealing with the Filipinos we deal with children. And so our government must be simple and strong. Simple and strong! The meaning of those two words must be written in every line of Philippine legislation, realized in every act of Philippine administration. A Philippine office in our Department of State; an American governor-general in Manila, with power to meet daily emergencies; possibly an advisory council with no power except that of discussing measures with the governor-general, which council would be the germ for future legislatures, a school in practical government; American lieutenant-governors in each province, with a like council about him; if possible, an American resident in each district and a like council grouped about him; frequent and unannounced visits of provincial governors to the districts of their province; periodical reports to the governor-general; an American board of visitation to make semiannual trips to the archipelago without power of suggestion or interference to officials or people, but only to report and recommend to the Philippine office of our State Department; a Philippine civil service, with promotion for efficiency; the abolition of duties on exports from the Philippines; the establishment of import duties on a revenue basis, with such discrimination in favor of American imports as will prevent the cheaper goods of other nations from destroying American trade; a complete reform of local taxation on a just and scientific basis, beginning with the establishment of a tax on land according to its assessed value; the minting of abundant money for Philippine and oriental use; the granting of franchises and concessions upon the theory of developing the resources of the archipelago, and therefore not by sale, but upon participation in the profits of the enterprise; the formation of a system of public schools everywhere with compulsory attendance rigidly enforced; the establishment of the English language throughout the islands, teaching it exclusively in the schools and using it, through interpreters, exclusively in the courts; a simple civil code and a still simpler criminal code, and both common to all the islands except Sulu, Mindanao, and Paluan; American judges for all but smallest offenses; gradual, slow, and careful introduction of the best Filipinos into the working machinery of the government, no promise whatever of the franchise until the people have been prepared for it; all this backed by the necessary force to execute it; this outline of government the situation demands as soon as tranquillity is established. Until then military government is advisable.

ENGLISH OR DUTCH SYSTEMS IMPOSSIBLE—PROTECTORATE IMPRACTICABLE.

We can not adopt the Dutch method in Java, nor the English method in the Malay states, because both of these systems rest on and operate through the existing governments of hereditary princes, with Dutch or English residents as advisers. But in the Philippines there are no such hereditary rulers, no such established governments. There is no native machinery of administration except that of the villages. The people have been deprived of the advantages of hereditary native princes, and yet not instructed in any form of regular, just, and orderly government.

Neither is a protectorate practicable. If a protectorate leaves the natives to their own methods more than would our direct administration of their government, it would permit the very evils which it is our duty to prevent. If, on the other hand, under a protectorate, we interfere to prevent those evils, we govern as much as if we directly administer the government, but without system or constructive purpose. In either alternative we incur all the responsibility of directly governing them ourselves, without any of the benefits to us, to them, or to the archipelago, which our direct administration of government throughout the islands would secure.

KIND OF AMERICAN OFFICIALS NECESSARY.

Even the elemental plan I have outlined will fail in the hands of any but ideal administrators. Spain did not utterly fail in devising—many of her plans were excellent; she failed in administering. Her officials as a class were corrupt, indolent, cruel, immoral. They were selected to please a faction in Spain, to placate members of the Cortes, to bribe those whom the Government feared. They were seldom selected for their fitness. They were the spawn of Government favor and Government fear, and therefore of Government iniquity.

The men we send to administer civilized government in the Philippines must be themselves the highest examples of our civilization. I use the word examples, for examples they must be in that word's most absolute sense. They must be men of the world and of affairs, students of their fellow-men, not theorists nor dreamers. They must be brave men, physically as well as morally. They must be as incorruptible as honor, as stainless as purity, men whom no force can frighten, no influence coerce, no money buy. Such men come high, even here in America. But they must be had. Better pure military occupation for years than government by any other quality of administration. Better abandon this priceless possession, admit ourselves incompetent to do our part in the world-redeeming work of our imperial race; better now haul down the flag of arduous deeds for civilization and run up the flag of reaction and decay than to apply academic notions of self-government to these children or attempt their government by any but the most perfect administrators our country can produce. I assert that such administrators can be found.

There is one in Cuba now who, with the words "Money is not everything," refused $30,000 a year as president of a corporation that he might continue the work of our race in the regeneration of Santiago, and thus announced and typified the new ideal of the

Republic, which pessimists declared had become sordid and base. And among our 80,000,000 we have thousands like him. Necessity will produce them. Let no one fear that our party workers will seek to fill these places without regard to fitness. I know well this most maligned and most valuable class of American citizens—the precinct committeemen and party workers in the country districts of the Republic—and if we truthfully, bravely state the situation at the outset, these very politicians will insist most strenuously of all on the highest possible qualification in the administration of our possessions.

OUR ADMINISTRATORS MUST BE EXAMPLES.

I repeat that our government and our administrators must be examples. You can not teach the Filipino by precept. An object lesson is the only lesson he comprehends. He has no conception of pure, orderly, equal, impartial government, under equal laws justly administered, because he has never seen such a government. He must be shown the simplest results of good government by actual example in order that he may begin to understand its most elementary principles.

Such a government will have its effect upon us here in America, too. Model administration there will be an example created by ourselves for model administration here; and our own example is the only one Americans ever heed. It is not true that charity begins at home. Selfishness begins there; but charity begins abroad and ends in its full glory in the home. It is not true that perfect government must be achieved at home before administering it abroad; its exercise abroad is a suggestion, an example, and a stimulus for the best government at home. It is as if we projected ourselves upon a living screen and beheld ourselves at work. England to-day is the home of ideal municipal governments. Well, England's administration of Bombay did not divert attention from Glasgow, and Glasgow is to-day the model for all students of municipal problems. England's sanitary regeneration of filthy Calcutta made it clearer that Birmingham must be regenerated, too, and to-day Birmingham is the municipal admiration of all instructed men. England's miracle in Egypt, surpassing the ancient one of turning rods into serpents because the modern miracle turns serpents into men, deserts into gardens, famine into plenty—England's work in the land of the sphinx has solved its profound riddle, exalted not England only, but all the world, by its noble example, and thrilled to the soul every citizen of Great Britain with civic pride in the achievements of the greatest civilizing empire of the world. "Cast thy bread upon the waters and after many days it shall return unto you." "With what measure ye meet, it shall be meted to you again."

DOMINANT NOTES OF OUR FIRST AND SECOND CENTURIES.

Mr. President, self-government and internal development have been the dominant notes of our first century; administration and the development of other lands will be the dominant notes of our second century. And administration is as high and holy a function as self-government, just as the care of a trust estate is as sacred an obligation as the management of our own concerns. Cain was the first to violate the divine law of human society which makes of us our brother's keeper. And administration of good government is the first lesson in self-government, that exalted estate toward which all civilization tends.

Administration of good government is not denial of liberty. For what is liberty? It is not savagery. It is not the exercise of individual will. It is not dictatorship. It involves government, but not necessarily self-government. It means law. First of all, it is a common rule of action, applying equally to all within its limits. Liberty means protection of property and life without price, free speech without intimidation, justice without purchase or delay, government without favor or favorites. What will best give all this to the people of the Philippines—American administration, developing them gradually toward self-government, or self-government by a people before they know what self-government means?

TRUE INTERPRETATION OF DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

The Declaration of Independence does not forbid us to do our part in the regeneration of the world. If it did, the Declaration would be wrong, just as the Articles of Confederation, drafted by the very same men who signed the Declaration, was found to be wrong. The Declaration has no application to the present situation. It was written by self-governing men for self-governing men.

It was written by men who, for a century and a half, had been experimenting in self-government on this continent, and whose ancestors for hundreds of years before had been gradually developing toward that high and holy estate. The Declaration applies only to people capable of self-government. How dare any man prostitute this expression of the very elect of self-governing peoples to a race of Malay children of barbarism, schooled in Spanish methods and ideas? And you, who say the Declaration applies to all men, how dare you deny its application to the American Indian? And if you deny it to the Indian at home, how dare you grant it to the Malay abroad?

PHRASE "CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED" MISUNDERSTOOD.

The Declaration does not contemplate that all government must have the consent of the governed. It announces that man's "inalienable rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are established among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that when any form of government becomes destructive of those rights, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it." "Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" are the important things; "consent of the governed" is one of the means to those ends.

If "any form of government becomes destructive of those ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it," says the Declaration. "Any forms" includes all forms. Thus the Declaration itself recognizes other forms of government than those resting on the consent of the governed. The word "consent" itself recognizes other forms, for "consent" means the understanding of the thing to which the "consent" is given; and there are people in the world who do not understand any form of government. And the sense in which "consent" is used in the Declaration is broader than mere understanding; for "consent" in the Declaration means participation in the government "consented" to. And yet these people who are not capable of "consenting" to any form of government must be governed.

And so the Declaration contemplates all forms of government which secure the fundamental rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Self-government, when that will best secure these ends, as in the case of people capable of self-government; other appropriate forms when people are not capable of self-government. And so the authors of the Declaration themselves governed the Indian without his consent; the inhabitants of Louisiana without their consent; and ever since the sons of the makers of the Declaration have been governing not by theory, but by practice, after the fashion of our governing race, now by one form, now by another, but always for the purpose of securing the great eternal ends of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, not in the savage, but in the civilized meaning of those terms—life according to orderly methods of civilized society; liberty regulated by law; pursuit of happiness limited by the pursuit of happiness by every other man.

If this is not the meaning of the Declaration, our Government itself denies the Declaration every time it receives the representative of any but a republican form of government, such as that of the Sultan, the Czar, or other absolute autocrats, whose governments, according to the opposition's interpretation of the Declaration, are spurious governments, because the people governed have not "consented" to them.

CONSTITUTIONAL POWER TO GOVERN AS WE PLEASE.

Senators in opposition are estopped from denying our constitutional power to govern the Philippines as circumstances may demand, for such power is admitted in the case of Florida, Louisiana, Alaska. How, then, is it denied in the Philippines? Is there a geographical interpretation to the Constitution? Do degrees of longitude fix constitutional limitations? Does a thousand miles of ocean diminish constitutional power more than a thousand miles of land?

The ocean does not separate us from the field of our duty and endeavor—it joins us, an established highway needing no repair, and landing us at any point desired. The seas do not separate the Philippine Islands from us or from each other. The seas are highways through the archipelago, which would cost hundreds of millions of dollars to construct if they were land instead of water. Land may separate men from their desire, the ocean never. Russia has been centuries in crossing Siberian wastes; the Puritans crossed the Atlantic in brief and flying weeks.

If the Boers must have traveled by land, they would never have reached the Transvaal; but they sailed on liberty's ocean; they walked on civilization's untaxed highway, the welcoming sea. Our ships habitually sailed round the cape and anchored in California's harbors before a single trail had lined the desert with the whitening bones of those who made it. No! No! The ocean unites us; steam unites us; electricity unites us; all the elements of nature unite us to the region where duty and interest call us. There is in the ocean no constitutional argument against the march of the flag, for the oceans, too, are ours. With more extended coast lines than any nation of history; with a commerce vaster than any other people ever dreamed of, and that commerce as yet only in its beginnings; with naval traditions equaling those of England or of Greece, and the work of our Navy only just begun; with the air of the ocean in our nostrils and the blood of a sailor ancestry in our veins; with the shores of all the continents calling us, the great Republic before I die will be the acknowledged lord of the world's high seas. And over them the Republic will hold dominion, by virtue of the strength God has given it, for the peace of the world and the betterment of man.

WORDS OF EMPIRE EXPRESSLY IN CONSTITUTION.

No; the oceans are not limitations of the power which the Constitution expressly gives Congress to govern all territory the nation may acquire. The Constitution declares that "Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory belonging to the United States." Not the Northwest Territory only; not Louisiana or Florida only; not territory on this continent only, but any territory anywhere belonging to the nation. The founders of the nation were not provincial. Theirs was the geography of the world. They were soldiers as well as landsmen, and they knew that where our ships should go our flag might follow. They had the logic of progress, and they knew that the Republic they were planting must, in obedience to the laws of our expanding race, necessarily develop into the greater Republic which the world beholds to-day, and into the still mightier Republic which the world will finally acknowledge as the arbiter, under God, of the destinies of mankind. And so our fathers wrote into the Constitution these words of growth, of expansion, of empire, if you will, unlimited by geography or climate or by anything but the vitality and possibilities of the American people: "Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory belonging to the United States."

POWER IMPLIED TO GOVERN AS WE PLEASE.

The power to govern all territory the nation may acquire would have been in Congress if the language affirming that power had not been written in the Constitution. For not all powers of the National Government are expressed. Its principal powers are implied. The written Constitution is but the index of the living Constitution. Had this not been true, the Constitution would have failed. For the people in any event would have developed and progressed. And if the Constitution had not had the capacity for growth corresponding with the growth of the nation, the Constitution would and should have been abandoned as the Articles of Confederation were abandoned. For the Constitution is not immortal in itself, is not useful even in itself. The Constitution is immortal and even useful only as it serves the orderly development of the nation. The nation alone is immortal. The nation alone is sacred. The Army is its servant. The Navy is its servant. The President is its servant. This Senate is its servant. Our laws are its methods. Our Constitution is its instrument.

This is the golden rule of constitutional interpretation: The Constitution was made for the people, not the people for the Constitution.

Hamilton recognized this golden rule when he formulated the doctrine of implied powers. Marshall recognized it when he applied that doctrine to constitutional interpretation in McCulloch vs. Maryland. Congress recognized it when it provided for internal improvements. The Supreme Court of the Republic recognized it when it confirmed the act of Congress in making the promissory notes of the Republic legal tender for debts. Washington recognized it when he sent the nation's soldiers to suppress local riot in 1794; and Lincoln, the soul and symbol of the common people, recognized the doctrine of implied powers in every effort he made to save the nation. There is no power expressed in the Constitution to charter a bank; and although the subject was familiar to the framers of the Constitution, who still remained silent on it, Marshall said that this power was implied. There is no power expressed in the Constitution to make internal improvements; and although it was a subject painfully before the framers of the Constitution, who yet remained silent upon it, Congress said it is implied.

There is no power expressed in the Constitution, but almost the reverse, to make anything but gold and silver legal tender for payment of debts; the Supreme Court declared it is implied. There is no power expressed in the Constitution to maintain order in a State with the nation's soldiers unless the State first calls for aid; Washington, Lincoln, and Cleveland said it is implied. The legislative, the executive, and the judicial departments of our Government have recognized and confirmed the doctrine of implied powers, by which alone the Constitution lives, the people make progress, and the Republic marches forward to its imperial destiny. "The letter killeth; but the spirit giveth life."

By the same reasoning that Hamilton, Marshall, Washington, and Lincoln employed we could infer our power to do the work of administering government in the Philippines as the situation may demand, even if that power had not been affirmed in express words. We could infer it from the purpose of the Constitution to "provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare" of the nation and the power given Congress to make laws to secure these ends. For the archipelago is a base for the commerce of the East. It is a base for military and naval operations against the only powers with whom conflict is possible; a fortress thrown up in the Pacific, defending our Western coast, commanding the waters of the Orient, and giving us a point from which we can instantly strike and seize the possession of any possible foe.

MAY GOVERN UNDER ANY FORM WE PLEASE.

The nation's power to make rules and regulations for the government of its possessions is not confined to any given set of rules or regulations. It is not confined to any particular formula of laws or kind of government or type of administration. Where do Senators find constitutional warrant for any special kind of government in "territory belonging to the United States." The language affirming our power to govern such territory is as broad as the requirements of all possible situations. And there is nothing in the Constitution to limit that comprehensive language. The very reverse is true. For power to administer government anywhere and in any manner the situation demands would have been in Congress if the Constitution had been silent; not merely because it is a power not reserved to the States or people; not merely because it is a power inherent in and an attribute of nationality; not even because it might be inferred from other specific provisions of the Constitution; but because it is the power most necessary for the ruling tendency of our race—the tendency to explore, expand, and grow, to sail new seas and seek new lands, subdue the wilderness, revitalize decaying peoples, and plant civilized and civilizing governments over all the globe.

For the makers of the Constitution were of the race that produced Hawkins, and Drake, and Raleigh, and Smith, and Winthrop, and Penn. They were of the great exploring, pioneering, colonizing, and governing race who went forth with trade or gain or religious liberty as the immediate occasion for their voyages, but really because they could not help it; because the blood within them commanded them; because their racial tendency is as resistless as the currents of the sea or the process of the suns or any other elemental movement of nature, of which that racial tendency itself is the most majestic. And when they wrote the Constitution they did not mean to negative the most elemental characteristic of their race, of which their own presence in America was an expression and an example. You can not interpret a constitution without understanding the race that wrote it. And if our fathers had intended a reversal of the very nature and being of their race, they would have so declared in the most emphatic words our language holds. But they did not, and in the absence of such words the power would remain which is essential to the strongest tendency of our practical race, to govern wherever we are, and to govern by the methods best adapted to the situation. But our fathers were not content with silence, and they wrote in the Constitution the words which affirm this essential and imperial power.

THE WHOLE QUESTION ELEMENTAL.

Mr. President, this question is deeper than any question of party politics; deeper than any question of the isolated policy of our country even; deeper even than any question of constitutional power. It is elemental. It is racial. God has not been preparing the English-speaking and Teutonic peoples for a thousand years for nothing but vain and idle self-contemplation and self-admiration. No! He has made us the master organizers of the world to establish system where chaos reigns. He has given us the spirit of progress to overwhelm the forces of reaction throughout the earth. He has made us adepts in government that we may administer government among savage and senile peoples. Were it not for such a force as this the world would relapse into barbarism and night. And of all our race He has marked the American people as His chosen nation to finally lead in the regeneration of the world. This is the divine mission of America, and it holds for us all the profit, all the glory, all the happiness possible to man. We are trustees of the world's progress, guardians of its righteous peace. The judgment of the Master is upon us: "Ye have been faithful over a few things; I will make you ruler over many things."

What shall history say of us? Shall it say that we renounced that holy trust, left the savage to his base condition, the wilderness to the reign of waste, deserted duty, abandoned glory, forget our sordid profit even, because we feared our strength and read the charter of our powers with the doubter's eye and the quibbler's mind? Shall it say that, called by events to captain and command the proudest, ablest, purest race of history in history's noblest work, we declined that great commission? Our fathers would not have had it so. No! They founded no paralytic government, incapable of the simplest acts of administration. They planted no sluggard people, passive while the world's work calls them. They established no reactionary nation. They unfurled no retreating flag.

GOD'S HAND IN ALL.

That flag has never paused in its onward march. Who dares halt it now—now, when history's largest events are carrying it forward; now, when we are at last one people, strong enough for any task, great enough for any glory destiny can bestow? How comes it that our first century closes with the process of consolidating the American people into a unit just accomplished, and quick upon the stroke of that great hour presses upon us our world opportunity, world duty, and world glory, which none but a people welded into an indivisible nation can achieve or perform?

Blind indeed is he who sees not the hand of God in events so vast, so harmonious, so benign. Reactionary indeed is the mind that perceives not that this vital people is the strongest of the saving forces of the world; that our place, therefore, is at the head of the constructing and redeeming nations of the earth; and that to stand aside while events march on is a surrender of our interests, a betrayal of our duty as blind as it is base. Craven indeed is the heart that fears to perform a work so golden and so noble; that dares not win a glory so immortal.

Do you tell me that it will cost us money? When did Americans ever measure duty by financial standards? Do you tell me of the tremendous toil required to overcome the vast difficulties of our task? What mighty work for the world, for humanity, even for ourselves, has ever been done with ease? Even our bread must we eat by the sweat of our faces. Why are we charged with power such as no people ever knew, if we are not to use it in a work such as no people ever wrought? Who will dispute the divine meaning of the fable of the talents?

Do you remind me of the precious blood that must be shed, the lives that must be given, the broken hearts of loved ones for their slain? And this is indeed a heavier price than all combined. And yet as a nation every historic duty we have done, every achievement we have accomplished, has been by the sacrifice of our noblest sons. Every holy memory that glorifies the flag is of those heroes who have died that its onward march might not be stayed. It is the nation's dearest lives yielded for the flag that makes it dear to us; it is the nation's most precious blood poured out for it that makes it precious to us. That flag is woven of heroism and grief, of the bravery of men and women's tears, of righteousness and battle, of sacrifice and anguish, of triumph and of glory. It is these which make our flag a holy thing. Who would tear from that sacred banner the glorious legends of a single battle where it has waved on land or sea? What son of a soldier of the flag whose father fell beneath it on any field would surrender that proud record for the heraldry of a king? In the cause of civilization, in the service of the Republic anywhere on earth, Americans consider wounds the noblest decorations man can win, and count the giving of their lives a glad and precious duty.

Pray God that spirit never fails. Pray God the time may never come when Mammon and the love of ease shall so debase our blood that we will fear to shed it for the flag and its imperial destiny. Pray God the time may never come when American heroism is but a legend like the story of the Cid, American faith in our mission and our might a dream dissolved, and the glory of our mighty race departed.

And that time will never come. We will renew our youth at the fountain of new and glorious deeds. We will exalt our reverence for the flag by carrying it to a noble future as well as by remembering its ineffable past. Its immortality will not pass, because everywhere and always we will acknowledge and discharge the solemn responsibilities our sacred flag, in its deepest meaning, puts upon us. And so, Senators, with reverent hearts, where dwells the fear of God, the American people move forward to the future of their hope and the doing of His work.

Mr. President and Senators, adopt the resolution offered, that peace may quickly come and that we may begin our saving, regenerating, and uplifting work. Adopt it, and this bloodshed will cease when these deluded children of our islands learn that this is the final word of the representatives of the American people in Congress assembled. Reject it, and the world, history, and the American people will know where to forever fix the awful responsibility for the consequences that will surely follow such failure to do our manifest duty. How dare we delay when our soldiers' blood is flowing? [Applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Applause is not permitted in the United States Senate.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts will suspend for one moment. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, the title of which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business be informally laid aside, as I understand no Senator wishes to speak upon it this afternoon, and I desire to make a very few observations on the pending resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts asks that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Massachusetts will proceed.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I have listened, delighted, as have, I suppose, all the members of the Senate, to the eloquence of my honorable friend from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE]. I am glad to welcome to the public service his enthusiasm, his patriotism, his silver speech, and the earnestness and the courage with which he has devoted himself to a discharge of his duty to the Republic as he conceives it. Yet, Mr. President, as I heard his eloquent description of wealth and glory and commerce and trade, I listened in vain for those words which the American people have been wont to take upon their lips in every solemn crisis of their history. I heard much calculated to excite the imagination of the youth seeking wealth or the youth charmed by the dream of empire. But the words Right, Justice, Duty, Freedom were absent, my friend must permit me to say, from that eloquent speech. I could think as this brave young Republic of ours listened to what he had to say of but one occurrence:

> Then the devil taketh Him up into an exceeding high mountain and sheweth Him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them.
> And the devil said unto Him, "All these things will I give Thee if Thou wilt fall down and worship me."
> Then saith Jesus unto him, "Get thee behind me, Satan."

Mr. President, the Senator himself and the evidence coming from our two commanders, General Otis and Admiral Dewey, and witnesses for whom they vouch, refute every one of the propositions of fact on which my honorable friend has built his glittering temple of glass. He describes the impotence and ineffectual attempt of Spain for three hundred years to reduce that people to subjection; tells us that she had failed. He counsels us to avoid the errors and the mistakes and the sins she has committed. If that be true, Mr. President, where did Spain get the right to sell the people of the Philippine Islands to us? They had risen against that effete and impotent and ineffectual effort of Spain; they had driven her from the entire soil of their island, save a single city; they hemmed in her troops in that single city of Manila by a cordon of their troops stretching from water to water; and Spain surrendered to us only because her soldiers could not get out of reach of the American guns without being compelled to surrender to the Filipinos.

I think you will have to enlarge the doctrines of the American Declaration of Independence. I think you will have to build anew a Constitution which, he says, is only an instrument and not a rule of duty, before you can find your right to buy and sell that people like sheep.

My honorable friend, I am sure, when he reflects upon it, will never advise the people of the United States to do a base thing for all this wealth, for all this glory, for all this empire. I say if it be true that that was a people that desired independence and were fit for independence, then it would be a base thing for this young giant in its might to strike down that infant republic. Do you not think so? [Addressing Mr. BEVERIDGE.] If you do think so, I can prove to the Senate every one of these propositions from the testimony of Otis and of Dewey and of Schurman and of the witnesses for whom they vouch.

The Senator said that he said it in the sorrow of his heart, and he would not have said it if he had not been compelled to say it, that all this blood and warfare and loss of life and expense of treasure in this war was occasioned by utterances at home and, he was sorry to say, by speeches in the American Senate. The debate in the American Senate on this subject began—with the single exception of a brief and calm constitutional discussion by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST]—on the 9th of January, 1899.

Now, let us see what happened. I have in my hand the report of Major-General Otis; and without detaining the Senate at this hour in the afternoon, for I shall have occasion to speak more at length on this subject later, all through that report and through that whole summer are found again and again communications to the Government of the United States that the people of the Philippine Islands desire their independence; that is one thing; that they are a people; so the President calls them; and that is the phrase which the Declaration of Independence uses when it says a people have a right to establish their government in such form as they conceive to be necessary for their safety and happiness. Then Aguinaldo was brought over there to a people 30,000 of whom were in arms as an organized army before he went, and he was placed at the head of that people, who were desiring independence, and furnished with arms by the Government of the United States. That was the condition of things until Manila was surrounded, the Spanish army captured, and the surrender of Manila was effected.

I have here the report—and I have seen the original, and it is from the Navy Department—of two naval officers, which Admiral Dewey certifies under his own hand gives the best account of the condition of things in northern Luzon that is in existence. That is the Admiral's own statement. Those officers made a journey through the island of Luzon in the months of October, November, and I think a few days in December, 1898, just before hostilities broke out, and they report everywhere courts, municipal government, peace and order, the Spanish prisoners kindly treated, schools and churches; that they were received with elegance and hospitality, I will not say such as my friend would receive me with if I went to Indiana, but with a very much more gracious and generous hospitality than it would be in my humble power to receive him with if he came to Massachusetts.

They report schoolbooks, and report the constant, eager desire of that people for education. I have all the extracts here before me, and here is the summing up. This is the original report which I have got from the Navy Department, and here is George Dewey's certificate, dated December 1, 1898. I am going to ask the Senate to print it:

Special attention is invited to this interesting and carefully prepared report, which in my opinion contains the most complete and reliable information obtainable in regard to the present state of the northern part of Luzon Island.

GEORGE DEWEY.

DECEMBER 1, 1898.

Everywhere a people in better order than is found at this moment, to say nothing of what was found at the time of their revolution, in some countries on the continent of America between the Rio Grande and Cape Horn. They were a people fitter for self-government than were those of any country on the continent of America from the Rio Grande to Cape Horn when its independence from Spain was achieved, and fitter than some of them are to-day.

Mr. President, it is that which you want to crush out and that from which the American flag is supposed to get new glory if we stamp it out—this young giant of ours in the freshness and the fullness of his strength—and that you call glory!

What happened in regard to this outbreak which was caused by the debate in the United States Senate which began on the 9th of January, 1899? I have General Otis's report here. In December, 1898, the President sent to General Otis a famous proclamation—mark the date, December, 1898—and it contains a statement asserting the sovereignty of the United States over the Philippine Islands and our purpose to give them a good government, but that we must take possession of the entire island and keep them, and so on.

Otis read it and he suppressed the President's statement. He said that that language was calculated to create an immediate outbreak of hostilities. I have his exact language here. I will read it:

After fully considering the President's proclamation and the temper of the Tagalos with whom I was daily discussing political problems and the friendly intentions of the United States Government toward them, I concluded that there were certain words and expressions therein, such as "sovereignty," "right of cession," and those which directed immediate occupation, etc., which, though most admirably employed and tersely expressive of actual conditions, might be advantageously used by the Tagalo war party to incite widespread hostilities among the natives. The ignorant classes—

These fellows, incapable of self-government according to my friend—

had been taught to believe that certain words, as "sovereignty," "protection," etc., had peculiar meaning disastrous to their welfare and significant of future political domination, like that from which they had recently been freed.

Now, Mr. President, I have seen in my youth in Massachusetts—I do not know much about Indiana—ignorant fellows who believed that precise thing here at home, and who are undoubtedly unfit for self-government according to him. There are certain men in Massachusetts, and the woods are full of them, who would think that if Great Britain or any other nation should come and propose to assume sovereignty and protection and immediate occupation and take possession of Massachusetts, they would be excited and alarmed and would fly to arms, and they would think even that there was a certain glory in giving their lives to prevent that sort of thing from being done.

But whether that be true or not, whether I misunderstand the temper of this great American people, whether I misunderstand what the American flag stands for or not, that is what I thought it stood for. But I dare say I am mistaken in that belief.

At any rate, that is what General Otis said. So he took the most extraordinary responsibility ever assumed by a military commander in regard to his superior's orders, and suppressed President McKinley's proclamation, a proclamation which would, as he says, have created armed hostilities and an outbreak immediately, as it would have been likely to do wherever there is human nature and human feeling and love of liberty.

But he issued a proclamation in its stead, which he gives here. My honorable friend thinks the Filipinos are not fit for self-government, and he says there are only, as I understand it, about a hundred in the island who are. He cites the evidence of a good many employers of labor who say there are a great many more, but that is his summing up of it. General Otis, instead of this proclamation which the President directed him to issue and which he thought would bring on a war, goes on and issues a proclamation in which he promises them independence. That is the next thing that happened in December. Here it is. I shall have occasion to go into this matter more at length when I have more time. I will read one of his sentences:

It is also my belief that it is the intention of the United States Government to draw from the Filipino people so much of the military force of the islands as is possible and consistent with a free and well-constituted government of the country. * * * I am also convinced that it is the intention of the United States Government to seek the establishment of a most liberal government for the islands, in which the people themselves shall have as full representation as the maintenance of law and order will permit, and which shall be susceptible of development, on lines of increased representation and the bestowal of increased powers, into a government as free and independent as is enjoyed by the most favored provinces in the world.

That is what you told those men through your military commander six weeks before the hostilities broke out.

Mr. TELLER. What is the date of that report?

Mr. HOAR. It is dated January 4, 1899. There is the promise. In another statement he says:

I will assure the people of the Philippine Islands the full measure of individual rights and liberties, which is the heritage of a free people.

Now, what does that mean? What does that mean, Mr. President? My honorable friend says we must hold onto those islands forever; that he is a dastard who does not think so. And yet General Otis, whom the honorable Senator as I have no doubt justly eulogized, as the representative of the honor and the justice of the people of the United States, uttered that promise. Did he utter that promise to a people of slaves, half Spaniards and half savages in character? Did he utter that promise to a people incapable of self-government? He sent home his dispatch, and he is in command there now. Now, what happened?

General Otis states that he sent the original proclamation of the President containing these words, which were sure to bring on an outbreak of hostilities, to General Miller. General Miller was lying with a part of the United States fleet opposite Iloilo, where the Spaniards had been captured and the insurgent forces were in control. He was spoiling for a fight. He was urging Otis all the time to let him make an attack at once, "because," he said, "the insurgents are strengthening themselves every day."

General Otis says that, before having carefully read this proclamation, he incautiously sent a copy of it to Miller, and thereupon Miller, contrary to his desire, made it public, and the Philippine Island people got hold of it as it was originally made. So this document which your great military authority affirmed would bring on instant hostilities if it was published, and which he had taken the liberty to suppress, was published and sent abroad. Then he proceeds to give an account of the effect of the publication. He says:

The publication separated more widely the friendly and war factions of the inhabitants. * * * The ablest of insurgent newspapers, * * * edited by the uncompromising Luna, attacked it with all the vigor of which he was capable. * * * This paper was published in Tagalo; had a considerable circulation. * * * No statement reflecting upon the United States Government * * * was too base, untruthful, or improbable for newspaper circulation.

Was there anything worse for newspaper circulation than substituting a promise of independence for a purpose to take immediate possession, I should like to know?

Aguinaldo met the proclamation by a counter one, in which he indignantly—

I now read from General Otis's report—

in which he indignantly protested against the claim of sovereignty by the United States in the islands which had really been conquered from the Spaniards through the blood and treasure of his countrymen. * * * Even the women of Cavite province * * * gave me to understand that after all the men were killed off they were prepared to shed their patriotic blood for the liberty and independence of their country.

Mr. President, I am proud as any man of the history of the United States. I suppose I feel a special and peculiar pride in the history of my own beloved State of Massachusetts. I have sat at her dear feet, I have looked into her beautiful eyes, I have listened to her high counsel from my earliest childhood. But I should feel prouder still if I could write into her glorious history a statement like that.

Is there any American Senator whose blood is so cold, whose eyes are so blinded by this wretched glitter and glare of empire which Satan is setting before us as he did before the Saviour, that his bosom can not be stirred by such a thing as that, or that he is willing to join in an attempt to trample under foot the liberties of a people like that? Have you read the death song of Rizal? It rises to the loftiest strains. Have you read the state papers of these men—these Filipinos? They will compare favorably with the state papers of any nation on the earth. Have you read their constitution?

Mr. President, I omitted to state one very simple fact given by these naval officers. There came a report into the province where they were being received as guests at the house of the principal magistrate of the village that our commissioners at Paris had rejected the proposition to buy them and had substituted for it what they did in regard to Cuba; and the commander of the military forces, on that report, which turned out to be a mistake, instantly resigned his authority to the civil magistrates and sheathed his sword.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator please allow me to inquire if that is the statement made by the naval officers to Admiral Dewey?

Mr. HOAR. It was made by the naval officers. I have it in my desk.

Mr. BACON. I hope the Senator will read it.

Mr. HOAR. Admiral Dewey vouches for it. It would take some time to hunt it up, but I have it here.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator from Massachusetts is going to print it in his speech.

Mr. HOAR. I am going to print the whole of it in my speech.

Mr. BACON. I will withdraw the request, then.

Mr. HOAR. It is there. I should like to print also two very brief, clear narratives by the same officers, which appeared in two New York publications, if I may have leave.

I was going to ask, not referring to any Senator—I am referring to some outside statements—is it not a little bold to charge with the responsibility of making this war the men who tried to stop it, who protested against it, instead of the men who made it? There has not been a time from the beginning to this hour when assurances of General Otis, given the 1st of January, 1899, if repeated from Washington, that they should be as independent as the most favored provinces of the world, would not have prevented the outbreak. But although they got that, they got at the same time the true proclamation, which affirmed sovereignty and occupation and the right of cession, and pretty soon after it they got the news that they had been bought like a flock of sheep for $20,000,000.

The mistake of our honorable friends who disagree with me in this matter is that they do not understand that the God who made of one blood all the nations of the world has made all the nations of the world capable of being influenced by the same sentiments and the same motives, and that the love of liberty does not depend on the color of the skin, but that it depends on humanity. These men are God's children, as you are and as I am, and the men who boast that sublime and lofty parentage have had given them by the Universal Father the love of liberty and the sense of justice.

I had no intention of speaking this afternoon; and I have it not before me, but you will find in these reports that one of the officers makes the exact statement that the Filipinos are exceedingly sensitive to any matter of injustice, and all that they need is to know that they are to be treated with justice and righteousness.

I will ask leave also to print these two articles, which are very brief. I am not sure whether the statement I now refer to is in the magazine article or the report written by the same man.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Chair understand that the Senator has asked consent to print the other paper?

Mr. HOAR. Yes; I ask consent to print the report forwarded by Admiral Dewey and articles in the Outlook and New York Independent by Messrs. Sargent and Wilcox, the two naval officers who made the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. COCKRELL. Let them be printed as a separate document.

Mr. HOAR. Very well. I was going to incorporate them in my speech, but I should also like to have them printed as a document.

Mr. COCKRELL. Then I ask that they be printed as a document.

Mr. HOAR. Let them be printed in both forms.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts and of the Senator from Missouri, that the matter referred to be printed in the RECORD and also as a document? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

[See appendix.]

Mr. HOAR. Now, Mr. President, my honorable friend thought that saying in a very feeble way such a thing as this in the Senate of the United States tended to excite hostilities in the Philippine Islands. If I understood him correctly, he said also that he thought it was not necessary to wait until we could get the very best of government here, but if we established it abroad under some commissioners to be appointed by some executive authority they would govern so well that they would furnish a good example for us at home and we should improve. I suppose, though he did not say it, that he thinks, also, we had better not have free speech here in the United States Senate until they have got it out among the Filipinos, to see whether it works there, and then it may come back to us in a way which gradually would permit us to use it here, in a sort of diluted form.

Mr. President, the Senator gave us his opinion of General Aguinaldo. Mr. Schurman, the president of the Filipino Commission and of Cornell University, says in a speech made to his students last week that he considers Aguinaldo an honest man. The two testimonials must of course stand side by side or one must fall before the other.

The Senator cites a good many witnesses from whom he concludes that the Filipinos are not capable of self-government, but when he reads the testimony of a great many of them the reason they give is that the lower and uneducated classes will take the advice and act under the influence of their leaders. His witnesses say that the self-government will work all right. But it is because the superior will influence the inferior. I looked around to see whether the Senator from Indiana was likely to have the full assent of my honorable friend the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HANNA], or my honorable friend the senior Senator from New York [Mr. PLATT], who happens to be present, to the proposition that it is a sign of absolute unfitness for self-government which justifies us in slaughtering that people and putting them under our heels that the poor ignorant classes are likely to act under the influence of their leaders and follow them. [Laughter.] The late honorable Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Quay] is not present. I trust my honorable friend will not be influenced in his vote on the constitutional question of admitting Senator Quay by any idea that Mr. Quay may possibly be penetrated by that Philippine notion.

Mr. President, I wish to read an extract from a letter which is one of a great many letters I have received. I had one within two days from an eminent general officer thoroughly sympathizing with my position in this matter, a man who came home with a great and a brave record, but who said that while the excited condition exists he does not want to have his name used and he should say nothing. I have here a letter from a soldier, who says:

I am a returned volunteer who believes the United States is pursuing a wrong course in the Philippines. There are thousands of others, I believe, who, in spite of the noisy receptions, the glamor and glory and medal promises, believe the same way. I promised myself before leaving the islands to enlist another two years if necessary to help bring the Government back to the "humanity" policy stated when it enlisted us to fight. Though a private soldier, my word may weigh little, but I feel it will be a source of pleasure in the future to remember that at this critical period in our history I was spending time and money to help in my humble way to bring the nation back to her old-fashioned ideas of liberty.

I would come to Washington if I could be of any service, but you doubtless have plenty of soldiers and others at hand better capable than myself to answer your questions. I hope you will put up the fight of your life against the Administration's policy. It seems to me you can do a great deal of good by acquainting the people with the real condition of things in the islands, which no one knows better than yourself that they do not get through the papers. The death of General Lawton almost in sight of the church steeples of Manila, in a battle that lasted three hours in taking a town our forces captured several times before, but never before found it so hard to take as this time—this of itself should make sensible people doubt that the war is "just over now." The Army of late has been making a good showing, but Congress should realize that every Filipino under arms there to-day means to have and has sworn to have "liberty or death."

Who was it who used that phrase? Is there a Senator from Virginia here who remembers where that expression came from? The miserable Filipino got hold of it somehow. I rather think on the whole we had better charge this whole bloodshed and slaughter and loss of life and treasure to Patrick Henry. The writer of this letter says Congress should realize that every Filipino under arms there to-day—

believes that down under our commercial greed must still smolder in our hearts a feeling that respects him for this resolution.

Just think of this man, who has been so long in the Philippine Islands, actually so far conspiring with the Filipino insurgent cause that he believes, and says the Filipino believes—those savage barbarians believe of the American people "that down under our commercial greed must still smolder in our hearts a feeling that respects him for this resolution."

We may have been more humane to our prisoners, but our Army has been a greater scourge to their country than the Spanish army in a hundred years. But still they dispute every advance and close in in the wake of every retreat. They are not savages, Senator, as you know, of course. I want to tell you how our regiment changed its mind upon this point. We had been taught (the devil only knows why) that the Filipinos were savages no better than our Indians.

But General Lawton took half my regiment with him on the Santa Cruz expedition. The boys came back with different ideas, denied that they were savages, and confessed they did not want to fight them any more. They had seen in their deserted houses schoolbooks everywhere—grammars, geographies, and arithmetics—well thumbed. They had seen schoolhouses, churches, government buildings, halls of justice, paintings, decorations, and all kinds of handiwork; a city paved, cleaned, and drained, happy in peace and plenty, before they came on their mission of distributing the peace commissioners' proclamation. After this trip neither the "niggor" nor "Indian" talk made them enthusiastic soldiers.

One thing more: The papers announce that the Filipinos are to do honor to General Lawton. This, whether intended or not, puts things in a false light. The fact is, there are a lot of Filipinos working for and hanging on to the Americans because of the big wages they pay, and much of this money is sent through the lines one way or another to help the insurgents. Nine out of every ten of these men are at heart in sympathy with the insurgent cause. The people should know these things.

Pardon me, Senator, for addressing one who must at this time be burdened with correspondence, but I felt I must say a word and tell you one soldier at least respects the American traditions, etc.

I shall have occasion, Mr. President, to discuss this question at some length hereafter. I desire to ask leave to print with my speech an appeal made by Felipe Buencamino, setting forth the desires and aspirations of the Filipino people, addressed to the House of Representatives. I suppose it does not come in regularly as a petition, but I should like to have it to refer to. I wish to have it printed in connection with my speech and also as a document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts desire that it shall be included in the other document or printed as a separate document?

Mr. HOAR. I think it would be well to include it in the other

document. I desire to have it printed with my speech and also as a document. I add, also, this letter from Gen. Charles King:

[Gen. Charles King's letter to Milwaukee Journal.]

THE FILIPINOS AS THEY ARE.

SAN FRANCISCO, *June 22, 1899.*

To the Editor of the Journal, Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR SIR: Thinking over your telegram and request of June 7, I find myself seriously embarrassed. As an officer of the Army, there are many reasons why I should not give my "views of situation in the Philippines, how long fighting is likely to continue, and thoughts as to America's part in future of islands."

The capability of the Filipinos for self-government can not be doubted. Such men as Arellano, Aguinaldo, and many others whom I might name are highly educated; nine-tenths of the people read and write, all are skilled artisans in one way or another; they are industrious, frugal, temperate, and, given a fair start, could look out for themselves infinitely better than our people imagine. In my opinion they rank far higher than the Cubans or the uneducated negroes to whom we have given the right of suffrage.

Very truly, yours,

CHARLES KING,
Brigadier-General.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there any objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts, that the paper to which he refers be printed as a part of his speech and also as a document? The Chair hears none. It is so ordered.

[See appendix.]

APPENDIX.

[From The Outlook, September 2, 1899.]

THE BACKWOODS FILIPINO.

[By Leonard R. Sargent.]

It has been my privilege to have been intimately associated with the Filipino people for a short time at a most interesting period of their history. With the permission of Admiral Dewey, I spent the greater part of the months of October and November of 1898, in company with Paymaster W. B. Wilcox, United States Navy, in the interior of the northern part of the island of Luzon.[1] It will be remembered that at that date the United States had not yet announced its policy with regard to the Philippines. The terms of the treaty with Spain were being negotiated by our commissioners at Paris, and the fate of the islands hung in the balance. In the meantime the native population, taking matters into their own hands, had declared their independence from all foreign jurisdiction and had set up a provisional government, with Aguinaldo at its head.

Although this government has never been recognized, and in all probability will go out of existence without recognition, yet it can not be denied that, in a region occupied by many millions of inhabitants, for nearly six months it stood alone between anarchy and order. The military forces of the United States held control only in Manila, with its environs, and in Cavite, and had no authority to proceed further; while in the vast remaining districts the representatives of the only other recognized power on the field were prisoners in the hands of their despised subjects. It was the opinion at Manila during this anomalous period in our Philippine relations, and possibly in the United States as well, that such a state of affairs must breed something akin to anarchy.

I can state unreservedly, however, that Mr. Wilcox and I found the existing conditions to be much at variance with this opinion. During our absence from Manila we traveled more than 600 miles in a very comprehensive circuit through the northern part of the island of Luzon, traversing a characteristic and important district. In this way we visited seven provinces, of which some were under the immediate control of the central government at Malolos, while others were remotely situated, separated from each other and from the seat of government by natural divisions of land, and accessible only by lengthy and arduous travel. As a tribute to the efficiency of Aguinaldo's government and to the law-abiding character of his subjects, I offer the fact that Mr. Wilcox and I pursued our journey throughout in perfect security, and returned to Manila with only the most pleasing recollections of the quiet and orderly life which we found the natives to be leading under the new régime.

Some years ago, at an exposition held at Barcelona, Spain, a man and woman were exhibited as representative types of the inhabitants of Luzon. The man wore a loin cloth and the woman a scanty skirt. It was evident that they belonged to the lowest plane of savagery. I think no deeper wound was ever inflicted upon the pride of the real Filipino population than that caused by this exhibition, the knowledge of which seems to have spread throughout the island. The man and woman, while actually natives of Luzon, were captives from a tribe of wild Igorrotes of the hills; a tribe as hostile to the Filipinos as to the Spaniards themselves, and equally alien to both. It is doubtful to what extent such islanders are responsible for the low esteem in which the Filipino is held; his achievements certainly have never been well advertised, while his shortcomings have been heralded abroad. The actual, everyday Filipino is not as picturesque a creature as the Igorrote. The average human imagination has a remarkable affinity for the picturesque; and the commonplace citizen of Luzon is too often overlooked in the presence of the engrossing savage. If the observer's attention can be drawn to the former, however, much that is of interest will be found in his comparatively homely life.

In our journey we traveled first across the province of Nueva Icija, by far the poorest and least interesting of all the provinces we visited. And yet even here we were greatly surprised by the intelligence and refinement of the inhabitants. While our entertainment at first was meager—for want of the wherewithal to provide a more generous one—we could nevertheless detect the same spirit of hospitality that found vent in elaborate manifestations in the richer towns which we visited later. We were particularly struck by the dignified demeanor of our hosts and by the graceful manner in which they extended to us their welcome. We had unlimited opportunities for conversation with the citizens of the towns, and we found everywhere a class that gave evidence of considerable culture and a certain amount of education. Their education included those branches only which were taught at the schools conducted by the priesthood at the capital towns of the provinces, and was of rather an impracticable nature. The Spanish language, Spanish history (appropriately garbled), church history, and the dead languages evidently formed its leading features.

The natives of this class seemed to have made the most of the opportunities offered them, and they had the subjects above mentioned completely at command. This enabled them to give a trend to their conversation that served at least to indicate their aspirations. On the other hand, their ignorance of modern history and politics, and particularly of current events, was astonishing. What they knew of the United States had been learned, like the Latin, from Spanish teachers, but was not equally reliable. Not only in the backward province of Nueva Icija, but elsewhere throughout our journey, we found the same fund of misinformation on the subject. This related in great measure to the attitude of our Government toward the two races of people that have come under its jurisdiction with an inferior political status, namely, the negroes and the Indians. Of the condition of the negroes since the war, the Filipinos seem not to be aware. They express great curiosity on the subject of the Indian question, and have evidently been taught to see in the unhappy condition of that race the result of deliberate oppression, and a warning of what they may expect from our Government if they submit themselves to its legislation. Of ourselves, the citizens of the United States, they have been told that we possess neither patriotism, honor, religion, nor any other restraining or refining influence. A character has been given us consistent with the acts attributed to our nation. The natives are now undoubtedly becoming enlightened as to our true character, but it will probably be a long time before their last suspicions are removed. In the meanwhile we can not but hope that the good faith of our Government in any proposition it may make to the Filipino people will be accepted in advance. When it becomes a question of our fairness and our honest intentions toward them, the burden of proof must rest on us.

The towns of Nueva Icija are small and unimposing. They are composed principally of "nipa" huts, built on "stilts" to evade the vapors that rise from the marshy ground.

The "stilts" and the frame of the hut are framed of bamboo poles, and an excellent floor is made from long, thin strips of the same wood laid together with their curved surfaces upward. The roof is thatched with grass, and the sides of the hut are formed of leaves of the "nipa" plant plaited together. Screens made of the same material serve in place of windows, sliding back and forth on bamboo guides in front of apertures cut in the walls. A short bamboo ladder gives entrance to the hut, which consists of two rooms, one forward of the other. The front room is raised a step higher than the rear one and is provided with as smooth a floor as possible, to be used principally for sleeping purposes. The back room contains the native stove, the only piece of furniture in the hut. This consists of a section of the trunk of a large tree hollowed out into the form of a bowl and lined with mortar. Many "nipa" huts are far more elaborate, but the one described is of the commonest type and frequently forms the home of a large family.

It will be noticed what an important part the bamboo forms in the construction of these huts. The value of the bamboo tree to the natives of all tropical countries has been too often dilated upon to bear further repetition; but I can not refrain from mentioning one use to which I have seen it put in this province. In the outskirts of one town through which we passed we noticed a number of huts whose owners, having made some attempt at cultivating the land in their immediate vicinity, had built a fence of bamboo to separate their fields from the road. There was nothing particularly remarkable about the fence, except that fences of any kind are not numerous in that country, but we were struck with astonishment on noticing a gate, through which a native had passed, close forcibly behind him without any effort on his part. We proceeded at once to investigate the phenomenon and discovered that the result which had so surprised us had been accomplished by the following unique arrangement: A long bamboo cord had been made fast to the gate and to a point near the top of a bamboo sapling growing in the yard, so that the cord was taut when the gate was shut. The gate opened outward, and could be passed through only by bringing sufficient pressure to bear to bend the sapling. When the pressure was released, the sapling would spring back to its erect position, closing the gate with a slam. With the means at hand a Yankee might well have been at a loss to devise a neater or more effective scheme.

The province of Nueva Icija is low and marshy, and rice is almost the only agricultural product. At the time of our visit the entire population, both male and female, was engaged in the thrashing of rice, which, under their artistic manipulation, becomes a most picturesque proceeding. The implements used resemble, on a large scale, the pestle and mortar of a chemist. The mortar is replaced by a section of a log of hard wood, hollowed out into the shape of a bowl or trough; the pestle by a club about 4 feet long, with ends about 6 inches in diameter and the middle part scraped down to the shape of the hand and worn smooth by constant friction. The rice is thrown into the mortar as it is cut. The club, held in the middle, is raised well above the head in the right hand and cast vertically down upon the rice; caught up with the left hand as it rebounds, thrown again, and caught up with the right.

The workers make an interesting picture, half a dozen of them perhaps beating in the same mortar, their dark skins glistening in the sunlight, and every firm muscle working as their bodies move in the graceful action of their labor. These people are musical by nature, and there undoubtedly is harmony in this rhythmical beating of wood on wood. The sound penetrates to the most distant places and seems never to cease. It comes to you like the beating of a muffled drum, and brings before your mind the supple figures of the native girls casting their clubs in that graceful movement, down with the right hand, up with the left, down with the left hand, up with the right. I only once saw the workmen emphasize the musical element that characterizes this labor. On this occasion a party of four natives, two young men and two young women, were beating at the rice in one long trough, while an old man, sitting near with a musical instrument like a guitar, strummed the time.

In traveling from Nueva Icija into the neighboring province of Nueva Vizcaya, and from there on through the greater part of the latter province, we passed through a rough and mountainous country. Our progress here was deplorably difficult, but the numerous views of magnificent scenery to which we were treated more than repaid us for our labors and hardships. I never before had suspected that Luzon Island contained within its borders such harmonies in landscape as it has been my good fortune to see. There are spots in the mountains of Nueva Vizcaya from which the aspect of the surrounding country overwhelms an observer with all the power of music and thrills his artistic sense into ecstasy. The deep-rooted prejudice that many men possess against all that is tropical, I think, would disappear in every case under the influence of the clear atmosphere and healthful soil of this beautiful province.

From Nueva Vizcaya for the next three weeks of travel we passed from one hospitable town to another, and enjoyed a round of novel entertainments. Our route now carried us through the valley of the Rio Grande Cagayan—probably the largest area of level country in Luzon Island.

With the exception of the region in the immediate vicinity of Manila, and of the narrow strip of land along the western coast, this valley, previous to the revolution, was the firmest and most ancient seat of Spanish authority on the island. Its towns throughout give evidence of the labor that has been expended on them. There are comparatively few "nipa" huts, and many

[1] The author of this article, it should be stated, is a naval cadet. The report made by Mr. Sargent and Paymaster Wilcox was regarded by Admiral Dewey as of great value, and the Admiral commended them for "the success of their undertaking, their thoroughness of observation, and the ability shown in their report."—*The Editors.*

substantial frame buildings. Each town, moreover, has an elaborate church and convent, usually built of brick. Many of these churches date back into the last century, one which I remember particularly bearing the date 1780 as that of its completion.

Our entertainment in the different towns varied according to the facilities at hand; but in all cases music was a leading feature. In the absence of all accessories the village band would be called into the building in which we were received and would play tune after tune well on into the night, while we conversed at our ease with the village fathers. At the little village of Cordon, which has a population of only a few hundred, we passed one of the pleasantest evenings of our journey. In this instance four accomplished little girls gave the entertainment its particular charm. Soon after our arrival the entire village trooped into the large room of the public building that had been turned over to our party. The floor was cleared for a dance, and the band commenced with a waltz. After the waltz was finished two of the little girls danced a minuet and sang a very pretty dialogue accompaniment. The movement of the minuet was very slow and stately, and the little dancers went through it with charming effect.

As an encore when the minuet was finished, they sang a Spanish love song together. The ages of these little girls were 11 and 12, respectively, and they did not look at all older than their years. They were dressed as grown-up young ladies, however, with their hair elaborately arranged, and with long trains to their cotton gowns. When I asked their mother if this style of dress had been adopted as a masquerade, she said, "Oh, no. I expect both my little girls to be married very soon." After all, some of the customs of the Filipinos are rather picturesque.

After a short rest these girls and two others of about the same age danced the "contrabandista," using castanets. We enjoyed this dance very much. The dancers arranged themselves at starting in the form of a square, and frequently returned to that figure. Passing and repassing each other, twirling unexpectedly about, and posing for an instant, only to resume the rapid step, their tiny, erect figures moved with charming grace and quickness in time with the music, and their castanets kept up a lively accompaniment. When directions were needed, they were received from an old man, who occupied the position of dancing master in the village. A guitar and a flute supplied the only music for the dance. At times even this was dispensed with, and, in its stead, the dancing master sang a plaintive air in his native dialect. The music and dancing continued until we requested an opportunity to rest. On other occasions we have been shown many dances peculiar to the country, and have found that, while they are all graceful and interesting, none are in the least grotesque or barbaric.

The towns of Ilagan and Aparri, with their wealthy and pleasure-loving population, provided the most elaborate entertainment. Ilagan is the capital city of the tobacco-raising province of Isabella, and is situated near the head of navigation of the Rio Grande; Aparri is situated at its mouth, in the province of Cagayan, and is the only seaport of the valley. These towns are laid out in regular streets, and have many squares of substantial frame buildings. They have each a population of between ten and fifteen thousand. We spent three days at Ilagan, and I think that it was here that we were brought into closest touch with the Filipino character. The cultured class, which I have spoken of before, was strongly in evidence; and I think that before leaving we had discussed views with nearly every member of it. They all realized that they were passing through a crucial period in the history of their people, and young and old were eager to acquire all possible knowledge that might assist them to think clearly at this crisis. Their realization of the gravity of their position did not, however, rob their character of its natural gayety, nor make them forget their duty as hosts. On the evening following our arrival a ball was given in our honor, which was attended by all the élite of the town. There were present about fifty young women and twice that number of men. All were dressed in European fashion. The girls were pleasant and intelligent; the men comported themselves in all respects like gentlemen. It was hard to realize that we were in the very heart of a country generally supposed to be given up to semisavages. At intervals between dances many songs were sung, usually by one or two of the guests, while all frequently joined in the chorus. The national hymn was repeated several times with great enthusiasm. The ball lasted until nearly 3 o'clock in the morning, and broke up with good feeling at its height.

On the second evening we were invited to attend the theater, where two one-act Spanish plays were presented by the young society people of the town. The theater itself had been constructed by the villagers only a few weeks before. It was a large bamboo structure, one end of which was used as the village market, while the stage occupied the other end. The stage arrangements were good; curtain, side scenes, and footlights all en règle. In the performance of the play we saw our friends—these typical young Filipinos—in a light in which very few of our nation have had an opportunity to view them. They comported themselves with credit in a position where humor, intelligence, and artistic ability were the requisites of success.

During our stay at Ilagan we lived at the house of the mayor. This building was of great size, and was built of magnificent hard wood from the neighboring forest. One wing, containing a reception room and two bedrooms, was turned over to us. The reception room was very large, with a finely polished floor, and with windows along two sides. It contained a piano and a set of excellent bamboo furniture, including the most comfortable chairs and divans imaginable. There were two tall mirrors on the wall, and a number of old-fashioned pictures and framed paper flowers. In this room our friends gathered in the afternoon and took measures to make the time pass pleasantly for us. Whenever the conversation threatened to lose its animation, there was always some one at hand ready to accede to our host's request to play on the piano or to sing.

There was one form of hospitality which we met both at Ilagan and at Caparri that we would gladly have avoided. I still shudder when I recall the stupendous dinners that were spread before us night after night. The Filipinos pride themselves on their cookery, and it is indeed excellent. There could be no cause for complaint on that score. There is never any suspicion of the greasy and garlicky flavor to the food that characterizes a Spanish meal. Our host at Ilagan employed three cooks, each of whom in turn officiated at the preparation of one of the three dinners which we ate in that town. It is impossible to say which one deserved the palm. The shortest of the three dinners numbered fifteen courses and seemed interminable. In addition to fish, rice, chickens, and other domestic products of the country, there was served game of many sorts, including doves, snipes, deer, mountain buffalo, and boar. It was astonishing how many of the dishes were "coniida del pais," and must be sampled by the visitors to secure a just conception of the Filipino talent in matters of the palate. We felt on leaving the table as if the horn of plenty had been thrust against our lips and its contents to the last crumb forced down our unwilling throats. I notice in my diary an entry made after returning from a dinner in one of the western provinces, where more moderation was displayed, which reads: "We had been in dread of encountering another such feast as those at Ilagan and Aparri, but found, to our great relief, that this meal lasted through only eight courses."

A Filipino dinner is usually served shortly after noon, and is followed by the siesta. The next meal comes about 9 o'clock, but is ordinarily preceded about three hours earlier by light refreshments of chocolate and sweetmeats. The native is very fond of the latter, which he prepares from cocoanut meat and sugar. His table is always set—at least when guests are present—with a tablecloth and napkins, and the customary supply of knives and forks. He is very temperate in his use of liquor. An alcoholic beverage is made from the sap of the "nipa" plant, and imported wines are served in the houses of the rich in the large towns. None of these are used to excess, however; and I have never seen an intoxicated Filipino.

Throughout the valley of the Rio Grande, as well as the province of Nueva Vizcaya, the wilder regions are inhabited by Igorrotes. These savages are not powerful enough to attack a town of any size, but they are a formidable menace to the smaller villages, and particularly to travelers. Unarmed individuals can not go with impunity from one town to another, but must travel in parties and with an armed escort. For this reason communication between the towns of these provinces is comparatively rare. Many provinces—such as Nueva Vizcaya—are shut off from their neighbors by ranges of mountains, whose passes lie in the Igorrote territory, and are eminently exposed to attack. At certain seasons of the year these attacks become especially numerous, on account, it is said, of the religious ceremonies observed by the Igorrotes. These ceremonies require the presence of human heads; and, accordingly, the whole tribe, moved by a deep feeling of piety, proceeds, with its armament of arrows and lances, to waylay whatever unhappy Filipinos may come within reach. One of these seasons of religious manifestation lasts nine days. It had become so notorious, and had cost so many lives, that a few years ago a law was passed prohibiting travel on certain roads between prescribed dates.

Many tribes of Igorrotes have been brought partly within the pale of civilization, principally in the western provinces. These tribes, in their semicivilized state, are called Trugmanes. They live in primitive villages, and are presided over by leaders chosen from their own tribe. I have seen many of these people. The chiefs dress in Filipino garb, with cotton trousers, and a shirt falling outside of all. The chief is always seen carrying his staff of office—a gold-headed cane. The tribesmen wear only loin cloths. They are finely-built and very powerful men.

The dangers incident to travel have had much to do with the confusion of dialects that prevails on the island, and this confusion is consequently more marked in the eastern than in the western provinces. The educated class of Filipinos can speak two languages that are universal throughout the island in their own class; these are Spanish and Tegalog. The ignorant natives, on the other hand, have only their own provincial dialect. These dialects are so different one from another that they must be separately studied to be understood. Dictionaries of many of them have been made by the Jesuit priests. Through the servants of our party, we had at command five dialects in addition to the Spanish and Tegalog, yet in passing through one province we failed utterly to make ourselves understood by a native whom we accosted, although we plied him patiently with these seven languages.

There is but one individual who seems never to be daunted by the obstacles and dangers that separate him from the province toward which he sees fit to direct his footsteps. I refer to the Chinaman. In almost every village we visited we found at least one of that race; and in the larger towns there were many. They are the merchants of the island, presiding over every shop, and drawing money from every village. They are deeply hated by the Filipinos, and were the object of a strict emigration law under the administration of Aguinaldo's provisional government.

The steamer *Oslo*, which took our party from Aparri, brought to that port a number of Chinese immigrants, destined in the greater part for Manila. The supercargo, however, desired to leave 50 of them at Aparri, and offered the governor of that place $50 per head for that number if he would permit them to land. His offer was promptly refused.

Our party proceeded on the *Oslo* from Aparri around the northwestern corner of the island and landed on the coast near the northern end of the province of South Ilocos. From here we proceeded by land southward through the western provinces. During this part of our journey we were thrown into closer association than previously with the military element of the population, of which I hope to have an opportunity to speak further in a subsequent article.

The towns on the western coast are even larger than those on the Rio Grande. Vigan, the capital of South Ilocos, has a population of about 28,000, and Candon, farther to the southward, is not far behind this figure. The mayor of Candon was of the hustler type, and was evidently on the outlook for an opportunity to "boom" his town. On our departure he presented us with a written description of its exceptionally desirable location from a business standpoint. Every town gave evidence of the bitter fighting that had taken place between the natives and the Spaniards; many of the larger buildings, which had been used for defense, being riddled with bullet holes.

We no longer passed from town to town through unsettled stretches of country. The fields on both sides of the road were under cultivation and were dotted with laborers, while on the road itself there were always many travelers. The laborers in the fields worked in the shade of large screens of nipa leaves, which they carried with them from place to place.

Many of the travelers we passed were women. To give freedom to their limbs in walking, the skirts of their dresses were so arranged that the rear end could be drawn up between the knees and tucked into the belt in front, leaving the legs bare from the knees down. Their graceful carriage, which never failed to elicit our admiration, is due, to a great extent, I think, to their custom of carrying burdens upon their heads. This method of transportation has become a second nature to them, and is applied to articles of all descriptions. I have seen a native woman, with her hands swinging freely at her sides, walk briskly along with a pint bottle of gin balanced carelessly upon her head. On the other hand, their loads are often of great weight and towering height.

The Filipino maidens of high degree do not differ from their laboring sisters in the matter of graceful carriage. Many of them are pleasing in feature as well. Their education, however, seems to be responsible for a lack of vivacity, at least in their conversation with young men. They have evidently been taught to appear as cold and distant as possible in such society. On one point only they are always ready to meet you on terms of friendly equality; and that is when you make bold to suggest a smoke. They are always glad to accept a cigarette or small cigar, and if you are not prompt in offering one in all probability will produce one from their own supply and ask your permission to light it. This habit quickly ceases to attract your notice, except under unusual circumstances. At a town in Isabella my attention was drawn to a number of young girls returning from their first communion. They were clothed in dresses of pure white, and long veils hung chastely down below their shoulders.

I drank in the details of the picture with delight until I came to the thick haze that overhung it. Through the meshes of each veil a tube of tobacco was thrust, and every pair of dainty lips gave its continual contribution to the cloud of smoke that dwelt around the little group like a halo of universal sanction.

The men whom we met in the western provinces—our hosts at the different towns—possessed in general the same characteristics that we had observed in their countrymen farther to the eastward. We noticed, however, a marked difference between the inhabitants of the two districts in the matter of the prevailing religious sentiment. Throughout the valley of the Rio Grande the

ordinary ceremonies of worship were almost entirely suspended for want of persons ordained to conduct them.

In Ilocos and Union, however, natives had been promptly placed in the sacred offices left vacant by the imprisonment of the Spanish priests; and at the time of our visit they were conducting all the services of the church. Freedom of thought marked the views of every Filipino that I have heard express himself on the subject of religion, and although I certainly have met devout Catholics among them, I judge that that church, on account of the abuses with which it has been associated on the island, has failed on the whole to secure an exclusive hold on the minds of the natives.

In speaking of the Filipino people, I have had reference throughout principally to one class of their society, which I have called the cultured class. If my observations of that class are just, however, I think that inferences can safely be drawn from them that extend their application over the entire Tagalog population. The great mass of this population has been kept in an unenlightened state by deliberate legislation which has effectually deprived them of every possible opportunity for advancement. Those who have acquired education have acquired it at an extravagant cost that has placed it hopelessly beyond the reach of all but the wealthy. There are few, if any, among that number, however, who, while possessing the price of a schooling, have neglected to apply it to that end. I can not see what better gauge we can obtain at present of the intelligence and ambition of the whole Filipino race than the progress that has been made by its favored members with the limited opportunities at their command. Throughout the island a thirst for knowledge is manifested and an extravagant respect for those who possess it.

I have seen a private native citizen in a town in the interior exercise a more powerful influence than all the native officials over the minds of the inhabitants, simply because he was known to have been educated in the best schools at Manila, and was regarded for that reason as a superior man. The heroes of these people are not heroes of war, but of science and invention. Without rival, the American who is best known by reputation in Luzon is Mr. Edison, and any native with the slightest pretension to education whom you may question on the subject will take delight in reciting a list of his achievements. The ruling Filipinos, during the existence of their provisional government, appreciated the necessity of providing public schools to be accessible to the poorest inhabitants. Had events so shaped themselves as to have provided an opportunity for carrying into effect the plans formed on this point, it seems possible that the mental plane of the entire population might have been raised gradually to a surprising height.

Out of respect to the statements of other people which the narrative of my experience may seem to contradict, I wish to say that I have found the native of the interior of Luzon an astonishingly different character from the one ordinarily met in Manila. Previous to my journey, I regarded those whom I had encountered in that city with great dislike, and after my return I was unable to overcome that feeling. They are not a fair sample of the race; and I can not expect anyone who has formed his judgment on the subject merely from observations of that type to express an opinion similar to mine, as recorded above.

[From The Outlook, September 23, 1899.]

THE MILITARY FILIPINO.[1]

[By Leonard R. Sargent.]

The provisional government which assumed control of Filipino affairs in Luzon Island after the downfall of the Spanish power was a military one. The president of the so-called republic was general of the army and had at his command all the forces of the state, while military officers filled the high positions throughout the provinces. It was continually asserted by those in power that this disposition of the control of affairs had been resorted to merely to tide over the existing emergency and that it should continue only until the establishment of a permanent peace. As long as it remained in force, however, the concentration of power was absolute, and, moreover, no change of government could be contemplated without the cooperation of the controlling class. In the event of peace the population hoped to see the reins of government placed in their hands, but if opposition were offered, they certainly had not the power to seize them. The military class controlled the situation, and with it, in great measure, the destiny of the people. Accordingly as they were actuated by motives of patriotism or of personal ambition they could, if unmolested, inaugurate a just and liberal government or they could set upon the galled shoulders of their race a yoke as cruel as that they had just cast off.

It will never be known how they would have stood this crucial test. The peace they had anticipated is further from them now than ever, and it has been decreed that a stronger power should relieve them of the responsibility of the vital decision. Yet they have not been deprived of importance. They still retain the official voice of their people, and it is with them that our nation is now at war. In view of their preeminent position in Luzon affairs, past, present, and future, some interest must attach to every observation of their character, especially to such as tend to show to what extent they represent the feelings and aspirations of the great mass of the Filipino population, and in what measure they have at heart the truest interests of their race.

The leaders of the military element have been drawn, almost without exception, from the younger generation of that enlightened class of Filipinos, of which I have spoken in a previous article as existing everywhere throughout Luzon Island. They possess, of course, many qualities in common with their older kinsfolk, in whose charge they have been reared; and yet they differ from them so significantly on many points as to deserve particular attention. The characters of men are not set to such rigid lines as to remain unchanged by the sudden attainment of authority, and the Filipino, like his brother of every other land, assumes a new demeanor with his uniform of office.

Throughout the period of my association with both classes I found the distinction apparent between civilians and military officers. Had Mr. Wilcox and I been provided for our journey with the customary credentials required of travelers in that country many of the evidences of this difference which came to our notice would have been missing. Starting without passports, however (in fact, after having been refused them by Aguinaldo), our status was such as to invite all possible arrogance on the part of the officials, while throwing the most favorable light upon the open hospitality of the citizens. Under the circumstances I am inclined to think that there was a surprising lack of arrogance in the attitude which the officials assumed toward us. Yet there was a dignity in their bearing, and in some cases a coldness, caused by their suspicions of the motive of our journey, which were entirely lacking in their civilian countrymen. "Armor is heavy, but it is a proud burden, and a man standeth straight in it." So these young Filipinos, vested with the authority of their office and supporting the responsibility of their duty toward the state, assumed a manlier and more independent bearing than the genial and conciliatory one of the older men.

In the opposition which they frequently offered to our plans we found much that was inconvenient, but nothing that was unreasonable from their point of view. We found them hard to cajole, or to "bluff," or to move by any means other than a fair and open statement which they could clearly understand. Before the end of the journey we came to regard the military Filipino as the only stumbling block to our progress. And yet, in spite of the annoyance he caused us and of the frequent changes in our itinerary induced by his persistent opposition, we learned to admire him far beyond his simpler and more amiable countrymen.

It could easily be seen that we did not control a monopoly of the admiration expended on this subject. The older men looked with manifest pride on the evidences of the firm purpose and quick decision of their sons and nephews, even while endeavoring, in many instances, to mollify the rigor of their methods; and the young officers themselves evinced great complacency when they dwelt upon the subject of their past achievements in the field and of the efficiency of their subsequent administration of affairs. The experience through which they had passed had imparted to their character a respect for their own ability and confidence in their own resources that is woefully lacking in the untried Filipino.

Prior to my departure from Manila I had witnessed many examples of this deficiency in the national character, and had considered them of considerable significance. I remember on one occasion having observed a native coachman whose carriage had been overturned by a collision stand helplessly in the road regarding the wreck with an expression of utter despair, while he wrung his hands together and repeated in tones of the most agonized self-pity the expression, "Pobre Filipino! Pobre Filipino!" He was still in this attitude when an American soldier near by took the matter in hand, and in a very short time had the horse on his feet, the carriage right side up, and the harness readjusted. I thought at the time that if the Filipino race possessed no more stamina than that displayed by this coachman and no more readiness and resource to assist them in confronting unforeseen situations they would be indeed fortunate to have always at hand the ready support of a stronger power.

I was not aware of the hardening effect upon the national character of the events even then occurring, and did not guess that the identical qualities whose absence I had noticed were being rapidly inculcated by the first phases of that experience to whose success I had considered their presence indispensable.

Other qualities than these, moreover, are wakening from a dormant state. Prior to the advent of the great incentive in his life that came with the revolution, the native displayed, in all his undertakings, but little endurance and less perseverance. His existence was so ordered that no permanent good could come to him or to his family from even the most continued endeavor, and he labored, therefore, for some temporary emolument only. He never had at stake a prize really worth the winning, and there was nothing within his horizon that appealed to him as deserving of as much attention as his own physical comfort.

It was this that he considered first when set to any task, and he refused always to work under a strain. He recognized the limit to his powers within which he could work at ease, and, if forced beyond this limit, he promptly "threw up the sponge." In our party, at one time, among the number of our packmen were several old natives whom we had picked up at a little inland town. They belonged to the "ante-bellum" type of Filipino, and seemed scarcely cognizant of recent events. One day, toward nightfall, noticing that one of these packmen was missing, we sent back over the trail to ascertain what had become of him. He was found about 5 miles in the rear resting by the roadside, the picture of ease and indifference. In answer to our indignant inquiries, he merely replied that he had felt tired and had stopped to rest. When ordered to proceed, and threatened with punishment if he loitered, he made the distance to camp in good time. It had not been a case of exhaustion or of physical inability, but merely of an inconvenient weariness and an entire absence of grit. Such was the old, purposeless, unawakened Filipino, and he bears a marked contrast to the vigorous and enthusiastic young insurgent soldier, whose every energy is at the service of the cause he has espoused, and who has endured every hardship and braved every danger in its support.

We heard many tales, and were in a position to authenticate them to a great extent, of deeds that told in glowing terms of the endurance and courage the Filipinos could display when impelled by a sufficient motive. The revolution in Luzon Island was by no means a simultaneous uprising of the population, and in its early stages the force that opposed the Spanish power was not overwhelming in its numbers. In the provinces far in the interior particularly the earlier encounters found the advantage in the hands of the Spaniards, whose opponents were but small bands of the most daring and desperate natives of the vicinity, poorly armed and entirely without organization or discipline. Yet these pioneers of rebellion did win brilliant and surprising victories, and, by their success, encouraged their more timid neighbors to join their fortunes to the cause.

In a district embracing the capital city of Nueva Vizcaya, a band of 20 Filipinos were for several days the only natives in open rebellion, and they conducted hostilities unaided against a force of Spaniards of ten times their number. The Spanish commander, alarmed at the signs of discontent among the population, undertook to proceed with his troops to a neighboring town possessing stronger defenses. He was ambushed three separate times on the march by the little band of rebels, and suffered a large loss. Recruits immediately swelled the ranks of the insurgents, and before the week was out the entire province was in their hands. The leader of the gallant little band of patriots, Lieutenant Navarro, is one of the very few officers whom I have met who represent the more ignorant class of the population. He could not speak Spanish, nor read nor write his own language, and on that account, at the time of our visit, had not risen above the rank of lieutenant.

In many of the provinces the revolution received its start from detachments of Aguinaldo's expeditionary forces, which were sent across the island from the more populous districts on the western coast. These detachments—in some cases mere squads—performed most remarkable service.

They traveled through the wildest parts of the island to reach their destination, and, arriving there, were forced to depend, for the support of the natives, upon the success of their own first operations against the superior force of the enemy. Of these expeditions, one of the most noteworthy was that sent from North Ilocos overland to Cagayan. The mountains lying between these provinces are generally considered impassable on account of the absence of beaten paths and of the presence of one of the most formidable tribes of Igorrotes on the island. The expeditionary force, however—about forty strong—succeeded in accomplishing the journey after five days of constant effort and hardships, and arrived at Aparri in an exhausted condition, but with undaunted spirit.

The Filipinos have a national weapon with which they claim to have won their independence from Spain. This is the bola or native knife. It is used in times of peace for all conceivable purposes, and through constant practice is handled with the utmost dexterity. It is as much a part of the Filipino of

[1] See the article on "The backwoods Filipino," by Mr. Sargent, in The Outlook of September 2. The author, it will be remembered, is a naval cadet who spent the greater part of the months of October and November of 1898, in company with Paymaster W. B. Wilcox, United States Navy, in the interior of the northern part of the island of Luzon.

the provinces as a jackknife was of the old-time sailor. When traveling even for very short distances, or when working where the bola is likely to be of service, the native carries it slung on his belt and shoved around behind him, so as not to interfere with his movements. It has no definitely fixed size or shape, but the commonest type applied to the purposes of war is about 2½ feet long, including the handle, and has a broad, thick blade, with the weight and edge of a guillotine. The effect of such a weapon in hands thoroughly trained in its use can be imagined. At the time of our journey the Filipinos had absolute confidence in it, and claimed that no other weapon could withstand it. When wielded in the mad fury of a charge, its effects were certainly terrible. Not only were heads shorn off at a stroke, but bodies were severed through the trunk from shoulder to hip; and rifles held in a position of defense were cut through the barrels and the skulls beneath were split down to the chin. The native officers relied almost entirely upon these "bola charges" for the defeat of their Spanish foes. When the call to charge was sounded, the entire force, including the highest officers, discarded all other weapons and charged the enemy, bola in hand.

After the successful termination of the rebellion, all the insurgent officers provided themselves with sabers and revolvers from the supply captured from the Spaniards, and wore them with great satisfaction. As far as concerned their use in warfare, however, they regarded them with contempt, and asserted the superiority of the bola. I could not but admit that even our own soldiers would have but little chance in a hand-to-hand encounter, without firearms, with an equal number of natives armed with their favorite weapon; but I was also well aware that with revolvers they could defeat a large attacking party. I argued the point unavailingly with Aguinaldo's officers, however, and only succeeded in tainting my own reputation for veracity by relating the following incident in support of my assertions:

An American soldier on guard duty in Manila was suddenly attacked and struck to the ground by a Filipino desperado, who then took to his heels. The soldier, without attempting to rise, drew his revolver and emptied the chambers at the fleeing figure. When the native's body was examined all the bullets expended were accounted for; one had shattered his ankle, another was imbedded in his thigh, three were responsible for wounds in the trunk, and the sixth had pierced his skull. This was an actual occurrence, and I believe that the Filipino soldiery could now be easily convinced of its truth when supported by other evidences of good marksmanship that have undoubtedly come to their notice. The reason for their original incredulity could easily be understood, however, after an examination of the revolvers with which they were provided. These were miserable imitations of the Smith & Wesson revolver, and bore on the back of the barrel the name of the makers, garbled into "Smit & Wilson." No part of their action was perfected; the cartridge frequently failed to come in line with the hammer, and 50 per cent is a fair estimate of the misfires.

At the time of our journey the patriotic enthusiasm of the population was everywhere at its height. The boast of every inhabitant was the national army whose organization was then being rapidly perfected. Commissions were eagerly sought by the young men of the higher class, and there were more volunteers for service in the ranks than could be armed or uniformed.

It was universally asserted that every preparation should be made to defend the newly won independence of the island against all foreign aggression. The older Filipinos, especially those of wealth and influence, declared their desire to give every support in their power to the cause, and were as much a part of the warlike movement as those who actually took up arms. The great majority of the latter, both officers and enlisted men, were extremely young. I have met a brigadier-general of 21 years of age, many captains of 18, and lieutenants of 15 and 16. Captain Natioidad, a particularly young officer of that rank and a member of a prominent Luzon family, explained that it was the aim of his government to rest its defense in the field in the hands of those of its supporters who were at that age that is most forcibly swayed by the love of military glory. For the desperate encounters that might await its army in the future it desired that sort of valor of which discretion is not the better part.

That the civil power should be placed in the same hands was a dangerous experiment, but at the same time a necessary one. The first object of the Filipinos had been to win their independence; the next was to defend it. For both these purposes they had need of their best fighting material, and the selection was made accordingly. The result proved more fortunate than there had been any reason to hope. While exercising absolute authority throughout the island and governing entirely by military law, the leaders of the army appeared, nevertheless, to endeavor to mete out justice to all classes alike. They continued, moreover, to assert their intention to relinquish their temporary power when the establishment of a permanent peace should make such a step possible, and gave most encouraging proofs of the good faith with which they spoke.

A tendency was apparent in many individual instances to treat the entire civilian population with contempt, and the lower element of it with oppression and abuse. In one or two districts through which we passed this spirit was particularly marked, but it was not countenanced as a rule, and had been made the subject of a special order from the authorities at Malolos. On the whole, as far as I could judge, the tendency was upward. The young officers displayed an earnest desire to improve their minds for the benefit of the State, and seemed to be impelled by the ambition to prove themselves worthy of the trust that had been confided in them.

I passed one evening about the middle of last November in the "Commandancia" at San Fernando, in the province of Union, where were quartered over forty officers belonging either to companies stationed at the town or to the staff of General Fiña, the commander of the northwestern district. Our conversation was confined, as usual, to a great extent to professional subjects; but I remember the visit particularly on account of the presence of a number of Spanish text-books on infantry tactics which were distributed among the officers and were evidently in almost constant service. * * * How many of these eager young students of the rudiments of military science have since learned the final lesson of war?

[From The Independent, September 14, 1899.]

IN THE HEART OF LUZON.

[By Paymaster W. B. Wilcox, United States Navy.]

No doubt it is a misfortune that the Filipino does not understand American valor, and I dare say it is equally unpleasant that the average American does not know the true character of the natives of the Philippine Islands. Diplomacy could do much, and justice as we claim for ourselves could do more.

I was fortunate in being allowed by Admiral Dewey to make a long journey through the Island of Luzon; in fact, I covered the whole northern portion from Manila to Aparri with the then Naval Cadet Sargent, and in no country have I been treated with more kindly hospitality.

We started with eight horses and five servants and came to Bayambang, where we spent Sunday at the house of Mr. Clark, an Englishman, and were entertained in a thoroughly English country gentleman's way. The next day we limbered up and made the first stage to Rosales and pitched our tents on the bank of the Rio Aritao. That evening the presidente local sent a man to invite us to the convento, but I said we were settled for the night, our horses tethered, and prepared to remain until next morning. We rode into this town and were received with the band playing and given a most welcome reception. Soon after we saddled up and proceeded to the next stage. The towns passed were all in gala attire, having known from couriers that we were coming. Nothing occurred until the journey from San Jose to Puncan was undertaken, and that was almost the hardest of the whole trip. Horses were of no use, we engaged bagadores to carry our outfit, and I must say if we could have traveled as fast as these men, with packs of nearly 70 pounds each, in the driving rain, we would have reached Puncan early in the afternoon. But horses can not compete with muscular men in the long run. Arriving at the river Carranglan, swollen from heavy rains, our men said it was impossible to cross; but Mr. Sargent plunged his horse into the raging stream and reached the other bank. The natives followed. I was left as the only one. We had brought several hundred fathoms of small rope for just such purposes, and I suggested tying this to a tree and bringing the end to me to tie around my waist, and thus swim over the stream. The current was running 6 miles an hour. The plan was partly carried out, but in bringing the rope across the line parted, and Sargent, who had the end, went under the stream and we never expected to see him again. Finally I got over. In all towns the best the Filipinos had was given us and not a cent would be accepted in payment.

From Puncan the next important stop was at the river Carranglan, which was roaring so hard it made it impossible to cross at night, and we pitched our tents on the bank. The major-domo of the party said there were numerous caymans (alligators) and they would crawl up and eat us and our horses some time during the night. So he kept firing guns and was awake all night. He could imagine the 30-foot alligator walking away with a horse and a tent and all contents, though we had about forty men all told and many guns.

Passing over much that occurred, we reached the foot of the Carabello Mountains, which began the hardest of all the journey.

After many weary hours I, who was carrying 220 pounds, finally reached the summit at the altitude of 3,000 feet.

On reaching Aritao the presidente local put us up in an old convent and his band serenaded us at night, and in the morning everywhere the same generous kindness was shown. Our next stop was at Bambang, where the nephew of Aguinaldo met us some distance out of town, guns firing and convent bells ringing. In the evening a fine orchestra was stationed in the hall and lulled two sleepy Americans to rest in sweetest strains, for almost all Filipinos can play some sort of music. In leaving this spot we were accompanied by soldiers as usual, and by Aguinaldo himself, to Bayombong, capital of the province of Nueva Vizcaya. I was met at the bank of the river by the presidente local, and we rode into town amid flags flying and the band playing and were taken to the municipal building. In this far-away town of Luzon I met the most intelligent man, a lawyer by profession, an educated man, and his theory of the future of his country appealed to me as quite the proper solution: what he wanted was free public schools in every village and town, where English would be taught and where the children would soon have wiped out from their curriculum all the Spanish form of government and all the Spanish customs that have brought devastation to their homes; as prostituting all the virtues of a people who want their homes protected and to live in quietness and peace where their daily earnings will not be filched from them by the ingenious methods only known to the hidalgo Español and the man whom he employs for purpose of the basest robbery.

From this place our next important stop was Iligan, the capital of the province of Isabella, where millions of dollars come in annually to purchase the product of tobacco which is grown in this, perhaps the most fertile province in the whole of Luzon.

On our first night in this inland capital we were given a dance at which fifty well-dressed young ladies and the same number of gentlemen attended. I was sorry, indeed, I had not my dress suit. One young lady with whom I danced had a splendid gown of rare silk handsomely embroidered, and she danced, I confess, better than I; she was a fine player on the piano and sang many songs for us. The next night a theater was given, and the players were quite as good as in some shows in a more pretentious country.

From Aparri we took steamer to the west coast, and then by horse and various other means made our way to Dagupan and Manila, after a month and a half of most delightful experiences.

The resources of the country can hardly be estimated, but it must have peace and, still more important, transportation, railroads, and means of getting the product of the soil to ready market.

Public schools will do more for the civilization of the island of Luzon than bayonets, and in a few years the Filipino children, who are now most anxious to learn the English language, will be the producers of shiploads of products of the most fertile soil in a tropical latitude and make an empire in the Orient of which not only ourselves but the Filipino will be justly proud.

We must first destroy all vestige of the Spanish ideas and have one language for all the island. As it is now a man of one province can not understand the language of his neighbor, living across the line within a few hundred yards.

When the Filipino can see the benefit of honorable treatment and that justice will be dispensed without favor, he will come into the fold and be a citizen not to be ashamed of.

IN AGUINALDO'S REALM.

[By Ensign L. R. Sargent, United States Navy.]

In the early part of October, 1898, Paymaster Wilcox, United States Navy, and I obtained from Admiral Dewey leave of absence from our duties on board the U. S. S. *Monadnock* for the purpose of making a tour of observation through the northern part of the island of Luzon. Our original plans were of a very indefinite nature, being merely to proceed as far to the northward as the character of the country and the attitude of the natives would permit and to return only when forced to do so. The existing ignorance of the conditions prevailing in the interior gave rise to a very exaggerated idea of the difficulties of such a journey.

Had it been suggested at any time prior to our departure that we could cover the ground as completely as we eventually succeeded in doing, we should have scouted the idea as preposterous. Suggestions of this nature were, however, conspicuous by their absence, while prophecies of an early failure and an ignominious return were numerous. As the few days that we could devote to our preparations passed and we found ourselves coming face to face with the difficulties of our undertaking, these gloomy prophecies certainly forced an echo from our own hearts.

The first material obstacle that we encountered was the refusal of Aguinaldo to provide us with passports. These, we had reason to believe, were a sine qua non of peaceful travel through the island, officers of our Army whose duties carried them beyond our own lines having been repeatedly turned back for want of them. Mr. Wilcox, with the outfit, servants, and horses, proceeded to Bayambang, a town near the northern terminus of the railroad, where he was entertained by Mr. Donald Clark, a hospitable Englishman, while I spent two days at Malolos petitioning Aguinaldo for a more favorable answer. The Filipino president remained firm, however. He expressed great friendliness, and readily gave his consent to our journey, refusing only to provide written passports, without which we should be, of course, as defenseless against the opposition of his officers as the most unwarranted trespassers. It was evident that he preferred that we should remain

at home. When I joined Mr. Wilcox at Bayambang we talked the matter over and came to the conclusion that we held anything but a strong hand. We decided, therefore, to adopt that method of play by which alone it is possible to win on a poor one. Leaving Bayambang at daybreak next morning, we accordingly proceeded by the main traveled road on the first stage of our journey.

This road led us almost due east through the low and marshy province of Nueva Ecija. The rainy season at this time was at its height, and for seven days we scarcely saw the sun. Almost from the start we found the mud so deep that it was impossible to ride the horses through it. Leading them by their bridles, we struggled on on foot until men and beasts were exhausted, covering in this way only 10 or 12 miles a day. Even with the sun covered the heat was excessive, and members of the party were frequently prostrated by that and the exertion combined. Two of our servants proved too old to stand the strain and were sent back, a fate which befell two of our horses also. We soon recruited our party to its original strength, however. Pack horses were quickly abandoned in favor of natives, who accompanied us from town to town, carrying our luggage divided among them on their backs. For the tremendous labor which these men performed they considered 10 cents a day ample pay. This amount seems still more ridiculously small when you consider that the men were usually discharged a full day's travel distance from their homes. As we proceeded the road grew worse, until finally at San José it dwindled to a soggy bridle path. Just beyond San José the province of Nueva Ecija joins that of Nueva Viscaya, the division between them being marked by a range of mountains. The natives along the route had informed us that this range was impassable, even to natives, during that season of the year, and this statement received decided indorsement at San José. It was not with any great hope of success, therefore, but with a determination to carry the attempt as far as possible that we set out from San José. We had difficulty in obtaining men for this stage of the journey, but succeeded finally, by offering considerable inducements, in engaging ten men and a guide. We found that the difficulties in this case had been very little exaggerated. Many times our progress seemed effectually checked. The continuous rains of the past week had swollen every one of the innumerable mountain streams until its passage had become a problem. This stage of not over 30 miles as the crow flies occupied three days of ten working hours each. The trail was extremely intricate. Our guide was a native of the district and had often made the journey (though never at that season of the year), yet he lost the way three times, and had great difficulty in finding it again. Here, for the first time, we heard fear expressed by members of our party of an attack by the Igorrotes, or savages of the hills; a possibility which afterwards came to form an important part in all our calculations. We also became acquainted with the native terror of the alligators which infest the streams, and, in a lower degree, of the serpents occasionally met in the forests.

Upon reaching the town of Carranglan, on the other side of the mountains in the province of Nueva Vizcaya, we took a day to dry our outfit and to recuperate. Our diet during the past three days had been cold boiled rice and hard-tack, and our rest at night had been on the wet ground with practically no protection from the violent rain. In that climate hardships can not be endured with impunity, and every man of the party, native as well as American, showed the effect of this treatment. Fortunately, however, the traveling from this point on became easier, and we were able, even in our somewhat weakened condition, to travel at a more rapid pace than previously. Our arrival at Carranglan marked the end of one distinct stage of our journey, and our departure therefrom marked the beginning of a second.

Up to this time the obstacles encountered had been natural ones—bad roads and swollen rivers. The province of Nueva Ecija is an important one from a military standpoint. Its towns at that time were garrisoned by small squads of soldiers, commanded by noncommissioned officers, and we met no one who felt it incumbent upon himself to make any determined opposition to our progress, although many expressed surprise at our lack of the customary passports. From Carranglan on through the province of Nueva Vizcaya we met with more varying fortunes, experiencing the coldest suspicion as well as the most demonstrative hospitality, being greeted at one town by the ringing of church bells and the music of the band and at the next by the critical cross-questioning of the local authorities. At Bayombong, the capital of the province, we were stopped for several hours by the military officer stationed there. After ridiculing the whole idea of passports, and giving this officer some good advice on the manner of conducting a republican form of government, we succeeded in obtaining his permission to proceed.

At an elevation of four or five hundred meters above the sea level, with firm roads and a cordial sun, traveling became the greatest of pleasures. No matter what the attitude of the military officers in the different towns might be, we were invariably made welcome by the citizens.

The larger towns at which we spent the night gave balls in our honor, while the smaller ones, with the village band and native dancing, gave what entertainment they could improvise—often the most enjoyable. While the towns of this province are larger and more pretentious than those of Nueva Ecija, they are situated farther apart and are more completely isolated one from another. The forests between are inhabited by tribes of Igorrotes, who are a constant menace to travelers. On one road over which we passed a party of 20 Filipinos had been murdered to a man only a few days before our arrival. The character of the country offers every opportunity for such savage attack, the trail frequently leading through thick forests or plains of rank grass meeting overhead. Although we considered our party strong enough for its own protection, we were usually provided with an escort of Filipino soldiers.

Frequently we were joined by natives who had been awaiting an opportunity to go from one town to another in safety, bringing the number of our party at one time up to forty-seven. Often from the high points on the road we could see the smoke of at least one Igorrote camp fire, frequently within a few miles of a large Filipino town. There can hardly be any direct method of attack against these savages, since they build no villages and have a vast wilderness for refuge; but at the time of our visit the Filipinos had already begun to build small forts at the points most frequently subject to their menaces—a step in advance of any the Spaniards had taken.

At the town of Carig, near the frontier of the province of Isabella, we encountered Major Villa, the military governor of the province, who had been sent from his capital city by his superior officer, Colonel Tirona, the commander of the northeastern military district, to demand our passports, and, if we did not have them, to examine into the purpose of our expedition. In carrying out his orders this officer kept us for seven days quartered in a deserted convent in this miserable village. At the end of that time, by the permission of Colonel Tirona, with whom we had succeeded in opening direct communication, we were allowed to proceed.

A few miles from Carig we reached the Rio Grande de Cagayan, down which we descended in canoes to its mouth. We spent two days at Iligan, the capital of the province of Isabella, and three at Aparri, the only seaport on the northern coast of the island, towns having a population of about 15,000 each. We were extremely well entertained. At Iligan a large ball was given in our honor, and two Spanish operas were presented by the young people of the town. From this performance we received most pleasing proof of the humor, intelligence, and refinement of our entertainers.

At the towns we had previously visited we had occasionally seen numerous Spanish prisoners, all of whom were apparently enjoying full liberty within the limits of the town. At Iligan we saw Spanish soldiers and ex-civil officials in the same status; but the priests had been differently dealt with; they were too dangerous to be left at large, we were told, and were accordingly confined in a convent. We saw them one morning, to the number of 84, lined up in the street in charge of a squad of Filipino soldiers.

At Aparri I witnessed a ceremony which, at the time, I considered pregnant with significance, and I have seen no reason since for changing my opinion. During our entire journey we had noticed the existence of a distinct civil and military government. The civil government was simple and efficient, consisting of four officials for each province and four for each town. The military government consisted of an officer in command of a military district, having under his orders one officer as military governor of each province and one as governor of each important town. The military government was the dominant one. We remarked on this condition several times, and were told that it would last only during a state of war. At Aparri we received proof of the sincerity of this statement. Word had been received from Hongkong that our commissioners at Paris, negotiating the terms of the treaty of peace, had plainly indicated that it was their intention not to return the islands to Spain. Relieved from their great apprehension of this action, the Filipino population began at once to see rosy visions of peace descending on their war-torn country. Steps were immediately taken to adjust existing conditions to the new state of things. Colonel Tirona, the governor of the northeastern military district, took the lead by relinquishing the control of affairs in the provinces comprised in his district in favor of a civil official chosen by the people. I was present at the impressive ceremony which solemnized this change in the province of Cagayan. The ceremony took place in the cathedral at Aparri and was attended by all the local officials of the towns of the province, as well as by any military officers that could be spared from their duties. Colonel Tirona placed the usual insignia of office—a gold-headed cane—in the hands of the governor-elect at the close of a short speech, in which he said that now that a state of peace seemed probable he desired to divest himself of the unusual authority that it had been necessary for him temporarily to exercise and to assume his proper position as a servant—not a ruler—of the people. The governor, in reply, expressed his thanks to the Colonel and to all of the expeditionary forces for the incalculable service they had rendered the people of the province in freeing them from Spanish rule and declared the purpose of the people to expend the last drop of their blood, if necessary, in defending the liberty thus gained against the encroachments of any nation whatsoever. The governor then took the oath of office, being followed in turn by each of the three other provincial officials, the heads of the departments of justice, revenue, and the police. It was the Colonel's intention to have a similar ceremony performed in each of the other provinces under his control. Had the Filipino government been allowed to work out its own salvation, this movement could hardly have failed to become historical.

At Aparri we saw proof also of the extent of Aguinaldo's authority. Four natives had been tried for robbery and attempted murder and had been sentenced to death. At the time of our visit they were awaiting the arrival from Malolos of the ratification of their sentence by the president.

Everywhere we traveled the greatest loyalty toward Aguinaldo was expressed. Now, at the time of his reverses, it is possible, though I am far from convinced, that he represents but one element of his people; then, in his prosperity, he certainly represented them all—at least in northern Luzon. At that time the enthusiasm of the people was tuned to the highest pitch. In every village every man was training in arms. Companies were formed of boys from 8 years of age upward. Wooden guns were furnished them, and they were drilled systematically every day. The women also were imbued with the spirit. Many and many a time have the people of a village gathered in the large room of the "presidencia," where the paymaster and I were quartered, and put their whole hearts into the songs in which their patriotism found vent. Of these songs the national hymn was the favorite, and no one within hearing ever failed to join in the chorus:

Del sueño de tres Siglos
Hermanos despertad!
Gritando, "Fuera España!
Viva la libertad!"

(From your sleep of three centuries
Brothers awake!
Crying, "Away with Spain!
Live liberty!")

After a delay of three days we were fortunate enough to catch a small coasting steamer, which took us around the northern end of the island and landed us on the western coast at the northern end of the province of South Ilocos. From here we proceeded toward Manila. We wished to visit the interior provinces on this side of the island, but were prevented by the authorities. Already the hope was fading that freedom from Spain meant freedom of government. The feeling toward Americans was changing, and we saw its effect in the colder manner of the people and in their evident desire to hustle us along by the most direct road to Manila.

Although the spirit was evidently missing, we were nominally treated with every distinction. A mounted escort was furnished us, which rode ahead with guidons to clear the road. The towns in these western coast provinces are larger and more numerous than those in the valley of the Rio Grande. The military element is much more in evidence, as well as the native religious element, which has succeeded the Spanish priests. At Vigan, the capital of South Ilocos, we dined with twenty-eight military officers, and at San Fernando, the capital of Union, with forty. All of these officers are very young, a large proportion being minors. General Tino, commanding the northeastern military district, is just 21. Captain Natividad, the commander of three important towns with an aggregate population of over 40,000, is 18 years old, while his younger brother, who bears a commission as lieutenant, is but 16. His elder brother, with the rank of lieutenant-general, was next in command to Aguinaldo at the age of 28 when he fell in action in the revolution of 1896.

In the latter part of November Paymaster Wilcox and I returned to Manila. A few minutes after our arrival I attempted to engage the services of a Filipino coachman, and found him stubborn and insolent almost beyond belief. I thought of the courteous gentleman and respectful servant I had met in the interior and wondered where among them I should class this brute. Yet they are all three one; and together they make up the Filipino. Good treatment makes of him the respectful servant, education makes of him a gentleman that no man need be ashamed to greet; but anything that he interpreta as injustice arouses something in his nature that makes of him a stubborn and intractable brute. If all were known about the Filipino, public sentiment toward him, while it might not be changed, would at least be softened. There are qualities in him too fine to be wantonly destroyed. If the brute must be broken, let us hope that the respectful servant and the gentleman will be encouraged.

REPORT OF TOUR THROUGH ISLAND OF LUZON.

MANILA, P. I., *November 23, 1898.*

SIR: 1. In obedience to your order, we herewith submit a report of the tour of observation of the northern part of the island of Luzon, undertaken by your authority during a leave of absence beginning October 5, 1898.

2. Paymaster W. B. Wilcox was detained by duty on board the U. S. S. *Monadnock* until October 6, Naval Cadet L. H. Sargent leaving on the 5th. Preparations for the journey were immediately begun, and were completed by the evening of October 7. From the experience of certain American officers we had learned that it was necessary, in order to pass through the lines of the Philippine forces, to obtain permission from their leader, Señor Emilio Aguinaldo. To comply with this form, Naval Cadet Sargent visited Aguinaldo at his official residence in the town of Malolos. Leaving Manila by train at noon, October 7, he arrived at his destination shortly after 2 o'clock. Señor Aguinaldo at this time was attending a meeting of the Philippine cabinet, and our request for passports through his troops in the northern provinces was taken to him by his aid-de-camp, Señor C. C. Zealcita. In making this request we stated our rank as naval officers and the object of our proposed journey as a desire to acquire information with regard to this country, at present almost unknown to Americans. Señor Aguinaldo sent out word by his aid-de-camp that he was too busily engaged that day to provide the passes, and, furthermore, that a member of our party coming later to request them should be expected to have a letter from either Admiral Dewey, General Otis, or General MacArthur.

3. Naval Cadet Sargent returned to Manila by the evening train. The flagship *Olympia* being at Cavite, to have requested a letter from the commander in chief would have caused a delay of at least one day. Both members of our party being acquainted with General MacArthur, the circumstances were explained to him and a letter obtained on the evening of the 1st to Malolos. This letter was addressed "to whom it may concern," and was a mere statement that the officers presenting it wished to visit the northern provinces of the island and desired passports through the Philippine forces. It gave the itinerary of the proposed journey. The next morning, October 8, we also obtained from Consul-General Williams a personal letter to Señor Aguinaldo, requesting that passports be provided us.

4. At noon of this day, October 8, we left Manila by train with five servants, eight horses, and between three and four hundred pounds of baggage, including a camp outfit, two rifles, and a shotgun, with ammunition. Paymaster Wilcox, in charge of the expedition, went on to Bayambang that night, while Naval Cadet Sargent left the train at Malolos to present our letters to Señor Aguinaldo. As on the day before, our request was taken in by Señor Zealcita. After a delay of about two hours Señor Aguinaldo's answer was brought out. It was to the effect that he declined to assume the responsibility of providing us with passports to travel in the provinces we wished to visit. Rumors had just been received of an insurrection, instigated by a Spanish bishop, in the northern provinces, on the western coast, and he could not tell how far an insurrection thus started might spread. While his authority was thus menaced he refused to provide us with papers that would make him responsible for our safety, while they might not protect us from illtreatment. He also refused a second request to furnish us passports specifically addressed to those soldiers only that were loyal to his command and stating that we traveled at our own risk. Through his aid-de-camp, however, he gave us the repeated and positive assurance that we were free to prosecute our journey without passes from him, and that we should encounter no opposition from his forces. This oral promise was the only substitute that we were able to obtain for the formal passports that it has been the custom of the country heretofore to demand of every traveler.

5. Naval Cadet Sargent left Malolos by the first train next morning, October 9, and joined Paymaster Wilcox at Bayambang. At this town we remained at the house of Mr. Donald Clark, an Englishman, superintendent of a rice mill situated there. Here we made final preparations for an early morning start on horseback the next day. That evening two Americans came to Mr. Clark's house and requested shelter for the night. They had gone by train that morning to Dagupan, the northern terminus of the railway, intending to spend the night there. A squad of Philippine soldiers at the railway station, however, had demanded of them passes signed by Señor Aguinaldo. For want of them they were compelled to remain within the station until the departure of the next train south, which train they were required to board. This train remained for the night at Bayambang. This evidence of the attitude of the Philippine troops toward travelers increased our fears that our progress would be opposed at the first town on our route. Through the influence of Mr. Clark we obtained from the "presidente local" of the town of Bayambang a letter to the "presidente local" of the town of Rosales, the first town of importance on our route. This letter merely requested that we be allowed to continue our journey through that town.

6. At daylight next morning, October 10, we left Bayambang and took the road for Rosales. We reached that town just before sundown and pitched our tent on the bank of the river Agno, outside the limits of the town. For the first 5 or 6 miles from Bayambang we found the roads in good condition and traveled with ease. Nearer to Rosales the roads were deep with mud and covered with water in places. We were forced to go on foot the greater part of the distance, men and horses having great difficulty in making their way. About 11 o'clock in the morning we passed through the small town of Alcala. There were 12 soldiers stationed at this town in charge of a sergeant. They were armed with Remington rifles. We were met by the civil authorities and were surrounded by the people. Much curiosity was expressed in regard to our outfit, but it was of a harmless and friendly nature. No suspicion was excited and passports were not mentioned. The soldiers did not assert themselves in any way.

7. Between Alcala and Rosales we passed from the province of Pangasinan to that of Nueva Ecija. The province of Pangasinan is not touched upon in this report, since, except for the few miles traveled on the morning of October 10, we traversed it only by rail.

8. We were visited shortly after dark at our camp near Rosales by a messenger from the presidente local of that town with an invitation to pass the night at the government building or "presidencia." As we were already unpacked, we decided to remain in camp. We sent back to the presidente local by his messenger the letter we had obtained from the presidente local at Bayambang. We were visited during the evening by many natives from the town, among them several civil officials. No soldiers came near the camp. The next morning, October 11, we continued our journey, reaching Rosales in a few minutes. We visited the "presidencia," where we were met by the presidente local and all other natives of consequence in the town. We were allowed to proceed without protest, although surprise was expressed that we had not obtained written passports from the Philippine government. There were about 20 soldiers in this town, armed, as before, with Remington rifles and commanded by a sergeant. We were detained at Rosales only a short time and then took the road for Humingan.

9. From Rosales to Humingan, and thence to San Jose, our experiences of travel were much the same as those already described. The road led through the low rice region of the province of Nueva Ecija. It rained almost constantly, and the roads were nearly impassable. We went on foot much of the distance. The pack horses were unable to carry their loads, and we were forced to engage natives to relieve them. Labor was cheap. Ten men could usually be engaged for a day for the sum of $2 in silver, or less than 10 cents in gold per man. We traveled slowly over this distance, the labor of walking through the mud, frequently over our knees, being excessive. The horses grew poor rapidly and we were forced to husband their strength. They were occasionally prostrated in the road and our progress was delayed until they could recover their strength. Moreover, we could seldom find proper food for them at night. As many as three at a time were unable to carry any weight for several days. One servant became ill and was left at a village. The rest of the party retained their health, with the exception of occasional cases of diarrhea and consequent sickness at the stomach, which did not prevent traveling. Our food during this period consisted of bacon and hardtack, which we had brought with us, and chickens and rice, which we obtained from the natives. The cooking was done by our own servant.

10. Through this part of the province of Nueva Ecija almost the only form of agriculture encouraged at present by the natives is rice growing. A little sugar is also raised. The land is very rich; we encountered no barren or unfertile spots. The fields at this season of the year are several inches deep with water. There is no timber of value along the direct line of our route, but in the hills along the River Agno forests could be seen. We passed through similar forests later, which will be treated in their turn. The forests in this district, however, are nearer to a market. There are very few horses and practically no cattle. There are a great number of buffalo, and these are of extreme utility. The principal labor of the natives at this season is the thrashing of rice. This is done very primitively with implements that resemble on a large scale the pestle and mortar of a chemist. The mortar is replaced by a section of a log of hard wood hollowed out to receive the grain, the pestle by a hard club from 4 to 5 feet long and about 6 inches in diameter at each end. This club is scraped down at the middle to the size of the hand. In thrashing out the rice the native stands above the mortar and throws his club vertically into it with one hand, catching it up with the other hand and repeating the blow, always changing hands at the bottom of the stroke. Usually three or four natives beat into the same mortar and a certain cadence is always maintained. We have even seen them accompanied by a musical instrument. They pursue this occupation very industriously, and we seldom in this district got beyond the muffled sound of the rice beaters. A little cotton weaving is also done here. The cotton thread is brought from Manila and woven on crude bamboo looms into rough cloth, used by the natives.

11. In the villages of Humingan and Lupao there are a few Spanish prisoners—priests, soldiers, and civil officials. We have seen representatives of each of these three classes in these towns. We could detect no signs of previous ill treatment, nor of undue restriction. On the contrary, they appeared to possess the freedom of the town in which they lived.

12. The towns in this section are neither large nor important. Humingan, the largest, has not over two or three thousand inhabitants. The church, with the convent attached, is the largest building in each town; it is built of planed wood, whitewashed. There are three or four houses of planed wood in each town, the rest of the village consisting of grass huts. The presidente local and other local officers are native Filipinos. Most of them have received a certain amount of education at religious schools in Manila. They are intelligent men and are extremely eager to learn news from the outside world. Their knowledge of modern history and geography, however, is extremely limited; and their ignorance of current events is surprising. We brought them their first definite information with regard to Cuba and to their own present status. One or two of them had heard of the Congress at Paris; but no one had any idea as to its object, nor as to its relation to themselves. They were well grounded on only three points—the destruction of the Spanish squadron in Manila Harbor, the surrender of Manila, and the declaration by the Philippine government at Malolos of the independence of the islands and the establishment of a republican form of government with Señor Aguinaldo as president. Even on these points the details they had received were very inaccurate. Between the towns of Rosales and Humingan there are two small villages, called barrios, varying in population from one to three thousand inhabitants. We were thus enabled to sleep in a hut over night, and avoid camping in the wet fields by the roadside. These barrios are under the jurisdiction of the nearest town or "pueblo." There were soldiers in each town, but not more than twenty in any place, and there was no commissioned officer in the district. We were cordially received everywhere, not only by the heads of the town, but also by the laboring and farming people, who always saluted us in a friendly manner when we passed. On leaving each town our interpreter was presented by the presidente local with passes. These passes always included our native servants and packmen and sometimes ourselves as well. They were good only to the next town, and secured a comparatively prompt exchange of packmen. We were never allowed to take any men farther than to the next town without permanently attaching them to our party. It is the duty of the presidente local of each town to do his share in facilitating the journey of every properly accredited traveler. Usually the assistance brings him in a pecuniary return. The duty then becomes a privilege, and is very zealously guarded.

13. We arrived at the town of San Jose on the evening of October 14 and spent the night there. There was the usual guard here of between 12 and 20 soldiers, armed with Remington rifles and commanded by a noncommissioned officer. We had been warned by the official of the last town that San José must inevitably prove the end of our journey. There is no road for 30 miles beyond this point, and in this season the natives consider the trail impassable to white men. Very few of the natives themselves attempt it in the months of rain. We found at San José, however, 10 men willing to accompany us as pack bearers, and with these we started out next morning. The trail proved to be a little better than represented. Twenty-four hours more of rain would have made at least three mountain streams impassable. The trail is, moreover, extremely intricate. It leads for over half a mile along a shoal in a small river, and follows the beds of different mountain streams for many times that distance. Rushing water, frequently knee deep on the horses, covered these stretches of the trail at the time we passed. On land grass and underbrush grow thickly over the trail and conceal it for considerable distances. Our guide had spent his life in this district and had traveled the trail very often. He deviated from it twice that day, however, and had much difficulty in regaining it. During the insurrection a company of Spanish soldiers had been sent over this trail. Our guide pointed out many spots where numbers of them had been ambushed and slain. Huts that had been built for shelter at night could frequently be seen. According to the statement of our guide, very few of this Spanish force lived to reach the town of Carranglan. It is undoubtedly a trail that a few men could hold against heavy odds; it is the first of this nature we have seen. It is very hilly and the ascents are steep, crooked, and surrounded by heavy trees and underbrush. Numerous rapid streams were crossed during the day. The pack bearers at first refused to cross two streams that were deeper and more rapid than the others. They required both encouragement and example before they could be induced to make the attempt. It rained fiercely all day.

14. At dark we arrived at the town of Puncan. This town is the smallest and least pretentious that we visited during our entire journey. It has a

population of about 300 inhabitants, only two or three of whom speak Spanish, and these imperfectly. The presidencia is a thatched hut with only one room. Next morning we continued our journey with the same pack men as before. The presidente local of the town could not provide a sufficient number and permitted this breach of etiquet.

15. The journey of this day was a repetition of our experience of the preceding day, with the exception that the rain was neither so continuous nor so violent. At 3 o'clock we reached the bank of the last river that separated us from the town of Carranglan. This river, the Rio Barat, was swollen to such an extent that our horses were carried off their feet before the bed of the stream was reached. Not being able to get our freight across the stream with the means at hand, we attracted the attention of a native on the other bank by discharging our firearms and sent him to the town of Carranglan to procure buffalo for our assistance. The buffalo did not arrive that evening, however, and we spent the night in camp on the bank of the river. Next morning we found that the river had gone down considerably. Buffalo arrived from the town, and with their help we crossed in safety with all our freight.

16. On the other bank we were met by a lieutenant of the Philippine army, the first military officer we had seen since leaving the railroad. We were escorted by him and his soldiers to the presidencia. The presidente local received us rather coolly and treated us in that manner while we were his guests. He asked us for passports from the central government, and expressed surprise and suspicion when he learned that we had none in writing. He was the only civil officer that we met until after we left Aparri that joined with the military power in opposing our progress. Moreover, he was the only one that seemed to have more power and influence in his own town than the military officers stationed there. The troops here consisted of 40 soldiers armed with Remington rifles and commanded by the officer we had met at the river.

17. We spent the day at Caranglan, drying our baggage, which had been constantly wet for two days and had begun to mold. The officers here told us that there were still worse rivers to cross than those we had already encountered and other obstacles as well. This day was the 17th of October. At the rate we were traveling it was plainly impossible to accomplish the journey planned by November 5, and there appeared at this time no prospect of an improvement in the roads. We sent, therefore, letters addressed to the commanding officer U. S. S. *Monadnock*, requesting of the commander in chief an extension of leave of absence until November 20. These letters were given to the presidente local, who assured us that they would arrive safely at their destination.

18. We left Caranglan next morning. The presidente local insisted upon our taking a guard of 12 soldiers, with a sergeant, to protect us against the Igorrotes or savages, that are said to infest the hills between this town and Aritao. We had but little difficulty in making this trip, which lasted two days. The rain had ceased, and the rivers had decreased so much in size that they were crossed with ease. At the end of the first day we camped at the foot of the Caraballo Sur Mountains, at an elevation of 200 meters above the sea level. The next day we crossed the mountains. The road is very steep and of a clayey formation. It ascends very quickly to a height of 1,050 meters, as recorded by our barometer, and then descends at about the same incline to an elevation of between 200 and 300 meters. The northern slope is covered with stones and pebbles. At the highest point of the road, a very well-defined summit, there is a stone barricade facing both slopes. This barricade was left here by the Spanish soldiers during the insurrection. They were driven from it by lack of water. It is an extremely strong position. At a level spot on the northern slope, about 500 feet below the summit, the Spanish troops have built a more elaborate fortification, consisting of a bamboo stockade inclosing a rectangular barricade of stones with a small blockhouse at each end. There is a watchtower at each corner of the stockade. This fortification can be fired upon from above and approached from several directions at the same time.

19. We arrived at Aritao shortly before sundown. A broad branch of the Rio Magat separated us from this town. There was a "banca" or native dugout canoe, however, in which men and baggage were taken to the other side, while the horses were swum across at a point higher up the stream. These facilities for crossing streams were always available when necessary during the remainder of our journey. In the mountains and highlands through which we passed in the last two or three days there are extensive forests. The forests are not homogeneous but contain many different classes of trees, the timber of which is in many cases valueless. Of the timber which we have seen the most valued on the island is the "mulawe," so called both in Spanish and Tegala. This is a tall straight tree with very few branches; the bark is very light in color but the wood is very dark and close-grained and resists water and weather. It is much used for boats and for the floors and exposed uprights of houses. There is also much bamboo, some of which has been cut. The heavier trees are as yet unmolested. We saw no signs of savages nor of poisonous snakes against which we had been warned by the natives of the district. In going from Carranglan to Aritao we went from the province of Nueva Icija to that of Nueva Vizcaya.

20. We were very cordially received by the presidente local of Aritao. On leaving next morning we were saluted by the music of a brass band and by the ringing of church bells. This precedent was followed by many of the towns which we visited in the next few days. There were about 30 soldiers at Aritao, but no commissioned officers. We were escorted on our journey by a squad of 6 mounted soldiers. At Dupax our escort was exchanged for a detail from that town. There, also, there were about 30 soldiers, commanded by a sergeant. Toward evening we arrived at the town of Bambang. These towns of Aritao, Dupax, and Bambang are much superior in size and appearance to those of Nueva Icija. These towns and those to the northward of them lie in the valleys of the Rio Magat and the Rio Grande de Cagayan. They have been seats of Spanish authority for over a century. A telegraph line previously connected the towns in these valleys with Manila. This line, however, was torn down during the insurrection. The native officials have repaired it between Bayombong and Aparri, using barbed wire. They have been forced to leave many poles uninsulated and short circuits frequently occur, especially in wet weather. The line between Bayombong and Carranglan is still down. There are many substantial wooden houses in each town. The church, with its convent, is usually built of brick and is very elaborate. The church at Aritao and many others date back over a hundred years. The native officials and leading men are better educated and better informed than those we had previously met. They possess, in addition, the same desire to improve their knowledge and the same receptivity that we had noticed in their countrymen.

21. We spent the night at Bambang. The presidente local was absent, attending a fiesta or carnival at Ilagan. A military officer stationed here received us and entertained us. This officer, Lieutenant Aguinaldo, is a nephew of Don Emilio. He is the first military officer we have met since leaving Carranglan. He commands the usual force of 30 or 40 soldiers. Our treatment at this town was extremely friendly and cordial.

22. We spent the night at Bambang. We were accompanied by several soldiers and Lieutenant Aguinaldo. This was the first time that a commissioned officer had formed part of our escort. This town is the capital of the province, and has a population of about 12,000 inhabitants. At this place we met the first formidable opposition to our progress. A military officer of the rank of commandante, corresponding to the grade of major in our Army, is stationed at this town, and is in fact the governor of the province under the orders of the colonel commanding in this district. He was absent at the time of our arrival, attending the fiesta at Ilagan. His place was taken by the next military officer in rank, Lieutenant Gemenes. This officer received us very coldly and demanded passports. He refused to be satisfied with our statement of the promise we had received from Don Emilio Aguinaldo. He informed us that before permitting us to proceed he would require the authority of his colonel, who was then at Ilagan. He sent a telegram concerning us to the colonel and left us to await the decision of that officer.

23. We spent the afternoon and night at the house of a native lawyer, Señor Arriola. Our host was a very intelligent man, and we explained our position fully to him. We told him that passports are not required of travelers in the United States nor in any other free country. This information seemed to surprise him very much, but he readily accepted it as an argument against the attitude of the local lieutenant toward us. He left us for a short time to speak with other men of importance in the town and to use his influence in our favor. When he returned he assured us that we were at perfect liberty to travel without passes, and that the only question remaining was whether or not we were entitled to a military escort. As we would have gladly dispensed with the escort, we accepted this information as a decision entirely in our favor.

24. Next morning Lieutenant Gemenes came very early to the house where we were entertained, to tell us that a military escort was ready to accompany us on our journey at any hour. He hoped that we cherished no ill will against him for his action on the preceding day. We were not able to determine whether a favorable reply had been received from the colonel or whether this change of attitude was due to our arguments on the evening previous and to the influence of Señor Arriola. We left Bayombong with an escort consisting of a second lieutenant and 10 soldiers. The band was paraded and church bells rung. There was the greatest possible cordiality of feeling. At Bayombong there are stationed the commandante, First Lieutenant Gemenes, and a second lieutenant. There are 60 or 70 soldiers at Bayombong, armed, in this case, with both Remington and Mauser rifles.

25. We proceeded through the town of Solano to Bagagag. These towns are similar to Bambang and Dupax. They have the customary guard of about 30 soldiers. There are no commissioned officers in these towns, the soldiers being controlled by the officers at Bayombong. We were cordially received everywhere during this day and the next, and were greeted unconditionally as friends. From Aritao to Bambang we had found very good roads. The weather had been clear since our departure from Carranglan, and the roads were consequently dry and the traveling easy. From Bagagag to the next town (called Estella on the map), Cordon, there is only a mountain trail. This trail is infested at certain seasons by Igorrotes, who waylay and murder persons traveling in small and unarmed parties. Several murders have occurred here recently. Three small parties of natives, with horses and buffaloes, had been waiting at Bagagag for several days for an opportunity to travel with a military escort. They joined us next day.

26. We left Bagabag next morning with 12 soldiers. These, with the pack bearers and natives accompanying us, brought our number up to 47. The trail over these mountains is a good road, very easy of ascent. It winds up the slope, making the incline very gradual. The mountains are covered with forests similar to those on the Caraballo, and contain many small streams. There are two bamboo stockades between Bagabag and Cordon. One of these, Diadi, is indicated on the map; the other, Rosario, has been recently erected by the native government. It is situated about halfway between Bagabag and Diadi. Each stockade has a garrison of 15 soldiers in command of a sergeant. These stockades are merely outposts against the Igorrotes. They are very frail and would offer no resistance to a rifle bullet. In passing over these mountains our escorts used their rifles very freely, firing into every thick bush that might conceal a savage and frequently into the air as well, in order, they said, that the Igorrotes might know that our party carried firearms. We spent the night at Cordon, where the feeling toward us proved to be very friendly. There are 30 soldiers at Cordon under command of a first lieutenant.

27. In passing from Diadi to Cordon we went from the province of Nouva Vizcaya into that of Isabella. Nouva Vizcaya is a rich province naturally, but it is surrounded by the mountains, and has no outlet. The Rio Magat which connects the province with Rio Grande de Cagayan is not navigable, even for canoes of large size. The province produces principally rice, sugar, cocoa, and coffee. It is also rich in timber.

28. We left next morning, October 24, for Carig, intending to reach Echague that night. We were escorted by 6 soldiers and the lieutenant. We found the road to Carig in good condition, and reached that town about 10 o'clock. This town is small and poor. It has a guard of only 15 soldiers, with no officers. The garrison had been reduced to a minimum on account of an illness prevalent in the immediate locality, which had affected the soldiers. We left Carig after a short stay for breakfast with a squad of 5 soldiers. One of them introduced himself as Señor Villa, commandante of the military forces of the province of Isabella. His companion was Lieutenant Guzman, an officer acting as his aide. Señor Villa informed us that he had received orders from his colonel to leave his headquarters at Ilagan and to make all possible speed toward Bayombong, where we had last been heard from. His orders were to demand passports from us signed by Don Emilio Aguinaldo. If we were traveling without them, he was to examine into the object of our journey and to consult by wire with his colonel before permitting us to proceed. As there was no telegraph station at Echague, we were forced to turn back to Carig. Here we were informed that the line was down somewhere between the station and Ilagan. Men were sent out to repair it, and we were forced to wait until it should be opened. We were taken by the commandante to the convent of the town and installed there. Our delay in this town lasted seven days, from noon October 24 to noon October 31.

29. The first two days were occupied in repairing the lines. On October 27 Señor Villa was able to communicate with his colonel. He brought back the answer that that officer had already sent a messenger to the central government asking for instructions. We were required to await the answer of the message, which had been, according to the information we received, three days on the road. Señor Villa assured us that an answer would arrive in three days. This appeared impossible to us, but we were obliged to accept his statement. After the expiration of three days we gave to Señor Villa, and requested him to send to Colonel Tirona, a telegram signed by ourselves. It was a mere statement that our accommodations were poor in Carig, and that, if a longer delay was necessary, we desired to proceed to Ilagan. This telegram was sent to Aparri. The colonel, however, at that time was on his way from Ilagan to Aparri. That night it rained and there was a violent wind. Next morning the line was down in several places. While we were waiting for the line to be repaired we composed a long telegram to Colonel Tirona, stating our position, explaining that we were required to return to Manila by the 26th of November, and requesting him to decide from his own authority whether we should proceed or turn back. On the morning of October 31 we gave the telegram to Señor Villa. Señor Villa himself wrote a telegram to accompany ours, stating that, in his opinion, we had not come into the country to draw plans or for any other military purpose. This was

a statement which he had given us to understand at the time had formed part of his original telegram to Colonel Tirona a few days before. The line from Carig to Ilagan was still closed, but that from Ilagan to Aparri was supposed to be open. The two telegrams were given to a mounted courier with orders to take them with all speed to Ilagan; to send them from there by wire, and to return with the answer. This journey would have occupied at least three days. Fortunately the line to Ilagan was reported open just as the courier was about to start. His orders were accordingly countermanded. Colonel Tirona's answer to our first telegram came during the morning. It was favorable. He saluted us affectionately, and authorized Señor Villa to accompany us to Ilagan.

30. During our detention at Carig we were not treated as prisoners. We were informed that if we wished to return to Manila by the same road we had followed in leaving it we were at liberty to do so. Within the village itself we had, of course, entire liberty. We asked Señor Villa if the Philippine republic intended to demand passports of travelers, and used the same argument that had proved so efficient at Bayombong. He replied that it would be the custom only in time of war. He classed this period as a time of war and the congress at Paris as a mere suspension of hostilities, at the end of which their nation might again be enveloped in war. Our relations with Señor Villa were mainly official. His manner toward us was brusque, and at times discourteous. He was extremely suspicious of us, particularly of the diary that we kept from day to day, and of a camera that formed part of our equipment. He became slowly convinced, however, that we were not seeking for military information. After he had assured himself of this, he told us that the colonel had feared that we were making maps of the country. During the rest of our journey we were entirely free from the taint of this suspicion. According to Señor Villa's statement, the charge had first been made by the Spanish prisoners, who have never ceased to warn the natives that American troops would come into the province to conquer them, when they would find themselves in worse hands than before they rebelled against Spain.

31. A redeeming feature of our detention at Carig was the companionship of two lieutenants of the Philippine army that were quartered with us. These officers, Lieutenant Guzman and Lieutenant Clarabal, were very pleasant and gentlemanly.

32. We left Carig on the afternoon of October 31, accompanied by Commandante Villa, Lieutenant Guzman, Lieutenant Clarabal, and the 5 soldiers that had arrived with the commandante. It had rained almost constantly during the last week, and the two rivers between Carig and Echague were greatly swollen. We lost a horse in the river Carig, but crossed without other accident. In these streams, and particularly in the river Magat and the Rio Grande de Cagayan, there are many alligators, of which the natives are in great fear. No native will venture into the water nor into the grass along the bank until he has first thrown stones in front of him to frighten away any alligators which may be in the neighborhood.

33. Echague is somewhat larger and more pretentious than Carig. It has a guard of 20 soldiers. From this town we went by boat to Ilagan, sending the servants with the horses by the road. The boat was a dugout 25 feet long and 3 feet wide, with a grass canopy amidship 8 feet long. It was rowed by six natives. There are many eddies and whirlpools in the river, rendering it for some distance below Echague almost unnavigable even for bancas. We shipped water repeatedly and were twice nearly swamped. Farther down, particularly below the mouth of the Rio Magat, the stream is deeper and quieter, and cascoes and pangas come up to this point with freight received from the steamers at Aparri.

34. We arrived at Ilagan that evening, November 1. This town is the capital city of the province of Isabella. It has a population of between ten and fifteen thousand inhabitants, and has many large wooden houses roofed with corrugated iron, giving it rather a European appearance. It is well situated for defense, being at the junction of the Rio Pinacanauan with the Rio Grande. It is protected by these wide streams from all points except the south. To attack the city by land from the south it would be necessary to bring troops up the eastern side of the Rio Grande, where there are no roads. The site of the city is raised, moreover, about 40 feet above the level of the river. At this city there are stationed the commandante, Señor Villa, 2 captains, 4 lieutenants, 1 surgeon, and about 100 soldiers. Besides the officers named above, there is a "commandante interno," or civil officer, who takes charge in the absence of the commandante.

35. We remained at Ilagan two days and were treated with great friendliness. The commandante interno, who is the highest civil officer in the province, was particularly cordial. This gentleman, Señor Guzman, father of the lieutenant who was with us at Carig, is a member of one of the most influential families in the province, and his friendship was of great advantage to us. In this town we were entertained at the house of a wealthy citizen. The first night after our arrival a ball was given in our honor, at which there were over forty young ladies and an equal number of well-dressed and gentlemanly men. The ball was well conducted. The dances were Spanish. The next evening we were invited to the theater to see two one-act Spanish comedies, presented by the society young people of the town. They were both excellently given, and spoke well for the intelligence of the players.

36. We desired to continue our journey from Ilagan to Tuguegarao and from that point across the mountains to the western coast. This request was wired by Señor Villa to Colonel Tirona at Aparri. That officer replied that it would not be possible to make the proposed trip at this season of the year. He invited us to proceed to Aparri, saying that he would send a steam launch up the river to take us to that city. We replied by another telegram, repeating our request and saying that the trip across the mountains would be made at our own risk. The reply was a courteously worded but positive refusal. The colonel had sent out messengers to examine the roads and they reported them impassable. Moreover, there was danger from Igorrotes. He said that he felt himself responsible for our safety in the district over which he held command. He feared that any accident happening to our party might be misconstrued by our Government and create a wrong and injurious impression of the good faith of the Philippines and the tranquillity of the country. He repeated his invitation to visit Aparri, take a steamer from that port, disembark at a northern point on the western coast, and continue our journey south by land. This arrangement was accepted as the most satisfactory one left open to us.

37. There are many Spanish prisoners in this town—civil officers, priests, soldiers. Eighty-four priests were paraded in the street for our inspection. The greater number of them were dressed in civilian garb, only four or five of them wearing the robes of their office. Nearly all of them wore long hair and beards. They appeared in good health, and we could detect no evidence of maltreatment. These priests had been assembled from different parts of the province. They are kept under stricter guard than either of the other two classes of prisoners for the reason that the native officials fear that if permitted to go among the people they will use the influence they possess through their position in the church to incite them against the Philippine government. We also met Don José Perez, a Spaniard, who had previously been governor of the island. He was well dressed and appeared to be enjoying all the ordinary comforts.

38. Our horses arrived at Ilagan November 2 and were sent on to Aparri next day. The steam launch mentioned by the colonel not arriving on time, we expressed our desire to set out in a canoe without delay. A "panga," or large built-up canoe, rowed by twelve men, was accordingly prepared. Friday morning, November 4, we embarked for Aparri. We were accompanied on the journey by Commandante Villa and Lieutenant Guzman. All the officers, civil and military, of the town accompanied us to the boat and wished us a pleasant journey.

39. The trip from Ilagan to Aparri lasted three days. We stopped at only one town on the way. This was Cabagan Viejo, which we visited while waiting for the moon to rise on the evening of the third day. At 4 o'clock on the afternoon of the second day we were met, about 18 miles above Aparri, by the steam launch sent by Colonel Tirona. We were taken in tow and arrived at Aparri that night, November 5.

40. In these two days we passed out of the province of Isabella and entirely through the province of Cagayan. These are the leading tobacco provinces in the island. An idea of their wealth can be obtained from the fact that before the Philippine insurrection $3,000,000 in tobacco alone came yearly from the one province of Isabella. The tobacco of this province is preferred for exportation to that of Cagayan. Both provinces raise also sugar, rice, cocoa, and coffee. Cattle also are shipped from Aparri. The Rio Grande through these provinces is the great artery of trade. Tobacco is sent down the river in cascoes and pangas, and imports from Aparri are taken back by the same means. The current is very swift, and it is slow and difficult work to ascend the river in these boats. Poling is the method resorted to. The banks of the river are about 20 feet above the stream over most of the distance and are regular throughout. The width of the river varies from 100 to 500 yards. Much fishing with nets is done in the river.

41. At Aparri we went alongside the *Philippina* and reached the wharf by crossing this vessel. We were met on board by Commandante Leyba, military commander in the province of Cagayan. We were taken to a private house, where we were quartered during our stay, at Aparri. Here we met Colonel Tirona, commander of the military district, including the provinces of Nueva Vizcaya, Isabella, and Cagayan. He welcomed us cordially and continued from that time to treat us in a very friendly manner. We remained at Aparri three days, until the departure of the steamer *Oslo*, November 9.

42. The steamer *Saturnas*, which had left the harbor the day before our arrival, brought news from Hongkong papers that the Senators from the United States at the congress of Paris favored the independence of the islands, with an American protectorate. Colonel Tirona considered the information of sufficient reliability to justify him in regarding the Philippine independence as assured and warfare in the island at an end. For this reason he proceeded to relinquish the military command he held over the provinces and to place this power in the hands of a civil officer elected by the people. On the day following our arrival in Aparri the ceremony occurred which solemnized this transfer of authority in the province of Cagayan. The presidentes locales of all the towns in the province were present at the ceremony, conducted by a native priest. After the priest had retired Colonel Tirona made a short speech, stating that, since in all probabilities permanent peace was at hand, it became his duty to relinquish the authority he had previously held over the province and to place it in the hands of a civil officer elected by the people. He then handed the staff of office to the man who had been elected "jefe-provincial."

This officer also made a speech, in which he thanked the disciplined military forces and their colonel for the service they had rendered the province and assured them that the work they had begun would be perpetuated by the people of the province; where every man, woman and child stood ready to take up arms to defend their newly won liberty and to resist with the last drop of their blood the attempt of any nation whatever to bring them back to their former state of dependence. His speech was very impassioned. He then knelt, placed his hand on an open Bible, and took the oath of office. He was followed by the three other officers who constitute the provincial government, the heads of the three departments—justice, police, and internal revenue. Every town in this province has this same organization. At the time of our departure Colonel Tirona planned to go within a few days to Ilagan and from there to Bayombong, repeating this ceremony in the capital city of each province.

43. We were hospitably entertained at the Aparri; two balls were given in our honor. The town has a population of 20,000 inhabitants. It has many handsome houses and several well-defined streets. The military force stationed here consists of 300 soldiers, in addition to which the harbor has the protection of the gunboat *Philippina*, which carries two guns of a caliber of about 3 inches. There are several officers here, three captains and five or six lieutenants. The colonel goes from town to town in his district, and Commandante Leyba spends part of his time at Tuguegarao. There are no Spaniards here, with the exception of two or three merchants; one of these, representing the company of the steamer *Saturnas* we have met. He is pursuing his business entirely unmolested. All the priests, soldiers, and civil officers have been sent to Tuguegarao and other towns up the river. Colonel Tirona does not consider them secure in a port town.

44. We left Aparri November 9 on the steamer *Oslo*. Before leaving Colonel Tirona provided us with a letter directed to Colonel Tino, at Vigan, in the province of Ilocus Sur; or, in the event of his absence from that town, to the commandante. This letter was sealed. The steamer left port at 12.30 p. m., drawing 14 feet 9 inches; Captain Pederson, commanding the *Oslo*, was not acquainted with the port of Currimao, in the province of Ilocos Norte, the port at which we wished to disembark, but took us to Salomague, a few miles farther south, in the province of Ilocos Sur. The natives assert that the former harbor is much more secure and easy to enter than the latter. The *Oslo* remained outside the breakers, while we were put ashore in a ship's boat. We passed several native canoes going out to the ship, the leading one having on board a sergeant with a squad of soldiers. We landed on the beach and immediately sent the boat back to the ship. A few minutes later two officials from the town of Cabujao rode up. Our arrival had been reported to them, and they had come immediately to refuse us permission to disembark. The *Oslo* was already under way, however, and they were not able to carry out their intention. On the shore at Salomague there is a fortification about 5 feet high and 150 feet long. This barricade is built of sticks arranged in two rows and filled in between with sand and coral stones.

Its walls are about 4 feet thick, and it is built in the form of a crescent, with the concave part toward the sea. The formation of the reefs here and for some distance south along the coast is coral. The officers who met us were both dressed in military uniform. One of them wore the insignia of a first lieutenant, the other none whatever. Horses were provided for us, and we accompanied the officers to Cabugoa. The officer without insignia of rank proved to be a native priest, the curé of the village. He put on his robe over his uniform as soon as he reached the convent. It is a fact worthy of note that in every town we visited in the provinces on the western coast we were met by a curé, who appeared to have great influence in civil matters. In the four provinces we had previously visited, on the contrary, we saw only one native priest. He was in a church performing service. At Cabugoa our letter to Colonel Tino was not sufficient to gain permission to proceed. We were detained here all day, while the lieutenant sent a messenger to Vigan to obtain instruction from the commandante. The telegraph line was down and we could not wire. We were treated very coolly at this town and were regarded with suspicion. Next morning, an answer not having been

received from Vigan, we asserted our right to proceed to that town to present our letter to the commandante. The lieutenant finally withdrew his objections. There were no transportation accommodations. We succeeded at length in buying one horse and a broken-down killis, in which only one could ride. We proceeded to the town of Lapo, where we changed vehicles. We left that town in a killis drawn by a steer. We were halfway between Lapo and Magsingal when we were met by three military officers—two captains and a lieutenant—in a carriage drawn by two horses. The senior captain informed us that they had been sent down from Vigan by the commandante, with orders to require us to turn back and reembark on our ship, the report having reached Vigan that we had disembarked from an American man-of-war, which was still waiting for us at Salomague. When we explained our position and showed them the letter to Colonel Tino, or, in case of his absence, to the commandante at Vigan, they permitted us to proceed to Magsingal, where they could communicate with their superior. They very politely insisted on our taking their carriage, while they followed in our cart. We were delayed at Magsingal until the early evening, waiting for an answer from the commandante. He brought the answer himself, in a handsome carriage drawn by four horses. He had with him a copy of the order he had just received from the Philippine secretary of war. This order granted liberty to persons of any nation, except Spain, to travel at will through the islands, under certain restrictions, viz, that they could not carry arms, nor approach within 200 meters of a fortification, nor make any plans, or take photographs of them. In compliance with this order, we were allowed to proceed, but were requested to give up all our arms, including our revolvers. We went on to Vigan that night, accompanied by the commandante and five other officers who had assembled at Magsingal. We rode in carriages, none of them drawn by fewer than three horses, and arrived at Vigan about 8 o'clock. Vigan is a town of about 27,000 inhabitants. Its streets are well laid out, and all the houses near the center of the town are built of wood, usually whitewashed. It has much more the appearance of a city than any other town we have visited. We were entertained at the palacio. This building before the insurrection had been the residence of the governor of the province, but it is now used as the headquarters of Colonel Tino. It is by far the handsomest house we have seen outside of Manila, and is perhaps the equal of any there. There is another house in the town even more elegant; this was formerly the residence of the archbishop. At the palacio there are quartered over eighteen military officers; they are all very young, as is usual in the Philippine army. The oldest one among them was a man of 29 years, with the grade of captain.

46. We remained at Vigan all next day, November 12. It had rained during the night, rendering impassable a part of the road to the next town. We walked through the town and visited the houses of several tradespeople. At one of these houses we heard the first and only definite complaint which came to our ears during the entire journey on the part of the natives against the present government. These people complained of the taxes imposed upon them and even went so far as to state that they preferred the Spanish Government. This statement was made in the presence of a party of six natives and was acquiesced in by all; they were all, however, of the same family.

47. Next morning we left Vigan and proceeded to Santa Maria, passing through the towns of Santa and Narvacan. Between Santa and Narvacan we came to the pass of Pidig. The road here goes between a bold rocky point and the sea. To-day the sea line was 70 or 80 feet from the bluff, but in windy weather the waves cover the road and dash against the bluff. During the insurrection the Spaniards attempted to defend this pass; their barricades are still standing. We were escorted out of Vigan by the commandante and eight of his officers, all in carriages. These turned back, one at a time, until we were left with one lieutenant, who had been detailed to accompany us to San Fernando, and by two captains, who were going home on leave of absence. We also had a guard of four soldiers, who rode ahead with pennants and cleared the road. At each town we were joined by the senior officer stationed there, who accompanied us on horseback to the next town. From Narvacan we were accompanied to Santa Maria by Captain Natividad, an officer 18 years of age, who commands the military forces in the three neighboring towns. Captain Natividad remained with us at Santa Maria, where we spent the night in a convent. We intended to leave this town by trail for the mountains, passing through the provinces of Lepanto and Benguet and returning to the main road in the province of Union. When we wished to start next morning, Captain Natividad opposed our going, saying that he was under orders to take that action. It rained very hard all night and all morning, and the Captain gave as his first reason that the roads were not passable. It was only when we continued to insist that he told us positively that he could not permit us to go, as there was danger from Igorrotes and Colonel Tino felt himself responsible for our safety. He told us that Colonel Tino had invited us to visit him at San Fernando. We left Santa Maria that afternoon and reached Condon before night, passing through the towns of San Estaban and Santiago. We were escorted by the lieutenant and Captain Natividad. We found Condon a handsome town systematically laid out. After Vigan, it is the handsomest town we visited. There are two captains here and several lieutenants. We were received here with unusual cordiality and were accompanied out of town next morning by the presidente local and by a captain stationed at the town. Our journey this day took us to Namagpacan, passing through the towns of Santa Lucia, Santa Cruz, and Tagudin. Fresh horses were procured at each town and the officers accompanying us were changed.

48. In going from Tagudin to Bangar we passed from the province of Ilocos Sur into that of Union. The province of Ilocos Sur raises principally rice, tobacco, sugar, cattle, and sheep. The tobacco is of an inferior quality, being coarser and stronger than that raised in Isabella and Cagayan. The cultivation of cocoanuts is profitable and is increasing. Goats and pigs are raised in great numbers. Many of the people are engaged in the weaving of cotton, from which they make cloth, towels, etc. The cloth is coarse, but very strong. The natives realize the inferiority of the cloth and the discrepancy between its commercial value and the labor expended on it. Some of the cotton comes from Ilocos Norte and from Abra; much of it, however, comes as thread from Manila. The only part of the province that is cultivated or settled is a narrow strip between the province and the sea. This strip is very thickly settled. In the mountains there are mines of copper, sulphur, and gold; but these we have not seen. The Spaniards have spent much time and labor on these coast provinces, relatively speaking. Probably the best road in the island is the one on which we traveled through Ilocos Sur and Union. It is raised above the level of the fields, and has a foundation of stone and lime. Bridges were built when the road was constructed, over a hundred years ago, but they are down now. Some of these were passable at the beginning of the insurrection, but were burned during that struggle. At the beginning of the dry season every year bamboo bridges were put across these streams. They usually last from December to June. Several of them have already been built this year, but the recent rains had caused them to be washed away. During the rainy months other methods are adopted for crossing these streams. The streams are numerous, but many of them have very little current. They are crossed by a ferry—a bamboo raft hauled across by means of a bamboo rope which spans the stream. Traveling on this road in the rainy season is rather difficult. Carriages are usually used but they are frequently mired and the passengers are compelled to walk. The carriages are drawn by either horses, steers, or buffaloes, according to the state of the road. The towns along this road have usually many wooden houses, and invariably a very handsome church and convent, usually of brick. There are more barrios here than in the eastern provinces; each town has two or three. Spanish soldiers laid waste this region during the insurrection of 1896. The principal buildings in many towns have been burnt, particularly in the province of Union. On the other hand, during the last insurrection the Spaniards took refuge in the large buildings, and these are consequently riddled with rifle shots.

49. We spent the night in the small town of Namagpacan and went on to San Fernando next morning. Carriages were prepared for us at every village, and we traveled with the customary escort. At San Fernando we met Colonel Tino, commander of the military district embracing the provinces of North and South Ilocos, Union, Abra, Lepanto, Bontoc, and Benget. This officer had received his commission as brigadier-general three days before our arrival; he is 21 years old.

We were received politely by this officer, but not cordially. He expressed several times his suspicion with regard to the object of our journey. He asked several times if we knew how to make maps and plans; also why we were not in uniform. We had sent word to this officer that we desired to visit the province of Benguet, taking the trail from San Fernando. He showed us an unsigned telegram purporting to be from the central government instructing him not to permit the American officers to reconnoiter any further in the district. For this reason he said he could not permit us to visit Benguet. We sent, through him, a telegram to the central government repeating our request and calling attention to their war department's order of October 20 regarding travelers. We were informed next morning by General Tino that our request had been refused. The reason given was that there were dangers on the trail. We accordingly left the town next morning, taking the road directly for Dagupan.

50. San Fernando is the capital city of the province of Union. It is a town of only three or four thousand inhabitants and is very limited in area, lying between the mountains and the sea. It is the port for the province of Union. We have seen trains of buffalo carts taking tobacco there for exportation. There were about twenty military officers in the town when we were there. Many of them are on General Tino's staff and are not regularly stationed in the town.

51. From San Fernando to Dagupan there were few significant or instructive incidents. We were never without a guard of soldiers. At the town of Baoong we met a German, Mr. Otto Sheerer, who had lived three years in the province of Benguet and was about to return there with his family. He said the trail was safe and could be traveled by horses. The Igorrotes of the province, according to his statement, are a very gentle people. These are the civilized Igorrotes, or Tinguines. At noon November 18 we arrived at Santa Tomas. The land between here and Dagupan is very low; the roads are heavy. We accordingly took a native sailboat for Parao; from that town to Dagupan. The natives, fearing to take their boat across the bar at Dagupan, we crossed that at San Fabian and proceeded to our destination through a protected inlet of the sea. Along our route there were great beds of nipa. This plant is of great value to the natives. Wines are made from the sap, and the leaves are used for thatching houses. We arrived at Dagupan that night, and at Manila November 20. We reported to the commanding officer of the *Monadnock* and next morning to the commander in chief.

52. The foregoing narrative of our journey is designed to give a general description of the country we passed through and of the methods of travel, and to illustrate by its incidents the character and grade of intelligence of its people and their attitude toward Americans, especially toward ourselves as military officers. The information we have acquired on certain points is summed up in the following paragraphs:

INTELLIGENCE AND EDUCATION OF THE NATIVES.

53. The Philippine officers, both military and civil, that we have met in all the provinces we have visited have, with very few exceptions, been men of intelligent appearance and conversation. The same is true of all those men who form the upper class in each town. The education of most of them is limited, but they appear to seize every opportunity to improve it. They have great respect and admiration for learning. Very many of them desire to send their children to schools in the United States or Europe. Many men of importance in different towns have told us that the first use to be made of the revenue of their government, after there is no more danger of war, will be to start good schools in every village. The poorer classes are extremely ignorant on most subjects, but a large percentage of them can read and write.

RELATION BETWEEN RICH AND POOR.

54. There is a very marked line between these two classes, and this has been broadened by the insurrection, for the reason that military officers must equip themselves without pay, and that civil officers have numerous expenses for which they receive no return. All officers, civil and military, have therefore been chosen from the richer class; and the political and military power of the provinces is in the hands of that class. The private soldiers are fed and clothed by the government and allowed a very small amount of spending money—in the western provinces 30 cents in silver per week.

ATTITUDE OF THE MILITARY TOWARD THE CIVIL CLASS.

55. In the provinces of the east that we have visited there appears to be little or no friction between the civil and military classes. Officers and privates, as far as we could observe, treat civilians with consideration. In the provinces of Ilocos Sur and Union there is a marked difference. The officers are more domineering. In traveling in these provinces we had many opportunities to observe this attitude. When accidents happened to our carriage, the officer commanding our escort called to our assistance every native in sight. When they did not answer his call promptly, we have seen him strike them with his riding whip. One man had a serious wound on his face where an officer had struck him with his pistol butt. He came to us for redress, after having appealed in vain to the military officer in command of the town. An order from Don Emilio Aguinaldo, dated October 18, 1898, calls the attention of his officers to the evils of this practice and orders them to correct it in themselves and to instruct all sergeants, corporals, and privates on the attitude they should maintain toward civilians.

DOMINION OF THE CHURCH.

56. In the provinces of Nueva Ecija, Nueva Vizcaya, Isabella, and Cagayan the native priests have no voice whatever in civil matters.

The Catholic Church itself seems to have very little hold on the people of these provinces. Many men have expressed to us their preference for the Protestant Church. In Ilocos Sur and Union there are many more priests than in the other provinces mentioned. Every pueblo and barrio has its cura, and there are higher offices of the church in the larger towns. They appear to have an important influence in all civil matters.

POPULAR SENTIMENT REGARDING INDEPENDENCE.

57. Of the large number of officers, civil and military, and of leading townspeople we have met nearly every man has expressed in our presence his sentiment on this question. It is universally the same. They all declare they

will accept nothing short of independence. They desire the protection of the United States at sea, but fear any interference on land. The question of the remuneration of our Government for the expense of establishing a protectorate is never touched upon. On the subject of independence there is, again, a marked difference between the four provinces first visited and those of Ilocos Sur and Union. In the former there is more enthusiasm—the sentiment is more of the people; in the latter it is more of the higher class and of the army. In these provinces we have seen signs of actual discontent with the existing state of things.

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE UNITED STATES.

58. There is much variety of feeling among the Philippines with regard to the debt of gratitude they owe to the United States. In every town we found men that said our nation had saved them from slavery, and others who claimed that without our interference their independence would have been recognized before this time. On one point they are united, however, viz, that whatever our Government may have done for them it has not gained the right to annex them. They have been prejudiced against us by the Spaniards. The charges made have been so numerous and so severe that what the natives have since learned has not sufficed to disillusion them. With regard to the record of our policy toward a subject people, they have received remarkable information on two points—that we have mercilessly slain and finally exterminated the race of Indians that were native to our soil, and that we went to war in 1861 to suppress an insurrection of negro slaves, whom we also ended by exterminating. Intelligent and well-informed men have believed these charges. They were rehearsed to us in many towns in different provinces, beginning at Malolos. The Spanish version of our Indian problem is particularly well known.

PREPAREDNESS FOR WAR.

59. The Philippine government has an organized military force in every province we have visited. They claim it extends also into Ilocos, Norte, Abra, Lepanto, Bontoc, and Benguet. With regard to its existence in Ilocos and Benguet, we can speak with assurance.

We have met two officers with the rank of captain who are regularly stationed at Lacag, the capital city of Ilocos Norte, and also the commandante of the province of Benguet. The latter officer had come to San Fernando to obtain instructions from General Tino, and was about to return to Trinidad, the capital of that province. The number of troops under arms can only be given approximately. There are comparatively few in Neuva Icija; an estimated number of not over 300. In the military district embracing the province of Neuva Vizcaya, Isabella, and Cagayan, Colonel Tirona, Commandante Leyba, and Commandante Villa agreed in giving the number of soldiers under arms actually as 2,000. An estimate, founded on the size of the garrisons in the towns we visited, would bring the number nearly up to that figure. In the western military districts the number of forces is about double that number, leaving out those stationed in the interior provinces of Abra, Lepanto, Bontoc, and Benguet, of which we know nothing positively. In the coast provinces of Ilocos Norte, Ilocos Sur, and Union a conservative estimate of the forces is 3,500. In most of the pueblos the garrison is but little larger than those in the towns of the western districts; but there are many barrios, each one of which has its guard of soldiers, never less than 12. In the eastern military district we met not more than 25 officers, and in the western district over 60. There are rifles enough for all, principally Remingtons, but many Mausers. In every cuartel there were at least as many rifles as there were soldiers in the garrison. The arms are more numerous in the eastern than in the western provinces. It is safe to estimate the number of rifles in the eastern district as at least twice the number of soldiers. Commandante Villa and other officers made the statement that 40,000 rifles were being distributed among the people of that district. We have seen no proof of this statement. Ammunition is said to be plentiful, and it appears so from the fact that the soldiers use it freely in hunting for deer. With regard to the total force of the Philippine army, actual and reserve, we can not speak from our own knowledge. Colonel Tirona claimed that 200,000 men from all the islands could be put in the field well armed; and several other officers have independently given the same figure. Every officer that we have seen carried a Spanish sword and revolver. They wear these weapons constantly, but regard them with contempt, preferring the bola at close quarters. The *Philippina*, which was at Aparri during our visit, carries two guns of a caliber of about 3 inches. These are the only guns we have seen, with the exception of two revolving cannons in the palacio at Malolos. We saw no fortifications. The Spaniards have left numerous stockades in the wilder regions, and the natives have built a few others. There are also numerous barricades thrown up during the insurrection. In the towns the Spaniards defended themselves in the houses for want of other protection. The military spirit pervades in the eastern district, where every town and barrio has organized companies of its children, which are drilled every day. In the western districts we did not see any children under arms. The officers have had no military education except that which they gained during the insurrection. Spanish drill tactics are used, and most of the officers are still studying the elementary text-book.

Respectfully submitted.

W. B. WILCOX,
Paymaster, U. S. N.
LEONARD R. SARGENT,
Naval Cadet, U. S. N.

The following document has been translated in English and reprinted by the "Comité Central Filipino en el Extrangero," in virtue of instructions received from their government. Official editions of this correspondence have been forwarded through the post to the Presidents of both Houses:

To the honorable the members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The government of the Philippine republic being informed that it is the intention of the President of the United States to convene a meeting of the honorable members of Congress at a comparatively early date for the purpose of discussing and passing a resolution having for its object a just decision as to the policy to be pursued in reference to the present situation in the Philippines, I believe it to be consistent with the dictates of courtesy, as well as a duty to humanity, that in view of the fact that I have been intrusted with the portfolio of foreign affairs I should respectfully submit this document to you, setting forth the aspirations of the Filipino people and their reasons and justification for wishing to be recognized by your influential Government as an independent state.

Allow me, gentlemen, to lay before you, for your distinguished consideration, the facts and rights that form the grounds upon which the claim for recognition is made and sustained.

FIRST.

It is generally accepted as an axiom that as regards international affairs the larger and more powerful a state the greater is the obligation, morally, to support and maintain lesser states in the independence, the welfare, and the happiness with which God, in His bountiful goodness, has designed should be theirs and of which the greater states are guardians.

For instance, it appears evident that the powerful and wealthy nation which you, gentlemen, represent in Congress has been deputed by God to assist the weak Filipinos in the arduous and difficult task of restoration of their independence.

Eloquent proof of this is to be found in the cooperation offered and rendered to Don Emilio Aguinaldo in May, 1898, by the United States consuls at Hongkong and Singapore (Mr. Rounsevelle Wildman and Mr. E. Spencer Pratt) in order that our illustrious leader might continue the revolutionary war waged against Spain in 1896 and 1897, hostilities in connection with which were suspended under the provisions of the compact of Biacnabató.

The cooperation referred to consisted of the facts that the United States dispatch boat *McCulloch* (attached to Admiral Dewey's squadron) conveyed Don Emilio Aguinaldo from Hongkong to Cavite, where he arrived on the fifth May, 1898; that Admiral Dewey received Don Emilio Aguinaldo with the ceremony and honors due to a general, in the presence of the whole of the officers and men of the flagship *Olympia*, and, besides, gave him 60 Spanish Mauser rifles to aid in a renewal of the revolution against Spain; that Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo was allowed to establish in Cavite—which was then held by the United States naval forces—the headquarters of the Filipino government, which commenced to exercise the functions of government on the 24th May, 1898, issuing therefrom a proclamation declaring war against Spain to wrest from her our independence. (Proclamation attached hereto.)

The letters of the aforesaid consuls, which are attached hereto for the information of the free and enlightened citizens of the United States, confirm the above statements.

Mr. Pratt, in one of his letters, says he congratulates himself on the rapid triumphs of Don Emilio Aguinaldo over the Spaniards, as it proves the wisdom of his judgment in recommending him to Admiral (then Commodore) Dewey and the Government at Washington, and he added that he hoped to receive, when General Aguinaldo captured Manila, some historic memento of the place and of the incident, such as the flag or keys of the city or principal fortress.

Consul-General Wildman, of Hongkong, instructed Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo, in a letter attached hereto, respecting the treatment of Spanish prisoners, advising General Aguinaldo to give them only rice and water and treat the Spaniards "as they would treat you," advice which our humane leader declined to accept and act upon.

Thus in this wholly unexpected and unforeseen way bonds of good will and friendship were formed between Americans and Filipinos, resulting, as is well known, in the heroic and triumphant campaign of the Filipino army against the Spaniards, though it must be admitted, with due regard for the truth, that after the above-mentioned assistance and cordial cooperation our army received no more aid from the high officers of the United States, the Filipino army thereafter prosecuting the war against the Spanish land forces independently of any authority other than that exercised by our successful and brave leader, Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo, who, while directing the military operations with well-nigh miraculous skill and startling results, was also engaged in the task of organizing the Filipino national government on the model of Western nations, which are, admittedly, founders and leaders of modern civilization.

Thus it is plain that it was through providential agencies that the Filipino state came into being on the 24th day of May, 1898, and has existed to this day, replacing the alien Spanish Government which fell definitely on the 13th day of August, 1898, on which day our troops, which, in fact, and as set forth in Consul-General Pratt's letters, had closely invested Manila for more than two months, captured the suburbs of Manila, driving the Spaniards from their defenses, while the United States forces peacefully occupied the walled city in accordance with the terms of capitulation signed by the Spanish general.

It would seem, therefore, that there can be no doubt that God, in his infinite goodness, wisdom, and mercy, intrusted to the honor of the United States the liberation and independence of the Filipinos; but notwithstanding the evidence that the hand of Providence has guided the course of events, the United States are now endeavoring to prevent the consummation of the glorious and just purposes of the Creator. By whom, by what agency, were the two peoples united in the bonds of sympathy and friendship? Who could have prevented it?

Who is it that has caused these two friends and brethren to wage war upon one another? Alas! esteemed citizens of the great American Republic, you know well who is the cause of such reckless perturbation. It is the President of your Republic, Mr. William McKinley, who, using as a pretext alleged rights obtained through the purchase of the more than doubtful sovereignty of Spain, gives evidence of his intention to ignore the bonds of friendship and guardianship which should unite the two nations by imposing on us, by force of arms, the sovereignty of the United States. Is this line of conduct of Mr. McKinley in harmony with the canons of morality simply because the American nation is greater, more opulent, and more powerful than the Filipinos? Surely it is not, for if moral obligations, which bind parties to respect the generally accepted codes of morality, are applicable in international affairs, it is beyond question that there should be no evasion of obligation on the part of the great American nation to stand by and protect the small Filipino nation until the great work of securing the recognition of our existence as an independent nation is recognized and thereby firmly established—a great work to which your consuls (above mentioned) and commanders unquestionably and providentially applied themselves.

In the name, therefore, of Almighty God, of humanity, and of national honor, I now appeal to the great and influential citizens of the United States to fulfill these obligations, by passing, as a matter of paramount importance, a just resolution in your national Congress officially recognizing our independence, thereby bringing to an end this inhuman and wicked war and restoring the reign of peace and harmony between Americans and Filipinos, who, in accordance with the infallible will of God, should live under the happy conditions of brotherhood.

SECOND.

Accomplished facts are accepted in dealing with things political as rights unless the facts are at variance with the doctines laid down in international law or the eternal principles of justice. Strictly in accordance with these incontrovertible principles the independence of the United States was realized and recognized in the last century.

In the same manner, and in more recent times, the Kingdom of Italy and the German Empire have come into existence, the ruling principle being, and the reason of it, that all men are born equal and possess inalienable rights of life, liberty, independence, and freedom in the pursuit of happiness.

Now, it is indisputable that we, the Filipinos, defeated the Spaniards, capturing 9,000 prisoners, and set up a republican government in the place of the one which had been vanquished. It is also beyond question that these accomplished facts have been recognized in a practical manner by the high officers who at that time, and since then, represented the United States in this archipelago, which is proved by the correspondence of our leader with Admiral (then Commodore) Dewey and Generals Anderson, Merritt, and Otis, copies of which are attached hereto for the information of the citizens of the United States.

It is to be observed, in the first place, that in his first letter to Gen. Don Emilio Aguinaldo Admiral Dewey states that he has received with pleasure

the documents forwarded to him by our distinguished leader, promising to transmit them to their respective destinations. The documents referred to are: The first proclamation issued by Gen. Don Emilio Aguinaldo announcing his arrival and the establishment of the dictatorial government at Cavite; also the proclamation of Philippine independence, issued in the town of Cavite, in the province of the same name—some to be forwarded to the United States Government in Washington and others to be forwarded to the representatives of the powers in Manila.

Secondly, it is to be noted that the Admiral in another letter asks General Aguinaldo for passports for several gentlemen recommended by the British consul, who was also acting consul for the United States of America in Manila, to enable them to travel freely and safely through our territory.

And, finally, it is noteworthy that Generals Anderson, Merritt, and Otis in their correspondence styled—as was only right and proper that they should—our leader "General Commanding the Philippine Revolutionary Army," while General Anderson asked Gen. Don Emilio Aguinaldo for quarters and camping ground for the forces under his command, as well as other assistance and cooperation in the campaign against the Spaniards—our "common enemy." It is also a well-known fact that the American commanders applied to us for positions and trenches for their troops in Maytubig so as to place their forces side by side with our troops in the siege of Manila. In fact, the records prove that everything was done in a manner that indicated full recognition of our triumphant revolution and the noble ends kept constantly in view, namely, our liberty and independence, and owing to which (the righteousness of our cause) the new Filipino State, by its just and irreproachable procedure, unquestionably merited the consideration and respect of the American commanders.

This explains how Admiral Dewey submitted for the disposition of Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo a protest lodged by the French consul in respect of the capture of the steamer *Compania de Filipinas*, which had been seized by us, the Admiral stating positively that he and his forces had nothing to do with the affair; held no jurisdiction in the premises.

In the light of the correspondence it is readily understood how Generals Anderson and Merritt came to address telegrams to Gen. Don Emilio Aguinaldo on the 13th of August, 1898 (the day on which our troops captured the whole of the suburbs of Manila and the Spaniards in the walled city capitulated to the forces of the United States), requesting General Aguinaldo to give instructions for his troops to evacuate the suburbs in order to avoid the dangers inseparable from a dual military occupation, and offering to negotiate with General Aguinaldo afterwards.

Lastly, it is quite comprehensible how General Otis came to appeal to General Aguinaldo in the name of the United States Government for the release of the friars held by us as prisoners—acts which show in an eloquent manner distinct recognition of the sovereign power and authority of the Philippine people, which had been recovered from the Spaniards since then and reassumed in the exalted and worthy personality of our leader, Gen. Don Emilio Aguinaldo.

Viewed from another standpoint the above-mentioned incidents might be held to indicate that they were clear evidence that it was the bounden duty of the American commanders to harass, and, if possible, quell the Philippine revolution, not convey our illustrious leader to Cavite, to begin with, and thereby afford him very favorable opportunity (in view of the mode of conveyance, his reception by the Admiral, and the permission granted him to establish his headquarters in Cavite, whence he issued, without protest of any kind by Admiral Dewey or anyone else, a proclamation calling on the people to rally round his standard and wage war upon Spain to wrest from her the sovereignty of the archipelago) to revive the revolution against Spain, using his prestige and exercising his authority and genius to that end. But far from being indiscreet or ill-considered action, the recognition of General Aguinaldo's power and prestige, the arrangement to bring him back to the Philippines, the courtesy extended to him by Admiral Dewey, and the conduct of your consuls and generals was, on the contrary, rightful recognition of our revolution, in that our sovereign rights and independent authority in the archipelago was practically conceded and accepted as accomplished facts. It is therefore evident that we have a perfect right, and are not straining any points, in demanding from the Government of Washington official recognition of our independence, basing the demand on the above-mentioned reason that accomplished facts in affairs political constitute right.

This is altogether apart from and does not clash with the victories of your troops over the Spaniards, nor the cession of sovereignty by Spain in the treaty of Paris of the 10th of December last in favor of the United States.

As regards your victories, there are the proclamations of General Merritt and the letters of General Anderson clearly setting forth that America did not come to the Philippines to make conquests, much less to wage war against the natives, but to free the people from the galling yoke of Spain. "We came not as enemies, but as liberators." Such were the solemn pledges of your Generals Merritt and Anderson to the Filipinos when they arrived in these islands.

Therefore it is plain that it can not be claimed that by reason of your victories over the Spaniards rights of conquest accrue to you as being due from the Filipinos for the all-sufficient reason that you were not engaged in war with us between the 1st of May, 1898, and the 4th of February, 1899, during the night of which latter date your forces, in accordance with the orders of President William McKinley, commenced hostilities against our forces for the purpose of establishing American sovereignty in our archipelago by force of arms.

As for the cession of sovereignty, I have to say it is a null and void agreement in every respect, for it has been celebrated in contravention of all rules of international law and in opposition to the eternal principles of justice.

For example: It is not moral, nor could it be just, and much less is it in accord with international right to say to a nation: "I will help you to sweep away Spanish sovereignty and make you independent, and after helping you to sweep away and destroy the said sovereignty I come and buy the sovereignty from Spain by title of cession and impose it by force of arms upon the protected people."

Such a proceeding is self-condemnatory, for its accomplishment rests only with arbitrary power and in the power of anyone exercising such power and carrying it to the extent of injuring an ally or a friend to whom protection is offered. Fiore, Bluntschli, and Hallet, authorities on international right, established as a rule to be universally applied the following: "It is not just under the pretext of assumed laws of nations to amalgamate or segregate a people against their obvious will spontaneously and voluntarily acclaimed."

Therefore the cession in question is an act completely null and void, being neither moral nor just; nor is it even licit according to international law.

On the other hand, in respect of cessions the essential conditions include the possession of what is ceded, and when it concerns inhabited territories the concordance and express consent of the inhabitants is necessary. Neither of these conditions have been fulfilled in respect of the cession of the Philippines by the treaty of Paris of the 10th December, 1898. First, because at that date, and long before it, Spain exercised no sovereignty whatever over any Philippine territory, which was reconquered by us and governed by us since June, 1898, which facts were well known to the Governments of Washington and Madrid. Second, because the Philippine people had publicly and loyally manifested to the Government of Washington and to the whole world that it was their desire to live independently of all alien sovereignty; and perhaps on this account our wishes were not consulted when the cession was made. An act, without doubt, of bad faith on the part of the two contracting parties, who were perforce obliged to make the terms null and void by reason of this false step.

Consequently the treaty of Paris of 10th December, 1898, does not convey any sovereign rights whatever in favor of the United States over any of the Philippine Islands or its inhabitants. Nor are the United States in any way entitled by it to impose upon the Philippine people an alien sovereignty by force of arms.

The United States, therefore, can not be excused from recognizing our independence either on account of their victories over the Spaniards or by reason of the provisions of the treaty of Paris. We, however, readily admit that our gratitude and full recognition are due to the great North American nation for the generous assistance proffered us by their consular representatives and commanders in bringing from Hongkong to Cavite our illustrious leader to continue the rebellion against Spain, and then, by respecting that revolution, recognizing it as the sovereign power which replaced that which Spain had lost: but, from the fact of oppressing us and endeavoring to filch from us our liberties, subjecting our independence, so dearly won, to the influence of a new foreign yoke there is a wide gulf fixed, which is as limitless as the distance to another world, and the only possible way to accomplish your object is to destroy the lives of 8,000,000 Filipinos—an act which would leave on the hitherto spotless pages of your glorious history and traditional liberality an everlasting and indelible stain.

THIRD.

The Filipinos can justly boast of a social status on a par with cultured peoples and are fit to commingle and live on an equality with civilized nations, forming in common with them part of the magna civitas.

We are a community of 8,000,000 people politically organized on well-defined territory, with our own government, which is competent to and sufficient for the protection of the rights of our citizens and capable of assuming full responsibility for our acts in the conduct of relations with other states. We have an official language—Spanish. We have accepted an enlightened religion—the Roman Catholic faith. Strict morality, which emanates from christianizing influences, governs our manners and customs. Our laws are on a par with statutes of other civilized states, being identical with those in operation in these islands during the last few years, which have been generally accepted as meeting the requirements of civilized communities. And, lastly, we live in families, in towns, and in cities, affording permanent evidence of a status of cultured and civilized society; it being universally conceded that the Philippines, unlike other far eastern states, have invariably extended hospitality to all foreigners and enjoy the reputation of exceptional faultlessness and the strongest aversion to anything in the nature of barbarous conduct.

We, the Filipinos, respect life, honor, and rights in property, and punish with severe penalties all violations of these governing principles of humanity. We also have laws encouraging the knowledge of science and arts, protecting industries, commerce, and agriculture, and we profess, finally, our acquaintance with all the most noble sentiments of friendship, gratitude, and honesty.

We possess, therefore, all the conditions requisite for existence as an independent state according to article 37 of the International Code of the famous jurisconsult Fiore, and that being so, we are perfectly justified in demanding from all the great civilized states official recognition of our independence in conformity with articles 44, 48, and 49 of the said standard work, which provides, moreover, that such recognition can not, under the circumstances, be denied us, nor should it be unduly delayed. It is clearly set forth in articles 55 and 56 of Fiore's work that any course of procedure in contravention of the foregoing articles is opposed to the principle of high policy.

To better prove to the people of the United States our culture and state of civilization there are annexed to this document copies of our fundamental laws and various decrees relating to the establishment of our executive and judicial administration, our educational establishments, and our army regulations. In this way, perhaps, the people of the States will be better able to grasp the truth respecting our advancement along the highroad of modern civilization and be thereby convinced of our ability to rule and govern ourselves in an independent manner.

These are the reasons why we appeal for official recognition of our independence—reason which we confidently submit to the deep conscientiousness and of the enlightened people of the United States—a people destined by God to decide the fate of our unfortunate country—a fate which would be better if, heeding the dictates of justice and humanity, your President, Mr. McKinley, had not chosen to wage this cruel, devastating war against us with your powerful land and sea forces.

It is sometimes said that we are to blame for the outbreak of hostilities during the night of the 4th February last, but this is not an established fact.

In the first place, because we, the Filipinos, were expecting at that very time (the beginning of February) official recognition of our independence from the Government of Washington, an expectation which was justified by the annexed letter of Gen. E. S. Otis, dated 25th January; also on account of what took place at the conferences of the mixed commissions of Americans and Filipinos, which sat in Manila during the latter part of the said month of January to discuss matters and arrange for a basis of friendly relations between the two parties, which, it was hoped, would be permanent. Moreover, there was another reason, namely, the Filipinos were fully aware of the superior strength of your forces, against whom it would have been criminal folly to pit our inexperienced and undisciplined army.

Accordingly, it is unquestionable that we were not the aggressors, for we knew full well that were we to act on the offensive we could look for neither military nor political gain of any kind. On the contrary, we regarded such action as bordering on suicidal folly and well-nigh sure to bring down on us the hatred and contempt of the American people. We had, in fact, nothing to gain and very much to lose by aggression.

Esteemed citizens of the United States, if with the foregoing reasoning there be borne in mind the fact that we were living in peace and harmony with your forces since June, without the smallest intention or inclination to commence hostilities, at a period when your forces were smaller and therefore more easy to cope with than subsequently, I verily believe that the enlightened people of the United States will not be slow to realize that it is not in the least degree probable, nor is it reasonable to assume that we were the aggressors, seeing that we stood in need of their good will and were anxious to court and maintain a favorable impression with the American electorate in the interest of our cause. Peace and good will were essential to the success of our cause—a cause which would at once be jeopardized by any overt act of aggression.

We are neither celebrated warriors nor great fighters; nor are we as quixotic as the Spaniards. We took up arms to obtain our independence, and it is self-evident that we did not develop our little armed force for the purpose of making an enemy of such a great and mighty people as the citizens of the United States in order that thereby our noble cause might the more easily triumph.

If we call to mind the fact that your President, Mr. McKinley, caused reenforcements to be sent to Manila after the capitulation by Spain on the 30th

August, 1898, if we remember his refusal to listen to our humble petition to him, praying for recognition of our independence through our representative, Don Felipe Agoncillo, whom he refused to receive, or whether we recall the fact that he refused to give ear unto our appeal through the good offices of General Otis, as is proved by a letter from the General and the [omission in copy] to; and if we take into consideration that, lastly and finally, the treaty of Paris was so framed as to involve the cession of the sovereignty of Spain to the United States, I am of opinion that the most natural sequence of these incontestable moves of Mr. McKinley is to be found in the outbreak of hostilities, namely, an order from your President to General Otis to commence with acts of aggression and impose on us that odious sovereignty by force of arms, notwithstanding the fact that we had demonstrated and made it evident in every possible way from the first that we would accept no solution other than our independence.

You, honorable representatives of the people of the United States, having in view the providential bonds which bind the fate of the Philippines to your supreme decision, surely you will not be unmindful at such a momentous epoch of the sublime principles of right and justice proclaimed by the illustrious founders of your independence on 4th June, 1776. Endowed with those magnificent principles your nation advanced rapidly along the paths of progress till it became great and powerful, admired and respected by all the aged states of Europe.

Trusting, therefore in your glorious traditions of humanity and liberality, the Filipinos look forward with confidence to obtaining from your acknowledged rectitude a just resolution officially recognizing the independence of our beloved country.

I have the honor to be, gentlemen, yours, very respectfully.

(Signed) FELIPE BUENCAMINO.

TARLAC, P. I., *20th August, 1899.*

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana desire any disposition of the joint resolution which was laid on the table at his request, subject to his call?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Let it be referred——

Mr. SPOONER. Let it lie on the table.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Very good; let it lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there is no objection, the joint resolution will lie on the table.

TWELFTH AND SUBSEQUENT CENSUSES.

Mr. CARTER. I desire to call up the bill (S. 2179) relating to the Twelfth and subsequent censuses, and giving to the Director thereof additional power and authority in certain cases, and for other purposes.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CARTER. The bill was read yesterday, I believe, and it is now open to amendment.

Mr. CULLOM. I have an amendment in my hands which I ask the Clerk to read and the chairman of the committee to accept, if he will, as an amendment to the bill. I do not know where it ought to come in, but I suppose at the end of section 2 would be as well as anywhere else.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois submits an amendment, which will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert at the end of section 2, on page 3, the following proviso:

Provided, That the Director of the Census may, in his discretion, collect statistics relating to all the deaf, dumb, and blind, notwithstanding the restriction in this section relating to special classes.

Mr. CULLOM. That was meant to apply to section 8 of the original act, which I have not here, and I should like to have it inserted in some part of the pending bill.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, this amendment is a very simple one, and it appears somewhat ungracious to oppose its insertion in the bill, but we are confronted by a policy which will lead to an indefinite expansion of the census work and a repetition of the misfortunes and delays that have attended like efforts in the past. No one is better informed than the Senator from Illinois concerning the many difficulties that have been encountered in previous attempts to cover too large a field in connection with the census inquiries.

When this bill for the census was originally framed the Senate in no uncertain terms expressed itself in favor of a census so limited as to enable us to secure the results within a reasonable period of time. In conformity with that purpose, the census, as stated upon yesterday, was divided into two parts. By section 7 we undertook to provide for the regular decennial census. That section provides for only four topics of inquiry—the population, agriculture, manufacturing, and vital statistics—mortality record. This identical purpose found favor elsewhere, but it was assumed, and correctly, too, that in the course of time inquiries concerning other matters would be of public importance, and we therefore provided in the next section, section 8, that immediately upon the conclusion of the decennial census the Census Office should proceed through special agents and other methods aside from the regular enumerators to collect data upon a number of important questions concerning which statisticians and legislators and others have much interest.

During the consideration of the bill here presented numerous persons have appeared before the committee endeavoring to have the work contemplated as supplemental work, to be taken up after the census was completed, imported into the census work provided for in section 7 of the bill. Professor Bell, who has given much attention to the subject-matter of the Senator's amendment, appeared before the committee and in most eloquent terms urged the committee to incorporate the proposed amendment in the bill being framed at that time by the committee. The committee, after full consideration of the matter, not, I am sure, minimizing the importance of the subject, but determined to adhere to a policy which we deemed necessary in order to make a success of this census in the matter of time, unanimously determined not to have this feature incorporated in the regular census work. In view of that determination by the committee, I feel constrained to object to this amendment.

In this connection I wish to appeal to the Senate, desiring, as I know Senators do, to have this census work completed in an effective and expeditious manner, to adhere to the policy inaugurated when the original legislation was approved. If we depart from that policy in one particular, we shall be compelled to depart from it in many particulars. The experience of the past is quite sufficient to admonish us of the danger involved in any single departure. As suggested by the Senator from South Carolina yesterday, and the suggestion was not overdrawn, tons upon tons of schedules that had gone through the hands of the enumerators at a cost not of $500,000, as suggested by the Senator, but at an expense involving millions of dollars to the Government, were taken out as rubbish and burned because it was found utterly impossible to tabulate the statistics to be deduced from the material put together, and what was left unburned required in the neighborhood of eight long, painful years to put into book form for the use of the public.

Mr. President, at the opening of this century we should adhere to the departure made when the bill was framed, to have, as the Senator from Maine says, a quick census. We desire to know how many people there are in this country. We desire to know what progress has been made in agriculture and manufacturing lines. We desire to know essential things concerning vitality and mortality statistics. The bill now covers only those propositions requiring for complete information house-to-house canvass. Where, by or through correspondence or special agents or inquiries conducted in that manner, statistics can be collated, it is needless and therefore vicious to undertake to burden the enumerators with the task of collecting the data.

I sincerely hope that this amendment will fail, not because it is lacking in merit, for it is as meritorious as the proposition of the Senator from South Dakota or the very wise suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts, two additional amendments which, I assume, in the course of this discussion, will be offered to this bill, but it is objected to because it will so encumber this work as to defeat the purpose Congress had originally, in attempting to confine the census to the simple propositions involved in population, agriculture, manufacturing, and vital statistics.

Mr. HOAR. Let the amendment be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will again be read.

The Secretary again read the amendment.

Mr. CULLOM. If the amendment should be adopted, it perhaps ought to read "and be it provided," so as to make it a part of the bill with any sort of connection.

Mr. President, I am certainly not one of those who desire to interfere with the rapid taking of the census. I have some knowledge of the censuses heretofore taken, having been on the committee most of the time, and I know that there has been great delay, in part consequent upon changes in the law after the work had begun. Just a few moments ago I came into possession of this amendment, and I really did not know the status of the bill until after I received it from a gentleman of this city. It is the result of resolutions which I find in a magazine entitled The Associations Review, from which I will read.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator from Illinois a question before he proceeds, so that I may understand him? The subject of this amendment is not provided for in section 8?

Mr. CULLOM. Of the original act?

Mr. HOAR. Yes; where it provides in reference to the feeble-minded, deaf, dumb, and blind.

Mr. CULLOM. I do not know what the provision of the law is.

Mr. CARTER. That, I will state to the Senator from Massachusetts, is a provision in reference to the supplemental work. This matter is taken care of in that section.

Mr. HALE. Entirely.

Mr. CARTER. And will be regularly disposed of, but subsequent to the taking of the census.

Mr. HOAR. My amendment merely amends the provision about supplemental work. It does not bring anything forward from the deferred to the immediate.

Mr. CARTER. There is no objection to an amendment to section 8.

Mr. HOAR. That is what I proposed.

Mr. CULLOM. This amendment was proposed to section 8 of the present law as it was sent to me.

Mr. HOAR. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator, who knows

more about it than I do, but, as I understand it, there are two classes of census work provided for in the bill which is now the law. One is that which relates to the quick census of which the Senator spoke, and then there are others to be done after the first is completed; and that will be attended to. I supposed the Senator's purpose was to transfer this matter from class second to class first. If it is not even in class second now——

Mr. HALE. It is. It is all in class second.

Mr. CULLOM. The amendment was handed to me, and it was proposed to make it an amendment to section 8 by adding to it the following proviso:

Provided, That the Director of the Census may, in his discretion, collect statistics relating to all the deaf, dumb, and blind, notwithstanding the restriction in this section to special classes.

I submit to the chairman of the committee, in view of the fact that this is proposed to be an amendment to section 8, whether he has any objection to it.

Mr. HOAR. It is there now.

Mr. CULLOM. It is there now in a way, but it certainly is not satisfactory to those who are interested especially in this subject.

Mr. HALE. How can he have it much better than this:

That after the completion and return of the enumeration of the work upon schedules—

We kept that line of demarcation clear all the way through—

relating to the products of agriculture, etc., the Director of the Census is hereby authorized to collect statistics relating to special classes—

We kept them out of the first enumeration because it embarrasses the census—

including the insane, feeble-minded, deaf, dumb, and blind; to crime, pauperism, and benevolence, including prisoners, paupers, juvenile delinquents, and inmates of benevolent and reformatory institutions; to deaths and births in registration areas; to social statistics of cities; to public indebtedness.

And so forth.

All of those things which not only embarrass the first census, the immediate census, what I have called the quick census, but which can be better done by special agents. If the Senator will think a moment he will see that this delicate matter of intruding upon a family and reporting that it has in it one or two insane persons or idiotic persons is not a thing that ought to be done by enumerators.

Mr. CULLOM. Suppose that is true——

Mr. HALE. It should be done by special agents, as provided for in section 8.

Mr. CULLOM. This is proposed as an amendment to section 8 of the original act, about which the Senator is talking. Whether it enlarges the work so as to make it desirable I am not prepared to say, as I am not familiar with section 8, and I call upon the chairman of the committee to say whether this amendment adds anything to the real work desired by the people who are interested in this special subject.

Mr. CARTER. It adds in this respect, in answering the Senator's query directly. The section as at present existing contemplates only the enumeration of persons in institutions.

Mr. CULLOM. Oh.

Mr. CARTER. The amendment contemplates going beyond the institutions, which can only be done, I assume, through the enumerators; and that is the real purpose of the amendment, I think.

Mr. HALE. Undoubtedly.

Mr. CARTER. That fixes upon the Director of the Census a burden which he can not discharge unless by virtue of a schedule delivered to every enumerator who goes forth. I will suggest in that particular, with the permission of the Senator——

Mr. CULLOM. Certainly.

Mr. CARTER. That one of the most difficult problems with which the last Director had to contend was found in this inquiry relating to the feeble-minded and the classes, so to speak.

Mr. CULLOM. There certainly ought to be information on that subject in the census. I desire to read the resolutions that were adopted by the association at the summer meeting at Northampton:

Whereas it appears that no provision has been made for an enumeration of the blind, or of the deaf, commonly known as "deaf and dumb," or "deaf-mutes," in the census of 1900; and

Whereas the enumeration hitherto made and returns tabulated for every decennial census since the year 1830 have been especially useful, valuable, and interesting to the educators of these classes, and have undoubtedly resulted in extending the blessings of an education to large numbers of the blind and of the deaf; and

Whereas the enumeration of these classes is a matter of great importance to the blind and to the deaf, and to those who are seeking their welfare: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That Dr. Alexander Graham Bell, president of the American Association to Promote the Teaching of Speech to the Deaf, and four others shall constitute a committee on behalf of this association with full power to take such steps as may be necessary to secure an enumeration of the blind and of the deaf and of the deaf blind in the next census. This committee is requested to confer with the Hon. William R. Merriam, Director of the Census, and Dr. Fred H. Wines, assistant director, in order to secure under the existing law, if possible, an enumeration of the classes herein referred to upon schedules which shall include at least the name, residence, age, parents' names in cases of minors, sex, race, and age at which deafness or blindness occurred.

If it shall appear that an amendment to the law is necessary in order to secure the enumeration aforesaid, this committee is hereby requested and empowered to appear before the proper officers of the United States Government and committees of Congress of the United States and to make use of every endeavor to secure a proper amendment of the law.

While it may be somewhat embarrassing to take the statistics of the unfortunates, yet I hardly feel willing that they shall be omitted. I am sure I do not want to embarrass this bill or the prompt taking of the census for 1900, but it seems to me that the wishes of the people who represent these two unfortunate classes ought to be complied with if it can be done. Now, if, as the chairman suggests, the provisions of the act in section 8 apply only to those in institutions, it is only a partial census and does not cover the ground as it ought to be covered. If we can amend the law in some way so as to take them all in, if we undertake to take in any of them, I shall be satisfied, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. HOAR. This amendment leaves it to the discretion of the Director of the Census?

Mr. CULLOM. It does. It provides that in the discretion of the Director of the Census this shall be done, and I understand—I do not know whether it is true—that he has provided a more enlarged amendment, but it was the desire of these people, especially such as Dr. Bell and others, that they should embarrass the committee as little as possible, and so they contracted it to the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. CARTER. I will state, Mr. President, that the Director of the Census indicated that he would not strenuously object to this addition; but at the same time he announced that the population schedules were all printed, and therefore a separate schedule would have to be printed and delivered to every enumerator in order to collate this information. I believe that after this decennial census shall have been completed the Bureau may more effectively acquire this information by addressing letters to all the practicing physicians in the United States than they can by undertaking to collect the information through enumerators. The name and address of every physician practicing medicine on the continent can be readily obtained, and a letter addressed to each will secure information on this and other delicate subjects of like character more effectively and, I think, in a more satisfactory manner than can be acquired by the enumerators.

Mr. CULLOM. I dislike very much to embarrass the committee or to cause the incurring of any extraordinary expense. Do I understand that these schedules are all printed?

Mr. CARTER. The population schedules are printed.

Mr. HOAR. May I say one word at this point?

Mr. CULLOM. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HOAR. I can not for the life of me see why everything for which the Senator from Illinois asks is not now provided for in the bill, and substantially in his language.

Mr. CULLOM. The chairman of the committee thinks not.

Mr. HOAR. I do not see why the old law does not answer. Perhaps I may be mistaken. Let us see. This information is to be obtained after the completion and return of the enumeration and of the work upon the schedules relating to the products of agriculture, and so on. Then the Director of the Census is especially authorized "to collect statistics relating to special classes, including the insane, feeble-minded, deaf, dumb, and blind." That is the only limit in relation to those in asylums. The Bureau is also to collect statistics relating "to crime, pauperism, and benevolence, including prisoners, paupers, juvenile delinquents, and inmates of benevolent and reformatory institutions."

Therefore it is not going to delay your present census, because it is not to be done until after that has been completed. It is not going to be confined to persons in asylums, because the Director, in his discretion, can make it general, and it is to be assumed that he will do it in a humane and decent way. Nobody can doubt that.

It seems to me the objections which have been made to the amendment of my honorable friend from Illinois are objections to the original law, and that everything in his amendment is in the law now, I think, without exception.

Mr. CULLOM. It seems to me to read that way, I confess, but the chairman of the committee indicated that it only applied to those in institutions.

Mr. KENNEY. If Senators will recur to section 8 of the law, they will find that it reads:

The statistics of special classes and of crime, pauperism, and benevolence specified in this section shall be restricted to institutions containing such classes.

There is the limitation.

Mr. CULLOM. But that is taken out.

Mr. HAWLEY. That is no good at all.

Mr. CULLOM. A census of a portion of such classes is taken and the balance left out. If they are not included, it would not be anything like a proper census. So I should like to have my amendment added to section 8 of the law.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. CULLOM. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I wish that Senators would

refrain from offering amendments enlarging the scope of the census to this purely administrative bill. I can understand that the subject of enlarging the scope of the census is a proper one to bring before the Census Committee and before Congress; but this bill was drawn up as a purely administrative bill, and the Director of the Census needs this bill now in order to go on with his work.

Mr. CULLOM. If the Senator will allow me to ask him a question, does he think that taking this census, including only the unfortunates who are in institutions and leaving all the remainder out, is a proper census?

Mr. CHANDLER. No, Mr. President.

Mr. CULLOM. Then how are you going to amend it?

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator will listen to me, I will tell him what my notion is, and I shall be very glad to have half a dozen Senators on the floor aiding me, all at the same time. [Laughter.]

The object of the Senator's amendment is to transfer the taking of the census of the deaf, dumb, and blind from the special agents to the enumerators. I understand that to be his object. Is it not his object?

Mr. CULLOM. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. If it is, I want to speak against it.

Mr. CULLOM. I do not care how the committee provides for taking that census so that it is taken properly, fully, and effectually. If the committee can so frame the bill as that in the end all these people may be counted as indicated in the amendment, that is all I desire.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am willing for one that that shall be done, but I do not want it done on the population schedule, and therefore I am opposed to the amendment of the Senator. But I was addressing myself to the general question.

Mr. HALE. Has the Senator got the amendment there? If so, I inquire how does it read? Will not the Senator read it?

Mr. CHANDLER. It has been amended since it was offered, I think.

Mr. HALE. No.

Mr. CARTER. The amendment was suggested for the purpose of perfecting the bill. The amendment reads as follows——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. CHANDLER. Of course when a Senator is making a speech it is not of the slightest sort of importance what the proposition is upon which he is speaking. [Laughter.]

Mr. HALE. That may be so in some cases, but the Senator from New Hampshire always talks upon the direct proposition.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will yield to the Senator from Montana to have the proposition stated.

Mr. CARTER. The amendment reads as follows:

Provided further, That the Director of the Census may, in his discretion, collect statistics relating to all of the deaf, dumb, and blind, notwithstanding the restrictions in this section relating to special classes.

Mr. HALE. Suppose you put in there, as suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire, that under the provisions of section 8 the Director may do this.

Mr. CHANDLER. That will be proper, and that is probably what was intended by the Senator from Illinois in the amendment as it now reads, or by the learned gentleman who induced him to undertake its advocacy. It does, in terms, introduce this subject into the enumeration schedule. So I now understand the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CULLOM. Will the Senator allow me to suggest that if that is put in as an amendment to section 8, and then the subsequent section is so amended as to allow this census to be taken not only of those classes in institutions, but outside of them, it will answer my purpose.

Mr. CHANDLER. Personally, I have no objection to that, but what I was pleading for was that upon this purely administrative bill we should not enlarge the scope of the census. I think the subject is a proper one to be considered by the Committee on the Census and by Congress, and it is probable that some enlargements will be made, but they should be made carefully, they should not be made upon the impulse of the moment, but every one of them should be examined by the Committee on the Census, and there should be action taken upon them deliberately and in order. That can not be done, Mr. President, if amendments enlarging the scope of the census are to be adopted to this purely administrative bill.

I would like to have Senators consent to withhold amendments until the administrative bill is disposed of, then offer their propositions, let them go to the Committee on the Census, and have them considered in order, for if we begin this way, upon the motion of a single Senator to enlarge the scope of the census upon this administrative bill, there is no knowing where we shall stop.

Mr. HALE. The Senator knows, does he not, that this is not in the least a new matter. The committee has had hearings on this very subject, and has had eminent persons before it. It has gone over the whole matter carefully, without any prejudice, and rejected the proposition, because its members thought it would interfere with the scope of the work. Now it is the fashion, and gentlemen have the right to follow it, after they are overruled in committee on full examination, to apply to a Senator and insist that he shall offer the proposition; and he offers it as new matter.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator will allow me to go on.

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. It is not so much this particular amendment, but the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] wants to enlarge the scope of section 8 so as to include an investigation into the water power of New England, and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW]—I call the attention of the members of the committee to this—has an amendment which he proposes to offer, to have an investigation made into the subject of the distribution of the wealth of this country, and that, as is the case relating to the water power, is a very proper subject of investigation. It is certainly a proper subject of statistical inquiry. It may possibly be something which the Census Bureau ought to take up; but all these propositions ought to be considered by a committee of the Senate before they are acted upon. We ought not to adopt one of them after another upon this administrative bill.

When the bill for the present census was being prepared, it was found to be of the highest importance—and I can add nothing on the subject to what the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] said yesterday—to so frame the bill as to reduce the size of the volumes of the next census and to limit the work of the enumerators. It appeared upon inquiry that ten years ago the enumerators who went around to take the population census had to make a very large number of inquiries. The then chairman of the committee, the Senator from Maine, will remember, I think, that two or three hundred inquiries had to be made in every family, and it was thought proper that the subjects as to which the enumerators, who have but a week or a fortnight in which to do their work and make inquiries, should be reduced somewhere down to 100.

The number of inquiries which they are to make is too large now, Mr. President. But by strenuous effort the committee set their faces against too wide a scope for the census, and the number of inquiries that these enumerators are to make next June was reduced from two or three hundred down to between one and two hundred; and the number was too large then. It was also found that we could probably have the volumes of the census of 1890, numbering 24, reduced to 5 or 6 in 1900. It was with quite a great effort and with considerable self-denial and after quite a debate that the determination was arrived at to thus reduce and limit the scope of the census for 1900. I hope we shall not go on little by little and undo that work and pile upon the Director of the Census the duty of adding innumerable items to the subjects which are to be investigated until you will have again a census of 24 volumes and a census which would be so bulky that it would be comparatively useless.

It is entirely certain that we can not afford to go on and convert our Census Office into a general statistical office for the country. The further the census has got from a mere enumeration of the inhabitants the more expensive it has become, the more complicated it has become, and I will not say, although I am inclined to say it, the more useless it has become because of its great bulk and of the extensive researches into which the investigators have been led.

I am opposed to any enlargement of the scope of the census upon this bill, and I hope all amendments to it will be voted down. I trust, if Senators want to enlarge the scope of the census, they will offer bills for that purpose and have them referred to the committee and fully examined.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, the statistics of these unfortunate classes are of very great value, and care ought to be taken that a census of these classes should be somehow thoroughly taken. I find in the existing act that the enumerators are to take account of only those persons who are in institutions.

Mr. CULLOM. More than half of such persons are outside of institutions.

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes, more than half of them are outside. They have gone into schools and are living in various ways and in various places. The statistics on that subject will not be worth one farthing, and the census authorities will not get half the number of the deaf, dumb, and blind there are in the country. It is not the way of getting at them by simply calling at the buildings where they may be confined. They can furnish the census of those in the institutions, of course, and may know where some of their graduates are. If the Senator in charge of this bill will strike out the limitation as to institutions only and will accept the proposed amendment, the work will be done. That is all I care about. I do not care how it is done, but I wish he would try to have it done.

Mr. TILLMAN. Let that be stricken out.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be read.

Mr. TILLMAN. Before that is done, I suggest to the chairman

of the committee and to the Senator from Illinois that the object both of them are desirous of obtaining may be reached by omitting in the eighth section the prohibition in regard to the census of these unfortunate classes, which provides that only those who are in institutions shall be enumerated. If you will strike out that provision, you will then allow the special agents to gather these facts after the first census is taken. You will not hamper the population census and the important work of the Census Bureau, but you will leave this data, which is valuable only to scientists and to some few people who are interested in such matters, to be collected by special agents, by striking out the words which confine those inquiries to those unfortunates who are in institutions, but leaving it open to the Director to get them wherever they are to be found. Then you accomplish the work which the Senator from Illinois seems to desire and do not hamper the census authorities.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, one of the difficulties connected with the suggestion of the honorable Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] will be found in this. It is properly the desire of Congress to keep within the limits of reason the work to be accomplished by any bureau of the Government which incurs expense. With that restriction removed, the Bureau of the Census would be commissioned to go beyond institutions and to inquire into the question of the criminal classes of the country, if you please, who are not in institutions, to examine police-court records, and to tabulate information that might or might not be of value. The same would be true with relation to juvenile delinquents and all those classes, save and except the blind, the deaf, and the dumb. In some instances these unfortunates are outside of institutions. The criminal classes, according to the theory of our law, are all within institutions, either reformatory or penal. It seems better to make the exception in the form presented by the Senator's amendment rather than to remove all restriction relative to the subject.

Mr. TILLMAN. I was only endeavoring to meet both points.

Mr. CARTER. I will state generally, Mr. President, and I think it will be concurred in by all of the committee, that it was the purpose of the committee to provide in this section 8 for a line of special work which would cover every necessary and reasonable investigation that Congress might deem it wise to hereafter authorize the Census Bureau to prosecute. The desire of the committee is that the section preceding section 7, which provides for the enumeration, shall not be overburdened and overloaded, so as to defeat the object of the census from the beginning. I ask the Secretary to read the amendment as it has been amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the amendment by inserting after the word "may," at the end of line 1, the words "after the completion of the census as aforesaid;" so that, if amended, it will read:

Provided further, That the Director of the Census may, after the completion of the census as aforesaid, in his discretion, collect statistics relating to all the deaf, dumb, and blind, notwithstanding the restriction in this section relating to special classes.

Mr. CULLOM. If that is adopted, it will cover the particular subject.

Mr. CARTER. I think, instead of the words "this section," which would refer to the section of the bill in which this amendment appears, it should be "notwithstanding the restriction contained in section 8 of the act of March 3, 1899."

Mr. CULLOM. That is the suggestion I was going to make. I feared the restriction in section 8 would defeat its object. If there is no objection to that, I have nothing further to say.

Mr. CHANDLER. The only objection I have is that it is enlarging the scope of the census; and if we have to deal with this subject, we shall have half a dozen others.

Mr. CULLOM. It is left entirely in the discretion of the Director of the Census.

Mr. CHANDLER. But this administrative bill ought to be passed without reopening the question of enlarging the scope of the next census.

Mr. HAWLEY. I think we can be trusted, in view of that advice, not to encumber this bill with other amendments. If we do right in this case, we may do wrong in the other cases if we choose.

Mr. HOAR. I think the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] overlooks the way we legislate and have to legislate in the Senate. I suppose if we took up regularly and in order and in the best way all business which comes to us we could not do one year's legislation in ten. We have to take such imperfect opportunities as we can get to make our attempts to procure legislation which is desired when the general subject is up. Now, if we should send these amendments, which everybody agrees, I think, ought to be made, to the committee, the chances are that they would bring in a report, perhaps at the shortest, in six weeks from now. Then they would have a fight all the rest of the session, with at least ten other subjects all seeking the attention of the Senate. The result would be that these simple and clear amendments would have against them probably not only the members of the Senate who are opposed to them, but the members of the Senate who want other subjects considered.

Here is a simple thing. The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] stated that it could be put into the eighth section, and that he had no objection to it. The Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] stated that he had no objection to it. Both of them so stated in regard to my amendment, which was merely an interpretation of the law relating to the statistics of manufactures, so that the inquiries should include the subject of water power, a matter about which the Commissioner of the Census is in some doubt. It seems to me these two or three matters should be put in the bill.

Then, when it comes to the matter of the statistics of wealth, that is something which we will not deal with until it is explained; at least, I hope not. That we shall need the statistics upon some of these subjects no one questions, and it should be provided for, if it can be done, in this eighth section. The other amendments had the assent of representatives of the committee, who regard them as good things in themselves, and I do not think we ought to go without them on the chance that we may get up another census bill a few months hence.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] as it has been modified will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of section 2, on page 3, it is proposed to insert:

Provided further, That the Director of the Census may, after the completion of the census as aforesaid, in his discretion, collect statistics relating to all of the deaf, dumb, and blind, notwithstanding the restriction contained in section 8 of the act of March 3, 1899, relating to special classes.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] seems to be exceedingly earnest in the advocacy of this amendment, as do some other Senators. I do not consider it a very material amendment; I do not consider it a very important amendment. There are other amendments which, if this shall be agreed to, ought to be adopted, which I consider infinitely more important to the great masses of the toiling millions of this country than this amendment. I understood, however, when the last census bill was reported and passed, with a good deal of unanimity, that we were going to stand by it, that we would have a census taken in pursuance of it, and that we would not be, from the day the bill passed until five or six years afterwards, amending, enlarging, and extending it until the publication of the census would be a disgrace to any government.

I insist that we shall stand by the act as it was passed, and take the census which it provided for. If it is desired to have any other census taken, it can be taken. We are not confined to taking a census every ten years. We have, under the Constitution, to take one every ten years, but we can take a census at any time; so we need not encumber this bill with amendments. Why mix this up? We have not, I believe, received all the reports of the last census. I think in the last year some of the volumes came in.

Mr. CULLOM. I assume that the Senator from Missouri does not desire a partial census of those unfortunates to whom my amendment refers, but a whole census, with all the facts.

Mr. COCKRELL. I think the census will be complete enough for any man to form a just conclusion from. Though it may not include every such person found in some private home, it will have all those in institutions.

Mr. CULLOM. The census will contain simply the enumeration of those in the institutions, and no others.

Mr. COCKRELL. I say that that will include 999 out of every 1,000.

Mr. HAWLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. CULLOM. I differ with the Senator very materially.

Mr. COCKRELL. I am only stating what the amendment will do. I do not think it a very important amendment. There will simply be a few whose names will not be taken in the census, but that will not be fatal to it and will not injure the reputation or character or standing of our nation; it will not prohibit anybody from obtaining information, and all the information on that subject that is worth a continental cent.

Mr. CULLOM. We might say that none of it is worth a continental, but when we come to take a census of any class of people let us have an enumeration of all in that class. If that is not to be done, we ought to strike out the original provision of the law.

It seems to me the Senator is entirely wrong in the position he takes. This amendment will not interfere with the population census at all. It simply provides that the census of all of these two unfortunate classes shall be taken, not only those in institutions, but those who are not in institutions, and I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The question being put, there were on a division—ayes 9, noes 22.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum has not voted.

Mr. HOAR. I rise to move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. ELKINS. Before that is done, I desire to present some papers in the nature of morning business.

Mr. COCKRELL. We can not do any business in the absence of a quorum.

Mr. ELKINS. I merely want to present some papers and bills, so as to get them out of my charge.

Mr. HOAR. That can not be done now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 10, 1900, at 12 o'clock meridian.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *January 10, 1900.*

The Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou in whose hand our breath is and whose are all our ways, as the Senate meets to-day to pay its tribute of respect and affection to the memory of our late beloved Vice-President, a man whose generous nature, sunny temper, and friendly ways endeared him to all who were brought in contact with him, grant that the men who speak may set forth the feeling not only of the Senate, but of the whole country.

Hear our devout prayer in behalf of the wife who has been widowed, and of the son who has been rendered fatherless. Uphold and steer them in their unspeakable bereavement. And let this great sorrow, which has touched so many homes and hearts, come to us with the sense that there is a future where God's sons and daughters are gathered in immortal peace and blessedness, where are no tears, nor sorrow, nor grief. We pray through Jesus Christ, our Saviour. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. LODGE, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal, without objection, will stand approved.

NAVAJO INDIAN RESERVATION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and the House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, dated the 5th instant, with accompanying papers, expressing an urgent necessity for the enlargement of the Navajo Indian Reservation, in Arizona, to enable these Indians to support themselves by stock raising within the limits of their reservation.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, January 10, 1900.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT OF MARCH 9, 1898.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 8th instant, certain information relative to that portion of the $50,000,000 appropriated by Congress under the act approved March 9, 1898, making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for prior years, and for other purposes, and stating that no portion of the amount was assigned to and expended by or under the direction of the Department of Justice.

What disposition does the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] desire to have made of the communication?

Mr. ALLEN. I move that it be printed, with the accompanying papers, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

NEW YORK BANK TRANSACTIONS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 4th instant, copies of all letters, communications, agreements, papers, and documents between the Treasury Department of the Government of the United States and the National City Bank and the Hanover National Bank, of the city of New York.

The papers are quite voluminous. The Chair supposes they should be referred to the Committee on Finance. Perhaps the question of printing should be referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. ALLISON. Do all those documents accompany the communication?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All the documents are connected with it.

Mr. ALLEN. Is it in response to the resolution I introduced some days ago?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is inclined to think it is.

Mr. ALLISON. I understand it is in response to the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN]. Those papers seem to be rather voluminous. I suppose they are letters and documents.

Mr. ALLEN. They ought to be printed. Their value, I suppose, consists in being printed and made public.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the rule they would go to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. HALE. That committee can report at any time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. But the Senate can order the printing without a reference.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senate can order the printing. I hope they will be ordered printed.

Mr. ALLEN. I trust they will be ordered printed without a reference of the question.

Mr. ALLISON. Let them be printed and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. VEST. Is there any statement there by the Secretary?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is quite a long statement from the Secretary.

Mr. ALLEN. That should be printed as a part of the document.

Mr. VEST. Yes, if it is too long to be read. I should like to hear it read. I do not care anything about the exhibits, but I should like to hear the Secretary's general statement about this matter, unless it would take too much time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It comprises six or eight pages. Does the Senator ask that it be read?

Mr. VEST. Unless it would take too much time. I do not know how long it is.

Mr. LODGE. How many pages does it comprise?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Perhaps 10 pages.

Mr. VEST. Let it be read if it is only 10 pages long.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair discovers that it is a great deal longer. It comprises the entire document here. There must be 30 pages of it.

Mr. ALLISON. Thirty printed pages?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Thirty printed pages.

Mr. ALLEN. Why can not that be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. VEST. I do not ask that it be read if it is that long.

Mr. ALLEN. Let it be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. ALLISON. I think it is too much matter to be printed in the RECORD, although I do not know; it may be such an important document that it deserves to be printed in the RECORD. If it were read, of course it would appear in the RECORD.

Mr. VEST. I take it for granted that the Secretary has answered in a general way the inquiry which was made of him by the Senate and that in substantiating his statement he has filed these exhibits. My object in asking for the reading is to get a general idea of what his statement is. It seems to me that the Senate ought, out of respect to him, to have it read.

Mr. ALLISON. Without knowing the contents of the paper, I think the Secretary has attempted to answer with great fullness and in an explicit way the inquiries of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska. I would be glad to hear it read, or I think it might very well be printed in the RECORD or printed as a document, I do not care which. It ought to be printed as a document in connection with the papers submitted.

Mr. ALLEN. It ought to be printed as a part of the proceedings, with all the exhibits, as a document.

Mr. ALLISON. It can be printed in a day or two. I suggest to the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Missouri that this document can be printed and placed on our tables to-morrow or Friday morning. I ask that the communication be printed as a document, with all the accompanying papers, and then we shall have the whole story, whatever it is.

Mr. ALLEN. That will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. HALE. Let me suggest that if we print the report of the Secretary and the accompanying documents we shall have a great, cumbrous book that nobody will read. Not only ought the communication to be printed with the accompanying papers, but as a separate document, because most people will want to see the report without regard to the papers that accompany it. I suggest to the Senators to have it done in that way.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well; I do not object to that.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not object to that part of it, but I want to see the report, with the exhibits, printed as an entire document.

Mr. VEST. We ought to have that report read.

Mr. HALE. What the Senator from Nebraska desires will be done under my suggestion. The communication will be printed, with the accompanying papers, as a document. All together it will be a very bulky document. Then let the Secretary's report be also printed as a document by itself.

Mr. ALLEN. I think it ought to go in the RECORD, too. The RECORD has a general circulation.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have no objection to the Secretary's report itself going into the RECORD.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not want the exhibits to go into the RECORD, but I want the report itself printed in the RECORD.

Mr. HALE. Then let the RECORD to-morrow morning contain the report of the Secretary. Let the report be printed separately as a document, and let it also be printed, with the papers accompanying it, as another document.

Mr. ALLEN. That is right.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine asks that the report of the Secretary be printed in the RECORD; that the report and memorandum accompanying it (there is a memorandum separate from the other papers) be printed together as a document, and that the other papers be printed with the report and memorandum. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The communication ordered to be printed in the RECORD is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., January 10, 1900.

The PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Senate resolution dated January 4, 1900; which reads as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate copies of all letters, communications, agreements, papers, and documents between the Treasury Department of the Government of the United States and the National City Bank and the Hanover National Bank, of the city of New York, or either or both of them, since the 4th day of March, A. D. 1897, in any manner respecting the deposit of public funds, bonds, and revenues of the Government of the United States with said bank or banks, and inform the Senate respecting any other relation or relations now or heretofore existing between the Government of the United States and the said bank or banks, and the amount of money, bonds, public funds, and revenues, respectively, deposited in said bank or banks by the Government of the United States, the reasons therefor, and whether said bank or banks have paid the Government of the United States any interest on said deposit or deposits, and if so, how much interest and the length of time the money, public funds, bonds, and the revenues of the Government of the United States were held on deposit by said bank or banks, and whether said money, public funds, bonds, and revenues, or any portion thereof, were loaned to other banks, corporations, or persons, giving their names and addresses, respectively, and if so, the amount and dates thereof, respectively. And the Secretary of the Treasury is further directed to inform the Senate what compensation has been paid to said bank or banks, directly or indirectly, by the Government of the United States for the custody, handling, and disbursement of said money, public funds, bonds, and revenues of the Government of the United States, and give to the Senate all other information in any manner pertaining to said transaction or transactions."

Such transactions as the Treasury Department has had with the banks specifically named in the resolution, or with any other banks not so specifically named, have been governed by the provisions of section 5153 of the Revised Statutes, which is as follows:

"All national banking associations designated for that purpose by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be depositaries of public money, except receipts from customs, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary; and they may also be employed as financial agents of the Government; and they shall perform all such reasonable duties, as depositaries of public moneys and financial agents of the Government, as may be required of them. The Secretary of the Treasury shall require the associations thus designated to give satisfactory security, by the deposit of United States bonds and otherwise, for the safe-keeping and prompt payment of the public money deposited with them, and for the faithful performance of their duties as financial agents of the Government. And every association so designated as receiver or depositary of the public money shall take and receive at par all of the national currency bills, by whatever association issued, which have been paid into the Government for internal revenue, or for loans or stocks."

The statute quoted became a law June 3, 1864, and from that day to the present time it has been the practice of the Treasury Department to deposit with such institutions, as convenience might suggest or require, internal revenue and other receipts, except those from customs.

The first marked recognition of such agencies occurred during the period when the refunding operations were being carried on in the seventies, but particularly in 1879, incident to the resumption of specie payments, when Secretary Sherman found it necessary to place with national-bank depositaries large sums of money, reaching as high as $270,544,645 at the end of May of that year.

The second notable use of national banks as Government depositaries was in 1887 and 1888. Then, owing to an abnormal surplus of revenues, Secretary Fairchild increased the number of depositary banks, and encouraged those then existing to enlarge their qualification to hold public moneys by increasing the amount of their United States bonds on deposit with the Treasurer of the United States as security. Under this operation public moneys were accumulated in the depositary banks until, at the end of February, 1888, the aggregate was $61,546,000. Later, when the revenues decreased, funds were transferred from the depositary banks to the subtreasuries, whence they were disbursed on account of public expenditure. By midsummer of 1892 the balances in depositary banks were reduced to their normal average of about $15,000,000, and they were maintained practically at this figure until the early months of 1896, when a portion of the moneys derived from the sale of bonds of that year was deposited with such banks. At the end of March, 1896, public deposits in national banks aggregated $27,010,994.

On March 4, 1897, there were 159 national-bank depositaries, holding a total of $16,198,410. With few exceptions, these institutions were made the recipients of deposits from internal-revenue collectors at the various points in the country where the chief offices of the collectors of the several districts are located. All these depositary banks were permitted to hold, as fixed balances, an amount approximating the par value of the bonds deposited as security. Any surplus over the amount which each was authorized to hold was required to be transferred to some one of the several subtreasuries as soon as received.

This general course of affairs and practice continued until November, 1897. At the end of October of that year public deposits in national banks aggregated $17,159,616. During November, however, were begun those large payments which resulted from the highly successful settlement of the Pacific Railroad indebtedness. The receipts on account of the Union Pacific Railroad aggregated $58,448,223.75, all of which was paid between November 26, 1897, and January 6, 1898, a period of little over a month.

It was thought expedient, as a part of this enormous transaction, to utilize for a few days the services of depositary banks, with the result that at the end of November, 1897, public deposits with such institutions had increased to $37,744,217, and at the end of December, 1897, to $40,182,717.

The reason for this action was to avoid the injurious effect upon trade and industry of a too sudden withdrawal from public uses into the vaults of the Treasury of so large a sum as $58,000,000. For the same reason, on December 13, 1897, I gave notice that on Friday, December 24, 1897, the Department would be prepared to begin the redemption, without rebate of interest, of the bonds, aggregating $29,904,352, issued in aid of the Pacific railroads, commonly known as "currency sixes," and maturing January 1, 1898.

By the end of May, 1898, public deposits in depositary banks had been reduced to $28,239,359.

At this time occurred an event which has ever since had a marked influence upon the course of national finances, namely, the breaking out of war between the United States and Spain. June 1, 1898, there were 172 depositary banks, holding a total but little in excess of $28,000,000, thus showing only a slight modification of the condition existing on March 4, 1897, notwithstanding the receipts on account of the Union Pacific settlement.

Now, however, the Government was confronted with the necessity of raising immediately a large fund for war purposes. The act of June 13, 1898, known as the war-revenue act, conferred upon the Secretary of the Treasury the power to issue bonds to the extent of $400,000,000. Acting under this authority, it was considered to be wise and expedient that the people of the United States should be called upon to subscribe to an issue of $200,000,000.

The Treasury Department feels justified in indulging in some degree of pride over the results of this loan. It demonstrated at once the power, wealth, and patriotism of the people of the United States. Those of small means were given the first opportunity to obtain the bonds, and they who had but $20 to invest were the most welcome of all; yet, in passing, it may not be amiss to say that one of the elements of the success of the war loan was the fact that it was supported by great financial institutions. On the day the books were opened the National City Bank of New York and its associates, the Central Trust Company of New York and Vermilye & Co., offered to take at par and accrued interest any portion of the bonds offered that might not be subscribed for by the public.

On the same day, also, as appears from the record of the Department, J. P. Morgan & Co. and their associates, numbering fifteen of the greatest financial houses of the country, subscribed for the entire issue of $200,000,000, or such part thereof as might not be subscribed for by the general public. Without knowing that they would get a dollar of the bonds, unless, through some untoward event, the national credit should become impaired and the new bonds fall in value, they thus substantially guaranteed the success of the loan.

It will readily be recognized by everyone that the absorption by the Government of a sum so large as $200,000,000 within the space of a few weeks could not fail to disturb most seriously the general business of the country. In fact, it is not saying too much to allege that were the Government to draw into the Treasury $200,000,000 within a brief period of time, the financial disaster and ruin which would ensue would be appalling. The obligation to avoid such unhappy conditions is one of which the Secretary of the Treasury is deeply sensible, and he feels with some measure of just pride that the financing of the war loan of 1898 was accomplished without the slightest interruption to that revival of commerce and the industries of the country which has made the present a period of unexampled prosperity.

In the conduct of the war loan the Treasury again resorted to depositary banks, and their use as such may be seen from the following statement:

1898.	Balance at end of month.
May	$28,239,358.72
June	38,795,630.52
July	58,236,017.70
August	65,968,467.15
September	80,888,712.09
October	95,014,969.60
November	94,641,001.00
December	94,860,916.00

These deposits were scattered throughout the length and breadth of the land in forty-three States and Territories. December 31, 1898, the number of national-bank depositaries was 316. In the course of affairs just reviewed the depositary banks in the city of New York were able to buy more bonds and thus qualify themselves in a much larger proportion than the interior cities and smaller towns throughout the country.

Yet many applications to be designated as depositaries came from such quarters after the money for the war bonds had been substantially paid in and there appeared to be no further need for diverting the funds from the subtreasuries. With a view, therefore, to secure a more equitable distribution of the depositary funds, beginning early in January, 1899, I designated between forty and fifty depositaries throughout the country and directed the internal-revenue receipts, or a portion thereof, to be deposited in such new depositaries. At the same time transfers from the New York City banks into the subtreasury were ordered, thus reducing the proportion of the total funds held by the New York City banks. On January 1, 1899, the New York City banks held a total deposit of $43,275,487. By the 30th of June the following changes had occurred: New York City banks had been reduced to $24,686,391, and the other cities, towns, and villages had been increased from $50,570,879 on January 1, 1899, to $54,624,481 on June 30, 1899. These operations, covering a period of six months, had therefore resulted in decreasing deposits from a total of about $94,000,000 January 1, 1899, to a total of about $79,000,000 on June 30 of that year.

Thus closed the fiscal year 1899, and this point of time marks another important change in the course of the public finances. The National Treasury

had at last begun to feel the influence of the revival of commerce and the industries under the revenue legislation of the Fifty-fifth Congress, and with the closing month of the last fiscal year the Government's receipts showed a marked tendency toward improvement. The wider activities we have been enjoying have been reflected month by month since the opening of the current fiscal year by increasing receipts, both from customs and internal revenue. Six months of the current fiscal year have now elapsed, and for the half year ending December 31, 1899, there was an excess of receipts over expenditures aggregating $21,026,935. This absorption of money from an active use in trade and commerce into the Treasury, where it could serve no present useful purpose, was the source of apprehension to the public and of anxiety to the Department. The situation was intensified by the fact that the fall movement of currency to the interior for the movement of crops operated to reduce the cash reserves at all the commercial centers and to disturb the ability of the banks to continue their operations as lenders of credit.

For more than half a century it has been the established policy of the Government to endeavor, wherever it may, to contribute toward the avoidance of commercial disaster. If Secretary Windom may be quoted as an authority, attention is called to the following extract from his annual report for 1890:

"The policy of affording 'relief to the money market,' now so much criticised in certain quarters, is by no means a new thing. It has been the uniform policy of the Government, when possible, in all commercial crises from 1846 to the present time."

Indisposed to increase deposits in public depositaries, if it could be avoided, on October 10, 1899, I offered to anticipate, until December 31, 1899, interest coming due at any time during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900. This offer was accompanied by the requirement that the beneficiaries of such payment should allow to the Government a rebate on the interest so received, at the rate of 2.4 per cent per annum. Had all the holders of the public debt applied for interest payment under this offer, $26,000,000 might have been thus used. As a matter of fact, however, the applications were so few that only $2,219,847.60 was disbursed.

Perceiving the futility of this method of reducing the Treasury's absorption of funds which were needed in active business, I offered to buy, for the sinking fund, any part or all of $25,000,000 of those issues of Government bonds first maturing—i. e., the fives of 1904, and the fours of 1907, the total outstanding issues of which amounted to $659,690,400. The price at which the Government would buy these bonds was fixed at the current market price of the day preceding the announcement. This proposition, of which Congress was duly advised in my last annual report, was kept open until December 23, 1899, but only $19,300,650 of the bonds were presented for sale in response to the Department's offer.

In the purchase of this amount the Government disbursed $21,771,866. While holders of such bonds were given until December 23 last to present them for redemption, offerings to the Treasury ceased substantially about December 5, the price of the bonds having advanced in the market to a point 1¼ per cent higher than the price offered by the Government.

Perceiving that the full amount of bonds thus desired would not be received, on December 14, 1899, I announced that coupons for interest due January 1, 1900, would be cashed on presentation at any of the subtreasuries, and checks were remitted on December 15 to all the holders of registered bonds entitled to interest on January 1. As with the other efforts of the Department above outlined, I hoped this measure, comparatively unimportant in itself, would tend to avert anything like a panic and the resultant widespread evils. The measure was one more of assurance that the Government stood ready to guard the welfare of general business than of inherent efficacy.

The movement toward stringency in the money market had assumed too great momentum to be averted by the means already employed. December 18, 1899, an unsettling financial panic occurred in New York. Prices of investment securities of every grade and kind except Government bonds fell ruinously, interest rose to fabulous rates, and a general constriction of the money market was apparent. While this state of affairs found its most violent expression in the security market, it excited a state of anxiety and alarm throughout our industrial and commercial communities wherever located.

The situation was believed to be so grave as to justify the utmost interference. As before stated, the daily receipts into the Treasury were in excess of expenditures, and it was clearly perceived that such excess for December would be seven or eight millions. Under these circumstances a peculiar responsibility was thrown upon the Treasury Department. The authority conferred by section 5153, Revised Statutes, to place public money, except customs, in designated depositaries gave power to relieve the situation without possible prejudice to the Treasury's needs. On the evening of December 18, 1899, there appeared, therefore, in the public press the following announcement:

"The Secretary of the Treasury announced at the close of business to-day that he would increase the funds in depositary banks now existing and would designate new depositary banks, which may apply and qualify themselves by deposit of United States bonds, as the law requires. To such banks the incoming receipts from internal revenue, estimated at about $1,000,000 a day, will be distributed. The large balance in the Treasury will enable the Government to deposit to a total of $30,000,000 or $40,000,000, should so much be applied for."

Thus much I have premised before proceeding to respond to the resolution specifically, in order that a general review of my whole course of this branch of the public finances may be before you. I may add that as a principle of action I have endeavored so to manage receipts and expenditures as to produce the least disturbance in that part of the money supply which must be at the service of commercial and industrial use.

Success or failure in this direction may be here indicated. Since June 1, 1898, the receipts of the Treasury, including proceeds of bonds, have amounted to about eleven hundred millions of dollars. With the aid and use of depositaries, the actual cash in the Treasury vaults at the dates shown herewith was as follows:

1898:	
July	$232,601,739.13
October	304,550,695.89
1899:	
January	282,086,984.43
April	275,986,434.22
July	273,859,780.70
October	283,497,897.49
1900:	
January	273,159,422.86

It will be observed that substantial equilibrium has been maintained at all times, and the result has been to minimize the evils which may attend the administration of Government finances under our present system.

The resolution directs particular attention to the relation of the National City Bank and the Hanover National Bank to the Treasury with regard to public deposits. The National City Bank was appointed a depositary July 21, 1894. It qualified as such by the deposit of $200,000 of United States bonds, and the collector of the internal revenue district in which said bank is situated was directed to deposit from the above date a portion of his collections. The bank, according to the rule for all such agencies, was permitted to retain as a balance an amount equal—never more than par—to the bonds deposited by it with the Treasurer of the United States.

This continued to be the course of business with said bank until February, 1895, at which time the then Secretary of the Treasury effected the sale of a large amount of Government bonds in exchange for gold. In that connection it was deemed advisable by him to use, for temporary purposes, five national banks in New York as depositaries. The records show that in connection with that operation something over $15,000,000 was deposited with the First National Bank of New York, $2,600,000 with the National City, $3,100,000 with the National Park, $1,200,000 with the National Bank of Commerce, and upward of $1,000,000 with the Hanover National Bank. The amounts so deposited with said banks were secured as usual by the pledge of United States bonds with the Treasurer of the United States; and the moneys were from time to time transferred to the subtreasury, under the orders of the Secretary, until June 20, 1895, when they were all so transferred.

It appears also that in February, 1896, an issue of bonds was made in connection with which the New York banks were again used as depositaries in the following manner: The First National Bank of New York was made a depositary to the amount of $5,500,000; the National City, $9,600,000; the National Bank of Commerce, $1,800,000; the Chase National Bank, $1,900,000; the Continental National, $3,100,000, and the Hanover National Bank, $9,400,000. These deposits were secured as usual by the pledge of United States bonds with the Treasurer of the United States; and the moneys were, from time to time, transferred to the subtreasury under the orders of the Secretary until June, 1896, when they were fully transferred, with this exception: The Hanover National Bank being a temporary depositary, the account was entirely closed, while the National City Bank, being what is known as a permanent depositary, had the amount which it was permitted to hold reduced to its qualification as a permanent depositary, namely, $200,000.

The status of the National City Bank, so far as the Treasury Department was concerned, remained substantially without change until the settlement of the Pacific Railroad indebtedness, late in 1897. I have heretofore adverted to this subject, but its importance justifies repetition. The Union Pacific settlement brought to the Treasury the sum of $58,448,223.75. This sum was paid in substantially equal installments ten days apart. To avoid the transfer of so large a sum in so so short a period from public uses in the Treasury vaults, the New York banks were invited to qualify as temporary depositaries for the reception of funds received on this account. Eight banks qualified, as follows: The National City, the Chase National, the Hanover National, the Fifth National, the American Exchange National, the National Bank of the Republic, the Seaboard National, and the Western National. The National City qualified for the reception of an amount approximating $24,000,000. It received of the Union Pacific money, as the highest amount at any one time, $23,883,652.27, and as fast as the other banks above enumerated qualified it transferred to those institutions as follows: To the Chase National, $2,000,000; to the Hanover National, $2,000,000; to the Fifth National, $200,000; to the American Exchange National, $500,000; to the National Bank of the Republic, $500,000; to the Seaboard National, $500,000, and to the Western National, $1,000,000. These various sums were withdrawn by transfer to the subtreasury until all of the several balances were finally discharged.

As has been stated in another part of this communication, a new and deranging influence, both to the Treasury and general commercial affairs, appeared in June, 1898, through the offer of the Government to place by popular subscription the sum of $200,000,000 in 3 per cent bonds. As before explained, the receipt into the Treasury of such an enormous sum of money within a period of three or four months could not be regarded by any intelligent person otherwise than as a dangerous thing for the public interests, and as an entirely useless thing to the Government finances. For these reasons the Treasury Department announced to all national banks its desire to place temporarily on deposit a portion of this incoming fund, and all banks, without regard to size or location, were invited to apply and qualify as temporary depositaries. Three hundred and eighteen banks so applied either for increase or designation and qualified in various sums by the deposit of bonds, as required by Treasury regulations. All applications were accepted; none was refused. The National City Bank qualified itself by the deposit of more than $14,000,000 of bonds, and the balance held by said bank on this account never exceeded $14,000,000. The Hanover National Bank qualified itself by the deposit of more than $11,000,000 of bonds and received a balance never larger than $11,000,000.

Toward the close of the year 1898 many banks scattered throughout the country, which could not qualify as depositaries for lack of bonds during the period when the bond money was coming into the Treasury, applied for designation as temporary depositaries. I have already explained how, with a view to securing a better distribution of the public moneys in depositary banks, a number of such banks were designated at interior cities and towns early in the year 1899, while at the same time the balances in the New York banks were reduced by transfer to the subtreasury. On January 7, 1899, the National City Bank held as a deposit $20,565,000. The Hanover National Bank, on the same day, held $7,560,000. By July 8, 1899, the National City's deposit had been reduced to $10,500,000, and the deposit with the Hanover had been reduced to $4,075,000.

The next transaction which the Treasury Department had with the National City Bank as a Government depositary relates to the deposit with that institution of the proceeds of the sale of the old custom-house property in the city of New York. This entire transaction is fully described in a memorandum herewith, prepared in the office of the Supervising Architect. Copies of all papers and documents relating to the same are also herewith transmitted. I adopt as my own the memorandum referred to, because it is a complete and full answer to the inquiry presented in the resolution. I desire to call attention to one feature of the case which offers an opportunity for misunderstanding. It is alleged that the Secretary of the Treasury has violated the law by depositing the proceeds of the sale of this property in a bank depositary, because the act authorizing the sale decreed that the proceeds should be deposited "in the United States Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, derived from the sale of Government property." Every United States depositary bank is, within the meaning of section 5153, Revised Statutes a part of the United States Treasury. The moneys which may be deposited in such a bank include all classes of receipts except customs, and when such moneys are deposited in such a bank to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States they are "in the Treasury" just as much as if they were physically on deposit in the Treasury vaults at Washington.

The Comptroller of the Treasury, whose decision is binding upon the executive branch of the Government, holds "that money is paid into the Treasury of the United States by being deposited with the Treasurer of the United States here in Washington, or to his credit with an assistant treasurer or in a designated depositary This has been the uninterrupted and universal rule governing the accounting officers of the Government for many years." See the letter of Hon. R. J. Tracewell, Comptroller of the Treasury, dated January 8, 1900, herewith.

The practice of the Treasury Department with reference to depositing

money in the Treasury is shown by letters addressed to me by Mr. J. F. Meline, Assistant Treasurer of the United States at Washington, D. C.; Mr. E. B. Daskam, who has been connected with the Department thirty-five years, and for many years has been Chief of the Division of Public Moneys, and Mr. W. F. MacLennan, who, connected with the Department for thirty years, has for twenty years of that period been Chief of the Division of Bookkeeping and Warrants. I content myself by here quoting one—that of the Assistant Treasurer of the United States, Mr. J. F. Meline, who for thirty-four years last past has been intimately associated with the business of the Treasurer's office. His letter is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE TREASURER,
Washington, D. C., January 6, 1900.

SIR: In response to your verbal inquiry as to what constitutes a deposit in the Treasury of the United States, I have to say that in my opinion a lawfully constituted depositary bank is as much the Treasury of the United States as any of the offices of the Treasury system. The practice in vogue in the Department has been to consider the fact of the Secretary of the Treasury covering in such receipts as are authorized to be deposited with national-bank depositaries by the issue of covering warrants as required by law, a full compliance with the law, in properly getting the money into the Treasury of the United States. The balance of public funds reported at stated periods as available to the Treasurer's check covers not only the funds held in the Treasury offices and mints, but also the amounts held by the national-bank depositaries to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States. This total represents the moneys in the "United States Treasury."

Respectfully,

J. F. MELINE,
Assistant Treasurer United States.

The SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

In the case of Branch *vs.* United States (100 Sup. Ct. Rep., 673), Chief Justice Waite delivered the opinion of the court. That was a case where, by order of a district court, its clerk deposited to his credit in a national bank, duly designated as a depositary of public money, funds which were in dispute between the United States and certain claimants. The bank failed, and judgment concerning the disposition of the funds having been rendered in favor of the claimant, he brought a suit against the United States to recover said proceeds on the ground that as the bank was at the time when the deposit was made a designated depositary of public money, it was part of the Treasury of the United States, and that consequently the deposit made by the clerk was equivalent to the payment of the money into the Treasury, binding the United States to the claimant for its return in case the court should determine in the condemnation suit that the cotton when seized was not liable to confiscation. This is what Chief Justice Waite said:

"The position assumed by the appellants is to our mind wholly untenable. The designated depositaries are intended as places for the deposit of public moneys of the United States; that is to say, money belonging to the United States. No officer of the United States can charge the Government with liability for moneys in his hands not public moneys by depositing them to his own credit in a bank designated as a depositary."

It can not be contended by reasonable persons that the language used was a decision that a designated depositary is not a part of the Treasury of the United States. It simply means that a public officer can not deposit moneys which are not public moneys in a designated depositary so as to bind the Treasury of the United States for their return. The Chief Justice declared what the designated depositaries are when he said:

"The designated depositaries are intended as places for the deposit of the public moneys of the United States; that is to say, money belonging to the United States."

The proceeds of the sale of the old custom-house property in New York City were moneys belonging to the United States, and they were deposited to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States, and were, therefore, "in the Treasury."

The case of Coudert, Administrator, *vs.* United States, opinion delivered by Mr. Justice McKenna, was a case where money was deposited by the marshal, to await the further order of the court, in a national bank which was a designated depositary of public moneys. A portion of this deposit was lost by reason of the failure of the bank. The Supreme Court held in its opinion, reported in 175 Reports, 178, that such money deposited by the marshal to await a further order of the court was not public money. After quoting those sections of the law which were involved in the case, Justice McKenna said:

"It is obvious from these provisions that it was only public money of the United States of which national banks could be made depositaries, and it was therefore only public money which an officer could deposit in them, whether he received it originally or received it to disburse. This is the ruling in the Branch case, and it is clearly applicable to the case at bar."

These two cases which have been referred to as conclusively determining the unlawfulness of the deposit of the proceeds of the sale of the old custom-house property in New York in the National City Bank, a designated depositary, are in fact fully confirmatory of the legality of my action in the premises.

In this connection, reference is also made to the letter of the Solicitor of the Treasury, which appears among those accompanying this communication.

A reference to the memorandum prepared in the office of the Supervising Architect, referred to above, will show that the old custom-house property was sold July 3, 1899, to the National City Bank of New York for $3,265,000, which amount was $190,000 larger than that tendered by the next highest bidder. August 28, 1898, certificates of deposit were forwarded to the Department covering $3,210,000, which was credited as proceeds of old custom-house property in New York in the general account of the Treasurer of the United States with the National City Bank, a designated depositary. Of this deposit the Treasurer of the United States was informed, and the fund was duly accepted by him as a "deposit in the Treasury," subject to his jurisdiction and orders. Subsequently the National City Bank was ordered by the Treasurer of the United States to transfer to the subtreasury and to other national-bank depositaries a sum approximating $3,800,000. In the meantime new internal-revenue receipts have been deposited with such bank to an amount substantially equivalent.

No rent has been paid to the National City Bank for the Government's occupancy of the old custom-house premises, for the reason that such payment awaits appropriation by Congress.

In a previous part of this communication I have reviewed in general the situation leading up to the panic of December 18 last, and have quoted in full the announcement which was made on the evening of that day to the effect that the Secretary of the Treasury would place in designated depositaries the incoming internal-revenue receipts to a total of $30,000,000 or $40,000,000 should so much be applied for. The record will show that early on the morning of the 19th of December, 1899, the National City Bank had, in pursuance of my announcement, deposited with the Assistant Treasurer at New York $4,000,000 in United States bonds, which it desired to pledge as security for deposits. During the day applications of a similar kind from various parts of the country were received, and so continued until the evening of December 22, when it was found that sixty-eight banks had applied either for original designation or for an increase in their former deposit allowance. The total sum thus applied for aggregated $17,846,000.

On Tuesday, the 19th of December, I held a conference with the Treasurer of the United States as to a safe and convenient way to distribute the incoming revenue among the numerous applicants, with the view of giving to each his fair and just proportion, without favoritism toward any. As a result of this conference the Treasurer was directed to address a letter to the National City Bank of New York, a copy of which is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE TREASURER UNITED STATES.
Washington, D. C., December 20, 1899.

SIR: The Secretary of the Treasury directs that the proceeds of the internal revenue shall, for the present, be concentrated in your bank. Instructions to that end have been sent to the various depositary banks throughout the country. The purpose of this concentration is for distribution of funds to all the banks which accept the offer of the Department to pledge additional bonds in order to secure such moneys.

You will appreciate that at present the Department can leave with your bank only a fair pro rata share of the funds transferred to you, and will ask you to pay transfers drawn on your bank for the proposed distribution. Care will be taken by this office to insure the retention by you of your fair and increasing share of the funds gathered by this process, and the transfers will be adjusted with this plan in view.

The Department relies on your cooperation in this task, and trusts that the receipts will without unreasonable delay fill your quota of deposits.

Respectfully,

ELLIS H. ROBERTS,
Treasurer of the United States.

Mr. JAMES STILLMAN,
President National City Bank, New York City.

In considering these instructions it must be borne in mind that the incoming receipts were about $1,000,000 per day; that the National City Bank had $4,000,000 of bonds on deposit against which it had no Government funds in its hands; that the next largest depositor of bonds was the Hanover National Bank, in amount $1,910,000, and the next largest to that bank, the First National Bank of New York, which had on deposit $1,500,000. This latter deposit, it may be added, was not made until December 22. Evidently considerations of relative security pointed to the National City Bank as the best qualified intermediary for distribution. It was this consideration, and this alone, that operated on my mind in the choice of that bank to perform the service contemplated. At my request the Hon. Ellis H. Roberts, Treasurer of the United States, has reviewed the transactions of his office under my order of December 18, 1899.

A copy of his statement will be found herewith, from which it appears that urgent reasons made it desirable to concentrate the distributable funds at a single point, from which transfers could be made.

No Treasury office is adapted to such a purpose. It was necessary, therefore, to select a bank strong enough and with a volume of securities pledged for such deposits adequate to cover the transactions from day to day. The National City Bank of New York was the only bank which met this requirement, and it was therefore accordingly directed to assume the task. If any other bank had earlier pledged a similar or greater amount of United States bonds as security for deposits, it would, under the circumstances, have been directed to assume the distribution of the incoming receipts.

To prevent delay in the distribution of the funds and to return to the banks promptly consideration for their pledged securities, a group of depositaries was constituted, including all applicants to December 23. All applications were accepted to the full amount of the bonds proffered. They were 68 in number, and came from 21 States. A list of such banks and the amount of the securities put up by each is given in the letter of the Treasurer now under consideration.

The acceptance of the work of distribution is shown by the following letter, signed by the president of that bank:

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE,
NATIONAL CITY BANK OF NEW YORK,
New York, December 21, 1899.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have received this morning from the Treasurer of the United States a letter advising me that the various depositaries of the internal-revenue receipts throughout the country have been instructed to remit here, and that we will be called upon to distribute these receipts pro rata among the various banks who qualify as depositaries.

It will give us a great deal of pleasure to act in this capacity; but I feel, inasmuch as we deposited immediately with the assistant treasurer here upward of $4,000,000 in bonds, all of which were secured by us at a considerable expense, and that we the same day placed in the market a large amount of money in anticipation of receiving at once reimbursements from the United States Government, that the pro rata distribution which the Treasurer refers to would work a material hardship upon us. I therefore hope that before we are required to divert the receipts to any extent we may be allowed to accumulate a sufficient amount to cover the bonds which we have deposited.

Very respectfully, yours,

JAS. STILLMAN.

Hon. LYMAN J. GAGE, *Washington, D. C.*

The request made by the National City Bank that it be allowed to accumulate a sufficient amount to cover the bonds it had deposited before it was required to divert the receipts to any extent was not complied with, as will fully appear below.

The concentration of funds in the National City Bank of New York was begun at once. Transfers to the designated banks were drawn daily on that institution to an amount a little less than internal-revenue collections each day concentrated with it. All banks having pledged $50,000 of bonds, $100,000 of bonds, in fact, all applicants in the group designated, have been satisfied by deposits in full by transfers on the National City Bank, except five depositaries, the amount of whose securities pledged for this account exceeds $900,000 in each case. Special attention is directed to the fact that the Treasurer reports that at the same time, January 6, 1900, the amounts of funds on deposit in the National City Bank and the Hanover National Bank, New York, under the order of December 18, are shown by the books of his office to be as follows: The National City Bank holds $2,300,000 against $4,000,000 bonds, and the Hanover National Bank $1,160,000 against $1,910,500 bonds.

Accompanying this communication are copies of all letters, communications, agreements, papers, and documents as called for by the resolution. There is also transmitted a statement showing the amount of public money or revenue deposited with all national-bank depositaries at this time. No bonds have ever been deposited with national-bank depositaries.

The resolution contains an inquiry as to the length of time public moneys, etc., have been kept on hand in said banks. No public funds are ever deposited with national-bank depositaries for any specified time. Such funds are held by the depositaries subject to the draft of the Treasurer of the United States, and are payable by such depositaries at all times upon demand.

No bank is permitted to hold an amount of balance in excess of the par value of the United States bonds furnished as security therefor. It is the uniform rule of the Department to allow a balance equal to par of the security furnished if consisting of United States 4 or 5 per cent bonds and 95 per cent on 3 per cent bonds.

The table which accompanies this letter will show in general the length of time during which existing depositary banks have held public deposits.

No interest is received by the Government on public deposits, and no compensation has ever been paid by the Government to national-bank depositaries for services rendered by them.

Summing up my reply to the several inquiries of the resolution, I would say:

First. That the reason for utilizing national banks as depositaries for public moneys, as authorized by law, when the receipts of the Treasury were exceeding its expenditures, has been to avoid the disturbance to business which the withdrawal of large sums of money from active circulation to the Treasury vaults must inevitably cause. The policy thus pursued by me has been the established policy of the Government for many years, and a departure from it under similar conditions would certainly cause disastrous results.

Second. The reason for directing the internal-revenue receipts into depositary banks at this time is that the revenues are now largely exceeding disbursements from month to month, and seem likely to do so for an indefinite time. This condition would be a menace to the business world if assurance were not given that this surplus would be diverted from the Treasury vaults to public depositaries, where, while secure to the Government, it would remain available to business use.

Third. The reason for directing all of the internal-revenue receipts to one depositary was that it is more convenient to first collect the receipts of numerous offices into one place, and make the desired distribution from it, than to give new instructions daily to 113 collectors. The most convenient agency to effect such distribution is a bank which is a member of the New York Clearing House.

Fourth. The reason for selecting the National City Bank as such distributing agent was that at the time the order was issued it was one of but two banks which had offered bonds sufficient to cover the amount of the daily deposit. Its bond deposit was $4,000,000 and that of the Hanover National Bank $1,910,500. The National City Bank was therefore the one most naturally chosen. Of the 68 banks applying for a share of the deposits, the National City Bank, the Hanover National Bank, and 3 others, applicants for over $800,000 each, are the only ones out of the 68 constituting group 1 which have not been supplied the full amount for which they had offered security.

Fifth. The custom-house property was sold to the National City Bank as the highest bidder on July 3, 1899. Under the terms of the sale it had the option of paying in cash all of the purchase money at any time, or any part it might elect above $750,000, which sum it was absolutely obliged to pay. It exercised this option by choosing to pay $3,215,000, leaving $50,000 yet due. No deed will be executed until full payment has been made.

The payment received was turned into the Treasury by deposit in the National City Bank, it having been the established custom of Treasury officials, under the counsel of their legal advisers, supported by decisions of the Supreme Court, to consider moneys on deposit to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States in designated depositaries as moneys in the Treasury. This deposit was made in a depositary bank for the same reason that other deposits have been made in them, viz, because to withdraw the currency into the vaults of the Treasury, where it was not needed and could not be utilized, would have required a withdrawal of credit that was being extended in commercial circles, and to that extent a disturbance to the natural order of business would have followed. To have required its payment by the National City Bank to another designated depositary would have been an ungracious discrimination without substantially changing the fact.

Finally, under my administration of the Treasury Department no discrimination in favor of one bank against another has been made. Generally speaking, when an increase in depositary banks was desired, all have been invited to qualify themselves for receiving such money, and have been equally and equitably considered in their respective relations to the Treasury.

Respectfully,

L. J. GAGE, *Secretary.*

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The communication and accompanying papers will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented the petition of M. B. C. Brown, of Scranton, Pa., praying for the adoption of the proposed amendment to the pending census bill relating to the deaf; which was referred to the Committee on the Census.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented a petition of sundry citizens of Lisbon Center, Boise, Cooks Corners, Burke, Brookdale, and North Stockholm, all in the State of New York, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of G. N. Stoddard, of Wilson; of Mariani & Co., of New York City, and of the Moxie Nerve Food Company, of New York City, all in the State of New York, praying for the repeal of the internal-revenue tax on proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry railway mail clerks of Ilion, New York City, Amsterdam, Stapleton, Oneida, Wellsville, Schenectady, Olean, Norwich, Ithaca, Gloversville, Catskill, Port Chester, Batavia, Waverly, Seneca Falls, Rochester, and Medina, all in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. SEWELL presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Bridgeton, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. LODGE. I have here a petition urging favorable consideration of the treaty of The Hague. It is a very brief petition with a not very large number of signers, but the names are unusual—all men of great distinction. The petition covers only one short printed page. I should be very glad if the petition and the signatures could be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The printing of the signatures can only be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. BATE. What is the petition?

Mr. LODGE. It is a petition for the favorable consideration of The Hague treaty. It is too short and small to make a document of.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the petition he presents may be printed, with the signatures, in the RECORD. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The petition is as follows:

To the honorable the members of the Senate:

The undersigned unite in respectfully urging your favorable consideration of the treaty of The Hague, relative to the peaceful adjustment of international differences.

The Congress of the United States, in 1890, adopted a concurrent resolution requesting the President to invite from time to time negotiations with all foreign powers, to the end that any differences or disputes which could not be adjusted by diplomatic agency might be referred to arbitration and be peaceably adjusted by such means. In the spirit of this resolution our Government was among the first to accept the proposal of the Emperor of Russia for a conference "as to the most effective means of securing to all peoples the benefits of a real and durable peace."

The labors of that conference, in which the leading powers of the world were represented, resulted in a unanimous agreement. This agreement establishes as the avowed policy of all the nations concerned the beneficent principle that force ought not to be employed unless neither friendly offices, nor mediation, nor arbitration, can settle the difficulty. At the same time it leaves every nation absolutely free to follow its own judgment of what its interest and honor demand.

Our representatives in the conference declared over their signatures, and their action in so doing was accepted as entirely satisfactory, that the treaty was not to be held to conflict with our traditional foreign policy. European interference in American affairs is not invited or permitted.

For more than a hundred years the United States has been foremost among the nations in the settlement of international disputes by means of arbitration.

Therefore we trust that the pending treaty, the provisions of which we have carefully examined, may receive your favorable consideration.

We have the honor to transmit, under separate cover, two pamphlets in which the merits of the treaty are discussed.

With great respect, we remain,

Simeon E. Baldwin, president of the International Law Association; Cornelius N. Bliss, ex-Secretary of the Interior; John L. Cadwalader, ex-Assistant Secretary of State; John G. Carlisle, ex-Secretary of the Treasury; James C. Carter, president of the Bar Association of New York; Leander T. Chamberlain, New York; Grover Cleveland, ex-President of the United States; Thomas J. Conaty, president of the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.; J. L. M. Curry, Washington, D. C.; William R. Day, ex-Secretary of State; William E. Dodge, New York; Charles W. Eliot, president of Harvard University; William M. Evarts, ex-Secretary of State; Charles S. Fairchild, ex-Secretary of the Treasury; John W. Foster, ex-Secretary of State; Daniel C. Gilman, president of Johns Hopkins University; George Gray, ex-Senator of the United States; Arthur T. Hadley, president of Yale University; William R. Harper, president of the University of Chicago; Abram S. Hewitt, New York; Henry Hitchcock, St. Louis; M. E. Ingalls, Cincinnati; David Starr Jordan, president of the Leland Standford Junior, University; George E. Leighton, St. Louis; Cyrus H. McCormick, Chicago; John B. Moore, ex-Assistant Secretary of State, professor of international law and diplomacy, Columbia University, New York; Levi P. Morton, ex-Vice-President of the United States; Richard Olney, ex-Secretary of State; C. Stuart Patterson, Philadelphia; Robert E. Pattison, ex-governor of Pennsylvania; Francis L. Patton, president of Princeton University; Whitelaw Reid, New York; George L. Rives, ex-Assistant Secretary of State; John M. Schofield, Lieutenant-General, U. S. A., retired; J. C. Schurman, president of Cornell University; Hoke Smith, ex-Secretary of the Interior; William L. Wilson, ex-Postmaster-General; Benjamin Ide Wheeler, president of the University of California; William C. Whitney, ex-Secretary of the Navy; James B. Angell, president University of Michigan; Marshall Field, Chicago.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of the Maritime Commercial and Trade Organizations of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the extension of the United States Weather Bureau; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of sundry railway-mail clerks of Chester, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for uniformity of lights to be displayed by steam pilot vessels, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the Minnesota State Pharmaceutical Association, praying for a reduction of the revenue tax on proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McLAURIN. I present a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Charleston, S. C., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the construction of a competing cable between

the United States of America and Cuba. I ask that the petition may be read.

The petition was read, as follows:

CHARLESTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, CHARLESTON, S. C.

The following preamble and resolutions were adopted by the Charleston Chamber of Commerce at their meeting held on December 12, 1899:

Whereas the Commercial Cable Company of Cuba has petitioned the Congress of the United States to pass the necessary legislation to authorize the construction of a competing cable between the United States of America and Cuba: It is

Resolved, That the Charleston Chamber of Commerce hereby expresses its approval of the proposed establishment of a competing line of cable between this country and Cuba for the purpose of increasing the facilities of quick communication between the two countries.

Further resolved, That the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State be respectfully requested to use their best efforts to secure the passage of the necessary legislation to carry these resolutions into effect.

Further resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded by the secretary to each of the Senators and to each member of the House of Representatives from the State of South Carolina.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To what committee does the Senator from South Carolina desire to have the petition referred?

Mr. McLAURIN. I think perhaps it should go to the Committee on Naval Affairs. But there is now a Committee on Relations with Cuba.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What committee does the Senator suggest?

Mr. McLAURIN. The Committee on Relations with Cuba.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petition will be so referred.

Mr. WELLINGTON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Emerson Drug Company, of Baltimore, Md., and of the Winklemann & Brown Drug Company, of Baltimore, Md., praying for the repeal of the revenue tax on proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McMILLAN presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Bay City, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut presented the petition of Edmund C. Ingalls and sundry other citizens of Colchester, Conn., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ALLEN presented a paper to accompany the bill (S. 2052) granting a pension to Mary Stotsenburg; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

LAND SYSTEM OF HAWAIIAN ISLANDS.

Mr. MORGAN. I wish to ask for the printing of a document prepared by the land agent of Hawaii, J. F. Brown, under the supervision of the officials of the government of Hawaii, which explains fully but still briefly the complicated land system of those islands. I ask that it be printed and lie over, inasmuch as the bill to which it relates is probably to be taken up very soon, and the committee, I think, have had great difficulty in understanding this question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. BAKER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2285) granting an increase of pension to Charles Ross;

A bill (S. 2286) granting an increase of pension to John W. Craig;

A bill (S. 2287) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Haas (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2288) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Hymer (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2289) granting a pension to Thomas Corcoran;

A bill (S. 2290) granting a pension to James Richardson;

A bill (S. 2291) granting a pension to Cora I. Dexter;

A bill (S. 2292) granting a pension to Teressa Jane Hoyt;

A bill (S. 2293) granting a pension to Addison Walker;

A bill (S. 2294) granting an increase of pension to J. M. Cooper;

A bill (S. 2295) granting an increase of pension to Mary Y. Stewart; and

A bill (S. 2296) granting an increase of pension to John J. Sears.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 2297) granting a pension to all honorably discharged soldiers and sailors of the late civil war; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2298) to grant land warrants to New York Indian soldiers who served in the war of 1812; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2299) for the relief of Mary M. Kennedy and others; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 2300) for the relief of First Lieut. Benjamin J. Edger, jr.;

A bill (S. 2301) to correct the military record of James Dunlap; and

A bill (S. 2302) to correct the military record of Daniel H. Snyder.

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2303) granting an increase of pension to Anna B. McCurley (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2304) granting a pension to Elias Demus;

A bill (S. 2305) granting a pension to Eliza D. Pennypacker; and

A bill (S. 2306) granting an increase of pension to John I. Fleming.

Mr. WELLINGTON introduced a bill (S. 2307) to reimburse and indemnify the town of Frederick, in the State of Maryland; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BATE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2308) for the relief of Franklin Lodge, No. 4, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Franklin, Tenn. (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2309) for the relief of Hiram Johnson and others; and

A bill (S. 2310) for the relief of the heirs of L. H. Mosely, deceased (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. McLAURIN (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2311) for the relief of Mrs. Ella M. Shell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2312) for the relief of Agnes and Maria De Leon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. TURLEY. I introduce a bill for the relief of a German citizen who was injured while in the service of the United States. I introduced it in the last Congress, and on examining the precedents I found that it was proper to refer it to the Committee on Foreign Relations. That committee reported it favorably at the last session, and I ask to have it referred to that committee now.

The bill (S. 2313) for the relief of Christian Arndt was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TURNER introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 58) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to have a monument erected in the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., to the memory of Lieut. Philip V. Lansdale and Ensign John R. Monaghan, United States Navy, and the men who lost their lives in battle in Samoa in April, 1899; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

THE CAUSES THAT PRODUCE TRUSTS—THE REMEDY.

Mr. BUTLER introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 59) declaring the duty, power, and purpose of Congress to destroy trusts by removing the causes that produce them, to restore competition, and open the door of opportunity to individual and independent business enterprises; which was read the first time by its title.

Mr. BUTLER. Let the joint resolution be read at length.

The joint resolution was read the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas the only logical and effective way to destroy trusts is to remove the causes that logically and inevitably produce them; and

Whereas those who control the instruments of commerce have it in their power to control commerce, to build up one section and tear down another, to build up one city or private business enterprise at the expense of another, to destroy all competition and put any and every business into a trust at will; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States confers upon Congress the power, and makes it its duty, to regulate commerce between the States; and

Whereas Congress can exercise and perform this power and duty in no other way except by controlling and regulating the instruments of commerce; and

Whereas each instrument of commerce is a great natural monopoly, and therefore should never be owned by private enterprise, but should belong to all the people and be regulated by their agent, the Government, with justice to all and favoritism to none; and

Whereas the failure of Congress to perform this constitutional duty has resulted in private enterprise taking possession of all the instruments of commerce, and by using them for private gain and power has enabled such private enterprises to absolutely dominate the business world, creating a few great industrial monopolies, known as trusts, which, with the cooperation and favoritism of those who control the instruments of commerce, are enabled to drive every competitor out of business and close the door to individual effort, besides centralizing in a few hands a power over the life and liberty of the people greater than the power of the Government itself: Now, therefore,

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the three great instruments of commerce—money, the means of exchange; the national highways, the means of transportation: the post-offices, the telegraph, and the telephone, the means of the transmission of intelligence—are, and of right ought to be, public functions.

2. That to this end the national banking system, which delegates to a few private corporations the great governmental function of issuing currency and regulating its volume as selfish whims or private avarice may dictate, should be abolished and the sole power of issuing money and regulating its volume should be restored to the representatives of the people in Congress assembled, where it constitutionally belongs. That every dollar of money issued by the Government, whether of gold, silver, or paper, should be a full legal tender, equal in purchasing and debt-paying power with every other dollar, and that its volume should be from time to time increased to keep pace with the demand of increasing population and business, to the end that prices may remain stable and that debts contracted may be paid in a dollar representing the same amount of labor and product as the dollar of the contract.

3. That the power to build up one city or section and destroy another, the power to build up one business enterprise and close the doors of another, to centralize any line of business into one great industrial trust and to crush out all competitors by discrimination in freights and fares, and by exercising the most powerful, unlimited, and unrestrained taxing power known to the civilized world, which Congress has permitted a few private interests to usurp and control, should, by appropriate legislation, be reclaimed by the people, to the end that the national highways should be open to the use of all on equal terms, to be maintained by taxes or tolls no larger than necessary to maintain the cost.

4. That the telegraph and the telephone, which, with the post-office, constitute one of the three great instruments of commerce, should, as speedily as possible, be reclaimed from private hands and added to the people's great national postal system, where they rightfully belong, to the end that every post-office where citizens live and are taxed to support the Government may have the benefit of all that science and invention have contributed toward equipping a modern, up-to-date postal system.

5. That when Congress by thus exercising its constitutional powers and performing its constitutional duties shall have reclaimed from private hands the trust on money, the trust on transportation, and the trust on the transmission of intelligence, and restored these three great instruments of commerce to the use of all the people as a public blessing, the three greatest trusts for evil known to civilization will have been destroyed and at the same time the causes which have logically and inevitably produced the aggregation of great industrial trusts will be forever removed, the reign of monopoly will be at an end, the door of opportunity be again reopened, and the era of competition, with equal rights to all and special privileges to none, will be reenthroned.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, it seems too clear for controversy that the only way to remove any deep-seated evil from the body politic is to remove the cause or causes that produce it. I take it that there will be no controversy as to that proposition. Therefore, the only controversy among those who are opposed to trusts that there can possibly be, will be whether or not the joint resolution which I have offered sets forth the true causes that produce trusts.

Trusts are deep-seated evils on the industrial body politic. Everybody, from the President of the United States down, has denounced these evils, but nothing has been done. We have been tampering with them by restrictive legislation and by palliatives, which is at best simply pruning the branches of the growth and not going to the root.

We have on the statute books much legislation. There is a law, known as the Sherman Act, to remove trusts or to repress them; but yet they flourish under it and in spite of it. That was Republican legislation. When the Wilson-Gorman revenue bill was before Congress another effort was made to deal with the trust problem and another anti-trust measure was put into that act; but I believe that up to date not a single trust has been dissolved by means of that law, and not a single offender has been indicted.

Mr. President, the press of the country to-day is discussing trust evils, and both great political parties are no doubt getting ready in their next national platform to denounce the evil; and yet so far no one, as far as I have seen, has offered a remedy that is more than restrictive or a palliative.

The most sensible editorial that I have seen in any great American paper on this question is in the New Orleans Times-Democrat of Sunday, January 7. I ask permission to read a sentence:

> The people have realized ere this that many of those who are shouting the loudest against the trusts are not really opposed to them, but are joining in the hue and cry because they want to curry popular sentiment and in the hope that they will be able to prevent anything being done against the trusts or that their own special favorite trust will, in some way, be rescued from the cataclysm of monopolies that must come sooner or later.

Further on in the editorial the editor says:

> The test of opposition to the trusts must rest not on mere denouncement of them in platforms or on the stump, but in a willingness to do something practical to crush them, to legislate against them, and to vigorously enforce this legislation, and to attack not a few of the more notorious trusts, but to crush out the entire army of combines and monopolies, root and branch.

Mr. President, the resolution that I have offered furnishes that test. It specifically points to the causes that produce trusts. Those who oppose it must either show that I am wrong and show other causes as the true ones, or they must confess that while "they have joined in the hue and cry" against trusts "because they want to curry popular sentiment," that they are at heart for the trusts and against independent industrial enterprises.

If anyone will show that the causes that I have set forth are not the real causes that produce trusts and will specifically set forth other causes, then I will join him in removing those causes.

But however that may be, the reforms set forth in the resolution are demanded by existing conditions, and, besides, the Constitution demands that Congress take such action.

Suffice it to say now that there is not a case in all history where trusts were formed except where the Government had surrendered these instruments of commerce to private hands.

Mr. President, at a future time I desire to address the Senate at some length on this resolution. I ask that it be printed and lie on the table subject to call.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina asks that the joint resolution introduced by him lie on the table subject to call. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRIES.

Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 738) to establish the department of commerce and industries; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

SEIZURES IN AND NEAR DELAGOA BAY.

Mr. HALE. I offer a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

> Whereas property of citizens of the United States not contraband of war has been lately seized by the military authorities of Great Britain in and near Delagoa Bay, South Africa, without good reason for the same and contrary to the accepted principles of international law; and
>
> Whereas said property is now unjustly detained by the military authorities of Great Britain, in disregard of the rights of the owners of the same: Therefore,
>
> *Be it resolved by the Senate of the United States*, That the Secretary of State is hereby requested to send to the Senate all information in possession of the State Department relating to said seizure and detention; and also to inform the Senate what steps have been taken in requesting the restoration of property taken and detained as aforesaid, and whether or not the Department has informed the proper British authorities that, if said detention is persisted in, such act will be considered as without warrant and offensive to the Government and people of the United States.

Mr. LODGE. Let the resolution go over.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Before it goes over, I should like to hear one phrase in the second whereas, the latter part of the preamble, read.

The Secretary read as follows:

> Whereas said property is now unjustly detained by the military authorities of Great Britain, in disregard of the rights of the owners of the same: Therefore.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I do not think we ought to say that in a resolution of inquiry, and as it goes over until to-morrow, when it comes up I hope the Senator from Maine will modify that statement that the property is unjustly detained.

Mr. HALE. Yes; I understand. That can be modified by inserting words so as to read, "said to be unjustly detained."

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Something of that kind will answer.

Mr. HALE. I do not think we should assume that it has been done; but I do think that in a matter of such vital importance the attention of the Senate should be drawn to it, and that the executive department of the Government should realize the public sentiment which exists on this matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. LODGE. I think, as it is a pretty important resolution, it had better go over until to-morrow. I should like to see it in print.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution goes over under the rule.

DAUGHTERS OF ARTHUR BARNES, DECEASED.

Mr. BUTLER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

> *Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay to May Barnes, Blanche Barnes, and Maud Bynum, daughters of Arthur Barnes, deceased, late a messenger on the rolls of the Senate, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate paid by law to said messenger, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF RAILROADS.

Mr. PETTIGREW submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

> *Resolved*, That a paper written by Prof. Frank Parsons, of the Boston Law School and the College of Social Science, entitled "Public Ownership," be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to accompany Senate bill No. 1770, entitled "A bill to provide for the acquisition, purchase, construction, and condemnation by the United States of America of railroads lying in the Territories of the United States, the respective States, and the District of Columbia engaged in interstate commerce in carrying the mails, and to provide for the operation of said roads by the United States, and amending the act of Congress of February 4, 1887, entitled 'An act to regulate interstate commerce,' and for other purposes."

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE VICE-PRESIDENT HOBART.

Mr. SEWELL. Mr. President, I call up the resolutions which I gave notice I would call up to-day, on the death of the late Vice-President of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions submitted by Mr. SEWELL December 4, 1899, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has received with the deepest regret information of the death of GARRET AUGUSTUS HOBART, late Vice-President of the United States.

Resolved, That the business of the Senate be suspended in order that the distinguished public services of the deceased and the virtues of his private character may be fittingly commemorated.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be instructed to communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

The resolutions were considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

Mr. SEWELL. Mr. President, there are occasions in the life of men and of nations when we turn from the turmoil of civil duties to behold the work of the reaper, Death; there are times of solemnity and bereavement, when language can not portray the emotions of the soul; there are periods when sadness, like a tidal wave, sweeps over a people with resistless force; there are experiences which beget bitter though unavailing tears and vain regret that, like the breath of winter, is fraught with desolation.

Who can glory in his strength, or stretch forth his hand and stay the Angel of Death? Who can defy the dread summons to join the innumerable host, whose way lies through the portals of the tomb? Who can tell the day or the hour when his earthly estate shall be closed and an account rendered of the deeds done in the body?

The uncertainty of human life looms up ever before us and seems to make all human achievements futile and worthless, but this is only apparently so. Men pass away, but their works endure. The body may be laid in the grave, but the rich legacy of lessons and influences of the life of a good, brave, honorable man remain to us and to our children. The subtle, powerful, though silent, influences of such a life bear perennial harvests which death can not destroy.

Our beloved Vice-President has been taken from us, and the nation mourns his loss. The patriotic citizen, the able statesman, the wise counselor, the honorable man, the devoted father has passed away, and the wail of the people will not return to us the departed. The consolation of religion, the teaching of faith, our inborn conviction of immortality, may assuage our grief and temper our sorrow, but this is a wound which can not be healed.

We have appointed this day, Mr. President, to pay our high official and personal tribute of respect to the memory of our late associate and honored dead and to publish to the world his sterling integrity and worth. Let us calmly review his life, services, and character, in which we may find much that will profit us.

GARRET AUGUSTUS HOBART was born in 1844, at Long Branch, N. J. It has been well said that the blood which flowed in his veins was from good English stock and was mingled with the martyr blood of Dutch and Huguenot ancestors and that the spirit of fidelity and courage was his by inheritance. The happy domestic environment in which he lived, enriched by keen intellectuality and literary culture, had much to do with the formation of his character.

He received the benefits of a common-school education, finally graduating from Rutgers College, New Brunswick, in 1863. He then became a school-teacher for a brief period, when he commenced the study of the law, in which profession he attained considerable eminence. Though his means were meager in the early years of his life journey, his natural endowments were such that wealth and success rewarded his toil.

His first public office was that of city counsel of Paterson in 1871, and in the following year he was made counsel of the board of freeholders of his county. He was elected a member of the house of assembly of New Jersey in 1872, reelected in 1873, and attained by his ability and popularity the office of speaker of that body in 1874. He was elected a State senator in 1876, and reelected in 1879. During his six years' service in the State senate he was twice chosen its president. In 1883 he was the nominee of his party for the United States Senate. In 1884 he became a member of the national Republican committee, and served as such until his decease. He was nominated at the national Republican convention in 1896 for the Vice-Presidency, and triumphantly elected, and was sworn into office at Washington, March 4, 1897. He enjoyed the high distinction of his office but a brief period of years, his death occurring the 21st of November last.

Mr. HOBART was removed from his earthly career at an age when the magnificent status of his manhood was reaching its prime; when the grand elements of his character were ripening to their full development; when his great usefulness to the nation was becoming more and more apparent; at an age when his life, chastened by sorrow, hallowed by resignation, and tempered by experience, had been attuned to that key whose sweetness and force reverberated through the hearts and lives of all with whom he came in contact.

His public duties were marked by zeal and devotion to the interests of the people, and some of the most salutary and effective measures upon the statute books of New Jersey were the result of his efforts. He sought in his legislative career to check illegal expenditures and to reduce local and State taxation; to encourage manufactures and promote those enterprises which now place New Jersey in the front rank of States. Educational and philanthropic institutions received his special assistance, and he was one of the leading supporters of the general railroad law of his State, which is one of the most effective of its character. The general welfare, rather than the conserving of private interests, engaged his time and attention.

His shrewdness, sagacity, and promptness soon won him an enviable reputation that was not confined to the limits of his city, while the value of his counsel was defined by the complicated matters intrusted to his care, difficult and arduous duties were so satisfactorily performed by him as to gain the thanks of the public, and so popular had he become that public honors were thrust upon him.

He was a lifelong Republican, and his political views were the fruit of sound judgment, experience, and conscientious thought.

The performance of his duties as President of the Senate has ever evoked the favorable criticism of the members of this body, and the justice and fairness of his rulings have elicited their warmest commendation. Neither the partiality of friendship nor the interest of individuals has warped his judgment or tinctured his decisions. His manner of going and coming amongst us was marked by kindliness and consideration. No word of censure, no carping criticism, no ungenerous reflection escaped his lips, but his constant desire to help and assist in every proper way was always manifest.

The character of Mr. HOBART was as the open day—neither darkness nor shadow rested upon it. Like a beautiful landscape, its varied features were plainly seen—there was nothing hidden that should be revealed; there was nothing concealed that should be known. Rockribbed by integrity and probity, his conduct was ever just and honorable. The dignity of his manhood spurned all that was mean and worthless, and his virtues lent a charm of manner and social attractiveness that gave him preeminence.

The page of his life was clearly written and without blot or stain, though tinged by sadness for the loss of a dear child from his fireside. His record is unchallenged. The breath of suspicion or the shafts of obloquy could not reach it; the rancor of aspersion could not touch it.

Malignity and vindictiveness found there no entrance, but rather his life was rounded out by kindness and love for all men. His loyalty to truth, his fealty to duty, his unswerving devotion to the interests of his constituents have carved for him in the hearts of men an enduring tablet. His acts of mercy and philanthrophy, though many, were unproclaimed—like the gentle dew of heaven, they nourished the sterile soil of human poverty and lifted up the downcast and fallen. He recognized the fact that human justice and benevolence have not as yet eliminated charity from the social fabric. The enmity evolved by the heat of partisanship and political strife passed by him as an idle wind. Sensitive to reproach and injury, his sympathy reached out to those who were maligned and forbade the entrance of resentment. The even tenor of his way was illumined by a radiance born of noble aspirations and high endeavor.

Fate links such souls as these to greatness, that man, even in his low estate, may see the stamp of Heaven.

My personal relations with Mr. HOBART covered a long period of years, extending from his early manhood. It seems to me now as a golden chain, each link of which constitutes a pleasant service performed or some valuable assistance rendered. His solicitude for the welfare of his friends caused him many personal sacrifices. His heart, his brain, his purse, were welcome to all that needed them—"his pity gave, ere charity began."

His generous hospitality and good cheer flowed in a continuous stream that found its source in the benevolence of his heart. The happiness of others was dearer to him than his own, and the cardinal principles of his creed were sympathy and kindness. He loved to do good, and sought opportunities to accomplish it. His word was his bond, and those who knew him best asked no other security. His course in life indicated obedience to duty and resignation; duty, nobly performed, toward his neighbor and to himself—resignation to whatever might betide, cheerfully and willingly displayed.

Amid the common current of men and affairs, in the daily routine of personal and civic functions, in the exercise of refined and extended social relations, and in the nearer and dearer ties of home the voice of duty prevailed. In sorrow, in disappointment, in the struggle with disease and battle for his life, though sustained by an unflinching energy, resignation pointed the way. Though we indulge the brilliant flow of rhetoric, impassioned by the glow of memory; though we strike the minor chord of eloquence, touched by the poignancy of grief; though we utter a lofty

strain of thought, inspired by personal association, yet to me these two words, duty and resignation, seem the leading exponents of his nature.

Ah, Mr. President, we need no inspiration to show that so noble a soul can not taste of annihilation; we need no divine revelation to prove that such a spirit can not pass to the realms of oblivion and nothingness; we need no testimony from the dead that immortality is the reward of such a life. Could we harbor the thought that the reverse were not true, it would wring the very fiber of our nature and proclaim its falsity. Mr. HOBART has passed to the better and higher life that lies beyond the confines of mortality—a life the span of which, unmeasured by the flight of years, is filled with immortal significance and joy.

The lessons of his life, whose pleasant remembrances rob even death of its sadness, let us treasure, and may they prove a stimulating influence in the conduct of our own.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, this body is a miniature of our country. In it is represented both the equality of the States and the unity of the nation. Large and small States, rich and poor States, populous and thinly settled States, all alike have two Senators, and each Senator has one vote. But when we look toward the Chair we behold another ideal of the Constitution incarnate. The Vice-President of the United States, chosen by all the electors of all the States, is President of the Senate. By him is represented here, as by the Federal President is represented in the nation, the supremacy and authority of the United States. And as each of the States appears here as an equal block in the arch of our federative system, so our President would seem to us the keystone binding together in power and grace the tall columns of indestructible States which in his office are visibly linked in indissoluble union.

From the foundation of our Government the people have called to this great office men of character and attainment. Rarely indeed has any mistake been made in the selection, and from Adams and Jefferson to Stevenson and HOBART we may scan with general satisfaction the illustrious roll. Yet I venture to say that the office was never filled by one who met all of its responsibilities with more equal and uniform sufficiency or discharged its duties with more acceptability to all concerned than did our beloved and lamented friend GARRET A. HOBART, who has now passed forever hence where no storm shall roll or billows beat across his peaceful breast.

Few of us knew him, and few indeed had ever seen him before he appeared on Inauguration Day, the 4th of March, 1897, to take the oath of office. But his genial, manly countenance, beaming with health, intelligence, and good nature, and the unaffected dignity of the refined and accomplished gentleman which characterized his bearing were a pleasing introduction before personal presentations were made, and as soon as he assumed his duties it was evident that the gavel was in a master's hand.

Nothing that happened in this Hall escaped the eye of his alert attention. No "occasion sudden" ever overmastered the resources of his ready information or ruffled his even, well-trained mind. He conducted business with composure, facility, accuracy, and expedition. His inborn courtesy and fairness stopped the approaches and suppressed the temptation to unseemly wrangle, while his clear and sympathetic perception and his prompt action attested the virtues and bore the fruits of the decisive character.

This combination of excellent qualities made our late President the model presiding officer of a deliberative assembly. And the fact speaks more than words could utter that throughout his service of well-nigh three years, with oft-repeated trials of his equanimity, his patience, and his skill, not a single incident occurred that mars the memories in which his good name and fame are enshrined.

But such a body as this, diverse in its antecedents, histories, environments, and opinions, and representing such diverse and oft conflicting interests, needs in its presiding officer more than the expert and tactful parliamentarian. Where the technique of the book and the drill and the school find their terminus, wisdom in the practical and involved affairs of men often finds its largest and most fertile field of tillage. That exalted station filled by union—idealizing union—and designed in its institution to conduce to the sentiment, the justice, and the harmony of union, can not be roundly filled save by one of broad and generous social instinct, imbued with the spirituality of the friend, the patriot, and the statesman. "Great empires and small minds," said Edmund Burke, "go ill together," and in such a place the ill fit would be no less than a national calamity.

I do not believe there was any member of this body who did not regard the late Vice-President as a friend, for he was a friendly man, a social man, a neighbor-like man, given, as we have been told, to the large charities which his success made possible, but given, as we know, to the small, sweet courtesies of life, which are perennial charities, given to hospitality, and to all those gracious ways that attract and cement friendship. That he was a patriot none will question. And that he was a pronounced party man, or, if you please, a partisan, can not detract from his merit as man or statesman in the esteem of honorable and candid men.

In our strenuous American life, boiling over with the vast activities, the keen competitions, and the boundless aspirations that free government stimulates in a land of opportunity, with new problems continually springing up for solution, and startling changes bursting unannounced upon the scene, we must of necessity dwell in perpetual conflicts of opinion.

But these conflicts are swiftly followed by settlements at the polls and the evolution of new conflicts again and again and evermore again in endless succession, each one being but an introductory skirmish to a broader field and a heavier battle.

Of such conditions the partisan is alike the cause, the product and the essential solvent. Instead of denouncing the differences of opinion which make him, we should ever recall that these differences are evoked, stimulated, and resolved by the free government which lives, moves, and has its being in them, and that its prime office is to tolerate, protect, and foster them. In this respect such government is in unison with the eternal order of God's providence, which through difference and opposition brings forth what is truest and best and makes them the resultant force in consonance with the ruling principle of the universal thought.

The clashing swords of warriors, the opposing stones of the millers, the upper and lower teeth of animals, the negative and positive poles of electricity, the centripetal and centrifugal tendencies of gravitation, the opposing arguments and votes of debaters, all these are but diversities of the powers which pervade the physical, moral, and intellectual being, and to rebuke or suppress difference of opinion is a certain species of infidelity to, and revolt against, the decrees of the Creator.

Despotism is sad and hateful, because it freezes the inner impulses and paralyzes the movements of the vast and complex mechanism of providential development; and freedom is joyful and loveable, because it looses to their fitting work all the divine forces implanted in the heart of man and in the heart of nature.

Yet differences must unite, oppositions must eventuate, debate must cease, results must be obtained; and freedom, when it has been exercised, but fulfills and verifies itself in bowing to and obeying the overweening thought of the majority.

This thought is freedom's crown. It inheres in the great office which our departed friend was chosen to fill, and which he exalted by the manner in which he filled it.

The very gravest questions of world-wide interest passed to their solution beneath his gavel. War and peace were alike proclaimed within the brief period of his career as Vice-President. But, more than this, every vestige of legislation was wiped away from our statute books that marked the bygone asperity of internecine conflict.

In all the momentous scenes of which he was an important part his influence for good was felt and was profoundly and heartily appreciated. Nothing harsh, fierce, or sardonic, nothing narrow, bigoted, or intolerant, was in his composition or shadows his history. It is a blessing to all the land that such a man has filled such a place. And having filled it well, and filled well the measure of his days, he sleeps well now in the noble Commonwealth of his nativity, which gave him to the Union, and to which the Union, made more perfect and fraternal by his life, hath now returned his honored dust.

It was my sad privilege, with my colleagues, to follow his bier. No gilded pomp or ostentatious show blighted the simplicity of the last scene; but the multitudes gathered from far and wide in mighty concourse, the great officers of the nation and of the State alike mingled with them in their unaffected sorrow, and with the beautiful service of the church to which he belonged he was laid to his earthly rest.

Who could have witnessed that impressive scene, where wealth and power and art and skill and all loving kindness despaired that they could do no more, without being penetrated with the littleness of human life; without seeing again its realistic emblem in the grass which springeth up in the morning and in the evening is cut down and withereth? Yet there crept into the thought, as ever when it pauses puzzled, baffled, cast down, and set at naught in its finite reachings forth to grasp the infinite mystery, and even as a soft, inarticulate whisper from the Everlasting Throne might steal upon the ear, the ideal and aspiration of immortality.

That poor, shrunken form, hidden away beneath the flowers of the earth, did not seem to us to be him that we had known. Nor was it. Where the flash of intellect? Where the steadfast purpose graved upon the face? Where the smile of genuine, sweet nature? Dead, do we say? But we say not that of the electricity which has flashed its message through a wire and left the wire stolid and cold and dead and dumb. Neither can we say it of the soul, which has so left the body which it quickened.

That body is given back to its place—the dust from which it

sprung—and there not to cease to be, but only to change its form and resolve into its elements. Whence goeth the soul that has left the body? In the dim centuries long bygone—before He spoke as never man spoke—the Greek answered, for he had pondered as we ponder yet, and even as the dead and forgotten generations pondered before him, and as the unborn generations will ponder after us; and thus he said:

> That which has grown from the earth to the earth—
> But that which has sprung from heavenly seed,
> Back to the heavenly realms returns.

Mr. DEPEW. Mr. President, in mid-ocean, on one of the great steamships, some years ago, a gentleman extended his hand and said: "I am GARRET A. HOBART, of New Jersey. I know you and want you to know me." Afterwards, in the confidences of fellow-passengers on the sea, he said: "The value of success is not so much in the things it enables you to do as the consideration it gives you in the minds of others. I have been successful, and I want that understood and appreciated." In this incident came out the character of the man. The freshness, the frankness, the unspoiled joy of the boy, as happy over the things which gave pleasure and importance to his friends, as he felt sure they would be over his own advancement.

The financial distress which caused hard times in 1894 and 1895 produced a widespread spirit of pessimism and despair. It resurrected the question, "Is life worth the living?" which had been discussed nightly at Athenian dinners in the time of Plato and Socrates. The doubt is not American. Its most emphatic affirmation is evidenced in the life and career of our friend. He was an illustration of what is possible under American conditions and with American opportunities, with equal laws for all, and no class or privilege barring the way to the highest places in the land. At 19 he was a graduate of Rutgers College, and for six years teaching school and studying law; and at 25 he was called to the bar and began his battle with and in the world. Without money or influence, but with brains, education, health, industry, and character, his was the typical beginning of most of the youth of our country. His confidence in himself and his future led to an early marriage and an ideal domestic life.

At 53 he was among the foremost citizens of his State in every department of its activities. He was a leader in his profession of the law and of his political party; he had been repeatedly honored by his fellow-citizens in positions of trust and power; he had accumulated a fortune and was Vice-President of the United States. The idle and the incompetent will find no comfort here for their favorite theory that life is luck. He had the good fortune to be descended from that mixed Dutch-English ancestry which has the inspiration of glorious traditions of civil and religious liberty, of literature and adventure, of art and arms, of indomitable endurance, of conquest over all obstacles, and of strenuous endeavor which no difficulties can discourage.

It was his happy lot to have his career to work out in this Republic and in the latter half of this marvelous nineteenth century. With these advantages, common to millions, fortune withdrew her assistance, and the brilliant example we contemplate was the result of the energy and ability of this fine specimen of a self-made man. At the threshold of his career, by profession and membership, he proclaimed himself a Christian, and as he began so he continued until his death, a consistent child of the Church. His was not the religion which in Jonathan Edwards's period filled the churches with terror and in our time empties their pews, but the religion of the Evangelist Moody, which rests upon the Golden Rule. Preferring always his own way, he recognized with a broad charity that the paths pursued by others led to the same heaven and could be more easily trod by them. He had no aggressive faith which fought on dogma other creeds and sects, but he was at all times active in the good works which are common to all creeds and all sects.

The scholar in politics is the familiar theme for academic discussion. His duty to participate all admit, his usefulness is often doubted. He too frequently lacks that touch with affairs and knowledge of men which are necessary to give him the weight in party councils due to his character and culture. The business man in politics is the hope of the present and future. The measures we carry here are reflected in the markets of the world and react upon the farm, the factory, the furnace, and the mine. Their influence for good or evil is felt in every home. They tie government and its policies so closely to the manufacturer, merchant, farmer, and mechanic that business is politics and politics is business. Men of fortune or of large affairs often affect contempt for those in public life and denounce with unbridled license the conduct of national, State, and municipal matters. They complain bitterly of taxes and the burden of government. They are entitled to no sympathy. They are suffering, if at all, from their own want of appreciation of their duties as citizens and of patriotism.

Mr. HOBART was, during his whole career, the lawyer and man of business, who keenly understood and laboriously lived up to a high ideal of citizenship. His party found him at the caucus and at the polls. He had time for conventions and public meetings. He could promote the best interests of his State by service in its legislature, or remain in retirement while working diligently for the nomination and election of those best fitted for the offices to be filled. Charles James Fox said of Edmund Burke that "he was right, but right too soon." His speeches emptied the House of Commons in his time, but in our day are text-book and manual for British statesmen. Statesmen and reformers of this prophetic order sow the seed, but they do not govern. Wendell Phillips, Lloyd Garrison, Lovejoy, and John Brown created conditions which made it possible for Lincoln to act. Successful leaders grapple with the workaday elements about them and, combining the conscience and intelligence of the hour, solve the problems which more immediately concern their constituents and their country.

The Vice-President was of this class. He was not troubled with illusions nor bound by theories. He pitied the man who perpetually longs for the good old times and mourns the decadence of the present, and sympathized with the far more useful one who is providing for the unborn millions of the coming century. His lot was with neither. Acute questions—financial, industrial, international, or moral—are always knocking at the door. Their settlement is vital to the position of the country among nations, or to the comfort and happiness of its people. Mr. HOBART was not a State builder nor a prophet, but he was among the master workmen who, as the years go by, slowly perfect the structure of government by providing for its present needs and are digging trenches or leading the assault against those who would destroy it.

The Joint Traffic Association was a conference of the thirty-seven railroads which carry the traffic of the country between the interior and the Atlantic coast. Their quarrels and rate cutting injured their investors, demoralized business, and promoted trusts. The members were not capitalists nor speculators, but the hard-headed and able managers of these corporations who had come up from the ranks and adopted the operation of railways as both a career and a profession. Their efforts to cure the evils of the situation were doomed to failure from the jealousies of large companies and the fear of small ones and the lack of any power to enforce their agreements.

By unanimous vote they selected GARRET A. HOBART as arbitrator. The questions submitted to him involved the revenue of the disputants and the movement by one route or another of a vast volume of freight. No judge ever held office by so precarious a tenure or had to decide more important matters. The defeated litigant could refuse to submit or, by carrying a charge of injustice, unfairness, or incapacity into the governing body, compel a resignation. As chairman of the association I was brought in frequent contact with him, his work, and its difficulties. He administered that judicial responsibility for three years, resigning during the first year of his Vice-Presidency. There could be no more significant tribute to his unfailing judgment, tact, and character than the remarkable fact that there was never an appeal from his decisions nor complaint of their fairness and justice. In this demonstration is found the secret of his success.

Very many in our country rise by their own exertions from nothing to affluence. The rapid evolutions caused by steam, electricity, and invention give numberless opportunities for the far-sighted and courageous to seize the hand of Fortune before their fellows know of her presence. These capable men of affairs are of two classes—the class who make what others lose and the class who benefit their associates or the community or the whole country by the developments they promote and the enterprises they create. The first are the pirates of society and of business. They are the fathers of communism and the foster fathers of anarchy. The others are among the benefactors of their time. It was the characteristic of our friend that, possessing the far-sighted faculty and having the sense and training to keep the curb of caution upon the promptings of acquisitiveness and imagination, he drew a large circle into his plans, and all shared in the profits of his undertakings.

The founders of the Republic meant to provide for a successor to the President who should be equally worthy of the Chief Magistracy; but the machinery they devised gave the Vice-President no voice in the Government, and created an inevitable antagonism between him and the President. It revived in a form the old historic struggle of the able and ambitious heir for recognition and influence in affairs of state. The contest began during our first Administration. Confidence and cordiality were impossible between the self-centered Washington and the imperious Adams. With Adams and Jefferson was the mutual repulsion of the Puritan and the cavalier. In Jefferson and Aaron Burr the revolutionist was seeking to destroy the patriot. The practical Jackson and the philosophic Calhoun were soon at war. The man of action threatened to hang the theorist if he carried his ideas to their logical conclusions.

With the growth of the country, the strength of parties and their internal dissensions, the Vice-Presidency was thrown to the friends of disappointed candidates and at disaffected States to select the nominee and be appeased. Fillmore and Arthur discarded the friends of the dead President, and Tyler and Johnson reversed their politics and policies. The power in control at the White House and in Congress sought to minimize the Vice-President and make him obscure and inoccuous. Happily for Mr. HOBART there was no conflict over candidates in the convention which nominated William McKinley. The partisans of defined policies had selected him as their best exponent in advance. There were no disappointed and vengeful interests to be reconciled. The choice settled upon HOBART as the most fit and available running mate for the Ohio statesman.

Coming thus into this high office, his talent of common sense and his charm of personality made him, from the beginning, the friend and chosen counselor of the President. He lifted the office out of the rut of conventionality and possibility to a position of dignity, usefulness, and trust. He won the warm affection of his party associates and the esteem and respect of his party antagonists. He had the faculty of the wisely busy man of always having plenty of time, and that he shared with his friends in that hearty and healthy companionship which has made his name a hospitable memory at the Capitol. Though he died in his prime, with apparently years of usefulness before him, yet his was a full and rich life and a nobly rounded career. It is fitting that such a man should fall in battle with his armor on. The conspicuousness of his departure gives luster to his example. Statesman, citizen, husband, father, friend, the sum of his worth among us is that he performed with faithfulness and fidelity, with conscientious care and magnetic ardor, all the duties of public and private life.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, I avail myself of the opportunity to-day to join in paying the last public tribute of respect, friendship, and affection to the memory of our late Vice-President, GARRET A. HOBART.

His busy, industrious, honorable, and successful life can well be held up as an exemplar to encourage, strengthen, and inspire the young of our great country.

A native of New Jersey, of English and Dutch parentage, born June 3, 1844, he graduated from Rutgers College in 1863, at the age of 19; then taught school and began the study of law; admitted to the bar in 1869; city counsel of Paterson in 1871; in the State legislature in 1873; reelected and made speaker in 1876; in the State senate in 1879, and in 1881 elected president of that body; reelected in 1882; a delegate at large to the Republican national conventions in 1876 and 1880; elected a member of the national committee in 1884, serving continuously until 1896, when nominated for Vice-President; elected and became Vice-President of the United States and President of the Senate on March 4, 1897, a comparative stranger personally to many members of this body.

The office of Vice-President of the United States, under our Constitution, is a peculiar one. In the proceedings of the convention that framed our Constitution the office of Vice-President first appears in section 3 of the partial report of the committee of eleven, submitted September 4, 1787, which provided that "the Vice-President shall be ex-officio President of the Senate."

In its discussion Mr. Gerry said:

> We might as well put the President himself at the head of the Legislature.

To this Gouverneur Morris replied:

> The Vice-President, then, will be the first heir apparent that ever loved his father.

By our Constitution—"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

"The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish."

"The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of four years, and, together with the Vice-President, chosen for the same term."

The constitutional qualifications for President and Vice-President are the same—a natural-born citizen "who shall have attained to the age of 35 years and been fourteen years a resident of the United States."

In the election of a Vice-President, "if no person have a majority, then from the two highest numbers on the list the Senate shall choose the Vice-President. A quorum for the purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice."

The only express authority given to the Vice-President is in these words: "The Vice-President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but he shall have no vote, unless they be equally divided."

"In the absence of the Vice-President, or when he shall exercise the office of President of the United States," the Senate chooses a President pro tempore.

"In case of the removal of the President of the United States from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice-President, and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice-President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed or a President shall be elected."

"The President, Vice-President, and all civil officers of the United States shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors."

No authority is given to fill any vacancy in the office of Vice-President in any case. When the office becomes vacant from any cause, it so remains until another Vice-President is elected. As President of the Senate the Vice-President presides over its deliberations and transactions of business according to the rules and regulations made by the Senate and sees to their enforcement. It is at times a trying and delicate position. In the one hundred and eleven years of our constitutional existence, on March 4, 1900, as a nation, there have been 28 Vice-Presidential terms, filled by 24 different persons. Four Vice-Presidents—John Adams, George Clinton, Daniel D. Tompkins, and John C. Calhoun—were each elected for two terms, and Clinton and Calhoun each with two different Presidents.

One Vice-President—Richard M. Johnson—failed of election by the Electoral College for the term 1837–1841 and was chosen by the Senate.

One Vice-President—John C. Calhoun—resigned on December 28, 1832.

Three Vice-Presidents—John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, and Martin Van Buren—became Presidents of the United States to succeed the Presidents with whom they were respectively elected as Vice-Presidents.

Four Vice-Presidents became Presidents by the death of the Presidents—John Tyler, by death of President Harrison, April 4, 1841; Millard Fillmore, by the death of President Taylor, July 9, 1850; Andrew Johnson, by the death of President Lincoln, April 15, 1865, and Chester A. Arthur, by the death of President Garfield, September 19, 1881.

Twelve of our twenty-four Vice-Presidents were members of the Senate before or after they were Vice-Presidents. Of these twelve, eight, Aaron Burr, Martin Van Buren, Richard M. Johnson, John Tyler, George M. Dallas, William R. King, Henry Wilson, and Thomas A. Hendricks, were United States Senators before they were Vice-Presidents; one, John C. Calhoun, resigned the Vice-Presidency to become United States Senator; one, John C. Breckinridge, was Senator after his term as Vice-President; one, Hannibal Hamlin, resigned as Senator to become Vice-President and was afterwards Senator, and one, Andrew Johnson, was Senator before and after his Vice-Presidency and Presidency.

Six Vice-Presidents have died in office: George Clinton on April 20, 1812, Elbridge Gerry on November 23, 1814, William R. King on April 18, 1853, Henry Wilson on November 22, 1875, Thomas A. Hendricks on November 25, 1885, and GARRET A. HOBART on November 21, 1899. Two died in April and four in November.

One out of every four of our Vice-Presidents has died in office. This is a remarkably great mortality. Only two Vice-Presidents, Levi P. Morton and Adlai E. Stevenson, are surviving.

During my service in the Senate we have had seven Vice-Presidents, with only the two survivors.

Vice-President HOBART was one of the twelve Vice-Presidents who had never been a member of the Senate. He soon made himself familiar with the rules and methods of business of the Senate and proved himself to be a good parliamentarian. He was quick in disposing of the business on his desk and in facilitating the procedure of business before the Senate.

He was a man of decided abilities and varied and liberal attainments, with great firmness and decision. In discharging his duties he was eminently fair, impartial, able, and prompt, and by his genial temperament and charming personality was a most acceptable and popular President of the Senate.

It is no disparagement to the twenty-three distinguished Vice-Presidents and Presidents of the Senate who preceded him to say that he had few superiors as President of the Senate.

Personally he was the true gentleman—hopeful, pleasant, generous, and kind.

We shall miss him in this Chamber, but while life remains we shall cherish the kindliest remembrance of GARRET A. HOBART, our late President of the Senate and friend.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, it is but natural that we should place our offering of affection upon the grave of our dear associate and friend who so recently presided over this body. It is fit that we shall pay tribute to the kindly and great qualities of the late Vice-President in this public manner.

We as Senators of the United States, comprising all shades of public opinion, coming from all sections of our common country,

are animated by a common desire to do honor to the memory of this man whom we had learned to love, and to place upon the perpetual record of the Senate our tribute to his illustrious memory.

I feel that I but express the sentiment of every member of this body when I say that the few years of my acquaintance with GARRET A. HOBART have added to my love for the human race, and have stimulated every fiber of my being to a higher conception of the worth and value of a man of character. The entrance of the Vice-President into the fellowship of this body and his association with us in the administration of affairs have seemed to me to be of great benefit to every Senator.

Vice-President HOBART was an active man of the business world in which he lived. His integrity and good judgment were the bases of a reputation for ability, honor, and justice, which the entire people recognized. No one distrusted his sincerity. All who knew him instinctively relied upon his judgment. His life was stainless, and his whole career, active and successful as it was in every way, contained nothing which, dying, he could wish to blot. Nothing received his approval which was not just and right. I do not recall a single decision made by him in this body which was ever reversed.

He make no hasty rulings, nor did he indulge in careless opinions. Strong in convictions, and with the moral courage to express and be governed by them, he was always tolerant of the views of others. A keen, unerring judge of men, he was charitable in his judgment of them. I do not remember ever hearing a word from his lips or of reading any expression of his which would wound the heart or feelings of another. He was naturally and always broad minded, and his great heart was full of kindness and human sympathy. His loyalty to his friends reached in its intensity the point of genuine chivalry. He was an earnest speaker, an excellent and successful lawyer, and it is not strange that he was chosen by great interests to arbitrate their differences, as has been referred to to-day. He was by nature a judge and counselor.

Mr. President, the great mystery of death in all the ages has challenged the wisdom of men for its solution, and to-day, after countless efforts in consideration of the problem, mankind is quite as helpless and unsettled as it was six thousand years ago.

The approach of death, whether it appears in the silence and quiet of the peaceful home or in the midst of the thunder of battle, with the attendant struggle of warfare and carnage, always reaches the same result—ultimate rest, the rest and quiet of the grave.

The life of the busy, active public man, who has dealt with the affairs of his time with care and skill and good judgment, finds its close just as simply and certainly as that of the humblest person who wrought out his own salvation while on the earth. And yet this life of ours is but a stage upon the shores of time which leads to an eternal future. It is but the portal to a long home awaiting us. If the experiences which have accompanied us upon the earth have brought honor and fame and have given us comfort and peace in life, we may have just hope in the coming future.

Vice-President HOBART, in a degree beyond that of most men of his time, was active and powerful in his chosen field of labor. He built up a reputation for simple, honest performance of duty which all of us may well emulate. His passing from life was like that of a good man who had performed his duty upon the earth. He was not ashamed to meet his Judge. His was a story to be commended, a life to be loved and copied. The world was better for the presence of and the kindly life of GARRET A. HOBART.

A few months ago Vice-President HOBART was in the vigor of health. Disease seized upon him. He sickened and died. Such is the weakness of human life. Health, energy, power yesterday; death to-day. The great spirit of the great man is gone to the God who gave it. In his death the Senate has suffered a great loss. He was a man of wonderful qualities. Among these were energy, industry, judgment, courage, integrity, and great common sense. As the presiding officer of this body, no Senator, I am sure, ever felt for an instant that there was the slightest disposition on the part of the Vice-President to do or to allow an injustice.

The fact that the news of his untimely death brought to each member of this body the keen pain of personal bereavement is in itself a higher tribute than any Senator can express.

His close attachment for the President was as rare as it was generous and beautiful. The undisturbed harmony between the two was creditable to each, a gratification to our people. Mr. HOBART was a whole-hearted patriot. He loved his country, its institutions, and the flag. He had no false pride. He was a model citizen and an equally model official. He was never unmindful of duty and was rarely absent from the chair which by the people he had been called to fill. Indeed, we all know now that this sense of duty kept him at his post when the dictates of health enjoined otherwise.

Mr. President, in these days of trial—for they are days of trial—to all men charged with official duty it is well to dwell upon the examples of faithful, conscientious men, who strive to do right as God gives them to see the right. And a recital of the noble deeds and manly virtues of great men who pass away benefits the nation. The Vice-President loved justice. His sense of fairness made him the friend of the people and the people his friend. His love for fair dealing and common honesty was a natural sentiment and without doubt was the controlling reason which caused his influence to be sought by men of affairs and his methods to be followed high in the councils of the State and nation. That peculiar quality of clear-sightedness in important matters seemed to clothe him with wisdom in his official station and directed him with unerring certainty. His utterances as the presiding officer of the Senate were clear, correct, and never confused. His method of accurate statement impressed his associates with the force and strength of his opinions.

I have said that in his death the Senate suffered a great loss. The great event which took him from our midst in his strong manhood was a dispensation not easily borne by the members of the Senate. But the life we live imposes burdens upon all of us. We must assume and bear our responsibilities in order that we may become worthy of the rewards of our own lives. We must make friends with adversity and strike hands with sorrow that we may not forget our obligations to humanity. We can not determine that all our ways shall be cast in pleasant places, nor can we elect that we shall enjoy a future of peaceful quiet. But whatever betides us, let us bravely bear our responsibilities as he did, and submit, like him, without murmuring, to the burdens which may press upon us. Then may the future bring to us, as it did to him, the acclaim, "Well done, good and faithful servant."

Mr. President, we miss his genial presence, the ring of his cheerful voice, the warm grasp of his hand. He sleeps the sleep that knows no awakening, but he will live with us all in our memory. "Many times and oft" will we find ourselves looking for a face which we can not see and listening for a voice which we can not hear. But the grave is not the end. We look beyond to the great fact of immortality and we cling to the fact that we are immortal; that there is light and life beyond the grave, and, comforted by such reflections, we can say of departed friends:

Hail and farewell.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, so much has been said, and not too much, and said so well, concerning the character of the late Vice-President of the United States, that I shall conform to the strictest propriety if I limit my remarks to a brief statement of the impressions which that character produced upon me, impressions which will remain so long as I shall have the power to retain them.

As he appeared to me, Mr. HOBART was a man of very simple character. There were no intricacies in his composition; and yet the simple character has many moods and phases, and it will best serve my present purpose to consider him in certain several aspects in which that character presented itself. As presiding officer of this body his discharge of his functions was marked by great alertness of perception, a perfectly clear conception of what was transpiring, a simple impartiality in decision, and, above all, Mr. President, by an administrative ability which expedited the business of this body without precipitately hurrying it. This is no small commendation; and he possessed in an eminent degree those qualities which made him an ideal presiding officer.

Something has been said in the remarks that have preceded mine as to his influence as a Vice-President. I do not think, Mr. President—indeed, I do not know from anything I have ever read or heard—that any predecessor of Mr. HOBART has ever exercised over public affairs that marked and persistent and beneficial influence that he did. There was something in the large composition of the man which necessarily impressed itself upon every situation, social, business, or political, with which he was brought into contact. And accordingly we all felt here, irrespective of party, that our deliberations were being guided by a serene, just, and impartial intelligence, which we now miss so greatly because it has gone forever.

As a member of a great political party Mr. HOBART was a man of the clearest political convictions. He believed implicitly in the cardinal and axiomatic principles of that great organization, which to him were the directing forces toward national prosperity. He was tolerant of the opinions of others, but firm in the assertion of his own; and in a time of great national exigency, when the honor of this country was at stake, when its dignity was imperiled, and when its safety was not altogether assured, his influence was felt more than it was perceived by the senses—was powerfully influential in guiding not only the councils of his party, but the united councils of this nation in the events which preceded and which continued throughout the recent war.

But, Mr. President, it is always best to consider a character like Mr. HOBART, or any character, indeed, as a man, because after all it is as a man that history will consider the best and the bravest before she gathers up his ashes into her everlasting urn and

impresses upon it her indelible inscription. As I said, he was a man of great simplicity of personal character. He had been fortunate in life in all respects. If aught has ever been said against him, I never heard of it or saw it in print. He seems to have pursued the even tenor of his way among his neighbors and also in the lofty walks of public life unscathed by criticism, unslandered by adverse report. What his purposes were in the long life which seemed to lay before him I do not know. Doubtless he had ambitions. He had a right to have them. He might well, like the dark astrologer aspiring for empire, have consulted the stars in their course and said:

> Is it wrong to make the fancy minister to hope,
> To fill the air with pretty toys of air,
> And clutch fantastic scepters moving toward me?

But if he had such ambitions, Mr. President, they were noble ambitions. If he sought popularity, it was the popularity which was aspired to by Lord Mansfield—that which follows and not that which is run after. He was entitled to conceive and cherish the loftiest ambitions. Life seemed to spread out all beautiful and most extended before him. It passed almost in an hour.

But irrespective of any dreams of ambition or of the future in any aspect which he may have entertained, he had assured to him and he died in the full enjoyment of that which is superior to and more precious than the realization of any dream of that kind. In that heaven on earth known as home, in all of his social relations, in the prosperity of his material conditions, in everything which goes to make up a happy and contented life, he had entitled himself, and had "honor, love, obedience, troops of friends," without having to wait for that old age in which these things are hoped for.

But, Mr. President, he has left us. He will not return to us, but we shall go to him. He has penetrated the cloud. He has gone beyond the curtain. He has solved the great riddle which mankind for generations and generations has been reading in vain, and it only remains to say that the sacred soil of his State, which has gathered into its unreturning bosom for generations from colonial times, through Revolutionary times, and through all the history of our Government, the bodies of so many noble men, scholars, patriots, and men of affairs, holds no more sacred form than that of GARRET A. HOBART.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, the century which has just closed has enfolded in its archives the names of a large number of magnificent men, but I doubt if in its vast sweep across the area of time it has recorded the history of a more perfectly rounded American character than that of GARRET A. HOBART. That is a very great character, Mr. President. It had its origin centuries ago. It has been improving in its characteristics, its attributes, its strength, and its perfectness during all the time since it first was known to the world—the character of an American citizen. The public requirements of American character have been increasing in their intensity from year to year and century to century, so that a public man who is brought in contact with the universal observation of mankind in a great office such as Mr. HOBART held undergoes the close, careful inspection of all classes of these seventy-five or eighty millions of people, and that observation extends even farther than our own continent and reaches to other countries. Now, when it can be said of an American brought under this great lens of inspection that he has stood the test in every particular, that he has proved himself worthy of this lofty citizenship and the confidence of this great people, what higher eulogy can the tongue of man pronounce upon him?

Mr. HOBART appeared to me to be as nearly a perfect representation of the manhood, of the grandeur, of the nobility of this American character as any man I have ever read of—certainly as nearly as any man I have ever seen. In establishing this great position for himself we find that he had no adventitious aid. It has been the work of the development of a noble nature under institutions suited to its perfection. So that in his character and in his conduct this Government receives honor and praises among men.

It has been said here that we miss him from the Senate. We do miss him, not because his place can not be supplied among the great Americans who might be put in his position, but unfortunately in our system of government there is no opportunity to supply the loss, and it is a very serious matter, particularly to the Senate of the United States. Twice have I witnessed this occurrence since I have had a place in this body. The Government of the United States, and particularly the Senate, loses one of its great balancing and determining powers on the death of the Vice-President. There is no opportunity to substitute him in his power to give a casting vote on matters of legislation or in confirmations to office. It sometimes happens—yes, very often happens in circumstances of political exigency—that the vote of the Vice-President of the United States is necessary to determine questions in which the people of the present age and of coming generations are profoundly interested.

In this respect his office is higher in its importance than that of the President of the United States and is nearer to the people, as the legislative power, in which the Vice-President may participate, is higher than the veto power of the President.

In his person the people at large have their only direct representative in the lawmaking power of Congress, and it is a grand thought that their will, expressed in the vote of the Vice-President, decides all questions when the Senate is equally divided.

We have lost that power out of the Senate, and while we can supply, and do supply from our own body, a presiding officer who is worthy of the situation in every possible respect, we can not confer upon the presiding officer the power to cast a vote in case of an equal division of the Senate. So that in his death under the circumstances the Government is bereaved and the Senate has lost an immense force. It may turn out not to be unfortunate. At the same time it is the striking out of a wheel or a power in the Government of the United States which we can not supply, and in that respect I look upon the death of our Vice-President as a great public calamity.

It was his honor to participate, as has been remarked here to-day, in some of the most eventful facts in the history of the American Union. It has been many years, Mr. President, if ever, since any Vice-President from that desk announced the passage of a measure of greater importance than that which declared war against Spain. Out of the passage of that bill has come the emancipation of races, scattered almost around the entire world, from Bourbon rule; from that last remnant of tyranny, which now has departed forever from this hemisphere, and, I may say, from the Pacific Ocean. That was a great opportunity to GARRET A. HOBART, and I wish he could have lived to realize, as he would have realized, the great blessings that will flow to mankind from that grand declaration.

But it seems that it was not the will of Providence that this beautiful character should dwell among us longer. It was our good fortune that we should have the benefit of his councils and his example. If any man within my acquaintance has ever been taken away from happier circumstances than those which surrounded him I am unconscious of it. He abounded in wealth built up by his own hands, so that he really lived under his own vine and fig tree, planted with his own hands. He was surrounded by family ties such as few men in the world boast of or ever enjoy, ties that were the tenderest and the truest that a noble woman can create about the heart of true man. He had the universal friendship of this grand Republic, from the greatest to the least, without distinction of persons and without stint.

Upon his magnificent form sat the very beauty of health, power, and the glory of a splendid manhood. There was nothing needed by GARRET HOBART, it seemed to me, to make his life completely happy. But he was called, as all men must be called. It has frequently occured to me that it ought to have been painful to him to separate himself from the good fortunes by which he was surrounded here, but when he was called he answered like a child called by its mother or father and said, "Here, Lord, am I," and he passed away from this life without a regret, it seems, except on the part of those who knew him and loved him.

No smoother, quieter, or more gentle death has any man died in this land, and when we come to understand how and why it was, as explained by the Senator from New York [Mr. DEPEW] to-day, we find that he lived and acted a Christian life; not professing Christianity and failing to observe its injunctions, but he lived a Christian life, and "his works do follow him." So when the summons came to this magnificent man he quietly laid down all of the splendors, all of the attractions, all of the charms of life, called his family about him and bade them quietly adieu, having made all preparations for the disposal of his body after death. Who would not say, "Let my last end be like his"?

He has left in this Chamber, Mr. President, a very sweet memory; one not merely honored, but a memory that is beloved by his associates here. I have never heard a criticism or ill-natured remark made about GARRET A. HOBART while he was Vice-President and in the occupancy of the Presidency of the Senate. It is wonderful that under his Presidency we could pass through the scenes that we have here, wrought up almost to the pitch of exasperation at times by party conflicts and differences of opinion about matters of the greatest possible moment—wonderful that in the midst of all our excitements we were all the friends, the warm personal friends, of the late Vice-President of the United States.

I will read a roll of the Vice-Presidents, of whom he was the last: John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, Aaron Burr, George Clinton, Elbridge Gerry, Daniel D. Tompkins, John C. Calhoun, Martin Van Buren, Richard M. Johnson, John Tyler, George M. Dallas, Millard Fillmore, William R. King, John C. Breckinridge, Hannibal Hamlin, Andrew Johnson, Schuyler Colfax, Henry Wilson, William A. Wheeler, Chester A. Arthur, Thomas A. Hendricks, Levi P. Morton, Adlai E. Stevenson, and GARRET A. HOBART.

In that illustrious roll of great statesmen, some of whom have

impressed themselves upon the world until, we may well say, their memory will last for all time, there is the last name, which we honor to-day, who was unpretending in his course of life, who appeared not to be an ambitious man, but who carried wisdom and justice in his bosom and friendship in his heart, love for his race, his fellow-man, and for his country.

As he loved us, so we love and revere his memory.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, in paying my tribute of respect and affection to the memory of our late Vice-President, I am naturally reminded of his relations and those of Mrs. Hobart to the State of New Hampshire. As Merrimack County, during the closing years of the last century, was the pioneer region of the Granite State, where Daniel Webster first saw the light of day, with the smoke from no hearthstone rising over the frozen hills between the rude chimney of his father's home and the settlements on the rivers of Canada, so during the earlier years of the present century Coos County was the frontier section, close up to the Canadian border, narrowed almost to a point by the eager pressure of the Green Mountain boys of Vermont on the west and the sturdy woodsmen of Maine on the east. In this county of Coos, in its primitive days, strong and God-fearing men and women pierced the damp wilderness, conquered the frosts and snowdrifts, tilled the rough and rocky land, and went on amid such surroundings to cultivate and develop the noblest aspirations for themselves and their descendants for their State and their country.

Born in this county of Coos from English and New York ancestry, Addison W. Hobart, son of Roswell Hobart, as a boy, moved to New Jersey and became a school-teacher, later a prosperous and respected merchant. From the same frontier county of Coos also went to New Jersey one of her best sons, Socrates Tuttle, who became likewise a school-teacher and afterwards a lawyer of ability, eminence, and success. From the families of these two New Hampshire men, who were intimate friends in their new home, came GARRET A. HOBART, for whom we now mourn, and his helpful and devoted wife, in the presence of whose sacred grief we should to-day speak with the utmost tenderness and sympathy.

The Vice-President was a man of rare gifts of person, mind, and manners; never acting with boisterous force in affairs nor with fierce energy in oratory, but possessed of the highest native intelligence, assisted by the most ample culture and marvelously blessed with the most potent ability to meet the strongest men of the country in business negotiations, in legal contests, and in political management, and to control and influence their actions according to his plans and desires. He was fortunate in his preparatory education, and also in his college course, which ended at an early age and gave him an opportunity, like his father and his wife's father, to fasten his hold upon what he had learned and to prepare to make use of it with readiness and power through that best of discipline, which has helped to form the characters and give success to the careers of so many of America's public men—a period of patient service as a school-teacher.

Then he studied law, entered upon its practice, and became successful as a lawyer before he interested himself in the political struggles of his city, county, and State. He had valuable training during repeated terms of service in the legislature, and while presiding as the chosen official head in each of its branches he enjoyed unusual opportunities for the complete exercise and improvement of his highest faculties. It was through all these experiences, doing his part well in every function, whether small or large, that he made himself wise and cautious, able and strong, cultivated perfect self-control, secured the supreme confidence of his associates in every station, and finally came to exhibit those traits of character which gave to him the supreme successes of his life, his worldly riches, and his last and highest public honors, those of the Vice-Presidency.

My own personal relations with Mr. HOBART, beginning with political associations of many years ago, were most cordial, based upon that mutual respect which is essential, I think, to perfect friendship; and those relations were without a break or a flaw at any time. I am therefore not willing now to coolly analyze his mental characteristics or to speak discriminately of his merits in private life and in public station. For such a purpose this date is too near the time of his obsequies, where we saw so many of his countrymen coming from miles around his home, quietly thronging the streets of Paterson and giving mute recognition of the great loss that had come to them through the death of their most distinguished citizen. Their affection for him brought them to his bier; and it is only of that side of his character which evoked such affection that I am willing to speak to-day.

Sometimes it is possible that kind and tender hearted men are too weak for the great affairs of life, private and public. Yet it can not be successfully maintained as a general assertion that the strong men of this world have been unamiable in their relations either with their families or their fellows. In truth, the contrary, I think, is the case. Those who have been the sweetest and gentlest of men in ordinary life have been also the strongest and the bravest when great and worthy exigencies have called upon them for courageous action. It must not be said only of the warriors that—

> The bravest are the tenderest—
> The loving are the daring.

It may be also said of those in civic station that some of the noblest and most heroic deeds of history have been performed by the quietest and most affectionate of men.

At all events, he whose career we now eulogize never was called weak or undecided when strength and decision were needed. He had sufficient will power and could strenuously exert himself whenever the occasion required him to do so. Does anyone doubt that in any possible emergency of life that we can conceive of in which he might have been called to act firmness and strength of character would have been shown sufficient to stamp him as one of the strongest of men?

But how gentle was his nature to all around him. His joyous looks, his smiles of humor, his words of greeting, commendation, and advice made him the most pleasing of comrades, the truest, sweetest, and dearest of friends. No effort is needed at this moment on the part of any one of us who has served with him in this Chamber to see him, in the mind's eye, courteously and graciously presiding over the Senate, heeding the rights of all, giving to everyone his due, offending no one, and drawing to himself a respect and affection from all his companions which will never fade as long as his memory lingers in their minds and hearts.

The thoughts of our departed friend should always be accompanied by a vivid faith that he is immortal, is even now with all his heart and soul serving the Creator of his being in a world more wonderful, more glorious and happier than this in which we are left behind. Such faith in a future state can not be driven from the minds of men. That it is given to us to see in this life, even with limited vision, the countless stars of heaven, each one the center of a solar system like that which we call our own, whose vastness appalls the mind with its visible immensity; that we are allowed to perceive the wonders of the earth and ocean, what God has created and what man has wrought; that we are permitted to know and feel the reality of the existence of the souls of men and each one the existence of his own soul; and yet that at the end of a short stage of being on this planet we are doomed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, when the mere body dies, to be annihilated, to be known no more by others, to become ourselves forever unconscious—nobody believes in such a cruel fate for all mankind. Everyone has hope and faith in immortality. The change is to be a solemn one, but who would prefer annihilation?

Nor are we in the life to come to be merely disembodied spirits. Such a transition is not conceivable. We are to possess material bodies, not the same we now have, less earthy, more spiritual, than those, we trust, but still material bodies, exploring the great physical orbs about us, learning what they are, beginning to comprehend the mysteries of their vastness. Then also shall we meet those who have gone before us.

> When the mists have risen above us,
> As the Father knows his own;
> Face to face with those who love us,
> We shall know as we are known.

We may clasp hands with the Master; and—who can tell?—possibly in some far-off time, yet after a period short compared with the full measure of our immortal existence, we may be permitted humbly to look upon the great white throne and Him who sits thereon. Without a doubt I believe that our friend whom we have lost here now lives—the same soul that we knew and loved—but endowed with a new body and a glorified spirit, inhabiting some one of the stars which nightly shine upon us, impress us with a deep conviction of our immortality, and subdue us into awe and reverence for the great Creator of the universe.

> The city of our God
> Her gates shall open wide,
> And through her streets and portals broad
> Shall pour a living tide.
>
> There no more night shall be,
> And death shall reign no more;
> There shall be no more sea,
> No partings on the shore.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the death of Mr. HOBART was both a loss to the country and a deep personal sorrow to his friends, of whom no man ever had more. Of the qualities of mind and heart which make it possible to say this without going beyond the limits of simple truth, there is much to be said. But there was one conspicuous public service rendered by Mr. HOBART which I think has not been understood, and certainly has not been adequately appreciated. He restored the Vice-Presidency to its proper position and lifted it up before the people to the dignity and importance which it merits. The decline of the Vice-Presidency in political weight and popular estimation has been an unfortunate development of the last fifty years. In our regard for that office

and in our treatment of it we have departed utterly from the wise conception of the founders of our Government. The framers of the Constitution intended that the Vice-President should be, in all respects, in ability, in reputation, in weight of character, and in his standing before the people, on a plane of absolute equality with the President. We have but to turn to the original clause of the Constitution, amended so long ago that it is well-nigh forgotten, and there find the proof of this statement.

In that clause it was provided that the electors in each State should vote for two persons from different States without naming the office voted for, and that the man receiving the highest vote in all the electoral colleges should be President and the one receiving the next highest should be Vice-President. In other words, the electors were to vote for two men who were equally fit to be President, and one was to have the first and the other the second place. This system led to the tie between Jefferson and Burr in 1801, the dangerous intrigue in the House to supplant the former by the latter, and the consequent amendment of the Constitution compelling the electors to indicate the office voted for. The amendment was undoubtedly necessary, but it does not touch in any way the original conception of the makers of the Constitution, nor should it ever have been allowed to affect it.

According to that conception, the Vice-President, placed on equal level in choice, was to be a man not only fit to succeed to the Presidency in case of death or disability, but was marked out by his position as the natural successor when the four or the eight years' term of his associate had expired. In this way Adams succeeded Washington and Jefferson succeeded Adams. Then, again, after a long interval, Van Buren went from the Vice-Presidency to the White House. Since that time the conception of the framers has faded and grown dim. The Vice-Presidency has been treated too often by party conventions either as a convenient and honorable shelf upon which an eminent man might quietly close his career, or as a consolation prize to be awarded to the faction in the party which had failed to win the highest place. In the first case the country ran the risk of having a Vice-President incapable, from age or perhaps other causes, of carrying the responsibilities of the Presidency if they were forced upon him; and in the second they had a Vice-President who lived in strained and distant relations with the White House, and if suddenly called to occupy it brought a change of men and of measures when the people had voted for policies and executors of policies who should be continuous in action for four years.

So far has this misconception and this false treatment of the Vice-Presidency gone that it is almost universally looked upon as certain political extinction for any man with a career before him, still more with hopes of the Presidency, to accept the second place in the Government, to which he is chosen by the votes of the entire American people. Such ideas and such a practice are bad for the Government, complete perversions of the intentions of the framers, and breed conditions which are potentially dangerous. Out of this neglect and misconception Mr. HOBART silently lifted his great office merely by the manner in which he filled it and performed its duties. Quietly, firmly, and with perfect tact he asserted the dignity of his high position, never going too far and always far enough. Without knowing exactly why, people suddenly came to realize that there was a Vice-President of the United States, that he held the second position in the Government, and that, with the exception of the President, he was the only man in the country holding office by the vote of the entire people. In the same way the old and true conception of the Vice-Presidency in relation to the Administration reappeared. Instead of holding aloof or remaining indifferent to the conduct of the Government, Mr. HOBART regarded himself as a part of the Administration and as a representative of the policies which that Administration had been chosen to carry into effect—as one of the President's friends, advisers, and supporters, equally interested with him in the success of the measures to which they were alike committed.

As presiding officer of the Senate he fulfilled carefully and thoroughly every duty of the place. He abandoned once for all the bad habit which had grown up of submitting nearly every question of order to the Senate and ruled promptly and well on all these points, as every presiding officer ought to do. In these ways he steadily elevated the Vice-Presidency in the estimation of the people, and made the office what the framers of the Constitution intended it to be.

When he came to Washington he was but little known to the people of the United States outside his native State of New Jersey. When he died the whole country grieved, not because the Vice-President was dead, but because GARRET HOBART was gone, who had in a time only too brief impressed himself upon them as a worthy holder of a great office and as a distinguished public man.

It may be that we shall drift back into the old and false idea which has grown up about the Vice-Presidency. It may be that again it will be treated as an office for someone about to retire from public life, as a consolation prize to a defeated faction, but should this happen I can not believe that it will last, and there will certainly be no excuse for it now, because Mr. HOBART demonstrated plainly to all men the real greatness and importance of the office and has shown that it ought to be one of the great prizes of political life, to be desired by our most ambitious men, and regarded not only for its intrinsic importance, but as a stepping-stone to higher honors. That a man in two years could do this is the strongest evidence of an unusual force of character and of abilities of no common order.

I have dwelt at length upon this point because it has seemed to me that it showed in a very marked way what manner of man Mr. HOBART was. There is, however, much more to be said. I did not have the good fortune to know Mr. HOBART until he came to the Vice-Presidency, but during his service here I came to know him well and to regard him as a most valued friend, and to hope that he had given his friendship to me. He had an unusual capacity for winning affection. No one, I think, could be closely associated with him without becoming sincerely attached to him. His invariable good temper, his cheerful disposition, his sense of humor, his love of fun, all made him a most attractive companion, but beneath these agreeable attributes were much stronger qualities.

In the trying days which preceded the Spanish war, when the country was moving surely toward the last resort of nations, and when doubts and hesitations were apparent in many directions, Mr. HOBART revealed himself to me as a man of strong sense and with a clearness of vision which showed him to be a statesman. When perplexing questions were upon him, he showed in a marked degree that highest of qualities, veracity of mind. He was never muddled with words, entangled with phrases, or lost in the mist of fine sentiments. He never mistook words for things. He saw facts exactly as they were and dealt with them accordingly. He knew that in the conduct of the Government, and especially in in times of war, it was sometimes necessary for the public good to disregard individual feelings. However unpleasant such a duty might be, he would not shrink from it, and he never hesitated to tell a needed truth if it was for the benefit of the country, although his tact was such that personal enmity never followed.

I trust and believe that when the history of the momentous times in which he rendered his greatest public services comes to be written he will receive the very high meed of praise which he deserves. Those who knew him and saw him in that eventful period know well what he did and appreciate at their right value the courage, loyalty, and ability which he displayed. We mourn him as a friend, as an eminent and patriotic public servant, faithful to his country in all relations of life. His death, while he was still in his prime, was a grevious loss, not only to those who loved him, but to the country which he loved and which he served so well.

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. President, I did not learn of the date of the eulogies on Vice-President HOBART in time to prepare any elaborate statement upon his life and character. I will limit myself to a brief but sincere tribute of affection and esteem to his memory. I will touch upon his character only as it was exhibited here. I had not that personal acquaintance with the Vice-President which would warrant me in any extended remarks upon his inner life.

But, Mr. President, there are abundant opportunities to discover what material a man is made of when he is placed in the position that Vice-President HOBART was. He was in daily contact with the members of this body; he had to pass upon questions of great moment; and however much his position would seem to screen him from that scrutiny into character which the ordinary man affords, yet there was abundant and ample opportunity to know and to judge of his great merits.

Mr. President, as a presiding officer of this body Vice-President HOBART could be truthfully said to be an ideal one. His judgments were characterized by clearness and comprehension, and by a trait which is rarely possessed—of absolute impartiality. He was a partisan, as all adherents to great political parties are; but in the discharge of his duties as President of this body he was absolutely impartial. It mattered not what the question was, it mattered not whether there was an opportunity to catch the nearest way for political advantage, in every ruling of his it was at once perceived that he was animated solely by the honorable and high purpose to discharge the functions of his great office as befitted the Vice-President of the whole United States and not as the adherent or partisan of any party. The smoke of the battle between adherents and the shoutings of the captains never ascended to the chair which he occupied. There all was calm and serene; justice and impartiality presided there.

Now, Mr. President, with the limited scope of my observation, I can truthfully say that no more kindly or courteous man ever presided over any deliberative assembly in these United States. His kindliness of disposition, his courteousness of demeanor, impressed everyone that came in contact with him. There was no show; there was no pretense; but there was the simple performance

of duty by an American elevated to his high position. And, Mr. President, it is one of his highest praises that he was of the noblest and purest type of American manhood, American virtue, American patriotism, American justice, and American impartiality in the discharge of the functions of his great office.

This simple tribute of mine, Mr. President, is sincere. I speak with absolute sincerity in all the remarks that I have made about the deceased Vice-President. I know that his character and his qualities have been portrayed before the Senate to-day in language too eloquent for me to attempt to rival or to equal. I know that they have uttered the living truth. I know that no word of praise that has fallen from the lips of those who have eulogized the deceased Vice-President has been said beyond the truth. I know that all the Senators who have addressed us to-day upon the life of our departed President have been animated solely by a desire to pay their tribute of respect and admiration which we all, as American Senators, feel to the memory of the late Vice-President.

The old Latin maxim, De mortuis nil nisi bonum, is surely inapplicable to Vice-President HOBART. His armor of character is so perfect as not to be penetrable by the tongue of detraction however keen, nor by the pen of criticism however hostile. Armed with this character of truth and honor, kindliness and courtesy, impartiality and justice, detraction and criticism are alike baffled to find a flaw in the admirable type of manhood which he exhibited.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, occasions like this rob me of what little power of speech nature has given me; and yet I feel that I would not be doing my full duty, occupying the peculiar political attitude I do in this Chamber, if I should now fail to say a word commemorative of the life and virtues of our deceased Vice-President.

My acquaintance with Mr. HOBART began, of course, March 4, 1897. It ended March 4, 1899, having extended through the three memorable sessions of the Fifty-fifth Congress. I had heard of him before his nomination to the Vice-Presidency. I had known of him as one citizen would know of a distinguished citizen living in a distant part of the nation. But I had never met him, and I knew of him more particularly as a prominent Republican in high favor with his party on the Atlantic seaboard.

There was nothing in common between the late Vice-President and myself politically; we were antipodal. He was a most pronounced Republican; I an equally pronounced Populist. He believed in the doctrines of his party; I did not and do not. He did not believe in the doctrines of my party. And yet, Mr. President, on this solemn occasion it affords me a mournful pleasure to be able to testify to the high personal worth and character of this distinguished citizen. There was much in the character of GARRET A. HOBART that was lovable. He was a sincere and truthful man. He was an intelligent and honest man, always actuated by the highest and purest of motives.

It is sometimes said that men are not entitled to any particular mention or credit for discharging their duties. I do not believe in that saying. In these days and in this generation, where greed is pushing for power and sometimes abusing it, to find one of pronounced political proclivities and opinions who can withstand the appeals and the cajolery of his party and discharge his duty fully and well in the face of public sentiment is so rare as to require recognition and notice.

Of course my acquaintance with the distinguished deceased was not such as to permit me to speak at length of his virtues. And yet, Mr. President, it is not necessary to have known a man throughout his entire career to enable one to form something of an estimate of his character and his characteristics. The late Vice-President was a typical American. There was nothing of snobbishness in his character. Whatever he was was upon the surface, it was noticeable by all men. He was a product not only of the soil in which he sleeps, but he was a product of American institutions, and was thoroughly American in all his habits, thoughts, instincts, and purposes.

I feel, Mr. President, something of a personal loss in the death of Mr. HOBART. When he, on the 4th of March, 1897, stood at the desk you now occupy and I listened to his address to this Chamber and to the country, there came over me a thought that possibly this man intends to revolutionize the rules and violate the traditions of the Senate that had stood unchallenged for over a hundred years. I now recognize that possibly I was oversuspicious and somewhat hypercritical at the time. As time wore on and I became more familiar with this distinguished citizen I learned his many virtues and his high character. I found him to be a man of supreme courage at all times and under all circumstances, dealing justly with all Senators and with all having business before this great body.

I would say, Mr. President, my estimate of Mr. HOBART is that he possessed in a rare degree those qualities which would make a judicial officer. His temperament was judicial. While he was rapid and accurate in the transaction of business, he was always just and considerate of the rights and welfare of others.

Mr. President, on more than one occasion this friend of ours showed me acts of kindness that it would be impossible for me to forget; and throughout the years, whether they be few or many, that may be allotted to me on earth I shall look back to the Fifty-fifth Congress with kindly recollections of this distinguished man, who has been untimely taken from his family and his country.

Death, Mr. President, is a peculiar thing. Men are born to die, and they die to live again. I am of that number who believe in the immortality of the human soul and in the undying faith of the Christian. Our friend is not dead. He has simply passed through a transition state that will enable him to live in glory and immortality. To his wife and to his child goes out the unfeigned sympathy of the people of this nation, regardless of station, regardless of political alignment. His memory is sacred to all. And the saddest of all is that he was called before his time from the scenes of life and the active duties incumbent upon him.

Mr. President, it would be useless for me to say more. If I were to write the epitaph of this distinguished man, I would chisel upon the shaft that stands above his mortal remains the words: "Here lies an honest man, the noblest work of God."

Mr. KEAN. Mr. President, the State of New Jersey mourns with the Union of all the States in the untimely death of her distinguished son, GARRET A. HOBART. Great as the loss has been to the nation, the blow has fallen with heavier force and with the sense of a personal and intimate loss upon the people of the city and State among whom his busy and useful life has been spent. He was born in the State of New Jersey. His youth and early manhood, his college days, and the ripening seasons of his life were passed amid the familiar scenes and the friendly faces of his native home, and at the last, when the inevitable summons came, he died in the city which mourned him as its most illustrious citizen and in the State to which he brought so much honor and distinction. If the State gave him birth and education, training and experience, home and success, he, too, was generous to New Jersey, for he brought new honors to the old Commonwealth, he reflected new glory upon its career, already bright with the achievements of the distinguished patriots who had preceded him, and he returned with thousandfold interest the bounty of his generous parent.

His was a life of usefulness. All his abilities centered about that pivot of action and conduct. He believed that the only aristocracy and the true aristocracy was the aristocracy of useful men and useful women. He lived loyally by that principle through all his days. He exemplified it in his boyhood among the farms of Monmouth County. It was the principle which guided him through his undergraduate days at Rutgers College. It animated his early life as a law student and as a follower of the law. It was the magic wand which brought him the gifts of success in all his undertakings, in his private and domestic life, in his business and political career, and, finally, in the lofty sphere of public activity to which at the call of the people he was summoned. He had not only the desire to be useful, but he knew how to be useful. There was no waste of effort either in his intention or in the application of it. He was not led aside into bypaths. He followed the direct road to usefulness by the shortest route. Thus he accomplished great deeds of usefulness for his city, his State, and his country. It was the legacy he most desired to leave for his fellow-citizens.

Loyalty was no less a striking feature of his character. He came of a loyal, patriotic ancestry, and the influence of that heritage was manifest in all the phases of his busy, useful life. He was loyal to his home, to his city, to his State, and to his country. He was loyal to the great principles of liberty upon which the fathers founded this Government. From his early youth he was led to believe in the wisdom, the justice, and the patriotism of the Republican party. He never swerved in his loyalty to that belief, and all the activities of his energetic political career were devoted to the maintenance and the strengthening of that party and its principles. He was loyal to his friends because he believed friendship to be a sacred association. He was loyal to his country because he believed that within the United States God in His wisdom had established the highest and noblest form of government yet given to man. He served his country, his fellow-man, and his God with a loyalty that marked him as a man apart.

From his young manhood he had taken a deep interest in public affairs. With him this inclination seemed to be the outcome of a special genius for public and political life. He might, indeed, have spent all his days in the public service from the day when fresh from his law studies he was summoned to political office in his own city and county. The ability with which these earlier tasks were discharged made clear the path before him when it was desirable in the interests of his constituency that he should represent his county in the State legislature. In the legislative halls of his own State he rapidly made an enviable reputation as a faithful legislator, a wise public servant, and a man whose integrity and honesty of purpose no man ever questioned. He was barely over 30 when he was chosen speaker of the assembly. A few

years later he became president of the senate. In both these positions he displayed the same grasp of parlimentary practice, the same dispatch of public business which were so strongly revealed in his career as presiding officer of this body.

Gradually, step by step, he increased his sphere of activity and influence. He became a power in the politics of his own State. He became a factor in the politics of the nation. For years he represented the State of New Jersey on the national Republican committee, and during all this time he worked with unceasing energy for the success of the party and its candidates wherever they might be. His political acumen became traditional. His judgment on political matters was regarded as unerring. His loyalty was a constant inspiration. His zeal accomplished results where others failed. Not a few of the successes of the Republican party in New Jersey and elsewhere were due to the remarkable combination of qualities and activities found in GARRET A. HOBART.

Popularity came to him as naturally as if it were an endowment of his birth. He made friends as easily as he kept them. To meet him was to come under the influence of a gentle, lovable, sunny, affectionate nature such as few men have the fortune to possess. Strong as he was in his beliefs, courageous as he was in his convictions, and unyielding in his sense of right and honor, it seemed impossible for him to make an enemy. He dwelt in an atmosphere which impelled men toward him. Add to this a mental equipment of the highest order, and the secret of his success in winning success is disclosed.

The people of his own State knew him and loved him long before his great and good qualities as a man and as a statesman became known to all men. New Jersey had tried him through a long period of years. In everything he had been called upon to do for his State or for his people he had done more than the full measure of his duty. He had always surpassed even the fond expectations of those who expected the most of him. He had endeared himself, as few sons of New Jersey have ever done, to all the people of his State, and when the national convention of Republican delegates summoned GARRET A. HOBART to be a standard bearer with William McKinley, New Jersey felt that at last her honored son had come into the legacy that was his and her due.

How the Vice-President bore himself since that day in July, 1896, when he was called upon to be a candidate for the second highest office in the gift of the people it is not my province to attempt to describe. I am here to-day to testify to the love that New Jersey bore for her distinguished and lamented son—gone, alas, too early to his long rest; to testify to the honor and distinction that Vice-President HOBART conferred upon the State, which mingles tears over his untimely departure with pride for his illustrious career. Well might New Jersey and the nation engrave this epitaph over his grave:

To live in hearts we leave behind
Is not to die.

Mr. SEWELL. Mr. President, I move, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Vice-President, that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 11, 1900, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *January 10, 1900.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday last was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolution of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 1477. An act in amendment of sections 2 and 3 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890;

S. 1478. An act to repeal so much of the act of June 7, 1888, making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes, as relates to the commencement of pensions to widows under the acts of July 14, 1862, and March 3, 1873; and

S. R. 8. Joint resolution construing the act approved June 27, 1890, entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents."

The message also announced that the Senate has passed the following resolutions; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Senate concurrent resolution No. 11.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 7,000 copies of so much of the civil report of Maj. Gen. John R. Brooke, military governor of the island of Cuba, made to the Adjutant-General of the United States Army, with accompanying papers and documents, as is in the English language, together with a prepared index; of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 4,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 1,000 copies for the use of the War Department.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 12.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 4,500 copies of the report transmitted by the Secretary of State of the Commissioner for the United States on the International Prison Commission on "Crimes, misdemeanors, and penalties" in the United States; of which 1,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 1,500 for distribution by the Department of State.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 13.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause a survey and estimate to be made for the dredging of a basin in the harbor of Wilmington, N. C., of sufficient dimensions to allow a vessel of large tonnage to turn or swing around in said harbor.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed joint resolution and bill of the following titles:

On December 16, 1899:

H. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1899, on the 19th day of said month.

On December 20, 1899:

H. R. 4152. An act to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts by bureaus and offices of the War Department.

SENATE BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTIONS, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills, joint resolutions, and concurrent resolutions were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. R. 8. Joint resolution construing the act approved June 27, 1890, entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents"—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1477. An act in amendment of sections 2 and 3 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1478. An act to repeal so much of the act of June 7, 1888, making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes, as relates to the commencement of pension to widows under the acts of July 14, 1862, and March 3, 1873—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 11:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 7,000 copies of so much of the civil report of Maj. Gen. John R. Brooke, military governor of the island of Cuba, made to the Adjutant-General of the United States Army, with accompanying papers and documents, as is in the English language, together with a prepared index; of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 4,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 1,000 copies for the use of the War Department—

to the Committee on Printing.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 12:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 4,500 copies of the report transmitted by the Secretary of State of the Commissioner for the United States on the International Prison Commission on "Crimes, misdemeanors, and penalties" in the United States; of which 1,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 1,500 for distribution by the Department of State—

to the Committee on Printing.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 13:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause a survey and estimate to be made for the dredging of a basin in the harbor of Wilmington, N. C., of sufficient dimension to allow a vessel of large tonnage to turn or swing around in said harbor—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

The SPEAKER. The reference of the bill (H. R. 3343) to regulate the service and fix the hours of service for persons employed as policemen, firemen, and officers in the District of Columbia will be changed from the Committee on the District of Columbia to the Committee on Appropriations, if there be no objection.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

PRINTING FOR COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read, subject to the right of objection.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be authorized to have printed and bound such documents for the use of said committee as it may deem necessary in connection with subjects considered, or to be considered, by the said committee during the Fifty-sixth Congress.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, and agreed to.

On motion of Mr. GROSVENOR, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the second resolution which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to sit during the sessions of the House and during any recess thereof.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. GROSVENOR, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE DANFORD.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House to vacate the order made on yesterday for eulogies on my late colleague, Mr. DANFORD, of Ohio, fixed for to-morrow. I hold in my hand a telegram from his successor, Mr. GILL, who states that it is impossible for him to be present at that time.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the order referred to by the gentleman from Ohio will be vacated.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

BOOKS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

Mr. RAY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I present the following unanimous report from the Committee on the Judiciary, and ask immediate consideration of it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution which will now be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the resolution of the House, No. 32, providing that the Superintendent of Documents be requested to furnish the House of Representatives, for the use of the House Library, 50 copies of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and the same number of the supplements thereto, report the same back with the recommendation that it pass, when amended as follows:

Line 5, after "50," insert "2."

At the end of line 8 add the following: "two of which supplements shall be for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary.

"*Also resolved*, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to furnish for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary the indexed Digest of United States Reports, in three volumes, published by The Lawyers' Cooperative Publishing Company, volumes 57 to 97, inclusive, of The Federal Reporter, 1 copy of Standard Unabridged Dictionary, Bouvier's Law Dictionary, last edition, and English Encyclopedia of Law, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House."

The Revised Statutes of the United States and supplements thereto are published by the Government and kept for sale by it. There are now on hand a large number of copies, and the same can be furnished without expense. In 1886 100 copies were furnished for the use of the House Library, but the most of these have disappeared, and but few copies remain, not enough to supply the calls of members, who are frequently greatly inconvenienced. This is also true of the supplements. The Committee on the Judiciary has 3 copies of the Revised Statutes, but only 1 copy of the supplement, and at least 3 are needed. Hence the amendment providing for 2 copies for the use of that committee.

The Committee on the Judiciary almost daily necessarily refers to the Federal Reporter. It already has in the committee room permanently the first 57 volumes of the 97 published. That committee is greatly delayed and seriously inconvenienced in its work by being compelled to send to the general library for these volumes. Only two copies of each volume are kept there, and frequently these are found in use by the members of the House or by the Court, and hence can not be had when wanted. That committee has a complete set of the Reports of the Supreme Court of the United States, but no recent or complete digest. That published by The Lawyers' Cooperative Publishing Company is concededly the best and can be had at an expense of $30.

Questions of law are constantly before that committee, especially when it is in session, and as it meets twice each week some general work in the nature of an encyclopedia of the law is absolutely essential. The Encyclopedia of English and American Law is the best and really the only work of the character suggested.

A good law dictionary and a dictionary of the English language are absolute essential, as in the framing of statutes the use of the right word in the right place and the use of the exact word to express the meaning intended is of great consequence.

The expense of obtaining all these books will not probably exceed $300.

The Clerk read the resolution as amended, as follows:

Resolved, That the Superintendent of Documents be requested to furnish the House of Representatives, for the use of the House library, 50 copies of the Revised Statutes of the United States (second edition, 1878), and also 52 copies of the Supplement of the Revised Statutes of the United States (volume 1, second edition, 1874 to 1891), two of which supplements shall be for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to furnish for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary the indexed Digest of United States Reports, in three volumes, published by The Lawyers' Cooperative Publishing Company, volumes 57 to 97, inclusive, of the Federal Reporter, one copy of Standard Unabridged Dictionary, Bouvier's Law Dictionary, last edition, and American and English Encyclopedia of Law, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have never known a resolution like this to be adopted by the House of Representatives. I was not aware that it was going to be introduced. I do not know that the members of the minority of the Judiciary Committee have passed upon it specially, but I see the famous watchdog of the Treasury is on the floor——

Mr. RAY of New York. I can not hear what the gentleman is saying. I ask for order.

The SPEAKER. The point is well taken. The House will be in order.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that it is a very unusual resolution. I have never known a committee to come here and ask for spelling books. They call this a dictionary, but it seems to me it is a spelling book. But I am not going to object to it if the committee want these books, and besides, as I stated, I see the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON] here; and if he does not object to spending the people's money in this way, to supply the committee with books, I shall not object to it. But I want to call attention to it and to state that it is the first time I have ever known a committee of the House to be supplied with books of the kind called for in this resolution. I do not know where it will stop if we are going to commence buying law dictionaries, Bouvier's Law Dictionary, the reports of the decisions of different courts, and a Standard Dictionary for the committee.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is going very far, but I see the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] is in his seat, and I will leave the expenditure to him if he desires to let it pass.

Mr. RAY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, in reply to the remarks of the gentleman, that ordinarily when a committee desires some book incurring only a small expenditure of $8 or $10, the Clerk of the House or the Chief Clerk is called upon to supply the book. Now, this resolution calls, first, for 50 copies of the Revised Statutes of the United States and 50 copies of the Supplement for the House library. The Revised Statutes and the Supplement are printed and published by the Government, and a large number of copies are now on hand. In 1886 a resolution was adopted by this House providing a hundred copies for the House library, and since that time no similar resolution has been introduced, for the reason that no such resolution has been necessary.

Now, those copies then furnished, or most of them, have become scattered; they have disappeared; and the librarian of the House finds himself unable to supply the demands of the members of the House made from time to time; and he has therefore requested that this demand be made upon the Superintendent of Documents, who can supply these volumes without expense to the Government. This is simply a transfer from one department to another. The books are needed, and the members of the House generally understand that. Now, so far as the other books are concerned, the Committee on the Judiciary are unanimous in asking for them. Of course such a resolution comes in very rarely. We have in the committee room the first 57 volumes of the Federal Reporter. There are 97 volumes.

The Committee on the Judiciary has occasion to refer to those books almost every day, and it is indispensable that we have them. While we were asking for these books we thought it well enough to ask for a law dictionary and a dictionary of the English language. Perhaps my friend from Tennessee never needs a dictionary of any kind, but the members of the Committee on the Judiciary do. They deem it advisable, at least, and I trust no objection will be made. The expense is very small, and we are all united in asking for these books.

Mr. DALZELL. How much will they cost?

Mr. RAY of New York. About $300.

Mr. BARTLETT. I could not hear the reading of the resolution thoroughly, and I would like to ask the gentleman from New York, in the first place, how much this is going to cost?

Mr. RAY of New York. Not to exceed $300, probably; we can not tell to a dollar.

Mr. BARTLETT. Do you have to buy the Federal Reporter? How many sets of this do you have to buy?

Mr. RAY of New York. The resolution only proposes to purchase part of one set. We already have the first 57 volumes. We need the balance of the set, 40 additional volumes of the Reporter.

Mr. BARTLETT. Are there not copies of all those in the Law Library in the building?

Mr. RAY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I hope we will have order; I can hardly hear the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentleman that—perhaps as a time saver, glancing at it casually and other people appealing to me to offer amendments that these various encyclopedias and digests ought to be supplemented for this and that committee—I think the resolution ought to go to the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have no objection to the consideration of the resolution, but think it ought to go to the Committee on Accounts, which has jurisdiction of all expenditures out of the contingent fund.

REPORT OF THE NICARAGUA CANAL COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith the report of the Nicaragua Canal Commission, provided for in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1897, entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for other purposes."

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, January 9, 1900.

ENLARGEMENT OF THE NAVAJO INDIAN RESERVATION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and, with the accompanying papers, ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, dated the 5th instant, with accompanying papers, expressing an urgent necessity for the enlargement of the Navajo Indian Reservation, in Arizona, to enable these Indians to support themselves by stock raising within the limits of their reservation.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, January 10, 1900.

OLEOMARGARINE.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following privileged report from the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota submits the following privileged report, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution No. 77.

Whereas there was manufactured in the United States during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899, 83,141,081 pounds, or 41,750 tons, of oleomargarine, being an increase in production over the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, of 25,654,445 pounds; and

Whereas the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine, colored as butter, is prohibited by law in thirty-three States of the Union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, requested to furnish to the House of Representatives information as to the particular States in which said oleomargarine is shipped and distributed by the producers, the amount in pounds shipped or distributed in each State, and also the number of licenses issued to persons in the several States for the manufacture and sale, either by wholesale or retail, of oleomargarine, stating the number of such licenses issued to persons in each State.

The report (by Mr. TAWNEY) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Ways and Means, to whom was referred resolution No. 77, reports the same back to the House with the following amendments:

First. Amend by striking out the preamble.

Second. Amend by striking out the word "said," in line 3.

And, as amended, recommend that the resolution do pass.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the resolution read as it will be when amended.

Mr. TAWNEY. It has been read as it will be when amended.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. There was so much confusion in the House that we could not hear on this side.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read again as it will read when amended.

The Clerk read the resolution again.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, is this a privileged report?

The SPEAKER. It is a resolution of inquiry, as the Chair understands.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Introduced and referred to the committee and a report by the committee?

The SPEAKER. Within the six-day rule.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment to the preamble will be agreed to.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I submit that there is no preamble; the preamble was stricken out. That was one of the committee amendments, striking out the preamble.

The SPEAKER. That was one of the amendments, but the amendments to the resolution must be agreed to before the amendment to the preamble.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I understood the proposition submitted by the Chair was to agree to the preamble.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the preamble. Without objection, that will be done.

There was no objection.

On motion of Mr. TAWNEY, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The hour fixed for eulogies on the death of the late Mr. GREENE, of Nebraska, was set for 1 o'clock. Without objection, this proceeding will now be taken up and considered by the House. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House take a recess until 1 o'clock, the hour originally fixed.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House took a recess until 1 o'clock p. m.

The recess having expired, the House resumed its session.

LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS.

At the request of Mr. BALL, leave to withdraw from the files of the House without leaving copies the papers in the case of William W. Armstrong in the Fifty-fifth Congress was granted, no adverse report having been made thereon.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT W. L. GREENE.

The SPEAKER. The hour for the special order having arrived, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MERCER].

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolutions and ask their adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. WILLIAM L. GREENE, late a Representative from the State of Nebraska.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the House be now suspended to enable his associates to pay proper tribute of regard to his high character and distinguished public services.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Resolved, That as an additional mark of respect the House, at the conclusion of these ceremonies, do adjourn.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to.

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Speaker, on the 11th day of March, 1899, at 8 o'clock p. m., Hon. WILLIAM L. GREENE, a member of the Fifty-fifth Congress and a member-elect to the Fifty-sixth Congress, and representing the Sixth Congressional district in the State of Nebraska, came to a sudden and unexpected death in my home city of Omaha. Only a few days before the date mentioned he was with us in this Chamber, full of life and hope, and without a sign of ailment or disease. He was daily in attendance upon the sessions of the House, active in his Department work, and watchful of the interests of his constituents here and elsewhere. He gave close attention to all proceedings in this body and made his presence felt in many debates. The closing hours of the Fifty-fifth Congress were most tedious, and we were kept in session until late in the morning, yet Mr. GREENE never rested from his labors and was on duty when that Congress adjourned sine die. He seemed in the best of health and full of good humor. During a lull in the proceedings, while awaiting a conference report, he and I had our last exchange of greetings. Notwithstanding we belonged to different political organizations and more than once clashed our blades over a difference in opinion, we separated at the close of the Fifty-fifth Congress good friends and little dreaming that that separation was to be our last.

The following extract, taken from the Omaha Bee of date March 12, 1899, fully explains the manner of his death:

At 7 o'clock last night WILLIAM L. GREENE, of Kearney, of the Sixth Congressional district of Nebraska, was apparently hale, hearty, and in the full enjoyment of life, with all its pleasures, domestic, social, and political. At 8 o'clock he had joined the great majority, and the awful majesty of death was stamped upon his face as he lay in his last sleep on the cold mosaic floor of the Burlington station in this city.

Mr. GREENE came to Omaha from Lincoln on Friday evening and put up at the Arcade Hotel. He had been at the State capital for some days, having come up from Washington to witness the election of a Nebraska Senator. After spending Saturday greeting his friends and attending to business in town he took a hack about 7.45 in the evening to catch the Burlington train to Lincoln.

Congressman GREENE was accompanied by three friends, bound for the same train, J. C. Reeves, of Madison County, a farmer; F. B. Prince, a hotel keeper of Madison, and T. B. Donovan, of the Madison Star.

On reaching the station Congressman GREENE was observed lying back in the seat of the hack as if asleep, and every effort was made by his companions and the passenger director to arouse him. He was borne in an unconscious state to the waiting room of the depot, and in answer to a telephone message Dr. S. H. Smith was soon in attendance. On looking at the body the doctor pronounced him dead and advised the railway authorities to summon the coroner. His advice was immediately followed, and in a few minutes Coroner Swanson had gathered the facts and the body was removed to the morgue. Death was attributed to heart failure.

Mr. GREENE was born October 3, 1849, and hence was not quite 50 years of age at the time of his death. He first saw the light of day upon a farm in Pike County, Ind., and his father being a farmer he followed that vocation until he acquired a sufficient education to teach school. During his farm life he attended the district school in winter until he was competent to enter the academy at Ireland, Ind., an institution he attended for three years. While serving as school-teacher he employed his spare time to such an advantage that in 1876 he was admitted to the bar in Bloomington, Ind., and soon thereafter he was in full practice of his new profession.

Mr. GREENE was an ambitious young man, and not making the headway in his law practice that he desired, he decided to move west and reap some of the harvest falling to the lot of others who had preceded him to that great empire beyond the Mississippi. After some correspondence with friends in Nebraska, he decided that Kearney, Nebr., a rapidly growing town about 200 miles west of Omaha, would meet his expectations, and thither he and family went in 1883. By close application to his profession he soon became recognized as an able exponent of the law and his rank at the bar, especially in criminal practice, was high. He was a Democrat in politics, but gave very little attention thereto until the Populist party effected an organization in our State. Of this party organization he was a charter member and achieved so much distinction in it that during the winter of 1892–93 he came within a few votes of being elected United States Senator, the prize finally going to Hon. WILLIAM V. ALLEN, after a spirited contest.

In 1895 Mr. GREENE was elected judge of the Twelfth judicial district of Nebraska, which position he resigned to enter Congress.

Mr. GREENE at the age of 22 years wedded Miss Emma Dowell, at Shoals, Ind., and his widow and seven children survive him.

I will leave to those of my colleagues who were intimately and personally associated with Judge GREENE the privilege of reciting at length his life and character, for my acquaintance with him was limited and confined principally to our association as members of the Fifty-fifth Congress. I first met him in Kearney, Nebr., when he was serving as district judge, and I found him then not only kind and courteous to members of the bar and litigants generally, but I also found him to be very popular with the masses. As an advocate, he was unusually strong before a jury, and as a campaign orator he was without many equals in our State, while as a judge he had the confidence both of the people and the bar.

When he came to Congress he proved himself dangerous in debate, for he was not only forceful in manner but ingenious in his argument. He was full of confidence in himself and never appeared ill at ease in addressing the House. He loved discussion, and took part in the running debates at every opportunity. His tongue was full of words and it tossed them right and left at the slightest provocation. These words were not always gentle; on the contrary, more than once they seemed to have been dipped in vitriol, and in consequence during one term in Congress he became involved in most serious contentions, but his big heart soon prompted him to forgive and forget.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of sorrow and of loss that we meet here to-day to talk of the life and services of our friend and colleague, WILLIAM L. GREENE. He was a man splendidly endowed and superbly equipped by the Creator for the struggle of life. A strong man physically and mentally, he was ready to meet any emergency and enter any conflict. For more than twenty-five years he was in the public view, either holding positions of trust and honor or on the platform, battling for principles and truths as he understood them. Absolutely fearless in standing for what he believed to be right, he possessed none of those hesitations and doubts that less ably equipped mortals have in enunciating and defending well-matured convictions on public questions.

For years prior to his election to Congress he was a leading character in the political history of our State. During the early alliance days and in the organization of the reform movement he was a power. Gifted with all the attributes of the orator and with a singular power over the minds of men, his services were in great demand. In the Senatorial contest of 1893 he was a leading candidate for that high office, and for many ballots by the legislature he came within two votes of the election, but, voluntarily withdrawing, he threw his influence in favor of the one of his choice, who was elected.

In 1895 he was elected judge of the Twelfth judicial district of Nebraska, holding that important office until his election to Congress. The lawyers and litigants of the district were unanimous in his praise as one of the best and fairest judges that ever presided over the court of that district. He dearly loved a debate on the questions of the day, and to him it was happiness in the extreme when some one crossed swords with him. His devotion to his family and the manner in which his children at home crowded around him and took possession of him but indicated the tenderness of the parent and the reciprocal love of the child.

In his platform work his style was felicitous. How often have I heard him tell a story that clearly illustrated a point, with a humor that was irresistible, and then almost instantly the whole question would be reviewed with a pathos that would touch the roughest heart. But death is an inexorable tyrant. He comes at his own appointed time, whether we are ready to greet him or not. He says to the mother that her little babe must go, and although the mother's heart breaks with sorrow, the flower that is the joy of her life is transplanted to bloom in fairer fields. He casts his dart at the strong young man, just ready for life and its opportunities, and although his plans and those of his friends comprehend magnificent conquests, yet in sight of them all he falls. He came to my friend and colleague, strong in his power and manhood, in the midst of his work that a great people had commissioned him to perform, and with a sigh he joined the ever-increasing multitude that are passing over to the other side. The old man whose hair is whiter than snow and whose heart has sung nothing but psalms his whole life long gladly meets the king of terrors and lies down to sweet slumber. It is one deep mystery and unsolved problem to us all. The veil that separates us from the knowledge of the unseen is thin, but it can not be penetrated. The longing for immortality has possessed every heart from Plato's age to our own. In good time it will be made clear to each of us. My hope is that when we come to lay down our burdens and to render unto nature the things that are due her, that we may leave behind us as many loving hearts and true friends as did WILLIAM L. GREENE.

Mr. ROBINSON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, so far as we have any knowledge man, is the only one of all created beings to whom is given the information that all earthly life must end in death. The experience and observation of mankind early in life impresses upon his mind the fact that death is the common lot of all the race. Through the grim gateway whose gloomy portals open upon a mystery which the yearning eyes of humanity have never penetrated or solved all created beings which from the beginning have trod the earth in life have passed, and through that same gateway all created beings now living or hereafter to be born must surely go. This much we know to be the plan of the great Creator of the universe. The gift of earthly life brings with it the certainty of earthly death.

The promised length of days to man is three score years and ten, but certain as is death, it seems to enter but little into the p'ans and calculations of our life. There is within us a feeling which causes us to look with terror and aversion upon death. We shrink from contemplation of the awful mystery. So common and universal to mankind is this feeling that many join in the belief that it is part of nature's plan to guard the race in times of trial, misfortune, misery, and despair from seeking entrance through the gates of death before, in the fullness of nature's plans, they are called to go. In vain has humanity, during all the centuries, rapped at the dark and silent portals through which the countless millions have passed. The yearning desire of all mankind to know what lies beyond the tomb is only satisfied by faith as it is manifest in some of the established forms of religion upon earth.

As in the course of life youth, strength, and vigor must pass from us with the lapse of years, to give way to the feebleness and helplessness of age, it would seem to be a part of nature's plan to prepare the human mind to enter into the dread "valley of the shadow of death" with resignation. But death does not always wait until the tree of life is withered, nor does it always give warning of its approach by robbing the vigorous limbs of their strength, by whitening the locks, by dimming the brightness of the eye, or causing the elastic step to become feeble and wavering. It comes at times without warning to robust youth and vigorous manhood; and so the message came to him whose untimely death we this day commemorate. When to the human eye he seemed in the full vigor of health, when, judging by his years, he was in the very prime of manhood, death placed its finger upon his heart and it was still.

In speaking of the brother who has gone I leave to others who were acquainted with his work on this floor and who knew him intimately as a friend the task of telling in detail of his life. I had no personal acquaintance with the deceased in life, and only knew him as he was known by thousands of the people of our State. He was a man who possessed to a remarkable degree the gift of oratory, but he only used that great gift in advocating that which he believed to be right.

His early life was spent upon a Western farm; he knew the hardships and trials of the early pioneer, and his first toil was performed in reclaiming land from the wild state of nature and in sowing the seed and gathering the harvest. His sympathies were always with the masses of mankind.

He was one of the founders of the People's Independent Party and was one of the strongest advocates and stanchest defenders of its principles.

He was repeatedly honored by the people of our State. In 1895 he was elected to the office of district judge and brought to the discharge of the duties of that high office a mind ripened by years of training and study in the active practice of the law. He was called from that position by the people of his district to represent them in the Fifty-fifth Congress and was reelected to the present Congress.

His work in life is done; he rests in eternal sleep, surrounded by the broad prairies of the State he loved, where the winds in summer kiss the fields of ripening grain, loved and remembered by the thousands who listened to his voice in life, as it pleaded for liberty, justice, equality, and right.

Mr. NEVILLE. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a sad duty to offer words of condolence, due this House, a suffering constituency, and bereaved family, by reason of the death of one so beloved by all.

While your acquaintance with Judge GREENE was the result of necessary business contact, and your opinion of him formed, no doubt, first, from a social chat in the cloakroom, and afterwards modified or wholly changed by heated political discussion in this Hall, yet you were not in position to fully understand the greatness of our deceased brother.

I knew Judge GREENE personally well from the time of his advent in Nebraska, seventeen years ago, until the day of his death, and during that period had the good fortune to be associated with him many times in the political field, quite frequently in the trial of causes before the courts, and for some years upon the bench.

His characteristics were most agreeable to those who knew him best.

His mind was a great deal stronger than his body, and his soul immensely greater than his pocketbook.

He was always in sympathetic touch with the environments of his daily walks—an ideal Populist—jocund and happy when his fellow-men were prosperous and contented, and despondent and solicitous when disaster and squalor threatened those surrounding him.

Early in life Judge GREENE attached himself to the membership of the Baptist Church and throughout was an able exponent and successful defender of the faith and creed in which he believed.

In his business associations he was always ready to assume his share of the burden, but gave little heed to the emoluments which follow business methods.

In his social relations he was an agreeable and genial companion, and in his home life he was a kind, loving, and indulgent father and devoted and affectionate husband.

Reflection only mystifies, and the field of vision and research will not reveal; yet it must be that the God of all, in the interminable conflict with Satan, needed less advocates here or a more skilled one in the perfectly developed world, where acoustic properties are unlimited and human effort becomes divine.

His death was your loss. It shattered the fond expectations of a confiding constituency and stranded upon the sandy beach of despair the hopes of a trusting but dependent family.

From a narrow-minded and selfish view his death was my gain, but with bowed head and sorrowing heart I join with you, with his constituency, and his bereaved family in casting upon his bier the green twig of regret and planting upon his fresh-made grave the constant forget-me-not.

To-day we record the grief sayings of contemporaries; to-morrow we plunge into the domain of business demands, forgetting our sorrow or the possible results from its cause. A few days hence squalor overtakes the loved but helpless ones surviving. Soon thereafter we leave the beaten path. A new generation trods by in business garb without time to turn their heads or read our record.

It is well that God takes care of those gone; we delve in our limited way for the benefit of those to come.

Business absorbs the energies of the human family. Rush is the order of the day regardless of the wake. Yet death overtakes all; a sad awakening to the heedless, but a relief to those whose charity is great without its instrument.

We say our brother is dead, yet we believe he still lives, and our belief should make us strive to do in our allotted time upon this earth as much good and as little intentional wrong.

Mr. BURKETT. Mr. Speaker, of the time that has been set apart for eulogy on the life and character of our late Congressman from Nebraska, the Hon. W. L. GREENE, I feel that I should occupy but a few moments. There are others who have better right to claim the time than I have.

I feel that this hour should be occupied by those who knew him personally, who were associated with him as a member of this House, and to whom that acquaintance and association had endeared him. Yet, sirs, I can not refrain from adding a few words to the many that shall be spoken kindly and tenderly of him today. I regret that it was not my privilege and honor to know him personally. We were citizens of the same State; our homes were separated only by a few level miles of beautiful Nebraskan prairies; yet for some unaccountable reason an opportunity never presented itself for us to become acquainted. I knew his associates and acquaintances in great numbers; many of his friends were and are my friends; hence I do feel that in a measure and in a sense I did know him.

I knew him as an active, prominent citizen of our State; I knew him as a tender-hearted father and a good neighbor; I knew him as a man ever ready to sacrifice his personal welfare that others might be comforted; I knew him as a big-hearted, generous, and charitable man.

Few men of our State were better known among us than was Judge GREENE. He held important official positions and took an active part in the affairs of our Commonwealth. I presume that few names were more familiar to the people than was the name of our late Congressman from the Sixth district. He was prominent in politics long before he came to Congress. His coming here was the reward for faithful service to his party and loyalty and devotion to the rights and needs of his people. He was an unusual man in many particulars. I am told by those who knew him that he had a faculty of making very warm friends and that, as is usual with such natures, he did not have many bitter enemies. His friends loved him and followed him and supported him with a true devotion.

He was a brilliant campaigner. His reputation as an orator was indeed an enviable one, if such a selfish expression were permissible. Few men had the readiness of speech that he had, and still fewer possessed, combined with that readiness, the wit and eloquence with which he was gifted.

His presence on the platform was attractive, his nature was magnetic, and he was always able to hold the closest attention of his hearers.

He had a faculty of using the simplest and oftentimes the most ridiculous objects as illustrations with persuasive effect. I remember once of hearing a man telling of a speech that he had heard Mr. GREENE deliver somewhere the night before and he had taken for his theme, or rather object lesson, a brass button that he had happened to find as he came to the place of meeting. With that insignificant object as a subject, he made his address. With it he made fun and pathos, and from it he proceeded to discuss both the coinage and the tariff questions. Whatever else may be said of him, he possessed rare genius as an orator.

It was not my good fortune, as it was permitted many of you here to-day, to sit in Congress with him. I know very little of his work here in this body. But that he performed the duties of his office to the satisfaction of the majority of his constituents at least was told by his reelection to a seat in this Congress, which he was prevented from taking only by death.

It was my sad duty to attend his funeral services. Of the things that most impressed me upon that occasion was the great multitude of people that had gathered there to help consign his remains to the tomb.

It was a raw, wintry March day. It rained and sleeted and snowed, but breasting all the elements, they came from far and near, from all that country, to pay their last tribute of love and respect for their departed friend and public servant.

It only demonstrated that the people loved him. It was an inaudible eulogy to his manhood and spoke clearer than a clarion that he had been a good citizen at home, a good member of the community in which he lived, and that he had endeared himself to the hearts of his fellow-men.

This, to my mind, is the highest tribute that can be paid to any man, that he was loved by his fellows.

If there was one sentiment more often than all others voiced there upon that occasion, it was the humanitarian principle and practice of Judge GREENE. All said that he was generous even to his own detriment; that he was charitable beyond measure; that in his heart there abounded fraternity, and that he loved his fellow-men and was willing to sacrifice his personal comfort and welfare that others might be more happy. And as we stood there by his open grave, surrounded by those friends from far and near, from all walks and callings and avocations in life, the raw wind driving the sleet and snow into our very marrow, I could not help but think of that story of George Howe, in that beautiful little compilation of tales of Auld Drumtochty—Bonnie Brier Bush.

That story impresses the fact, as you remember, that to be great in death one must have merited it in life—that men are loved for what they do for others, rather than what they do for themselves. You remember George Howe sacrificed his comfort and personal tastes for poor, miserable, drunken, gutter-bedragged Andra Chaumbers. He curbed his vanity and gave others credit for his own efforts, and "made them better than himself," as one of the characters says. But in turn all loved him, and at his death they

gathered together from all classes to lay him away. The rich boy from the city was there, and the fisherman's son from the seashore.

Royal blood coursed through the veins of the one, and tracing his ancestry to the "beautiful queen," he gloried in a noble pedigree. The other could see naught behind him but a stern manipulator of a fishing smack. With them, too, you remember, was poor downfallen Chaumbers. Truly it was a cosmopolitan gathering. They blended their tears and shared their sorrows—the rich and the poor, the high and the low, nobility and peasant. For each and all he had done something.

Our beloved Congressman is gone. He lives now only by his example. His deeds are history. From them may we cull the good and emulate them, and thus build for ourselves lasting tablets in the memories of our fellow-men.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I had not thought to say anything on this occasion, and only do so now from the fact that it was my good fortune to know Judge GREENE when he and I were in our young manhood. More than twenty years ago in Indiana he was the pastor of the Baptist church in the neighboring town of Ellettsville. Although a young man, his eloquence was known far beyond the town in which he was the pastor. In his young days, as demonstrated here in his latter days, he was aggressive—not only aggressive, but was always ready to stand by the firm convictions he had.

A controversy arose between Mr. GREENE and Elder W. B. F. Treat, of the Christian persuasion, and a little later a joint discussion was arranged. Nearly everybody said that the young Baptist had made a mistake; that he would hardly be able to cope with the elder, who was fifteen years his senior, and had already participated in several similar debates. Gentlemen, as you who knew him on the floor of this House would expect, the debate had gone on only a day when public sentiment began to change, and at the end of the week, when the discussion closed, everybody sang the praises of the young Baptist, and many of his friends claimed that he had won the debate from the elder. Certainly he conducted the discussion in such a vigorous and aggressive manner that he won a reputation as a debater throughout the State of Indiana.

I only speak of this, gentlemen, for the purpose of exhibiting in its true light the real merit of our distinguished friend who has gone hence. Not only did he make his convictions manifest in that way, but he always loved a war of words. It was the ambition of his youth to become a lawyer. Shortly, he determined to abandon the profession of the ministry, having read law during the entire time of his preaching; he was admitted to the bar at Bloomington, of which I had the distinction at that time of being a member. Although he may have been considered somewhat lacking in early training, it was only a short time before he had a clientage that was not only lucrative, but one which any of the older members of that bar might have envied. All knew that he was painstaking—always faithful to the interests of his clients; and the lawyer who had "WILLIAM L. GREENE," as he was generally called, as an adversary, knew that there was before him a battle royal until every point in the case had been fully contested and settled one way or the other.

In the course of about three years he made a remarkable reputation as a preacher, and in less time as an attorney—coextensive not simply with his county, but with the entire section of the State. He went West, and he had been there but a little time when the people of his adopted State recognized his magnificent ability, his impressive oratory, and his strength before a jury. They recognized also that he had a judicial mind; and in view of this he was elected to the responsible position of judge of the district in which he resided. I am told by his friends that on the bench he acquitted himself with great ability and credit.

It was my good fortune to meet him next at the beginning of the Fifty-fifth Congress; and to you who are here I can say, without speaking disparagingly of other members of that or preceding Congresses, that I question whether any gentleman has made here a stronger, a more deserved, a better reputation as a debater and for fidelity to the principles which he came here to advocate.

Always present, ever ready not only to combat the opposition of those with whom he disagreed, but ready to advocate and maintain the position that he might take in opposition, ready in debate, quick of perception, strong and forceful in speech, true not only to the principles of the platform on which he was elected, but true to the citizenship of his State, and, above all, his principles were always American.

And who of us, gentlemen, could leave behind us a greater or a better name, a more honorable heritage, than Mr. GREENE left as a father true, honest, and faithful, a husband loyal and loving, a preacher in the fullest sense, a lawyer in its broadest meaning, and, above all, a statesman able to take rank as a peer with the best men of his age?

Mr. Speaker, WILLIAM L. GREENE has gone to that bourn whence no traveler returns; but his spirit, his strong manhood, his fidelity to principle and to the fundamental doctrines of the Republic remain; and they may well be emulated by any one of the members of the Fifty-sixth Congress and others who may follow him on the floor of this House.

[Mr. RICHARDSON addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, the deceased, WILLIAM L. GREENE, though he was in this body but a few months, left a void most difficult to fill.

He was congenial, approachable, evenly tempered, very resourceful, and a lovable companion.

His avenues of learning were vast and extensive. He had a great familiarity with the best current literature; was thoroughly familiar with the most advanced thought in political economy and the science of government, and possessed a most versatile and happy faculty for making application of his knowledge.

Nature, in making its wise division of labor by giving different men aptitudes for different callings, was certainly very liberal in blessing him with unusual powers of eloquence and with great facilities as a debater.

He had inherited a great memory that enabled him to easily store the choicest metaphors and allegories in literature for use at a moment's notice.

He was industrious and, while not ambitious or egotistical, yearned for a contest in the arena of debate. This was not for vainglory or spectacular display of his superb powers, but rather because he had well-settled convictions and desired to expose what he considered the errors of his adversaries, so that those who ran might read, and at the same time to convince them of what he considered as the inherent logic and eternal justice involved in his convictions.

He, like others so gifted, was conscious of his great equipment for debate and was also conscious that he, belonging to a minority party and having to occupy a position on insignificant committees and having no great newspapers back of him, had to force his way by the sheer power of aptly pointing out the merit of his own cause and the clean exposition of the demerits in that of his antagonists.

But few probably have ever appeared in these halls under so many discouraging environments who have risen higher above them in so short a time. He was not extreme in anything, indulged in no intemperance of language or sallies of passion, confining himself at all times to the most becoming amenities of debate.

He, like many other men so gifted, overworked the brain at times and was compelled to disengage his faculties from the direction in which they had been too long bent. It was most unfortunate that his party and his country had to lose one so equipped for good in the very noontime of his allotted three score and ten years, but such is the inexorable law of nature that whenever man overdraws her resources for any considerable length of time, the penalty is demanded.

It is with much sadness and regret that we are called upon by this unfortunate event to pay this last tribute to his merit, but he will always be remembered in his State, in his party, and among his friends as a great combination of good fellowship, great intellectual resources, and possessed of the highest aspirations for the complete brotherhood of man and for a government whose benefits and burdens, like the air of heaven, shall ever bear equally upon every individual.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Speaker, these memorial occasions, of which there were many during the Fifty-fifth Congress and will be many more during this, impress the fact upon our minds that "in the midst of life we are in death."

We are forcibly struck with the truth of this declaration as we remember how unexpectedly the last summons came to our friend and colleague.

When I bade him good-bye at the close of the last session, he was, to me, the picture of health; and when the papers gave the shocking intelligence that he had fallen before the last enemy a few days after reaching his home, I remarked to friends that he was one of the members of Congress who promised to live his three score and ten.

I must leave to those nearer to him an outline of his life, while I speak briefly of his public character and the impressions he made on me.

Nature seemed to have endowed him with a strong character and fixed purposes, and great zeal and earnestness in the discharge of his duty.

These qualities, together with his experience at the bar and on the bench, rendered him an active and useful member of this House. Very few men during their first term have taken a more active part in the debates than did Judge GREENE, and a stranger listening would have taken him for one of the older members, so perfectly at home did he appear and so free from self-consciousness. His uniform courtesy and frankness impressed me, and it gave me pleasure on more than one occasion to congratulate him

on his efforts or express admiration at his forbearance. I am glad to be able to say this in all sincerity, for we too often wait until our friends are dead to speak words of praise. It is well to strew flowers on their graves, but better to cheer their lives with well-chosen words of commendation whenever they are deserved.

I was struck with his earnest and well-defined patriotism, his love for his State and country.

This was evident to all who heard his speech April 12, 1898, on Cuban independence. As I listened to that speech, I thought of what Patrick Henry said in the Virginia convention in September, 1774:

> I am not a Virginian, but an American.

The speech of Judge GREENE breathed a spirit of fervor and consecrated love of country that we witness so often in the lives of men who come from the broad plains and fertile fields of our splendid Western Commonwealths.

We count on the sterling character of their Representatives, backed by a noble body of yeomanry behind them, to help steer our ship of state through the perilous voyage on which we are embarked in this transition period.

In the speech referred to Judge GREENE gave utterance to these words:

> We have reached a point where partisanship should be forgotten. But while devoted to the principles of the party to which I belong, I am first and above all an American citizen, and I seek first the welfare and glory of my country; I seek the honor of my country, and whatever makes for its peace and permanent prosperity I welcome, whether it come from this or that or the other section of this Chamber or any one of the political organizations into which it is divided.

These occasions remind us that "it is not all of life to live, nor all of death to die."

What we call death, with all its painful apprehensions and anxious forbodings, is but a change of form and duration of existence. Religion, nature, conscience—all teach that there is a life beyond. When the frail casket that holds our better and nobler being is laid in the silent grave, the emancipated spirit will return to the Being who gave it, and we shall find homes prepared that the "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither entered into the heart of man."

Though cut off in the prime of life, in the midst of an honorable and useful career, our colleague did not live in vain. His influences will survive in his country, his State, and on the pages of his country's history.

We do not agree with the couplet—

> The evil that men do lives after them;
> The good is oft interred with their bones—

But prefer to believe that the evil that men do is a signal light to warn their fellows of the breakers ahead, while the good is a friendly signboard to point the road to higher endeavor and nobler purpose.

May these occasions, hallowed in their tendencies and time-honored as a custom, bring pure and noble thoughts to our minds as we pay tributes of respect to our departed friends. In emulating the virtues and shunning the weaknesses—if he had them—of our lamented friend, let us so live as to bring credit to ourselves and advance the interests and promote the happiness and well-being of those who have clothed us with the grave responsibilities of official position.

With tender memories of our departed colleague we pray that peace and happiness may follow those who immediately and directly bind that memory to earth.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to go into a history of the life and career of Judge GREENE, our deceased colleague. That history has been already well and faithfully given by his colleagues on this floor from the State of Nebraska and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MIERS]. They have told us how Judge GREENE began the struggle of life in Indiana, how he went to the great West and settled in the State of Nebraska, which he loved so well, and there began the practice of his profession of the law; how he was elevated to the bench and finally elected to Congress. I rise as one who never knew Judge GREENE until the beginning of the Fifty-fifth Congress to bear my testimony to his worth and character. I can speak with knowledge of his ability, disposition, and temperament, as I have often seen him tried on this floor.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is fitting when a gentleman who has been honored by a great people departs this life in the service of his country that his colleagues should pause for a while in their ordinary legislative duties for the purpose of paying a tribute of respect to his memory. We have many occasions of this character.

Since the election of 1898 seven members elected to this body have died. Mr. Dingley, of Maine; Mr. GREENE, of Nebraska; Mr. Baird, of Louisiana; Mr. Bland, of Missouri; Mr. Danford, of Ohio; Mr. Ermentrout, of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Settle, of Kentucky; and I might add that the recently elected Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Hayward, is dead, as well as the Vice-President of the United States, Mr. Hobart, eulogies upon whose services and character are to-day being delivered by Senators in the other end of this Capitol.

When an old man dies the span of whose life has been finished, whose work is done, we say it is a pity; we recognize that it is a cause of sorrow, although we know that it is in the course of nature and that such must be the case. Death must come to the old. But when a young man, or a man in the prime of life, with his great life work still before him, with the burden still on his shoulders, dies, either by accident or suddenly, we are more than ever reminded that life on this earth does not and can not last always, and that humanity is mortal. Such was the death of WILLIAM L. GREENE. In March last we shook hands with him, then strong, joyful, confident, apparently well, framed to reach three-score years and ten. A few days thereafter over the wires came the news of his sudden death.

I remember very well, Mr. Speaker, the first impression that Judge GREENE made upon me and, I think, upon the House.

It was in the beginning of the first or extra session of the Fifty-fifth Congress. Many here now will remember how, at one of the night sessions in the early part of that Congress, he made a most vigorous and effective speech during the pendency of the tariff bill then before us; and we remember how, during the course of that speech, many of the members on the floor who had not known Judge GREENE took out their Directory and consulted it to find out something about him, and asked each other, "Who is that man?" He was a man of large form, about 5 feet 10 inches high and weighing about 200 pounds, broad shouldered, wide in forehead, with a heavy suit of waving dark-brown hair, and piercing eyes. He indicated by his very presence extreme vigor and physical strength, and his argument was evidence of a strong intellect. As we heard that speech and saw in the Directory that he was a lawyer, we could well imagine his great influence and strength before a court and jury. I think I can safely say that he never made a speech on the floor of this House without adding information to the subject on which he was talking and without giving strength to the position he advocated.

I do not know that I ought to refer to personal matters or to matters that partake of a personal character in this connection, but we remember that he and his distinguished colleague from the Second district of Nebraska had an earnest and somewhat personal controversy on the floor of this House. It was a controversy in which both gentlemen displayed unusual resource, strength, knowledge, and ability, and out of which both came with respect for his adversary—both parties receiving from and yielding to the other respect. And we remember, Mr. Speaker—and I thought it the most striking part of that discussion—the courteous spirit of magnanimity and kindness of heart with which Judge GREENE met the conclusion of the colloquy.

He impressed me as being a man of a clear intellect, a candid heart, and a truthful tongue; as a searcher for the truth in every controversy in which he was engaged, and a man whose influence must have increased had he lived to bear the part that he seemed then destined to bear in the deliberations of this House. Clearness, strength, readiness, and kindness were striking traits of his character.

We easily believe him to have been a speaker of the first rank on the stump, and the great principles to which he dedicated his best manhood lost one of their ablest and most effective champions in his death. May the eulogies to-day delivered be a consolation to his friends who shared with him in political sentiment and with whom he labored till the close of his earthly career.

Genial, candid, generous, he realized that life was toil and duty, not a trifle or a plaything, and to perform the toil and duty of living he consecrated a great mind, a great heart, and a strong body. The recollection of his virtues and powers will ever be a pleasure to his friends, while the Christian life and death he had will be a sweet consolation to all who knew him, and especially to his loving kindred. After all, to die a Christian's death should be the great purpose of every man. Honors and riches and all else desired by mortal man shall perish away with generations and be forgotten amid the centuries, but the soul that has put its trust in the Conqueror of death, the Redeemer of the world, shall live forever. Wherever human intellect has existed there has been an earnest desire, a silent prayer, for immortality—for an eternity of existence.

The kindness and mercy of an all-wise Creator has answered that universal prayer, and so to-day, in accordance with the blessed doctrines of the New Testament and his faith in them, we believe that the spirit of Judge GREENE is destined to eternal happiness. As we have by his death been reminded that Father Time is ever ready with his scythe to strike us down, let us take the solemn lesson ever impressed upon us and renew our devotion to the best principles of every great and worthy existence, right and justice to all and by all, strict performance of duty amid all temptations, and never-failing kindness and charity to all of God's

creatures. Then may we, Mr. Speaker, when the dread summons calls us from loved ones into unknown darkness, go not alone—terrible thought, alone—but be, as we believe Judge GREENE was, accompanied by the Prince of Peace, whose mercy, love, and sacrifice is sufficient for us and shall ever bless us.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Speaker, Representative STARK, of our State, is unavoidably absent because of the death of his father. It was his intention to address the House to-day, during these proceedings, in commemoration of our deceased colleague. I ask unanimous consent that he, and other gentlemen who desire to do so, may be permitted to print remarks in the RECORD in this connection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, that consent will be given.

There was no objection.

Mr. MERCER. I now ask the announcement of the result of the vote on the pending resolutions.

The result of the vote was then announced; and accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Friday noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of the Kennebec River between Gardiner Bridge and Augusta Dam, Maine—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Supervising Architect submitting an estimate of appropriation for repairs of the United States court-house and post-office building in New York City—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Supervising Surgeon-General of the Marine-Hospital Service submitting estimates of appropriations for the hospitals at St. Louis and Cleveland—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Camden Harbor, Maine—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a reply to the inquiry included in the House resolution dated January 4, 1900, relating to the transactions of the Treasury Department with certain banks—to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from Assistant Treasurer C. N. Jordan, at New York, and relating to reimbursement of certain public money lost—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. JENKINS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5297) to amend the act entitled "An act to better define and regulate the rights of aliens to hold and own real estate in the Territories," approved March 2, 1897, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 30); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5042) to provide for improvements in the tax departments of the District of Columbia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 31); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAY of New York, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the resolution of the House (H. Res. 32) directing the superintendent of documents to furnish the House of Representatives, for the use of the House library, 50 copies of the Revised Statutes of the United States and 52 copies of the Supplement of the Revised Statutes of the United States, volume 1, second edition, 1874 to 1891, etc., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 32); which said resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. OTJEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3204) to refer certain claims for Indian depredations to the Court of Claims, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 25); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WEAVER, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 628) for the relief of Hamilton M. Sailors, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 26); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRENNER, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred House Executive Document No. 224, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 5755) for the relief of William Wolfe, accompanied by a report (No. 27); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORT.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 283) for the relief of Mrs. Eliza E. Hebert, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 28); which said bill and report were ordered to lie on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills and petitions of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 202) to pay the Standard Steel Casting Company for one 6-inch gun casting—Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 1992) for the relief of Mathias Pederson—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 3242) for the relief of the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company—Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 4537) for the relief of William Wheeler Hubbell—Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 4538) to pay just compensation to William Wheeler Hubbell for his invention of high-power steel guns, and improvements in other guns, made and adopted by the United States for its military service and Navy at the present time—Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 4669) to grant a pension to William D. Humbard, of Coahulla, Tenn.—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5142) granting a pension to Mrs. Sarah J. Stewart—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5116) granting pension to Mary Dozha—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5084) granting a pension to Robert S. Logan—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4827) granting a pension to Emily M. Gillespie—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1807) granting an honorable discharge to John B. Tredenick—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 2316) for the relief of Mrs. R. C. Jones, of Fairfax County, Va.—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 3950) for the relief of Eliza C. Armin, widow of Frank Armin—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

Petition and bill for the relief of Jerry S. Fish—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RIDGELY: A bill (H. R. 5756) for raising revenue, and other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5757) to provide for the construction and operation of certain public improvements in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 5758) to amend section 3 of the act of May 28, 1880, entitled "An act for the relief of settlers upon the Osage trust and diminished reserve lands in Kansas, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 5759) authorizing the improvement of the Black Warrior River above Tuscaloosa, Ala., between Lock and Dam No. 4 and Valley River, and the improvement of Valley River, Alabama, from its mouth to McAdory—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 5760) to reduce taxation—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 5761) to establish a branch mint of the United States at Kansas City, in the State of Kansas—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 5762) to extend the time for the completion of the classification of lands within the land-grant and indemnity land-grant limits of the Northern Pacific Railroad Company, as authorized by the act of Congress approved February 26, 1895, to and including the 31st day of October, 1900—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5763) to extend the public-land laws to the district of Alaska—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 5764) for the erection of a post-office building at Sterling, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 5765) relating to section 61 of the revenue act of August 28, 1894—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: A bill (H. R. 5766) in reference to the civil service and appointments thereunder—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5767) to amend section 3738 of the Revised Statutes of the United States for 1878—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 5768) to adopt the weights and measures of the metric system as the standard weights and measures in the United States—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. BELLAMY: A bill (H. R. 5769) to appropriate $10,000 to inclose and beautify the grounds and repair the monument on the Moores Creek battlefield, North Carolina—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEVY: A bill (H. R. 5770) to provide for the payment of interest on internal-revenue receipts now deposited, or hereafter deposited, in national banks of the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 5771) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to constitute a new division of the eastern judicial district of Texas, and to provide for the holding of terms of court at Beaumont, Tex., and to provide for the appointment of a clerk of said court"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 5772) to provide for macadamizing Fort Crook military boulevard from Fort Crook, Nebr., to Omaha, Nebr., and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 5773) to adjust the rank and pay of certain officers of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BROMWELL: A bill (H. R. 5774) to provide for the payment of medical expenses of sick officers and enlisted men of the Army while absent from duty with leave or on furlough—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 5775) to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States," approved March 3, 1899—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 5776) in amendment of sections 2 and 3 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 5777) to create a permanent board for the opening of streets, and so forth—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BRICK: A bill (H. R. 5778) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Elkhart, in the State of Indiana—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BROMWELL: A bill (H. R. 5779) giving preference to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines in all appointments in the civil service of the United States—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. JETT: A bill (H. R. 5780) providing for the cutting of tie and bridge timber for the construction of railroads in the Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5781) to amend section 63 of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and in force from said 1st day of July, 1898—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 5782) continuing the life, powers, and functions of the Court of Private Land Claims—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 5783) to make an appropriation for the improvement of Cypress Bayou and the lakes between Shreveport, La., and Jefferson, Tex.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 5784) in reference to the civil service and appointments thereunder—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5785) to increase the limit of cost of public building at Cumberland, Md.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5786) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," and all acts amendatory thereto—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5787) for the extension of Fifth street NW., in Takoma Park, District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: A bill (H. R. 5788) to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of site and erection of a public building at Lawrence, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 5789) for the improvement and care of Confederate mound in Oak Woods Cemetery, Chicago, Ill., and making an appropriation therefor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 5790) for the equipment of buildings in navy-yards with automatic fire sprinklers and for other purposes—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PEARCE of Missouri (by request): A bill (H. R. 5791) to provide for the collection of judgments against municipal corporations—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 5792) for the appropriation of $200,000 for the building of a custom-house, public buildings, and so forth, in the cities of Phœnix, Prescott, and Tucson, Ariz., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5793) for the appropriation of $10,000 for the repair of the levee of the United States at Yuma, Ariz., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 5794) to prevent the pollution of water supplies—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COWHERD: A bill (H. R. 5795) for the purchase of a bronze portrait statue of George Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SPALDING: A bill (H. R. 5796) authorizing the renewal of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines who served during the war with Spain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARHAM: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 113) granting a life-saving medal to Frank J. Bagley, of Guerneville, Cal.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 114) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEEKS: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 115) fixing the status of the islands ceded to the United States by Spain—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 116) construing the act approved June 27, 1890, entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents"—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MINOR: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 117) authorizing

and directing the Secretary of War to make a preliminary examination and survey for deepening the Sturgeon Bay and Lake Michigan Ship Canal—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ACHESON: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 118) authorizing the enlargement and improvement of dams and locks 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 in the Monongahela River, Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 5797) granting a pension to Perry B. Wilson, Scottdale, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5798) granting a pension to James Jackson Purman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5799) to correct the military record of Henry Fitzgerald—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5800) to correct the military record of R. B. Secirst, of Connellsville, Fayette County, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 5801) granting a pension to Jane Hoake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 5802) granting a pension to Eliza D. Pennypacker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5803) for the relief of Malvina A. Maltby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5804) for the relief of Byron F. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5805) for the relief of Frances Riley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5806) for the relief of Frank W. Babcock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARHAM: A bill (H. R. 5807) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Thomas McMullen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 5808) granting a pension to Lucy Pratt Estabrook—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5809) granting a pension to Allen Buckner, of Baldwin, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5810) granting a pension to Joseph L. Farris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5811) granting a pension to Charles E. Jones, of Paola, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5812) granting a pension to Lucinda B. Hull, widow of James E. Darrow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5813) granting an increase of pension to William Taylor, of Mound City, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5814) granting an increase of pension to James K. Proudfit, of Kansas City, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 5815) granting a pension to Warren F. McChesney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRENNER: A bill (H. R. 5816) for the relief of Sylvester Haus, late of Company E, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Ohio Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5817) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Richard H. Sterling, late of Company A, Thirty-second Pennsylvania Colored Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5818) to correct muster of Albert Kellar—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BREWER: A bill (H. R. 5819) granting a pension to Amanda J. Stewart—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5820) granting a pension to Sarah E. Hawkins—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 5821) for the relief of James W. B. Turk, of Poteau, Ind. T.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5822) granting a pension to Henry Hubbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOREING: A bill (H. R. 5823) granting a pension to Amanda Lucas—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5824) for the relief of W. B. Estes, of Rockholds, Whitley County, Ky.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5825) for the relief of Mrs. Martha Noe, née Blanton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5826) granting pension to certain battalions of Kentucky State militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARMACK: A bill (H. R. 5827) for the relief of the estate of Mark M. Harwell, deceased, late of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5828) for the relief of Andrew J. Ballard, of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5829) for the relief of the legal representatives of Marcus Holbrook, deceased, of Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5830) for the relief of Eliza A. Swift, of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5831) for the relief of J. W. Simmons, of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5832) for the relief of estate of George W. Reeves, deceased, late of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5833) for the relief of the estate of Julius Walker, deceased, of Memphis, Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5834) for the relief of Leger Restle—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5835) for relief of estate of Stativa Moore—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5836) for the relief of William H. Noland, of Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5837) for the relief of Joseph A. Hill, of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5838) for the relief of Abner D. Lewis, of Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5839) for relief of Martha A. Booth, administratrix—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5840) for the relief of Mrs. W. A. Scott, of Hardeman County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5841) for the relief of Thomas C. Jones—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLAYTON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 5842) granting a pension to W. W. Jewett—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5843) for the relief of A. J. Smith, of Bullock County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5844) granting a pension to Nancy Caroline Pickard—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5845) granting a pension to Georgia Ann Vaughan—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5846) granting a pension to James D. Whitaker—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5847) for the relief of R. R. Barrow, of Geneva County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5848) for the relief of the heirs at law of William F. Martin, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5849) to refer the claim against the United States of Elizabeth Haden to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5850) granting a pension to Dicey Woodall, widow of William W. Woodall—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5851) granting a pension to Malcolm A. Chisholm—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5852) granting a pension to Lavinia H. Gachet—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5853) granting a pension to Mary Black, widow of Samuel C. Black—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5854) granting a pension to A. A. Pinkston—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5855) granting a pension to David Blackshear—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 5856) to increase the pension of Morris M. Comstock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5857) for the relief of Crosby J. Ryan—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5858) for the relief of Philip Weitz—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: A bill (H. R. 5859) for the relief of A. G. Brenton, late member of the Second Battery, Iowa Light Artillery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEARMOND: A bill (H. R. 5860) for the relief of Isaac McConnaughay, private, Company H, Fortieth Iowa Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS: A bill (H. R. 5861) for the relief of Adam Eichelberger—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 5862) to pension Sarah Horton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5863) to remove charge of desertion from record of Edward Brady—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5864) to remove charge of desertion from record of John S. Wood—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5865) to remove the charge of desertion against George Willis Abbey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 5866) to authorize the President to appoint John L. Davis a second lieutenant on the permanent waiting order list of the Revenue-Cutter Service of the

United States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 5867) for the relief of Silas Darling—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EDDY (by request): A bill (H. R. 5868) for the relief of Marie J. Blaisdell—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 5869) granting a pension to George S. Hubbard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILBERT: A bill (H. R. 5870) for the relief of the Madison Female Institute, at Richmond, Ky.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GASTON: A bill (H. R. 5871) to grant a pension to Mrs. Katharina Schwartz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5872) for the relief of the Pittsburg, Shenango and Lake Erie Railroad Company—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 5873) for the relief of Marcus L. Pelham—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 5874) to pay H. P. Dyer for carrying mail—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 5875) for the relief of Mrs. Willie Belger Morse—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 5876) for the relief of V. R. Hughner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5877) for the relief of W. F. Johnston—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOY (by request): A bill (H. R. 5878) for the relief of Herman H. Horstkotte and others—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KLUTTZ: A bill (H. R. 5879) for the relief of Jennie A. Kerr—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5880) granting a pension to Jennie A. Kerr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5881) for the relief of A. E. Conrad, executor of John J. Conrad, of Yadkin County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 5882) granting an increase of pension to John Fairchild—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5883) granting a pension to Gertrude M. Kerr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5884) granting a pension to John McGuire—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5885) granting a pension to Henry B. Magill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 5886) granting a pension to William H. Lane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 5887) to increase the pension of A. W. Huffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 5888) for the relief of Samuel Slack—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5889) granting a pension to Elizabeth Neal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5890) for the relief of James Wilson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5891) granting an increase of pension to Owen T. Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5892) directing the issue of a duplicate of a lost check drawn by W. H. Comegys, major and paymaster, United States Army, in favor of George P. White, lieutenant, Ninth Cavalry—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 5893) to increase the pension of Lizzie M. Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5894) to increase the pension of Nathaniel Townsend—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5895) granting a pension to Sarah E. Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5896) to increase the pension of Amanda Miner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANE: A bill (H. R. 5897) granting a pension to Paul Kempter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5898) granting an increase of pension to George F. White—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 5899) granting a pension to Eleanor R. Sullivan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5900) to amend the military record of John H. Lamson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5901) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Franklin B. Hill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5902) granting an honorable discharge to James Woods—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5903) for the relief of Patrick J. Madden—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5904) for the relief of Mary Jane McLaughlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5905) granting a pension to Andrew L. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: A bill (H. R. 5906) for the relief of the estate of C. G. Raleigh, deceased, late of Phillips County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5907) for the relief of Mary E. Whitehead—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5908) for the relief of Anna F. Polk and the heirs or legal representatives of Allen J. Polk, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOODY of Oregon: A bill (H. R. 5909) for the relief of Mary Welch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARSH: A bill (H. R. 5910) granting an increase of pension to William Pointer—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 5911) for the relief of George T. Epperson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MADDOX: A bill (H. R. 5912) granting a pension to Annie E. Brumby—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MANN (by request): A bill (H. R. 5913) for the relief of Charles H. Cotton—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5914) granting a pension to Georgia R. Demarest—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5915) granting a pension to Mrs. Caroline Frances Spiegel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5916) to authorize the Secretary of War to remove the charge of desertion as to Francis A. E. Briot, late a private in Company G, Seventeenth Wisconsin Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5917) granting a pension to Absolam Grubb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5918) granting a pension to William Bowen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5919) to grant a pension to Isaac M. Lamb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5920) granting a pension to Adam J. Wall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5921) granting a pension to Henry Charles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5922) granting a pension to Thomas L. Kimbrell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5923) granting a pension to Samuel H. Draper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5924) granting an increase of pension to Hiram E. Crouch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5925) granting an increase of pension to Hiram P. Pauley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5926) granting an increase of pension to William P. Liford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5927) granting an increase of pension to Leander Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5928) granting an increase of pension to William H. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5929) granting an increase of pension to Barton Acuff—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5930) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Morgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5931) for the relief of Henry L. McCalla—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5932) to change the military record of William R. Davidson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5933) for the relief of Leven Sullivan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5934) for the relief of James L. East—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5935) to correct the military record of Jeremiah Wilkie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5936) to grant an honorable discharge to Henry King—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5937) to grant pension to Rachel Cameran Vasey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 5938) to increase the pension of Mary M. Strong, widow of the late Brig. Gen. Thomas J. Strong—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 5939) for the relief of Franklin Buchanan Sullivan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5940) to increase the pension of Lorenzo Thomas, late captain Battery H, First United States Artillery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5941) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John W. Porter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5942) for the relief of Andrew H. Rinehart—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5943) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Thomas Coughlin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5944) granting pension to Jeremiah Everly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5945) granting a pension to Richard Tasker,

late private, Company A, Second Potomac Home Brigade, Maryland Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5946) to remove certain disabilities in the case of Ezekiel Ayers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5947) to remove the sentence of a court-martial from the record of Lieut. Theodore A. Ogle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5948) granting a pension to Isaac D. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5949) granting a pension to Frederick Weber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5950) to appropriate $740 for the relief of N. F. Edmonds, assignee of Henry Shaw, of Washington County, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5951) for the relief of George E. W. Sharretts—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5952) for the relief of Charles K. Remsberg—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5953) for the relief of Polly Jackson, of Frederick County, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5954) to reimburse and indemnify the town of Frederick, in the State of Maryland—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5955) granting a pension to Hilleary F. Willison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5956) for the relief of Thomas P. Morgan, of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 5957) for the relief of the vestry of St. Mark's Episcopal Church, Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUPPERT: A bill (H. R. 5958) to increase the pension of John D. Terry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5959) to correct the military record of William H. Lake—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5960) for the relief of the 198 survivors of the Twentieth New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5961) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to reissue the pension certificate of Charles A. Hausmann, and increase the rate of his pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 5962) granting an honorable discharge to Aaron B. Galloway—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5963) granting a pension to Sarah Meeker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5964) granting an increase of pension to Buel C. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5965) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Searles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5966) granting a pension to Ezra C. Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5967) granting an increase of pension to Jerome Sherwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 5968) granting a pension to Margaret Maria Hedge—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBB: A bill (H. R. 5969) for the relief of the devisees and legal representatives of D. L. Huskey, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 5970) for the relief of Phebe S. Riley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5971) for the relief of Joseph Crockford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5972) for the relief of Samuel H. Salyards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5973) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen B. Fesler—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5974) granting an increase of pension to Michael Lochard, of Osborne, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5975) for the relief of Eli Fox, George C. Fox, and Thomas Levick—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5976) for the relief of Simeon Motz, Nathaniel Robbins, and William J. Sloan—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5977) for the relief of William A. Grogan—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5978) for the relief of Amos Van Nausdle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5979) granting an increase of pension to Franklin W. Emery—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RIDGELY: A bill (H. R. 5980) granting pension to Daniel Bellman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5981) granting a pension to Samuel W. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 5982) for the relief of John A. Sigur, of Acadia Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5983) for the relief of W. O. Rodney, of Pointe Coupee Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5984) for the relief of estate of E. J. Penny, deceased, late of Baton Rouge, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5985) for the relief of the estate of John Shelton, deceased, late of East Feliciana Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5986) for the relief of the estate of Margaret E. Woodward, deceased, late of East Feliciana Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5987) for the relief of the estate of Charles Lemelle, deceased, late of St. Landry Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5988) for the relief of the estate of John Shelton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5989) for the relief of the estate of Hilliare Paillett—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5990) for relief of the estate of Ludger Lemelle, deceased, late of St. Landry Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5991) for the relief of Alexis Leduff—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5992) for the relief of Belote Auguste Donato—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5993) for the relief of Lucian Males and Denophon Tureaud, administrators estate of Emile Fagot—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5994) for the relief of Virginia McGloughlin, of Pointe Coupee Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5995) for the relief of Victor Lastrapes, of St. Landry Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5996) for the relief of Leon Lemelle, of St. Landry Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5997) for the relief of George W. Munday, administrator—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5998) for the relief of Louis Barron, of East Baton Rouge Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5999) for the relief of Cornelius Donato, administrator of Joseph Gradengo, deceased, late of St. Landry Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6000) for the relief of John A. Sigur, of Acadia Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6001) for the relief of Jean Marie Tatin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6002) for the relief of Leonora J. Kennedy—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6003) for the relief of B. R. Keaton, of Washington Parish, La., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6004) for the relief of heirs of Davis Lannoux—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6005) for the relief of John A. Porche, of Pointe Coupee Parish, La., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6006) for the relief of the estate of Turner Merritt, late of the parish of East Baton Rouge, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6007) for the relief of Anna Decoux, of Pointe Coupee Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6008) for the relief of estate of Pierre Lement—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6009) for relief of Lucien Meuillon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6010) for the relief of Sarah J. Vallean—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6011) for the relief of Polina Vignes—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6012) for the relief of Joseph Collins, of St. Landry Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6013) for the relief of the estate of Rebecca V. Packer—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6014) for the relief of George Neck, sr., of Avoyelles Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6015) for the relief of Jean Baptiste Rabot—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6016) for the relief of Florimand Izard—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6017) to correct military record of Eugene Sovine—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 6018) for relief of Hiram C. Childress, a Mexican war veteran—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 6019) granting a pension to Mrs. Therese W. Hard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 6020) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Walker McQueary—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 6021) for the relief of Charles H. Dunning—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6022) to correct the military record of Daniel Curtain, deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 6023) to pension Delia R. Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6024) to pension Mary E. McCarty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 6025) granting a pension to Maria L. Place—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6026) granting a pension to Mary J. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6027) repealing an act of Congress granting a pension to Magdalena Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHATTUC: A bill (H. R. 6028) for the relief of John H. Meeker, late first-class pilot, United States Navy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6029) granting an honorable certificate of discharge to Philip Ruths, alias Philip Kautz, deceased, late private in Company G, One hundred and sixty-fifth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6030) for the relief of Eliza S. Beard, widow of William Beard, late of Camp Dennison, Hamilton County, Ohio—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama (for Mr. WHEELER of Alabama): A bill (H. R. 6031) granting additional pension to James W. Carmody—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOMPKINS: A bill (H. R. 6032) for the relief of David V. Howell—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6033) for the relief of James Bigler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6034) to authorize the payment to retired enlisted men of the United States Army for an allowance for quarters and fuel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6035) for the relief of James J. Cox—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6036) to remove from the military record of Charles L. Robinson the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6037) to relieve George W. Powers of the charge of dishonorable conduct—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa (by request): A bill (H. R. 6038) for the relief of Joseph H. Penny, John W. Penny, Thomas Penny, and Harvey Penny, surviving partners of Penny & Sons—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 6039) granting pension to Thomas J. Shindelbower—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6040) for the relief of M. H. Carr—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6041) for the relief of James Parker—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: A bill (H. R. 6042) to pension Ella S. Mannix—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZIEGLER: A bill (H. R. 6043) to increase the pension of John C. Shenermen, Company C, Ninth Regiment, and Company A, Eleventh Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6044) to increase the pension of Charles C. Bunty, of Company C, Two hundred and second Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6045) to grant a pension to Rosanna Wavell, widow of Henry Wavell, of Company M, Third Regiment United States Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6046) to grant a pension to Margaret E. Miller, daughter of Catharine E. Miller, the mother of Charles B. Miller, musician, Third United States Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 6047) for the relief of William G. Mayer—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of the Union Veteran Legion, Connellsville, Pa., for the passage of the per diem pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois: Petition of post-office clerks in the Sixth Congressional district of Illinois, asking that the pay of post-office clerks be readjusted—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of druggists in the city of Chicago, Ill., to repeal the stamp tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Chicago Bar Association, asking for the consolidation of the United States circuit and district courts and increasing the salaries of Federal judges and clerks—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROMWELL: Resolutions of the First and Second Kentucky Regimental Association, in regard to per diem service pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of post-office clerks of Chester, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CONNELL: Petition of clerks in the post-office at Scranton, Pa., asking for the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the classification of clerks in the first and second class post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CROWLEY: Paper to accompany House bill No. 3761, to correct the military record of John H. Neidigh—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STANLEY W. DAVENPORT: Petition of clerks in the post-offices at Wilkesbarre and Pittston, Pa., asking for the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Petitions of the Minnesota State Pharmaceutical Association, druggists of Minneapolis, and the Kondon Manufacturing Company, asking for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAMBLE: Petition of post-office clerks at Deadwood, S. Dak., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Resolutions of the Southern Cotton Spinners' Association, of Charlotte, N. C., favoring the preservation of our treaty rights with the Chinese Empire, the vigorous prosecution of the Philippine war, the construction of an isthmian ship canal, the establishment of a cable from the Pacific coast to Hawaii, Japan, China, the Philippines, and other oriental points, and other measures—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GROUT: Petition of Henry, Johnson & Lord, of Burlington, Vt., asking for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to George S. Hubbard, of Montpelier, Vt.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Dr. G. W. Ward, of St. Johnsbury, Vt., favoring the establishment of a veterinary corps in the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAY: Petition of druggists of New Market, Va., to modify the existing internal-revenue law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL: Papers to accompany House bill to correct the military record of Marcus L. Pelham—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOPKINS: Petition of post-office clerks at Aurora, Ill., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the reclassification of postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. JOY: Paper to accompany House bill relating to the claim of Herman H. Horstkotte—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, resolutions of the Sixth Regiment, U. S. Grant Command, Union Veteran Union, Department of Missouri, in opposition to House bill No. 3988, relating to appointments in the Weather Bureau—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. KITCHIN: Petition of fourth-class postmasters in Stokes County, N. C., urging the passage of House bill No. 4931, for increase of compensation, etc.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LACEY: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Amanda Miner, widow of Henry A. Miner, of Company B, Twelfth Ohio Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANE: Petition of post-office clerks of Iowa City, Iowa, for the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Petitions of Henry A. McDonald, J. P. Putman, and others, in the State of Maine, in favor of the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petitions of E. P. Spofford, E. R. Conners, S. B. Thurlow, C. H. Scott, W. O. Emery, A. I. Brown, W. E. Closson, J. & E. A. Wyman, J. A. Ward, W. F. Cummings, D. J. Sawyer, Welsh Brothers, Robert Corbett, Frank McGuire, George Gardner, J. M. Spear & Son, and numerous others, in the State of Maine, for the establishment of a fish hatchery in Maine—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McCALL: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Andrew L. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Petition of Thomas J. Keenan and Caswell A. Mayo, of New York City, relating to the stamp tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARSH: Petition of K. S. Holt and Charles H. Holt, of Quincy, Ill., relating to the stamp tax on medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of post-office clerks of Monmouth, Ill., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MERCER: Petition of members of the Nebraska Improved Live Stock Breeders' Association, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 34, known as the anti-vivisection bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of druggists, urging the repeal of the internal-revenue tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Papers to accompany House bill relating to the claim of Henry L. McCalla—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill to correct the military record of Jeremiah Wilkie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill granting William P. Liford a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Thomas Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Hiram P. Pauley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of William Bowen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Benjamin F. Morgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Henry Charles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Adam J. Wall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Thomas J. Kimbrel—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Barton Acuff—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Leander Woods—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Hiram E. Crouch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Absalom Grubb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers in support of House bill to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James L. East—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill correcting the record of William R. Davidson, or Harmon Davidson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the restoration of Henry King to the muster rolls—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the removal of the charge of desertion against Leven Sullivan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers of John S. Dukate, to accompany House bill No. 3214, for his relief—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers in support of House bill No. 2786, for the relief of William Burch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 4263, for the relief of Cook Burke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 4674, for the relief of William Connell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers in support of House bill No. 3217, for the relief of John W. Burton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers in support of House bill No. 4436, for the relief of Martin V. B. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill No. 4079, for the relief of Mahala Alexander—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill No. 4083, for the relief of Nute Clemut—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 4981, for the relief of Barton P. Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 4096, granting a pension to Milton Roseberry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 4092, granting a pension to Margaret J. Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 4090, granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 4087, to correct the record of Cornelius Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 4085, for the relief of Edward Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 4982, for the relief of A. Braham Hawkins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 2781, to remove the charge of desertion against John Bass—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Frank B. Gillespie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: Petition of the heirs of Jesse Morrison, deceased, late of Washington County, Md., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Jeremiah Kanode, of Frederick County, Md., asking reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the heirs of John Mentzer, of Frederick County, Md., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the heirs of William S. Elgin, deceased, late of Washington County, Md., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Elizabeth Morris, of Washington County, Md., asking reference of her war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Lorenzo Thomas, to accompany House bill for his relief—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Franklin Buchanan Sullivan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill relating to the claim of Thomas P. Morgan, jr.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RIXEY: Affidavit to accompany bill for the relief of St. Mark's Episcopal Church, Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Miss Lucy Bowen, of Fauquier County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 1092, to set apart a portion of the Arlington estate for experimental agricultural purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Petition of J. J. Pike & Co., of Chelsea, Mass., relating to the stamp tax on medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of post-office clerks of Revere Station, Boston, Mass., for the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the classification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Eugene Sorine—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Petition of railway postal clerks of the Third Congressional district of Connecticut, urging the passage of the bill relative to the railway mail service and the clerks therein—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SHATTUC: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of John H. Meeker, late pilot, United States Navy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Eliza S. Beard, widow of William Beard, late of Hamilton County, Ohio—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany House bill to correct the military record of Philip Ruths, alias Philip Kautz, deceased, late private in Company M, One hundred and sixty-fifth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 3950, for the relief of Eliza C. Armin, widow of Frank Armin—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of W. G. Mayer—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Testimony in support of bill to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Miles F. Durkee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 2430, for the removal of the charge of desertion from the military record of Jacob L. Hanger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper in support of House bill No. 4118, allowing an increase of pension to Enos H. Kirk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPRAGUE: Resolutions of the Massachusetts Dental Society, asking for dental surgeons in the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of clerks in the post-office of Jamaica Plain, Mass., for the classification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Petition of Dr. J. H. Burton and other dentists of the Third Congressional district of North Carolina, for dental surgeons in the Army and Navy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Petitions, etc., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a

Representative from Utah were laid on the Clerk's desk, and severally referred to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case, as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of Rev. C. Edgar Parker and other citizens of Millsboro, Pa.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania: Petition of D. Harbison and others of Catasauqua, Pa.; Central Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Allentown, Pa.; Young Men's Christian Association, James Robinson, and others, of Reading, Pa.

By Mr. MERCER: Petition of voters of the Second Congressional district of Nebraska.

By Mr. MESICK: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Carson City, Mich.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Petition of W. G. Law and others, of the State of Indiana.

By Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts: Petitions of Charlton B. Bolles, of Rockport, Mass.; C. Julian Tuthill, of Georgetown, Mass., and others.

By Mr. PEARRE: Petition of Thomas A. Johnston, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Hagerstown, Md.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Petition of Presbyterian Church of Hansen, Nebr.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *January 11, 1900.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. CULLOM, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand approved, without objection.

ADMIRAL DEWEY'S REPORT.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 8th instant, a copy of a letter from Admiral Dewey, dated March 31, 1898, relative to the reducing of the defenses of Manila; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED INTERCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of a letter addressed to the President of the United States by Mr. W. P. Sloan, of Cincinnati, Ohio, suggesting that commerce between the United States and South America be promoted without entering upon the construction of the proposed intercontinental railway; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Railroads, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of the State Grange of Illinois, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of the State Grange of Illinois, praying for the Government ownership of railways; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the State Grange of Illinois, remonstrating against the adulteration of food products; which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented a petition of the State Grange of Illinois, praying for the enlargement of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the State Grange of Illinois, praying for the establishment of postal savings banks throughout the country; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the State Grange of Illinois, remonstrating against the retirement of the greenback and against the enactment of legislation obstructing its continued circulation; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the State Grange of Illinois, praying for the establishment of a parcels-post system throughout the country; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the State Grange of Illinois, praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of a ship canal connecting the Mississippi River, the Great Lakes, and the seaboard of the Atlantic Ocean; which was referred to the Committee on the Improvement of the Mississippi River and its Tributaries.

He also presented a memorial of the State Grange of Illinois, remonstrating against the free disposition of seed by the Agricultural Department; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the State Grange of Illinois, praying for the extension of the free rural mail delivery system to the farmers of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the State Grange of Illinois, praying for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal; which was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

He also presented a memorial of the State Grange of Illinois, remonstrating against combinations or corporations known as "trusts;" which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NELSON presented the petition of Maj. John W. Blake, of Dalton, Ga., praying that he be granted an increase of pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PRITCHARD presented the petition of T. H. Tate and 4 other citizens of Greensboro, N. C., and the petition of J. Fisher Corell and 6 other citizens of Charlotte, N. C., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. MCBRIDE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Montavilla, Oreg., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of 67 citizens of Jackson, Mo., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CLAY. I present a resolution adopted by the general assembly of the State of Georgia, favoring the enactment of legislation to enable C. P. Goodyear to continue his work upon the outer bar of Brunswick, Ga., by the use of dynamite and auxiliary methods. The resolution was unanimously adopted by the legislature of my State, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

A RESOLUTION.

Whereas the general assembly of the State of Georgia of 1893 by joint resolution urged that the Senators and Representatives from Georgia in the Congress of the United States be requested to urge upon Congress the passage of legislation which would enable C. P. Goodyear to continue his work upon the outer bar of Brunswick, Ga., by the use of dynamite and auxiliary methods; and

Whereas such legislation was procured from Congress and C. P. Goodyear has patriotically continued this great public work at great sacrifice to himself and has procured a channel through the ocean bar of Brunswick, Ga., over 25 feet in depth and over 150 feet in width, and 24 feet in depth over 250 feet in width at the narrowest point in said channel to the ocean, as contrasted with 18 feet at the period when he commenced work upon the said bar, a gain in depth of 7 feet and over in a new and independent channel to the sea, far less difficult of navigation than the old channel, and through which the largest vessels now constructed can pass with ease, such channel width being in excess of the contract of C. P. Goodyear with the Government, of both the 24 and 25 foot depth, of 50 feet in the narrowest point of said channel; and

Whereas the results have fully justified the general assembly of 1893 in its action, and it is understood that after entire payment of the contract price with the Government to C. P. Goodyear he will be largely indebted on account of said enterprise, and is willing to procure a channel of 26 feet in depth across said bar, and that he can maintain said depths at a reasonable compensation per year for a period of ten years or longer; and

Whereas the statistics of the port of Brunswick, compiled by its board of trade, show that, due to this great work, the business of the port of Brunswick has increased 400 per cent in the past five years, the largest increase in any port in the United States, to the great benefit of Georgia and the entire country:

Resolved by the house of representatives of the State of Georgia (the senate concurring), That the Senators and Representatives from Georgia in the Congress of the United States be requested to urge the passage of such legislation, the appropriation under Mr. Goodyear's methods being, with the exception of a compensation for an excess of widths described, purely conditional upon such procurance and maintenance and at less cost than such work has ever been done in the history of harbor deepening in this and other countries.

JOHN D. LITTLE,
Speaker House of Representatives.
JOHN T. BOIFEUILLET,
Clerk House of Representatives.
WILLIAM A. DODSON,
President of Senate.
CHARLES S. NORTHEN,
Secretary of Senate.

Approved 19th December, 1899.

A. D. CANDLER, *Governor.*

STATE OF GEORGIA, OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Philip Cook, secretary of state of the State of Georgia, do hereby certify that the foregoing three pages of written matter contain a true and correct copy of "A resolution memorializing Congress relative to harbor improvements at Brunswick, Ga.," approved December 19, 1899, and now of file and of record in this department.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of my office, at the capitol, in the city of Atlanta, this 27th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1899, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and twenty-fourth.

[SEAL.]

PHILIP COOK,
Secretary of State.

Mr. SEWELL presented a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Ancient Order of Hibernians of Middlesex County, N. J., extending sympathy to the Boers; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation granting to the Commercial Cable Company permission to lay a new submarine cable to Cuba; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petitions of the Agricultural and Horticultural Society of Lancaster County, the Farmers' Institute of New Holland, the Farmers' Institute of Quarryville, of sundry citizens of Wrightsville, and of sundry citizens of Gat, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to encourage American shipping; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of the Emmet Club, of Gardner, Mass., praying that Congress extend its sympathy to the South African republics in the present war with Great Britain; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petition of George L. Stevens and sundry other citizens of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Omega Chemical Company, of Boston, Mass., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DEPEW presented the petitions of J. G. Lindley and 17 other citizens of Newburg, Charles A. Merrill and 19 other citizens of Hermitage, Rev. Henry T. Scholl and 18 other citizens of Junius, Merton A. Smith and 18 other citizens of Nineveh, Stephen Bradly and 27 other citizens of Dobbs Ferry, Alfred E. Donnelly and 12 other citizens of Rochester, Rev. J. B. Moore and 14 other citizens of Meredith, Joseph Hawk and 5 other citizens of East Hampton, Rev. Carl Councilman and 13 other citizens of Tioga Center, Rev. J. Graff and 38 other citizens of Scarsdale, William Leslie Boss and 64 other citizens of Brooklyn, G. C. Dana and 19 other citizens of East Worcester, L. G. Burton and 16 other citizens of Greenwood, Ira C. A. Baird and 61 other citizens of West Oneonta, Rev. W. H. Way and 16 other citizens of Rensselaer Falls, W. L. Woolworth and 58 other citizens of Jamesport, and of Mrs. R. A. Dorman, of New York City, president of the International Board of the Woman's and Young Woman's Christian Associations, all in the State of New York, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. VEST presented a petition of the congregation of the Memorial Tabernacle Church, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting the reproduction of prize fights in the District of Columbia and the Territories and the interstate transmission of the same; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Memorial Tabernacle Church, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to limit absolute divorce in the District of Columbia and the Territories; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Memorial Tabernacle Church, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Soldiers' Homes, immigrant stations, and all other Government buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Memorial Tabernacle Church, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the suppression of gambling in the District of Columbia and the Territories, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Memorial Tabernacle Church, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the congregation of the Memorial Tabernacle Church, of St. Louis, Mo., remonstrating against the desecration of Sunday in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Memorial Tabernacle Church, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting the transmission by mail or interstate commerce of pictures or descriptions of prize fights; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Memorial Tabernacle Church, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation raising the age of consent for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia and the Territories; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Memorial Tabernacle Church, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation excluding illiterate immigrants; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Memorial Tabernacle Church, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation providing that cigarettes imported in original packages, on entering any State, shall become subject to its laws; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. PROCTOR presented the petition of F. C. Spooner and sundry other citizens of Brandon, Vt., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SPOONER presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Janesville, Wis., and a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Stevens Point, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of Dr. G. E. Swan, of Beaver Dam, Wis., and the petition of C. W. Aust and Charles H. Slocum, druggists, of Superior, Wis., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CARTER presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Butte, Mont., and a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Anaconda, Mont., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. ALLEN (for Mr. THURSTON) presented a petition of sundry citizens of Lincoln, Nebr., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ALLEN presented a memorial of the Live Stock Institute of South Omaha, Nebr., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation discontinuing the manufacture and sale of butterine, oleomargarine, and kindred products in the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the employees of the New York Navy-Yard, Brooklyn, N. Y., praying that the proposed 12 gunboats and 6 cruisers be constructed in the several naval yards of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. MORGAN presented a petition of sundry druggists of Birmingham, Ala., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FRYE presented a memorial of the Citizens' Association of Congress Heights, D. C., remonstrating against the purchase of Wilson Park as an addition to the grounds of the Government Insane Asylum; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented an unsigned petition, praying that the southern portion of the reclaimed Potomac Flats in the District of Columbia be named the Great Columbia Park; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. McBRIDE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1933) to provide an American register for the steam whaler *Bowhead*, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PENROSE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1746) to provide for the inspection of the boilers of the *Alvena* and *Ailsa*, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PENROSE. I am also directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 191) to provide for the inspection of the boilers of the *Alvena* and *Ailsa*, to report it adversely. This bill was improperly drawn. I move that it be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HANNA, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 732) relating to lights on steam pilot vessels, reported it with amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 442) for the relief of M. E. Saville, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2281) for the relief of Charles Stierlin, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the

bill (S. 195) for the relief of Louis Miller, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 188) for the relief of the estate of Charles M. Roberts, deceased, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1894) for the relief of the Union Iron Works, of San Francisco, Cal., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BERRY, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 734) relating to Cuban vessels, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 737) for the establishment of a light and fog signal on Duck Island, Maine, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. HARRIS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 395) to authorize the President to revoke the order dismissing William T. Godwin, late first lieutenant, Tenth Infantry, United States Army, and to place the said William T. Godwin on the retired list with the rank of first lieutenant, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PETTUS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 792) for the relief of William H. Hugo, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2114) to constitute Manchester, Conn., a port of delivery, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 728) to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 39) granting an increase of pension to Caroline V. English, widow of Lieut. Col. Thomas C. English, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER. The bill (S. 1285) for the relief of Susan S. Rayner, the bill (S. 1322) for the relief of Henry Brandt, and the bill (S. 1923) for the relief of Henry Lane have respectively been referred to the Committee on Pensions. I am directed by that committee to report the bills back and to ask that the committee be discharged from their further consideration and that they be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, where they properly belong.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be so ordered.

Mr. DEPEW, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2177) to extend the privileges of section 4216 of the Revised Statutes to the yacht *Andria*, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 281) to restore Benjamin W. Loring to the Revenue-Cutter Service, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CLAY, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 731) to amend section 4290 of the Revised Statutes, relating to log entry of collisions, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SHOUP, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 255) to ratify an agreement with the Indians of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, in Idaho, and making appropriations to carry the same into effect, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1938) to place Henry Biederbick, Julius R. Frederick, Francis Long, and Maurice Connell on the retired list of enlisted men of the Army, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 328) for the relief of Richard King, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I am directed by the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 17) to provide free homes on the public lands for actual and bona fide settlers, and reserve the public lands for that purpose, to report it without amendment, and submit a report thereon.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I desire to state that, as a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs, I do not concur in that report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1800) providing for the retirement of John Briercliff Brown, light-house keeper at Point Bonito, and providing for the payment to him of $40 per month, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was indefinitely postponed.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2284) extending the time for the completion of a wagon and motor bridge across the Missouri River at St. Charles, Mo., as provided by an act approved June 3, 1896, reported it without amendment.

Mr. CARTER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 704) for the relief of the county of Custer, State of Montana, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. VEST introduced a bill (S. 2314) to amend the act entitled "An act granting pensions to the soldiers and sailors of the Mexican war, and for other purposes," approved January 29, 1887; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 2315) to correct the military record of Eugene Budson, alias Dann; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2316) to correct the military record of Engleberth Benzinger; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2317) granting a pension to Sarah J. Stewart;

A bill (S. 2318) granting an increase of pension to Robert B. Paul; and

A bill (S. 2319) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Bunty (with accompanying papers).

Mr. STEWART introduced a bill (S. 2320) to set apart certain lands in the States of California and Nevada as a public park and forest reservation, to be known as the Lake Tahoe National Park, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. PRITCHARD introduced a bill (S. 2321) for the construction of a driveway and approaches to the national cemetery at Salisbury, N. C.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2322) for relief of John W. Gray; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ELKINS introduced a bill (S. 2323) for the relief of W. D. Catlett; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2324) for the relief of James M. Clouston; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2325) for the relief of G. A. Davis, administrator of Mrs. Martha N. Davis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2326) granting a pension to George W. Johnson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2327) granting a pension to William H. Shivers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2328) granting a pension to David S. Fox; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 2329) to provide for eliminating certain grade crossings of railroads in the District of Columbia; to require and authorize the construction of new terminals and tracks for the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company in the city of Washington, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 2330) to authorize the President of the United States to invite the International Congress of Navigation to hold its ninth session in Washington, D. C.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 2331) creating a preserve for the American bison, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2332) granting an increase of pension to Margaret H. Kent; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a bill (S. 2333) granting an increase of pension to James Osborn; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 2334) to authorize Hon. Arthur S. Hardy, at present envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Greece, Roumania, and Servia,

to accept the decoration tendered to him by the Shah of Persia while he was minister of the United States to that country; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 2335) granting an increase of pension to Maj. John W. Blake; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 2336) repealing section 4716 of the Revised Statutes so far as the same may be applicable to the claims of dependent parents of soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the Army or Navy of the United States during the war with Spain; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ALLEN. In behalf of my colleague [Mr. THURSTON], who is necessarily detained from the Senate, I desire to introduce two bills:

The bill (S. 2337) granting a pension to Emily M. Gillespie was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (S. 2338) to authorize a trial of the outlet system of lowering the flood line and improving the low-water navigation of the Mississippi River and its tributaries on the plan of "No cure, no pay," was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 2339) to prevent the overcapitalization of corporations, companies, and associations of persons doing an interstate carrying trade, and requiring the taking out of a license therefor in certain cases, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2340) to authorize the creditors of insolvent national banks to elect a permanent receiver, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Select Committee on National Banks.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2341) directing the Secretary of the Interior to make surveys for and determine and report on the cost of erecting reservoirs on certain rivers in the United States and their tributaries, and making appropriation therefor, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2342) to establish the official survey of fractional townships 31 and 32 north, of ranges 6, 7, and 8 west of the sixth principal meridian, in the State of Nebraska, north and west of the Niobrara River, and quieting the title of settlers thereon, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2343) for the relief of the homestead settlers on that portion of the Great Sioux Reservation lying and being in the State of Nebraska, formerly in the Territory of Dakota (now State of South Dakota), and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2344) granting a pension to Alice V. Cook;

A bill (S. 2345) to restore the pensions of widows in certain cases;

A bill (S. 2346) granting a pension to Alfred Bigelow;

A bill (S. 2347) granting an increase of pension to Stephen D. Avery;

A bill (S. 2348) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Swallow;

A bill (S. 2349) granting the right to personally inspect and have attested copies of all evidence and reports filed or used in proceedings to obtain a pension, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 2350) to secure the rights of pensioners, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 2351) granting a pension to Joseph W. Skelton.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 2352) to authorize the judges of the district courts of the United States to appoint stenographic reporters, fix the duties and compensation thereof, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2353) granting to the incorporated town of Valentine, in the county of Cherry and State of Nebraska, certain lands, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 2354) authorizing railroad lines in Indian Territory to lease or consolidate continuous lines under certain circumstances; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 2356) extending the powers and functions of the Court of Private Land Claims to June 30, 1902; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2357) granting an increase of pension to Seymour F. Burlingame; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 2358) to amend sections 2731 and 2732 of the Revised Statutes so as to increase the salary of the assistant appraisers at San Francisco, Cal., from $2,500 a year to $3,000 a year; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2359) for the erection of a statue of Commodore John D. Sloat in the city of Monterey, Cal.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 2360) for the relief of Daniel Martin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2361) to remove the charge of desertion from Thomas Colahan; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 2362) to amend certain sections of Title LII of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the inspection of vessels; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MONEY introduced a bill (S. 2363) for the relief of James W. Person and Isabella M. Person; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BERRY introduced a bill (S. 2364) for the relief of Anna F. Polk and the heirs or legal representatives of Allen J. Polk, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 2365) for the relief of the estate of John T. Callahan, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BUTLER introduced a bill (S. 2366) to authorize the establishment, at some point on Beaufort Harbor, North Carolina, of a station for the investigation of problems connected with marine fishery interests of the middle and south Atlantic coast; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 2367) granting a pension to Susan Stratton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2368) granting a pension to May A. Randall; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. SPOONER introduced a bill (S. 2355) in relation to the suppression of insurrection in, and to the government of, the Philippine Islands, ceded by Spain to the United States by the treaty concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898; which was read the first time by its title.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask that the bill be read at length and ordered to lie on the table.

The bill was read the second time at length and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

A bill in relation to the suppression of insurrection in, and to the government of, the Philippine Islands, ceded by Spain to the United States by the treaty concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That when all insurrection against the sovereignty and authority of the United States in the Philippine Islands, acquired from Spain by the treaty concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898, shall have been completely suppressed by the military and naval forces of the United States, all military, civil, and judicial powers necessary to govern the said islands shall, until otherwise provided by Congress, be vested in such person and persons and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of said islands in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. SEWELL, it was

Ordered, That the papers accompanying Senate bill 5360, Fifty-fifth Congress, third session, to correct the military record of Thomas W. Buttle, private, Company C, Eighth Regiment New Jersey Volunteers, be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

MAHON HARBOR (DELAWARE) IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. KENNEY submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause a survey and estimate to be made for the dredging, improving, and protection of Mahon Harbor, Delaware.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF PENSIONS.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following concurrent resolution; which, with the accompanying letter from the Commissioner of Pensions, was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 10,000 additional copies of the last annual report of the Commissioner of Pensions for the use of the Bureau of Pensions.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT GREENE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, transmitted to the Senate the resolutions of the House as a tribute to the memory of Hon. WILLIAM L. GREENE, late a member of the House of Representatives from the State of Nebraska.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask that the resolutions just received from the House be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following resolutions from the House of Representatives; which were read:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. WILLIAM L. GREENE, late a Representative from the State of Nebraska.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the House be now suspended to enable his associates to pay proper tribute of regard to his high character and distinguished public services.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Resolved, That as an additional mark of respect the House, at the conclusion of these ceremonies, do adjourn.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I trust that the resolutions will take the ordinary course, and I shall call them up at some future time for the purpose of affording Senators an opportunity to deliver addresses upon the life and services of Mr. GREENE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will lie on the table for the present.

HUGO O. LOEWI.

Mr. DAVIS. I ask for the present consideration of the resolution I send to the desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, requested to furnish the Senate, if not incompatible, in his opinion, with the public interests, with copies of all the correspondence which has been had relating to the claim of Hugo O. Loewi against Haiti since the response to the Senate's resolution of June 6, 1898.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move to strike out the word "requested" and insert "directed."

Mr. HOAR. Before that question is put, I should like to explain to the honorable chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations that I understand it never has been the custom—at any rate it has not been the general custom—to address requests of this kind to the Secretary of State. I think we always use the word "directed" in reference to a Department officer, and we never leave to him the question of expediency with reference to the public service. Requests relating to foreign relations, if I am not mistaken, are always addressed to the President.

Mr. DAVIS. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. HOAR. And the President is requested to furnish the information if, in his judgment, it is not incompatible with the public interests.

Mr. DAVIS. The Senator is entirely correct. It was a mere inadvertence. If it goes to the Secretary of State, it should be a direction.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senate may have some doubt about it, the request ought to go to the President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota asks for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. BACON. I was unable to hear the colloquy between the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Minnesota, but unless the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts covers the point, I suggest that the resolution ought to be further amended by striking out the words "if not incompatible, in his opinion, with the public interests." Those words are included in the resolution, and they ought to be stricken out.

Mr. HOAR. My suggestion was that if it were a matter pertaining to the foreign relations of the country, as to the publicity of which there was any doubt, it ought to go to the President and be referred to his discretion; but if there was no doubt in the Senate as to the propriety of the matter being disclosed, then it should go to the Secretary of State with a direction without any reference to his discretion; and in this view I understood the Senator from Minnesota to concur.

Mr. BACON. Then I understand the Senator from Minnesota also agrees to striking out the words "if not incompatible, in his opinion, with the public interests." It is directed to the Secretary of State and not the President.

Mr. DAVIS. This is a mere matter of the claim of a private citizen against Haiti. This request is for the continuation of the information heretofore furnished. It does not belong at all to the discretion of the Secretary of State. It was through an inadvertence that that phrase was used. The words "if not incompatible, in his opinion, with the public interests" have no place in a resolution of this character.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota asks for the present consideration of the resolution?

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Chair understand the Senator from Minnesota to modify his resolution?

Mr. DAVIS. I modify the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution is modified by changing the word "requested" to "directed."

Mr. CHANDLER. And by striking out the clause "if not incompatible, in his opinion, with the public interests."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will be so modified. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

Mr. HOAR. Let it be read.

Mr. CHANDLER. Let it be reported to the Senate.

The Secretary read the resolution as modified, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish the Senate with copies of all the correspondence which has been had relating to the claim of Hugo O. Loewi against Haiti since the response to the Senate's resolution of June 6, 1898.

Mr. SPOONER. It seems to be perfectly obvious, as stated by the Senator from Minnesota, that this is information which would without any question be accorded by the Secretary of State; but I ask the Senator from Minnesota if he remembers an instance where the Senate has directed the Secretary of State to furnish information?

Mr. TELLER. In many cases.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not remember one instance.

Mr. DAVIS. According to my present recollection, it is not at all infrequent in cases of this character.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to state to the Senator from Wisconsin that if he will look up the authorities, he will find that we have frequently done that. To withhold information is a right which the Secretary of State or any other officer has, if he thinks it is incompatible with the public interest. That is a sufficient excuse, as far as we are concerned, as a rule. It might not be in all cases. I suppose no officer would hesitate to exercise that right. I do not think the clause needs to be put in. I think the officer has precisely the same right without the clause being in the resolution that he has when it is put in. But it has been the custom to insert it. We have always directed all of the Departments and requested the President. That is the rule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

INQUIRIES RELATIVE TO THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There are certain resolutions coming over from a former day which, by agreement, are to be laid before the Senate to-day. The first is the resolution offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW] and an amendment to the same offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. PETTIGREW on the 3d instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate whether General Torres, one of the officers of the Philippine army, came to General Otis with a flag of truce on February 5, 1899, the day after the fighting commenced between our forces and those of the Filipinos, and stated to General Otis that General Aguinaldo declared that fighting had been begun accidentally and was not authorized by him, and that Aguinaldo wished to have it stopped, and that to bring about a conclusion of hostilities he proposed the establishment of a neutral zone between the two armies of a width that would be agreeable to General Otis, so that during the peace negotiations there might be no further danger of conflict between the two armies, and whether General Otis replied that fighting having once begun must go on to the grim end. Was General Otis directed by the Secretary of War to make such an answer? Did General Otis telegraph the Secretary of War on February 9, 1899, as follows: "Aguinaldo now applies for a cessation of hostilities and conference. Have declined to answer." And did General Otis afterwards reply? Was he directed by the Secretary of War to reply; and what answer, if any, did he or the Secretary of War make to the application to cease fighting?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To this resolution the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] offered an amendment, which is pending, and which will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the resolution by striking out all after the word "*Resolved*," and inserting:

That the President be requested to send to the Senate, if not inconsistent with the public interest, all reports and dispatches relating to the insurrection in the Philippines, and especially any information as to communications or correspondence with the insurgents, from the 1st of January, 1898, on the part of any officer in the military, naval, consular, or diplomatic service of the United States.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I offered that resolution as a substitute for the resolution of the Senator from South Dakota, thinking that it covered what he desired to get entirely, was in a better form, and would bring in everything relating to that subject. Subsequent to that my colleague offered a resolution which it seemed to me at first sight was unnecessary, in view of the one which I had offered, but upon examining it I came to the conclusion that his resolution, which entirely covered all that was asked

for by the Senator from South Dakota, was in a better form, that it was more specific, and I have no change to suggest in the words. I think the resolution offered by my colleague will bring everything asked for either by the resolution of the Senator from South Dakota or mine. But I desire to enlarge its scope. I wish to make an addition to it. There are certain subjects for which it does not call, upon which I should like to have information, and I have no doubt other Senators would. If the Senator from South Dakota feels that his resolution is covered by the one offered by my colleague, as it seems to me it clearly is, we can withdraw ours and let that one stand with the amendment which I propose to offer to it. I want to insert, after the seventh line, on page 2, the following additional inquiries:

Also any information which may have come to him since January 1, 1898, in regard to any plans of the people in arms against the United States for the pillage of Manila, for risings in the city, or for the destruction of foreign property and the massacre of foreign residents.

It has been stated very freely and largely, Mr. President, that such plans were entertained by the insurgents and their friends, and I think it is only proper that if there is any information within the possession of the Government we should have it. It has been said quite recently that some of the sympathizers with the insurgents in Manila proposed to throw dynamite bombs into the funeral procession of General Lawton and to take advantage of the confusion thereby arising to create disorders in the city. It seems to me that that is a subject of importance, upon which we ought to have all possible information.

Also any information that may have come to him of the treatment of the other inhabitants of the Philippines by those in arms against the authority of the United States and of the attitude and feeling of such other inhabitants or tribes toward the so-called government of Aguinaldo and his armed followers.

It has been stated in an article published by Professor Worcester, of the Philippine Commission, and in other quarters by persons whom I suppose to be well informed, that there was great hostility amongst many of the inhabitants and tribes to the Tagalo tribe, of which Aguinaldo is the representative; that they dislike the Tagalos, that they have resisted their domination, and that Aguinaldo and his followers have exercised reprisals against them and have plundered their villages. That seems to me an important point to get information upon, if there should be any in the Department.

Also any information that may have come to him of the treatment of prisoners, either Spanish or American, by the people in arms against the authority of the United States.

There have been many statements in regard to that. I think it was stated in debate the other day that the Filipinos treated prisoners with extraordinary humanity; but considering the account recently published of Lieutenant Gillmore's experiences, the statement that has been widely disseminated of the execution and mutilation of wounded American prisoners, and the treatment of Spanish prisoners, it seems to me if it be the desire to do no injustice toward anybody, we ought to have information upon that point as well.

Also any information that may have come to him as to any aid or encouragement received by Aguinaldo and his followers from persons in the United States; as to what pamphlets, speeches, or other documents emanating from the United States, and adverse to its authority and to its policy, were circulated in whole or in part among the Filipinos in arms against the United States, among the other inhabitants of the island, or among the soldiers of the United States; and any information as to the effect, if any, of such pamphlets, speeches, and other documents, or of similar utterances in the United States upon the course of the rebellion against the United States.

In his very brilliant and interesting speech the other day the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] stated that there had been a great effect produced by documents of this character and by utterances in the United States in encouraging and inciting rebellion and in keeping it alive. The statement was made in a most serious manner. My colleague [Mr. HOAR] in his reply denied absolutely the possibility of such a thing, and it is a very grave question, as it seems to me. If there is any evidence upon that point, we ought to know it.

It was also stated by the Senator from Indiana that there were persons calling themselves Americans who had furnished arms and other more material aid to the insurgents. It was also a matter of very general report last summer—and I think generally understood—that persons connected with what is called, I believe, the Anti-Imperialist League had been circulating documents among the soldiers of the United States, urging them to oppose the war and to leave their colors. I do not think those efforts had much effect. It was a sort of dabbling in treason, from the penalties of which the persons who engaged in it were protected by their insignificance and by the fact that no sensible man wants to convert a bore into a martyr, even if he is a malevolent bore.

Those things, I think, ought to be known if there is any evidence or any testimony——

Mr. RAWLINS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. LODGE. With pleasure.

Mr. RAWLINS. In view of the suggested information covering so many points now made by the Senator from Massachusetts, does he not think it would be well to call upon the President to furnish in chronological and consecutive order all the communications and information in his possession relating to the Philippine question from the time the negotiations began on the 24th day of April, 1898, when the first interview between a representative of the United States and Aguinaldo took place? Following that up will doubtless reveal the fact that Admiral Dewey, under the direction of the President——

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I yielded for a question. I do not think it is quite fair for the Senator to make a speech.

Mr. RAWLINS. I will only complete my sentence—that Admiral Dewey furnished arms to the Filipinos.

Mr. LODGE. I think——

Mr. RAWLINS. It will appear from that, if the Senator will permit me, what were the aspirations of the Filipino people as disclosed to the President. It will probably follow from that what the Administration knew would be the consequences of an effort on the part of the United States to defeat those aspirations. The suggestion I make is whether or not the chairman of the Committee on the Philippines will not propose a resolution covering the entire ground in that way.

Mr. LODGE. That is precisely what I am endeavoring to do, Mr. President.

I think the resolution offered by my colleague, with the amendment which I have suggested, will cover every possible phase of the question, and will enable us to procure, so far as the President deems it not inconsistent with the public interests, an absolute account of everything that has happened.

When the Senator interrupted me, I was about to read the last clause of the amendment I propose, which is as follows:

Also any further or other information which would tend to throw light upon the conduct and events of the insurrection against the authority of the United States in the Philippine Islands and of the military movements for its suppression since January 1, 1898.

That seems to me to about cover everything.

Mr. RAWLINS. Will the Senator permit me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. LODGE. With pleasure.

Mr. RAWLINS. I simply desire to inquire of the Senator from Massachusetts if he means January prior to the beginning of the Spanish war—January, 1898?

Mr. LODGE. The 1st of January, 1898, certainly covers everything.

Mr. COCKRELL. It does not cover the President's proclamation.

Mr. LODGE. The 1st of January, 1898? That was three months before the war began.

Mr. RAWLINS. That is right.

Mr. LODGE. Eighteen hundred and ninety-eight I said, not 1899—the 1st of January, 1898.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is right. I did not so understand the Senator.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator from Massachusetts allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. Does the Senator's resolution cover those documents which passed between Admiral Dewey and our consuls prior to the war, or after it began, before which time we could not possibly claim those people to be insurgents or in insurrection against this Government? They were insurgents against Spain. But under the wording of the resolution offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and that of his colleague [Mr. HOAR], that matter is not embraced in this inquiry. There is nothing said about a naval officer in the resolution. What we want to get at is the whole correspondence which has passed between the Filipinos and the officers, civil, military, and naval, of the United States from the beginning of this trouble.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not see how anything could be more sweeping on that point than the inquiry framed by my colleague.

Mr. RAWLINS. Will the Senator permit one other question?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. RAWLINS. Why does the Senator fix January 1, 1898?

Mr. LODGE. Because I wanted to put the date so far back that it would bring in everything that preceded the Spanish war, and so that it would carry everything that could possibly be brought in.

Mr. RAWLINS. The point of my inquiry is simply this: If the Senator proposes to go into the question of the insurrection and the relations between the insurgents and Spain prior to the inception

of the Spanish war, he ought to go back beyond that. If he does not intend to go into that subject at all——

Mr. LODGE. We are not inquiring into the relations of the insurgents with Spain.

Mr. RAWLINS. That is what I wanted to ascertain.

Mr. LODGE. No; I am not seeking information as to that. I do not suppose our Government has information on that subject. We were not the custodians of the insurgents then or of Spain. What we want is every shred of information in regard to our relations with the insurgents.

Mr. RAWLINS. If the Senator will permit me, I did not know but what he was also aiming to get into the disputed question as to whether Aguinaldo sold out to the Spaniards.

Mr. LODGE. I do not care whether he sold out or not.

Mr. GALLINGER. We know he did.

Mr. LODGE. I am not seeking evidence for or against Aguinaldo's character. What we want to get is all the information upon all these points which throw light on the insurrection against our authority in the Philippines, what led to it, and all that concerns it in any possible way. It was my intention, by making these additions to my colleague's resolution with the last sweeping clause, that I have drawn to bring in everything. I do not think there is any disposition to withhold anything, and I think that Senators will find that the resolution as framed will bring every possible document or information that is possessed by the Government.

Mr. HOAR. Will my colleague allow me to make a suggestion to him?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to his colleague.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. This discussion is upon a resolution offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW], but it has been directed wholly, or nearly wholly, to a proposed amendment to the resolution offered by me, which is to come up a little later, I suppose.

I should like to say that I entirely approve the purpose which my colleague has avowed, and everybody knows that any purpose which he avows is his purpose and that he is absolutely frank about this matter, as about all matters, public or private.

I wish to express my entire general accord with what he has said and what he desires; but I should like to have distinctly inserted, what I understand my colleague will have no objection to, a direction to transmit to the Senate the President's instructions to the body known as the Philippine commissioners, and I should like to have also distinctly inserted "all correspondence between the President and our commissioners at Paris." But I shall not press that now, because I suppose, I conjecture, at any rate, that there will be some opposition to that on some specific ground not affecting the general subject. I merely take this occasion to express that desire without saying I shall undertake to press it. But I should like to have this resolution, if it is to be amended—unless my colleague will let his go as a separate resolution and let mine stand—contain a distinct request for the instructions to the Philippine Island commissioners.

Then I should like to have the resolution so worded that all this matter will not come in in one enormous document of 10,000 pages. I desire that the information on these specific subjects may not be delayed for the completion of the whole thing, but that it may be communicated in some shape where it will be compact and by itself. Nobody can comfortably study and argue a great subject of this kind if the document before him is in the form of the Encyclopedia Britannica without an index. I think my colleague will agree with my desire that the President shall not delay one part of the information until all of the information called for by the resolution is obtained.

Mr. LODGE. That is contained in the resolution.

Mr. HOAR. I wish that information should not be delayed in answer to one part of the resolution for that in answer to another part; but that separate topics should come in, so that they can be separated in the publication if it shall be found desirable by the Senate. But I accept, so far as I am concerned, the suggestions of my colleague.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Will the Senator from Massachusetts allow me?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. PETTIGREW. The resolution before the Senate is one that I introduced, but the Senators from Massachusetts seem to be discussing a resolution which is not before the Senate. It would seem to me that it would be better to dispose of the resolution which I have offered before we take up this other subject, for I desire very much to have the resolution which I have offered adopted and the information which I seek furnished.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota offered a resolution relating to one single transaction in the Philippines, which is entirely covered both by the substitute I offered and still more specifically covered by the resolution offered by my colleague. It does not seem to me that we want to ask for specific information and then follow that request up with sweeping resolutions which cover the subject. It seems to me that it would be better, if the Senator does not desire to withdraw his resolution, that we should lay his resolution and the resolution which I offered as a substitute for it upon the table, then take up the resolution of my colleague and amend it so as to satisfy the Senate that it covers every possible phase of information, and then pass it.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing that both of the Senators from Massachusetts should make such inquiries as they choose and seek such information as they desire. I think it is entirely proper. If they believe the information is necessary in order that they may the better discharge their duties, they ought to seek it, and the Senate should give them the opportunity to do so.

Of course the details of the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] might be considerably extended in the pursuit of valuable information for the public. We might inquire whether our soldiers did not desecrate churches and plunder sanctuaries; whether they did not kill prisoners, murder women, burn houses, rob the persons of the inhabitants of the country, both men and women, of their jewels, and so on, covering the usual train of horrors which follow the operations of hostile armies in the field.

It seems to me that my resolution is exceedingly pertinent. It pertains to questions the people of the United States ask to have answered. They want to know what our course has been in regard to the Philippine people previous to the commencement of hostilities, what our course was immediately after hostilities began, what our relations were to those people, and whether or not war on our part is justified. Certainly no nation should wage war unless there is the best of cause and unquestioned justice on the side of the aggressor. For the purpose of ascertaining these pertinent facts, as they seem to me to be, I introduced a resolution on the 12th of December, which reads as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate whether the flag of the Philippine republic was carried by vessels in the bay of Manila, and whether the flag of the Philippine republic was ever saluted by Admiral Dewey or any of the vessels of his fleet at any time since May 1, 1898. Were Spanish prisoners delivered over to the Philippine forces at the time of the surrender at Subig Bay? Did a vessel commanded by the forces under Aguinaldo, flying the Philippine flag, accompany the vessels *Concord* and *Raleigh* back to Subig Bay in June, 1898, in order to compel the surrender of the Spanish forces?

One object in offering this resolution was to ascertain whether or not the Filipino people had been the allies of the United States Army and Navy; whether we had operated with them against a common enemy. The resolution was laid upon the table on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], and the only reason given for this attempted suppression of information was that if the Senate passed the resolution, such action would be telegraphed immediately to the insurgents.

The object of concealing conditions or operations in time of war must be to keep from an enemy information it does not already possess. If what I state in the resolution is true, the facts were well known to the insurgents at the time the facts were created. If we saluted their flag, they knew it; if their vessels came from Subig Bay to Manila, and if they asked Admiral Dewey to assist them in the conquest of the Spanish garrison at that place, and our vessels went back and captured the garrison and turned the prisoners over to the insurgents, the insurgents knew it at the time. Therefore the passage of the resolution or the promulgation of the facts to the American people could not encourage the enemy.

Mr. President, the object in this suppression of information is to keep from the American people certain transactions which after history will record. The trouble with these imperialists is that they confound the Government of the United States with their puny President. The trouble is that his interests are paramount to the interests of the whole people of this country, and that the desire for political success has more bearing upon grave questions than the mere encouragement or nonencouragement of the insurgents. My resolution was laid upon the table. The information asked for was denied. I want it answered specifically, because I think it is pertinent to this controversy.

On January 3 of the present year I offered another resolution—that is, the pending resolution—which reads as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate whether General Torres, one of the officers of the Philippine army, came to General Otis with a flag of truce on February 5, 1899, the day after the fighting commenced between our forces and those of the Filipinos, and stated to General Otis that General Aguinaldo declared that fighting had been begun accidentally and was not authorized by him, and that Aguinaldo wished to have it stopped, and that to bring about a conclusion of hostilities he proposed the establishment of a neutral zone between the two armies of a width that would be agreeable to General Otis, so that during the peace negotiations there might be no further danger of conflict between the two armies, and whether General Otis replied that fighting having once begun must go on to the grim end. Was General Otis directed by the Secretary of War to make such an answer? Did General Otis telegraph the Secretary of

War on February 9, 1899, as follows: "Aguinaldo now applies for a cessation of hostilities and conference. Have declined to answer?" And did General Otis afterwards reply? Was he directed by the Secretary of War to reply, and what answer, if any, did he or the Secretary of War make to the application to cease fighting?

This resolution embodies direct questions. They are pertinent questions, and upon them I desire information.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator if he has information that the contents of the resolution are true?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I do not assert in the resolution that the contents are true, but I believe they are true; for if they were false, every imperialist in this body would be in great haste to secure replies, and they would have passed my resolution without any delay whatever.

Mr. ALLEN. Has the Senator any information in his own possession about the truth of the assertion contained in the resolution?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will reach that subject later. I will come to it in the course of my remarks.

Mr. ALLEN. I want to know, because I am in hearty sympathy with the resolution, and I think it ought to pass. I do not think there is anything of such a sacred character that the American people should not know it, this being a Government by the people and for the people.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will come to that, Mr. President. The facts recited in the resolution are facts, and they are therefore true. I am much obliged to the Senator from Nebraska for bringing out this fact at this time. I will produce abundant proof of these facts later on in my remarks.

Mr. President, is war such a flippant thing to engage in that when an enemy with whom we are fighting declares that the conflict was not intentionally commenced and desires to cease fighting in order that peace may be restored and the killing of men stopped, we should answer that the war having commenced, it shall go on to the grim end, and when later—but a few days later—the request for a cessation of hostilities is again made, our general telegraphs to the Administration that he has declined to answer. It seems to me the questions are so pertinent, so pointed, so important, Mr. President, that they ought to be the subject of a separate resolution; not be clouded by a series of events which have occurred since, not clouded by those horrible deeds which occur on both sides when men are engaged in shedding each other's blood.

Therefore I believe that resolution is important. Any other resolutions which may be presented covering other phases of this controversy will not be objected to by me. If information is wanted by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I am willing he shall secure it. But I want these questions—these two or three pertinent questions—answered, and answered directly and at once. That is why I object to the substitute. The substitute of the Senator from Massachusetts is what? It reads as follows:

Resolved, That the President be requested to send to the Senate, if not inconsistent with the public interest, all reports and dispatches relating to the insurrection in the Philippines, and especially any information as to communications or correspondence with the insurgents, from the 1st of January, 1898, on the part of any officer in the military, naval, consular, or diplomatic service of the United States.

I have no objection to that information being secured, but I do not wish to have action delayed on these two great important questions until the information desired by the Senator from Massachusetts can be secured; neither do I care to leave discretion to the President as to whether his reply shall be in accord or consistent with public interests. The people of the United States, who are sovereigns in this country, have a right to know the facts regarding which I ask.

Leave it to the discretion of the President! Why, this resolution, Mr. President, should be amended so that it will accord with the facts. The President himself is unable to distinguish between his own interests and the interests of his country, between the political contest which is about to come on and the question of the destiny and duty of the United States. This resolution might be changed so as to read: "If not inconsistent with the interests of the President as a candidate for reelection," for that will govern the answer we shall get. The concealment of news, the suppression of facts, has marked the course of this miserable and wretched transaction from the beginning.

Even the report of General Otis, which is sent to us purporting to give a history of the war, does not contain all the facts and was either censored at this end of the line or the other. It does not contain his report of the 6th of April, which gives an account of how the fighting commenced and who inaugurated the war. It does not contain MacArthur's report, before whose forces the fighting was begun. MacArthur describes the opening of hostilities, but that report was not included. It does not give any recital since the war commenced of repeated efforts on the part of the insurgents to cause the cessation of hostilities; it does not give the telegram which Otis sent to the Department dated the 9th of February, 1899, and which is as follows:

Aguinaldo now applies for a cessation of hostilities and conference; have declined to answer.

His report does not contain that exceedingly important telegram. Fighting commenced on the 4th. On the 9th General Otis telegraphed the Department that Aguinaldo desired to cease fighting and have a conference, and that he had not answered. There is no reference in the report to so important an incident as the officially expressed desire of the commander of the enemy to stop the effusion of blood.

There were innumerable efforts on the part of Aguinaldo to stay the tide of war. He sent flags of truce time and time again, accompanied by communications, asking if hostilities might cease; and what General Otis did with those messages of good will, and what the Department here did with them, is not contained in Otis's report; all were censored out of it. For what purpose? The facts are known to the insurgents. They are not known to the people of the United States. They were omitted to conceal the true situation from the people of the United States.

That is not all, Mr. President. This process has been going on at both ends of the line. Of Otis's telegrams, of Otis's reports, it is well known that only portions were given to the American people. Negotiations with regard to the Sulu agreement were mangled and partially denied until after the election in Ohio. The President himself sent a proclamation to General Otis, which I will read. It is dated the 21st of December, 1898:

PRESIDENT'S PROCLAMATION.

With the signature of the treaty of peace between the United States and Spain by their respective plenipotentiaries at Paris on the 10th instant, and as a result of the victories of the American arms, the future control, disposition, and government of the Philippine Islands are ceded to the United States. In fulfillment of the rights of sovereignty thus acquired and the responsible obligations of government thus assumed, the actual occupation and administration of the entire group of the Philippine Islands becomes immediately necessary, and the military government heretofore maintained by the United States in the city, harbor, and bay of Manila is to be extended with all possible dispatch to the whole of the ceded territory.

Here, then, is a declaration on the part of the President that we had acquired sovereignty by purchase and that we proposed to extend a military government over the entire group of the Philippine Islands. What was the situation on that day? We occupied simply the city of Manila and a small promontory about 20 miles from the city.

Mr. HOAR. What is the date of that proclamation?

Mr. PETTIGREW. The 21st day of December, 1898. The city of Manila was invested by the army of the Philippine republic. That army had built earthworks from water to water, 14 miles in length, clear around that city, hemming in the Spanish garrison at the time the city was surrendered, and the position of the Filipinos was maintained up to the date of this proclamation. This was the message sent to a government exercising jurisdiction over millions of people, maintaining an army of 30,000 men surrounding the city of Manila, occupying only the country they had conquered and captured from Spain. Then the President goes on:

In performing this duty, the military commander of the United States is enjoined to make known to the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands that, in succeeding to the sovereignty of Spain, in severing the former political relations of the inhabitants, and in establishing a new political power, the authority of the United States is to be exerted for the sovereignty of the persons and property of the people of the islands and for the confirmation of all their private rights and relations. It will be the duty of the commander of the forces of occupation to announce and proclaim in the most public manner that we come, not as invaders or conquerors, but as friends, to protect the natives in their homes, in their employments, and in their personal and religious rights. All others will be brought within the lawful rule we have assumed, with firmness if need be, but without severity so far as may be possible.

Here was a direct declaration of war. Lay down your arms, submit to our sovereignty, to our military rule throughout the whole of these islands, or we will proceed against you by force of arms and compel you to do so. What is the use, after the issuance of this proclamation, of quibbling about who commenced the war?

But General Otis, fearing that something might occur that would be disagreeable in this connection, did not give out the proclamation sent to him. He altered it materially. He altered it so that it was not the same proclamation. He altered it so that it read as I shall now read. This is to the people of the Philippine Islands:

Instructions of His Excellency the President of the United States relative to the administration of affairs in the Philippine Islands have been transmitted to me by direction of the honorable the Secretary of War, under date of December 28, 1898. They direct me to publish and proclaim in the most public manner to the inhabitants of these islands that in the war against Spain the United States forces came here to destroy the power of that nation and to give the blessings of peace and individual freedom to the Philippine people; that we are here as friends to the Filipinos; to protect them in their homes, their employments, their individual and religious liberty, and that all persons who, either by active aid or honest endeavor, cooperate with the Government of the United States to give effect to these beneficent purposes will receive the reward of its support and protection.

The President said all those who surrender, all those who yield, will have protection, and those who do not will be caused to yield by force of arms. Mr. Otis, feeling that this proclamation of the President was too harsh, that it might involve trouble, censored

it, as the President has evidently censored Otis's report. So Otis was willing to deceive, swindle, and defraud the people of the Philippines by putting out a proclamation which was not transmitted to him to issue, and the Administration is willing to humbug the American people at this end of the line with a meager report of the facts in regard to this whole subject.

The entire wretched business is one of duplicity and concealment—an evident effort not only to deceive the people of the United States, but the people of the Philippine Islands. But as soon as General Otis received this proclamation he sent it to General Miller, down at Iloilo, and Miller promulgated it exactly as he received it, and within four days the genuine proclamation was back in Manila and all its brutal phrases were presented to the people there. They were suddenly stunned by the edict which declared war against them and which so unexpectedly announced that they should not have their liberty, for which they had sacrificed so much life and so much property.

Mr. GALLINGER. What were those brutal phrases? I should like to have one or two of them read.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will read them to the Senator:

All others will be brought within the lawful rule we have assumed, with firmness if need be, but without severity, so far as may be possible.

A straight and square declaration of war—an announcement that if you do not surrender, if you do not lay down your arms, if you do not give up your liberty, we will make you do all these things by force of arms. The other is as follows:

The military government heretofore maintained by the United States in the city, harbor, and bay of Manila is to be extended with all possible dispatch to the whole of the ceded territory.

The military government of the United States was to be extended over those 30,000 men in arms and over that government of a sister republic, founded upon a constitution similar to ours. I am glad the Senator from New Hampshire asked the question, for I have thought for a long time that those who are maintaining this policy on the part of the United States were ignorant with regard to the facts and stood in need of information.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, it strikes me that his declaration that those expressions of the President's message are brutal is absolutely refuted by reading them. The President of the United States used no brutal language and has not done so during the period of hostilities.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Now, Mr. President, let us see what General Otis says about this matter. If we have an ally and he has been fighting with us and has lost thousands of men in contact with a common enemy, for his advantage and for ours, and he has established a government and has helped us capture a city with a garrison of 13,000 men, and we then turn around and say to him, We have purchased title, from the persons whom we have been jointly assailing, to your country and to your land, and if you do not lay down your arms and surrender to us the liberties for which you have been contending, we will make you do it by force of arms. And if that is not brutal language and that is not a brutal course, then the estimate of these things placed upon them by the Senator from New Hampshire must be quite different from what has been placed upon them by the history of the world through all time.

Otis says, with regard to this proclamation, as follows:

Before publication of this proclamation I endeavored to obtain from able Filipino residents of the city an expression of opinion as to its probable effect upon the population, but was not much encouraged. A few days thereafter they declared the publication to have been a mistake, although the foreign residents appeared to believe the proclamation, most excellent in tone and moderation, offered everything that the most hostile of the insurgents could expect, and undoubtedly would have a beneficial influence.

Perhaps the proclamation which Otis put out, if it had not been for the President's proclamation itself, which came to them from Iloilo, might have been tolerated. How do we know? Otis sends out a lie to insurgents; Miller sends out the truth. A few days afterwards the truth comes, and then the difficulty of course ensues. Here is what he says with regard to the President's language:

After fully considering the President's proclamation and the temper of the Tagalos with whom I was daily discussing political problems and the friendly intentions of the United States Government toward them, I concluded that there were certain words and expressions therein, such as "sovereignty," "right of cession," and those which directed immediate occupation, etc., though most admirably employed and tersely expressive of actual conditions, might be advantageously used by the Tagalo war party to incite widespread hostilities among the natives.

Remarkable, is it not, that such words as "sovereignty" and "cession," such words as "conquest" and "oppression," might have disturbed the inhabitants? How gratifying it must be to the President to have this censor of his praise the Executive language!

So, Mr. President, the war was commenced, and yet the insurgents used every effort and every endeavor to prevent actual hostilities. I think I can prove from the record that such was their course.

But before I conclude with regard to this censorship question I want to call attention to the report of the Associated Press. Robert M. Collins, who represented the Associated Press in Manila, in connection with the concealment of facts and of truth from the people of the United States, makes the following statement in an interview which the press representatives had with General Otis. He threatened to court-martial the correspondents for sending the truth to the United States. Mr. Collins says:

But when General Otis came down in the frank admission that it was not intended so much to prevent the newspapers from giving information and assistance to the enemy (the legitimate function and, according to our view, the only legitimate one of a censorship), but to keep the knowledge of conditions here from the public at home, and when the censor had repeatedly told us, in ruling out plain statements of undisputed facts, "My instructions are to let nothing go that can hurt the Administration," we concluded that protest was justifiable.

In other words, Mr. President, the purpose of the censorship in Manila was not to keep facts from the enemy, not to keep information from the enemy, but to keep it from the people at home, the people of this great Republic. We have adopted a new policy along with the adoption of an empire and a pseudo emperor—a policy of no longer taking the American people into our confidence and consulting them with regard to questions of great national moment. Our military censors are instructed not to cut out from the dispatches sent to the newspapers in this country that which might help the enemy, but that which might hurt the Administration at home. Such instructions are issued by the Administration itself, and the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy must be obeyed by his subordinates. Military power is imperial, and the imperialist employed it not for the country's good, but to attain personal political ends.

Continuing, Mr. Collins says:

Otis had gained the idea, from the long submission by the newspaper men to his dictation, that it was a part of the duty of the Governor-General to direct the newspaper correspondents as he did his officers. Much of the censorship was conducted by him personally, the censor sending a correspondent to the General with any dispatch about which he had doubts. The process of passing a message was identical with the correction of a composition by a schoolmaster, Otis or the censor striking out what displeased him and inserting what he thought should be said; or, what came to the same thing, telling the correspondent he must say certain things if his story was to go.

And in this way these correspondents say they were compelled to send falsehoods home to us. What is more, Mr. President, further, Mr. Collins says:

Recently I filed what I thought a most inoffensive statement that the business men who had appeared before the commission had advocated the retention of the existing silver system of currency. The censor said: "I ought not to let that go. That would be a lift for Bryan. My instructions are to shut off everything that could hurt McKinley's Administration. That is free silver."

Now then, Mr. President, I object to the resolution or amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts because he proposes to leave to the President the discretion as to whether I shall have my questions answered or not. How can I leave that to the President and expect to get the information when he instructs a censor to deny to the American people the facts for fear that the truth will hurt his Administration? How can we expect to be given the facts when Otis's reports suppress everything almost that would be of importance as against the conduct and course of the Administration and gives us that only which he chooses to divulge?

Now, Mr. President, who commenced the war? I contend, in the first place, that the President inaugurated hostilities before the treaty with Spain was ratified, when he sent his declaration of war to Otis to be transmitted to the people of the Philippine Islands. What is more, Mr. President, Mr. Otis, in his report, in the first letter he wrote to Aguinaldo after he took command, made the statement which I shall read. I might preface this by saying that at the time Manila fell the insurgents had conquered the island of Luzon. The Spanish flag floated over only one port. They (the Filipino republic) had occupied many of the other islands, and shortly afterwards captured the city of Iloilo.

Their troops had taken 10,000 Spanish prisoners. They had captured garrison after garrison. They had several small vessels which patrolled the coast flying their flag. They surrounded Manila with a cordon of earthworks. They had 30,000 men in the trenches. When General Merritt went there, he asked the insurgents to allow him to land his forces on the beach in order to take the city of Manila. He sent General Greene, who was instructed not to recognize Aguinaldo or his forces, to try and avoid that, but nevertheless, by some hook or crook, to get a lodgment upon the beach. I will read from the statement of Francis V. Greene, major-general, with regard to this matter:

General Merritt arrived at Cavite in the *Newport* on the afternoon of July 25, and, after examining the ground the following day, promptly decided two points: First, that the attack would be made along the shore; and second, that it was necessary to get the insurgents off to one side, so as to give us the right of way. He was very anxious to avoid any entangling alliances with

Aguinaldo, with whom he had no direct communication. He therefore sent his chief of staff, on the afternoon of July 28, with a verbal message directing me to persuade the insurgents, if possible, to evacuate a portion of their trenches; but I was to do this on my own responsibility and without intimating that I had any instructions to this effect from him. I had previously met General Noriel, who commanded the brigade of insurgents nearest to the beach, and on receiving General Merritt's message I sent my orderly, who spoke Spanish fluently, to find this general and give him a most polite message that I desired to see him on matters of common interest.

What was the purpose of the President? When General Merritt was sent to the Philippines he went with different instructions from those which had been previously given. Previous to that time Aguinaldo had been armed by us, taken to the islands by us, had declared constantly that he wished to set up a government of his own, and that his people desired independence and had adopted a constitution, had established a government, and that they had consulted with Dewey about it. Dewey had said in one of his dispatches that he went ashore to consult with the Filipino people with regard to the establishment of a civil government. Their flag had been saluted.

Spanish prisoners had been turned over to their government. But suddenly the policy of the Administration changes, and the departure was instigated by England, in my opinion, for the tone of the English papers about this time changed. They began to talk about our duty in the Philippines. The men who were dominating England were opposed to war with Spain because they held Spanish bonds. They were in favor of our conquering the Filipinos because they would like to get more of the bonds of the United States. The great money oligarchy which has ruled the world for the last twenty or thirty years, dictated the march of armies, and the movement of navies, bidding war to commence or war to cease, has now crossed the Atlantic, and is to-day wielding the destinies of the great Republic and directing every movement, every thought of the servile President of this most corrupt and un-American of all Administrations.

So General Merritt was to try to fool the Filipinos and prevail upon them to do what he wanted and not let them know what was his purpose. He was armed with different instructions from those that had been given to anyone else. He tells General Greene to get possession of a piece of the shore; to do it without letting the Filipinos know that he recognized them in any way, but to accomplish it. Aguinaldo said he would give possession of the shore if they would make the request in writing. Upon that he withdrew his troops from the trenches and our troops took possession of 400 yards of Aguinaldo's works, from the shore part way around Manila. Without giving the request in writing, we simply promised that it should be sent the next day. This is contained in General Greene's statement.

Now what occurred? Manila surrendered. It was 14 miles around Manila, and of that 14 miles all but 400 yards was occupied by the Filipino forces. When the city surrendered we took 13,000 Spanish prisoners, according to General Greene's report, and there was no fighting. In fact, the surrender had been arranged. We were simply to make a demonstration and then the Spanish garrison was to lay down its arms. They were to give themselves up to us that they might avoid capitulating to the Filipinos, who had surrounded them. Thus the surrender of the Spanish forces was secured without bloodshed, except for an accident, or except for such bloodshed as the generals commanding our armies thought was necessary in order to humbug the insurgents, so they would be content to allow us to enter the city without them.

Immediately upon our occupation of the city we began to push the insurgents back. We gave them nice talk. We told them we were their benefactors. We pointed to our resolution with regard to Cuba. We declared that we had the highest motives and that conquest would not be thought of—that it was immoral. Thus we gained possession of one point after another.

In demanding the retirement of the Filipino troops the first letter which Otis wrote to Aguinaldo is as follows. Aguinaldo had protested against retiring from territory which he had conquered by sacrificing the blood of his men. A parley ensued.

On September 8, 1898, General Otis forwarded to Aguinaldo this communication, the first one he had sent to that officer:

> It only remains for me to respectfully notify you that I am compelled by my instructions to direct that your armed forces evacuate the entire city of Manila, including its suburbs and defenses, and that I shall be obliged to take action with that end in view within a very short space of time should you decline to comply with my Government's demand; and I hereby serve notice on you that unless your troops are withdrawn beyond the line of the city's defenses before Thursday, the 15th instant, I shall be obliged to resort to forcible action, and that my Government will hold you responsible for any unfortunate consequences which may ensue.

Here, then, on the 8th of September was a declaration of war, a threat to an ally who had done as much against the common enemy as we had done.

> Permit me to believe that my confidence in the sound judgment and patriotism of yourself and associates is not misplaced.

We were parleying with Spain. It was long before the treaty was made and many months before it was ratified.

> You will please pardon me for my apparent unnecessary delay in replying to your communication of the 27th ultimo, but press of the duties connected with the administration of the affairs of this city is my excuse.
>
> In conclusion, I beg to inform you that I have conferred freely with Admiral Dewey upon the contents of this communication and am delegated by him to state that he fully approves of the same in all respects; that the commands of our Government compel us to act as herein indicated, and that between our respective forces there will be unanimity and complete concert of action.

Now, this is Otis's report, from which I read:

> On September 13 a commission sent by Aguinaldo and consisting of three members, one of whom was the treasurer and another the attorney-general of the insurgent government, called for the purpose of discussing the subject of my letter of the 8th. They asked me to withdraw it and simply request in writing that the insurgent troops retire to the line designated by General Merritt, which I refused to do, stating that unless they withdrew as directed we would be obliged to resort to force.

Pretty talk, is it not, toward an ally who was fighting with us? If this Administration had a spark of honor when they sent General Merritt there they would have told the whole truth in his instructions to the insurgents, would have told them that they had nothing to expect but slavery at our hands, instead of still parading as their friends.

> They then asked that I withdraw the letter and issue a request unaccompanied by any threat to use force, as Aguinaldo was fearful that he would be unable to remove his troops upon a demand, to which I replied that the letter of the 8th instant would stand. They then said that as the demands of that letter must remain unchanged, the insurgents would withdraw as directed therein, but that if I would express in writing a simple request to Aguinaldo to withdraw to the lines which I designated—something which he could show to the troops and induce them to think that he was simply acting upon a request from these headquarters—he would probably be able to retire his men without much difficulty; that, of course, they themselves understood the direction to withdraw, which would be obeyed, and thereupon repeated their desire to obtain a note of request, whereupon I furnished them with the following.

Then comes a request simply to withdraw, designating the line, and this request was complied with.

Now we complain and the Administration justifies its commencement of the war upon these people because they were uneasy during this time; that threats were heard; that assertions were made that they had a right to independence. Aguinaldo issued a proclamation in answer to the President's proclamation, declaring that he sought independence for his people.

Now, Mr. President, who did begin the war? Here is Otis's letter of the 8th of September, saying that he would resort to war if they did not surrender to him some of the territory which they had conquered from Spain. Here is the President's proclamation, saying, "If you do not surrender the islands on the 21st of December, I will wage war against you to the death."

What is more, it is well to inquire who fired the first shot. It appears that there was a town between the lines of the two armies, occupied by the forces of Aguinaldo—a town 150 yards in advance of the line of the American troops—and that Otis wished to obtain possession of it. He therefore entered into an agreement to have Aguinaldo withdraw his pickets therefrom and retire to a greater distance.

This was done. On the night after this had been accomplished a patrol of the insurgents entered the abandoned town. A patrol is not a war party; a patrol is simply to pick up stragglers. They had occupied the place the night before, and they sent a patrol in the evening to see if any of their men had remained behind—if there were any stragglers in this village. We had occupied the place as a picket station, and when these Malays, who do not speak our language, came along, a Nebraska boy ordered them to halt, and they did not halt.

It is very strange, is it not, that the insurgents did not understand the Spanish or the Malay tongue of the Nebraska boy? He fired upon them and killed a lieutenant, and within a few minutes two or three more Filipinos were killed; and thus the war was begun. And who started it? We commenced it by the declaration of war on the part of our President, by every act of ours which indicated that we did not propose to give them their freedom. We inaugurated the conflict by killing the first man. But what does General Otis say about this? On page 92 of this report you will find the following statement:

> It is not believed that the chief insurgent leaders wish to open hostilities at this time—

It is not believed they wished to open hostilities. Let us see. On the same page he describes the battle of Manila:

> The battle of Manila commenced at half past 8 o'clock on the evening of February 4 and continued until 5 o'clock the next evening.
>
> The engagement was one strictly defensive on the part of the insurgents and of vigorous attack by our forces.

Here, then, Mr. President, is the killing of two or three or four Filipino soldiers who composed the patrol, which was not a war party, by a picket of ours; and then what? "The engagement was one strictly defensive on the part of the insurgents and of vigorous attack by our forces." Then we rushed upon their works, and the killing and destruction were well under way. We took their

trenches and drove them back. And yet it is claimed by the President, in his proclamation, that the Filipinos struck a foul blow. Who really struck the foul blow? Who was guilty of duplicity? Who was guilty of deception through the whole of this miserable transaction?

General Otis conceals the rest of the facts. The report of General MacArthur is not here, but I have read the reports of various soldiers, for the South Dakota troops were along this line. I have talked with many of them, and there is no possible question but that we were first guilty of shedding blood; that we began the attack, and that we followed it up.

What occurred, Mr. President? General Rives, of Minnesota, who was in charge of the city of Manila at the time fighting commenced, in an interview said:

> But I can tell you one piece of news that is not generally known in the United States. On Sunday, February 5, the day after the fighting began, General Torres, of the insurgents, came through our lines under a flag of truce and had a personal interview with General Otis, in which, speaking for Aguinaldo, he declared that the fighting had been begun accidentally and was not authorized by Aguinaldo; that Aguinaldo wished to have it stopped, and that to bring about a conclusion of hostilities he proposed the establishment of a neutral zone between the two armies of any width that would be agreeable to General Otis, so that during the peace negotiations there might be no further danger of conflicts between the two armies. To these representations of General Torres General Otis sternly replied that the fighting, having once begun, must go on to the grim end.

Mr. SPOONER. What date was that?

Mr. PETTIGREW. February 5.

Now, Mr. President, under all these circumstances, I would like to know what more Aguinaldo could have done. What more could he have done than continue to fight as long as resistance was possible? If I were a Filipino, I would fight until I was gray, if I were not killed before, against this unholy and infamous aggression.

I do not indorse the sentiment, Mr. President, of the Senator from Nevada, that having once commenced we must go on. That would compel him to join his brother if he found him stealing. That would compel him, if he found his comrades committing any crime, to join in the crime until it was consummated. If we are wrong, this Government can take no higher or grander position before the nations of the world than to acknowledge it.

My country, right or wrong, is a sentiment I indorse with this qualification: When right, to keep it right, and when wrong, to make it right. Neither do I confound the President with the Government. He is but our servant, and if he pursues a wrong course, if he precipitates us into a war unjustly and wrongfully and undertakes to override the Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence, then I am against him, and it is my privilege to attack his position.

I believe he is wrong in this contest. I believe my country can only be great and grand by pursuing that honorable course which has marked our career in the past, and by exercising that powerful influence which we can exercise and have exercised all over the world since we became a nation, because of the honor and dignity of our course and the respect we have always maintained for the rights of others. We have reached the turning point.

Are we to abandon this grand history; are we to pursue a course of aggression and wrong, plunder and robbery, on the English principle that having once commenced we must continue to the end? What would we think of the greatest athlete of the world to-day in insisting that, having begun the beating of a boy of 12, he should beat the boy to death in order to convince the world that he was strong?

Mr. President, if it takes more courage to do right than to do wrong, then the American people and the American nation should commence at once. Empire has been acquired before only to ruin the nation that started upon a career of conquest. Rome with her legions robbed the world. When the Roman Empire was founded most the people owned 12 acres apiece—12 acres per family—indicating a dense rural population. No foreign foe could march through that compact rural population of land owners to the wall of Rome. They were successful farmers and prosperous, and they made mighty soldiers. Cincinnatus left the plow and led legions on to victory. But during the first century of the Christian era centralization had done its work; the lands had been absorbed by the usurer and gathered into vast estates, cultivated by tenants and often by slaves.

Spain once had an empire which covered almost the world—greater than Rome or any other people ever acquired. Where is Spain to-day? No nation can pursue a course of wrong toward others and long preserve its own liberties. No nation can long give to its people happiness and prosperity, equality, necessary to the preservation of its institutions, when it proceeds to disregard the rights of other nations or plunder other men, no matter what the color of their skin.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator yield for one moment?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

Mr. PETTIGREW. I do not care to proceed further. I am perfectly willing to yield the floor.

Mr. LODGE. The resolution which has been under discussion—that of the Senator from South Dakota, and mine, offered as a substitute—will now go to the Calendar, I suppose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Undoubtedly, unless some arrangement is made regarding the matter.

Mr. LODGE. Then the resolution of my colleague will come up on another day without any question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has gone over one day and that will go to the Calendar. The same is true of the resolution offered by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. HOAR. My colleague and I, as I understand, are entirely in accord—that is, I have no objection to his amendment. On the other hand, I desire to insert one line in mine, which he entirely approves. I ask unanimous consent that the pending order may be laid aside that this resolution, with my colleague's amendment, may be adopted without debate. I do not think there will be any objection.

Mr. GALLINGER. That can not happen. There will be debate; and I shall object to any such arrangement.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Let me first have my resolution disposed of.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to state that in the statement made by him he was in error. When a resolution which lies over one day is considered and the consideration of it is not completed it goes to the Calendar. When resolutions are not considered (and the Chair supposes that neither the resolution of the Senator from Massachusetts nor that of the Senator from Maine has been considered to-day) they will still lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE. That was my understanding of the situation.

Mr. HALE. They do not lose their place.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. They do not lose their place.

Mr. HOAR. Very well, if that is understood. Otherwise I could bring in another resolution which would come up in the morning hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the ruling of the Chair that the resolutions still lie on the table.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I should like to have my resolution disposed of. At least, I should like to make a request in regard to it. I ask that it may lie on the table without prejudice, and that it shall not lose its place.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection to that course.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota asks unanimous consent that his resolution may lie on the table without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. CARTER. I will state that I shall call up in the morning hour to-morrow the census bill for the purpose of endeavoring to secure action upon it, and I can not be a party to any agreement which would preclude the possibility of doing that.

Mr. HOAR. It does not seem to be fair to interpose against these resolutions the census bill, and I appeal to the Senator's good sense of justice and fairness. Here are some Senators, and I am one of them, asking for information which they regard as most essential to the discharge of important public duties and the understanding by the Senate of the greatest question we have had before us for a generation. My colleague, representing the committee on that subject, comes to the Senate and concurs in the view as to the importance of the matter, and he asks simply that my inquiry be enlarged, which it certainly ought to be if any Senator on the floor wants to enlarge it. I have no objection to that and we have agreed on the resolution. Now, to say that the census bill shall be taken up out of order in the morning hour for the sake of preventing our getting the resolution through seems to be a proceeding which I hope the Senator will not insist upon.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask for the regular order. It is very evident that this discussion will go on indefinitely.

Mr. HOAR. These questions will be debated on their merits.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Massachusetts can take his own course.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Do I understand that my resolution goes over?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Response was not made to the announcement by the Chair of the request of the Senator from South Dakota. Is there objection made to his resolution retaining its place on the table?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I make objection.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will renew the resolution to-morrow. If you can throttle debate on this question, you will have to do it.

Mr. LODGE. For convenience, I ask permission to have my colleague's resolution printed with the amendments I have offered.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to have one amendment which is not in there printed.

Mr. LODGE. That amendment I have inserted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the junior Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GALLINGER subsequently said: A moment ago the Senator from South Dakota asked unanimous consent that the resolution which he offered might remain on the table. I raised objection, but at that time I supposed the Senator had concluded his speech. I understand that he has not concluded it, and for the purpose of giving him an opportunity to do so I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will then put the question again. Is there any objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none, and the resolution submitted by that Senator will lie on the table without prejudice.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I am surprised at the proposed legislation, the shadows of which already darken the hopes of the confiding victims of Wall street. It is so utterly contradictory of the St. Louis platform of the Republican party that it will astonish the country. That platform declared that—

> We are, therefore, opposed to the free coinage of silver except by international agreement with the leading commercial nations of the world, which we pledge ourselves to promote, and until such agreement can be obtained the existing gold standard must be preserved.

There were in the United States in 1896 between five hundred and six hundred millions of standard silver dollars and very nearly an equal amount of standard gold coin. Both the silver and gold coin were full legal tender and each one was standard money in the same sense in which the other was standard money. If five hundred millions of legal-tender gold money created a gold standard, then five hundred millions of full legal-tender silver money created a silver standard. Therefore, if there was a gold standard in 1896 there was also a silver standard. The Republican party was pledged to maintain the gold standard that then existed.

The standard money of the country in the act of November 1, 1893, which is the last legislative action on the subject, is described as follows:

> And it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money.

This last expression of the will of Congress recognizes silver coin as standard money equally with gold coin. There is no objection to maintaining gold as a standard money equally with silver, for the law so declares.

Secretary Carlisle, the modern Moses of the gold standard, in the revised edition of Circular No. 128, issued July 1, 1896, stated the law as follows:

> Gold coins and standard silver dollars, being standard coins of the United States, are not redeemable.

LEGISLATIVE POWER INVOKED TO SILENCE CRITICISM.

The Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. ALDRICH, in his explanation of the bill under consideration, said:

> Although United States notes and Treasury notes are by law redeemable in coin, the invariable practice of the Treasury Department since 1879 has been to redeem them in gold coin. * * *
>
> It is to allay the doubts which have been raised and to dispel the fears which have been aroused by the persistent antagonism of the friends of the free coinage of silver and the advocates of a silver standard to all sound monetary principles that this legislation is necessary.

The admission of the Senator from Rhode Island that it is necessary not only to violate the platform of the Republican party but to enact into law the usurpations of the Treasury Department in discriminating against silver in the payment of debts shows that the facts and law of the case are against the contention of the advocates of gold and that they are under the necessity to use the legislative power of Congress to silence just criticism. The enactment into law of the policy of the Treasury Department, which is in palpable violation of the statutes of the United States, would condone the sale of bonds by the Cleveland Administration, whereby somebody (not the Government) pocketed about $30,000,000. The $162,000,000 of 4 per cent bonds sold by the Cleveland Administration realized $30,000,000 less than the market price of such bonds both before and since the outrage was committed. The excuse for this robbery of the Treasury of the United States was the false pretense that gold was necessary to meet the obligations of the Government, whereas in fact those obligations were payable in silver as well as gold, and there was an abundance of silver in the Treasury to meet the same. The Democratic party repudiated Cleveland and his coworkers for this and similar transactions, and such betrayals of trust should remain forever repudiated. The effort to legalize such transactions will certainly encourage further usurpations in the Treasury Department.

SILVER COIN FULL LEGAL TENDER.

The Senator from Rhode Island makes another admission which destroys his whole contention. He says:

> Our own experience and that of other countries, notably France and Germany, clearly prove that it is possible to keep in circulation at a parity of value with gold a large but limited amount of legal-tender silver or notes based upon such silver without any provision for a compulsory redemption in gold.

The Senator ignores the fact that the standard silver money circulating in Germany, France, and the United States is a full legal tender equally with gold. It performs all the money functions that gold can perform, and of course it remains at par without redemption. It needs no redemption; it is its own redeemer as much as gold coin.

It is true the Senator from Rhode Island in his admission says that although the amount of legal-tender silver coin in circulation may be large, it is limited, but he failed to state the limitation. He did not follow the example set by Mr. Sherman when Secretary of the Treasury and Mr. Cleveland when President. Secretary Sherman in 1880 was quite confident that $50,000,000 of standard silver dollars was the utmost limit that would float on a par with gold; and President Cleveland in December, 1885, was positively sure that the limit of the amount of standard silver dollars which would circulate on a par with gold had been reached when there had been coined under the Bland-Allison Act only 215,759,431 standard silver dollars. But the coinage went on under the Bland-Allison and Sherman Acts until over 500,000,000 of standard silver dollars were put in circulation, and still standard silver dollars are on a par with standard gold dollars. In 1893 President Cleveland, the banks, and his Republican followers in the two Houses of Congress repealed all laws providing for the coinage of silver. What evidence is there, if the coinage of silver had continued, that standard silver dollars would not have remained on a par with standard gold dollars? There is certainly nothing in the monetary history of this or any other country which justifies such a conclusion. There never was in the United States a full legal-tender dollar, whether printed on gold, silver, or paper, which was not as good as every other legal-tender dollar in circulation.

The silver coin and the silver certificates representing coin now in circulation in the United States are not only as good as gold coin, but very much better, because they stay at home and do the business of the country. The Boer war does not make them desert this country to be naturalized under the mint laws of England to fight the Boers and thereby create a panic in New York. If all our money were silver, silver certificates, and greenbacks, with no gold whatever, the Boer war would not have disturbed the finances of this country by depressing prices, destroying values, and creating stagnation in business.

ARTFUL DESTRUCTION OF THE SILVER DOLLAR.

The Senator from Rhode Island did not proclaim in so many words that the object of the Senate substitute bill was to destroy the silver dollar. In fact, a casual listener might have understood that he intended to leave the silver dollar untouched. His mode of attack on the silver dollar is very artful.

The Senate substitute provides for the issuance of an unlimited quantity of 3 per cent gold bonds, principal and interest payable in gold, and also for the refunding of the entire national debt into gold bonds. When that is done, silver will be deprived of its debt-paying power. It will be crippled in the same way that the greenback was crippled in 1862 through the machinations of Wall street, by depriving it of the functions of paying customs dues and interest on the public debt. That wicked legislation was carried over the solemn protest of Thaddeus Stevens, the great commoner from Pennsylvania, who declared that such action would cost the United States more than a thousand million dollars. Upon the crippling of the greenback a gold board was organized in Wall street to make war on our armies in the rear while they were fighting the enemy in front. Depriving the greenback of its full legal-tender power did more harm than any financial legislation in the United States previous to the clandestine scheme of 1873 demonetizing silver.

While 500,000,000 legal-tender silver dollars, with their representative certificates, constitute our active and reliable circulating medium, we are told that legislation which destroys the legal-tender power of the silver dollar to redeem greenbacks and

pay the national debt is maintaining the gold standard as it exiated in 1896. If the Republican party had declared in the St. Louis platform that the standard silver dollar was to be abolished—as it is by this bill—it would not have been successful in the last Presidential election. If that party thought otherwise, why did it pledge itself to promote bimetallism by international agreement? Does anybody doubt that hundreds of thousands of votes were secured for the Republican party in the belief that that party would secure bimetallism and that an international agreement was the best mode of restoring silver?

The country will understand that a gold standard which excludes the silver standard of 1896 is a very different standard from the gold standard which existed in common with the silver standard, and in which silver possessed the same functions as gold.

NATIONAL-BANK NOTES.

The contention that national-bank notes are better money than standard silver coin or legal-tender paper issued directly by the Government can not be maintained. Why does it make money better to issue it to national banks and guarantee its redemption than to issue it directly by the Government and cover it into the Treasury, to be paid out in lieu of money obtained from taxpayers? It is very easy to see how the conversion of a thousand millions of noninterest-bearing money, consisting of standard silver dollars, greenbacks, and Treasury notes, into money bearing interest, payable to the banks, would be beneficial to the banks, but in what way the Government or the people are to be benefited I am unable to understand.

The whole scheme is in violation of the fundamental principles of monetary science. There has been much cruel legislation on the money question to reach a metallic basis consisting of both gold and silver, but never before in the history of the world has an attempt been made to regulate the volume of money by the accidental production of gold alone, the yield of which is the most uncertain and erratic of all the metals, whether precious or otherwise.

It was the silver of the New World which revolutionized the Old and broke up the feudal system. If silver had been demonetized at the time Columbus discovered America, the people would have remained serfs and progress would have been impossible, because there would have been no gold mining previous to the discoveries in California and Australia if there had been no silver mining. Nearly all the gold produced in America previous to the discovery of the great alluvial deposits of California and Australia was found in combination with silver as a by-product and could not have been otherwise mined. But, on account of the production of silver being more regular and constant and it not being so fleeting and transitory as gold, it formed the basis of a new civilization. It is a lamentable fact that money has never been studied as a science, and its creation and regulation has never been governed by fixed principles.

VOLUME OF MONEY REGULATES PRICES.

Ignorance, inattention, and cupidity have deprived the world through all the ages of an equitable measure of value. It is universally agreed that the property for sale and the money in circulation are reciprocally the supply and demand for each other. Learned and fair-minded economists agree that the volume of money controls general prices and that the property for sale is a measure of the money in circulation in the same sense that the money in circulation is a measure of the property for sale. This being conceded, it follows that money can not be a fair and equitable measure of value unless the ratio between the property for sale and the money in circulation can be maintained relatively uniform. In order to honestly measure the value of property it will require the same amount of money to buy a like quantity of property, considered in the aggregate, at one time that it does at another time.

POWER TO CREATE MONEY.

It is impossible to regulate the quantity of property for sale so as to keep a constant ratio between it and the volume of money, because all the people have an unlimited right to produce and sell property. Money, on the other hand, is the creation of law. No private person, either natural or artificial, can create money without special authority of law. The material used upon which to stamp or print money is no more the money itself than the paper upon which a will is written or a law is printed is the will or the law. This doctrine was announced by Aristotle more than two thousand years ago, and its truth can not be questioned. That the creation of money is a sovereign power was adjudicated by the highest tribunals in the British Empire at the time of Elizabeth and by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Legal-Tender Cases, and is therefore final.

Every independent nation has been compelled in times of emergency to save its national existence by creating legal-tender money without regard to the material upon which it was stamped or printed. Suspension of coin payments and the use of paper conquered Napoleon and placed Great Britain at the head of nations as a military and financial power. The legal tender left in the greenback, even after it was deprived of its function of paying customs dues and interest on the public debt, saved the Union. It is the law of legal tender that makes gold, silver, or any other material which bears the mandate of the Government money. Money is created by the sovereign power of Congress and is manifested by the stamp or imprint of the Government in the same way that printing on paper makes known the statute law of the land. Every taxgatherer must respect and obey the law of legal tender for the same reason that he obeys any other municipal law, because it commands the creditor to take the paper or metal bearing the governmental stamp in payment of the debt due him, and this, too, without regard to the material upon which the mandate is manifested.

There was great industrial prosperity in Great Britain immediately after the battle of Waterloo, and there was equally great business prosperity in the United States immediately after the surrender of Lee at Appomattox. But in each case that prosperity was lost by legislation destructive of the legal-tender money of the country which had created the prosperity. England, after the Napoleonic wars, suffered more in five years by legislation destroying the money of the country than from all her military expenditures of twenty-two years under suspension of specie payment. The United States suffered more in the ten years following the cessation of hostilities by the wicked policy inaugurated by Secretary McCullough and his coworkers than by all the expenditures of that tremendous war. Destruction of Government money and the substitution therefor of bank paper, or, what is worse, the commodity gold alone, has, in the language of a distinguished public man, done more harm to civilization than famine, pestilence, and war combined.

The Government being the only source of legal-tender power, it is its duty to keep in circulation that quantity of money which will at all times bear a uniform relation to the property for sale and thus be a just and equitable measure. The suggestion that a commodity, whether it be gold, silver, wheat, cotton, beef, or anything else, will have the same quantitative relation at all times to all other commodities is obviously impossible. The world has tried for several thousand years to maintain an honest measure of value by the use of both gold and silver. This was much more satisfactory than the use of one of these metals, because two commodities are not likely to change their relation to all other commodities as frequently or as rapidly as a single commodity. If one half of all commodities were measured by the other half, the changes between the aggregate of the two halves might not be very violent. Hence the advocates of silver have contended and still contend that if gold is to be used silver must also be used to avoid fluctuations which are disastrous to civilization.

CIVILIZATION AND PROGRESS FOLLOW PRODUCTION OF PRECIOUS METALS.

My investigation leads me to the conclusion that every preceding civilization has come into existence with productive mines and disappeared with their exhaustion. This is because the volume of money has been limited to the supply of gold and silver. Prosperity and progress as invariably follow an increasing supply of money as night follows day; and poverty and want have always followed the exhaustion of gold and silver mines. Mining for gold and silver during the fourteen hundred years preceding the discovery of America was an unknown industry. The property of what was once the Roman Empire was gradually drawn together by the deathly grasp of contraction into feudal trusts. A few feudal lords rioted in luxury, while the great mass of the people became serfs and were sold with the land.

Gold and silver from the New World revolutionized the Old, and in thirty years after Mexico and South America commenced pouring out their treasures a Luther appeared, and all Europe was in the throes of reformation. The new money gave new life and created modern civilization. For three hundred years and until the commencement of the present century the product of silver, with a little gold, continued to flow without cessation. Then the Spanish-American wars interrupted mining, and Europe suffered financial depression for nearly half a century. In the United States the money famine was less disastrous than in Europe, because the great Mississippi Valley was open to all who would come and make a home. When the supply of public lands was fast being exhausted, and when Europe was in the throes of revolution, the gold of California and Australia came to the rescue and created an era of prosperity throughout the world which had no parallel in previous history.

DEMONETIZATION OF SILVER.

The cupidity of the creditor class to enhance the value of money and obligations payable in money induced Europe and America to cease printing legal tender upon silver and to print it upon gold alone. The demand for gold was so increased by this legislation

that in twenty years an ounce of gold would buy as much property in general as 2 ounces of gold would have bought in 1870. The United States obtained partial relief from this drastic contraction by the Bland-Allison Act of 1878 and the so-called Sherman Act of 1890, by which over five hundred millions of new money was printed on silver and put in circulation. The repeal of all laws for coining silver into money took place in 1893, and thereupon the business of the country was paralyzed. In the last four years, according to the Director of the Mint, there has been an output from the mines of the world of over a thousand millions of gold.

This enormous and unprecedented output of gold has reduced its purchasing power, or, what is the same thing, has enhanced the price of property. The worshipers of gold call attention to the fact that the country is more prosperous now than it was three years ago, and argue that the gold standard has accomplished this result. They overlook our large war expenditures and the fact that while the supply of gold was shrinking prices were falling, and that prices did not cease to fall until the supply of gold was greatly augmented. If they would give this matter a little thought they would see that it is the quantity and not the quality of gold which has given prosperity, because the quality of gold during all our years of adversity was the same as it now is. The check in the fall of prices and the advance already gained by the new supply of gold proves the contention of the silver men. They never pretended that there was anything in the quality of silver that would make good times, but they did contend, and do now contend, that an increase in the volume of money is what makes good times, and that silver would accomplish that desirable object as well as gold.

I will not elaborate, but will defy anyone to give an instance of great prosperity in any country, in any age, when there was not at the same time an increasing supply of money, and I also defy anyone to name a time of prosperity when there was a shrinking volume of money. The limitation of the supply of legal-tender money to the commodity gold creates a fluctuating measure of value. If the gold standard had been adopted on the discovery of the precious metals in the New World the feudal trusts would not have been disturbed by the output of gold. Von Humboldt, the best authority we have, tells us that from the discovery of America until 1803, 44 ounces of silver were produced to 1 of gold, and we know, as a matter of fact, that nearly all the gold that was produced during that period was found in combination with silver. If silver had not been used as money the silver mines of the New World would have remained untouched and very little, if any, gold would have been produced. It was the silver mining of the New World which quadrupled the amount of coin in the civilized world during the first hundred years after the discovery of gold and silver in Mexico and South America. It was silver mining that enhanced the price of property during that same century more than 200 per cent, increased the land holders of Great Britain from 30,000 to 100,000, made tenants landlords, and serfs tenants.

INCREASE IN PRODUCTION OF GOLD.

No great gold mines were known to exist between the commencement of the Christian era and the discovery of gold on the American River in California in 1848. The discovery of gold in Australia soon followed. These discoveries revolutionized the finances of the civilized world. The annual output of gold rose in a few years from $13,000,000, in 1840, to $134,000,000 in 1856. The annual yield thereafter gradually declined, and between 1881 and 1885 fell below $100,000,000. Since that time there has been a continuous increase, and within the last few years that increase has been phenomenal, until the annual output is estimated to be over $300,000,000. How long this increase in the product of gold may continue no one can predict. The South African war will have a disturbing effect by cutting off a large supply. But whether or not the output has reached its maximum, it is unreasonable to suppose that such enormous yields will be continuous. On the contrary, gold mines are easily and rapidly worked out, and experience teaches us that they are as certain to be exhausted in the future as they have been in the past.

Is it wise to select gold as the only money metal and rely on it as a commodity which will always bear a permanent and unvarying relation to all other commodities when the history of the past shows that its yield is the most uncertain and fluctuating of all the valuable metals? Reasoning from the past and from the very nature of things, if this metal is adopted as the only material upon which money can be stamped, disaster must follow. When both metals were used for monetary purposes we had periods of prosperity and progress, and as long as one of them or the two combined furnished an adequate supply of money all went well; but the supply of money was seldom constant, even when both were used. The mining of both metals sometimes failed, and barbarism swept over the land. It was fortunate for preceding generations that the people were not quite foolish enough to commit the mistake which is now proposed. If the mines of both metals were occasionally exhausted, producing financial ruin, such calamities were less frequent with the two metals than they would have been with one alone.

DEMANDS OF INDIA.

In addition to the certainty that the gold mines now being operated will soon be exhausted and that others may not be found, the recent action of Great Britain in putting India on a gold basis will make an enormous drain upon the gold of the world. When the 900,000,000 rupees and all the paper circulation in that country are made redeemable in gold, India will practically absorb the recent phenomenal output of gold. The drafts on this country for gold are the rumblings of a financial earthquake which may shake the foundations of political parties in the next Presidential campaign.

GOVERNMENT DEPRIVED OF BENEFIT OF ISSUING MONEY.

The bill under consideration deprives the Government of all the benefits resulting from the exercise of its sovereign power to create legal-tender money.

There are now in circulation $563,000,000 in silver dollars and silver certificates representing silver dollars, $346,000,000 of United States notes or greenbacks, and $21,000,000 of currency certificates issued under the act of June 8, 1872, making a total of $930,000,000 of paper and silver coin doing duty as money under authority of law upon which the Government pays no interest.

The House bill contemplates the retirement of this $930,000,000 of circulation and the substitution therefor, so far as the banking syndicate may deem it profitable, of national-bank circulation, upon which the people will be compelled to pay 3 per cent interest. It is true the people do not pay interest on the bank notes as such, but they do what amounts to the same thing, pay to the banks 3 per cent on bonds which cost the banks nothing, because the banks get their money back which they paid for the bonds when they receive their circulation. This 3 per cent is practically a subsidy, or rather a gratuity to the banks for doing what it is the solemn duty of the Government to do.

The nominal tax of 1 mill on the dollar of capital stock of the banks is a very trifling internal-revenue tax which the banks will manage to collect from the people. The subsidy will, however, not stop at $25,000,000, because the growth of the country will require more circulation and the banks will receive more subsidies. This subsidy is a very small part of the voluntary contribution which this bill makes to the banking trust. It gives that trust the power to increase or decrease the amount of circulation, which means the power to absorb wealth as fast as the toiling masses can produce it. The money syndicate can at pleasure make money scarce, destroy values, then go "long" on property everywhere, put out more money and make it plentiful, boom prices, unload; then again contract the currency, go "short," ruin everybody that booming prices had induced to go in debt, start anew to take in property at a nominal price, and boom and sell again. This process can be repeated every year by the syndicate which the House bill organizes. The scheme of the House bill, which the Senate bill honey coats a little, seems to be based upon the theory that the people have no rights which the powers that control the Government are bound to respect.

NATIONAL DEBT TO BE MADE PERMANENT.

In addition to paying interest to the banks for the money issued to them and the sacrifice of the rights of the people to a colossal monopoly, a vast national debt is to be created and maintained for the purpose of paying subsidies to the banks and keeping an enormous reserve of idle money. Why is the Government compelled to maintain a reserve to redeem money in circulation, if it be money? The idea of redemption implies credit. Money is a mandate; it is a law requiring the creditor to take the metal or paper upon which that mandate is indicated by the stamp of the Government in payment of his debt, and there is no more necessity or propriety in redeeming real money than there is in redeeming a law against larceny or murder.

The advocates of this bill tell us that the Government can not be trusted to issue money because it will issue too much or too little. If the Government can not be trusted to issue money, why was that power conferred upon the Government in the Constitution? If the Government itself can not be trusted to issue money, how can it be trusted to delegate that authority to a banking syndicate or any other class of speculators? Again, it is said that the Government can not properly regulate the quantity of money; that it must be regulated by gold alone, so that it can not be disturbed. The quantity of money was regulated by both gold and silver for thousands of years. Did the money manipulators have any respect for immemorial usage or the rights of the people when they used the legislative power of the civilized world to exclude silver because they had a monopoly of gold?

HOW QUANTITY CAN BE REGULATED.

If I am asked how the quantity of money can be regulated by law, and honestly regulated, I will say that a money stamped on metal or paper, representative of all property for sale, clothed

with unlimited legal-tender quality, redeemable in debts and taxes, and of a proper volume, would be an ideal money. If such money were established, and the Secretary of the Treasury were required to pay it out in lieu of all other money now in the Treasury, or hereafter to be received; if he were further required to destroy all other money of whatever description in, or to be in, the Treasury, and to sell, as bullion, all gold and silver in, or to be paid into, the Treasury, and to replace it all with the newly-established money, the volume of circulation in the country would thereby be neither increased nor diminished, but it would consist of a single circulating medium, which, to the exclusion of all other money, would be clothed with the money function and legal-tender power.

Does anybody doubt that the only money which would pay debts and taxes in the richest country in the world would be the best money? Every resident and every foreigner desiring to buy property or pay debts or taxes in this country would be compelled to have it. Would not such a demand be sufficient? If it be contended that the present supply of money is adequate, it can not be maintained that it will continue to be so. The growth of population and business constantly increases the demand for money, and the supply must also be increased to prevent contraction. The percentage of increase of population is known, and a like per cent of money could be added by covering into the Treasury a further amount of representative money in lieu of taxes, and the paying out of the same for current expenses.

The increase of business might require a greater percentage of increase in the volume of money than the growth of population would indicate. In that case it would be necessary to resort to that certain and reliable gauge of the volume of money which is found in the general range of prices. Competent and reliable statisticians might be employed to investigate prices and ascertain whether general prices were rising or falling. If rising, the amount of money covered into the Treasury from time to time might be diminished, and if falling, an increased supply must be found, until stability in general prices should be restored and maintained. It is the volume of money which regulates general prices, and by the rise and fall of general prices any excess or deficiency in the volume of money in circulation is shown.

The reason why general prices and the volume of money respond and correspond to each other is because the money in circulation and all the property for sale are reciprocally the supply and demand for each other. The confusion which exists with regard to the relation between money and prices arises from a comparison of isolated articles or commodities with money. The demand for money is equal to the demand for all other things, because it is the universal order for property; but the demand for each kind of property is limited. Its value, as compared with other property, and its price in money depend upon the supply and demand of the particular kind of property. The fluctuations in price or value of every description of property, in obedience to the law of supply and demand, have no effect upon the aggregate value of all property offered for sale, for that value is dependent solely upon the total supply of money.

MANDATE OF GOVERNMENT MAKES MONEY.

The statement of the Senator from Rhode Island that Germany, France, and the United States have large amounts of legal-tender silver money in circulation at par with gold without any promise of redemption shows the practicability of such a scheme, and also that it is the mandate of the government, and not the material upon which it is stamped, which creates good money. This fact is further illustrated by the relation between gold and silver through all the ages previous to 1873. The relative price of these commodities in the market always corresponds to their coinage value. Although the gold produced between the discovery of America and the discovery of gold on the American River, in California, was less than one-fortieth part in weight of the quantity of silver produced, still an ounce of gold would always buy 15½ ounces of silver; and between 1850 and 1870 the gold produced was as much as one-sixth of the weight of the silver produced, and still an ounce of gold continued to buy 15½ ounces of silver, showing that it was the legal-tender function applied to each metal that made it money and maintained the parity between the coins of the two metals. The fact that the weight of the silver in the world is at the present time about sixteen times as great as the weight of the gold in the world would seem to indicate that the ratio of 16 to 1 established by law is in accordance with the common judgment of mankind. Certainly no change ought to be made in the ratio in the light of any existing facts, and particularly in view of the fact that the outstanding obligations of the Government are payable in gold dollars containing 25$\frac{8}{10}$ grains of standard gold, or silver dollars containing 412½ grains of standard silver. This includes our most recent bond issues, and it is hoped that it will include all that may be issued in the future. The suggestion of Secretary Sherman of continuous additions to the weight of the silver dollar shows his ingenuity and genius in assisting the gold standard.

Such a system as I have suggested would require no national debt to maintain it, no subsidies paid to banking syndicates, no rigging of the market for stockjobbing purposes, and no dishonest practices to rob the people. What a contrast that would be with the present plan of an enormous and increasing national debt; of the unlimited power of the banking syndicate to expand and contract the currency and to lower and raise prices at will; of the millions extorted from the people by subsidies to banks; of the ever-present danger of the inevitable fluctuations in the output of gold. Let the people look on this picture and then on that and choose for themselves.

If the Government would resume its functions and issue its own money, the tremendous load of national debt under which the people must forever groan and struggle would be avoided and an honest and equitable measure of value would be constantly maintained.

DISCRIMINATION BETWEEN BONDHOLDERS.

If bondholders belonging to the banking syndicate receive from the Government the amount of money which their bonds cost in the form of circulating notes, and at the same time draw interest on their bonds, why should not all bondholders have the same privilege? Why should not everybody who invests in United States bonds retain his bonds and have his money back from the Government?

If the object of this scheme of finance is to put money in circulation, why limit the privilege to the banking trust? There is no doubt that the banks would be willing to receive from the Government two or three thousand millions of money if the Government would pay them 3 per cent per annum for accepting the donation,

THE GOLD STANDARD.

and there might be others not connected with the banking trust who would be willing to do likewise.

What is meant by the hackneyed phrase, "the gold standard," has not been fully explained. When we speak of standard weights and measures our meaning is plain, because a yard is a fixed length and a quart or a bushel contains an ascertained quantity of space. Money, to be a standard in the sense of accurate measurement of value, must be of such volume as will always bear a uniform relation to the aggregate of property for sale. To contend that money which is of a greater purchasing power at one time than it is at another is a just standard of value is like contending that a yard-stick 50 feet long, if made of some particular kind of wood, would be the same standard of measurement as a yard-stick 3 feet long. If money can be an honest standard measure of value, and the same money can measure five times as much property in the aggregate at one time as at another, why may not a gallon which includes five times as much cubic space at one time as it does at another be an accurate measure of quantity?

The contention of the advocates of the gold standard rests upon the assumption that the quality of gold is the only question considered in commercial exchanges. They deny that either the supply or the demand for gold has any effect in estimating the quantity of any particular commodity which a given amount of gold will buy. Their contention also assumes that if all the mountains were gold an ounce of gold would buy the same amount of wheat, cotton, or other products that it will now buy. This is the intrinsic-value theory of men who look as wise as Harrison, Cleveland, or Bynum when they announce to the world the necessity of money possessing intrinsic value.

The Secretary of the Treasury is not so absolutely ignorant of monetary science as his contention that the value of gold never changes would seem to indicate. In his reply to the resolution of the two Houses of Congress respecting his transactions with certain New York banks, he gives as a reason for depositing the money of the Government in national banks that it is necessary to do so to avoid contracting the circulation, and that to keep it in the Treasury would disturb the business of the country.

It seems a little strange that the Secretary can understand that locking up money in the Treasury vaults disturbs business and at the same time thinks it is necessary to use only the commodity gold upon which to stamp money, although every foreign financial trouble takes gold out of the country and deposits it in foreign vaults. He contends that money to be good money must be made of the same material that all other nations use for that purpose, and he can see no inconvenience in its withdrawal from circulation in this country by foreigners, while he understands that hoarding money in the Treasury is injurious to business.

In his lectures on gold he confines his arguments in favor of the exclusive use of that metal to its peculiar qualities, claiming that it possesses intrinsic value, while in administering the Treasury he regards the volume of money in circulation as of paramount importance, and deposits the surplus of the Treasury in banks to keep it in use and prevent contraction. Still, he contends that no matter how much gold or how little gold is produced, its volume when used as money does not affect its purchasing power.

It is passing strange that business men shape their transactions

in view of the probable supply of money, but when they discuss the money question they follow the example of the Secretary and assert that the quality of the material used as money is the only question of importance, without regard to the volume in circulation. Is it not singular that people can not see the absurdity of the intrinsic-value theory, while in every kind of business, industrial as well as speculative, they act on the quantitative theory of money? In their business they have in view the supply of money, but many of them in their arguments follow the teachings of the Clevelands and the Harrisons and maintain that all they want is intrinsic value in the money in circulation, no matter whether the volume is large or small.

In the early legislation of this country a dollar was denominated the unit of account. No one was vain enough to suppose that a dollar of gold or silver was an unerring measure of value. Value is simply estimation. It is relative and results from the comparison of the relative desirableness of things and is determined by the estimation of man. Money, in order to be a just standard of value, must bear such a relation to property in general that it will command in exchange the same amount of property, considered in the aggregate, at one time that it does at another. The value of gold varies more radically on account of its sporadic production than that of any other commodity, and the comparison of all commodities with gold alone makes property fall and rise in a most injurious and destructive manner.

Why should gold be the standard of all things any more than some other thing should be the standard of gold? To say that gold is an exact measure and standard of value is to utter a doctrine manifestly more absurd than the flat-world theory, for which formerly men who doubted its correctness were burned at the stake. But the advocates of the so-called gold standard, which means the limitation of legal-tender money to the fluctuating and capricious supply of gold, assign the following reasons in support of their contentions:

1. They assert that it is necessary for the commodity upon which money is stamped to possess intrinsic value, and that such intrinsic value is confined to gold. A complete answer to this contention is that there is no such thing, in a monetary or commercial sense, as intrinsic value. Value is not a material thing nor a quality of a material thing. Value is the estimation of buyers and sellers in making contracts. If value were an intrinsic quality it would require chemistry, and not market reports, to determine the value of wheat, pork, or cotton. Useful qualities of things have much to do in controlling estimates which create value, but it does not follow because a thing is useful or necessary that it is valuable in a commercial sense. The air we breathe is essential to animal life, but it possesses no commercial value because it can be had without purchase. A quart of water on the Mojave Desert is more valuable than a quart of water at a mountain spring, because the supply on the desert is very limited and the demands of a thirsty traveler are excessive. Value can only exist in a commercial sense where there is a demand and a limited supply. If there is no demand, there is no value. If there is no limit to the supply, there is no value. Consequently, the value of things depends upon the law of supply and demand, which controls the judgments of men in exchanging property or buying and selling it.

2. It is contended that gold money is necessary to settle international balances. A full answer to this contention is that international commerce is confined exclusively to an interchange of commodities. Money as such is never used to settle international balances. Metal money is as much a commodity outside of the jurisdiction creating it as pork or hay. The fact that gold is used upon which to stamp governmental edicts creating money throughout the commercial world makes it a disastrous factor in human affairs. As gold deserts one country for another, it breeds depression and panic; whereas money without commodity value would do duty at home and stay there in time of need. The Baring failure in 1890 and the Boer war now pending show the disastrous effects of the universal use of gold as a commodity money. If our money were stamped on silver—a commodity too weighty and bulky for quick desertion—and paper, which is thoroughly domestic, financial stringencies, and failures abroad, and foreign wars would not materially injure this country. On the contrary, they might benefit us by increasing the demand for our products.

Bondholders and speculators may enjoy advantages over the masses of the people by juggling with gold, but every country, when its national existence is threatened, banishes the traitor gold and creates money that will stay at home and furnish an honest circulating medium. The fact that international commerce has been carried on from time immemorial by countries using different kinds of money and different kinds of material upon which to stamp or print money refutes the contention that any one commodity, whether it be gold, silver, wheat, or pork, is essential to international trade. I will not question the motives of those who contend that gold is necessary as money to carry on international commerce, but will compliment them by saying that they are not much more ignorant than were the advocates of the flat-world theory or the devotees of witchcraft.

THE HOUSE BILL.

Under ordinary circumstances at least two-thirds, and perhaps three-fourths, of the circulating medium of the United States, if the House bill becomes a law, would be national-bank notes, and the amount of such circulation would be under the control of a legalized trust known as the national banks. These banks are owned and controlled by members of the National Banking Association, who meet from time to time and determine the policy of the banks. The few men who control the policy of the banks will also have control of the stock exchange through a few leading brokers, whom they will take into their confidence. The trust which controls the banks, the volume of money, and the price of stocks, by playing fast and loose with the volume of money, will control the destinies of this country.

When this bill shall be in full operation a colossal money and property trust will be created which will overshadow the money trust which put the Roman Empire in liquidation. The money syndicate of Rome, through cruel laws for the collection of debts, sold the great mass of the people into slavery. The people were called nexi because they were annexed to the land as serfs and sold with the land as slaves. The feudal lords were the legitimate offsprings or descendants of the money powers which destroyed Rome. The world has marveled at the colossal fortunes which were consolidated in the great trust when the fall of Rome began. The consummation of this legislation will present a combination of wealth and power in comparison with which its Roman prototype will dwindle into insignificance. The question is, Will imperial wealth and degraded serfdom curse the United States as they did the empires of old? The passage of this bill would seem to answer that question in the affirmative, but I still have faith in the American people that they will be aroused to the danger before it is too late and apply the remedy.

This proposed legislation may prove a boomerang and destroy the powers which formulated it. It certainly ought to show the people, if nothing else will, the deception which has been practiced upon them by the Goldites for more than a quarter of a century. There has been no election in the past twenty years in which the great mass of the people of all parties did not believe that they were casting their votes in favor of bimetallism. It is true the language of the platforms of both parties, except the Chicago platform of 1896, was somewhat obscure and ambiguous, but the two parties contended each with the other that it was a better friend of bimetallism than its antagonist. The bold departure proposed by this bill from the professions of all parties in every election since silver was demonetized may attract the attention of the people and inspire them to apply a remedy. If it does, great good will come from the folly, avarice, or stupidity of the advocates of gold contraction.

COMBINING AND LEGALIZING TRUSTS.

There are in the United States combinations the operations of which are harsh, unjust, and oppressive. Such grievances can not be remedied by railing against all business corporations and combinations, because cooperation is the basis of civilization, without which society could not exist. There are bad men in every community, and it would be just as absurd to rail against all men because some are bad as it is to cry out against business combinations because some are oppressive. The remedy against crimes of individuals and the extortion of corporations must be such as will reach the wrongdoers without including good people with the bad and legitimate industrial associations with conspiracies to extort money.

The Government need not be a party to oppressive or robbing monopolies, and above all governmental authority which permits or authorizes extortions or oppressions ought not to be created. I am unable to conceive of a greater monopoly than the power to issue and control the volume of paper money in this country. Such power would control the whole business of the country, including all other trusts and monopolies. There is no provision in the organic act of any constitutional government on earth which delegates the money-creating power to individuals or corporations; on the contrary, every government reserves to itself the sovereign power to create money by law, the only method by which full legal-tender money can be created. The Constitution of the United States provides that Congress shall have power "to coin money and regulate the value thereof."

The Supreme Court, in the Legal-Tender Cases, holds that that power includes the power to stamp money on metal, paper, or any other material upon which the mandate of the Government can be impressed. Much is said against the Standard Oil trust, the sugar trust, the railroad combinations, the steel trust, and other industrial and speculative organizations. When this bill shall become a law, will not the Rockefellers, the Havemeyers, and the Carnegies avail themselves of the extraordinary powers delegated to the

banking syndicate and form the controlling power in that syndicate? How can individual enterprise compete with the organized capital of the country clothed with the sovereign power to issue and control the circulating medium? It is to be hoped that no person who votes for or advocates this bill will ever be heard complaining of any trust, however extortionate it may be, because he should bear in mind that he voted to establish and maintain that very trust and place it under the protection of the laws of the United States.

ELASTIC CURRENCY.

It is asserted by the advocates of a banking trust that an elastic currency is necessary and that the banks will so regulate the volume of the circulating medium as to furnish the exact volume of money required at all times. Will not the banks, if they have power to contract and expand the volume of money, contract and expand it for their own benefit? Will they not, when it is for the interest of their broker associates, contract the money volume and force down prices? And, again, will they not, when it is for the interest of themselves and their associates, expand the currency, put up prices, and reap a harvest? To put the power to contract and expand the currency into the hands of a banking syndicate for the alleged purpose of securing an elastic currency is to put this india-rubber currency trap into the hands of the banks with which to ensnare producers and to spring when it is full of game.

CONFERENCE COMMITTEE TO FRAME LEGISLATION.

The particular provisions of the House bill or the Senate substitute need not be examined in detail. The general purpose of the legislation is very clearly defined by the House bill, and the Senate substitute will place the whole matter of framing the details of the bill in the hands of a conference committee, and when it comes back for the consideration of the two Houses it will not be amendable. In fact, it seems that the Senate bill is a sort of "shifter," and the two bills may be compared to the loose and tight pulleys used in machinery. The loose pulley is called a "shifter," which simply carries the belt when the machinery is at rest. The Senate bill will carry the belt of legislation until the real power is exercised in conference, and then the belt will be slipped upon the tight pulley and the wheels of legislation will be put in motion.

I will, however, call attention to some of the provisions of the House bill. It has a sweeping clause which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to buy up and retire silver certificates, Treasury notes, United States notes, and silver coin by the use of gold borrowed on the bonds of the United States. The general language is as follows:

> The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and required to use said reserve fund in maintaining at all times the parity and equal value of every dollar issued or coined by the United States, and if at any time the Secretary of the Treasury deems it necessary in order to maintain the parity and equal value of the money of the United States, he may, at his discretion, exchange gold coin for any other money issued or coined by the United States.

But for the sake of concealment, or some other purpose, the mode of retiring all the moneys of the Government, except gold, is elaborated as follows: The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to redeem the Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890, in gold, and to coin the silver now held for their redemption into subsidiary coin, the limit on the amount of subsidiary coin being expressly removed by the bill. The mode of disposing of the standard dollars is still more artful. The Secretary of the Treasury, whenever he deems it necessary in order to maintain the parity and equal value of all the money of the United States, may, in his discretion, exchange gold for any paper whatever, including silver certificates; in other words, he may buy up the silver certificates in circulation, and the bill provides that the certificates when so bought shall not be reissued or disposed of except in exchange for an amount of coin equivalent to the amount of coin which was expended in the purchase of the certificates—that is to say, they shall not be paid out except for an equivalent amount of gold coin.

In plain English, this artful provision authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to buy up and impound all silver certificates, which, of course, would impound the silver in the Treasury. Just what disposition he will make of the silver nobody knows, and yet nobody doubts. Everybody can see by the language of the act that neither the dollars nor the certificates will go into circulation, but will be impounded when they are bought with gold.

The act provides that as fast as the greenbacks are bought or paid into the Treasury they shall not be withdrawn except for gold coin, and thus Sherman notes, silver certificates, and the dollars in which they are redeemable, together with the greenbacks, are all to be disposed of under this bill and replaced by money upon which the Government, as before shown, will pay 3 per cent.

The Senate bill accomplishes everything by a most comprehensive scheme. It provides for the creation of an unlimited bonded debt and the refunding of all existing debts, and makes all the obligations of the United States payable in gold alone, and thus robs all other money, of every name and description, of its legal-tender power. It is also made the duty of the Secretary to sell bonds enough to maintain the parity of all kinds of money by redeeming everything in gold. If the people want a national debt ever increasing, without limit, and desire that the Secretary of the Treasury shall purchase gold enough to pay interest thereon and enough more to redeem all other kinds of money and pay vast subsidies to the national banks, their desire for hard times must be insatiable. The people must decide whether the power conferred upon the National Government to create money shall be transferred to grasping syndicates to be used to deprive them of their property and eventually their liberty, or whether they will have a sufficient volume of legal-tender money issued by the Government to maintain stability of prices, and have such money covered into the Treasury and paid out for current expenses to relieve overburdened taxpayers.

The passage of this bill, whatever may have been the intention of its authors, will bring this question squarely before the American people. If this bill shall become a law, there will be no dodging the issue. It must be met, and that issue will be between a government by a colossal and imperial concentration of capital, wielding the sovereign power of the United States to create, contract, and expand the volume of money, and an honest measure of value consisting of the legal-tender money of the United States. Can anybody doubt what that choice will be? I advise the banks, the moneyed institutions of the land, and good citizens every where to pause before they sanction this legislation which must create financial despotism, revolution, or anarchy. It will settle nothing, but will provoke agitation to right the wrongs it will inflict, and if this bill shall become a law, the good old proverb that there is no peace for the wicked will be verified, and that beautiful sentiment expressed in the Swiss address to the Government of the United States, that "unsettled questions have no pity for the repose of mankind," will be realized.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President——

Mr. ALLISON. I ask the Senator from Montana to yield to me just a moment.

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. ALLISON. At this stage of the debate, without intending to discuss the pending bill, I ask that there may be inserted in the RECORD the amount of coinage of gold and silver of the mints of the world for the calendar years since 1873, including 1898.

Mr. TELLER. Not including 1899?

Mr. ALLISON. Eighteen hundred and ninety-nine is not included. I take the calendar year 1898. I quote from the last report of the Director of the Mint, page 50:

> The total value of gold coined during these years amounts to $4,604,891,321.

Mr. COCKRELL. During what period?

Mr. ALLISON. During the period from 1873 to 1898, inclusive.

Mr. TELLER. By years?

Mr. ALLISON. The calendar years, giving each calendar year.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That is the production?

Mr. TELLER. The coinage.

Mr. ALLISON. It is the coinage of gold.

The coinage of silver during the same period amounts to $3,359,909,625. I ask that this table may be inserted in the RECORD. It is very brief.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa asks that a table to which he calls attention may be inserted in the RECORD. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

Coinage of gold and silver of the mints of the world for the calendar years since 1873.

Calendar year.	Gold.		Silver.	
	Fine ounces.	Value.	Fine ounces.	Coining value.
1873	12,462,890	$257,630,802	101,741,421	$131,544,464
1874	6,568,279	135,778,387	79,610,875	102,931,232
1875	9,480,892	195,987,428	92,747,118	119,915,467
1876	10,309,645	213,119,278	97,899,525	126,577,164
1877	9,753,196	201,616,466	88,449,796	114,359,332
1878	9,113,202	188,386,611	124,671,870	116,191,913
1879	4,390,167	90,752,811	81,124,555	104,888,313
1880	7,242,951	149,725,081	65,442,074	84,611,974
1881	7,111,864	147,015,275	83,539,051	108,010,086
1882	4,822,851	99,697,170	85,685,996	110,785,994
1883	5,071,882	104,845,114	84,541,904	109,306,705
1884	4,810,061	99,432,795	74,120,127	95,832,684
1885	4,632,273	95,757,582	98,044,475	126,764,574
1886	4,578,310	94,642,070	96,506,844	124,854,101
1887	6,046,510	124,992,465	126,388,502	163,411,307
1888	6,522,346	134,828,855	104,354,009	134,922,544
1889	8,170,611	168,901,519	107,788,256	139,362,566
1890	7,219,725	149,244,905	117,789,228	152,293,144
1891	5,782,463	119,534,122	106,902,049	138,204,367
1892	8,343,387	172,473,124	120,282,947	155,517,347
1893	11,243,342	232,420,517	106,697,783	137,952,690
1894	11,025,680	227,921,032	87,472,523	113,095,788
1895	11,178,855	231,087,438	98,128,832	126,873,642
1896	9,476,630	195,899,517	123,394,239	159,540,027
1897	21,174,850	437,722,992	129,775,082	167,760,006
1898	19,131,244	395,477,905	115,461,020	149,282,955
Total	225,664,115	4,604,891,321	2,598,680,032	3,359,909,625

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not know for what purpose the Senator from Montana rises—whether he purposes to discuss the pending bill or not.

Mr. CARTER. I rose for the purpose of calling up at this time Senate bill 2179.

Mr. ALDRICH. There is a bill already before the Senate. I wish to have some understanding in regard to that measure before anything else is called up. I should like to ask whether any Senator is ready to go on with the discussion of the pending bill.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I understand that there is no one on this side of the Senate Chamber ready to proceed with its discussion at this time. Senators have been very much engaged with other matters. While I know of a number of Senators who intend to submit some remarks on the bill before the vote is taken, a number of them have said to me that it has been impossible for them to be ready at this time to proceed with the discussion, but they hope to be ready very soon. I assure the Senator, as I did the other day, that there is no disposition on this side to delay the bill; but the personal convenience of Senators, it seems, requires that some of them, at any rate, should have some more time in which to prepare for the discussion.

Mr. ALDRICH. I beg to remind Senators that this bill was reported to the Senate three weeks ago, that more than a week has elapsed since the bill was taken up for actual consideration, and that up to this time we have had no speeches on the subject by Senators sitting on the other side of the Chamber.

While I have said repeatedly that I did not expect to object to discussion, and that we would be glad to have the fullest and freest discussion, I think I have a right to ask that that discussion shall take place within some reasonable time. With a desire, which I believe is shared by almost every Senator sitting upon either side of the Chamber, to reach a conclusion upon this subject at as early a day as possible, I feel it my duty to give notice that I shall ask to have this bill taken up on Monday. If there are no Senators ready to discuss it, I shall ask the Senate to vote upon it; and if there is anyone ready to discuss it, I shall ask to have the bill considered continuously until it shall be disposed of, and that without any desire to be unreasonable in my request; but this is a matter which it seems to me I must ask of the Senate.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to ask the Senator a question, if he will allow me.

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator complains that the bill has been before the Senate for a week since he made his speech. I wish to ask the Senator if there is to be any further discussion on the side of those who support the bill except what we have had?

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not know at the present time of anyone who desires to speak. So far as that is concerned, we are ready to vote on the bill at the present moment.

Mr. TELLER. We who are opposed to the bill and who propose to discuss it—as the Senator from Arkansas says, without any intention to delay it unnecessarily—had a right to suppose that the bill, which presents so grave a question, one that has been so much controverted, would at least have more than one defender on this floor. If the bill is to be submitted without any debate on the other side except what we have had, it will be the most extraordinary thing that has ever happened in legislation in any free country.

Of course I know that this is a caucus bill, but I did not suppose that it was a caucus bill to the extent that the whole defense of the bill was left to the chairman of the Committee on Finance. However, if that is the case, we will get ready for this debate. I should have been ready for it before, but I had every reason to suppose that somebody besides the chairman—some member of the committee, some one who sees so much beauty in this system—would at least take up the question and do what the Senator did not do, except in part—present to us the necessity for this legislation.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Colorado is mistaken in his view of the substitute. In the first place, this is not a caucus bill.

Mr. TELLER. I wish to say that the bill before the Senate properly, the one to be considered, under the suggestion made by the Senator who just left the floor, as all who know something of practical legislation are aware, is the bill that came from the House. That is first to be discussed, although the substitute of the Senate committee takes its place. When we allowed the Senator to put in the Senate bill for convenience, so that amendments might be made to it, he did not understand, I hope, that he would cut us off from debating the House bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. Not in the slightest.

Mr. TELLER. That is the bill that some of us at least are going to address ourselves to, not but that practically the bills are the same, but there are some features which are different in the bill as it came from the House, which I understand is a caucus measure, although I do not think it is hardly just to say that it is the result of a caucus of the Republican party, because it is not. It was the result of a caucus of some outside, intermeddling people, who thought they knew more about finance than anybody else in the world, and who induced a small percentage of the Republican members to adopt it as their work.

But we know very well, Mr. President, that when this bill passes, if it passes with the Senate amendment and goes into conference, we are practically cut off from any further debate and amendment, and that we shall have to take the bill as it is. So far as I am concerned, I want to make some objection not only to the Senate bill, but to the House bill, upon the theory suggested by the Senator from Nevada a few moments ago, which is in absolute accordance with the practice in the Senate that has been so viciously followed. I will instance, if anybody wants an illustration, the Sherman Act of 1890, a bill that was forced upon the silver people of this country, which, as I myself said, thirty minutes before I voted for it, was absolutely indefensible as a money measure, and was only put upon us to prevent the passage of a free coinage bill and the necessity of a Republican President vetoing it, which he had declared over and over again he would do if it came to him.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I do not undertake to deny the right of the Senator from Colorado or any other Senator to discuss in any of its phases either the House bill or Senate bill; but I have suggested that if it is to be discussed that discussion ought to be had. I assume there is no obligation on our part to do anything more than to present the bill and to furnish with it the explanations which those who are responsible for the measure think are necessary for the information of the Senate.

I did not undertake to defend the bill, because the bill needs no defense from my hands or anybody else. The merits speak for themselves. I simply undertook to explain its provisions. Those provisions up to this moment have not been criticised by anybody upon the Democratic side of this Chamber and by no Senator except the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], who sits upon this side. The customary course of discussion, of course, is that some Senator representing the minority on the committee shall undertake to discuss the bill and give his reasons why it should not be adopted. That, up to this moment, has not been done, and I am simply trying to impress upon the Senate now that I feel it to be my duty next week, when the bill shall come up again, to try to secure either discussion or a vote.

Mr. COCKRELL. You will have some discussion.

Mr. TELLER. I wish to say one word further, Mr. President. I have not felt myself under obligation to commence the debate against the bill (although I am intending to debate it), because I think there is great force in what the chairman of the committee says, that the acknowledged minority of this body perhaps, who we know are not in accord with the bill, ought to attack the measure. I am in absolute sympathy with them in their attack against it. In the orderly way in which we are doing business here I suppose it is perhaps to be expected that they will commence the opposition to it.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The Senator in charge of this bill reminded the Senate that the bill had been reported to the Senate three weeks ago, but he did not remind the Senate that on the very day after his report was made the Senate took a recess for two whole weeks. Many Senators were out of the city and were not in a position to take up public business, and when they returned a number of matters were before the Senate for consideration. Bills have been taken up here for discussion, and the morning hour has been taken up in the discussion of matters of general and public interest.

Senators on this side did not consider themselves called on to lay aside every other question in which they felt a public interest for the purpose of preparing for this debate. I do not think there has been any such delay on this side of the Chamber as to call for any criticism, and none of which the Senator from Rhode Island can very materially complain. I have assured him that there is no intention on this side to delay the consideration of the bill or to delay a vote. It shall be had at an early date. There will be no disposition to prevent that; there is none whatever, and has been none; but gentlemen on this side who desire to submit arguments against the bill to show its unwisdom or the reasons why it ought not to pass need some time, in connection with other public duties which they have, to present their views in as clear, distinct, and concise a way as possible.

I hope there will be, I am sure, in fact, there will be gentlemen ready to take up the discussion on Monday next, and that there will be a number of gentlemen ready in the near future to proceed with the discussion. I hope there will be no disposition on the part of the Senator in charge of the bill, as I am satisfied there will not be, to prevent any fair discussion.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the further consideration of the bill be postponed until Monday at 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island asks that the pending bill be postponed as the unfinished business until Monday at 2 o'clock. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. It is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

TWELFTH AND SUBSEQUENT CENSUSES.

Mr. CARTER. I ask for the present consideration of Senate bill 2179.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I shall try to get an opportunity this afternoon for a vote on the resolution of inquiry, upon the terms of which my colleague and myself have agreed. I hope it may be adopted without objection. I give notice of that purpose now.

Mr. CARTER. I believe the census bill can be very promptly disposed of, I will state to the Senator. It is a matter of an urgent nature.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana asks that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill indicated by him.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2179) relating to the Twelfth and subsequent censuses, and giving to the Director thereof additional power and authority in certain cases, and for other purposes, the pending question being on the amendment of Mr. CULLOM to insert at the end of section 2, on page 3, the following proviso:

Provided, That the Director of the Census may, in his discretion, collect statistics relating to all the deaf, dumb, and blind, notwithstanding the restriction in this section relating to special classes.

Mr. CARTER. I have been authorized by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] to withdraw that amendment in his absence.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be regarded as withdrawn.

Mr. BACON. I should like to ask the Senator from Montana a question, not being familiar with the discussion which has been had so far. Is there any provision in the bill under which the census authorities would have an opportunity to take any statistics with reference to deaf-mutes?

Mr. CARTER. There is in section 8 of the bill a provision looking to that class of inquiries, and there exists an understanding that certain restrictions in section 8 will be removed when the time arrives for the active operations under and in conformity with the provision of that section.

Mr. BACON. The reason why I make the inquiry is because I have had a communication on the subject from an institution for deaf-mutes. I do not wish to offer any amendment if I have the assurance that the bill as it stands is sufficiently elastic to permit of such an enumeration and of such statistics as may be desired relative to that class of people.

Mr. CARTER. I will state to the Senator from Georgia that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] had an amendment pending, and discussed it at some length, and, in view of the arrangement made for some future action with reference to that subject, he authorized me to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. HOAR. Is there any harm in inquiring of the Senator what is that arrangement for future action?

Mr. CARTER. The desire of the Senator from Illinois was to amend section 8, which, for the time being, is an inactive section of the bill. It is provided that work under section 8 shall not be commenced until after the completion of the decennial census. The work can not be commenced under that section until an appropriation is made for that purpose. The work can not be commenced until Congress directs that the Census Bureau shall take up the subjects-matter embraced in section 8. Now, the objection to the present language of that section by the Senator from Illinois and those concerned in the subject to which he addressed himself, and to which his amendment relates, was that it confines inquiries as to special classes to those in institutions.

Mr. HOAR. I understand all that very thoroughly, but I want to know what is the remedy proposed.

Mr. CARTER. Not desiring to encumber the present bill, which relates to administrative work exclusively and is emergency work in its character, I have suggested to the Senator from Illinois, on the assurance of members of the Census Committee, that when work is to be taken up under section 8 we will favor his amendment to that section, removing all restrictions with reference to inquiries as to the deaf, dumb, and blind.

Mr. HOAR. I want to present a like consideration in regard to mine. I think that possibly the direction in the existing law to get the statistics of manufactures would authorize the statistics of manufacturing power, but I suppose a lawyer—I give that as an illustration of the whole point—would hold that the special enumeration of one, of electric power, is an omission of the rest, and that one power being mentioned in the section it would be held that that did not include water power.

I do not suppose there is anybody, certainly no business man, no manufacturer, no lawyer, who would question the importance of those statistics. Early in this very year I was counsel in an important controversy where there were some eighteen cases involving millions of dollars claims for damages, an entire stream having been taken by a city for the water power, and I was surprised to find how imperfect were the statistics as to the water power of the country and their large worth.

There is a paper on the statistics of water power in the last census, as the Senator will recollect. The gentleman who prepared the paper himself admitted the imperfect material he had for it. I have been very strongly urged to bring this matter to the attention of the Senate by the gentlemen who were engaged in compiling those statistics the last time. There is some statistical matter, and a great deal in regard to my own State, because we have had every alternate five years a State census. The material for this compilation very largely exists in the great national Survey, the Geological Survey, where, of course, the configuration of the earth's surface is very exactly measured and recorded now all over the country. So it will not be a very expensive affair to get the material, and I hope the Senator will give me the same assurance which I understand him to have given the Senator from Illinois. I may say that the amendment which I offer has been approved by the honorable Senator from Maine and by the honorable Senator himself as a good thing in itself. If they can give me the same assurance that they have the Senator from Illinois about my amendment, I will not detain the bill by debating it as an amendment here.

Mr. CARTER. The Senator from Massachusetts correctly states that the Senator from Maine, as well as the chairman of the committee, approved of an inquiry directed to the ascertainment of the information contemplated by his amendment; and in so far as personal assurance goes, I can state to the Senator that our votes on the committee of the Senate favor that amendment to the bill at the proper time.

Mr. HOAR. I ask leave to have the amendment moved now and printed for the information of the Senate, and then I will withdraw it on that assurance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts presents an amendment. Does the Senator desire to have it read?

Mr. HOAR. Let it go into the RECORD. I do not care about its being read. I move it as an amendment to the bill. I want it stated from the Chair that it is moved as an amendment. Then I will withdraw it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts offers an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. HOAR. It will be printed in the RECORD. It is not necessary to read it.

The amendment presented by Mr. HOAR is to add the following:

That, in addition to the statistics enumerated in the eighth section of an act to provide for the taking of the Twelfth and subsequent censuses, approved March 3, 1899, the Director of the Census be, and he is hereby, directed to collect statistics of the water power of the country.

Mr. HOAR. Now, I withdraw the amendment on the understanding of the chairman of the committee that in his opinion the committee will report favorably upon it as an independent matter when the proper time in the future shall arise.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not understand that that kind of a bargain is going around the Senate. I do not understand that the chairman pledges the committee to vote for anything. As I understood the words of the Senator, he said that the committee gave assurance that the committee would vote to adopt the amendment.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator did not understand me correctly.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I beg pardon.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator misunderstood my statement.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understand the assurance was that in consideration if the Senator would not press the amendment at this time the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Maine on the committee would vote for the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOAR. That is very different.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If there is to be any further bargain, I should like to know it.

Mr. HOAR. That is very different from what the Senator said first.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is very different from what I understood the Senator from Massachusetts to say.

Mr. HOAR. I did not say anything of the kind. I said on the assurance of the Senator from Montana that in his opinion it would be favorably considered when the time came, I would not press the amendment now.

Mr. WOLCOTT. But I did not understand the Senator from Montana to present so flowery a view of his committee as that. I did not understand him to say that in his opinion his committee would join with himself and the Senator from Maine in voting for the amendment. He only went so far as to pledge his own vote

and the vote of the Senator from Maine, and if it went further than that I should like to have the RECORD to show it.

Mr. HOAR. I will ask the Senator from Montana if it is not his opinion that the committee will be likely—I understand he does not pledge anybody—to consider the amendment favorably?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I should like to have it read, if I can have it.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the statement was—I repeat it as it was—that I understood the fact to be that the Senator from Maine had precisely, as represented by the Senator from Massachusetts, examined this proposed amendment, was favorable to it, his only objection to the amendment being its incorporation into this bill, such action being calculated to encumber the work of the census. That is my own position. The amendment is a simple one. There is no reasonable probability of any radical change of opinion concerning it. I have no doubt that the amendment will commend itself when presented at the proper time to the Senate and that it will become a part of the law. I merely express that opinion.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have been trying to further the interests of wise legislation. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts to the fact that the Senator from Montana now very carefully disavows any expression of opinion as to how anybody will vote on this bill in committee except himself and the Senator from Maine, whom he feels authorized to pledge.

Mr. HOAR. And he adds the opinion that he thinks the entire Senate will favor it when it comes up. I trust my very lively friend from Colorado will admit that that includes the proposition I stated.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the anxiety of the committee to have this bill acted upon promptly is based upon the considerations set forth very briefly in a letter just received from the Director of the Census. I appreciate the consideration of Senators in withdrawing amendments calculated to lead to protracted discussion.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator allow me a moment?

Mr. CARTER. I wish, for the information of the Senate, to have this letter read from the Secretary's desk, whereupon I will cheerfully yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will read the letter referred to by the Senator from Montana.

The Secretary read as follows:

CENSUS OFFICE, OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D. C., January 11, 1900.

DEAR SENATOR CARTER: I beg to hand you herewith samples of the schedules, now either in print or delivered at this office, that will be used in the coming enumeration. You will observe that there are altogether over 10,000,000 of these schedules. To make any change in their form would delay the work in such a way as to make it practically impossible to carry out the present law. These schedules will be packed for shipment during the coming month, and, in many cases, will be sent to the supervisors before the 1st of March. I sincerely trust that there will be no additions to the present law that will in any way interfere with the prompt delivery to the supervisors of the country of the schedules in the form herein indicated. The amendments that have been suggested through your committee are purely administrative in character and necessary for the work and efficient carrying out of the present act. I hope you will call the attention of the Senate to this, in order that there may be no delay.

Truly, yours,

W. R. MERRIAM, *Director.*

Hon. THOMAS H. CARTER,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

Mr. CARTER. I now yield with pleasure to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. SPOONER. I want to make a suggestion in regard to this bill to the Senator from Wisconsin, to which I think he will agree. I suppose I am not alone in having a desire to amend the bill, but I deferred proposing an amendment because of the urgency with which the Senator from Montana pressed its passage without amendment. I am taken, as I suppose other Senators are, somewhat by surprise by the proceedings here to-day.

If I had known what was to happen, I should have offered my amendment yesterday and secured on the record here a stipulation from the Senator to-day as the price of my withdrawal of it. Now, I suggest to the Senator whether it would not be entirely agreeable to him and altogether fair to let this go over until Monday next, in order that those of us who desire to advantage ourselves in the interest of the general public in this arrangement should have an opportunity to prepare our amendments, to offer them, and to secure on the record a stipulation in regard to them similar to that which has been arranged with certain other Senators.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I want to call the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin to the fact that the pledge is only made on the part of the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Maine.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not dispute that.

Mr. CARTER. I ask the Senator if he thinks the arrangement is of sufficient importance to justify waiting over until Monday?

Mr. SPOONER. The arrangement being confined to the Senator from Montana, I am inclined to say I do not. [Laughter.]

Mr. PETTIGREW. I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, as section 3, the following:

SEC. 3. That the Director of the Census is hereby required to collect statistics relating to the indebtedness of individuals and corporations, public or private; also in relation to the distribution of wealth among the people of the United States; also statistics as to the displacement of labor by machinery, and the increase of the power of production by machinery in proportion to the number of laborers employed during the last thirty years. And for this purpose the Director of the Census may employ special agents, and such special agents shall receive such compensation as other special agents.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, this amendment is intended to secure statistics with regard to the distribution of wealth. It does not require the enumerators to gather the statistics on this subject, and therefore will not delay the purpose of the law which we have passed.

We make the Census Bureau, as I understand, a perpetual bureau of statistics and information, and to fail to gather the information referred to in my amendment, it seems to me, would be a very serious mistake. The question as to what becomes of what the toilers of this land produce, whether it goes to them or is taken from them by special privileges and accumulated in the hands of a very few people is a very important one and reaches ultimately the question of the preservation of free institutions.

The other subject in my amendment is with regard to the displacement of labor by machinery and the increased power of man's production thereby. I desire this information for the reason that I believe man's power to produce as the result of the adoption of machinery has increased many times more than the increase of his wages, which should have occurred as a result of his increased power of production; in other words, that the increased power of production as the result of machinery has inured to the advantage of capital many times more than to the advantage of labor; that this has caused in a large degree the unequal distribution of wealth in this country; that the increased power of production as the result of machinery should go to the toiler in a much larger degree than to the capital employed; that the power to produce by machinery is a benefit to mankind if the increased power to produce goes to the toiler, because his power to consume is also increased, and thus the consumption and enjoyment of a greater measure of the luxuries and comforts of life must go to those who produce the wealth of the land.

I therefore believe these two questions are exceedingly important; and I have asked that this information be collected by special agents rather than by the enumerators, so that it will not delay a single day or a single hour the securing of that information which seems to be the prime object of the bill.

I hope the additional section I have offered will be adopted without objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will not be adopted at this time. It will come under the supplemental work provided to be performed after the conclusion of the present census; and inasmuch as the subject-matter is of the character specified by the Senator and should be performed by special agents, it is not necessary that it should be entered upon at this time, as it would seriously encumber this bill.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Montana how it would injure this bill? It does not seem to me that it can interfere with the purpose of getting the statistics of population or anything of that kind.

Mr. CARTER. It interferes with the bill in that it would begin at this time to provide for additional work to be performed and information to be obtained with the taking of the decennial census. Any additional task imposed after the schedules have been printed and prepared for shipment, as they are, involves the printing and preparation of other schedules, which must be perforce distributed to special agents, supervisors, or enumerators, and it is now quite obvious that after millions of these schedules have been printed——

Mr. PETTIGREW. My amendment does not interfere with that at all. It will not require anything to be done now.

Mr. CARTER. It will require additional printing in connection with the census, which is now prepared to be performed in an expeditious manner; and we think that, inasmuch as this work can be done through special agents, it ought to be confined to section 8 of the act, which provides for the performance of certain work after the completion of the census.

Mr. TELLER. I do not see how this amendment, if adopted, will in the slightest degree interfere, because the proposed work is not to be done by the enumerators, it is not to be done by the people who are going to receive those schedules, but by an entirely different force, as I understand the amendment; at least, it ought to be done in that way. It ought not to interfere with the enumerators. It seems to me it would be wise to place the amendment on the bill and let the Director of the Census know what he is to expect, so that he may get ready to enlarge his work; and this proposition, as I say, is separate and distinct.

He will want an entirely different schedule for it from that

which he has prepared. I do not myself wish to put anything in the bill which will retard getting out the population statistics and some other statistics of that kind, although I think the information desired by the Senator from South Dakota is much more important than even that of collecting the statistics of population. The Treasury Department gives us every month an estimate of population, and I have no doubt we know within probably a million what population we have now.

But the information designed to be secured by the amendment can only be collected by a class of high-grade people. Such work can not be done by the common man who goes and enumerates the people in his community. It can only be done by men of education and good judgment; and when the information shall be gathered it will be the most valuable we shall secure in the whole line of statistics.

The subject involved in the amendment is one very much discussed and very much mooted throughout the world; and yet no real data have been collected that I know of in any country which would entirely satisfy the desire for such information. I believe the adoption of this amendment would secure it. I should like to see the amendment adopted, and adopted early enough so that the work can be done, and we can get the result of it not at the same time with the population statistics, but afterwards.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, to that particular suggestion there can be no reasonable objection, but each of the persons interested in various special subjects considers the special subject attracting his attention as of the most vital and overwhelming importance.

Mr. TELLER. Let us keep the others off and keep this on.

Mr. CARTER. We have in section 8 of the law provided for the collation of statistics, after the completion and return of the enumeration, on the following subjects:

> Statistics relating to special classes, including the insane, feeble-minded, deaf, dumb, and blind; to crime, pauperism, and benevolence, including prisoners, paupers, juvenile delinquents, and inmates of benevolent and reformatory institutions; to deaths and births in registration areas; to social statistics of cities; to public indebtedness, valuation, taxation, and expenditures; to religious bodies; to electric light and power, telephone and telegraph business; to transportation by water, express business, and street railways; to mines, mining and minerals, and the production and value thereof, including gold, in divisions of placer and vein, and silver mines, and the number of men employed, the average daily wage, average working time, and aggregate earnings in the various branches and aforesaid divisions of the mining industry.

And a line of other productions. All of these were embraced in the Eleventh Census, and the incorporation of these mighty details into that census made the census such a ponderous work that its results were not known for eight or nine long years after the enumeration. It is that unfortunate situation we desire to avoid at this time, and for the purpose of avoiding it the census work has been divided by the original act into two distinct parts—first, a decennial census confined within the narrow limits of population, agriculture, manufactures, and vital statistics, and there we stopped.

We provide for the continuation of this line of investigation, though after the enumeration shall have been completed, and thereupon for these other subjects in which the people are interested, in which legislators are interested, humanitarians, and people in all the walks of human thought and endeavor, if you please, each feeling that the thing which has engrossed his attention is of more vital importance than all the other things put together.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator permit me to ask him right there at what time is it anticipated this special work will be begun? In other words, what I desire to know is this: The Senator has suggested that by subsequent amendment to the bill whatever defects there may be regarding enumeration upon such particular subjects as Senators desire may be subsequently corrected by amendment. The point of my inquiry is whether the subsequent enumeration on these special matters will probably be begun before or after the next session of Congress? The Senator will see the purpose of the inquiry. If this inquiry can not be begun before then, of course whatever amendments ought to be made should be made now.

Mr. CARTER. I will state to the Senator from Georgia that no investigation can be commenced on this supplemental work until Congress shall have appropriated the money for that purpose. Not one farthing has been appropriated, and no money will be appropriated at this session for this additional work, in all human probability.

I have suggested to Senators having in view inquiries upon supplemental topics that when the appropriation is made to conduct inquiries under this section will be the time to incorporate amendments directing the particular subjects upon which investigation shall be prosecuted.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to ask the Senator a question so as to see if I understood him. Does the Senator mean to say that no appropriation will be made at this session of Congress for this specific work?

Mr. CARTER. I doubt whether any will be made for this supplemental work.

Mr. TELLER. Why not?

Mr. CARTER. I do not know as to that, but the probabilities are that the regular census work will not be completed until Congress convenes in December next.

Mr. PETTIGREW. But the amendment I have offered provides that the special work referred to shall be delayed until after the completion of the returns of the enumerators and the work upon the schedules relative to agriculture, manufactures, and mechanical establishments.

Mr. CARTER. As a practical proposition in that particular it is known that the force which will carry out this supplemental work will not be through with the work of tabulating the schedules of the decennial census until probably the 1st of next January, and there will then be ample time to make the appropriations for this supplemental work.

Mr. ALLEN. I want to ask the Senator if it is proposed to enumerate the industrial combinations of the United States and their effect upon the industrial classes? Perhaps I do not make myself as fully understood as I should. What I mean is, whether there is any intention to make a distinct enumeration of the trusts and combinations, their capitalization, their actual capital, their influence upon the industrial classes, and so on and so forth?

Mr. CARTER. I refer the Senator for an answer to the seventh section of the act. The first part of that section provides what the Twelfth Census shall be.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator be kind enough to read it? I have not a copy of it before me.

Mr. CARTER. The seventh section provides:

> That the Twelfth Census shall be restricted to inquiries relating to the population, to mortality, to the products of agriculture and of manufacturing and mechanical establishments.

Then there is a definition of what the population schedules shall apply to.

Mr. TELLER. That is the bill at present before the Senate, is it not?

Mr. CARTER. I am reading from the present law. The bill before the Senate is one wherein certain administrative features of that law are corrected and provided for.

Mr. TELLER. The act provides, then, for a very limited examination?

Mr. BACON. I desire to make an inquiry of the Senator from Montana. I understand the objection urged by the Senator from Montana to the proposed amendment is that millions of copies of the schedules for the taking of the census will be practically useless or will have to be changed in order to conform to such requirements as amendments may place upon the census work. The question I want to ask the Senator is this: Do the schedules concerning which the letter from the Director of the Census has been read embrace anything more than the subjects-matter which the Senator mentions as the subjects for quick enumeration?

Mr. CARTER. They do not.

Mr. BACON. That is the very point as to which I desire information. If they do not, then of course these amendments can not in any manner affect those schedules, because, as the Senator states, the enumeration with reference to population, manufactures, agriculture, and vital statistics are to be begun immediately, and the schedules have been prepared for them. The other work which will be attended to under these proposed amendments is not to be done on those schedules at all, but upon altogether different schedules. Therefore the argument, it seems to me, as presented by the Senator is not forceful.

Mr. CARTER. The argument presented by the Senator from Georgia is upon a mistaken notion of the facts.

Mr. BACON. I was asking the Senator as to the facts before I proceeded.

Mr. CARTER. If the Senator had heard read the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW], he would have perceived that the amendment contemplates the addition to the decennial census work of inquiries on particular subjects—not waiting until after the completion of the enumeration. The same was true with reference to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM], relating to the deaf, dumb, and blind. He contemplates an inquiry upon that subject contemporaneous with the taking of the decennial census, which would involve the printing of separate schedules, which would have to be forwarded to the supervisors. To print those schedules would cause great delay, and the enumerators would be encumbered with additional work. The addition of any amendment is only unfortunate on account of the work it would entail by inaugurating a policy of legislation which would probably result ultimately in altogether breaking down this census.

I agree with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] that we have restricted the census to narrow limits in confining it to population, manufactures, agriculture, and vital statistics; but a line

of demarcation had to be drawn somewhere in order to have this work completed within any reasonable time, and the line was drawn there, the rule of action being to confine the census to such subjects only as could be intelligently investigated by a house-to-house canvass. Any matter that could be investigated through special agents or by correspondence was left out of the decennial census work.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I think I can throw a little light on the subject in which the Senator from Georgia is interested, in regard to the deaf, dumb, and blind. After the population schedule, as outlined in section 7, shall have been completed—in other words, after the enumerator has taken the population in accordance with the requirements of section 7—section 8 provides:

> That after the completion and return of the enumeration and of the work upon the schedules relating to the products of agriculture and to manufacturing and mechanical establishments provided for in section 7 of this act, the Director of the Census is hereby authorized to collect statistics relating to special classes, including the insane, feeble-minded, deaf, dumb, and blind; to crime, pauperism, and benevolence, including prisoners, paupers, juvenile delinquents, and inmates of benevolent and reformatory institutions; to deaths and births in registration areas; to social statistics of cities; to public indebtedness, valuation, taxation, and expenditures, etc.

There is a very vast field to be covered by this special work to be done after the first census, as it has been termed, has been completed. But there is a condition which limits the tabulation of the deaf, dumb, and blind to those who are in institutions.

Mr. BACON. That is true.

Mr. TILLMAN. Therefore the deaf, dumb, and blind population scattered throughout the country in private families, of whatever age or condition, are not to be enumerated in the census, and there is no means of arriving at the number of persons of that character.

Mr. BACON. It is to cure that defect that I desire to have the amendment put in the original law. If the Senator from Montana will pardon me a moment, there is already pending the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM].

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. That has been withdrawn.

Mr. BACON. It is stated that that amendment has been withdrawn. I was about to read it for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that it does not in any manner, so far as I am able to judge of it, complicate or interfere with the taking of the quick census. If it is practicable to do what the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] has criticised, to have an agreement to the effect that this subject will be attended to on the appropriation bill, it will be all right. I do not wish to embarrass the present bill, but I do not see how the amendment would do so, for the reason that it expressly provides this work shall be done after the enumeration in which the quick census is to be taken.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will say for the information of the Senator from Georgia that if it is not taken with the first census it can not be taken at all without an intolerable additional expense. It is for the Senate to determine whether it will enlarge the scope of the census. If we break down the barrier erected by the Census Committee, we simply, as we were notified by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] the other day, open up a flood of amendments concerning each special class of inquiry any Senator may wish to have included.

Mr. PETTIGREW. My amendment provides for nothing of the kind. It simply provides that this Census Bureau of statistics, which is perpetual, may by special agents, not by enumerators, investigate this all-important subject. I think the census would be of very little value without it. It is not personal to myself, nor a subject that I am particularly or personally interested in, but it is a great public question. The question of the distribution of the wealth of this country is certainly a question of more importance than almost anything else that can be investigated. As the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] has said, we have almost day by day a very accurate estimate of the population. We have very many other statistics which are constantly being produced by the statistical bureau, but the question of the distribution of the wealth of this country has never been adequately and fairly investigated. It ought to be.

I do not propose to delay the taking of the census, and my amendment does not delay it at all. It simply provides an additional section for the doing of this additional work. If the schedules are all prepared and the work is disposed of, the enumerators can commence their operations; and therefore the Department will have the time to get out additional schedules for the special agents to do the work which I desire to have done. This work can not commence until an appropriation is made. It is quite proper, then, that the amendment should be on this bill, because section 8 is in the original law, which provides a large amount of extra work to be done after the main census has been taken through the enumerators; and if it was a proper time to provide section 8 in the law when we passed it last year, it is time now for my amendment to be placed on this bill. That is all I want. I do not care to discuss it further.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, I should like to contribute a few words to this discussion. If I understand the matter, the present bill of the Committee on the Census relates purely to the administration work under section 7, and is necessary in order that that work may go on for the quick census, as it is called. Having presented a bill upon that subject, it happens that there are a good many Senators here who feel that the scope of section 8 ought to be enlarged. It seems to me that that is a matter for the committee to consider and to bring in for the consideration of the Senate hereafter.

It is perfectly apparent that if we are going to try to enlarge the scope of the work under the eighth section by the adoption of one amendment, this bill is not going to pass in that form after that amendment shall have been adopted, but all Senators who feel that the scope of the census should be enlarged are going to ask to have action delayed upon it until they can bring forward the particular measures which they think should be attended to in the enlargement of section 8.

Now, we are not going to pass any bill for the perfection of the administration of the census if this policy is pursued. It seems to me that the way to do is for the person who wants the census enlarged to present amendments to that bill and refer them to the committee and have the committee consider them. It is evident it has got to be enlarged in some respects. Then let the committee consider all the questions as to the enlargement of the scope of that work and present them all together to the Senate. Then if Senators are not satisfied, of course that bill will be a proper one to amend by the introduction of other topics. But it does seem to me we ought to pass this bill now and not complicate it with these other questions.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, I wish to say simply one word, and that is that section 2 of this bill does enlarge the scope of the census as provided for in the original act.

Mr. BACON. I wish to call the attention of Senators, and particularly of Senators on the committee, to one consideration which, it seems to me, takes this particular subject-matter, in which I have some interest, out of the possibility of its being included in the suggestion made by the Senator from Connecticut.

The suggestion which I wish to make is that the enumeration as to the deaf, dumb, and blind can not be made at any time except when the enumeration of population is made, except at a very great expense, which would require a canvass from house to house, just in the same way that the canvass is made for the purpose of ascertaining the number of people.

There are a great many matters which can be investigated and statistics collected relative thereto which are not subject to this particular requirement, and therefore it is either now or never. It seems to me practical. If I am wrong, I should like to be corrected by the committee. If there is a way in which it can be done subsequently, of course I have no desire to embarrass the committee by doing that which they do not wish.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Georgia, I desire to state that all this matter has been before the Committee on Census, and it was thoroughly considered. It was then decided to be not best to embody it in this amendment of the law, for the reason that the enumerators appointed throughout the country are not the class of people who would be best fitted to investigate the question in which the Senator from Georgia is so much interested, and that by special agents hereafter appointed for that purpose, or it may be by getting in correspondence with the physicians throughout the country, better results would be reached than could be obtained by the enumerators who are not of the standard to go into the several households in their enumeration districts and ascertain this very important information.

Mr. BACON. I understand, then, and I call attention to it because we may have to refer to it hereafter, that it is the opinion of the Census Committee, after having investigated the question, that this subject-matter can be especially attended to hereafter—that it will be practical to do it?

Mr. CARTER. Yes, sir; that is it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have an amendment which I wish to offer. I move to add as an additional section:

> That in the event of the death of any supervisor or enumerator after his appointment and entrance on his duties, the Director of the Census be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay his widow or legal representative such sum as may be just and fair for the services rendered by said supervisor or enumerator prior to his death.

Mr. CARTER. That amendment relates purely to an administrative matter and is entirely germane to the bill. I see no objection to it.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLEN. I have an amendment very imperfectly drawn which I desire to present and which I hope will be amended and amount to something. I will read it, as no one could read it but

myself. I desire to offer it as an amendment to section 2 of the bill on page 3 after line 23:

And provided further, That the Director of the Census shall also cause to be enumerated all industrial and other combinations known as trusts, their situs, the amount of their capitalization and the actual capital invested in them, their effect on the laborers and consumers of the country; and he shall also gather and tabulate all other information with reference to them necessary to an understanding of their character and effect on the Government.

That, I admit, is rather crude in its language, but I think it covers the case.

Mr. ALLISON. How does the Senator propose to have the work done?

Mr. ALLEN. Let it be done by special agents. I do not care how it is done so it is taken up as a distinct branch and the country furnished with full and accurate information on the subject. I do not want to delay the passage of the bill nor discuss its merits after 4 o'clock, but this matter seems to have been entirely overlooked.

Mr. CARTER. I wish to state for the Senator's information, if he will permit me——

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. CARTER. The present law the Senator will find in Public Act No. 183, and section 7 provides as follows:

The schedules of inquiries relating to the products of manufacturing and mechanical establishments shall embrace the name and location of each establishment; character of organization, whether individual, cooperative, or other form; date of commencement of operations; character of business or kind of goods manufactured; amount of capital invested; number of proprietors, firm members, copartners, or officers, and the amount of their salaries; number of employees, and the amount of their wages; quantity and cost of materials used in manufactures; amount of miscellaneous expenses; quantity and value of products; time in operation during the census year; character and quantity of power used, and character and number of machines employed. The form and subdivision of inquiries necessary to secure the information under the foregoing topics relating to manufacturing and mechanical industries shall be in the discretion of the Director of the Census.

I suggest to the Senator that these inquiries will, I think, fairly cover the matter contemplated by his proposed amendment.

Mr. ALLEN. If I thought so I would not offer this amendment. The inquiries called for by the section just read by the Senator from Montana, in my humble judgment, call for nothing more than what may be called the legitimate manufacturing and industrial interests of the country. A trust, if I am correctly informed, is a combination. It is an association of corporations intended and calculated to control the particular output which it undertakes to produce, to fix its price, to regulate the price of labor, and all matters pertaining to that particular branch of industry. What the Senator has read does not cover the question of these trusts.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to call the Senator's attention to one matter. I am very much interested in his proposition.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. ALLEN. Always, Mr. President.

Mr. HOAR. Do not the words "character of organization, whether individual, cooperative, or other form" include, in part at least, what the Senator wishes to reach?

Mr. ALLEN. I should think not; at least it is capable of a double construction. What I want to see, Mr. President, is a distinct enumeration of the numerous trusts of this country. I would like to have the Director of the Census go further, and find out the percentage of increase, showing when they started. Certainly it is important to the country, and it is daily growing more important, that the people should be informed of the influence of these trusts and combinations upon the Government itself.

This is not a question that any Republican or Democrat or Populist should shrink from. It is a question that every man, regardless of his political opinions, should be willing to have brought to the surface and have full information obtained upon it, for I feel confident, Mr. President, that however much we may disagree respecting measures and policies affecting the country (and we do disagree, and we disagree irreconcilably), yet we can not disagree upon any question which the people, or any respectable portion of the people, believe is sapping the life and the vitality of the Government itself. There we reach the plane of patriotism where we must all stand in favor of the Government.

Now, I do not understand that it is the purpose of the act which has been passed to enumerate these trusts as separate institutions, to compile the information under a distinct head, necessary to a clear understanding of them. It ought to be so simple and so plain that the commonest reader could understand it. It ought not to be scattered through five or six large volumes or more. It ought not to be in such a form that those who desire to know what the truth may be respecting these institutions shall be compelled to search through the volumes of the census, when they are published, to ascertain what the facts may be.

It is strange to me that a subject so important as this should escape the attention of Congress. These combinations, Mr. President, are the subject of delay and agitation in the press of the country and among the people, and whatever we may say respecting the political views on any class of our people, whether we agree with them or disagree, we certainly can not afford to treat them with disrespect, and we can not afford to deny them the information to which they are entitled.

The money that pays for this census, Mr. President, comes from the taxpayers of the country, the rich and the poor alike. There is no distinction; every man pays according to his ability. If any class of our people desire to know whether these gigantic financial and industrial institutions are threatening the life of the nation, they ought to be permitted to know that, and there ought to be no disagreement between us here respecting it.

Mr. President, I would not insinuate that there is any purpose to escape this unpleasant duty by a misconstruction of the law already in force, but I can see that a man who is rather technical in the construction of language may say that that does not mean that there shall be a separate enumeration of all these institutions. It provides that they shall simply be classed as a part and parcel of the industrial institutions and enumerated under the separate and distinct heads to which the contributing corporations and organizations belong. That is not what I want. That is not, Mr. President, what I believe is necessary for the people for whose information all this mass is to be gathered.

I have no desire to talk longer on this subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska. [Putting the question.] The noes appear to have it. The noes have it, and the amendment is lost.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to have a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment, if I can get it.

Mr. CARTER. I trust the Senator will not demand a yea-and-nay vote at this hour in the afternoon.

Mr. ALLEN. Why not? Mr. President, does the Senator propose to deny the country this information?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Nebraska I will state that his proposition is to pay a $3-a-day enumerator or a $600 clerk to pick out certain lines of business, without judicial inquiry or determination or day in court, and pronounce them trusts.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not propose anything of the kind.

Mr. CARTER. Nothing else on earth can be done with the proposition as presented by the amendment than to commission a clerk in the Census Office to denounce certain persons as conducting business under what is commonly denominated the organization of a trust. The proposition answers itself.

There are certain laws which have been passed, very strict, stringent, and drastic, denouncing trusts. These trusts, if trusts exist, have a right to their day in court before the criminal laws of the country can be applied to them. Every individual citizen of the United States, and every combination of capital, in whatsoever engaged, has a right to a fair hearing before being denounced and put in an odious position in the public prints. The amendment could not be executed at all.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator from Nebraska a question?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. I sympathize with his desire to get this information as thoroughly as possible, and I think it ought to be got under the present law. It requires the character of all corporations to be ascertained, which, I suppose, would mean, of course, their legal character—whether an association of individuals or of partners. But the question I wish to put to the Senator is, Who, under his amendment, is to deal with the very interesting and important question of the effect of each one of these organizations upon the public interest and welfare? He requires that to be stated. It would seem to me that that function should be committed to a committee of the Senate or to some such tribunal. It would hardly be a function that we would commit even to any of these enumerators or even to the one man who is the Director of the Census.

I wish to ask the Senator the meaning of that particular phrase, that there shall be in the census a report of the effect on the public welfare of a certain way of doing business.

Mr. ALLEN. I shall be glad to answer that in consecutive order as far as I am capable of doing as I proceed with what I was going to say.

The answer of the Senator from Montana is hardly satisfactory to me on this question. I think I know something about the force of language, and I think also that I know something about what it is to inquire into facts to determine their effect upon a given condition.

The Senator from Montana is altogether too much alarmed about some $600 enumerator condemning and stamping as criminals certain organizations. Mr. President, I am not here at this time to say whether these organizations are criminal or not. I have my opinion about it, but this is not the time to express it. I do not care whether the clerk draws $3 a day or $33 a day, if he gets the information. I do not care if you call him a clerk or an enumerator or a director or a judge, or what you may call him. Names

count for nothing. It is the function that he performs that makes his services valuable or not valuable.

What is there about these industries that you can not get official information about them? The moment their name is mentioned or their interests are challenged in this Chamber that moment some gentleman stands on his feet to defeat any information respecting them. Of course he does not say in so many words "We do not want this information," but he finds some indirect and deft method of side tracking every measure that is calculated to bring out the desired knowledge.

There is no purpose, as I understand it, and I think the Senator from Montana impliedly, at least, confesses it, of classifying these institutions and enumerating them or of determining fully, or as fully as can be, their effect upon the institutions of our country. I come to that now to answer the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, when you ascertain the information respecting the wealth of the people of this country you ascertain valuable information upon the subject of its effect upon the country. The wealth of the people has all to do with that people. When you find out the per capita wealth of the country, you ascertain valuable information respecting the influences that bear upon the destiny of that country. When you gather this information, if it can be gathered, concerning these great and gigantic institutions and what they have done, if they have done anything, respecting the policies of the nation, respecting political parties, their success or their defeat, you ascertain valuable information that bears upon their influence upon the country.

As I said, Mr. President, I do not desire at this late hour to delay this bill. I have no more interest in it than any other Senator. I have as much; my people have as much. I dare say that among the people of the great State which I have the honor in part to represent in this Chamber there can not be found even a Republican—not one, and there are many strict party men there—who would deny the right of the people to this information, and who would not wish that some steps might be taken to gather it.

What subtle influences do these great organizations possess that you can not stand in the Senate of the United States and obtain proper information respecting their capitalization and respecting their influence upon the country? There seems to be some hidden power that is exercised over Congress respecting this matter. Have we come to that period, Mr. President, in the history of our splendid country when we dare not inquire into those organizations and those influences that affect it for its well-being, for weal or for woe?

This information hurts no person and no class of persons. It is highly important, and it strikes me that it is highly patriotic, for Congress to take some steps that will provide it for the benefit of the country.

I do not want to delay the Senator from Montana, but I should like to see an expression of the Senate on the subject. I should like to see gentlemen go upon record who say that this information is not valuable. Yet I realize that possibly a vote of that kind might disclose an unpleasant situation at the present moment, and therefore I do not desire to do that. But I suggest to the Senator from Montana to permit this matter to go over until to-morrow morning—I shall not debate it further—so that we may take a yea-and-nay vote upon it.

Mr. CARTER. I suggest to the Senator that going over to-day means a delay of the measure until next Monday.

Mr. ALLEN. I understand that this information is not to be gathered for five or six years yet anyway.

Mr. CARTER. The bill relates exclusively to the matter of administration; and certain work in the census is now being delayed—for instance, in the laying out of districts.

Mr. ALLEN. The matter of administration means the appointment of certain persons desiring positions.

Mr. CARTER. That is a very minor part of the bill.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from Nebraska did not answer my question, and I am afraid I did not make it clear. I did not ask him whether he thought that trusts, as they are called, are injurious or beneficial to the country, and I did not raise any question as to the collection of all the information about them being for the interest of the country. I think it is to the interest of the country to get all the information we can in the speediest way. But I understood him to go further and to propose to have the report of the census state whether trusts are beneficial or injurious to the country in the opinion of somebody.

Mr. ALLEN. No; to gather the information.

Mr. HOAR. I beg the Senator's pardon; I am stating what I understood.

Mr. ALLEN. Oh, I beg your pardon.

Mr. HOAR. That is what I understood the amendment to be—that somebody, some public official, is to report to us what is the effect of trusts on the interests of the country; and I asked him whose opinion on that point was the one to be reported, whether it was the enumerator or some clerk or the Director of the Census. Now, will the Senator have the amendment read, and he will see, I think, not only that I was likely to so understand it, but that I understood it correctly.

Mr. ALLEN. Let the Reporter read the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read by the Reporter.

The amendment was read by the Reporter, as follows:

And provided further, That the Director of the Census shall also cause to be enumerated all industrial and other combinations known as trusts, their situs, the amount of their capitalization and the actual capital invested in them, their effect on the laborers and consumers of the country; and he shall also gather and tabulate all other information with reference to them necessary to a clear understanding of their character and effect on the Government.

Mr. HOAR. That is the point I make, if the Senator will pardon me, that the Director of the Census shall cause to be enumerated the effect of the trusts on the business of the country. That is the logical effect——

Mr. ALLEN. It may be the effect of it. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] criticises my pronunciation of the word "situs," and it may be that the construction of the language I have used is not proper.

Mr. HOAR. That is the way I understood it.

Mr. ALLEN. Indeed, I am prepared for surprises of all kinds and to find that possibly there are no trusts in the country. So far as the effect of the language the Senator from Massachusetts refers to is concerned, I do not see the slightest thing to obstruct the obtaining of accurate information of the effect of these organizations upon the Government itself. I do not profess to say how this is to be done, but I know how I would do it if I were the Director of the Census.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator allow me right there?

Mr. ALLEN. No; let me finish my reply and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. TILLMAN. I just wanted to ask a question.

Mr. ALLEN. I have not finished my answer to the question of the Senator from Massachusetts. I would select the most competent men I could find to gather this information. In the first place, I would have Congress authorize me, if I could get it to do so, to appoint men who would have quasi-judicial power, if I have properly pronounced the word "quasi," and who, like a committee of Congress, should travel over the country to the situs of the different industrial organizations, and there inquire and take the evidence of those who know anything about the effect of those institutions in that community; whether they have reduced their labor force; whether they have reduced their wages; what has become of the persons thrown out of labor; whether they have raised the price of their manufactured articles; whether they have curtailed the output, and so on, ad infinitum, if that is correctly pronounced.

Mr. HOAR. Ad infinitum.

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, ad infinitum, if that is more comprehensible. I am glad even at 53 years of age to know that my education is imperfect and that I still have an opportunity to improve, and, Mr. President, I rejoice that upon my right I have the culture of the extreme East and upon my left I have the culture of the extreme South to assist me in my struggle. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOAR. I suppose the Senator pronounced that syllable short to save the time of the Senate. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALLEN. Possibly. Now that information is not difficult to ascertain. We send out committees almost every year to gather up specific information. A riot occurs in the country, or another matter of great importance to the country takes place, and we want to know what the facts may be and what is the truth respecting it.

Mr. ALLISON. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. ALLEN. Is it in the way of correcting my pronounciation? [Laughter.]

Mr. ALLISON. I wish to make a suggestion to the Senator.

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. ALLISON. We have an industrial commission now that is investigating this subject, I am told. It has very ample authority and ample means, and it is composed of eminent men, some of them members of the Senate. Are they not engaged in this work?

Mr. ALLEN. I do not know why they are not.

Mr. ALLISON. They are, I understand.

Mr. TILLMAN. Now, will the Senator allow me?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. I sympathize very deeply with the purpose the Senator has in view, and I am sure every Senator here would like to have correct information as to the location, which I think, if the Senator will permit me, is a better word than situs, of the various corporations.

Mr. ALLEN. Does the Senator say sītus or sĭtus?

Mr. TILLMAN. I never saw the word except in the ablative case and in what little Latin I read, "in situ." I say sītus, but of course I do not belong to that class of men who are well educated, and like my friend here, who is a graduate of a college. I quit

school at 17, about the time the Senator did, and I have been knocking around for a living ever since, and I am not putting up any pretense to be learned. But I would say that as to the location, as well as the actual works of the combinations of capital known as trusts, any man in the Senate will thank the Senator if he can define them in a bill in such a way that the enumerator, or special agent, or a committee on the census, or anybody else will be able to go immediately to any city where these people are at work, and will know where to find the man or men whom he must interrogate.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator will find 200 of them in the World Almanac.

Mr. TILLMAN. I expect there are 5,000 of them in the United States to-day. A large number of them have got charters from New Jersey, as I understand. But that is not the point now. The bill which is being pressed by the Senator from Montana looks to perfecting the working machinery for taking the census; in other words, the administrative features of the Census Office. It does not deal at all with the character of the work. If the Senator wants to amend the work—in other words, if he wants to enlarge it—if he wants to gain special information on any given topic, like he does on this, I am sure, judging from the conditions which are existing, the Republicans, who are going to howl in the next election as being the very sternest enemies and oppressors of trusts——

Mr. ALLEN. They are doing that now——

Mr. TILLMAN. Will join him in such a bill, and the Democrats will, who are going to howl that the Republicans are the friends of trusts and they are hypocrites, and all that kind of thing, and I will join the Senator in charging that. But please let the pending bill pass now just as it is; and let the Senator bring in a proposition for an amendment of the census law defining what a trust is, and what a combination of capital or association of capitalists is, or any other thing which he can designate with certainty as being a trust. I am sure the Senate will pass it without a word.

Mr. ALLEN. Well, Mr. President, I am sorry to see that my friend from South Carolina has gone, too.

Mr. TILLMAN. That is so ambiguous that I would like to ask the Senator in what direction I go. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALLEN. I do not know in what direction he has gone or in what direction he is going. Mr. President, it is the sheerest kind of nonsense to say that the bill provides simply for the administrative features of the census, and therefore you can not put anything else in it.

Mr. TILLMAN. I do not say that the census law can not be amended and probably enlarged in a way that it will be valuable. I do not think that we were perfect when we framed it last winter, because we were rushed. But, if the Senator will permit me, I am sure that the way to amend the law, if we should propose to enlarge its scope and incorporate new schedules in it, is not by attempting to amend this special bill that we now have under consideration.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, every well-drawn act (and it does not take an expert or a college graduate to know it; sometimes the college graduate knows the least about it) prescribes duties and its own administration. There never was a criminal statute drawn in the world creating a crime or defining a crime that it did not prescribe its administration, its enforcement. To say now that we must indulge in refinement, that we must have a bill creating certain duties upon the part of the Director of the Census, and then another bill directing the method of the performance of those duties, in my humble judgment is the worse kind of rot, if I may put it in that language.

All I have asked in this proposed amendment is that the Director of the Census shall gather this information. Now, Mr. President, we have Senators who throw up their hands and protest against it. Not one of them will stand upon the floor of the Senate and say that the information is not desirable. Even my friend from South Carolina, who I supposed was the deadly enemy of these organizations in so far as they injuriously affect the country, seems to want to side track this amendment.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator will permit me, I must protest that my language does not bear any such construction. I am simply trying to assist him in the object he seeks to accomplish, and that is, first, that the associations shall be so designated or described that the enumerator or special agent or special agents will be able to find them. Simply to designate something somewhere as a trust, if the Senator will permit me, reminds me very much of an expression that I have heard in the South in my childhood from the old darkies with whom I used to 'possum hunt. I have gone out with those old gray-headed fellows, as boys like to do, you know, running around at night with a torch when the moon was not shining hunting 'possum—opossum, if you prefer it; we do not put the "o" on.

Mr. ALLEN. Common 'possum will do me.

Mr. TILLMAN. A 'possum hound or dog is a very trusty and tried friend of the colored person, or the nigger, to turn to the vernacular; he rarely fails to do the work right. He would strike a trail, and we would follow it, pushing along more or less vigorously as he would proceed, and as he got hotter and hotter on the trail those of us who were trying to keep up with him, you know, would follow close. After a while he would come to a tree and rear up on it and bark.

Well, we thought we certainly were going to have "'possum and 'taters" next day, and we would go to work, having an ax along, of course, or two of them, and cut that tree down. Lo and behold when the dogs would rush in there was not a thing up there, and the darkies would immediately say "Let's go home; that dog was running haunts." [Laughter.] Now you are running haunts, my friend. There is no 'possum up that tree. My friend from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW] who is by my side did not understand me because I gave the nigger pronunciation. It is haunts, meaning spirits.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I am afraid my friend from South Carolina has strayed from the true path. I appreciate, of course, this little diversion and his reference to his unsuccessful 'possum hunt. I had some experience in that line of business myself when a boy. But, Mr. President, you can not laugh down this question, and the Senator from South Carolina will never be able to explain to the people of that State why at the critical moment when this information was in the reach of the Congress of the United States he took the attitude he takes here at this moment.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator permit me again?

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator's stories are not too long, I am perfectly willing to listen to him.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have no story to tell, Mr. President; I simply tried to illustrate the position. I sympathize with the Senator. The Senators on both sides of the Chamber are ready to pass any bill he can bring in here which will define clearly and distinctly what he proposes to designate as a trust. There are no friends of trusts here in the open. There is not anybody here, if the Senator will locate a trust and prove that it is a trust, but who will give him the right to inquire into its business by some census officer.

Mr. ALLEN. Here stands a Senator in the middle of the Senate Chamber declaring in the year 1900 that there is no such thing as a trust.

Mr. TILLMAN. I do not declare anything of the kind, because I know there are thousands of trusts in the United States. Everything we wear, eat, or have anything to do with, even to the smallest, is in charge of trusts now, and the people are being robbed by them.

Mr. ALLEN. Why, then, does the Senator from South Carolina want me to draft an amendment defining what a trust is?

Mr. TILLMAN. Simply for the reason that the census enumerator can not possibly under your amendment go to any manufacturing establishment and say, "I have authority to investigate you, and I declare you to be a trust." You must declare under the law what a trust is before this man will have authority to go to any association of capitalists or any manufacturing establishment and say to them, "Under the law you are described as such and such, and knowing from my personal knowledge that you are a trust, therefore you must answer my inquiries."

Mr. ALLEN. Then we have come to this, that you have got to define every word in a statute by that statute itself. A trust, a corporation, an association are words that are as well understood in the English language as the word "horse" or the word "dog," and yet what does the Senator here desire? That I should frame an amendment to define a trust. Why, Mr. President, the word "fraud" has been used for three hundred years in the legal nomenclature of the English-speaking people, and there is no man alive to-day who can define it.

Mr. DAVIS. The courts have declined to do so.

Mr. ALLEN. As the Senator from Minnesota says, the courts have repeatedly declined to undertake to define it. It is capable of so many phases, can be presented in so many forms, that no court, from the establishment of the English courts down to the courts of the United States this day, undertakes to define the word "fraud." Yet, Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina would have me draft an amendment that would undertake to define, and possibly that would be destructive of the very ends intended.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator permit me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. ALLEN. Oh, always.

Mr. TILLMAN. If, with your magnificent training as a lawyer, legislator, and statesman, you decline the task of defining what a trust is, how in the name of common sense can you ask some three or five dollar a day man, who is hunting around here for a job as a census enumerator or special agent, to go and designate them? He would not know them if he met one on the road. [Laughter.] I should like to ask the Senator, and I know he has no more admiration for the author of that expression than I have, what would he

say in regard to that famous remark, "A public office is a public trust"? Does that come in as an example of the subject that he would have investigated?

Mr. ALLEN. I do not see, really, the application of the last remark. But I understand Mr. Cleveland is not the author of that remark.

Mr. TILLMAN. I simply wish the Senator not to try to do me any injury with my constituents at home by undertaking to announce here as his opinion that I am bamboozled and debauched by my associates in this Chamber.

Mr. ALLEN. Not debauched, Mr. President, but bamboozled. The remark the Senator refers to antedates the advent of Mr. Cleveland into this world by a great many years, and it also antedates the advent of the Senator from South Carolina, and, I believe, the oldest Senator here. But it has no application to this bill or this proposed amendment, and I do not propose to notice it any further. I simply want to say that all this cavil and cajolery about this proposed amendment is designed to side track the amendment and distract the attention of the people from the fact that the Senate of the United States intends to decline this investigation.

The Senator from South Carolina says there is not a Senator here who will not vote to have these institutions enumerated. I can not, of course, speak for the Senate or for any individual Senator further than myself, but if I were out of this Chamber and not subject to its rules I would say that two-thirds, or at least a majority, of the Senators in this Chamber will vote against any measure that looks to the enumeration of these organizations and to an investigation of their influence upon the country. Whether Senators like it or dislike it, whether I please them or displease them—and I desire to please them as far as I can—I propose to bring this subject to the attention of the country in my feeble way and acquit myself of my duty, whether others see fit to do so or not. That is for them to determine.

Mr. President, this Congress does not belong to the members of Congress. This is not my body nor yours. It is the legislative branch of the Government of the people of this country. They sent us here. They want this information. Why not give it to them? There was a distinguished man in this country at one time who is said to have uttered the remark, "The people be damned." That seems to be the spirit in Congress now. There is not the slightest intention of gathering the information on this subject. Here stand these great combinations that are threatening the very life of the nation. Congress sits here impotent and powerless to investigate them and to see what they are and what influence they exercise upon the political institutions of the country.

And why? Because we are dealing with an administrative bill; ergo, you must not touch it with anything else. Senators talk about the administrative features of the bill. There is no reason why they should be bunched together. Every section that creates a duty or a right ought to be followed by administrative language in the same connection.

Of course I do not know what I can do more than to submit to the vote that has been taken here. I would be perfectly contented if Senators would put their votes upon record. I should like to put mine there, Mr. President, and I want the country to understand now that I do put my vote on record, not only in favor of the enumeration of these great organizations and the ascertainment of their influence upon the country and upon our political institutions, but in favor of their destruction as enemies of the country. I did not suppose it was in the heart of a Democrat, especially a Southern Democrat, who had been taught better from his youth up, to obstruct, directly or indirectly, the gathering of this useful information.

Now, Mr. President, I have said all I want to say. I wish the Senator from Montana would permit the measure to pass by. I do not want to be forced to the steps that I may be forced to take—I do not want to do that—yet I should like to see a yea-and-nay vote upon this question.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, it is important that the bill shall be acted upon to-night, and the Senate is so thin that it must be done without a roll call. I suggest to the Senator that the Census Office is very greatly hampered because of its inability, for instance, to pay the expenses of the supervisors in the ordinary work of laying out the enumerating districts. It is desirable that 300 supervisors shall be set at this work immediately. Three days' time or four days' time will be of much consequence in the execution of the work, that must be as nicely poised and in as good form as any piece of machinery in the works of a watch.

Mr. ALLEN. If we do not get the census reports any sooner than we got those of the Eleventh Census, a delay of several days will not be a serious matter.

Mr. CARTER. It is our desire to avoid the delay which attended that census. It is important to have the work pressed forward without unnecessary delay, and I trust the Senator will cooperate with us.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I only want to say a word for the benefit of my friend from Nebraska. I have no uneasiness as to any result to myself of his accusation that I am obstructing or endeavoring to obstruct as an ally to those who wish to keep this information from being obtained.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator permit me? If my language is capable of bearing that construction, it was not my intention.

Mr. TILLMAN. I do not think the Senator has any idea of doing more than to emphasize his own earnestness in the object he had in view in offering the amendment, and I of course absolve him from any other intention, but his language would necessarily bear the interpretation I put upon it.

Mr. ALLEN. Possibly my remarks were attributable to the Senator's 'possum story.

Mr. TILLMAN. If my little anecdote has offended the Senator, I am sorry that I told it. I had no purpose except to try to get him into a good humor, so as to let us get through with the bill.

I wish, however, to call the attention of the Senator from Montana, who will not be as frank as I am, to the fact that if he calls for a yea-and-nay vote it will be made manifest there is no quorum present; at least the indications are that there is none. So the bill can not pass to-night, and the Senator can not get a vote upon it. There is no purpose to obstruct the Senator from Nebraska. If he will bring in a bill which will define the associations of capital which he is endeavoring to locate, provide for having their business tabulated and their methods inquired into, and whatever other inquiries he may wish to have made, I feel that I can almost guarantee that the Senate will give him a patient hearing and a yea-and-nay vote, and, if I am not mistaken, will pass the measure.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I ask unanimous consent of the Senate for the present consideration of the bill (S. 301) to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Indianapolis, Ind.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with an amendment, in line 9, section 1, after the words "two million," to strike out "five hundred" and insert "two hundred and fifty;" so as to make the section read:

That the amount heretofore fixed as a limit of cost for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building for the use and accommodation of the United States post-office, court-house, custom-house, internal-revenue office, pension office, and other Government offices in the city of Indianapolis, in the State of Indiana, be, and the same is hereby, increased to $2,250,000, which sum is hereby fixed as the limit of cost of the site and the erection of said building thereon.

Mr. COCKRELL. I wish simply to ask for information in regard to this bill. The building has already been appropriated for, as I recollect.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. It was appropriated for at the last session of Congress.

Mr. COCKRELL. And this bill proposes to increase the limit of cost?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Yes, sir; that is the fact.

Mr. COCKRELL. What are some of the reasons for it?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. The appropriation made in the original bill was less than was necessary; it was quite inadequate. Since then there has been a very considerable increase in the cost of materials and labor, and the land necessary for the building site cost more than was originally estimated.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is very manifest that there has been an increase in the cost of all building material from 25 to 50 per cent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which has been stated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. SHOUP. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After ten minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 15, 1900, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 11, 1900.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Louis J. Winston, of Mississippi, to be collector of customs for the district of Natchez, in the State of Mississippi, to succeed David King, removed.

POSTMASTERS.

Lorena Hays, to be postmaster at Cullman, in the county of Cullman and State of Alabama, in the place of Elbert Hays, deceased.

George F. Beales, to be postmaster at Visalia, in the county of Tulare and State of California, in the place of M. J. Byrnes, whose commission expired December 21, 1899.

Thomas F. Griswold, to be postmaster at Covina, in the county of Los Angeles and State of California, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Lewis A. Groff, to be postmaster at Los Angeles, in the county of Los Angeles and State of California, in the place of J. B. Mathews, whose commission expired December 20, 1899.

John W. Loyd, to be postmaster at Portersville, in the county of Tulare and State of California, in the place of P. C. Montgomery, whose commission expired December 21, 1899.

John W. Wood, to be postmaster at Pasadena, in the county of Los Angeles and State of California, in the place of Webster Wotkyns, whose commission expired December 21, 1899.

Augustus G. Ising, to be postmaster at Danbury, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut, in the place of C. B. Mason, whose commission expired December 19, 1899.

William H. Kenyon, to be postmaster at Moosup, in the county of Windham and State of Connecticut, the appointment of a postmaster for said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

William L. H. Henderson, to be postmaster at Oxford, in the county of Newton and State of Georgia, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Wallace Peddicord, to be postmaster at Fort Valley, in the county of Houston and State of Georgia, in the place of Martha Brown, whose commission expires February 4, 1900.

August J. Beger, to be postmaster at Nauvoo, in the county of Hancock and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Henry J. Cheesman, to be postmaster at Princeville, in the county of Peoria and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

William A. McKnight, to be postmaster at Alexis, in the county of Warren and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Isaac W. Parkinson, to be postmaster at Stockton, in the county of Jo Daviess and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Benjamin F. Shaw, to be postmaster at Dixon, in the county of Lee and State of Illinois, in the place of Michael Maloney, whose commission expires January 23, 1900.

Jesse S. Birch, to be postmaster at Oxford, in the county of Benton and State of Indiana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Henry L. Kramer, to be postmaster at Indiana Mineral Springs, in the county of Warren and State of Indiana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Frank M. Pickerl, to be postmaster at Argos, in the county of Marshall and State of Indiana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Lars E. Bladine, to be postmaster at Marathon, in the county of Buena Vista and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

F. A. Christensen, to be postmaster at Lake Mills, in the county of Winnebago and State of Iowa, in the place of R. W. Lloyd, whose commission expired December 18, 1899.

George S. Crandall, to be postmaster at Schaller, in the county of Sac and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Wellington H. Gowdy, to be postmaster at Corwith, in the county of Hancock and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Charles L. Hartinger, to be postmaster at Alden, in the county of Hardin and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

William David Junkin, to be postmaster at Rock Rapids, in the county of Lyon and State of Iowa, in the place of Edward McCoy, whose commission expires January 15, 1900.

B. F. Keables, to be postmaster at Pella, in the county of Marion and State of Iowa, in the place of Lois Martin, resigned.

Gilbert Knudson, to be postmaster at Jewell, in the county of Hamilton and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

William C. Marsh, to be postmaster at Aurelia, in the county of Cherokee and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Caleb H. Wickersham, to be postmaster at West Branch, in the county of Cedar and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

William L. McWilliams, to be postmaster at Miami, in the Ottawa Nation, of Indian Territory, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Henry S. Mueller, to be postmaster at Sedgwick, in the county of Harvey and State of Kansas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Charles F. Hammond, to be postmaster at Nantucket, in the county of Nantucket and State of Massachusetts, in the place of J. M. Winslow, whose commission expires January 15, 1900.

Charles F. Reed, to be postmaster at Whitman, in the county of Plymouth and State of Massachusetts, in the place of Charles F. Reed, whose commission expired January 9, 1900. (Reappointed.)

Samuel Hambleton, to be postmaster at Rising Sun, in the county of Cecil and State of Maryland, in the place of J. C. Hindman, whose commission expired December 19, 1899.

Eldridge H. Bryant, to be postmaster at Machias, in the county of Washington and State of Maine, in the place of G. H. Walling, jr., whose commission expired January 9, 1900.

Jonathan F. Jefferds, to be postmaster at Livermore Falls, in the county of Androscoggin and State of Maine, in the place of J. L. Cummings, whose commission expires January 15, 1900.

John M. Thurlough, to be postmaster at Fort Fairfield, in the county of Aroostook and State of Maine, in the place of C. C. Harvey, whose commission expires February 1, 1900.

George Preston, to be postmaster at Grass Lake, in the county of Jackson and State of Michigan, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Bangs F. Warner, to be postmaster at Paw Paw, in the county of Van Buren and State of Michigan, in the place of William Killefer, whose commission expires January 24, 1900.

Harlow D. Wells, to be postmaster at Ypsilanti, in the county of Washtenaw and State of Michigan, in the place of F. P. Bogardus, whose commission expired December 30, 1899.

John Y. Breckenridge, to be postmaster at Pine City, in the county of Pine and State of Minnesota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Fred N. Corey, to be postmaster at Elk River, in the county of Sherburne and State of Minnesota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Ole C. Enge, to be postmaster at Elmore, in the county of Faribault and State of Minnesota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Hakon E. Glasoe, to be postmaster at Lanesboro, in the county of Fillmore and State of Minnesota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Lauriston H. Condit, to be postmaster at Canton, in the county of Lewis and State of Missouri, in the place of W. R. Odor, whose commission expires February 18, 1900.

Isaac H. Lutterloh, to be postmaster at Sanford, in the county of Moore and State of North Carolina, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Joseph Powles, to be postmaster at Milton, in the county of Cavalier and State of North Dakota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Charles E. Buzzell, to be postmaster at Lakeport, in the county of Belknap and State of New Hampshire, in the place of W. H. Jones, whose commission expired January 9, 1900.

George A. McIntire, to be postmaster at Milford, in the county of Hillsboro and State of New Hampshire, in the place of F. E. Hoyt, deceased.

Thomas W. Collier, to be postmaster at Raton, in the county of Colfax and Territory of New Mexico, in the place of F. R. Matthews, whose commission expired January 7, 1900.

Charles C. Jessup, to be postmaster at Woodbury, in the county of Gloucester and State of New Jersey, in the place of E. F. Dell, whose commission expires February 11, 1900.

John Heald, to be postmaster at Wappingers Falls, in the county of Dutchess and State of New York, in place of W. K. Roy, whose commission expires January 30, 1900.

George F. Merriman, to be postmaster at Medford, in the county of Jackson and State of Oregon, in the place of Mahlon Purdin, whose commission expired December 21, 1899.

Everett William Greene, to be postmaster at Patton, in the county of Cambria and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of E. A. Mellon, whose commission expires January 15, 1900.

Michael Weyand, to be postmaster at Beaver, in the county of Beaver and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of L. W. Reed, whose commission expires January 27, 1900.

Thomas H. Williams, to be postmaster at Mount Carmel, in the county of Northumberland and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Jane F. Hollister, whose commission expired January 7, 1900.

Patrick W. Carr, to be postmaster at Flandreau, in the county of Moody and State of South Dakota, in the place of Knudt Schyan, whose commission expires February 19, 1900.

Robert Murdock, to be postmaster at Logan, in the county of Cache and State of Utah, in the place of Orson Smith, removed.

Theodore Riel, to be postmaster at Burlington, in the county of Racine and State of Wisconsin, in the place of E. F. Rakow, whose commission expired December 30, 1899.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

INFANTRY ARM.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. John F. B. Mitchell, jr., Twelfth Infantry, September 20, 1899, vice Normoyle, Fifth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. James P. Drouillard, Sixth Infantry, September 30, 1899, vice Brady, First Infantry, resigned.

Second Lieut. Martin L. Crimmins, Eighteenth Infantry, October 1, 1899, vice Grubbs, Sixth Infantry, deceased.

Second Lieut. Marion M. Weeks, Twenty-first Infantry, October 2, 1899, vice Alexander, Eleventh Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. James M. Love, jr., Twenty-first Infantry, October 8, 1899, vice Wild, Twelfth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Paul H. McCook, Fifth Infantry, October 10, 1899, vice Johnson, Second Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Frederick W. Coleman, jr., Thirteenth Infantry, October 11, 1899, vice Lindsay, Eighth Infantry, promoted.

[NOTE.—The officers herein named were nominated to the Senate December 18, 1899, for promotion in the artillery arm, and were confirmed December 20, 1899. This message is to correct an error as to the arm of service in which the officers were promoted.]

APPOINTMENTS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

PUERTO RICO BATTALION.

Christian Briand, late first lieutenant, Fifth United States Volunteer Infantry, to be first lieutenant, Puerto Rico Battalion, June 26, 1899.

First-class Sergt. William W. Bessell, Signal Corps, United States Army, to be second lieutenant, Puerto Rico Battalion, November 3, 1899.

[NOTE.—The persons herein named were nominated to the Senate December 11, 1899, as Christian Briard and William W. Bessell, respectively, and were confirmed December 20, 1899. This message is to correct errors in the name of the former and in the date of rank of the latter.]

ELEVENTH CAVALRY.

To be lieutenant-colonel, to rank from August 12, 1899.

Capt. Charles G. Starr, First United States Infantry.

To be majors, to rank from August 10, 1899.

First Lieut. Thomas G. Carson, Fourth United States Cavalry.
First Lieut. Dennis E. Nolan, Thirteenth United States Infantry.
Maj. Hugh T. Sime, First California Volunteers.

To be first lieutenants, to rank from August 12, 1899.

Second Lieut. Charles C. Winnia, First Tennessee Volunteers.
Sergt. Lewis Foerster, Troop K, Fourth United States Cavalry.

[NOTE.—The persons herein named were nominated to the Senate December 6, 1899, with incorrect dates of rank, and were confirmed December 20, 1899. This message is to correct errors in the dates of rank of the nominees.]

TWENTY-SIXTH INFANTRY.

Sergt. Maj. George R. D. MacGregor, Twenty-sixth Infantry, United States Volunteers, to be second lieutenant, September 13, 1899, vice Comstock, promoted.

[NOTE.—The person herein named was nominated to the Senate December 11, 1899, as George R. D. McGregor, and was confirmed December 20, 1899. This message is to correct an error in the name of the nominee.]

Philip S. Golderman, of New York, to be first lieutenant, July 5, 1899.

TWENTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY.

First Lieut. George T. Langhorne, First United States Cavalry, to be captain, Twenty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, July 5, 1899.

THIRTY-FOURTH INFANTRY.

Cleveland C. Lansing, of Maryland, to be second lieutenant, July 5, 1899.

THIRTY-FIFTH INFANTRY.

Harry T. Matthews, of California, to be captain, July 5, 1899.

THIRTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY.

First Lieut. Charles N. Clark, Thirteenth Minnesota Volunteers, to be captain, Thirty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, July 5, 1899.

FORTY-SECOND INFANTRY.

Augustus B. Warfield, of New York, to be second lieutenant, August 17, 1899.

FORTY-FOURTH INFANTRY.

Frederick L. Dengler, late first lieutenant, First Arkansas Volunteers, to be second lieutenant, Forty-fourth Infantry, United States Volunteers, August 17, 1899.

FORTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY.

Sergt. William H. Allen, Troop A, Ninth United States Cavalry, to be first lieutenant, Forty-eighth Infantry, United States Volunteers, September 9, 1899.

[NOTE.—The persons herein named were nominated to the Senate December 6, 1899, as follows: Philip Golderman, George C. Langhorne, Cleveland C. C. Lansing, Henry T. Matthews, Charles M. Clark, Augustus P. Warfield, Frederick E. Dengler, and William A. Allen. They were confirmed accordingly December 20, 1899. This message is to correct errors in the names of the nominees.]

TO BE ASSISTANT SURGEON OF VOLUNTEERS WITH THE RANK OF CAPTAIN, TO RANK FROM JULY 5, 1899.

Frederick Hadra, of Texas.

[NOTE.—The person herein named was nominated to the Senate December 6, 1899, as Frederick Hadru, and was confirmed December 20, 1899. This message is to correct an error in the name of the nominee.]

PROMOTIONS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

THIRTY-NINTH INFANTRY.

Second Lieut. Arthur W. Orton, Thirty-ninth Infantry, United States Volunteers, to be first lieutenant, October 13, 1899, vice Baker, promoted.

FORTIETH INFANTRY.

First Lieut. William J. Watson, Fortieth Infantry, United States Volunteers, to be captain, November 11, 1899, vice Wing, discharged.

[NOTE.—The officers herein named were nominated to the Senate December 7, 1899, with incorrect dates of rank, and were confirmed December 20, 1899. This message is to correct errors in the dates of rank of the nominees.]

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Henry L. Howison, to be a rear-admiral in the Navy from the 30th day of September, 1898, vice Rear-Admiral Montgomery Sicard, retired.

Albert Kautz, to be a rear-admiral in the Navy from the 24th day of October, 1898, vice Rear-Admiral Edmund O. Matthews, retired.

George C. Remey, to be a rear-admiral in the Navy from the 22d day of November, 1898, vice Rear-Admiral Joseph N. Miller, retired.

Norman H. Farquhar, to be a rear-admiral in the Navy from the 25th day of December, 1898, vice Rear-Admiral Francis M. Bunce, retired.

APPOINTMENT IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

THIRTY-FOURTH INFANTRY.

Sergt. Maj. Ode C. Nichols, Thirty-fourth Infantry, United States Volunteers, to be second lieutenant, January 10, 1900, vice McAllister, promoted.

SUPERVISOR OF CENSUS.

Andrew J. S. Thomas, of Greenville, Greenville County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of South Carolina.

INDIAN AGENT.

Andrew F. Caldwell, of Pocatello, Idaho, to be agent for the Indians of the Fort Hall Agency, in Idaho, vice Clarence A. Warner, deceased.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn January 11, 1900.

Harry L. Rees, of Oregon, for appointment as paymaster, United States Army, with the rank of major.

[NOTE.—The person herein named was nominated to and confirmed by the Senate March 3, 1899.]

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 11, 1900.

CONSUL.

Thomas J. Prentis, of Massachusetts, to be consul of the United States at Rouen, France.

AUDITOR FOR WAR DEPARTMENT.

Frank H. Morris, of Ohio, to be Auditor for the War Department.

AUDITOR FOR NAVY DEPARTMENT.

William W. Brown, of Pennsylvania, to be Auditor for the Navy Department.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

James E. Hewey, of Maine, to be appraiser of merchandise in the district of Portland and Falmouth, in the State of Maine.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Edward H. Banks, of Maine, to be collector of customs for the district of York, in the State of Maine.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *January 12, 1900.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m., and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 10, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a resolution of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Senate concurrent resolution No. 14.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause a survey and estimate to be made for the dredging, improving, and protection of Mahon Harbor, Delaware.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Senate has received with the deepest regret information of the death of GARRET AUGUSTUS HOBART, late Vice-President of the United States.

Resolved, That the business of the Senate be suspended in order that the distinguished public services of the deceased and the virtues of his private character may be fittingly commemorated.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be instructed to communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 2179. An act relating to the Twelfth and subsequent censuses, and giving to the Director thereof additional power and authority in certain cases, and for other purposes; and

S. 301. An act to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Indianapolis, Ind.

SENATE RESOLUTION AND BILLS REFERRED.

Under Clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate resolution and bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committee as indicated below:

Senate concurrent resolution No. 14.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause a survey and estimate to be made for the dredging, improving, and protection of Mahon Harbor, Delaware—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

S. 2179. An act relating to the Twelfth and subsequent censuses, and giving to the Director thereof additional power and authority in certain cases, and for other purposes—to the Select Committee on the Census.

S. 301. An act to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Indianapolis, Ind.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Hon. Thomas C. Catchings, a Representative-elect from the State of Mississippi, appeared at the bar of the House, accompanied by his colleague, Mr. HENRY of Mississippi.

Mr. HENRY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to present my colleague, Hon. T. C. Catchings, and ask that the oath be administered to him as Representative from the Third district of Mississippi.

The oath of office was accordingly administered to Mr. Catchings.

RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication; which was read by the Clerk:

SNOWHILL, MD., *January 9, 1900.*

MY DEAR SIR: Having been elected governor of Maryland, I hereby tender my resignation as Representative in the Fifty-sixth Congress, from the First Congressional district of Maryland, to take effect immediately.

Yours, very truly,

JNO. WALTER SMITH.

Hon. DAVID B. HENDERSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. S. A. DAVENPORT, until Wednesday next, on account of important business.

SECTION 3005, REVISED STATUTES.

Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported the bill (H. R. 3334) to amend section 3005 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN NATIONAL BANKS.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the present consideration of the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read for the information of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee consisting of nine members of the House of Representatives be immediately appointed by the Speaker to make a thorough and complete investigation of all dealings and transactions between the Secretary of the Treasury or the Treasury Department of the United States and the National City Bank and the Hanover National Bank, of the city of New York, or any other national bank of the United States, from the 4th day of March, 1897, to the present time, and especially in regard to all letters, agreements, papers, or documents between the Treasury Department of the United States or any person connected therewith.

Mr. DALZELL. I rise to a question of order. That resolution belongs in the box.

The SPEAKER. The point is well taken.

Mr. SULZER. What is the point of order, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The point of order is that this is not a privileged resolution.

Mr. SULZER. Then I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. HOPKINS. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. SULZER. I am glad to note the objection comes from that side.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Is it in order to move that this resolution lie upon the table?

Mr. HOPKINS. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman state his point of order?

Mr. HOPKINS. The resolution is not before the House at all.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Oh, I thought it had been read.

The SPEAKER. Read simply for information.

Mr. DALZELL. Read out of order.

The SPEAKER. There is nothing before the House.

Mr. HOPKINS. The very clear and complete statement made by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Speaker of the House covers it all.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] rises to a question of privilege.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think, Mr. Speaker, the matter I present is one of privilege—one which affects the integrity of the proceedings of the House. I hold in my hand what purports to be a bill. It is in the form of a bill—that is, the first portion of it—and it is indorsed "H. R. 64. A bill to promote the commerce and increase the foreign trade of the United States, and to provide auxiliary cruisers, transports, and seamen for Government use when necessary."

It purports to have been introduced on the 4th day of December, 1899, and to have been referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and ordered to be printed.

The first few pages of this paper is in the form of a bill. The latter pages—four pages—are in different type, and an argument, a partisan argument, in support of the bill. After the conclusion of the bill there are four pages of partisan arguments and facts. It is made up in part of statements purporting to show the effect of the bill, which I controvert, and which every member or almost every member on this side of the House would controvert. But whether on this side or that side, Mr. Speaker, and whether true or false, those statements and arguments have no place in a bill. Now, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the rules have been grossly violated. I submit that this paper is not frankable by law, and any member of this House or of the other House who has sent out this paper is guilty of having violated the postal law. It is no part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; it is not a bill; the words used, or printed, have never been spoken upon the floor, so far as I know, and the paper is not frankable by law.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. Who is the mover of the bill?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this bill should be taken from the files, and if the gentleman desires to introduce the bill let it be introduced as all other bills are prepared, presented, and introduced in this House. I make the point of order, first, that the paper should be suppressed—it is not a bill—and, failing in that, I shall move to strike it from the files and have it destroyed.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Who introduced the bill?

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, this bill, commonly known as the shipping bill, was handed to me on the first day of the session in printed form. I was assured that it was a copy of the bill as reported in the Senate from the Committee on Commerce just before the close of the last session, and I handed in the bill in the regular way. It is true that this argument of Judge Edmunds was with that printed copy and was printed with the bill. I do not think it has any business to be there as a part of the bill. I think that that part of it should be stricken from the bill, but the bill itself, I think, ought to stand.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If the gentleman will allow me, I submit to him that it would be impossible to separate them, because a portion of the statement is upon the same page as the text of the so-called bill, and it would be impossible to separate it; and there can be nothing done effectually except the suppression of this paper and the reintroduction of the bill. I do not reflect upon the gentleman from New York, because I know he would not violate the rules of this House intentionally, but that they have been violated is perfectly apparent to every gentleman. I think the proper course would be to suppress the paper and introduce the bill as a bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, it is plainly apparent where that bill ends and where the argument commences. There is no difficulty in the House suppressing the argument and still allowing the bill itself to stand. The bill has been referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and in relation to it that committee has already had one hearing.

Mr. RICHARDSON. But you can not separate it. You can not send the bill out.

Mr. PAYNE. Suppose we have a reprint of the bill, by unanimous consent.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have no objection to a reprint of the bill, with this argument suppressed.

Mr. PAYNE. I am perfectly willing that all the bills having that argument shall be suppressed——

Mr. RICHARDSON. Taken from the files.

Mr. PAYNE (continuing). And that the bill itself be reprinted.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have no objection to that. I have no right to object to the gentleman introducing a bill in proper form.

Mr. PAYNE. I ask unanimous consent that the print of the bill be suppressed and the bill be reprinted without the argument.

Mr. GAINES. We want the argument suppressed, too.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It will be taken from the files.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of the opinion that that request should have coupled with it that the committee be discharged from the consideration of the bill, it not being before the House, and then have it reprinted.

Mr. PAYNE. I have no objection, if the bill be referred to the committee.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, the bill proper is before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and they have entered upon the consideration of the bill. I do not think that any action should be taken that would take from them jurisdiction of that bill at the present time. The argument that is mentioned by the gentleman from Tennessee is separable from the bill itself, and if he desires any action taken upon that I have no objection; but I do have objection to the suppression of the bill itself, which our committee is now considering.

The SPEAKER. That could be obviated by an order to rerefer it to the committee.

Mr. RICHARDSON. There would be no difficulty about reintroducing the bill, and let it go to the committee.

Mr. HOPKINS. There is no objection, if the gentleman will limit his motion to the suppression of what he calls the argument of Judge Edmunds. That is entirely separate and distinct from the bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I submit, Mr. Speaker, if the Chair will examine the bill, it will be seen that it is printed on the same page with the text of the bill, and it can not be separated.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of the opinion that the point of order made by the gentleman from Tennessee is a good one. The bill is not before the House—it is before the committee, and it seems that it is improperly before the committee; and now the request should be that the committee be discharged from the consideration of the bill, this objectionable part eliminated, and the bill re-referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries with a new order to print. If there be no objection to such an order, it will be made. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

STENOGRAPHER TO COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Invalid Pensions to introduce the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions be authorized to appoint a stenographer for said committee, whose salary shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, and which shall not exceed $100 per month.

Mr. RICHARDSON was recognized.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman from New Hampshire if the resolution has been considered by the Committee on Accounts?

Mr. SULLOWAY. I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, that I understood the gentleman.

Mr. BARTLETT. Has this resolution been referred to the Committee on Accounts?

Mr. SULLOWAY. No; it has not. Our purpose is to avoid delay in this matter as much as possible.

Mr. BARTLETT. I ask if the committee has not already a clerk and an assistant clerk?

Mr. SULLOWAY. The committee has a clerk and an assistant clerk.

Mr. BARTLETT. And neither one of them are stenographers?

Mr. SULLOWAY. Neither of them; and it is practically impossible to do the work without a stenographer, as every member of the committee knows.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the resolution take the usual course.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California objects, and the resolution will go to the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, January 15, 1900, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of the commanding officer of Watertown Arsenal of tests of iron and steel and other materials—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, recommending the creation of a new light-house district in Alaska—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting urgent estimates of deficiency in appropriations for the use of the Patent Office—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the chief of division of stationery, printing, and blanks, recommending an additional appropriation for Department printing and binding—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics recommending an appropriation for books of reference, etc., in his office—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an urgent estimate of deficiency in appropriation for repairs of the old Post-Office building—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Pleasant N. McBride against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Henry O. Talbott, administrator of estate of Sarah Talbott, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Supervising Architect in regard to additional vault accommodations in the Treasury building at Washington—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a statement of emoluments of the officers of the customs service—to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Bucksport Harbor, Maine—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Parkers Head Harbor and Channel, Kennebec River, Maine—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Boothbay Harbor, Maine—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of the waterways and low-lying marsh lands between the North and South Santee rivers, with a view of extending the Estherville Minim Creek Canal—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Lynchs River, South Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Wee Tee Lake, Williamsburg County, S. C.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Milford Harbor, Connecticut—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Woodbridge Creek, New Jersey—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Tuckerton Creek, New Jersey—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Punta Rasa, Florida—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Missouri River at and near Huntsdale, Boone County, Mo.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Cohasset Harbor, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Tarrytown Harbor, New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. HULL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 99) to establish a military post at or near Des Moines, Iowa, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 33); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2757) to authorize the purchase of certain lands in the district of Alaska, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 34); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JENKINS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2736) to change the name of the Potomac Insurance Company of Georgetown, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 35); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3334) to amend section 3005 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 36); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1092) to set apart a portion of the Arlington estate for experimental agricultural purposes, and to place said portion under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture and his successors in office, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 37); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills and paper of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4367) granting a pension to Mary L. Stotsenburg—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5319) for the relief of William B. Reaney, surviving partner of the firm of Reaney, Son & Archbold—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

Paper relating to the claim of Hannah E. Boardman—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 6048) to establish an assay office of the United States at the city of Prescott, in the Territory of Arizona—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 6049) setting apart certain public grounds in the city of Washington for the use of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the erection of a memorial building—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 6050) to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of site and the erection of a public building at Eau Claire, Wis.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 6051) repealing section 4776, Revised Statutes of the United States, and making the reports of civil examining boards in cases of examination of applicants for pension final and not subject to review—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEREA: A bill (H. R. 6052) to ratify an act of the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6053) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish circuit courts of appeals, and define and regulate, in certain cases, the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6054) to establish a court of appeals for the Territories of Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut (by request): A bill (H. R. 6055) for the reclassification of postal matter, the reduction of postal rates, the establishment of a parcels post, with free collection and delivery of the mails, house to house, throughout the whole territory of the United States of America, the insurance of all mail matter, and for the establishment of a postal currency for the payment of small sums by mail—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 6056) for the consolidation of second, third, and fourth class mail matter, the extension of the free collection and delivery postal service, and for the insurance of all mail matter against loss or damage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 6057) authorizing the Secretary of War to acquire, by purchase, the exclusive rights for the United States to the Isham high-explosive shell and the process for the manufacture of the high explosive "thorite"—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BOREING: A bill (H. R. 6058) limiting the application of section 4716, Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 6059) to extend the time for presenting claims for additional bounties—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LOVERING: A bill (H. R. 6060) to provide an American register for the steam whaler *Bowhead*—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 6061) providing for a naval training station on Lake Michigan, at the city of Milwaukee, in the State of Wisconsin—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 6062) to set apart a preserve for the American bison, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 6063) to amend chapter 2 of the laws passed by the first session of the Fifty-fifth Congress of the United States, being an act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1897—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6064) granting equal privileges to per diem employees in the United States Navy outside of Washington, D. C., with those employed at the Executive Department in Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 6065) for the erection of a monument to the memory of the women who, during the rebellion, attended and nursed the sick and dying soldiers of the United States—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 6066) in relation to claims arising under the provisions of the captured and abandoned property acts, and for other purposes—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 6067) to pay certain employees of the United States Government during the civil war wages illegally withheld from them—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 6068) providing for the erection of a public building at Muskegon, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6069) providing for the erection of a public building at Manistee, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RIXEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 6070) to authorize a trial of the outlet system of lowering the flood line and improving the low-water navigation of the Mississippi River and its tributaries, on the plan of "No cure, no pay"—to the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 6071) to amend the postal laws relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 6072) authorizing and directing the suspension of tariff duties upon imports, when their sale or manufacture are monopolized, and providing for the creation of a commission to investigate and report to the President thereon—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 6073) to amend section 4 of the act of Congress approved June 16, 1880, granting to the city of Hot Springs, Ark., certain lands as a city park, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McLAIN: A bill (H. R. 6074) for improvement of Chickasahay, Leaf, and Pearl rivers, Mississippi—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CLAYTON of New York (by request): A bill (H. R. 6075) to amend section 71 of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE VRIES: A bill (H. R. 6076) to amend certain acts and granting rights of way over public lands for canals, reservoirs, and so forth—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 6234) to amend section 1320 of chapter 4 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, prescribing the oath of a cadet, so as to prevent hazing—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6235) authorizing the appointment by the President of the United States of a commission of not less than five members to investigate the question of trade relations of the United States in the Orient, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6236) providing for the free coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. POWERS: A resolution (H. Res. 87) authorizing the appointment of a clerk to the Committee on Pacific Railroads—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. WEAVER: A resolution (H. Res. 88) to authorize Committees on Elections Nos. 2 and 3 to employ clerks—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A resolution (H. Res. 89) to authorize the Committee on Invalid Pensions to employ a stenographer—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SULZER: A resolution (H. Res. 90) to investigate dealings with the National City Bank and the Hanover National Bank, of the city of New York—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky: A resolution (H. Res. 91) relative to expenditures for naval operations in the Philippines from May 1, 1898, to and including January 1, 1900—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 92) relative to expenditures for military operations in the Philippines from May 1, 1898, to and including January 1, 1900—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Virginia: A memorial by the general assembly of the State of Virginia, relative to the establishment of a national battlefields park at and near Fredericksburg, Va.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6077) for the relief of Mrs. Mary E. Lermond, of Calhoun, McLean County, Ky.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6078) for the relief of Frank W. Clark—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6079) for relief of the Christian Church of Henderson, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6080) for increase of pension of Charles B. Eades, Hopkinsville, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6081) for the relief of Walter Langley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 6082) granting a pension to Dr. Samuel G. McLaughlin, Beltzhoover, Allegheny County, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6083) granting a pension to John R. Roseborough, of Dunbar, Fayette County, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 6084) granting a pension to Baley R. Gill—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: A bill (H. R. 6085) to restore Henry D. Hall to the Revenue-Cutter Service—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 6086) to authorize the President to place Samuel E. St. Onge Chapleau on the retired list of the Army with the rank of captain—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6087) for the relief of the widow and children of the late Joseph W. Etheridge and the widow of the late John M. Richardson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 6088) for the relief of the heirs of Stephen Casey—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6089) to pension Alfred T. Moreland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 6090) granting a pension to Johanna Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6091) granting a pension to Mary A. Fullerton, widow of Hugh S. Fullerton, first lieutenant of Company C, First Regiment Ohio Heavy Artillery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENTON: A bill (H. R. 6092) granting a pension to Louisa Stearns, widow of Lewis Stearns, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6093) for the relief of James H. Wimpey, of McDonald County, Mo.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BURKETT: A bill (H. R. 6094) granting a pension to William Cromie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6095) granting a pension to William T. Hutton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6096) granting a pension to Samuel W. Kirkendall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUSACK: A bill (H. R. 6097) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Cavanaugh—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6098) for the relief of Mrs. Marion V. Kenney—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 6099) for the relief of Anna O. Brush, widow of Alfred I. Brush—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 6100) for the relief of W. T. Scott and others—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 6101) to grant a pension to David Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: A bill (H. R. 6102) for the relief of Bettie Stafford, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6103) for the relief of Patrick Sheehan, of Warren County, Miss., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6104) for the relief of Mrs. H. O. Fitzhugh, of Vicksburg, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6105) for the relief of N. B. Lanier, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6106) for the relief of P. T. O'Shea, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6107) for relief of Marcella M. Davis and Mary A. Davis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6108) for the relief of Red Bone Methodist Episcopal Church, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6109) for the relief of Allen E. Anderson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6110) for the relief of Walter R. Billingslea—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6111) for the relief of the estate of Jarred R. Cook, deceased, late of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6112) for the relief of the estate of Phœbe Cummings, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6113) for the relief of Antonia Q. Lovell and others—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6114) for the relief of A. E. and M. E. Goodrich—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6115) for the relief of Mary B. T. Randolph, A. M. Randolph, Beverly Randolph, B. M. Randolph, and E. C. Turner, of Fauquier County, Va., and W. F. Randolph, of Washington County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLAYTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 6116) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Thomas Devine—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6117) for the relief of Stewart J. Donnelly—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6118) to correct the military record of Thomas Walker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 6119) for the relief of Edgar A. Bates—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 6120) for the relief of J. G. Fellers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6121) granting a pension to George G. Clevenger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6122) for the relief of John C. Gould—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6123) granting an increase of pension to Arthur I. Strosnider—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6124) granting a pension to Simon Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6125) removing charge of desertion from name of William M. Raber—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6126) granting a pension to Ephraim Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6127) to remove charge of desertion against name of John Hall—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6128) for the relief of Mary E. Guthrie, executrix of Newton B. Guthrie—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6129) granting a pension to John W. Coombs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6130) granting a pension to Mary Frame—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6131) for the relief of James D. Simon, administrator of Michael Simon, deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6132) granting a pension to Charles H. Fincham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6133) granting an increase of pension to James Richard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6134) for the relief of the estate of Stephen M. Holt, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: A bill (H. R. 6135) for the relief of Conrad Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6136) for the relief of Edward Hibbard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DE VRIES: A bill (H. R. 6137) to increase the pension of Martin N. Rogers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6138) granting an increase of pension to Lillian Capron—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 6139) granting a pension to Lucinda Haggard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6140) to grant a pension to Francis M. Webb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6141) to grant a pension to William C. Chandler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6142) inceasing the pension of William R. Duncan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 6143) granting an increase of pension to William H. Miles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 6144) to increase pension of Mrs. Margaret A. Porter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6145) granting a pension to Benoni A. McConnell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILL: A bill (H. R. 6146) for the relief of the administrators of William B. Moses, deceased, and of Lebbeus H. Rogers—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6147) to pension George W. Severs, late of Company K, Fifth United States Heavy Artillery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6148) to pension William M. Tom, late of Company E, One hundred and fifty-ninth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 6149) granting a pension to Jane A. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6150) granting a pension to Eugene H. Myers, and so forth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6151) granting a pension to Zylpha J. Kelly, of Aurora, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6152) granting a pension to Indiana Poling, of Nashville, Ind.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GAINES: A bill (H. R. 6153) for the relief of W. T. Garrett—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GARDNER of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 6154) to correct the military record of Jabez Lumbart—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6155) to correct the military record of John S. Cole—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 6156) for the relief of the sufferers by the wreck of the United States revenue cutter *Gallatin* off the coast of Massachusetts—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HALL: A bill (H. R. 6157) granting a pension to John W. Detwiler, of Coalport, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6158) granting a pension to George W. Brink, of Irvona, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill, (H. R. 6159) granting a pension to Arnold Bloom, of Curwensville, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6160) for the relief of F. R. Lanson, of Tionesta, Pa.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 6161) for the relief of John Landegon, of Danbury, Conn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6162) granting an increase of pension to Warren L. Eaton—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6163) granting a pension to Flavel H. Van Eaton—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6164) to restore Julia Traynor to the pension roll—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOY (by request): A bill (H. R. 6165) to increase the pension of Benjamin F. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACK: A bill (H. R. 6166) pensioning Mrs. Eliza McPherson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JETT: A bill (H. R. 6167) granting to Silas G. Cooper, late of Company F, Tenth Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, a pension, and so forth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 6168) for the relief of Henry Beck—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: A bill (H. R. 6169) to amend the record of Charles E. Miller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 6170) for the relief of Ford County, Kans.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 6171) for the relief of William Wolfe—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LENTZ: A bill (H. R. 6172) for the relief of Robert W. Caldwell, First Regiment Ohio Heavy Artillery Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6173) granting an increase of pension to Rida B. Haskell—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LESTER: A bill (H. R. 6174) for the relief of the estate of William I. Way—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MADDOX: A bill (H. R. 6175) to grant a pension to W. M. Morgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6176) granting an increase of pension to John W. Blake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6177) for the relief of John B. Russell, of Boynton, Catoosa County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6178) for the relief of J. B. Dixon, of Hargrove, Catoosa County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6179) for the relief of J. H. Brown, of Dalton, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McLAIN: A bill (H. R. 6180) for the relief of June Poitevent, administrator of the estate of William J. Poitevent, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6181) for the relief of Francisco Krebs—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill H. R. 6182) for the relief of Frank J. Ladner—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6183) for the relief of the heirs of James W. Felder, of Amite County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McDOWELL: A bill (H. R. 6184) to remove the charge of desertion against George Webb—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6185) to remove the charge of desertion against David Firestone—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6186) for the relief of A. B. Ackerman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6187) to remove the charge of desertion against Peter C. Lawyer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEYER of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 6188) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to refund certain moneys collected by the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6189) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to refund certain moneys collected by the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 6190) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Annie Duncan Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6191) for the relief of the heirs of Patrick Dooling—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: A bill (H. R. 6192) for the relief of Thomas Wallace, of Phillips County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6193) for the relief of the estate of Jamerson W. Rice—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NORTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 6194) for the relief of Thomas H. Kearney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 6195) granting a pension to Livingston B. Gregory, formerly private, Company F, One hundred and eighty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PACKER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6196) to correct the military record of Eugene Budson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POLK: A bill (H. R. 6197) for the relief of Isaiah Hagenbuch, of Bloomsburg, Pa.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6198) for the relief of William J. Freeman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6199) for the relief of William Ogden, Shamokin, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6200) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jacob Cole—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6201) to correct the military record of Lieut. Charles Mumey, of Milton, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 6202) for the relief of Ambrosia P. Kretchmar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. QUARLES: A bill (H. R. 6203) for the relief of C. M. Parkins—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RYAN of New York: A bill (H. R. 6204) for the relief of Olivia M. Clifford—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 6205) for the relief of J. P. Leachman, administrator of Johnson Cockrell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 6206) for the relief of the board of trustees of the Memphis Conference Female Institute, of Jackson, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 6207) for the relief of William G. Mayer—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6208) removing a charge of desertion from the record of Hiram May—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6209) for the relief of Anna Fernette—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 6210) for the relief of Lieut. George B. Loud—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6211) to increase the pension of O. M. Jenkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6212) for the benefit of Mrs. Precilla Childers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6213) for the relief of John W. Peck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6214) for the benefit of George W. Quick—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6215) for the relief of J. H. Stovall and William Hughes—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6216) for the relief of Joel A. King—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6217) for the relief of H. Wilhite—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6218) for the relief of John M. Higgins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6219) for the relief of Nathan Fralick—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6220) for the relief of P. F. Warterfield—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6221) for the relief of William H. Ogilvie—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6222) for the relief of the Spies Lumber Company, of Cairo, Ill.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6223) for the benefit of H. Cothe's heirs—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6224) for the benefit of Mary J. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6225) for the benefit of William J. Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER: A bill (H. R. 6226) to correct the military record of James Houselman, second lieutenant Company H, Sixty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: A bill (H. R. 6227) granting an increase of pension to James H. Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATERS: A bill (H. R. 6228) to remove charge of desertion against Benjamin F. Moore, alias Henry F. Hunt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6229) to remove charge of desertion against Monterville Mershon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 6230) for the relief of Robert Smalls—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6231) to correct the military record of George F. Peall—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6232) granting a pension to Eliza J. Noble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ADAMS: A bill (H. R. 6233) to correct the military record of Levi Cummings—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: Petition of the Woman's Sanitary League of Philadelphia, Pa., against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. ALLEN of Kentucky: Petition of evidence to accompany House bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary E. Lermond, of Calhoun, Ky.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: Petition of Edward L. Marshall and 56 citizens of York, Me., for further appropriation to dredge York Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BARTLETT: Petition of J. E. Stallings and others, committee of letter carriers, Atlanta, Ga., favoring the passage of the bill to equalize the salary of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Atlanta, Ga., favoring a competing submarine cable line between Cuba and the United States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Macon, Ga., favoring the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of J. W. Wood, J. F. Moseley, and others, officers of the United States court at Macon, Ga., for an increase of per diem for bailiffs and criers of United States courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois: Petition of citizens of Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4911, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of Charles K. Partridge and other druggists of Augusta, Me., relating to the stamp tax on medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COONEY: Petition of post-office clerks of Marshall, Mo., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petitions of the State Teachers' Association of Missouri and the board of curators and faculty of the State University of Missouri, for the establishment of free public schools in the Indian Territory—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. COOPER of Winconsin: Petitions of clerks in the Racine and Janesville post-offices, Wisconsin, for the reclassification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Dr. Shoop Family Medicine Company, asking for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Petition of E. L. Bastien and other railway postal clerks in the Tenth Congressional district of New York, to reclassify railway postal clerks and prescribe their salaries—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: Petition of S. T. Barnard and other citizens of Calumet County, Wis., relating to the stamp tax on medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of post-office clerks of Oshkosh and Neenah, Wis., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DAYTON: Petition of Jane W. Burner, to accompany House bill for the relief of the estate of Stephen M. Holt—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition and papers to accompany bill for the relief of the estate of Newton B. Guthrie, Mary E. Guthrie, executrix—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill to increase the pension of James Richards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of James D. Simon, administrator of Michael Simon, deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of John C. Gould—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the removal of the charge of desertion against William M. Raber—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting to George G. Clevenger a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Ephraim Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Simon Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DE VRIES: Petition of the employees of the Sacramento, Cal., post-office, urging the passage of House bill No. 4931, for the classification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of a convention of fruit growers of California, for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of fruit growers of California, relating to reciprocity, treaties, etc.—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill to increase the pension of Martin N. Rogers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: Resolutions of the Business Men's Association of Davenport, Iowa, favoring the adoption of the Wadsworth bill, No. 3988, to reorganize and improve the Weather Bureau—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: Petition of post-office clerks at Oneida and Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the reclassification of postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Charleston, S. C., in favor of the laying of competing cable lines to Cuba—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: Petition of the Omega Chemical Company, relating to the stamp tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the American Federation of Labor of Washington, D. C., in opposition to legislation against ticket brokerage—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GAINES: Petitions of Rev. A. T. Goodloe and others in the State of Tennessee, against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of citizens of Atlantic City, N. J., favoring the passage of House bill No. 3988, to reorganize and improve the Weather Bureau—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the railway mail clerks of the Second district of New Jersey, favoring the bill for the reclassification of the Railway Mail Service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Titusville, N. J., in opposition to the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, Pa., praying that a franchise be granted to the Commercial Cable Company of Cuba for laying a cable to connect the United States with Cuba—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of a meeting of employees of the New York Navy-Yard, asking that some of the new ships be constructed at the New York Navy-Yard—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Resolutions of the Massachusetts Dental Society, favoring the appointment of dental surgeons in the Army and Navy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GROUT: Petition of C. W. Wilcox and 4 other clerks employed in the Brattleboro post-office, Vermont, asking for the passage of the bill No. 4351, for the classification of clerks in the first and second class post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of E. F. Palmer, jr., and 17 other railway postal clerks of the Second Congressional district of Vermont, favoring a bill providing for the reclassification of the Railway Mail Service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of druggists of Asbury Park, N. J., urging the repeal of the internal-revenue tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of post-office clerks of Somerville and Red Bank, N. J., for the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the classification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HULL: Remonstrance of W. M. Stone Command, Union Veterans' Union, Knoxville, Tenn., against the passage of the Wadsworth Weather Bureau bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONES of Virginia: Petition of Johnston & Pearson and others, of Fredericksburg, Va., urging the repeal of the internal-revenue tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOY: Resolutions of Madison Miller Post, Grand Army of the Republic, St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of the Cullom bill, for the relief of deserters—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Memorial Tabernacle Church, of St. Louis, Mo., for the anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Memorial Tabernacle Church, of St. Louis, Mo., for the passage of a bill to limit absolute divorce, also to raise the age of consent to 18 years, in the District of Columbia and the Territories—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Memorial Tabernacle Church, of St. Louis, Mo., to protect the first day of the week in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Memorial Tabernacle Church, of St. Louis, Mo., relating to the sale of liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of the Memorial Tabernacle Church, of St. Louis, Mo., relating to the importation of cigarettes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Memorial Tabernacle Church, of St. Louis, Mo., to prohibit the transmission by mail or interstate commerce of pictures or descriptions of prize fights—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Memorial Tabernacle Church, of St. Louis, Mo., for the suppression of gambling—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Memorial Tabernacle Church, of St. Louis, Mo., to exclude illiterate immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Memorial Tabernacle Church, of St. Louis, Mo., to prohibit the reproduction of bull fights—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of druggists, relating to the stamp tax on medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of a convention of fruit growers of California, in relation to the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of a convention of fruit growers of California, in relation to reciprocity and other treaties—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Kate M. Pond, of San Francisco, Cal., for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Paper to accompany House bill relating to the claim of Henry Beck—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNOX: Petition of Edward J. Costello and 10 other post-office clerks of Lawrence, Mass., praying for the passage of the bill providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 5154, to remove the charge of desertion against Peter Holden, alias Peter Holt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LACEY: Resolution of the miners of Hiteman, Iowa, relating to the contempt case of John P. Reese—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition of post-office clerks of Camden, N. J., for the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MOON: Papers in support of House bill No. 2125, for the relief of Thomas R. Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of L. Gerstle & Co., to modify the existing internal-revenue law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NAPHEN: Petitions of the post-office clerks of Newton Center, Mass., Roxbury Station and Station A, Boston post-office, Massachusetts, in favor of the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. NORTON of Ohio: Petition of letter carriers employed in the post-office at Marion, Ohio, favoring the passage of House bill No. 4911, to equalize the salary of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petitions of post-office clerks at Tiffin and Marion, Ohio, asking for the passage of the bill No. 4351, for the classification of clerks in the first and second class post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. OTEY: Petition of the post-office clerks of Lynchburg, Va., for the classification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of John W. Steck and others, of Geneva, N. Y., and Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the Friends Church, Poplar Ridge, N. Y., in opposition to the admission of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, petitions of post-office clerks of Lyons and Auburn, N. Y., post-offices, asking for the passage of the bill No. 4351, for the classification of clerks in the first and second class post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. POLK: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Harriet L. Hughes, of Berwick, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill to correct the military record of Charles Mumey, of Milton, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Reformed Church and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Mount Carmel, Pa., in opposition to the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Petition of citizens of Colchester, Conn., against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. RYAN of New York: Paper to accompany House bill relating to the claim of Olivia M. Clifford—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, petition of members of the Seneca Nation of New York Indians, favoring legislation providing for the distribution of moneys received from leases of lands of the tribe—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SCUDDER: Petitions of the Christian Endeavor Society of Bethany Congregational Church, of East Rockaway, N. Y.; E. C. Hendrickson, J. E. Rausche, S. T. Carter, and others, of New York, in opposition to the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SHATTUC: Resolutions of the Union Veteran Legion Headquarters Encampment, No. 125, Cincinnati, Ohio, and of the First and Second Kentucky Association, headquarters at Cincinnati, Ohio, requesting the passage of the per diem pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 3949 for the relief of Minnie Gray, widow of Frank Gray, late captain, One hundred and twenty-fourth United States Colored Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Ohio Brewers' Association, praying for the passage of House bill No. 4727, known as the Babcock bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of 257 citizens of Norristown, Pa., for a public building in said town for post-office and other Government purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: Petition of post-office clerks of Natick, Fitchburg, Leominster, Waltham, Marlboro, and others, of the Fourth Congressional district of Massachusetts, for the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the reclassification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Mary J. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of William J. Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: Petition of William R. Warner & Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., to modify the existing internal-revenue law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Knitting Mills Company, in relation to the proposed reciprocity between the United States and France and the duty on hosiery and knit goods—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Thirty-third National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, commending the work of the Gettysburg National Military Park Commission and asking for further appropriations to complete the work—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill to correct the military record of George F. Peall—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of the construction of a competing submarine cable to Cuba—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *January 15, 1900.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last, when, on motion of Mr. HALE, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispened with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

KIOWA, COMANCHE, AND APACHE INDIANS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 14th ultimo, certain information relative to the quantity, nature, and character of the lands of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Reservation; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in further response to a resolution of the 14th ultimo, a copy of a memorial from the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians, remonstrating against the ratification of the agreement made with them on October 6, 1892, for the cession of their lands, now pending before the Senate, and also a copy of a letter of the 6th instant from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, transmitting and commenting upon this memorial and the agreement in question, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the thirteenth annual report of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

SOUTH CAROLINA STATE CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair presents a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury and calls the attention of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] to it.

The SECRETARY. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 4th instant, a statement of the indebtedness of South Carolina, to the amount of $248,750, together with a copy of a communication of the Treasury Department of November 8, 1899, to the governor of South Carolina, requesting payment of this indebtedness, and also a copy of the report of the Treasurer of the United States, dated the 6th instant, on the same matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What does the Senator from South Carolina wish to have done with the communication?

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask that it be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. And lie on the table?

Mr. TILLMAN. I will use it later in trying to get some legislation in regard to a settlement or adjustment of this matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the communication and accompanying papers will be printed and lie on the table.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented a petition of the Political Equality Club of Rochester, N. Y., praying for the adoption of a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the disfranchisement of United States citizens on account of sex; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

He also presented sundry petitions of railway mail clerks of New York City, Lyon, Brooklyn, and Middletown, all in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of Hiram Hitchcock, Church E. Gates & Co., and 100 other citizens of New York, praying that the Secretary of War contract with Charles Stoughton and his associates for the construction of the Harlem Kills Canal, to connect the Harlem River with Long Island Sound, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PRITCHARD presented the petition of A. R. Moore and 5 other druggists of Fayetteville, N. C., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SCOTT presented the petition of Mrs. Beulah E. Ritchie and Mrs. Annie C. Boyd, on behalf of the West Virginia Woman Suffrage Association, praying that political equality be granted to the women of Hawaii, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. QUARLES presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Racine, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Muncie, Ind., and a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Attica, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. CULLOM presented the petition of W. C. Hanawalt and 9 other citizens of Sheffield, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the improvement of the veterinary service of the Army; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented sundry petitions of railway mail clerks of Jacksonville, Cairo, and Alton, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. GALLINGER presented the petition of Armenia S. White, president, and Mrs. S. J. Whitney, secretary, of the Woman Suffrage Association of New Hampshire, praying for the adoption of a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution, prohibiting the disfranchisement of United States citizens on account of sex, and remonstrating against the insertion of the word "male" in the suffrage clause of the constitution to be framed for the government of Hawaii, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

He also presented the petition of Albert L. Wetherell, and sundry other citizens of Exeter, N. H., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Manchester, N. H., praying for the appointment of a commission to study and report upon the industrial and commercial conditions in China; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. NELSON presented resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of St. Paul, Minn., expressing sympathy for the Boers in their present struggle with England; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the American Association of Masters and Pilots of Steam Vessels of Duluth Harbor, No. 44, Duluth, Minn., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of a marine hospital at Buffalo, N. Y.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented sundry petitions of citizens of Albert Lea and Stillwater and a petition of the Trades and Labor Council of Minneapolis, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. HOAR presented the memorial of Mabel Caldwell Willard and 96 other citizens of the United States, remonstrating against any extension of the sovereignty of the United States over the Philippine Islands, in any event, and over any other foreign territory without the free consent of the people thereof; which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

Mr. CULBERSON. I present a memorial adopted at a mass meeting of the farmers of Red River County and sundry citizens of Clarksville, Red River County, Tex., remonstrating against the financial legislation recently embodied in the House currency bill, now under consideration by the Senate. I ask that the memorial be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. It is understood that, under an order entered, the Chair thinks, on motion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], the names attached to the memorial will not be printed.

The memorial was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the honorable Senate of the United States, sitting at Washington, D. C.:

At a mass meeting of the farmers of Red River County and the citizens of Clarksville, held this the 8th day of January, 1900, for the purpose of solemnly protesting against the financial legislation recently embodied in the House bill and now under consideration by the Senate, the following resolutions were unanimously passed: Resolved, that,

Whereas the House of Representatives has recently passed a bill for the purpose of changing the financial system of these States from gold and silver, the money of the Constitution, to gold alone; and

Whereas there is such a bill now pending in the Senate, which, should it pass and become the law, would in our judgment be the greatest calamity that could befall our beloved country; and

Whereas the values of all farm products, wages, and property have always since the beginning of the world been measured by both gold and silver, and it is now sought by a small minority of our citizens for selfish reasons, through the aid of the peoples' Representatives in Congress, to change this system, by which all values will be measured by gold only, thus doubling the value of money and all obligations payable in money and lowering one-half the values of all farm products, labor, wages, and property, which would be the greatest wrong, outrage, injustice, and robbery ever attempted to be perpetrated upon the people of any country or any age since the dawn of civilization; and

Whereas there are thirty millions or more farmers and their dependents and others in the millions who would be grossly outraged and unjustly discriminated against in favor of a few million bankers and capitalists by the passage of this law: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the undersigned, farmers and citizens of Red River County and Clarksville, of the State of Texas, do hereby solemnly protest against the passage of said financial bill, and petition your honorable body not to pass this bill and radically change the financial system of these States. And further

Resolved, That the American people are deeply attached to the silver dollar and will view with alarm and anger any legislation which seeks to destroy it as the legal-tender dollar of the people, which is ingrafted in the affections of the people—as well seek to destroy the Bible; and we further ask and petition the Senate to pass a bill opening the mints of the United States to silver on like and equal terms with gold, so that the bonds and indebtedness of the people may be paid by them in gold or silver, as per solemn contract entered into by the bondholders with the people, which said contract the bondholders are now seeking to repudiate through legislation; and we further petition your honorable body, if necessary, to change the coinage of our silver and gold coins to make them conform to those of England and France, namely, the 5-franc piece and the English pound, by which England outbids us for gold and France for silver, and the silver and gold coins of the United States will then circulate and remain in this country, the opinions of some to the contrary notwithstanding; and we further petition your honorable body to set aside the infamous bill passed by the House of Representatives, in order that a great calamity may be averted from the farmers and masses of the States and we and our children saved from the machinations and greed of the money power.

Mr. KENNEY presented a petition of Pomona Grange, of Kent County, Del., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the interstate-commerce law providing that when the Interstate Commerce Commission has determined what is unlawful it shall have the power to prescribe what is lawful in respect to rates, fares, charges, facilities, and practices, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. TURLEY presented the petition of W. D. Turnley and 35 other citizens of Montgomery County, Tenn., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of Lida Meriwether, president, and Elise N. Selden, secretary, on behalf of the Woman Suffrage Association of Tennessee, praying for the adoption of a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the disfranchisement of women; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. SPOONER presented the petition of A. F. Scheldrup and 6 other citizens of Stoughton, Wis., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Oshkosh, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the fruit growers of California, and a petition of the board of supervisors of Monterey County, Cal., praying for the immediate construction of the Nicaragua Canal; which were referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

He also presented a memorial of the fruit growers of California, remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on French fruits, nuts, and wines, etc., and praying for a modification of the proposed reciprocity treaty between the United States and France so as to permit the present tariff on imports of French fruits, nuts, and wines to remain unimpaired; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the fruit growers of California,

remonstrating against any reduction of the tariff rates on wines, ports, sherries, citrus fruits, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the One Hundred Thousand Club, of Fresno, Cal., remonstrating against the ratification of the so-called Jamaica and other treaties; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petition of David Lubin, of California, relative to the granting of subsidies to vessels; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Sacramento, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Wool Association of San Francisco, Cal., remonstrating against the ratification of any reciprocity treaty whereby the duties on wool or the manufactures thereof will be affected; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Newport, R. I., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. McMILLAN presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Port Huron, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of Mrs. Lenor Starker Bliss, president, and Elizabeth J. Truman, secretary, on behalf of the Woman Suffrage Association of Michigan, praying for the adoption of a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution, prohibiting the disfranchisement of women; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I present the petition of Anna R. Simmons, president, and Lizzie D. Bidwell, secretary, on behalf of the Woman Suffrage Association of South Dakota, praying for the adoption of a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution, enfranchising women, and insisting upon inserting in the laws with regard to Hawaii, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines a provision that women may vote. I move that the petition be referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Hot Springs, Ark., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. CLAY. I present a petition of the legislature of Georgia, praying that an appropriation be made for the further improvement of the Chattahoochee, Flint, and Apalachicola rivers in that State. I ask that the petition be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A resolution memorializing Congress in regard to the further improvement of the Chattahoochee, Flint, and Apalachicola rivers and Apalachicola Bay.

Whereas, in recognition of the value and importance of the Chattahoochee, Flint, and Apalachicola rivers to the commerce of the country at large, and especially to the commerce of the States of Georgia, Alabama, and Florida, the Government of the United States has from time to time expended considerable sums of money in the improvement of said rivers; and

Whereas, in order that the desired results may be obtained from such expenditures and improvements heretofore made, it is necessary further improvements should be made, and especially at the west pass entrance into Apalachicola Bay: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives of the State of Georgia in general assembly met, That it is of vital importance to the commerce of said States that said further and additional improvements should be made.

Resolved further, That our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States be requested to urge upon Congress the importance and necessity of such improvements, and especially the improvement and deepening of said west pass entrance at Apalachicola, Fla.

JOHN D. LITTLE,
Speaker House of Representatives.
JOHN T. BOIFEUILLET,
Clerk House of Representatives.
WILLIAM A. DODSON,
President of Senate.
CHARLES S. NORTHEN,
Secretary of Senate.

Mr. CLAY presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Macon, Ga., praying for the immediate construction of the Nicaragua Canal; which was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

Mr. BURROWS presented a petition of the State Woman Suffrage Association of Michigan, praying that political equality be granted to the women of Hawaii, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

He also presented the petitions of Waldron A. Todd and sundry other citizens of Kalamazoo; Dr. John Leeson, of Cadillac; of the A. H. Lyman Company and sundry other citizens of Manistee; of the P. K. Abbey Company, of Kalamazoo, and of Albert F. Wood, of Detroit, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petitions of Frank S. Knowles and 10 other citizens of Jackson, Chester H. Dunbar and 7 other citizens of Kalamazoo, Charles S. Jones and 9 other citizens of Battle Creek, Joseph H. Emerson and 4 other citizens of Benton Harbor, Laura R. Beers and 2 other citizens of Traverse City, Arthur V. Harner and 3 other citizens of Cadillac, George T. Haskell and 2 other citizens of Ludington, William A. Newbrand and 2 other citizens of St. Joseph, F. A. Reynolds and 2 other citizens of Ionia, F. J. Grano and 2 other citizens of Albion, and of Louis B. Allaugh and 4 other citizens of Marshall, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. ALLEN presented a petition of the city council of Omaha, Nebr., praying that an appropriation be made to macadamize a road from Fort Crook to Vinton street, in that city; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MONEY. I present, by request, the petition of Hala Hammond Butt, president, and Rebecca A. Roby, secretary, on behalf of the Woman Suffrage Association of Mississippi, praying for the adoption of a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution, prohibiting the disfranchisement of United States citizens on account of sex. The petition is very short, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSISSIPPI WOMAN SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION.

To the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Fifty-sixth Congress of the United States:

The Mississippi Woman Suffrage Association, in convention assembled at Clarkesdale, on the 6th day of April, 1899, unanimously adopted the following:

Whereas the trend of civilization is clearly in the direction of equality of the sexes, a condition that may not be obtained until women are fully enfranchised: Therefore,

Resolved, That we, the members of the Mississippi Woman Suffrage Association, do earnestly and respectfully petition your honorable body to submit a proposition to the several State legislatures for a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, forbidding disfranchisement on account of sex.

HALA HAMMOND BUTT, *President.*
REBECCA A. ROBY, *Secretary.*

Mr. McCOMAS presented the petition of William H. Lippy, of Westminster, Md., praying that compensation be granted him for property taken by Stuart's cavalry in York County, Pa., June, 1863; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also presented the petition of Elizabeth Thomas, of Brightwood, D. C., praying that she be granted compensation for property destroyed by the Army during the war of the rebellion; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ELKINS presented the petition of Mrs. Beulah B. Ritchie, president, and Clara Reinheimer, secretary, on behalf of the Woman Suffrage Association of West Virginia, praying for the adoption of a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution, prohibiting the disfranchisement of women; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

He also presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Charleston, W. Va., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. FOSTER. I present a petition of the legislature of Washington, praying that an appropriation of $20,000 be made for the purpose of removing obstructions to navigation in the Snake River, between Asotin City, in that State, and the mouth of the Grande Ronde River. I ask that the petition be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House memorial No. 3. State of Washington. Sixth regular session.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the house of representatives and senate of the State of Washington, most respectfully represent that—

Whereas Snake River is one of the largest tributaries of the Columbia River; and

Whereas Snake River is navigable from Riparia to Asotin City, Wash., at all times during the year; and

Whereas Snake River above Asotin City, Wash., is navigable to the mouth of Grande Ronde River, a distance of 20 (25?) miles, about six months in each year, beginning about the 1st of March and ending about the 1st of September; and

Whereas, owing to obstructions in Snake River at the following points: Ten-Mile, Captain John, and Billey Creek rapids, the navigation of Snake

River above Asotin City, Wash., is wholly obstructed for six months during the year, thereby working a hardship and financial loss to the numerous settlers living in the southeastern section of the State of Washington; and

Whereas the shipping points on Snake River above Asotin City, Wash., are Waha, Cousecreek, and Grande Ronde landings; and

Whereas the number of bushels of wheat stored at Waha Landing during the years 1898 and 1899 is 140,000 bushels, and the number of bushels of wheat stored at Cousecreek Landing during the year 1898 and 1899 is 16,000 bushels; and

Whereas the landing at the mouth of Grande Ronde, on Snake River, is used as the principal shipping point for live stock and other products of the range of the southeastern portion of the State of Washington; and

Whereas the obstruction to the navigation of Snake River at Ten-Mile Rapids consists of large bowlders in the channel of Snake River, and the removal of said bowlders will remove the obstructions to the navigation of Snake River at this point; and

Whereas the obstruction to the navigation of Snake River at Captain John and at Billey Creek rapids consists of bowlders and solid rock, which, when removed, will clear the obstructions to the navigation of Snake River at those points, thereby opening up Snake River to navigation for a distance of 25 miles above Asotin City, Wash.: Be it therefore

Resolved by the legislature of the State of Washington, That the State of Washington respectfully ask the Congress of the United States to appropriate $20,000 for the purpose of removing the obstructions to navigation in Snake River between Asotin City, Wash., and the mouth of the Grande Ronde River. Be it further

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives of this State in Congress are requested to use their most earnest efforts to procure an appropriation for the improvement of Snake River between Asotin City, Wash., and the mouth of the Grande Ronde River.

And your memorialists will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

Passed the house January 25, 1899.

Passed the senate February 2, 1899.

CERTIFICATE.

STATE OF WASHINGTON, OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE,
Olympia, Wash., December 2, 1899.

I, Will D. Jenkins, secretary of state of the State of Washington and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the enrolled document now on file in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State of Washington, the day and year above written.

[SEAL.] WILL D. JENKINS,
Secretary of State.

Mr. FOSTER presented a petition of the legislature of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the improvement and upbuilding of the American merchant marine; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial No. 2. State of Washington. sixth regular session.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the senate and house of representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent:

That the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Seattle passed the following preambles and resolutions:

"Whereas, by reason of the annexation of Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and other islands during the past few months, and by reason of the changed condition of affairs in Cuba, the Philippines, and elsewhere, new and unbounded opportunities for commerce have been opened to the capitalists, business men, and marine interests of the United States; and

"Whereas, with a proper encouragement by Congress, it is certain that no industry and no interest will be more favorably affected in consequence of these great changes in our national affairs than shipbuilding and shipowning, which may not only be restored to their former great prominence, but may also be placed on a higher plane, rivaling that even of Great Britain; and

"Whereas commerce and trade is as essential to the life and prosperity of our nation as mining, manufacturing, and agriculture, at least to the extent of conducting its own carrying trade; and

"Whereas this country is very deficient in its merchant marine and depends largely upon foreign bottoms for its ocean traffic; and

"Whereas the President of the United States in his recent message to Congress recommends 'prompt, durable, and liberal' legislation for the encouragement of American shipping: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Seattle Chamber of Commerce respectfully petition Congress to take action looking to the improvement and upbuilding of the interests of the whole American people on the seas and oceans of the world, than which nothing more important can call attention at this time; and

"*Further resolved*, That our delegation in Congress be invited and urged to use their best efforts to bring about as speedily as possible the desired results; and

"*Further resolved*, That our legislature also be invited and urged by memorial or otherwise to aid with its influence in the accomplishment of the same object; and

"*Further resolved*, That the Seattle Chamber of Commerce earnestly call upon all commercial bodies, political parties, newspapers, and citizens of the State of Washington to give their countenance and warm support to this movement in behalf of American shipping in the foreign trade: Now,

"Therefore we respectfully solicit your honorable bodies to take such action in the matter of the American merchant marine as will the most readily and in the most effective manner reach the object sought in the resolutions above referred to.

"And your memorialists will ever pray."

Passed senate February 14, 1899.

Passed the house February 15, 1899.

Approved February 16, 1899.

CERTIFICATE.

STATE OF WASHINGTON, OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE,
Olympia, Wash., December 2, 1899.

I, Will D. Jenkins, secretary of state of the State of Washington and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the enrolled document now on file in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State of Washington the day and year above written.

[SEAL.] WILL D. JENKINS,
Secretary of State.

Mr. FOSTER presented a petition of the legislature of Washington, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of United States Senators by the direct vote of the people; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution No. 7. State of Washington, sixth regular session.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:

Whereas the present method of electing a United States Senator is expensive, unsatisfactory, and ruinous to the best interests of the people, as also conducive to unnecessary delays in the passage of useful legislation: and

Whereas we believe the will of the people can best be ascertained by a direct vote of the people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the senate of the State of Washington, the house concurring, do by memorial respectfully and earnestly urge the Congress of the United States to make provisions for submitting a constitutional amendment providing for the election of United States Senators by the direct vote of the people; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be each sent one official copy of these resolutions; and be it further

Resolved, That one copy of these resolutions be sent to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress and they be requested to use their influence to secure the object herein set forth.

Passed the senate February 2, 1899.

Passed the house February 15, 1899.

Approved February 18, 1899.

CERTIFICATE.

STATE OF WASHINGTON, OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE,
Olympia, Wash., December 2, 1899.

I, Will D. Jenkins, secretary of state of the State of Washington and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the enrolled document now on file in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State of Washington the day and year above written.

[SEAL.] WILL D. JENKINS,
Secretary of State.

Mr. FOSTER presented a petition of the legislature of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation to promote the commerce and increase the foreign trade of the United States, and to provide auxiliary cruisers, transports, and seamen for Government use when necessary; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint resolution No. 12. State of Washington, sixth regular session.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:

We, your memorialists, the legislature of the State of Washington, represent as follows:

Whereas there has been introduced in the Senate of the United States a bill entitled "A bill to promote the commerce and increase the foreign trade of the United States, and to provide auxiliary cruisers, transports, and seamen for Government use when necessary;" and

Whereas the State of Washington is assuming new relations in matters of foreign trade with the new possessions of the United States; and

Whereas the shipping interests of the said State of Washington is one of the chief commercial industries of the State:

Resolved, That the legislature of the State of Washington petitions for the passage of said bill introduced in the Senate of the United States, believing that the same will greatly benefit the American merchant marine of the entire Pacific coast, as well as of the State of Washington.

Passed the house January 26, 1899.

Passed the senate February 3, 1899.

CERTIFICATE.

STATE OF WASHINGTON, OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE,
Olympia, Wash., December 2, 1899.

I, Will D. Jenkins, secretary of state of the State of Washington, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the enrolled document now on file in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State of Washington the day and year above written.

[SEAL.] WILL D. JENKINS,
Secretary of State.

Mr. FOSTER presented a petition of the legislature of Washington, praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the Columbia River at Priest, Rock Island, Orondo, and Methow Rapids, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House memorial No. 9. State of Washington, sixth regular session.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the house of representatives and the senate of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent:

Whereas the question of transportation of cereals and other products of the farm, mines, and pastoral pursuits and fruit culture of all the section of our State in the north and central portion thereof east of the Cascade range is of very great importance; and

Whereas the Columbia River can be made navigable for more than 100 miles by the expenditure of a small amount of money at Priest, Rock Island, Orondo, and Methow Rapids; and

Whereas a great demand exists for the improvement of said river at said places: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That your memorialists most respectfully and earnestly urge that your honorable bodies favor such legislation as will hasten the opening of said river to navigation by removing natural obstructions at said rapids, which will greatly aid transportation of persons and products in a territory three times as large as the State of Connecticut.

Resolved further, That your memorialists request of our Senators and Representatives in the National Senate and House of Representatives to press this matter before our National Legislature and urge upon it the necessity of immediate legislation that will afford the long prayed for relief sought, and that a copy of this memorial be sent to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress and to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House.

And this your memorialists will ever pray.

Passed the house February 25, 1899.

Passed the senate March 3, 1899.

CERTIFICATE.

STATE OF WASHINGTON, OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE,
Olympia, Wash., December 2, 1899.

I, Will D. Jenkins, secretary of state of the State of Washington and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the enrolled document now on file in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State of Washington the day and year above written.

[SEAL.] WILL D. JENKINS,
Secretary of State.

Mr. KYLE presented the petition of Joseph S. Baker and John Guild, of Deadwood, S. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of the Agricultural Society of Juniata County, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase American shipping; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of sundry railway mail clerks of Sunbury, Sharon, Reading, and Johnstown, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut presented petitions of sundry railway mail clerks of Bridgeport, Torrington, and Meriden, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. CHILTON presented the memorial of F. S. E. Watson, J. B. Dickson, W. S. Thomas, A. S. McAnear, M. S. Grant, and sundry other citizens of Red River and Clarkesville, in the State of Texas, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to establish the gold standard; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented sundry petitions of railway mail clerks of Galveston, Waco, and Greenville, all in the State of Texas, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of the Norway Medicine Company, of Norway, Me., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Auburn, Me., and a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Rockland, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of Louisa Hobart Day, president, and Anne Burgess, secretary, on behalf of the Woman Suffrage Association of Maine, praying that perfect equality of right, civil and political, may be secured to the women of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. HARRIS presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 809) to correct the military record of Benjamin Walker, of Ottawa, Kans.; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MASON presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Wheaton, Ill., and a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of La Salle, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the United Turnvereins of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the continuance of the war in the Philippines; which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

Mr. MASON. I present the memorial of James S. Cowden, relative to the Lake Borgne outlet system for lowering the flood line of the Mississippi River. I desire that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Printing. It is a very cumbersome document, and the question whether it should be printed will have to go to the Committee on Printing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the memorial will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. MASON. I desire to have a short editorial clipping from the Washington Post inserted in the RECORD without reading. I do not care to take the time of the Senate to have it read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois asks leave to print a clipping from the Washington Post.

Mr. SPOONER. What is the title of it?

Mr. MASON. It is an editorial in the Post of yesterday morning.

Mr. HAWLEY. What is the subject?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The title will be read.

The SECRETARY. Editorial title, "Let us be honest."

Mr. HAWLEY. I object. It is not worth while to reprint in the RECORD articles from all the newspapers in the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1881) defining and regulating proof in certain pension cases, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 447) to permit Anna M. Colman, a widow, to prosecute a claim, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 186) for the relief of John L. Smithmeyer and Paul J. Pelz, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BATE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 79) to construct a road to the national cemetery at Dover, Tenn., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 148) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Elias B. Bell, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PENROSE, from the Committee on Immigration, to whom was referred the bill (S. 233) to amend the immigration laws of the United States, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. CARTER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1018) to establish a Branch Home of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers at Castle Pinckney, in Charleston Harbor, South Carolina, or some other eligible site in or near that city, for the use of disabled officers and enlisted men of the Volunteer Army and Navy of the United States, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

THOMAS L. CROWELL.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask that the Committee on Pensions be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 486) granting a pension to Thomas L. Crowell, so that the bill may be brought before the Senate and indefinitely postponed. Mr. Crowell has died since the bill was introduced and no rights descend to his heirs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the committee will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 2369) granting a pension to Wilbur W. McKinney; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McENERY introduced a bill (S. 2370) for relief of the heirs of G. P. Work; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HARRIS introduced a bill (S. 2371) to correct the military record of Talton T. Davis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2372) to construct a road to the national cemetery at Baxter Springs, Kans.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. RAWLINS introduced a bill (S. 2373) granting a pension to George A. McKenzie; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PETTUS introduced a bill (S. 2374) to create a commission to adjudicate the claims of citizens of the United States growing out of the destruction of property and for other depredations committed on the island of Cuba during the late insurrection on said island; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Relations with Cuba.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 2375) granting a pension to Mary A. Russell; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. To accompany the bill I present the petition of Mary A. Russell, helpless and dependent daughter of Herbert C. Russell, Company C, Sixty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, together with the affidavits of herself, Mary A. Dyer, Lura Brown, Mary C. Eliot, P. D. Stockton, and Emma C. Collins. I move that the bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2376) granting an increase of pension to Michael Volz; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present the petition of the claimant, Michael Volz, Company G, Nineteenth United States Infantry, Sarcoxie,

Mo., for increase of his pension, with affidavits of Drs. J. F. Scott and A. S. Hawkins, and of L. R. Stickel, M. Y. Setzer, and W. L. Martin. I move that the bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CAFFERY (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2377) for the relief of Samuel Cary; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 2378) for the relief of Mary W. Southern, administratrix of John P. Southern, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. TURLEY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2379) for the relief of Patrick G. Meath;

A bill (S. 2380) for the relief of the estate of Zeno T. Harris, deceased; and

A bill (S. 2381) for the relief of J. P. McGaw, sr. (with accompanying papers).

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 2382) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," approved June 13, 1898; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2383) to amend section 4843 of the Revised Statutes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. STEWART introduced a bill (S. 2384) to reimburse certain persons who expended moneys and furnished services and supplies in repelling invasions and suppressing Indian hostilities within the territorial limits of the present State of Nevada; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2385) for the settlement of Piute war claims; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 2386) granting a pension to Joseph E. Hendrickson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 2387) authorizing the Secretary of War to issue an honorable discharge to William S. Clinton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SHOUP introduced a bill (S. 2388) to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Boise City, Idaho; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 2389) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jonas Albert; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2390) granting a pension to Louisa Straight; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2391) granting an increase of pension to James H. King; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WETMORE introduced a bill (S. 2392) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of those who were killed by the explosion of the gun-cotton factory at the United States torpedo station at Newport, R. I.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. McMILLAN (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2393) for the relief of Joseph S. Boss; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PLATT of New York introduced a bill (S. 2394) to authorize the President to place Samuel E. St. Onge Chapleau on the retired list of the Army with the rank of captain; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2395) for the relief of H. Clay Conde, a private soldier in Company I, Eighteenth Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, to correct the muster-in roll of said company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2396) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Schenectady, in the State of New York; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. PRITCHARD introduced a bill (S. 2397) to correct the military record of John Shelton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2398) granting a pension to Sarah Coffey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McCOMAS introduced a bill (S. 2399) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Washington;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2400) granting an increase of pension to Edith Lockwood Sturdy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2401) for the relief of Anna M. Anderson and Charles Y. G. Anderson, executors of George W. Anderson, deceased;

A bill (S. 2402) for the relief of Thomas Dixon;

A bill (S. 2403) for the relief of N. F. Edmonds; and

A bill (S. 2404) for the relief of Elizabeth Thomas.

Mr. ELKINS introduced a bill (S. 2405) granting a pension to Paul Summers, late of company of Capt. B. L. Stephenson, West Virginia State Guards; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2406) granting a pension to Eliza Ann Hewins; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2407) for the relief of John P. Fox;

A bill (S. 2408) for the relief of George W. Graham; and

A bill (S. 2409) for the relief of W. D. Catlett.

Mr. FOSTER introduced a bill (S. 2410) to establish a military post near the city of Tacoma, in the State of Washington, and making appropriation therefor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2411) to erect a memorial tablet to Ensign John R. Monaghan, United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 2412) providing for the collection of statistics by the Director of the Census; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Census.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 2413) granting a pension to Mathew C. Danforth; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 2414) for the relief of settlers upon the lands within the grant of the Northern Pacific Railroad Company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2415) to remove the charge of desertion from the name of John Davis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2416) granting a pension to Lasina Peterson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (S. 2417) granting a pension to Cyrus L. Wood; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2418) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the military record of Joseph Willett; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MASON introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2419) granting a pension to Walter Aitkens (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2420) granting a pension to Jennie A. McKinley (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2421) granting a pension to Elisha Hawk (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2422) granting a pension to Abraham W. Tillotson.

Mr. MASON introduced a bill (S. 2423) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John E. Thompson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2424) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Ambrose H. Green; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2425) amendatory of sections 3339 and 3341 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relative to internal-revenue tax on fermented liquors; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2426) to prevent manufacture of adulterated foods; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 2427) granting a pension to Cara H. Wilson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2428) directing the Secretary of the

Navy to consider and report on the subject of a statue of the late Admiral David D. Porter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2429) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John Haley, alias John Lynch; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CHILTON introduced a bill (S. 2430) granting a pension to Mary C. Williams; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BATE introduced a bill (S. 2431) to present to the city of Nashville, State of Tennessee, the cannon on the gunboat *Nashville* from which was fired the first shot in the Spanish-American war; which was read twice by its title, and, with the petition of the mayor, city council, and board of public works of the city of Nashville, Tenn., referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. TILLMAN introduced a bill (S. 2432) granting an increase of pension to James A. Thomas; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 2433) granting per diem pension service to honorably discharged officers and enlisted men of the Union Army in the civil war; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ELKINS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2434) granting a pension to Samuel H. Spence;
A bill (S. 2435) granting a pension to Luroy A. Lively;
A bill (S. 2436) granting a pension to William C. Davis; and
A bill (S. 2437) granting a pension to David O. Carpenter.

Mr. ELKINS introduced a bill (S. 2438) to establish a fish-hatching and fish station in the State of West Virginia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2439) to extend the laws relating to commerce, navigation, and merchant seamen over the Hawaiian Islands ceded to the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2440) to regulate the running of street cars in the city of Washington, D. C.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 2441) granting a pension to Felix G. Sitton; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. To accompany the bill I present the petition and affidavits of the claimant and John T. Brinegar, a letter from General Ainsworth, of the War Department, one from the Auditor for the War Department, and one from the Pension Bureau. I move that the bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2442) granting a pension to Martha Sanders; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SPOONER introduced a bill (S. 2443) to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of site and the erection of a public building at Eau Claire, Wis.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a bill (S. 2444) granting an increase of pension to Theodore McClellan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2445) authorizing the renewal of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines who served during the war with Spain; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WETMORE (by request) introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 60) granting permission for the erection of a bronze statue in Washington, D. C., in honor of Gen. Francis E. Spinner, late Treasurer of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 61) relative to the widening and extension of Sixteenth street, in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PLATT of New York introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 62) authorizing and requiring the Secretary of War to contract with Charles Stoughton for the improvement of the Harlem Kills, New York City, by a canal to connect the Lower Harlem River with Long Island Sound, 3,400 feet in length, 300 feet in width, and 15 feet in depth, at mean low water, or by a similar canal 18 feet in depth at mean low water, in strict conformity with the survey and report made thereon in 1881 by Col. John Newton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. McCOMAS introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 63) extending the thanks of Congress to Acting Rear-Admiral Sampson and Commodore Schley and the men under them for the destruction of the Spanish fleet at Santiago; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. MASON introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 64) to restore the status of the Chicago Dragoons, who served during the war of the rebellion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. CARTER submitted an amendment proposing an appropriation of $1,282.27 to pay the Herald Publishing Company, of Helena, Mont., for balance due on advertising the classification of lands, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TURLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1676) for the payment of certain claims; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PRITCHARD submitted an amendment proposing an appropriation of $10,000 for investigation and examination of the region of western North Carolina, east Tennessee, and that portion of Georgia adjacent to western North Carolina, with a view to secure a national park, intended to be proposed by him to the agricultural appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CHANDLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1706) for the reference of certain claims against the Government of the United States to the Court of Claims; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO THE FINANCIAL BILL.

Mr. BUTLER. I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes, striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting a substitute. I ask that the amendment be printed and lie on the table, to be called up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF NAVIGATION.

Mr. CULLOM submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate, That there be printed 1,000 additional copies of the report of Mr. Elmer L. Corthell, United States delegate to the Seventh International Congress of Navigation, Brussels, Belgium, July 28, 1898, to be bound in cloth, for distribution by the Department of State.

WARROAD (MINN.) HARBOR IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. NELSON submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to submit a report of survey and estimate for the dredging and other improvements of the harbor at Warroad, Minn.

REAR-ADMIRAL DEWEY'S REPORT.

Mr. PETTIGREW submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Senate 1,000 copies of Rear-Admiral Dewey's report of the naval operations on the Asiatic station, covering the naval battle of Manila Bay, May 1, 1898, and the investment and fall of Manila.

THE NAVY.

Mr. PERKINS. I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he hereby is, directed to inform the Senate how many vessels are now under construction, of all types and classes.

2. How many officers of each grade or rank would be required to officer vessels now in commission, or that could be put in commission in thirty days.

3. When the vessels now under construction will be completed, ready for commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from California if he would have any objection—if he has, I will not press it—to add to the resolution a statement of the number of officers and men now employed in our Navy.

Mr. PERKINS. I have no objection whatever.

Mr. HOAR. Let there be added to the resolution the words, "and the number of officers and men on each of the vessels of the Navy of the United States."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Add to the resolution:

4. The number of officers and men on each of the vessels of the Navy of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be so amended, in the absence of objection. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

REMOVAL OF SEAT OF GOVERNMENT.

Mr. GALLINGER. I submit an order to print a brief document, of which I have the proof sheets in my hand. It relates to the removal of the seat of government to the District of Columbia. The matter is of great importance, and I trust the order will be adopted.

The order was read and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That 500 extra copies of Senate Document No. 62 be printed and bound in paper for the use of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate——

Mr. VEST. Is morning business concluded?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair was about to state that morning business is concluded.

Mr. VEST. I ask unanimous consent to call up a little local bill to extend the time for building a bridge across the Missouri River. The work is suspended for the want of this legislation. It will cause no debate, and it will take but a minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the title of the bill?

Mr. VEST. It is the bill (S. 2284) extending the time for the completion of a wagon and motor bridge across the Missouri River at St. Charles, Mo., as provided by act approved June 3, 1896.

Mr. HALE. I hope the Senator will wait until the resolutions that come over from a former day in the morning hour are passed upon.

Mr. VEST. I understood that the morning business was finished.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is finished, but there are resolutions coming over from a former day.

Mr. VEST. The bill will not lead to the slightest debate.

Mr. HALE. It is all right.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill indicated by the Senator from Missouri?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to extend to June 3, 1902, the time for completing the construction of a wagon and motor bridge across the Missouri River at St. Charles, Mo., as fixed by an act approved June 3, 1896.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INQUIRIES RELATIVE TO THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution submitted by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW] on the 3d instant, which is on the table by agreement, to be laid before the Senate to-day. The resolution, which has been read several times, will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A resolution calling on the Secretary of War for certain information relative to the beginning of the war in the Philippines.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President——

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator from South Dakota whether he will not consent, as his resolution is to be the subject of debate, to allow the resolution which I introduced, as amended by my colleague [Mr. LODGE], the chairman of the Committee on the Philippines, to be adopted without delaying that by the necessary debate on his resolution? I am not prepared to speak for anybody, but I think the Senate will adopt that resolution unanimously.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I do not think I can consent to that course, for the reason that if my resolution is defeated I shall want to amend the other resolution and perhaps debate it. Therefore I think the resolutions had better be disposed of in their order.

Mr. President, I have some further remarks that I wish to make upon my resolution, but I will yield now to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY], who wishes to speak upon the subject, and after he has closed I should like to address the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution introduced by me, with the amendment of my colleague, may stand without losing its place until the disposition of the resolution of the Senator from South Dakota. I do not know but that is the rule now. The colleague of the Chair on my left suggests that is the rule now and that it does not require unanimous consent.

Mr. HALE. If it is not reached and debated, does it not go over without prejudice?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A former presiding officer of the Senate so held. The present occupant of the chair does not find in the rules any place for resolutions other than on the Calendar. The rules ought to be amended if the Senate opposes the present custom. But the Chair will hold, as has formerly been held, that these resolutions will lie until they have had one day in court.

Mr. HOAR. Very well; that is all I ask.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I ask to have read the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] on the 18th day of December with reference to the disposition of the Philippine Islands.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will read the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Georgia, which is on the table.

The Secretary read the joint resolution (S. R. 45) declaring the purpose of the United States with reference to the Philippine Islands, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Government and people of the United States have not waged the recent war with Spain for conquest and for the acquisition of foreign territory, but solely for the purposes set forth in the resolution of Congress making the declaration of war—the acquisition of such small tracts of land or harbors as may be necessary for governmental purposes being not deemed inconsistent with the same.

SEC. 2. That in demanding and in receiving the cession of the Philippine Islands it is not the purpose of the Government of the United States to secure and maintain permanent dominion over the same as a part of the territory of the United States, or to permanently incorporate the inhabitants thereof as citizens of the United States, or to hold said inhabitants as vassals or subjects of this Government; and the United States hereby disclaim any disposition or intention to exercise permanent sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said islands.

SEC. 3. That the United States, having accepted the cession of the Philippine Islands from Spain, and having by force of arms overthrown all organized authority and opposition to the authority of the United States therein, the duty and obligation rest upon the United States to restore peace and maintain order throughout the same; to protect in said islands the enjoyment of life and property and the pursuit of lawful avocations; and to continue such protection until the power and duty to maintain said protection shall have been transferred and intrusted by the United States to a government of the people of said islands deemed capable and worthy to exercise said power and discharge said duty.

SEC. 4. That when armed resistance to the authority of the United States shall have ceased within said islands, and peace and order shall have been restored therein, it is the purpose and intention of the United States, so soon thereafter as the same can be practically and safely accomplished, to provide the opportunity and prescribe the method for the formation of a government by and of the people of the Philippine Islands, to be thereafter independently exercised and controlled by themselves, it being the design of the United States to accord to the people of said islands the same measure of liberty and independence which have been pledged by the Congress of the United States to the people of Cuba.

SEC. 5. That when a stable government shall, by the method aforesaid, have been duly formed and erected in said islands, competent and worthy, in the judgment of the United States, to exercise the powers of an independent government and to preserve peace and maintain order within its jurisdiction, it is the purpose and intention of the United States, reserving to themselves only such harbors and tracts of land as may be needed for coaling stations or other governmental purposes, to transfer to said government, upon terms which shall be reasonable and just, all rights and territory secured in said islands under the treaty with Spain, and to thereupon leave the dominion and control of the islands to their people.

SEC. 6. That when said government has been thus formed and set up in the Philippine Islands and approved by the United States, it is the design and intention of the United States, through treaties with the leading nations of the world, to secure the guaranty of the continued independence of the same.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I desire also to have read the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] in regard to the course to be pursued with reference to the Philippine Islands.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the joint resolution (S. R. 53) defining the policy of the United States relative to the Philippine Islands, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., That the Philippine Islands are territory belonging to the United States; that it is the intention of the United States to retain them as such and to establish and maintain such governmental control throughout the archipelago as the situation may demand.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, at the time the treaty between the United States and Spain was pending in the Senate for ratification there were a large number of Senators here who believed it to be the wisest and best policy to insert in that treaty a provision making the same promises in regard to giving free government to the people of the Philippine Islands which Congress had, when the declaration of war with Spain was made, given to the people of Cuba.

Those who opposed that amendment of the treaty insisted at that time that it was important the treaty should be ratified at once in order that war should cease; that the whole question would be left open to the disposition of Congress thereafter, and that no prejudice would come to those who desired to finally dispose of the Philippine Islands in the same manner which was thought proper in the case of Cuba by the ratification of the treaty of peace. The President himself said that Congress would have entire jurisdiction of the matter; and those who argued against that amendment repeatedly stated upon this floor that when the subject came before Congress the entire question would be open for full discussion.

Now, Mr. President, the time has come when resolutions are presented here representing, I take it, the different views of the people of the United States as to the course to be pursued. And now, when those who believe that the Philippine people should be entitled to the same rights and privileges which we had promised to give to the Cuban people undertake to debate the subject upon the floor of the Senate, we are told that we are aiding those who

are in rebellion against the United States; that we are giving aid and comfort to men with arms in their hands, who are shooting at our soldiers, and that we, who opposed from the very beginning the method which has been pursued, are responsible for the death of our gallant soldiers who have fallen or who may fall in those islands. I submit to the Senate and to the people of the United States whether or not this is fair treatment.

I furthermore say that I apprehend that no man imbued with proper principles, who believes that the course proposed by the resolution offered by the Senator from Indiana will have the effect eventually to destroy this Republic, who believes that another course should be pursued, will not, I take it, be deterred from expressing that opinion because of such grave charges against him, which are unwarranted by the facts.

These two resolutions, the one presented by the Senator from Georgia and the other by the Senator from Indiana, as I believe, fairly represent the different views of the two great parties throughout the United States of America. The main features of the resolution by the Senator from Georgia will be indorsed and supported by all those who believe we in this country are yet bound by a written Constitution, by all those who believe in the principles laid down in the Declaration of Independence, by all those who believe that we should follow the advice of the fathers of the Republic when they said we should avoid entangling alliances with foreign nations.

On the other hand, the resolution introduced by the Senator from Indiana, as I infer from the surroundings, represents the views of the President of the United States and the members of his Administration. I say I assume it represents the views of the President because of the Senator who introduced it, because it has been indorsed by the leading Administration newspapers throughout the country, and because of the countenance, encouragement, and congratulations which were showered upon the Senator from Indiana by high Cabinet officials and others connected with the Administration. I therefore submit that these two resolutions join issue, which is to be submitted throughout the United States to the American people, as to the final disposition of the Philippine Islands.

The resolution introduced by the Senator from Indiana asserts, in my opinion, a power as absolute as was ever claimed by the most despotic government the world has ever known. Neither the Czar of Russia nor the Emperor of Germany could claim more absolute power than is claimed in the resolution introduced by the Senator from Indiana. He says that those islands shall be controlled as the situation demands. The Congress of the United States are to judge of what the situation there demands, and are then to exercise such control as in their judgment they may think necessary.

We are not to be restrained by the written Constitution of the United States of America; we are not to be handicapped by any rights or privileges which those people may claim. If the situation demands it, under that resolution there is no power which has ever been exercised by the greatest and most despotic government in this world which can not be exercised there. If the situation demands it, we may imprison men for an unlimited time without informing them of the nature of the charges against them; we may inflict capital punishment without confronting them with witnesses, without trial, and without jury.

Louis XIV of France in the very height of his power, when he filled the Bastile with men without informing them of the character of the charges against them, never exercised more despotic power than is proposed to be lodged in the Congress of the United States by the joint resolution offered by the Senator from Indiana. And yet we find men in high position who say that it is "nonsense to call this imperialism." I should like to ask, Mr. President, what is imperialism, if it be not the assertion of a power that we, and we alone, are the judges of what is necessary, and that we will exercise such control as the situation demands?

I assert, then, that that resolution, indorsed by the President of the United States and by the members of this Administration, if it is to be the policy to be pursued, is imperialism, absolute and unconditional. It is hardly necessary for me to say that I am unalterably and forever opposed to any such assertion of power by the Government of the United States. I believe we are restrained by a written Constitution, which we have sworn to support, and I believe that the happiness of this people will be best secured by following that Constitution.

But, Mr. President, let us see what arguments are brought forward to sustain the position which has been taken, so different from those which have controlled the Republic in all of its past history; let us see what reasons are given by those who advocate such a policy as to why we should depart from the principles laid down by Jefferson and the founders of the Republic. There are but two main reasons I have ever heard given; and yet, Mr. President, they are not good reasons. The same reasons that are given today why we should pursue this course of conduct in the Philippines have been given, I think, by every government in the history of the past which has sought to acquire additional territory by force of arms, or sought to crush out the liberties of another people. The reasons given in this case, I say, have been given in every case where governments have sought to gain territory by force and without right and without justice.

The first of these reasons is that it is the will of the Lord, that the Lord has selected certain persons as trustees. To use the exact language of the Senator from Indiana, "He has selected them as trustees under Him, and has marked them as His chosen people hereafter to lead in the regeneration of the world."

Mr. President, when an American citizen has such confidence in his own ability and in his own judgment as to believe that the Lord has selected him to do the identical things which the Lord has said shall not be done, I realize that that man is in a condition of mind incapable of judging impartially. When men assume that they are trustees of the Lord to violate His written word I want some testimony besides their own assertion that they have any such trusteeship.

The Good Book of the Lord says, "Thou shalt not kill;" "Thou shalt not steal;" "Thou shalt not bear false witness:" and yet men will come and say that the Lord has made them His trustees to commit every one of these acts upon which he has put the seal of His condemnation. And I say they are mistaken about their appointment.

As I said, Mr. President, this is not the first time this power has been claimed. If I correctly remember history, when Mohammed sought to conquer the entire world and impose his peculiar religious views upon all people, his soldiers went to battle with the cry, "There is but one God and Mohammed is His prophet." And when they murdered helpless women and children they said, "It is the will of the Lord; it is the will of the Lord."

When the Spanish Government was at the height of its power, when those who ruled it argued that it was necessary that they should expand their territory in order that they might grow and live, they sent Cortez to Mexico and Pizarro to Peru, where their paths were marked by death and desolation, by burning houses and murdered women and children, and yet they claimed this was all done in the name of the Lord, though its real object was to increase Spanish commerce and to pour wealth into the lap of the Spanish nation.

So, Mr. President, it has been everywhere, and it is even so today. I think that I have read somewhere that the Emperor of Germany asserts that he is the head trustee, representing the Lord in the regeneration of the world. Those are the kinds of arguments which are urged upon us to induce us to violate the Constitution of the United States, to induce us to trample on every precept of our fathers, to induce us to do an act indeed which, in my opinion, no time can ever cure and which will eventually destroy the very foundations of the Government itself. I deny the authority of those who claim such a trusteeship. I call for the proof of the appointment of these pretended trustees. I say such a trusteeship does not exist, for it would be folly to argue that a man who does wrong is following out the precepts of Him who taught us that order and truth and justice were the great virtues of mankind.

Mr. President, what is the other argument? It is that these men are trustees for the regeneration of the world, and they also claim that it will pay to do that work; that it will bring wealth into the lap of this nation; that it will increase our commerce and open the ports of China to us; that if we pursue such a course the country will grow greater, and stronger, and richer. I deny that proposition. It is true that such a course may bring wealth to some individuals, but I deny that it will bring wealth and prosperity to the great body of the American people. And yet the argument has been used recently, and an appeal has been made to the people of the Southern States especially, that if we adopt the policy of controlling by absolute force and power the Philippine Islands, denying them the right to govern themselves, which we promised to the people of Cuba, it will tend to increase the commerce of the South; that our citizens engaged in the growing and manufacture of cotton will have additional markets for their products and thus the price of cotton will be increased.

Mr. President, I assert here to-day that if we should adopt the resolution offered by the Senator from Georgia, immediately throughout the archipelago we would be granted every right, every privilege of commerce that we can secure by force; that those people would be glad to yield to us all rights in the way of coaling and naval stations we may desire; that they would be glad to grant us the privileges of free trade as to the importation and exportation of goods, and that there is no advantage in the way of commerce which would not come with additional force if we should make this peaceful and just and fair settlement with the Filipinos.

On the contrary, so far as the cotton spinners of the South are concerned, it seems to me that if we are to wield absolute power in the Philippines, the great trusts of the United States, the men of wealth, the men who have urged the President to this un-American course which he has pursued, would by their combined wealth and direct taxation in the Philippines secure labor at a cost

of 10 cents a day, erect cotton factories there, secure special privileges from the governor-general, and thereby competing with the people of the South in the price of cotton goods, absolutely putting cotton at ruinous prices. There is no difficulty there, I am told, in getting any amount of labor at 10 cents a day. If laborers there should ask more than 10 cents a day, the governor-general whom you send there with this unlimited power would no doubt use such power to fix such price as he should choose. Oh, but you may say, this will not be done.

I state, Mr. President, that under the resolution of the Senator from Indiana it can be done. We have been before told where unlimited power was sought that it would never be used. Away back in the days of 1868, when there were Senators on this floor who urged that reconstruction measures should be passed, we were told that American citizens would never abuse such power. Senators then contended that if the power was given they feared it would be used. The power was given, and we all remember the abuse which followed. For four years robbery, oppression, and every form of injustice prevailed to such an extent that it shocked the civilized world and brought a stain upon the American name. To tell me that if you grant absolute power unrestrained by the Constitution your governor-general and your carpetbaggers sent to distant islands will never abuse that power is to tell me what I do not believe.

But, Mr. President, whether it would pay in the South or not, I have such confidence in the Southern people that I believe the first question they will ask will be, "Is the policy just? Is it fair?" They will not, in my judgment, consider for one moment the benefits which may come to them until they have first determined whether the course proposed is in accordance with the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States and is right in itself. It has been the pride and the glory of the Southern people from the time this Government was organized to hold liberty, truth, and justice far above all money consideration.

Mr. President, if you ask the Southern people to use force to strike down the liberties of the Philippine people, to deny them the right of self-government, they will not forget that in the great contest with the United States in the civil war nineteen-twentieths of those who fought in the Southern army did not fight to extend and perpetuate slavery, but they fought for the rights of home rule and local self-government, because they believed those rights were guaranteed to them by the Declaration of Independence. Therefore, I trust that that people will not recede from the high and lofty position which they have always taken, and that they will contend that truth and justice and honor are still to stand far above the personal gain that you hold out to them in such glittering generalities.

As I have stated, Mr. President, these are the two main arguments which have been used why the policy should be pursued which the Administration seeks to justify. Let us see for a moment. I promise to be brief in that regard. What are the facts which led us to the present situation? Some three hundred or more years ago—I do not recall the exact time—Spain by her arms had conquered the inhabitants of the island of Cuba and of the Philippine Islands. She has exercised over them since that time a colonial government; she has ruled them precisely as the present Administration proposes to rule the inhabitants of the Philippines to-day; she has given them the most cruel, the most oppressive government under which any people have ever lived.

From time to time in desperation the people of those countries sought to throw off the Spanish authority and to win the liberties to which all people are entitled. Once or twice, when victory was almost within their grasp, the promises of Spain for better government, for autonomy, for home rule and local government, induced the people to lay down their arms, and just as regularly as they did so Spain forgot her promises, and no reform was ever made. This had gone to such an extent that in 1898, after some three years of insurrection in the Cuban Isle, when the outrages perpetrated by the Spanish soldiers were so great, and the sufferings of starving women and the starving children were depicted in the Senate and throughout the United States, the American people rose almost as one man and said that these outrages right under the shadow of our flag should continue no longer; they said that Spain must withdraw her power or war would result.

Mr. President, so particular and so cautious were the people of the United States that they should not be misunderstood, that they might not be accused of improper motives in the declaration of war made by Congress, any disposition was disclaimed to acquire territory, and there was also disclaimed any selfish purpose on the part of this Government, basing its action upon the broad ground of humanity, to enable the oppressed people of Cuba to secure to themselves the best possible kind of government, and that they should be free and independent; and I assert to-day that while the Philippine Islands were not named in that resolution, this Government is in honor bound to give them the same free government that we promised Cuba.

What was the result? Our young men in every part of the country rushed to arms with an enthusiasm and a patriotism which has never been excelled, and the glorious victories in the harbor of Manila and the harbor of Santiago and on the hills of San Juan showed what a great and free people could do when they were actuated by disinterested motives and only sought to relieve the oppressed of another country.

What was the condition at that time of the people of the Philippines? They, too, had sought liberty, they had been on the verge of victory, then promises were made to them, and they laid down their arms; but when the people of those islands heard that this great Republic, which desires that all people shall be free, was at war with their long-time oppressor, I can imagine the joy that thrilled the hearts of the people throughout the entire islands when they heard that Dewey had destroyed the naval power of their oppressor in the harbor of Manila.

There was not more rejoicing throughout the United States of America than there was throughout the Philippines. They hoped the time would come when their long-sought-for liberty and independence would be within their grasp. If they had had any doubt before, when Admiral Dewey put their exiled leaders at Hongkong upon American ships and brought them back with others to the islands, placed arms and ammunitions and supplies in their hands, their breasts were so full of hope that within a few weeks they rallied with such enthusiasm as to drive the Spaniards from every province except that of Manila.

They were only prevented from taking it by the advice of the American commanders. Knowing that we had promised the Cuban people that they should be free, knowing that they had aided us and that they had been our allies in the contest with the Spaniards in Manila, can you imagine that they did not expect and believe that the same treatment would be given them? And when it began to dawn on their minds that there was doubt about it, naturally, having dealt with Spain, they became uneasy and suspicious. They sent a man here to see the President of the United States, to offer this Government any kind of concession that it might demand. He came here in good faith, and yet the President refused even to give him audience. Not only that, but the Administration newspapers of this city denounced him as a spy and threatened to have him court-martialed and shot if he remained in the country. Finally he fled to Canada, and from there to England or France or to some other country.

Mr. President, not only this, but when the Peace Commission met at Paris, then, for the first time, it was given out that it was the intention of the United States to purchase and permanently hold the absolute sovereignty of those islands. Then it was, after the treaty was signed, but before it was ratified by the Senate, that the President of the United States issued that unfortunate proclamation of December 28, known as the benevolent assimilation proclamation. Bear in mind that this was done before the Senate had agreed to the treaty; that it was done at a time when we were seeking to get an amendment on the treaty, making the same promise to the Philippines which we had made to Cuba. He then put forth that declaration which claimed absolute sovereignty for the United States, and notified them that we would take possession of the islands. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], a few days since, furnished the absolute and incontrovertible testimony that it was that proclamation which brought on the clash of arms and which has caused all the suffering. So certain was General Otis that it would cause bloodshed that he struck out portions of it, but the Filipinos secured a copy of the original.

I assert here to-day that if the President had stated in his proclamation that he had no doubt Congress would grant them the same rights and privileges that we had promised Cuba, there would never have been a gun fired, and all this expenditure of money and all this loss of life of our best and our bravest soldiers would have been avoided. It came from that proclamation. There the responsibility rests, and there is no power to relieve those of it who are responsible for it. I will do the President the justice to say that I do not believe he did it willingly. I believe that he yielded after long pressure, after the persuasion and importunity of those who sought this mode of procedure for commercial speculation for themselves, and that the President of the United States only yielded after they had made him believe that a majority of the people of the United States approved that course.

But, Mr. President, he did yield, and the responsibility rests upon him and those who induced him to issue that proclamation, and not upon the men who tried to avoid it. I do not think it is either brave or manly or truthful for those who are responsible for the issuance of that proclamation, and who refused to grant the people of the Philippines the same rights we had promised to Cuba, to come here "howling like slaves whipped to their burden," and say, "You all did it because you opposed our course." If I had believed that I was a trustee under God to bring more wealth to this nation and my advice had been followed, I never would have come back and sought to avoid all responsibility and to charge upon the men who had used every effort to secure a peaceful settlement that they were chargeable with the death of our soldiers.

But that is the condition presented to-day. Mr. President, it is not yet too late. It is too late to save the lives of the brave Lawton and many others who have fallen there; it is too late to call back the expenditure of money; but it is not too late for this great and free Government of ours to disclaim responsibility for these wrongs and to do that which is right. If we to-day, followed by the House of Representatives and the President, would adopt the resolution proposed by the Senator from Georgia, I assert that not another gun would be fired in the archipelago.

I believe we should do an act which would place this great Government upon the highest pinnacle of fame. We stand to-day equal or superior to any other nation in the world. There is no human being who could claim that in doing this act of justice we are actuated by any motive except an honest one, or that we right the wrong which has been done through fear. We are the absolute masters of the situation. If, occupying that position, we rise to the necessities of this great occasion and assure these people that they shall be free, we will prove to the world that we were honest when we said that we went to war not for conquest, but in order to give freedom to others. I assert that if we should do that we would command the respect of every nation in the world and deserve the love and admiration of our own people.

But we are told it is too late. We are told again and again that the majority of the people of the United States have approved the policy of the President. Mr. President, I do not know how that is. Neither do the men know who make the assertion. I believe that if to-day a vote should be taken on these resolutions, disconnected from party politics, removed from all the great questions which divide the two political parties, if it could be submitted fairly to the country, an overwhelming majority would declare in favor of the resolution of the Senator from Georgia. We know that an overwhelming majority of the Democrats in the country are in favor of it. We know that the great body of our German and Irish American citizens are in favor of it. We know that the laboring people from one end of this country to the other indorse it and favor it, and that the great organization known as the Federation of Labor, said to represent 800,000 workingmen, but recently unanimously indorsed it.

We know, too, that there are thousands of Republicans who believe that the course of the Administration is inexcusable and unjustifiable, but their party allegiance and other great questions which are involved in the contest between the two parties prevent them from saying so. If anyone passes an opinion that a majority of the people of the country favor the President's policy, I say he does not know, and I do not know, but I believe a majority of the people of America believe in honor and justice, and I think I know that honor, good faith, and justice demand that we should give to these people the same freedom that we have promised to the people of Cuba. I believe that the future hope and prosperity of this country depend upon pursuing the course laid down in the resolution offered by the Senator from Georgia, and whether a majority be for it or against it, speaking for myself and believing that the honor of the Republic in which we live is involved, believing that no other course which we can pursue is honorable, no power on this earth could make me support resolutions of the character offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] or pursue the course advocated by the Administration and a large number of Republicans throughout the country.

But, Mr. President, when all other arguments fail, when those who favor these un-American and unconstitutional methods can find no other words, they fall back and say that wherever the flag once floats there it shall stay. It seems to me that the men who made this Government great in the past, that our ancestors who wrote the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, would answer that proposition and say that if the American flag can not float at any particular point in honor it had best not float at all. But I think I will answer this last argument in the language of a prominent lawyer in my own State, who but a few days ago said that "those who seek to raise the American flag above the crushed liberties of another people have already begun to haul it down from the Capitol of their own country." Such is my belief, and, believing so, I trust that whatever feeling may have been engendered in the past in regard to this matter, the calm and deliberate judgment of the Senate will be brought to the consideration of these resolutions.

I believe with the Senator from Massachusetts that it is the most important question which has confronted the American people for a century. I believe upon this action will depend, in a large measure, the stability of the Republic in which we live, and I trust, then, without feeling, without party prejudice, the Senate will rise to the high position which it has occupied in the past and will reaffirm the declaration laid down when we declared war against Spain, that we did not fight for conquest, that we fought to liberate the distressed and give them a free government, and having planted ourselves upon that high doctrine, that we will not place a stain upon the fair name of this Republic by using the power which has come to us from a war begun for freedom to wrong and oppress another people.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, I did not at this time intend to address the Senate at length upon this subject, for I had expected that the resolutions of inquiry which I had offered would be adopted and the information thus furnished from official sources before the debate commenced. But the discussions which arose and the impressions which were made seem to have precipitated a general discussion of the question. I shall begin my remarks to-day by reading from one of Lincoln's speeches the following paragraph:

> Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and under the rule of a just God can not long retain it.

I believe that is true. I believe the reflex action upon our own people of the conquest of other peoples and their governments, against their will, will gradually undermine free institutions in this country and result in the destruction of the Republic. What are the arguments urged why we should force a government upon the people of the Philippines? The President of the United States says they are not fit for self-government. From my observation of history I believe there are no people fit for any other form of government. Governments are instituted, not bestowed, and therefore derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Any nation of people are capable of maintaining as good a government as they are entitled to have, and when they can maintain a better government they will evolve it, and you can not give them a better government than they can maintain for themselves. A form of government is the result of the social compact, and therefore the government of a people will be as good as the average of the individuals composing the community are willing to have. The American Indians maintained a government, and for them a better one than we have been able to bestow upon them. The Esquimos in the arctic region maintain a government of their own, suited to their condition and their circumstances, and it is a better government than anybody else can give them. Would their condition be improved by sending to them foreign governors and a foreign council to enact laws and direct their course and method of life, to guide them in their civic and civil affairs? So with every other people the world round. There is nothing in the history of the colonies of the so-called Christain nations of the world to encourage the idea that we can give to this people a better government than they are able to maintain themselves.

The old doctrine of the divine right of kings, of the hereditary right to rule, is a doctrine that we disputed and controverted when we established our Government and when we announced the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence. So proud have we been of that discovery that each year we have celebrated the birth into the world of a new theory a new doctrine with regard to governments; and four hundred constitutions have been framed after ours. So powerful has our example been throughout the world, that nation after nation struggling to be free has adopted our form of government.

No nation, no people, in all time and in all history ever impressed such a powerful influence upon the human race as this Republic, and for this reason alone. Empires have been established, a trail of blood has been drawn across the world, and vast aggregations of people have been brought under the rule of an emperor or a monarch since history began, but no people, no nation, in the history of the world has ever produced such a powerful effect for good upon the human race as this great Republic, and simply because of the doctrine laid down by our forefathers in the Declaration of Independence.

Is it an old doctrine that all Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed? Some have said that it was a nursery rhyme sung around the cradle of the Republic. The doctrine is new. It was announced but a century ago, a day in the birth and life of nations, and yet this great Republic, boasting as we have on each recurring celebration of the event, proposes now to abandon it for the old doctrine and the old theory and the old idea of selfishness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] says that the Declaration of Independence does not contemplate that all governments must have the consent of the governed; that only those must have the consent of the governed that we think capable of self-government. Under that theory no people in the world are capable of self-government unless they first get our consent that they are fit to give their consent to a form of government which they wish to set up. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] says that governments derive their just powers from the consent of some of the governed. Thus the Senator from Indiana would extend the doctrine of imperialism to whole nations of people, while the Senator from Connecticut would extend the doctrine of imperialism to every nation and every people, for he declares that the consent of some of the governed only is required.

Thus we drift back to the divine right of kings, to the doctrine that those who govern shall determine who of the governed shall give their consent. Thus construed, our glorious Declaration becomes a mockery and a fraud. Therefore, when we meet each year to celebrate the instrument's birth into the world, the orators of the Republican party will have to explain its meaning and

tell the multitude that our notions, our opinions, of the Declaration have been wrong for a hundred years.

Lincoln, in his speech at Springfield, on June 26, 1857, thus defined his notions of the Declaration of Independence:

In those days our Declaration of Independence was held sacred by all and thought to include all; but now, to aid in making the bondage of the negro universal and eternal, it is assailed and sneered at, and construed, and hawked at, and torn, till, if its framers could rise from their graves, they could not at all recognize it. All the powers of earth seem rapidly combining against him. Mammon is after him, ambition follows, philosophy follows, and the theology of the day is fast joining the cry.

* * * * * * *

I think the authors of that notable instrument intended to include all men; but they did not intend to declare all men equal in all respects. They did not mean to say all were equal in color, size, intellect, moral developments, or social capacity. They defined with tolerable distinctness in what respects they did consider all men created equal—equal with "certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." This they said, and this they meant. They did not mean to assert the obvious untruth that all were then actually enjoying that equality, nor yet that they were about to confer it immediately upon them. In fact, they had no power to confer such a boon. They meant simply to declare the right, so that the enforcement of it might follow as fast as circumstances should permit.

They meant to set up a standard maxim for free society, which should be familiar to all, and revered by all, constantly looked to, constantly labored for, and even though never perfectly attained, constantly approximated, and thereby constantly spreading and deepening its influence and augmenting the happiness and value of life to all people of all colors everywhere. The assertion that "all men are created equal" was of no practical use in effecting our separation from Great Britain, and it was placed in the Declaration not for that but for future use. Its authors meant it to be, as, thank God, it is now proving itself, a stumbling block to all those who, in after times, might seek to turn a free people back into the hateful paths of despotism. They knew the proneness of prosperity to breed tyrants, and they meant when such should reappear in this fair land and commence their vocation, they should find left for them at least one hard nut to crack.

It seems to me that Lincoln, with his prophetic vision, must have seen this day, when prosperity, breeding tyrants, should undertake to declare that the Declaration of Independence no longer applies to anybody but the people whom we decide are capable of self-government. It stands to-day as a stumbling block; it is the hard nut to crack that the imperialists of this country find on this occasion, and it will confront them in this contest on every stump and on every platform in the land. Now, let us see what Stephen A. Douglas in that controversy said about the Declaration. I believe my imperialist friends must have been reading Douglass' argument. Said Lincoln:

I have now briefly expressed my view of the meaning and object of that part of the Declaration of Independence which declares that "all men are created equal."

Now let us hear Judge Douglas's view of the same subject, as I find it in the printed report of his late speech. Here it is:

"No man can vindicate the character, motives, and conduct of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, except upon the hypothesis that they referred to the white race alone, and not to the African, when they declared all men to have been created equal—that they were speaking of British subjects on this continent being equal to British subjects born and residing in Great Britain—that they were entitled to the same inalienable rights, and among them were enumerated life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The Declaration was adopted for the purpose of justifying the colonists in the eyes of the civilized world in withdrawing their allegiance from the British Crown and dissolving their connection with the mother country."

Lincoln says:

My good friends, read that carefully over some leisure hour, and ponder well upon it; see what a mere wreck, mangled ruin, it makes of our once glorious Declaration.

"They were speaking of British subjects on this continent being equal to British subjects born and residing in Great Britain."

Why, according to this, not only negroes, but white people outside of Great Britain and America, were not spoken of in that instrument. The English, Irish, and Scotch, along with white Americans, were included, to be sure, but the French, Germans, and other white people of the world are all gone to pot along with the Judge's inferior races.

I had thought the Declaration promised something better than the condition of British subjects. But no; it only meant that we should be equal to them in their own oppressed and unequal condition! According to that, it gave no promise that, having kicked off the King and lords of Great Britain, we should not at once be saddled with a king and lords of our own in these United States.

I had thought the Declaration contemplated the progressive improvement in the condition of all men everywhere. But no; it merely "was adopted for the purpose of justifying the colonists in the eyes of the civilized world in withdrawing their allegiance from the British Crown and dissolving their connection with the mother country." Why, that object having been effected some eighty years ago, the Declaration is of no practical use now—mere rubbish—only wadding left to rot on the battlefield after the victory is won.

I understand you are preparing to celebrate the "Fourth" to-morrow week. What for? The doings of that day had no reference to the present; and quite half of you are not even descendants of those who were referred to at that day. But I suppose you will celebrate, and will even go so far as to read the Declaration.

Why, Mr. President, when we quote the Declaration of Independence or the words of Lincoln, the imperialists of this country say that our words are telegraphed to Manila and give encouragement to the insurgents. If, on the last Fourth of July, I should have read here Lincoln's words, that people who disregarded the rights of freedmen in others can not long retain their own liberty, I suppose Otis would have had me arrested for an insurgent and insisted that I was giving aid and comfort to the enemy; and if I had there read the Declaration of Independence or the words of Lincoln as referring to all people, no matter what their color, I would have been driven from the islands or placed in prison. Has it reached the point that wherever our flag floats men can no longer, without being called rebels, quote from Abraham Lincoln or read the Declaration of Independence. Lincoln goes on to say:

Suppose, after you read it once in the old-fashioned way, you read it once more with Judge Douglas's version. It will then run thus: "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all British subjects who were on this continent eighty-one years ago were created equal to all British subjects born and then residing in Great Britain."

Could you make it any more absurd if on the next Fourth of July you should amend it to accord with the opinion of the Senator from Indiana or the Senator from Connecticut? Lincoln says:

And I now appeal to all—to Democrats as well as others—are you really willing that the Declaration shall thus be frittered away; thus left no more at most than an interesting memorial of the dead past; thus shorn of its vitality and practical value and left without the germ or even the suggestion of the individual rights of man in it?

On another occasion, in Lincoln's speech in Chicago, Ill., July 10, 1858, he makes this allusion to the Declaration of Independence, and it is so very pertinent to the present occasion and to this debate that I read it as an absolute refutation of the position of the imperialists on this subject.

I might say here, Mr. President, that I allude to those who advocate the conquest of the Philippines as imperialists and not as expansionists, for the reason that expansion implies the enlargement of the same thing, the adding of more of that which you already have, the acquisition of countries holding a population capable of living and supporting our Constitution to be admitted as States into the Union; while the imperialist doctrine is the acquisition of tropical colonies where it is admitted that self-government can not exist, as we understand it under our Constitution; and therefore the people must be governed perpetually and forever as crown colonies of this Republic.

The holding of such countries, the conquest of an unwilling people, their retention in subjugation by a standing army, means of necessity not a republic where all the people must be consulted, but a despotism where the will of one man can march armies, declare war, and act with great rapidity. A republic is naturally slow in action, because the people must be considered and must be consulted.

We have taken on many of the semblances of monarchy and of imperialism in the conduct of this Administration—concealment of facts from the people, denial of news and information, no knowledge of what is going on, no announcement of policy and purpose; and the excuse for it all was that if we should allow the people to know the facts there was danger of creating disapproval of the course of our monarch, and if the enemy should secure those facts it would be of some assistance to them. This is necessary in a monarchy. Press censorship, too, is a necessary adjunct of imperialism, one of the things our forefathers would not have tolerated for a day. And yet our people are becoming so numb that they are willing to accept it, and even criticise men who protest. Lincoln says:

Those arguments that are made that the inferior race are to be treated with as much allowance as they are capable of enjoying; that as much is to be done for them as their condition will allow. What are these arguments? They are the arguments that kings have made for enslaving the people in all ages of the world. You will find that all the arguments in favor of kingcraft were of this class. They always bestrode the necks of the people, not that they wanted to do it, but because the people were better off for being ridden. That is their argument, and this argument of the judge is the same old serpent that says, "You work and I eat; you toil and I will enjoy the fruits of it." Turn it in whatever way you will, whether it comes from the mouth of a king as an excuse for enslaving the people of his country or from the mouth of men of one race as a reason for enslaving the men of another race, it is all the same old serpent—

It is as true to-day as it was when Lincoln uttered it, and it will continue through all time and as long as men struggle for freedom—

and I hold if that course of argumentation that is made for the purpose of convincing the public mind that we should not care about this should be granted, it does not stop with the negro. I should like to know if taking this old Declaration of Independence, which declares that all men are equal upon principle, and making exceptions to it, where will it stop? If one man says it does not mean a negro, why not another say it does not mean some other man? If that Declaration is not the truth, let us get the statute book, in which we find it, and tear it out! Who is so bold as to do it?

While Lincoln lived and uttered these words forty years ago, there are men to-day in the Senate of the United States who are so bold as to be willing to go and tear them out.

A voice in the audience said, "No, no." Lincoln then said:

Let us stick to it, then; let us stand firmly by it, then.

Henry Clay took the same view on the subject, and I will read very briefly from what he said:

What is the foundation of this appeal to me in Indiana to liberate the slaves under my care in Kentucky? It is a general declaration in the act announcing to the world the independence of the thirteen American colonies, that "men are created equal." Now, as an abstract principle, there is no doubt of the truth of that declaration, and it is desirable in the original construction of society, and in organized societies, to keep it in view as a great fundamental principle.

But the difference, Mr. President, between the doctrines of the Republican party as founded by Giddings and Hale and Lovejoy and the party of PLATT and BEVERIDGE is not as great as the distance between Lincoln, the first President of the Republican party, whose greatest title is that of the Emancipator, earned by issuing on New Year's Day, 1863, the proclamation of emancipation,

and McKinley, whose name must go down in history as the last of the Presidents of the Republican party, and whose chief claim for remembrance will lie in the fact that he restored slavery to our country and that under his Administration, under the protection of our flag—the Stars and Stripes—the slave driver plies the lash to the back of unrequited toil. Lincoln in his emancipation proclamation said:

And by virtue of the power and for the purpose aforesaid, I do order and declare that all persons held as slaves within said designated States and parts of States are and henceforward shall be free, and that the executive Government of the United States, including the military and naval authorities thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of said persons.

President McKinley approved the treaty with the Sultan of Sulu, which provides:

ART. 3. The rights and dignities of His Highness the Sultan and his datos shall be fully respected, the Moros shall not be interfered with on account of their religion, all their religious customs shall be respected, and no one shall be persecuted on account of his religion.

And within that clause is embraced slavery and polygamy, both of them religious customs under the practice of Mohammedanism by the Sultan of Sulu.

But further than that, Mr. President:

Article 10. Any slave in the archipelago of Sulu shall have the right to purchase freedom by paying to his master the usual market value.

Nothing is said about where he is to get the consideration. The business of the Sultan of Sulu has been in the past to get into a quarrel with some of the negro tribes of the island of Mindanao, the largest island of the group, having an area nearly as great as the State of Indiana, and then, as an excuse for punishing them for having rebelled against his authority, to take prisoners and sell them as slaves to the planters raising sugar upon the island of Borneo. This is the way he gets money to carry on his business. Yet we have agreed in this treaty, ratified and sanctioned by the President of the United States, that we will not interfere with any controversy which exists between the Sultan and his subjects, but that they shall be tried and dealt with under the laws which he may make.

He is an absolute monarch, having the power of life and death. No one can question his right. If he commands his assistants to assassinate any one of his subjects, no one can call into question the act; yet we make an agreement with him whereby we pay him $250 a month to fly the flag of the United States over his slave ships and over his harem.

ART. 13. The United States will give full protection to the Sultan and his subjects in case any foreign nation shall attempt to impose upon them.

Nobody else. And we have agreed not to again interfere to stop his slave ships or stop the practice of slavery and polygamy in that country. And yet the President says that the Stars and Stripes mean the same thing wherever they float!

Article XIII of the Constitution of the United States provides, in section 1, that:

Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHILTON in the chair). The Senator from South Dakota will suspend for a moment. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. RAWLINS. Mr. President——

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Senator from South Dakota has been twice interrupted by the pending bill when the hour of 2 o'clock has arrived without being able to complete his remarks, and the resolution will come up again to-morrow in the ordinary course of business. I understand the Senator from Utah [Mr. RAWLINS] is at once prepared to proceed this afternoon. I have a very few remarks to make in answer to the Senator from South Dakota. They will not take more than ten or fifteen minutes, and I should like to ask unanimous consent that when the Senator from South Dakota speaks to-morrow he may proceed to the conclusion of his remarks, and that I may then follow him and make such few remarks as I desire; and that, if necessary, the unfinished business may be informally laid aside until we shall have finished. Is there any objection to that?

Mr. RAWLINS. As far as I am personally concerned, I am willing to defer my remarks until the Senator from South Dakota can conclude, if he desires to do so.

Mr. ALDRICH. How long will the Senator from South Dakota require?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I think about twenty or thirty minutes at the outside.

Mr. ALDRICH. Would the Senator like to finish now?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I should like to finish now.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the Senator from Utah permit me to follow the few remarks of the Senator from South Dakota with a few remarks?

Mr. RAWLINS. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. I shall not object if that is satisfactory to Senators.

Mr. LODGE. I think it would be better if we put it over until to-morrow, and then we can dispose of the resolution. As the Senator from Colorado wishes to follow the Senator from South Dakota, if permission is extended to the latter to go on now, I think the Senator from Colorado ought to have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not think those speeches will close the debate on the resolutions. If the Senator from Colorado replies to the Senator from South Dakota it may provoke more discussion and fuller discussion.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I should like very much to finish to-day.

Mr. ALLEN. I think the Senator from South Dakota ought to be permitted to proceed now.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that there are several resolutions pending, and if not, it is easy enough to have resolutions pending, I assume.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Dakota may proceed, and that——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be informally laid aside——

Mr. ALDRICH. I can not consent to an indefinite arrangement.

Mr. ALLEN. And that the Senator from Colorado be permitted to follow him in remarks which will take ten or fifteen minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is all. The only request is for the Senator from South Dakota and myself.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection, and leave is granted. The Senator from South Dakota will proceed.

Mr. PETTIGREW. The President of the United States, in his speech at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., in October last, said:

That from the hour the treaty was ratified it became our territory; there was but one authority and but one sovereignty that could be recognized anywhere in those islands, and it became our duty to restore order, to preserve peace, to protect life and property.

Yet he went to war with the Christian people of that country, with those who believed in the Catholic religion, and made a treaty with the Mohammedans by which they were to set up and maintain their own government almost absolutely independent and free from us. If he had granted to the Christians of the Philippines the same rights he granted to the slaveholders and polygamists of the Philippines, there would have been no war whatever. And yet we, as a great Christian nation, select for self-government the slaveholding Mohammedans, occupying more than one-third of the area of the entire group, and proceed to establish what? Not Christianity, for they are already Christians; but we make the effort to shoot Protestantism into the Catholic population of the rest of the islands.

If our flag floats over that entire region, and if, as the President said, it is absolutely under the dominion and control of the Constitution of the United States, it seems to me that he violated the Constitution when he made the treaty with the Sultan of Sulu, and that he ought to be impeached.

Mr. President, it would be in accord more with my ideas of American institutions if we had gone to the Sultan of Sulu and said, "You must abandon polygamy and slavery, and if you do not do it and recognize the power and authority of the Government of the United States over the whole group of islands under your control we will wage war upon you until you do it," instead of going to the people who had been our allies, the Christian people of the northern islands, and saying to them, "Unless you surrender your constitution which you have adopted, and which is framed after our Constitution, unless you surrender your right as a government of a free people, we will proceed to kill you until you do." Instead of drawing a trail of blood over those islands, where the population can read and write, where they have embraced the same religion as ours and pray to the same God, it would have been better had we attacked the so-called barbarous people of the southern island.

I might read several other extracts from the President's speech all to the same effect. He has hardly made a speech without an allusion to the flag, until I am almost convinced that he receives his direction from the English minister, for it is the same song always that England sings whenever she proposes to rob somebody. Whenever England concludes to go upon an expedition and plunder some of the weaker nations of the world, she makes her first appeal to patriotism, and then, step by step, goes on until she has committed the wrong, has transgressed, and then declares that the flag has been fired on and that no Englishman must question the right or wrong of what they are doing until the enemy is defeated and the country annexed.

We are pursuing the same course. Our Minister of State was trained in the English school, and he has come home with their ideas and their notions and is going to try their way of humbugging the people of this country as the people of England have been

humbugged. You can do it in England, but you can not do it here. More than a million of the people of England do not vote. Most of the population have been degraded by being herded in manufacturing towns until a very large per cent of her population have no property, no capacity, and no opinions except to toady to the aristocracy.

How appropriate, Mr. President, that the restoration of slavery and the new interpretation of the Declaration of Independence should come together. It seems to me, however, that it marks the saddest chapter in the history of that great political organization, the Republican party. It came into being as a protest against slavery, as the special champion of the Declaration of Independence, and it goes out of being and out of power as the champion of slavery and the repudiator of the Declaration of Independence.

The President says that moral reasons compel us to stay in the Philippines, and that we, under God's direction, owe a duty to mankind, and more of similar cant. Here is what John Morley, the English statesman and writer and biographer of Gladstone, says with regard to England's policy in this same connection:

First—

Speaking of England—

you push on into territories where you have no business to be and where you had promised not to go; secondly, your intrusion provokes resentment, and, in these wild countries, resentment means resistance; thirdly, you instantly cry out that the people are rebellious and that their act is rebellion (this in spite of your own assurance that you have no intention of setting up a permanent sovereignty over them); fourthly, you send a force to stamp out the rebellion, and, fifthly, having spread bloodshed, confusion, and anarchy, you declare, with hands uplifted to the heavens, that moral reasons force you to stay, for if you were to leave, this territory would be left in a condition which no civilized power could contemplate with equanimity or composure. These are the five stages in the Forward Rake's progress.

There is not a thing there that does not absolutely accord with the excuses given by the imperialists why we should abandon our former form of government and conquer and rule against their will an unwilling people. What blessing has England given to her colonies that has justified this plan throughout the world? Ireland came first, and the persecutions of Ireland were justified on a doctrine of benevolent assimilation—that they were Catholics, and therefore, unless they were converted from Catholicism, they would go to the devil, and it was England's great and grand mission to make them Protestant anyhow. She has succeeded neither in the one nor the other. Her course in Ireland has been one of the blackest pages in the history of the world—starvation and plunder.

If England will govern Ireland as she has done, what right has she to the claim that she can confer benefits upon any country? What is there in England's example that can justify us in undertaking the same work? The miserable, miserable, contemptible rot of Rudyard Kipling where he talks about the white man's burden it seems to me in the light of English history is contemptible—the white man's burden to confer the curses of English rule upon the other nations of the world.

England commenced with Ireland. How is it with India? They have made no converts practically to Christianity in India; neither have the natives learned the English language. None of the people of India talk English. They have to keep an army of 210,000 men to hold them in subjection and prevent them from securing modern arms, modern implements of destruction, while they trample upon their rights as a people. What blessing has England conferred upon India? Nothing but the fact that taking away her food supply has caused the starvation of a million of men in India every year for years, and some years six or seven millions of people in a year. One hundred and fifty million dollars' worth of the food products of India are shipped away to pay pensions in England, and the result is that the want of that food causes the people of India to starve.

Compare the provinces of India that do not recognize English rule, that are under an English protectorate, and you will find that there is no starvation there. The native princes rule, and the people govern themselves, and England simply has a suzerainty over them. There is no starvation in those provinces; the starvation is in the English part of India, where the English system of robbery and plunder holds sway. India gives no money to the English treasury, but India is a field for exploiting private enterprise, and thus further enriching the already over-rich classes that govern the English Empire.

What of New Zealand? Did the conquest of New Zealand confer the blessings of Christianity upon New Zealand? Why, it resulted in the destruction of the inhabitants. To-day a great colony of English people are in New Zealand, but the inhabitants who formerly occupied that land have disappeared as the result of English government.

How is it in Egypt? The Egyptian Government was bad, and bad for the same reason that the English Government was bad; but England went into Egypt to enforce the collection of a usurious debt for money which Egypt never received. England went there to force upon that people a debt which was composed almost entirely of interest at 26 per cent on a small sum of money, until to-day every acre of Egypt that is tillable is taxed $10 a year.

Every man, woman, and child in Egypt of native population, toiling and tilling the soil, is a slave to the English taxgatherer. Three thousand five hundred Englishmen wring the taxes by imprisonment and by the lash from those people, and yet the so-called civilized world looks on with approval. In order to better enlarge their capacity to pay taxes and bear burdens, the English officials have compelled those people to toil in a systematic manner, leaving nothing for themselves but a bare existence and a bare subsistence. So it is everywhere that England has gone.

As I said before, England's first conquest was Catholic Ireland, and the excuse for oppression there was that the Irish were Catholics. How appropriate that in our first act in the drama of imperialism we should undertake the conquest of another Catholic country, should undertake the conquest of the Philippines, and should make the same miserable and contemptible excuse which has justified England's atrocities in Ireland during all time. From the pulpits of this country we hear prayers for our success in order that we may introduce Christianity. Oh, Mr. President, if we are to go to war against Catholics, it is not necessary to go half way around the world to do so. We have more of them at home, although there are 6,000,000 of them in the Philippines.

If these islands were rich in every mineral men desire, if their supplies of gold surpassed those of the Transvaal, if every other metal precious and desirable were in unlimited quantities, if their soil were so fertile that it surpassed even the famous valley of the Nile, if they could produce every comfort with half the effort with which it can be produced elsewhere throughout the world, yet I would oppose the annexation of these islands because it is wrong, because it leaves those who have sneered at us in our claim that we were advocates of freedom a justification for their sneer in the future.

But, Mr. President, I hold that we can not profit from these islands. None of our race live within the Tropics. There is not a colony of our race, the Aryan race, anywhere within 22 degrees of the equator. The men of our race who have been doing a commercial business in Manila do not have their families there. They raise a family of half-mixed natives in Manila and leave their real families at home. So it has been with commercial England through the Tropics everywhere, for you can no more produce a white man, a man of our blood, in the Tropics than you can a polar bear. Climatic conditions place their limits upon men just as firmly as upon plants and upon animals.

You can not claim that our race have not been colonists and that they have not gone forward to plant colonies throughout the world, for they have; but they settle in that belt around the world, between the twenty-fifth and fifty-fifth degrees of north or south latitude.

Jamaica has been an English colony for two hundred years. Jamaica has 4,200 square miles. It lies within the Tropics. It has a a population of 633,000 people. How many Englishmen; how many Europeans? Including the garrison, including the officers, including the attachés of the Government, 14,600, and that is all. The rest are blacks. This island lies within the Tropics. It has an elevation of 7,000 feet. It is one of the most healthful of all the tropical islands.

And yet the European will not locate there. He goes to New Zealand, to southern Australia, to Canada. He abides where the frost chills man's blood and where clothing made of the wool of the sheep helps to keep him warm. I think you can lay it down as a proposition which can not be refuted that self-government and independence and high civilization are only embraced by people who find it necessary to wear warm clothes and who feel the tingle of the frost in their veins during a portion of a year.

The Leeward Islands have 701 square miles. They have 123,000 people, 5,000 of whom are Europeans. It is another English colony. These 5,000 are the garrison and the officeholders, with a few traders.

British Guiana, on the north coast of South America, has 109,000 square miles and a population of 280,000 people, which has been doubled in area, I think, very recently—negroes, contract laborers, coolies from India raising sugar, with 2,533 Europeans, including the garrison.

Haiti has a population of 600,000 people. It has 10,204 square miles. The language is French. Nine-tenths of the population are negroes, and the rest are mulattoes. You can say a thousand things about Haiti, about its healthful climate, about its wonderful productiveness, about its desirability. There is not a thing you may say about the Philippines that you can not say about this island with far more truth. White men will not live there because of the climate.

New Guinea, a British colony, lies between 8° and 10° of the equator and has 88,000 square miles.

New Zealand has an area of 104,000 square miles. It is near New Guinea. It is between the thirtieth and thirty-fifth degree of south latitude, and therefore outside of the Tropics. I give this illustration for the purpose of showing that it is a question of

climate whether the white race will occupy a locality or not. Its population is 628,000 Europeans, 41,000 natives, and 4,400 Chinamen. It is near New Guinea. It is in the Temperate Zone. So the Anglo-Saxon went there and settled, and he has built up a government, freer, in my opinion, and better than ours, because untrammeled by interference, untrammeled by older influences. This colony was planted later than ours, and, unhindered by greed, by a combination of circumstances which have oppressed us and the English people, the people of New Zealand have worked out what Anglo-Saxon men untrammeled will always work out—a free government participated in by all the people. In my opinion they have better laws. In fact, they furnish about the only example of a first-class English government on the globe to-day.

The Straits Settlements are within the Tropics. There is there a population of 512,000 natives. Singapore, the commercial city, is a great city, one of the emporiums of the East, right under the equator. It is on the route from the Suez Canal to China and Japan. It contains 512,000 natives, 6,500 Europeans and Americans. The Europeans are the English garrison and the English officeholders. The few Americans who are there are engaged in trade and business with the East, and they go away in the summer. They go up to Japan; they go to the health resorts of that delightful country to escape the evil effects of a tropical climate.

It was supposed that the French people would occupy the Tropics, but they do not. The Latin race, more or less, has occupied the Tropics, but the frost of winter has touched the veins of the Frenchman. It has overcome the tendency of his Latin blood to live within the Tropics, and although they have conquered Tonquin, with 9,000,000 people, and Cochin China, with 3,000,000 more, there are only 3,000 Frenchmen in the whole country, including the officers and the garrison. The rest of the troops are natives.

Martinique is an island on the north coast of South America, of which we have heard much of late. Martinique has 187,000 people, and only 1,307 Frenchmen and Europeans of all classes. The balance of the population are blacks.

French Congo has a population of 7,000,000, and only 300 Europeans, besides the garrison.

So it goes the world over. Our people do not go to the Tropics. Our people will not live and raise families in the Tropics.

Mr. President, we are told by the President of the United States and by the orators who favor imperialism that this will be a paying venture—that trade follows the flag. Well, the morality of that argument can be fairly illustrated, I think, in this way: If a boy of a numerous family should cross a wide desert and find at the foot of a mountain an old man with a family of children, possessed of vast wealth in gold, jewels, horses, and cattle, and should return to his brothers and say, "There are nine of us, and I believe, if we go together, we can overturn the old man, who is not fit to bring up those children anyway, and rob him of his wealth, and I think it will be a profitable venture," and they should start out and accomplish that act, it seems to me they would stand upon exactly the same plane as the man who stands upon this floor and advocates taking all the Philippine Islands because it would pay.

But, Mr. President, trade does not follow the flag. If it be true that trade follows the flag, then England's trade with her colonies ought to be a good example and an argument in its favor. That ought to settle the question. Trade follows the best markets, and England's experience is a refutation of the doctrine that trade follows the flag.

Let us see. The total imports to England in 1856 were $860,000,000 from all countries, and from her colonies and dependencies, $215,000,000. England's imports from all countries in 1896 amounted to $2,080,000,000, and from her colonies and dependencies, $475,000,000. Twenty-five per cent of all her imports came from her colonies or dependencies in 1856 and but 22.8 per cent in 1898. After forty years, if trade follows the flag and has such a tremendous influence upon it, the percentage of England's trade with her colonies ought to have increased rather than declined. This is not conclusive, but the other facts taken in consideration with it are conclusive that trade does not follow the flag.

The total exports from England to the whole world and to her colonies in 1856 were $575,000,000, and of this amount to her colonies and dependencies $165,000,000. In 1895 her exports to the whole world were $1,125,000,000, and to her colonies and dependencies $350,000,000.

These figures show that the trade has not increased in proportion to the general increase. In the four years 1856 to 1859, inclusive, the colonies took 32.1 per cent of England's exports, and for the four years 1891 to 1895 they took 32.4 per cent; in other words, there was an increase of three-tenths of 1 per cent of her exports to her colonies during that time, although there were forty years of growth.

Now, let us see how the total trade of her colonies compares with the trade of the colonies with the mother country. In 1856 $340,000,000 was the total value of the exports from the English colonies to all the world, and $215,000,000 of that trade went to England. The per cent of the colonial exports to England was 63.2 per cent of the total trade of the colonies in 1856. How was it forty years thereafter? In 1895 their total trade with all the world was $1,310,000,000, and with England $475,000,000, or 36.5 per cent—instead of an increase, a very great decrease.

Let us see how it is about the import trade. The English colonies imported from all the world $385,000,000 worth of imports in 1856 and $165,000,000 from England, or 42.8 per cent. In 1895 it seems the value of the imports to the English colonies and dependencies from all the world was $1,110,000,000, and from England $350,000,000, or 31.5 per cent.

Thus the imports to the colonies from the mother country had declined from 42.8 per cent in 1856, forty years ago, to 31.5 per cent in 1895, showing that the colonies constantly decreased in the relative amount of their purchases from the mother country. If trade follows the flag, then more and more of their purchases ought to have been, it seems to me, from the mother country rather than a steady decline.

Let us see whether there is any cause why this should be so. We will take the English trade with the United States. In 1856 the total imports into England from all the world amounted to $895,000,000, and from the United States to $170,000,000, or 19 per cent of her total trade. In 1898 England's imports from all the world amounted to $2,055,000,000, of which $530,000,000 were from the United States, or 26.7 per cent of her total trade. In other words, our exports from England had grown from 19 per cent of all England bought to more than one-fourth of all she bought, while her trade with her colonies had continuously declined. Why was this? Not because trade follows the flag, but because trade seeks the cheapest and best market.

It will thus be seen that the increase from the United States is very marked as compared with the trade of England when compared with her own possessions. If we compare the total imports into England from the whole world and the United States for four years from 1870 to 1873 and from 1895 to 1898 we will find that the increase from the United States was very much greater in proportion than the increase of English imports from all countries. In other words, our imports increased 183 per cent as against England's imports from the rest of the world of 121 per cent.

English exports to the United States have declined from 13 per cent of her total exports in the four years from 1859 to 1862 to 9 per cent of her total exports for the years 1895 to 1898, caused by tariff restriction. But if trade follows the flag this tariff restriction which we place upon English goods, thus causing a decrease of imports to this country, certainly ought to have affected their purchases in the direction of her flag, and ought to have been an additional reason and inducement to purchase more instead of less of her colonies, where she could sell and not be restricted by tariff provisions and could bring back cargoes.

From another view of the subject, let us see how England's trade with her colonies and the United States compares with relation to population. From 1892 to 1897 England imported from her colonies $1.25 worth of goods for each inhabitant of those colonies. From the United States she imported goods to the value of $6.68 for every inhabitant of the United States each year. While the United States purchased of England $1.50 worth for each inhabitant, the English colonies only purchased from England $1.02 worth of goods for each inhabitant, purchasing 48 cents' worth for each inhabitant less than we bought from England, even with our purchase of only $1.50 per capita.

So far as the English tropical colonies are concerned, England only sold to them 71 cents' worth of goods last year for each inhabitant in those colonies, and most of that was to supply her own army and her own officeholders, who wanted English goods. Her trade would have been infinitesimal, almost absolutely nothing, with her tropical colonies, except for her army in India of 70,000 Englishmen and her equally great army of officeholders there. So, such an argument is all nonsense. Trade does not follow the flag.

The United States can only secure tropical countries as colonies. As Schurman, our commissioner to the Philippines, said, the Sultan of Sulu and his people would fight, and therefore it was not well to bother with them. So the people who inhabit the temperate zone will fight, and our only place to get a people who are easy to control, a people who will not fight too hard, a people who are not armed with modern implements of war, a people who can be run over with battalions of our troops, is in the Tropics.

How, then, in the light of England's experience, in the light of the fact that England has practically no trade with the inhabitants of her tropical colonies, except the trade that comes from supplying her officeholders and her army, can we expect to have much trade with the people of the Philippines? How are we going to get rich keeping a standing army in the Philippines, so as to make people whose wages are not over 5 cents a day trade with us?

Mr. President, in the Philippines we do not even supply our own Army. If trade follows the flag, it seems to me that the trade with our own Army ought to follow the flag. So prone is trade to seek

the best markets that our Army is supplied with potatoes and beef and butter and pork from the English colonies; practically none of it comes from the United States.

Our soldiers are clothed by the English contractors at Hongkong. Only shoes and a few canned goods go from the United States, and the reason they go is because we export shoes and that people everywhere can buy shoes cheaper in this country than anywhere else, thus proving conclusively that trade does not follow the flag, but goes to the best markets. The coal that propels our ships across the Pacific is English coal. We do not even patronize our own coal mines on the western coast. Every vessel coming this way or going that way in passing Nagasaki, takes on a load of English coal. Our transports are chartered by the Government, and, therefore, every transport carries goods from the United States free of cost to the producers. It seems to me exceedingly strange why, if trade will follow the flag, it does not get under the flag and just float over and supply our own army in the tropics.

What is there in the future to warrant us to believe that trade will hereafter follow the flag in the Philippines? I should like to have somebody tell me. We made a treaty with Spain by which we agreed that the Philippines should have the "open door," so that all the world could trade there through all time to come. Therefore we broke down the barriers of protection, abandoned the policy upon which the Republican party has ridden into power for years. We declared that we would have the "open door," thereby destroying absolutely all hope of any trade in the future with the people of the Philippines, for, under the decisions of our Supreme Court, we can not impose a tariff on their products unless we amend the Constitution.

So their products will come to us free of duty. The tobacco made into cigars by the nimble fingers of those capable Malays will close the tobacco and cigar factories of this country and drive our labor into other channels of employment. There is no reason why they can not supply unlimitedly the cigars for American consumption. Labor there is cheap, labor is abundant, and New England's money—the vast fortunes of the men who have accumulated by the control of monopolies in our country—will go there to exploit this labor, go there to make cotton goods out of Chinese cotton to be sold in the American market.

Mr. President, I saw a cotton mill in China having 34,000 spindles, a modern mill, with, I think, 2,700 Chinese employees or laborers, every one of them men, full grown. There were no children and no women in that mill, and just one Englishman. Every other employee, every spinner, carder, weaver, engineer, every man running a loom, was a Chinaman; and the average wages—mark that—amounted to $3.50 a month, and they board themselves. Besides, they were paid in silver, in Mexican dollars, equal to $1.75 in our money. Yet the American laborer is invited to compete with 10,000,000 of this kind of labor by annexing the Philippines.

It seems to me the sum and substance of the whole scheme is to find a field where cheap labor can be secured, labor that will not strike, that does not belong to a union, that does not need an army to keep it in leading strings, that will make goods for the trusts of this country; and, as the trusts dominated the St. Louis convention and own the Republican party, it is a very proper enterprise for them to engage in.

England has not been enriched by her conquests. To-day, what is the happiest country in the world? It is little Switzerland. Where is there the best distribution of wealth, the best opportunity for man? Where is there the least poverty, misery, and distress? It is in Switzerland, without colonies. It is not in England. Her conquests have bestowed no blessings upon her people. Most of her people have no property; most of the people of England own nothing. Two-thirds of them—66 per cent of them—own nothing, while about 222,000 persons own all the property of Great Britain.

They are the people who exploit the tropical colonies; they are the people who build railroads and charge what they choose, and make loans at usurious interest, thus piling up higher and higher their great aggregations of wealth. Do we want to follow this example? From it no money will come into the Treasury for the benefit of the people of the United States. The laborers of this land, from whom we raise our taxes in the same way England raises hers—by a per capita levy upon consumption—are invited to contribute this taxation to support an army of occupation and subsidize ships to carry the trade in order that those people may be exploited by the trusts of the United States. I do not believe the people of this country will do it.

There is another object. It is well when people become restless, when people become dissatisfied with the conditions which exist, when the toilers of a land begin to believe they are not receiving their just share of the products of their toil, to give them amusement, to distract their attention by distant problems, to do as England has done, begin the killing of men in some distant land, and then appeal to the patriotism of the people and talk about the flag being fired upon in order to take the attention of the people from those great problems the right of solution of which is essential to the happiness of the toilers of the nation.

You ask me what I would do with the Philippines. I would draw our army back to Manila. I would send to the Philippine people assurance that they could set up their own government—a republic, such as they have set up under their constitution, framed after ours, providing, as it does, for universal education, for the protection of life and property, and I would say to the world, "Hands off!" Then I would try to neutralize that country—that is, I would try to make a treaty with the nations of the world by which those islands and their waters should be neutral ground, where any vessel of any country could go and coal and trade—not free trade, if they chose to put up a tariff wall against all the world, but it should be equal to all; but no nation could go there to fight.

I would do what Europe has done with Switzerland and what they have done with the Suez Canal; and if the nations of all Europe would not agree to it, I would say, "Hands off; we will plant a republic on the shores of Asia." The Malay race have shown their capacity for governing in their triumph in Japan. No nation in the world stands higher in the scale of civilization than the Malays of Japan, a kindred race to the people of the Philippines. Give them a chance, and they will plant republican principles on the shores of Asia that will spread to that continent and undermine and overthrow the despotism of colonial rule and the despotism of monarchies.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator from South Dakota allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. PETTIGREW. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator from South Dakota would not do that, of course, without the consent of the Filipinos?

Mr. PETTIGREW. No, sir; I would not do it without their consent. It seems to me a superfluous question if that is all there is to it.

We are precluded by our Constitution and by the Declaration of Independence and by every claim we have ever made, by every speech of every person who has addressed a Fourth of July audience, from buying sovereignty over a people without their consent first obtained. Purchasing sovereignty and transferring from one nation to another the rights of their fellow-men is simply a species of slavery. How can we justify it with all our boasted eloquence once a year for a century past? I say this Republic, above all the nations of the world, ought to refuse to be a party to the purchase or the effort at purchasing sovereignty over anybody.

In 1867, when we talked of buying the Danish West Indies, Denmark refused to sell until a vote of the inhabitants could be taken, to see whether or not they would consent to be sold. Even Denmark, touched by the influence of our Constitution and our example, refused to sell the sovereignty without the consent of the people, and for this great Republic to stand up to-day before the world and claim title because they have bought from dispossessed Spain sovereignty over those people it seems to me is remarkable indeed.

I think the words of the immortal Lincoln are applicable to this situation: "A house divided against itself can not stand." Under our flag you can not have a republic and an empire. You can not have self-government and a government by force. One or the other will triumph. Either the republic will go down and the empire survive, or we will at once retrace our steps to the old safe ground and anchor our ship of state to the declaration and to the doctrine that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, any general discussion upon our final duties toward the Philippine Islands seems to me out of place and premature at this time. All our energies should be devoted to first quelling the unimportant insurrection which there prevails, and finally, and when order is restored, to turn our attention to the great problems that will face us in that archipelago. I should not have ventured to take the time of the Senate, even for a few minutes, upon this occasion had it not been for the remarkable and intemperate utterances of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW].

There could be no better demonstration of the value of the Senate as an open public forum than the speeches which the Senator from South Dakota has made for the past two legislative days. There are in this country some seventy million people, of all sorts—the good, the indifferent, and the bad, mostly good; but scattered through different communities, small in each, but aggregating numerically many thousands, there are citizens discontented and unhappy, who view the world with jaundiced vision; people who, perhaps, not successful themselves, possibly not deserving prosperity, rail against the success of others, view with suspicion and hatred every other person whose life and whose efforts are crowned with success. They see some wicked motive in the conduct of everybody except themselves.

When the sun shines they see only the shadows it casts, and behind

every good act they find lurking some sinister and unworthy purpose. And so hate and malevolence are nourished, and the world seems to them all askew. It is but a step from individual hatred to national hatred. It is but a step from dislike of the people who succeed when they do not to dislike of the country whose administration they do not approve and to hatred of the flag and the government that nourishes and protects them. It is fitting that such people should be represented here, and I know of nobody in the whole United States so fitted to speak for them as the Senator from South Dakota, who, during all the years which I have served with him in this body—and I speak only of his public utterances—has never had a kind or friendly word to say of any person or of any cause.

And it is not alone, Mr. President, that such people should be represented, so that the opinions of everybody may be ventilated in this body, but it is also to my mind important that we should have such utterances as those of the Senator from South Dakota, that they may serve as an example and a warning and a deterrent to the thousands of young men who every year are growing to manhood and who must some day take their share in the burden of government, and upon whom eventually the mantle of responsibility must fall, that they may learn how "ill habit grows by usage," and that they may see how important it is, as they grow to manhood and responsibility, that they should cultivate a good digestion, a hopeful heart, and a cheerful mind.

Mr. President, I do not share the opinion which has been expressed in the Senate that the utterances of Senators here have any sort of effect upon the insurgents in the Philippine Islands. If Aguinaldo has his ear to the ground to hear what is going on here, he knows as well as we do how utterly trifling and unimportant are these expressions of sympathy which are from time to time heard in this Chamber. There is not a real honorable Democrat in the United States who would not admit to you that if his own party were in power the policy would be first to crush the insurrection against the flag and against the maintenance of order and our laws abroad, and then determine what should be done. These people here whose constant utterances encourage the insurrection will not fight; they will take it out in sympathy. And if our soldiers in Manila will take care of Aguinaldo and his straggling followers, as they seem to be doing very well, the American people here will take care of Aguinaldo's sympathizers in the Senate and outside of it.

Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota said the other day, in the commencement of his speech, that if he were a Filipino he would fight until he was gray against the unholy aggression of the armies of the United States. I have no doubt the Senator would fight if he were a Tagal; and it is possible, and I suggest to the Senator, that they might take him by adoption. I can picture him now, clad chiefly in that genial and pleasant smile which he always wears here, blazing away with his blunderbuss against everything in sight. [Laughter.]

The suggestion was the Senator's own, and it touches the imagination. It leads one to think of what would be the consequence if the Senator changed places with a Tagal. The exchange might, for purposes of experiment, at least, not be without attractiveness [laughter], and I believe if he changed places with Aguinaldo, who is brave, loyal, and patriotic, and Aguinaldo stood in the Senate representing the great State of South Dakota, which sent its soldiers to the Philippines and left some of them dead in the trenches there, he would never, Tagal though he is, be found in this body traducing the President of the United States and the Commander in Chief of our armies and slandering and maligning our officers now at the front and charging them with being "swindlers and defrauders."

Mr. President, the resolution which we are assuming to discuss is of no importance, and everybody knows that. It is covered and engulfed by a resolution which calls for all the information the Department will furnish. It is really of no value whatever, but it serves to indicate to the Senate and to the country some suspicion that there has been somewhere some crooked or dishonorable conduct in the Departments or by the Executive or this nation. Mr. President, there is nothing hidden, there is nothing that is not as open as the day, and there has been no step taken from first to last in these negotiations that does not reflect honor and credit upon the people of the United States and upon its Chief Executive. Do you remember the few words in the President's message touching our duty toward the Philippines? We can not hear them too often, and I wish to read them. They are in the last message of the President, which came to us a few days ago.

> No effort will be spared to build up the waste places desolated by war and by long years of misgovernment. We shall not wait for the end of strife to begin the beneficent work. We shall continue, as we have begun, to open the schools and the churches, to set the courts in operation, to foster industry and trade and agriculture, and in every way in our power to make these people whom Providence has brought within our jurisdiction feel that it is their liberty and not our power, their welfare and not our gain, we are seeking to enhance. Our flag has never waved over any community but in blessing. I believe the Filipinos will soon recognize the fact that it has not lost its gift of benediction in its world-wide journey to their shores.

That is the last public utterance of our honored President. And this is the President whose messages and whose treatment has been described by the Senator from South Dakota as being "brutal" and "cruel." That contest can not be cruel which seeks only to lift up and make better the man who treats you as his enemy. That contest can not be fraught with hardship or oppression that looks only to the civilization and the regeneration and the benefiting of these islanders of the sea. Mr. President, there might be a great deal worse in store for the savages of the world, as yet unreclaimed, than asking them to come with us and to take pot-luck with the people of the United States, in the protection of American laws, and to sit under the shadow of the American Government; and that is what we are seeking to do in those islands to-day. When that result is attained, as it will be, then we may talk of our eventual duty to those people.

But, Mr. President, if these utterances of the Senator from South Dakota are deplorable, I still am unable to acquiesce in all of the views which have recently been stated on the floor by extremists in the other direction. We took those islands not as a rich conquest. We took them as one of the penalties and burdens of a war which was imposed upon us because of the high duty we owed the human race. We entered into this war because we could no longer listen unmoved to the cry of sufferings in Cuba, and we girded up our loins for the contest and washed ourselves clean of selfish purpose by the preliminary statement that this was not a war of aggression, and that we took the island of Cuba when we took it solely that we might help fit it for self-government and turn it over to the people who occupy it.

When the war was inaugurated none of us dreamed of our acquisition of the Philippine Islands; but when the war was closed so quickly and so victoriously and we then had to deal with our conquered foe, we found the Philippines with more than 5,000,000 people suffering under oppressions and hardships and cruelty. We found Spain humbled and bankrupt, a fallen foe, and these islands a floating derelict in the Pacific; and we took them because if we had not taken them they would have led to international complications and might have passed into unworthy hands, and principally because of the duty we owed to the people in them. And had they been as bleak and barren as the desert of Sahara, our duty to the people who occupy those islands would not have been less or different.

Mr. President, we may have to keep them indefinitely: perhaps we shall; but they are not to be kept for the reasons so far stated. I listened with the greatest interest to the remarks of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE], for he was fresh from the islands and from an inspection of them. I keep an open mind upon the subject, but I confess I can not yet yield my approval of the resolution he introduced because of the arguments he adduced. He told us that there had been given him nuggets of gold and gold dust from placer diggings; that they told him of a mountain of 40 miles of coal; of unlimited beds of rich copper; he told us of great fields of indian corn, rice, sugar, coffee, and hemp, and of the rich and tempting valley of Luzon.

He told us that the islands were peopled by savages who could not be reclaimed, and that we had made the mistake of treating them with humanity and not with severity; that they would never work, and that we must get over our lingering prejudice to Chinese labor, and that in order to reap the benefit of those islands we must fill them with foreigners; but that the islands were rich, and that therefore we should hold them.

Mr. President, to my mind that argument is base and sordid. This war, as we inaugurated it and as we carried it on, if we are true to ourselves and consider first our duty to the people, will go down in history as one of the noblest that was ever fought; but if we base our intention and purpose to retain the Philippine Islands, irrespective of the people upon them, upon the fact that they are a rich and fertile and valuable acquisition, this war will go down in history as a war of conquest, waged by a strong against a weak nation, and as a mercenary and dishonorable war, worthy of the middle ages. If we are to keep these islands, it is because we owe a duty growing out of the cause of the war, and not because we were able to take them; and the same argument that would apply to our keeping the Philippines would apply with equal force to our loading our cruisers and our battle ships with shrapnel and with shell and cruising around the world seeking for savage islands which we might conquer.

Mr. President, is there not some danger that we are facing the question before us with a sentimentality that is somewhat maudlin? I confess that I am shrinking somewhat at frequent and constant reference to Almighty God and his dealings personal with the nations of the earth. History has taught me that He usually favors the heaviest battalions, and if He governs men irrespective of human agencies there are injustices in history concerning which we will never be set right until the light of another world dawns upon us.

May it not be possible, Mr. President, that the divine plan goes no further than to hold each individual responsible for his actions

toward his fellow man? It may be that we are His chosen people, and that God Almighty, as has been stated, has trusted this whole question of civilization and regeneration and conferred the duty of enlightening heathendom exclusively upon the English-speaking and Teutonic races, and chiefly upon the people of the United States. I read an extract from the remarks of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE]. He says:

> The Philippines are ours forever, "territory belonging to the United States," as the Constitution calls them. And just beyond the Philippines are China's illimitable markets. We will not retreat from either. We will not repudiate our duty in the archipelago. We will not abandon our opportunity in the Orient. We will not renounce our part in the mission of our race, trustee, under God, of the civilization of the world. And we will move forward to our work, not howling out regrets like slaves whipped to their burdens, but with gratitude for a task worthy of our strength, and thanksgiving to Almighty God that He has marked us as His chosen people, henceforth to lead in the regeneration of the world.

He says:

> God has not been preparing the English-speaking and Teutonic peoples for a thousand years for nothing but vain and idle self-contemplation and self-admiration. No! * * * He has made us adepts in government that we may administer government among savage and senile peoples. * * * And of all our race He has marked the American people as His chosen nation to finally lead in the regeneration of the world. This is the divine mission of America, and it holds for us all the profit, all the glory, all the happiness possible to man. We are trustees of the world's progress, guardians of its righteous peace. The judgment of the Master is upon us.

It may be so, Mr. President, but if it is true we should treble our fleet at once, and with England and Germany seize China and divide it, take away the French possessions in Madagascar and in Africa, and relieve Russia of its occupancy of Port Arthur and proceed to civilize and regenerate the natives.

Mr. President, my understanding of the duty and the mission of the American people was something far different. I had conceived us to be the last hope of the republics, blessed with a magnificent and large and fertile and varied area, which we were gradually filling up as our own population increased, and where we were welcoming the advent of strangers and foreigners and the oppressed from other lands, and were seeking to assimilate them with us as citizens of a free republic; and I was of impression that our land was not yet full, not yet overflowing, and that we had before us in days, we hoped of peace, vast and interesting and noble social problems that within our own borders we were to work out. That we had said to the nations of the earth, "You who are monarchies may hold your thrones so long as the people will tolerate you, but this continent is forever devoted to liberty, and you shall not put your foot upon it, nor shall we interfere with territories which you claim." That, as I understand, is our mission, our purpose, and our destiny. But events concerning which we had but little share have placed us in possession of these great islands, and we must meet those duties as we meet every duty at home, fairly and good-naturedly and hopefully and man fashion.

Mr. President, I believe myself it is idle for us to talk of being a God-given nation, with an ability to regenerate and colonize and civilize not possessed by any other people in the world. I was somewhat startled by the utterances of the Senator from Indiana when he told us that charity did not begin at home, but commenced outside and filtered back, and that, confessing the great municipal corruption which exists in all our large towns and cities almost without exception throughout these United States, a corruption which is growing less each year and will as men grow better and take greater interest in civil government, we had only to intrust the appointment of governors of the Philippines to the precinct committeemen of Indiana and of other States, when by the purity of government which would be administered in the Philippines a reflected glory and purity would shine across to our land, which would make at once our civic administration pure and stainless. Mr. President, if that be true, the Philippines would be worth to us a great many hundred millions of dollars if their soil consisted of lava beds and craters of dead volcanoes; but it is not so.

We will meet this question, and we will stumble and fall and make mistakes and pick ourselves up and go on again. When we took these islands we thought we had taken from Spain an orphan asylum which we were to nourish and nurture and make happy. It looks as if we might possibly have taken over, instead, a home for incorrigibles. But if we have, we will still deal with them in the same American fashion. It comes at the end of the century, when the world is growing better and more beneficent and kinder, when men recognize as never before their duties toward their fellow-men, when the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting richer too; and if we do our duty by these islands, as we shall, the time will some day come when the sun of prosperity, which now shines and illumines and blesses our own country, will shed its refulgent rays as well upon those islanders in far-off southern seas.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado says that I never speak a kind word of my fellow-Senators. I am not going to dispute that assertion except to say that my relations are most pleasant with almost all my fellow-Senators, and I hope he will not undertake to hide the whole Senate behind his large personality. I have not spent much time in laudation of him, because I never saw anything in his public career or private life worthy of praise; but I will confess one thing, and that now, which ought to be to his praise and to his advantage—he has a loud voice. It seems to me that his attack upon me is not worthy of reply, and I shall not reply to it.

As far as his argument is concerned, he has divided his attention between me and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE]. I should like to know, I should like to hear, I should like to ascertain some settled policy upon this question. We are told by the Senator from Indiana that it is greed, conquest, for the purpose of getting rich, with the idea of despoiling somebody, and we are told by the Senator from Colorado that we are prompted by ideas of philanthropy, but not quite so much philanthropy as the Senator from Indiana wishes to exercise.

Now, Mr. President, this cant about doing somebody good was the very argument which justified Spain in her conquests of the western world. No people ever went forth for conquest and for plunder who paraded more their pretext that they wished to civilize and Christianize the world. They drew their trail of blood across Mexico. What men in all the world had more religious zeal than Cortez and his followers and his priests? Pizarro destroyed the grand civilization of Peru, butchering her people right and left in the name of God. They said they did it because they wanted to confer blessings upon the people of these countries, and they made them desolate for centuries afterwards.

Russia in her conquest raises the same banner, and her newspapers are full of the same argument, the same cant.

You can pick out Spanish authors whose books are in our library, hundreds of them, who parade this excuse for conquest better than even the Senator from Colorado. And so it is with England. Wherever she has gone, wherever she has carried her conquest, as I read a short time ago, the same excuse has been made: "We are going to carry the blessings of English civilization." If you should ask the people where she has been—if you ask Ireland, and India, and the natives of New Zealand—what their opinion is of the blessing and benefit she has conferred, it seems to me it would deter us from undertaking the task.

I should like to know what the argument is? You can not smother debate or drive me from a discussion of the question by ridicule or abuse. Call me a traitor if you will. Men have been called traitors before because they stood up for what they believed to be right. Lincoln, in the House of Representatives, denounced the Mexican war and voted against its approval, and so did Alexander Stephens, of the South, and so did Boutwell, of Massachusetts, and so did many other names that might be added to the list.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. Boutwell was not in the House at that time.

Mr. PETTIGREW. The Senator from Massachusetts says that Mr. Boutwell was not there then, and I presume I am wrong in regard to that, although I heard him in a speech say that he took that position, which perhaps was not in the House of Representatives, and he believed that more than anything else had made him twice the governor of Massachusetts. What is more, Mr. President, Daniel Webster denounced the Mexican war and afterwards was charged with being a traitor to his country by these same people who have a philanthropic mission.

Fox and Pitt in the English Parliament denounced the war against the American colonies. Is it Lord North and his miserable cabinet who live in the minds of the people of the world to-day? No; it is those champions of freedom who dared to stand up in the British Parliament and denounce the course of their government of that day. Pitt said:

> What has the Government done? They have sent an armed force, consisting of 17,000 men, to dragoon the Bostonians into what is called duty; and we are told in the language of menace that if 17,000 won't do, 50,000 shall. If I were an American as I am an Englishman, while a foreign troop was landed in my country I would never lay down my arms—never, never, never.

I should like to know what course this debate is to take. If those who are in favor of imperialism are afraid to embrace the doctrine of greed and of conquest for profit and disagree about the amount of philanthropy that is necessary in order to justify their position, it is hard to tell what we shall answer or combat.

In this connection, Mr. President—for I do not care to talk longer—I wish to put in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Let us be honest," from the Washington Post, of this city. It seems to me it is quite pertinent in this connection as showing how badly divided are the hosts of imperialism.

LET US BE HONEST!

> Why can not we be honest in our utterances touching the territories we have recently acquired? Really it would save time and trouble, to say nothing of life and treasure, to come out frankly with the announcement that we have annexed these possessions in cold blood, and that we intend to utilize them to our profit and advantage. All this talk about benevolent assimilation; all this hypocritical pretense of anxiety for the moral, social, and intellectual exaltation of the natives· all this transparent parade of responsibility

and deep seated purpose; all this deceives nobody, avails nothing, helps us not an inch in the direction of profit, dignity, and honor.

We all know down in our hearts that these islands, groups, etc., are important to us only in the ratio of their practical possibilities. We value them by the standard of their commercial usefulness, and by no other. All this gabble about civilizing and uplifting the benighted barbarians of Cuba and Luzon is mere sound and fury, signifying nothing. Foolishly or wisely, we want these newly acquired territories, not for any missionary or altruistic purposes, but for the trade, the commerce, the power, and the money there are in them. Why beat about the bush and promise and protest all sorts of things? Why not be honest? It will pay.

As a matter of fact, we are not concerned in the ethical or religious uplifting of the Filipinos. After all, the difference between a breechclout and a starched shirt front is a mere matter of climate and personal opinion. Dishonesty, untruth, crime, and general wickedness are here in our midst—present with us as part of our daily life and growing with our growth. We need not go to the West Indies or the Philippines in search of material for moral rescue. Our own slums abound with opportunities for missionary zeal.

Why not tell the truth and say—what is the fact—that we want Cuba, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and Luzon, together with any other islands in either ocean that may hereafter commend themselves to our appetite, because we believe they will add to our national strength, and because we hope they will some day become purchasers at our bargain counters? We might as well throw off the pious mask and indulge ourselves in a little honest candor. It will cost us nothing, and it may profit much. At any rate, we shall have the comfort and satisfaction of being honest with ourselves and the privilege of looking into the mirror without blushing.—*Washington Post, Sunday, January 14, 1900.*

I present that as an answer to the whole philanthropic portion of the speeches of the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Colorado.

But in order to bring this debate back, it seems to me, to a higher plane and better character, I will read briefly, some verses by Howard S. Taylor, of Chicago:

THE CREED OF THE FLAG.

Who will haul down the flag?—*President McKinley.*

"Who will haul down the flag?" quoth he.
Why, no hand of flesh and bone
Can lower that flag, on land or sea,
Till the faith of the flag is gone!
Till a few shall rule and cunningly keep
The bunting to garnish their greed;
Till dollars are dear and humanity cheap
By the force of a tory creed!
Then will it fall!—but answer us, clear,
Do you fancy that hour is drawing near?

Did our Liberty Bell ring in vain?
Was our Declaration a lie?
Must we turn to the Old World again,
With the penitent prodigal's cry?
Must we arm us and march in the van
Of Europe's barbaric parade,
And boom out a gunpowder gospel to man
To open a pathway for trade?
Shall we strut through the world and bluster and brag
With the dollar mark stamped on the brave old flag?

Nay, haul up the flag—raise it high—
Not yet is its spirit spent!
Let it sing to the wind and the sky
The truth that it always meant!
Let it sing of the birthright of man,
Of progress that never can lag,
Let it sing that trade may go—where it can,
But liberty follows the flag!
Yea, haul up Old Glory—but, comrades, take heed
That no man part the old flag from the creed!

HOWARD S. TAYLOR.

CHICAGO, *January 7, 1899.*

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I rise simply to make an inquiry. I understand that all these resolutions will come up to-morrow for final disposition.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is not informed that any agreement has been made that the resolutions shall.

Mr. LODGE. Then I ask that the resolution of the Senator from South Dakota which has been under discussion and that of my colleague and my own may go over until to-morrow without losing their place, and I trust that to-morrow we shall dispose of them finally.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AGRICULTURAL CAPABILITIES OF ALASKA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a third report on the investigations of the agricultural capabilities of Alaska for the year 1899, in accordance with the acts of Congress making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1899, and June 30, 1900.

WILLIAM McKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *January 15, 1900.*

[NOTE.—Report, etc., accompanies message sent to the House of Representatives.]

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster-General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 8th instant, certain information relative to the $50,000,000 appropriated by Congress under the act approved March 9, 1898, entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for prior years, and for other purposes," and stating that no portion of this amount was assigned to or expended by or under the direction of the Post-Office Department; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Acting Commissary-General of Subsistence, together with a copy of the contract to furnish flour with the C. A. Gambrill Manufacturing Company, of Baltimore, Md., in May, 1898, and copies of correspondence relative thereto.

This information has been transmitted in reply to a resolution offered in the last Congress by the then senior Senator from Maryland, Mr. Gorman. In the opinion of the Chair it will be better that it shall be referred to the Committee on Printing. It will be so ordered.

Mr. COCKRELL. What is the resolution?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is a communication in response to a resolution in relation to quartermasters' contracts, which the senior Senator from Maryland at the last Congress submitted.

Mr. COCKRELL. Ought it not to be printed?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair doubts whether it should be printed, and therefore has sent it to the Committee on Printing under the rule.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah [Mr. RAWLINS] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. RAWLINS. Mr. President, if I may, without being subjected to the covert charge of treason, I will submit some remarks upon House bill No. 1.

The question which I am to discuss is grave, and yet it is not the gravest question confronting the American people.

The integrity of our free institutions is insidiously assailed. The right to disseminate truth to combat error and overthrow falsehood is questioned. There are those who would place under the ban this right, sacred to freemen and formidable to tyrants only. Freedom of speech in a republic is as sacred as the Ark of the Covenant in the holy temple of religion.

Any who would lay sacrilegious hands upon this are enemies of human freedom and must be overthrown.

I believe in the old Republic. I have no sympathy with imperialism or with any of its mercenary and blood-stained projects.

Mr. President, the House bill "to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all kinds of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes," which on Monday, the 18th of December last—when, in the midst of panic in New York, money was so scarce as to command 186 per cent on call—passed that branch of Congress by the unanimous vote of its Republican members, was the next day by the Senate referred to its Committee on Finance, and, strange to say, immediately reported back by the Republican majority of that committee with the recommendation that all the bill after the enacting clause be stricken out and a measure differing in tenor and effect substituted.

Thus, suddenly, was a long-cherished financial scheme conceived among the cave dwellers of Manhattan—sanctioned, undoubtedly, by their English archetypes upon the Thames, crystallized in select Republican caucus, in the dog days, at Atlantic City, sanctified by the approval of the Administration, and passed, as aforesaid, by the House—brought to grief in the very inner circle of its friends, the reorganized Republican Committee on Finance.

If this Senate attack could be regarded as sincere, bad as it is, it would afford cause for congratulation. But as the attendant circumstances must lead to the conclusion that it is but a parliamentary maneuver, temporarily to disarm criticism and smooth the way of the measure into conference from which will be sprung something even more menacing to the welfare of the country than the House bill, the present procedure must be treated as a part of the juggling hypocrisy and false pretense with which the Republican party has been wont to deal with the money question.

If we cared we might, upon this question, measure the Republican party by its own standard, try it by the declarations and conduct of its own leaders, and convict it and them out of their own mouths of insincerity in their dealing with the American people.

Their pledge in 1896 to "promote" international bimetallism; the appropriation of $100,000 March 3, 1897, to send a commission to Europe to bring it about; the President's message to the House in June of that year, while the commissioners were abroad, commending the "Indianapolis" scheme, based upon the permanent establishment of the single gold standard; the passage of a bill

by unanimous vote of the Republicans of the House, pursuant to the President's message, on the day it was received, appropriating $100,000 to promote the permanent establishment in the United States of the single standard of gold—the first $100,000 to promote bimetallism, the second to defeat it; the first to defray the expense of the commission appointed by the President to operate in Europe for bimetallism, the second to defray the expense of another commission appointed by the same President and to work at the same time for the permanent establishment of the single gold standard—such is but part of their record of duplicity.

Was ever inconsistency more glaring? Was there ever treachery more perfidious?

The Republican party can not be trusted to deal honestly and frankly with this question.

The "and for other purposes" appended to the title of the bill might well have been defined. If so, and the truth had been spoken, it would have revealed a nefarious compact and a promise of its fulfillment. The contributions of the banks in 1896 to the Republicans are reported to have been enormous. That alone accounts for the present occupancy of the White House. That explains how the six and a half millions of honest, independent, patriotic, and intelligent white men who voted for Mr. Bryan were defeated at the polls, how the idle, the vicious, the dependent, the ignorant, the alien, and the degenerate, everything corruptible, were thrown into the scale with the respectable but hopeless members of the Republican party to defeat the Democratic ticket.

These organizations who thus did so much for the Republican party have long been clamorous for their promised reward. They will have it. They will exact the fullest measure. They will not be put aside or cheated. Those Republicans who have halted, hesitated, and parleyed are being coerced and driven into line. The Republican leaders must show a record of promises kept to be able to make the fresh demands which will be so urgent during the coming campaign. Hence the House bill. Hence the unseemly haste in rushing it through.

Before making an analysis of the House bill (for it is to that I shall devote attention) and pointing out its probable injurious effects, I desire to recur as briefly as I am able to some elementary principles, self-evident in their correctness and whose intrinsic soundness can not well be questioned.

To man out of society, in a state of permanent isolation, money would be as useless as it would be indispensable to the social organization of which he might become a part. The Digger Indian is not an object lesson of the effect of the gold standard in the United States. Neither is the semibarbarian, dwelling half clad in his hovel, who does not borrow or lend, buy or sell, except in a limited degree, an object lesson of the effect of the silver standard in Mexico. You might pour into the lap of one of these the wealth of a Crœsus—for a few days he would live the life of a glutton, and then perish from the earth. If one of these beings should happen to cross the imaginary line which divides the sovereignty of these nations, if he should happen to change the metal in his pocket, if he had a pocket, it would not transfuse the blood which flows in his veins.

The small community might get along, making some division of their labor by a system of barter. But every transaction of barter must depend upon and await the coming together of persons having reciprocal needs and the power or means of mutual accommodation.

To use a familiar illustration, the man with two hats and no boots would profit if only he could find a man with extra boots and no hat. It might be that the one would become footsore before he would be able to find the other. Thus, while one member of the community might produce more of a given article than he could consume, he, in many instances, would find it difficult to procure someone to take it off his hands in exchange for something which the latter had to spare and the former needed.

The search for trades would often be fruitless. The time and energy which would be lost—wasted—under such a system would at least retard all progress and keep the community in a state of stagnation and poverty.

The necessity for something to serve as a measure of value and a general medium of exchange would become manifest.

Money is the outgrowth of the necessities of man in a state of society. For this reason every community in every stage almost of human development and at every period in the world's history has selected and used something which may be called money.

It is not very important to inquire as to the various articles, things, or materials which at different times and states of society have been selected for this purpose. The nature of the thing has always depended upon the particular needs and situation of the people adopting it.

Whether skins, sheep, cattle, corn, shells, the different metals, from iron to gold, were adopted, the use, the function performed has ever been largely the same.

Whenever a community has, by custom or law, adopted anything for this use, it has been to the end that to those who acquired or possessed it it would represent and command all desirable objects for sale and all needed services for hire, and indicate precisely the quantity of such things to be obtained by means of it.

Whoever produced in excess of his own needs would part with his surplus for money, because by means of the money so obtained he would acquire the ability and right to purchase any of the whole variety of surplus products of all the other members of the community then in existence or which might come into existence during his lifetime.

To its possessor it would be a measure of value, ever indicating that quantity of useful things, the amount of needed services to be obtained at his will in exchange for it. Instead of parting with his own labor or the products of his labor for the labor or products of others, he sold his own for money and then used the money to obtain theirs.

MEDIUM OF EXCHANGE.

The exchange of labor or commodity has as certainly taken place in the one case as in the other. But in the one case money has been the means of effecting it. Money has been for him thus a medium of exchange. Exchanges are not only accomplished by means of money, but greatly facilitated by its use. By it time is economized and the energies of the people conserved.

Money thus gives employment to labor and supplies a market for its surplus products. It is the alert and efficient middleman which brings buyer and seller together to their mutual enrichment.

It is, moreover, the standard by which each man measures his own and the wealth of his neighbors and that of the entire community.

With reference to this standard the burdens of public expenditure are equitably apportioned and distributed.

It serves also as a measure of deferred payments. It is at once a measure and the means of enforcing the performance of contracts. It also measures the liability of their nonfulfillment.

Money is thus a standard or measure of value, a medium of exchange, a measure of deferred payments, and means of performing contracts.

Its possessor may immediately convert it to supply his present wants or desires. He may keep it to provide for future wants or desires. If he stores it away or hoards it, while it becomes to him a store of value, it ceases to be an active agent either in facilitating or effecting exchanges. It is not dead, but latent. It is true that the use of money as a store of value is not necessarily inconsistent with its active use as a medium of exchange.

It may perform both functions at the same time. It may be loaned to be put into circulation by the borrower, its owner, whose wealth is stored in it, retaining the right to demand its return at the needed moment.

QUALITIES OF MONEY.

The thing or material in which money is symbolized ought to be something which is convenient to handle as it passes from hand to hand in effecting exchanges.

It ought to be durable, so that as a standard measure and store of value it may not suffer diminution or destruction.

It ought not to be easily counterfeited, and should be readily distinguishable from all things to which the money function or privilege does not pertain.

The quantity or number of units or pieces ought to be such that the community should at all times have a sufficient supply to enable its members to effect their exchanges with the greatest conservation of energy and economy in time.

It should be so adjusted as to measure values and deferred payments, and be the means of performing contracts equitably and justly. No man or class of men should be able to profit or compelled to suffer loss by its contraction or expansion.

In practice it may not be possible to attain to such a just and ideal system of money. It is such a system, however, which should ever be kept in view and to which the nearest possible approach should be made.

By far the most important consideration relating to this subject is:

What shall the quantity of money be and to what extent shall the original supply be from time to time increased, and by what method shall such quantity and its increase be fixed and furnished?

Shall it be by the automatic system, the fiat system, or a combination of both?

There is but one distinction between these two systems. In the fiat system there are three elements, each the creature of legislation.

Legislation designates the material in which the unit of money shall be symbolized and the device by which it may be identified. Legislation gives to it its legal-tender quality. Legislation fixes the number of units which may be issued. Every element of this money is dependent upon the behest of government.

VOLUME OF MONEY.

In the automatic system the unit or the material of which it is composed and the device by which it may be distinguished are the creatures of legislation; the legal-tender quality is bestowed by law, but the number of units or volume of money is left to depend upon the quantity of material or metal which may be discovered and produced.

In the one case the quantity of money is regulated or limited by artificial law; in the other by natural law.

Under the first system almost any convenient durable substance which may by suitable superscription or device be identified and protected from counterfeit may be selected for use as money. Because the number of money units will be arbitrarily fixed and limited. The volume of money will depend upon the will or caprice of the lawmaker.

By the fiat of legislation it will be great or small, with all the results following upon the plethora or dearth of money supply.

Under the automatic system the material selected must be of limited production, because if like the sands upon the seashore, it could readily be produced in unlimited quantity, the number of money units would soon approach infinity and their value or purchasing power zero.

GOLD AND SILVER.

Hence gold and silver, by the common consent of the human race, have ever been regarded as meeting most fully the requirements of the automatic system. The scarcity of these metals and the difficulties attending their production and separation from the crude materials with which they are usually found combined in nature gave assurance that their free use for money would not lead to unjust inflation.

Fiat money has usually been resorted to, not from choice, but from the necessity arising from the extreme scarcity at times of the precious metals or from some sudden and great demand for money. This has generally happened in times of war. England in 1796, during the war with Napoleon, had to resort to paper money. The United States have been compelled to do the same during each of the wars in which they were engaged except that with Mexico.

Since no civilized community can exist and progress without money, if gold and silver can not be obtained, something else will be adopted to take their place and perform their money function.

THE FIAT SYSTEM.

There is no essential evil connected with the fiat system of money except its liability to abuse. Those who control the issues and who, at will and without expense, may add to the volume of money are placed under great temptation.

The Government of France in issuing assignats, yielding to this temptation, so multiplied the issue that they became worthless, thus inflicting great wrong upon the nation. The farming out to private persons in England of the right to issue copper tokens without restriction, led to similar evils in that country. The turning over to the banks under this bill the entire control of all circulation other than gold, limited only by the discretion of a Secretary as to the issuance of bonds, he ever subservient to their wishes, will prove equally fraught with mischief.

If the number of money units in the fiat system were justly limited, so that their purchasing power would remain uniform and thereby the general level of prices be maintained, that system would be free from serious objection. Still experience has shown that fiat money has, as a rule, been resorted to as a temporary device in times of emergency or by some nation in distress and has had no recognition beyond the limits of the state or nation adopting it.

Even within the limits of such state the people may have little confidence in the permanency or durability of the system. The overthrow of the government destroys the value of such money effectually. Confederate notes utterly collapsed in value with the termination of the civil war.

So far all fiat systems have proved as fleeting and uncertain as the government which adopted them or the exigencies which brought them forth.

Such systems lacked soundness, in that the people have no confidence in their permanency, or, at least, in their continuance under uniform and reasonable regulations and limitations.

Under the automatic system, with gold and silver as the basis by which the supply of money for all time and in all nations was to be determined until the nineteenth century, at least, the question of soundness or permanency was never raised.

SCHEMES OF AVARICE.

The sordid promptings of avarice and chicane have done much during the present century to impair confidence in the stability even of the automatic system.

The demonetization of silver by Great Britain in 1816, at a time when the annual product of that metal was about three times greater than that of gold; the like action in respect to gold by Prussia and the German states in 1857, when the annual output of gold was some four times greater than that of silver, and the change back to gold again by Germany in 1873, preceded by the covert passage through the Congress of the United States of the bill denying access to the mints to silver, and followed by the suspension of silver coinage by France and other nations, all these different nations seemingly being impelled to this action by the potent influence of a class which could alone profit by the policy of monetary contraction—all this has led to the unsettlement of values, great disturbances of commerce, and distrust as to the stability of any system of monetary supply.

Until recently there was but little disagreement among writers upon finance and money as to the influence which the supply of money has upon prices, industry, and business.

The general rule is that, other things being equal, the value of money is in proportion to its quantity.

By value of money is meant its purchasing power, or the rate at which it will exchange for other commodities or property.

Otherwise stated, as the number of units of money is increased, other things being equal, the purchasing power of each unit will diminish.

Augment the number of money units, and each unit as a standard for the measurement of the value of other commodities becomes less. Any particular commodity will thus require more money units to represent or measure its value than before; a proportionate rise in the prices of other commodities than money takes place. When the supply of money is increased, prices rise; when the supply of money is diminished, prices fall.

This law has been considered so well established as to be called axiomatic.

However, it has recently been denied.

VALUE OF MONEY.

It is contended that the value of money does not depend upon the number of its units in circulation, but upon what is called its "intrinsic" value, or the demand for the material of which the unit is composed for other uses than that of money. It is insisted that the value or purchasing power of gold or silver is precisely what those metals will bring for use as ornaments and in the industrial arts.

A moment's reflection ought to convince any reasonable mind that this is not true.

These metals, without the money privilege, and regarded simply as commodities, would have values depending upon the demand for them, the estimation in which they might be held for the various known uses to which they could be applied.

If some new and beneficial use should then be discovered which would exhaust a large portion of the supply of these metals, is it not clear that their value would correspondingly rise? Again, if this new demand should be taken away, the value of these metals would as certainly suffer a decline.

The demand for these metals for coinage and for use as money operates like any other demand upon their value as commodities.

If there is uncertainty as to the continued use of a given metal or material as money, the people among whom it circulates may have greater confidence in it from the fact that it will still possess value, although demonetized.

It should be borne in mind that a material which is in greater demand for other uses than for money is thereby unsuited for coinage or use as money.

If a given quantity of it is coined or used as money, it will not circulate as such, but will immediately be converted to its more valuable use. Say an ounce of platinum is worth more than a dollar for the uses to which now as a commodity it may be applied. Then suppose it should be provided that an ounce of that metal should be issued as money and stand for $1. It is clear that it would not circulate as money, but would be withdrawn from circulation to be converted to its more valuable use.

The intrinsic value of a material which equals or exceeds its monetary value is inconsistent with the essential service which money is designed to perform—that is, as a medium of exchange. Such a material will not perform the principal duty of money. While high intrinsic value may thus destroy its efficiency as money, it otherwise exerts no influence upon its circulation or purchasing power. The latter must always depend upon the demand for money and the quantity of it in circulation.

NO CREDIT VALUE.

It is also insisted in some quarters that if the value of money does not depend upon the intrinsic or commercial value of the material of which it is composed, then its value rests upon the credit of the government which authorizes its issue. This contention leads to absurdity. Money in the government treasury or exacted under the taxing power from the people, or at least obtained in some manner, is the only means by which the government can meet the pecuniary demands upon it. The credit of the government is good or bad according to its ability and readiness promptly to meet its obligations and pay its debts.

Credit thus does not give value to money. On the other hand,

without money credit could not exist. Credit is not the basis of money, but money is the basis of credit. Credit in a government without money or the means of obtaining it is inconceivable. This idea that credit gives value to money is of very recent origin. It is put forth as one of the supports of the policy of contraction and to give it popularity. If the people can be made to believe that every dollar which is issued is a debt and burden which they must ultimately discharge, they will be the more easily convinced that the number of dollars issued should be as small as possible. The present efforts in Congress to pass a law calling in the United States Treasury notes for cancellation and for funding them in interest-bearing bonds are pursuant to this policy. The effort to fund the silver circulation in like manner is in harmony with the same vicious policy.

These two classes of money are to be treated as a public debt, payable on demand, for which deferred payments in the form of bonds are to be substituted.

Were this accomplished, a great contraction in our money supply would result, with the consequent decline in prices and the corresponding rise in the purchasing power of gold and the value of credits, including the bonds by which the notes and silver had been funded.

Instead of this relieving the Government, or the people, who in reality constitute it, from any burden, its debt would actually be greatly increased and its credit impaired because of the greater sacrifice which the Government or its people would have to make to obtain money thus made scarce.

The promoters of this bill well understand the operations of this principle. Who are they? The chairman of the Committee on Finance has answered. He says:

> In considering the possibilities of the future we can not overlook the fact that the national debts of the world have increased at an astonishing rate. In 1862 the aggregate of the national debts of the world was about thirteen thousand million dollars and in 1892 thirty-one thousand millions.

The holders of these debts, this gigantic, world-wide syndicate, cold, impassive, greedy, and remorseless, have for years steadily progressed in restricting the inhabitants of the earth to the use of gold alone with which to meet this mighty aggregate of obligation.

Let the Senator from Rhode Island tell how they are benefited. He says:

> We offer the holder of outstanding bonds the inducement of an obligation payable, principal and interest, specifically in gold coin and a security for a long term in place of one maturing in a short time.

And again:

> In recent years there has been a gradual appreciation in the prices of high-class securities throughout the world. This movement has been more marked in the United States than elsewhere. The increasing demand for our bonds has given to these securities an exceptionally strong position in the world's market. Take the fours of 1907 as an example. The prices at which they have sold in the past five months have realized to investors the following rates: August, 2.195 per cent; September, 2.222 per cent; October, 2.255 per cent; November, 2.206 per cent; December, 2.005 per cent.

A profit of more than 2 per cent a month. Their creed is more bonds and less money.

Money holders can not profitably invest in commodities or property or use their money in productive industry upon a falling market. So long as the decline in prices continues they may profit by hoarding the money or storing it away and holding it.

However, it is under precisely such conditions that money may most profitably be invested in Government securities, which, in addition to drawing interest, appreciate with gold proportionately with the decline in the values of other kinds of property.

By treating a portion of the money supply as a debt and funding it in this class of securities their own appreciation in value is greatly accelerated, and the correlative conditions of declining values and stagnant industries ensue.

DEMAND FOR MONEY.

It is true that there are other things which may affect the value or purchasing power of money besides quantity. The demand for money must always be taken into the account.

In one sense it may be truly said that the demand for money is always at a maximum. Whoever wants anything, any desirable object, first wants money, demands money.

Obtaining money, he at once transforms it into the object of his desire. So the demand for money equals the sum of the demand of all the people for all other things.

The demand for money has been considered as commensurate with the necessities, wants, and desires of the human race.

However, it must not be supposed that this demand which connection with supply fixes the value of money or the prices of commodities or property is the equivalent of necessity, want, or desire. The wants and desires of people are insatiate, illimitable. The supply of money necessarily being limited, if its value were fixed by demand in this sense it would logically follow that such value would fast approach the infinite.

Many a tramp is consumed with a desire to possess the mansion of the millionaire. Yet such desire does not add a penny to its exchangeable value.

The necessity, the want, the desire, before it can have any influence upon values or prices, must itself be capitalized, must be possessed of desirable objects, things of utility to others, and to obtain which others are willing to make a sacrifice. One person being the owner of an object of utility will not part with it except in exchange for another object of still greater utility to him.

No trade will take place when the sacrifice to be made would exceed the benefit to be derived.

The demand for money, while great, is always counterbalanced by the demand for other things; and there are some things which are even more necessary to human existence than money.

In the days of Job, skins seem to have constituted the money of the people. Still it was then said "Skin for skin; yea, all that a man hath he will give for his life." In all climates food is a necessity; in most, food, clothing, and shelter are indispensable. Before being deprived of these in the degree necessary to preserve life, almost any sacrifice of other things, including money, will be made. Every source of supply is itself accompanied with a demand which must be satisfied upon terms which will be satisfactory before the supply is surrendered.

A man presenting a horse and asking for it a hundred dollars in money creates such a demand as tends to fix the value of money, just as a man with a hundred dollars, willing to purchase a horse, presents a demand which affects the price of horses.

Thus qualified and explained, the value or purchasing power of money depends upon its quantity and the demand for it.

INFLUENCE UPON PRICES.

In considering the question of the influence of money upon prices it is necessary to keep in mind the different uses to which money is applied.

Only that portion of the money supply which for the time being is seeking exchange for commodities or other property, and so performing its function as a medium of exchange, operates in fact as a measure of value and to fix the general level of prices.

Money hoarded or used simply as a store of value, while possessing a potential influence, a latent energy, can have but little effect upon values or productive industry. While prices are on a decline such money has no inducement to leave its hiding place; because, in the hands of its holder its command of commodities and other property increases day by day as long as such decline in values continues. Such a situation is an encouragement to the withdrawal of money from active circulation.

Thus the proportion of money employed simply as a store of value is augmented.

That which seeks exchange for other property and helps to sustain the level of prices is diminished. So the speed of falling prices is accelerated as the withdrawal and hoarding of money proceeds.

Finally the necessities of the people holding the money for food, for clothing and shelter, or the cravings of pride and ambition force money from its hiding place to seek exchange for the things with which such necessity or desire may be gratified. This affords an impetus to a higher level of prices. As values of property other than money proceed in an ascending and that of money in a downward scale it becomes more profitable to store wealth in property than in money; and so the money is put into circulation, stimulating trade and vivifying industry.

It has been noticed and remarked by some of the ablest writers on finance that a decrease of money in circulation has a much greater proportionate effect in depressing the level of prices than an increase in the money supply has in raising such prices.

EFFECT OF RAISING PRICES.

With the level of prices at a certain stage, a given quantity of money may effect so many exchanges against commodities. Now raise the level of prices and it will require a greater quantity of money to effect the same exchanges. Every transaction requires more money. This increased demand for money always attends any increase of the quantity of it put into circulation, and tends to prevent a diminution of its purchasing power and to retard the upward tendency of prices.

Besides, under the stimulus of growing prices new industries might be established, new fields for enterprise and new channels of trade are opened in which money may be profitably employed.

Again, as wealth increases more people desire money in which to store their wealth, thus freeing themselves from the labor and responsibility of looking after the use and preservation of other kinds of property.

All these causes cooperate to prevent a depreciation in the value of money whose volume is increased. The added increment gives an impulse to the welfare and advancement of the race; and instead of becoming a competitor of the existing money, supply creates a new and added demand for its own use.

Time scarcely permits more than a passing notice of the fact that not only the quantity of money but also the rapidity of its circulation affects prices. The level of prices varies as the supply

of money multiplied by the number of exchanges which it accomplishes. This is but a corollary to the proposition that only the money which is seeking exchanges measures value.

Credit also has been regarded as exerting an influence in this direction. A man with a credit of a thousand dollars and an equal amount of money who buys a farm for $2,000 creates a demand with his credit as well as with his money which tends to enhance the price of farms.

It is said that the perfection of the credit system dispenses with the necessity of money. It is true that in times of buoyancy and confidence prices may be raised and business conducted simply by an extension or exchange of credit. However, it is a foundation of sand. Such prices are fluctuating and unstable. Such business has insolvency ever staring it in the face.

Credit is a good substitute for money until confidence is impaired and liquidation is demanded. It is then found to be worthless. The essential quality of being a lawful tender in payment of debts is lacking.

EXAMPLE FROM HISTORY.

Some examples, taken from history, may be given of the effect of an increasing or diminishing supply of money upon prices, trade, and business.

In King Solomon's time the navy of Tarshish brought gold and silver from the Tartessus and the navy of Hiram brought gold from Ophir, and "the King made silver to be in Jerusalem as stones." (I Kings x, 27.)

And the King made silver and gold in Jerusalem as plenteous as stones. (II Chronicles, I, 15.)

Such a superabundance of money ought, according to some modern financiers, to have brought the people of Israel to the very depths of financial abasement and misery.

Not so. It is said that these people attained their acme of prosperity in the days of King Solomon.

So King Solomon exceeded all the kings of the earth in riches and wisdom. (I Kings, x, 23.)

Jerusalem was most glorious. Trade and commerce flourished. All other nations were proud to do her homage and pay her tribute.

The seat of wealth, the center of power, her people were preeminent for their advancement in all the arts of peace and war, for their civilization, prosperity, and wisdom.

The greatest glory of Egypt seems to have been coincident with, if not caused by, the great output of gold from the plains of Nubia.

It is remarkable how the commercial prestige and glory of the nations of antiquity seem to have synchronized with the possession of the great gold and silver mines of Spain.

There seems to be little doubt that King Solomon's navy of Tarshish, which returned after periodical voyages of three years each, bearing gold and silver, visited the river in Spain anciently known as Tartessus, but now known as the Guadalquivir.

These mines next came into the possession of the Phœnicians. Carthage next succeeded to and held them for two centuries, until 200 B. C., during which time she was mistress of the seas and presided over the destinies of commerce.

Rome followed and held them while she retained the mastery of the world.

The mining of gold and silver at ancient Attica was at flood tide in the age of Pericles. The smelting works were at Ergasteria, 40 miles from Athens.

The scoria from these ancient works has recently (since 1870) yielded more than $5,000,000 to a company of French and Italians working it over under a lease from the Grecian Government.

Jacob, in his History of the Precious Metals, estimates that the amount of gold and silver in Rome in the Augustan period was $1,800,000,000; that after that time it dwindled until eight hundred years later it amounted to but one-eleventh of that quantity.

A MIGHTY AGENT.

The distinguished historian, Sir Alexander Alison, very justly observes: "That two leading events which have occurred in the history of mankind have been directly brought about by a successive contraction and expansion of the circulating medium of society."

The fall of the Roman Empire, so long ascribed, in ignorance, to slavery, heathenism, and social corruption, was in reality brought about by a decline in the silver and gold mines of Spain and Greece. And so, as if Providence had intended to reveal in the clearest manner the influence of this mighty agent in human affairs, the resurrection of mankind from the ruin which these causes had produced was owing to the directly opposite set of agencies being put in operation.

Columbus led the way in the career of renovation; when he spread his sails across the Atlantic he bore mankind and its fortunes in his bark.

The annual supply of the precious metals for the use of the globe had tripled before a century had expired; the price of every species of produce was quadrupled. The weight of debt and taxes insensibly wore off under the influence of that prodigious increase; in the renovation of industry the relations of society were changed, the weight of feudalism cast off, the rights of man established. Among the many concurring causes which conspired to bring about this mighty consummation, the most important, though hitherto least observed, was the discovery of Mexico and Peru.

From the discovery of America until 1640 it has been estimated by the most competent statisticians (Pixley and Hay) that the precious metals had increased until their quantity was six times greater than at the beginning of that period; that during the same time the level of prices advanced but 200 per cent, thus confirming the principle hereinbefore alluded to. After 1640, while the supply of the precious metals was greatly increased, prices remained uniform, thus showing that the increase of population, business, and wealth was sufficient to absorb the entire supply of money.

At the beginning of this century the Spanish-American revolutions led to the neglect of the mines in Mexico and Peru. The result, coupled with the demonetization of silver by England in 1816, is of great significance.

EFFECT OF CONTRACTION.

In 1822, Mr. Atwood in a speech in Parliament declared that there had been an average fall in the prices of the great articles of commerce of 45 per cent; that the fall was universal, embracing every article of industry, every branch of commerce.

In the work of Sismondi, published in 1827, it was declared that "a cry of distress is raised from all the manufacturing towns of the Old World and all the fields of the New World reecho it."

In 1830 Earl Stanhope said that the depression had been continuous and universal since 1816; that in ten years general prices had fallen 68 per cent.

In 1824 Mr. Clay vividly portrayed the distress in this country, saying that the values had fallen more than 50 per cent.

In 1843 Miss Martineau said "the depression had so deepened that many must die and a multitude lowered to a state of sickness and irritability from want of food."

The culmination of distress was reached in 1849. In that one year the persons in receipt of public charity in the British Isles were 4,250,000 in number. Every seventh person was a pauper and a public charge.

Prices had by this time, according to C. F. Bastable, professor of political economy in Trinity College, fallen two and one-half times.

But a new epoch was at hand. The gold discoveries in California and Australia constituted the bow of promise, which had its fulfillment in advancing prices and renewed activity in every line of industry, trade, and commerce.

Chevalier predicted that on account of the enormous output of gold prices would advance 50 per cent, to the ruin of creditors, and advised the demonetization of that metal.

Wolowski predicted that the rise would not exceed 10 per cent, as the added increments of money supply would create new fields for its operation and be largely absorbed by the increasing population and the expansion of trade and industry.

Wolowski was right.

The course of general prices of growing or languishing trade and industry since prior to 1849 has been carefully observed and noted under the system of index numbers in all the leading commercial nations, all of which tends strongly to confirm the truth of this statement of Alexander Hamilton, that:

To annul the use of either of these metals is to abridge the quantity of the circulating medium and is liable to all the objections which arise from the comparison of the benefits of a fall with the evils of a scanty circulation.

During the years 1898 and 1899 there was a temporary advance in prices and increased activity in business directly traceable to a wholly adventitious increase of the circulation. A part of this increase came from coinage of siver bullion in the Treasury. But the greater portion was due to the draft of gold from abroad by enlarged exports of food products at higher prices by reason of crop failures in Europe and Asia, the gold discoveries in the Klondike, and the increased output of gold in the United States and South Africa.

The last three are the main sources of gold production, while the first was the means of unequal distribution to the United States. The Secretary of the Treasury reports that there was in circulation in the United States in 1897 $1,640,209,519, in 1898 $1,837,859,895, and in 1899 $1,904,071,881. The increase from 1897 to 1898 was about $200,000,000, and from 1898 to 1899 the increase was about $66,000,000, in round numbers. With the latter had to be met the demands of an increasing population and the great drain and loss to Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines.

The money sent to these islands has more than exhausted the increment of increase for the past year.

The gold supply from South Africa is and will be for an indefinite period absolutely cut off. It is authentically stated that the gold output in the Klondike has reached its maximum and is now on the decline. There will inevitably result a great falling off in general production. As to distribution, the tide of gold, instead of being toward our shores, is setting strongly in the other direction at the rate of several million dollars each day.

Stringency of money and panic and financial wreckage come in natural, inevitable, and fatal sequence. Here the demand for money is augumented for use and loss outside our borders in far distant islands and among hordes of alien and barbarous peoples from whose bourne it will never return. The financial fabric of the commercial world is tottering. For gold alone is an insufficient and inadequate base to sustain it. The financial bed can not be covered with the golden blanket.

For a short time we have been warmed by pulling to our side the lion's share, while others suffered the exposure. Now it is being taken from us, and we will be made to suffer the chilling blast of poverty which must result. Already prices are falling, and the wail of distress will soon again be heard throughout the land.

Hence, as has been seen, as the production of the precious metals has increased or fallen off, as the volume of money has expanded or contracted, just so has civilization and the welfare of the human race waxed or waned.

Tell me the history of the discovery and development of the mines of gold and silver when these metals have been free for use as money and I will reveal to you the secret in the annals of human progress or retrogression.

BOTH METALS NEEDED.

The imperative necessity of the use of both gold and silver for purposes of money throughout the world is generally conceded.

The use of both is essential to the welfare and happiness of mankind. The reestablishment of such use is of such transcendant importance that no ordinary difficulty should be permitted to stand in the way of its achievement.

This is generally acknowledged. Without both gold and silver the people must sink in the scale of happiness and of civilization; they must languish in poverty; they must continue to struggle in vain to better their condition; they must toil on without even the hope of adequate reward.

Yet it is said that while there is a great, an all-pervading, all-destroying wrong, there is and can be no remedy—or at best no remedy except with the aid of those who are and will remain deaf to all appeals for relief.

The maxims of our race have proven false; the times, indeed, are out of joint, if at this day—this forlorn and unhappy day, this precise point of time out of all eternity—there is a right which can not be made to prevail, a wrong for which there is no remedy.

A PLAIN REMEDY.

But in spite of all dismal predictions to the contrary, it is not so. There is a remedy, plain, natural, and effectual.

That remedy is the enactment of a law by the Congress of these United States of America providing for the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver—such coin to be a lawful tender in payment of debts at the existing ratio of 16 to 1, without waiting for the aid of any other nation.

What would happen upon the passage of such a law?

It is predicted that many evils would come to afflict the people. It is said that gold would be driven from circulation; that we would at once pass to a silver basis; that thus a great and sudden contraction of the volume of money would take place, and that money, even silver, would be scarcer, would be more difficult to obtain than now.

At the same time it is said that by some illogical and devilish device, while dollars would be much scarcer and more difficult to obtain than now, when obtained their purchasing power would be actually much less than at present; the dollars at the same instant would cheat both him who parted with them and him who received them.

It is further said that such money would be an instrument of fraud and dishonesty; that though cold and spiritless and endowed with no moral attribute, it would be dishonest money. That such dollars would not be equal to the sum of all their parts, that they would not be double their halves or four times their quarters, that 100 cents would be, in reality, but 50.

It is claimed that the aggregate of indebtedness of all kinds in this country is as much as $60,000,000,000, and that the persons owing these debts would at once pay them off in the 50-cent silver dollars, thus despoiling and robbing the creditors of some $30,000,000,000. To the debtor it is also pointed that his creditor will no longer have compassion; that the claims of the latter will be suddenly and inexorably enforced, as in a panic, and that the former will be turned out without property and without hope.

Such are some of the diverse and direful evils which it is predicted will follow in the train of the free coinage of silver.

It is furthermore contended that this Government, alone and without the aid of other governments, can not maintain the parity between the metals with the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1.

Now it may be true that this Government as an artificial entity—separate and apart from the people and their commerce—could not maintain the parity. I do not believe that this Government cooperating with all other governments, acting merely as artificial entities and distinct from the people who carry on the commerce of the world, could maintain the parity. It may be conceded that governments as such can not at their mere behest create values or maintain parity. Such is not the function, the province, or the power of government, speaking with accurate and critical precision.

It is true that Congress alone has power to coin money. But when so coined Congress is absolved from all responsibility as to the value or parity of the money.

DEMAND GIVES VALUE.

An act of Congress authorizing the free coinage of gold and silver and making them a lawful legal tender for debts at 16 to 1 will not, strictly speaking, give value to either.

It is the demand for money which gives value to money.

Congress alone can, by coinage, make silver available to meet an already existing and unsatisfied demand for money. When so made available it is this demand for money which will give value to the silver coin, and not the act of legislation.

The present silver dollar does not derive its value beyond the bullion price from any acts of legislation or any Government pledge.

Without the demand for money, omnipresent and insatiate, which preceded as well as attended and followed the enactment of the law which authorized their coinage, then such law would have been utterly impotent to add a penny to the value of the silver out of which the dollars were coined.

A bimetallic law passed by Congress will not suffice, but such a law with the concurring condition of demand will achieve the desired result. We have now in this country one-half billion silver dollars, lawful tenders for debt at the ratio of 16 to 1 with gold; as against these dollars we have $60,000,000,000 of debts. Excluding other kinds of money, for debt-paying purposes alone there are 120 units of demand for every dollar in silver. Every such dollar is a prize for which there are 120 competitors. There is $4,000,000,000 worth of silver in the world. If under free coinage it were all brought here and coined there would still be $15 of indebtedness for every dollar in silver. Such is all the silver which has accumulated as the result of all the mining which has been carried on since the world began. How long must the world endure before it shall accumulate sufficient silver to equal the amount of our debts?

EUROPE NEEDS IT.

And the demand in Europe will hold all their coined silver there at the ratio of 15½ to 1. We can not get it. Asia, true to the practice of all her past, will retain her present supply and compete for the future product. No flood of silver will ever be seen. Under free coinage, so long as silver is in the slightest degree below par as compared with gold, the entire demand for money for payment of debts will fall upon silver. When at par the demand will rest indifferently upon both.

Thus, not our Government, but our people, in their demand for money will maintain the parity, and in this they will have the cooperation and assistance, not of foreign governments, but of the people of foreign governments with whom they do business and carry on trade. If this nation says that if there is a disparity between gold and silver its people shall have the privilege of paying in the cheaper metal, the world will know that it is too great to be coerced and potent enough to fulfill its promises. Foreign creditors and nations at once become interested in preventing disparity and thereby avoiding the loss which they would otherwise suffer.

Bimetallism is an automatic means of adjustment by which increasing demand falls upon diminishing value, and diminishing demand falls upon increasing value, thus restoring equilibrium and maintaining equality.

Supply and demand, the great centripetal and centrifugal forces of commerce, under bimetallism, will give value, maintain parity, prevent the divergency of the commercial from the legal ratio, as certainly as the great, analogous, countervailing forces in nature prevent the planets from flying from their orbits.

NO ONE WRONGED.

Will the free use of silver as well as gold for money cheat or defraud anyone of his just rights? If so, how?

The silver dollars under free coinage will be issued from the

mints on precisely the same terms, so far as their use in business and for payment of debts is concerned, as the silver coin now in existence has been issued. Two or three million dollars per month coined under existing law pass into circulation unperceived. The like amount, or any increased amount likely to be issued from the mints under free coinage, would be similarly absorbed.

If these dollars were used for the payment of debts, in the hands of the creditor, they would have a value, a purchasing power, a command over all the necessaries, conveniences, and luxuries of life, over everything that tends to the comfort of man or the elevation of the race—far greater, on the average, than was possessed by the dollars with which he parted in the creation of the debt. Then the creditor would have no right to complain. Such coinage would tend to arrest the fall of prices and would prove an inestimable boon to those now unable to carry on business, without continual loss, upon a falling market.

It would encourage investments in property and productive industry, and afford opportunity for employment to millions who might otherwise be in enforced idleness. It would lure money hoarded from its hiding place and set it to work honestly to perform the purposes for which money was designed—to effect exchanges, to facilitate trade, vitalize commerce, and stimulate to a higher and better civilization.

The money thus added by the use of silver would probably do no more than stay the downward tendency of prices. The added increment of currency would not compete with the existing money supply, but would readily find new fields of duty, new channels for employment, such fields being now unfruitful, lending no aid to human sustenance for lack of money.

Yet who can estimate the value to our people, to mankind, of the stable and uniform level of prices thus secured and maintained? Such money would be sound, not a delusive shibboleth, but in the highest and best sense of the word.

In view of the foregoing considerations, the provisions of the proposed legislation can be regarded with no milder emotion than that of astonishment. It is almost inconceivable that at this crisis of actual and threatened financial crash and general bankruptcy, due to arrested money supply, the evil consequences are by pernicious legislation to be multiplied upon the heads of the people.

SECTION 1. The standard unit of value shall, as now, be the dollar, and shall consist of 25.8 grains of gold, nine-tenths fine, or 23.22 grains of pure gold, being the one-tenth part of the eagle.

If such is now the standard, why this vain and idle declaration? If gold is not now the sole standard, why this false pretense except to mislead and deceive the people as to the effect of the legislation, to console them with the false assurance that they will not be worse off after than before the passage of this law?

The effect of the next provision is manifest:

SEC. 2. That all interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the payment of money, now existing or hereafter to be entered into, and all United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the law of July 14, 1890, shall be deemed and held to be payable in the gold coin of the United States, as defined in section 1 of this act; and all other obligations, public or private, for the payment of money, shall be performed in conformity with the standard established in said section.

The interest-bearing obligations of the United States July 1, 1899, were $1,046,048,750, all by the express terms of the contract and existing law now payable in gold or silver coin at the existing ratio.

By a message of President Cleveland in February, 1895, we are told that the difference in the market value of bonds amounting to $62,315,435, running thirty years, if payable in gold alone instead of coin, amounted to $16,174,770. Thus at this ratio upon the entire debt the Federal taxpaying people of the United States have paid ample consideration for the contract and legal right, while fulfulling every obligation of honesty and honor to pay in either gold or silver. This bill proposes to transfer this advantage of unestimated millions from the people to the bondholders.

Next, this bill proposes to convert the United States notes or greenbacks ($346,000,000) and the Treasury notes ($96,000,000), expressly payable in coin (both legal tender for debts and circulating as money), into debts to be paid in gold or to be turned into bonds bearing interest to be paid in gold. All the disadvantage and cost of this to the people it would be hard to calculate. It curtails the circulation about one-third, leading to a corresponding depressment of values and enhancement of all indebtedness, both public and private. The increase in the burden of debt and interest is not pleasant to contemplate by a tax-ridden people.

The final clause of section 2 is amazing in the ruthless robbery of the debtor for the benefit of the creditor which it is its object to bring about. It proposes the violation of the obligation of contracts and of every precept of constitutional and moral ethics.

If the parties have stipulated to pay in paper or silver or gold any or all it will not avail. Thus millions of people are to be despoiled by this arbitrary edict of legislation.

The proviso to section 2, that the legal-tender quality of silver is not to be interfered with, being in a flat contradition of the entire purpose and other express provisions of the act both preceding and following it, would by the courts be declared a nullity according to the maxim "Ut res magis valebat."

Now let us look into the effect of the subsequent provisions of the bill. There is much verbiage. But it all reduces to this: The Secretary of the Treasury is given an uncontrolled power to increase the national debt by the sale of bonds to be paid in gold, and with the gold thus or otherwise obtained redeem all outstanding greenbacks, Treasury notes, and silver certificates, which July 1, 1899, aggregated $803,005,223.

When all this paper is thus covered into the Treasury it can only again be paid out in exchange for gold, and must thereafter stand as nothing more than a certificate that so much gold has been deposited in the Treasury. None of this paper or the silver dollars ($563,697,082) or the national-bank notes now out or which may be issued will, after the passage of this bill, be available for the payment of debts if the creditor declines to receive it, because the first section requires that all debts, public and private, must be paid in gold. Every obligation payable in money is to be deemed payable in gold.

This is not true of the Senate substitute. The Senate substitute provides carefully, at the expense of the people, that the bondholders shall have their obligations payable specifically in gold coin. It takes care of the bondholders, who are mainly the banks, but it does not also take care of the great masses of the people. It provides that the bank notes issued by these people shall be payable in lawful money. In this sense the House bill is more universal and impartial in its operation. The Senate substitute discriminates wholly in favor of one class as against another.

Gold, in a word, is to be the only money. Whereas the total money or circulation in the United States July 1, 1899, as given by the Secretary of the Treasury, was $2,745,350,508, if this bill passes it will be only $963,498,384, being the amount of gold in the country according to the latest, though probably excessive, estimate of the Director of the Mint.

Thus the money which the debtor may lawfully tender in payment of his obligations will be reduced to one-third its present proportions.

The gold will be quite exhausted for use in the arts, for foreign exchange, and to supply the Treasury and bank reserves. The substituted bank notes will not be available for debt-paying purposes without the consent of the creditor.

Every man, every business, every industry in debt will thus be stricken down by this law and lie paralyzed and helpless at the feet of the creditor.

As under the proposed act the banks may issue bank notes to the par value of the United States bonds which they acquire, and as the Government is bound by law to accept bank notes when tendered in payment of dues to it, if issued the bonds may be obtained by banks without cost to them and upon which they may draw the interest as it accrues without a cent's outlay on their part. Therefore the banks have every inducement to turn into the Treasury all outstanding paper money and demand redemption in gold and thus force the issue of bonds. When the country is so reduced to the gold basis and flooded with bank notes, it will, in the first crisis, be found that the amount of gold is wholly inadequate for their payment.

Specie payments will accordingly be suspended and the business of the entire country will be at the mercy of the bankers' trust.

What will happen? What must happen? Is it possible for the ingenuity of man to devise and seriously undertake to consummate a scheme so appalling in its probable effects, so pregnant with infinite mischief? Like the hungry she wolf, there is abroad the voracious monster of greed, boundless in rapacity. Its subtle influence has benumbed the public conscience. The high ideals and benign example of those who with infinite sacrifice laid the foundation of the free institutions of the Republic are no longer potent in high places, but the objects of sneer and derision.

If justice and right now held sway, the forces here dictating legislation in these sacred Halls would take refuge in flight; if principle were predominant, they would turn tail. But, as it is, mention honesty to them and they but laugh at you. Rolling centuries end with the culmination of their audacity. So this brazen fraud will be written upon the statute book to ever after blacken the annals of the Republic.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. PLATT of New York, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That there be printed 200 copies of the annual report upon the improvement and care of public buildings and grounds and the care and maintenance of the Washington Monument in the District of Columbia, being Appendix 300 of the Annual Report of the Chief of Engineers for 1898, and 200 copies of the annual report upon the improvement and care of public buildings and grounds and the care and maintenance of the Washington Monument in the District of Columbia, being Appendix 300 of the Annual Report of the Chief of Engineers for 1899, for the use of the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds.

DIGEST OF DECISIONS AND PRECEDENTS.

Mr. PLATT of New York. From the Committee on Printing I report back unanimously, without amendment, the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] December 19, 1899, and I ask for its present consideration.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution; which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 3,000 additional copies of Senate Miscellaneous Document 278, second session Fifty-third Congress, the same being a "Digest of decisions and precedents of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, relating to their powers and privileges respecting their members and officers, and to investigations, contempts, libels, contumacious witnesses, expulsions," etc., as revised and new matter added, together with decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and other courts, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SPOONER. Is there anything there to indicate by whom this compilation was made?

Mr. PLATT of New York. I do not think it is indicated. All the work has been performed and the new matter incorporated as suggested by the special committee on the sugar-trust inquiry. The manuscript is brought down to date and includes all the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, the court of appeals, and the supreme court of the District of Columbia on what are known as the sugar-trust cases, and it also includes additional matter touching the powers and privileges of the two Houses of Congress.

Mr. SPOONER. I think it is a valuable work, undoubtedly, but I only wanted to know by whom the work had been done.

Mr. PLATT of New York. This document is especially desired by the House of Representatives on account of the pendency of the Roberts case, but the manuscript, as completed, is in the custody of the Senate.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator from New York if he proposes to have printed the decisions of the nisi prius courts in the District of Columbia on the sugar cases?

Mr. PLATT of New York. I can not answer as to that.

Mr. ALLEN. I thought I heard some Senator say that that was the purpose.

Mr. PLATT of New York. The resolution states exactly what it is desired to have printed. The resolution can be read again.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not want to object to the passage of the resolution, and I shall not do so, but I wish to submit an observation in connection with its submission to the Senate that I think is timely and I believe to be wise.

Mr. President, these precedents are without any value. Since I have been a member of the Senate, which is now going on seven years, with a few months' interruption, I have never seen a precedent followed in this Chamber. No man alive can tell what constitutes private or public legislation according to our rules. There have been five or six different rulings upon that subject, according to the caprice and whim of the presiding officer at the time.

Private legislation, Mr. President, is that legislation which affects private interests. Public legislation is that legislation which affects public interests. The distinction between the two kinds of legislation, according to the law books, is marked and distinct. No man, whether he is lawyer or layman, ought to stumble in determining the question. There are no two decisions in these precedents alike upon that subject.

So far as the sugar cases are concerned, Mr. President, that investigation was brought about by a resolution introduced by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to investigate some matters happening in New York, and an amendment was offered by myself, which was adopted, to investigate the sugar scandal. That was the principal thing investigated in 1894 under that resolution.

The committee of investigation, of which I was a member, was composed, I think, exclusively of lawyers, with one exception. We had some difficulty in getting witnesses. To my surprise, and I am used to surprises, I was informed by distinguished legal talent at that time that neither the Senate of the United States nor any other legislative body had power to protect itself by compulsory process and to inflict punishment upon derelict witnesses or contumacious witnesses for refusing to answer the process of the Senate or the committee.

That question was argued to some slight extent in the Chamber by Senators whose names I do not now recall. I think one of them was our late Senator from Oregon, Mr. Dolph, upon resolutions to bring the contumacious witnesses before the Senate and compel them to answer questions they had refused to answer before the committee, and as I recollect it the resolutions failed of passage in consequence of the widespread idea that the only power the Senate possessed was under a statute which was passed, I think, in 1857, or at least in antebellum days, to the effect that a man might be indicted in this District for a failure to answer proper questions put to him by an investigating committee.

Those witnesses were indicted under that statute in the District of Columbia and put upon their trial. One of them was tried before a judge and a jury and was convicted and sentenced to some forty days in the common jail of this District for a failure to answer. Two or three of them were tried elsewhere, and, to the utter amazement, I think, of the legal world, one of the judges held that the defendant could not be convicted because he had not been subpœnaed before the committee, although he appeared before the committee and was subject to its jurisdiction, and did not raise the question of his exemption at the time and followed the course of other witnesses.

Then, I think, he held also, if I am correctly informed (and I speak of this more particularly because I want the country lawyers, who are not supposed to know as much as these distinguished jurists, to understand it), that the witness could not be convicted because a question was put to him by one member of the committee which was not voted upon and sanctioned openly by the committee at the time, as though a question put by a member of an investigating committee which was not dissented from was not to be construed to be the question of the committee.

In other and perhaps in plainer words, Mr. President, that distinguished jurist and scintillating legal genius held that it was necessary for the entire committee to take up a question which was to be submitted to one of these witnesses and say, "That is the question of the committee," before it is put to him and before he would be responsible for contempt in failing to answer.

Mr. ALLISON. Where was that held?

Mr. ALLEN. That was held right in the district court of the District of Columbia by one of the present judges of that court. Mr. President, it would seem impossible, or at least preposterous, that any man who had the qualifications to occupy the position of judge of a high court of record at the national capital would either be so ignorant of the primary principles of the laws of evidence and of the laws of jurisdiction as to be guilty of a ruling of that kind.

Now, all this book of precedents is studded with stuff of that kind. Stuff is the proper expression. Of what earthly value is it? Do you want to send it to your constituents? Do I want to send it to mine? There is not a boy in the State of Nebraska who has been in a law office six weeks to whom I would send one of those books. It would mislead him. It would be an imposition upon his intelligence. I would not want him to take it in his hands or examine it.

Then, Mr. President, this book is to contain, or it used to contain, certain decisions which held that the courts of the United States had no power to make a man disclose his own complicity with questionable transactions, whether they were criminal or otherwise, if they reflected in the slightest degree upon his integrity, because, it was said, it is unconstitutional to make a man testify against himself. It is not unconstitutional to make a man testify against himself. There are some States which have constitutions of that kind.

The Constitution of the United States Government, Mr. President, is a constitution of enumerated powers. It is a government that is created, and that did not exist until the Constitution was adopted. It differs from a State constitution because the constitution of a State is a limitation upon power, and if a power is not limited expressly or impliedly by the constitution of the State it exists and adheres in the State. That is not the rule respecting the Constitution of the United States. So I say there is nothing in the Constitution of the United States which recognizes the rule that is recognized by some of these decisions.

So it comes to this, Mr. President, that whenever a man has cognizance of a questionable transaction which may in the slightest degree reflect upon his personal conduct, however important it may be to the Government to have his evidence, when he is called into court and a question is put to him, "Oh," he says, "that subjects me to the criticism of the people; it reflects upon my integrity, and any question of that kind I shall not answer," and the court is powerless to compel him to answer.

Mr. President, the true rule is—and it was the rule recognized by the English people and the English courts—that that which would incriminate a man and subject him to public infamy as a consequence of his crime he was not compelled to disclose in a case that would lead to his conviction or to his prosecution. There never was any other rule in this country or in Great Britain until it was recognized by some of the decisions that it is proposed to incorporate in this work of precedents. It would not be as valuable, Mr. President, except as a curiosity, as a Jayne's almanac of thirty years ago; it would not be half as valuable.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, this matter came up some time ago while I was chairman of the Committee on Printing. There is now in existence Senate Miscellaneous Document No. 278, which is a digest of the decisions and precedents of the Senate and House of Representatives in regard to their powers and privileges and election cases. But that was published in the Fifty-third Congress and has not been brought up to date. In fact, I think it is

pretty much out of print. There was a demand for this work, and at the time of the sugar-trust inquiry, when that committee of investigation sat, and both the Senator from Nebraska and myself were members of it, that committee felt that there was great need of bringing the precedents up to date, and the clerk of that committee, Mr. Smith, who had charge of the work of the committee, undertook, at the suggestion of that special committee, to complete that digest, which he did, and it is all ready now.

I reported the resolution for the printing, and it went to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and was reported back favorably and went to the Calendar. It was not acted on at the first session, but was taken up at the second session and agreed to. It was then found that the cost would exceed more than $500, and therefore had to be an act of both Houses. I reported a concurrent resolution for that purpose, but by a mistake the resolution was referred back to the committee instead of being placed upon the Calendar. In the meantime the House committee had agreed to a similar resolution and reported it to the House. The book has been a useful one in the past as a book of reference merely, which is all that it is.

I do not think I disagree at all with the Senator from Nebraska in his view of certain decisions which have been made here by a judge of one of the District courts in regard to questions which came up under the sugar-trust cases; but it seems to me the merit of those decisions does not affect the usefulness of the book. It is merely to get into a convenient form precedents and decisions to which there is constantly a necessity to refer.

As I have said, the resolution has been agreed to once by the Senate, and as it passed through my hands several times and I examined it I was satisfied that it was very desirable to have a reprint of this document, bringing the decisions down to date. Just at this moment there is an especial demand for the document in the House of Representatives. As is well known, they have a case there involving a great many questions of the privileges and powers of the Houses. I think the document is out of print, and I know that the House is very anxious to have it. I make this explanation because all of this thing went through the committee and through my hands before the Senator from New York took charge of it.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, the particular parts of this publication that I should like to see eliminated are the decisions in the sugar cases outside of the Chapman Case. The Chapman Case was tried before Judge Cox, and went before the District court of appeals or the District supreme court, and finally to the Supreme Court of the United States. I have no objection, and I think it will be probably wise to incorporate those three decisions and the precedents into this book; but the nisi prius trials in the other cases, that went off on the rulings I have spoken of, I think ought not to be printed and ought not to be circulated.

Mr. LODGE. Of course that would come within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Printing, and I have no doubt if the Senator from Nebraska will call the attention of the Senator from New York to that point when the book is going through the press the parts which the Senator considers objectionable could be perfectly well omitted. I do not suppose it was intended to put anything in the book except the decisions of the courts.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not want to bargain with the Senator from New York upon this matter. I do not want to object to the passage of the resolution, but I should like to have some indication that the decisions to which I refer are not to be incorporated in the document.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, there is no question whatever that the digest, if properly prepared, will be an important work. It would bring together the decisions and precedents upon a particular subject which has been of great interest at many times in the past and will doubtless be in the future. It will be a great aid to Senators, lawyers, and laymen to be able to find collated in one book the decisions and precedents upon the subject.

Mr. ALLEN. Like Barbour's New York Reports?

Mr. SPOONER. Like any digest. It is a new doctrine to me that decisions upon the subject should be eliminated from the digest because this Senator or that Senator or the other Senator happens to think that they were not good law. We might just as well make a digest and omit from it decisions which have been reversed or modified.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator permit me a question?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. If I have stated correctly the two propositions upon which one or two cases were decided, does the Senator think the decisions would be valuable as precedents?

Mr. SPOONER. No matter what I think, whether the reasoning of the court was justified or not, they are precedents upon the subject, and there may be lawyers who think they are justified.

Mr. ALLEN. Are they justified and are they in accordance with the established decisions and precedents?

Mr. SPOONER. Who was the judge?

Mr. ALLEN. I am somewhat modest about mentioning his name.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator from Nebraska had, while on the bench since he went out of the Senate, delivered an opinion upon some question of this kind, I should have wanted it included, even though I did not agree with him. I would ordinarily want all the law there is upon the subject. The Senate is not bound to follow that decision, and no other court is bound to follow the decision; but it is the contribution of a man presumably learned, and I think learned, and who is, I have no doubt, honest upon the subject. So I think it should be included. It belongs legitimately in such a digest. I should like to have included in the digest every pertinent decision made by any court in the country.

I understand there was an opinion delivered in the case which may be useful to lawyers who may wish to consult it hereafter. Some may disagree with it, others may agree with it, but in any event it forms a part of the law upon the subject. By the reasoning of my friend from Nebraska perhaps there are other decisions which he is willing to have included which I regard as very bad law and therefore, from his standpoint, ought to ask to have excluded. We ought to make this a complete digest.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator does not affirm whether he believes that is good law or not.

Mr. SPOONER. What is the proposition to which the Senator refers?

Mr. ALLEN. Where a judge held that, a witness being before a tribunal and a question being put to him which is proper in itself, the witness may decline to answer because he was not subpœnaed before that tribunal. That is one proposition which I should like to have the Senator affirm or disaffirm.

Mr. SPOONER. I think if the witness appeared before the committee and took the oath, he should answer.

Mr. ALLEN. Very well; this opinion holds the reverse.

Mr. SPOONER. That is where that judge and I differ, as I have differed with a great many judges.

Mr. ALLEN. I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin, and I am satisfied I was right a while ago.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator by that admission does his perspicacity credit.

Mr. ALLEN. The second proposition he affirmed was this: There being five or six members of the committee, each putting questions to the witness in person, all the others sitting as a body, without interruption and with the tacit consent of their associates, the judge held——

Mr. SPOONER. Was the question objected to by counsel for the witness?

Mr. ALLEN. No; nobody objected to it.

Mr. TELLER. Except the court.

Mr. ALLEN. The judge held that the decision was improper; that the witness had a right to decline to answer, and was not indictable under the statute, because the question did not have the active sanction of the members of the committee or the affirmative expression of their approval at the time it was put. Does the Senator hold that good law and worthy of perpetuation?

Mr. SPOONER. I think it is worthy of discussion.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator will allow me——

Mr. SPOONER. I think whether a man can be put in contempt for a failure to answer a question and the foundation be laid for a criminal proceeding might, perhaps, with some reason require some preliminary proceeding or action of the committee as a committee.

Mr. ALLEN. Then the proper course for a member of the committee to pursue, I suppose, would be, "May I put such and such a question?"

Mr. SPOONER. I say it is debatable.

Mr. ALLEN. And if a majority say yes, then you put the question?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALLEN. But if you put the question and the members of the committee sit there and do not object, and nobody objects, that is not the question of the committee?

Mr. SPOONER. I think that is a question that might admit of argument on both sides.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not think so.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President——

Mr. McCOMAS. If the Senator will yield to me a moment, the decision referred to in the nisi prius court was in a case almost of first impressions argued on either side by very able counsel, and perhaps presents the best accessible compendium of kindred discussions of the immediate question that can be had. That is one good reason why a decision of the nisi prius court upon a question which is new, unreversed, unappealed from, is the best accessible information, and there is a special reason, I submit with deference to the Senator from Nebraska, why this particular matter should be printed.

It is that the Senator from Nebraska has with very great unsuccess endeavored to state what was decided. I shall not, at a quarter after 5 in the afternoon, undertake to state my apprehension of the decision upon the two points by Justice Bradley; but when the Senator from Nebraska shall see them in print, as he may if this resolution passes, he will find that he has been quite unsuccessful and could have saved himself nearly all the comments which he has here made upon a state of facts and the rulings thereon, which are far from the decision, and certainly far from the reasoning of that learned justice.

Mr. SPOONER. I think it would be useful to have the facts stated in this digest if any court has made any such decision, because it will put committees on their guard, and it will be very easy for a committee to obviate any such question. It seems to me that the resolution ought to pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLAY in the chair). The question is on the adoption of the resolution reported by the Senator from New York.

Mr. PLATT of New York. Mr. President——

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator from New York desires the floor, I will yield to him, of course.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I only wished to ask that the vote be taken upon the passage of the resolution.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I admit that these decisions would be valuable as curiosities, and that would be their chief if not their only merit. When the Senator from Maryland [Mr. MCCOMAS] says that the decisions would be valuable as bringing together a compendium of discussion pro and con upon the first proposition, which I understood him to say is without precedent, I beg to call his attention to the fact that that question has been decided by the courts of this country years and years ago in scores and scores of cases.

The Senator from Maryland had the honor—and he worthily filled the position, I have no doubt—of presiding over one of the courts of record in this District for some years. I dare say that the Senator never made a decision, or never entertained the idea of making a decision, that a witness who had been sworn and was on the stand of a court could refuse to answer a question properly put to him by counsel because he had not been subpœnaed; and he would not have stopped, had the witness so declined, to look up precedents as to his power to punish that witness for contempt. That question is older than the Senator from Maryland and myself put together.

The other question, Mr. President, is equally without excuse, in my judgment. It may be, as the Senator from Maryland says, that I am misquoting the decision. I am speaking simply from my recollection; but I shall be glad, if I find myself mistaken, to address a letter of apology to the jurist who presided at that trial and to state publicly that I was mistaken. I have no compunction about things of that kind. Of course, there is not a person living who has sense enough to perform the ordinary functions of nature who does not know that the power to punish a contempt is an inherent power in every court and in every tribunal, whether the power be expressly conferred or not.

Suppose, Mr. President, this Chamber were invaded at this moment by three or four armed and lawless men, with the intention of breaking up its proceedings. Are we without any remedy or without any power except to call the Sergeant-at-Arms and his able and brave assistants to remove the invaders? After they have been so removed have we no power to bring them before the bar of the Senate and try them for contempt and pronounce judgment against them?

That is the argument which has been drifting along in this Chamber for five or six years to my knowledge, and yet we are told that precedents that uphold a doctrine so monstrous and so inexcusable have value in them. They have value exactly as a menagerie has value as affording an opportunity to look upon and examine the curios. That is all.

Now, if the honorable Senator from New York desires to put the precedents I have spoken of into this volume and send them broadcast throughout the land to corrupt the legal education of young men who are being educated for the law, he may do so, but I do not want any of them to invade my territory. We are undertaking to raise intelligent boys who will be a credit to the world wherever they go, who will have an education that is of some value, which will make them forces for good and intelligence in the communities in which they reside, and we do not want any of this kind of law scattered among them to corrupt their ideas of jurisprudence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution reported by the Senator from New York.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

NOTICE OF EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. DAVIS. I desire to give notice that on to-morrow at as early an hour as possible I shall move an executive session.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate resumes consideration of the unfinished business.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move the Senate proceed to the consideration of the executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the executive business. After forty-five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 6.05 p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 16, 1900, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 15, 1900.

ASSAYER OF THE MINT.

Charles H. Sherman, of California, to be assayer of the mint of the United States at San Francisco, Cal., to succeed Edward Elias, removed.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Peter F. Barclay, of Del Norte, Colo., to be receiver of public moneys at Del Norte, Colo., vice Elias E. Dorsey, term expired.

SURVEYOR-GENERAL OF MINNESOTA.

Eli S. Warner, of St. Paul, Minn., to be surveyor-general of Minnesota, vice Patrick H. Kirwan, term expired.

APPOINTMENT IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

THIRTY-THIRD INFANTRY.

First Sergt. Walter J. Scott, Company C, Thirty-third Infantry, United States Volunteers, to be second lieutenant, January 11, 1900, vice Willard, promoted.

PROMOTION IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

THIRTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY.

Second Lieut. Winston Pilcher, Thirty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, to be first lieutenant, January 9, 1900, vice Bowman, deceased.

APPOINTMENT IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

THIRTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY.

Battalion Sergt. Maj. Richard W. Walker, Thirty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, to be second lieutenant, January 11, 1900, vice Pilcher, promoted.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

Maj. Thomas H. Barry, assistant adjutant-general, to be assistant adjutant-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, January 10, 1900, vice MacArthur, appointed brigadier-general.

CAVALRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Wirt Davis, Eighth Cavalry, to be colonel, January 10, 1900, vice Young, Third Cavalry, appointed brigadier-general.

Maj. James M. Bell, First Cavalry, to be lieutenant-colonel, January 10, 1900, vice Davis, Eighth Cavalry, promoted.

Capt. Samuel L. Woodward, Tenth Cavalry, to be major, January 10, 1900, vice Bell, First Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Robert E. L. Michie, Second Cavalry, to be captain, January 10, 1900, vice Woodward, Tenth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Charles B. Drake, Fifth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant, January 10, 1900, vice Michie, Second Cavalry, promoted.

QUARTERMASTER'S DEPARTMENT.

To be quartermaster with the rank of major.

Capt. George Ruhlen, assistant quartermaster, January 6, 1900, vice Summerhayes, retired from active service.

APPOINTMENT IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

TO BE QUARTERMASTER OF VOLUNTEERS WITH THE RANK OF MAJOR.

Capt. Robert R. Stevens, assistant quartermaster, United States Army, January 11, 1900, vice Ruhlen, who vacates by promotion to quartermaster, United States Army.

CONFIRMATION.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 15, 1900.

POSTMASTER.

S. Davies Warfield, to be postmaster at Baltimore, in the county of Baltimore and State of Maryland.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *January 15, 1900.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 12, was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following credentials:

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
Frankfort, December 23, 1899.

The undersigned, a board for examining and canvassing the returns of an election held on Monday, the 18th day of December, 1899, for the purpose of electing a Representative to fill a vacancy in the Congress of the United States from the Seventh Congressional district of the State of Kentucky, do certify that June W. Gayle received the highest number of the votes given for that office, as certified to the secretary of state, and is therefore duly and regularly elected for the term prescribed by the Constitution.

WILLIAM S. PRYOR, *Chairman,*
WILLIAM T. ELLIS, *Member,*
CHAS. B. POYNTZ, *Member,*
State Board of Elections Commissioners for the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Attest:
C. R. CHENAUTT,
Secretary State Board of Elections Commissioners.

The Hon. June W. Gayle, a Representative-elect from the State of Kentucky, appeared at the bar of the House accompanied by his colleague, Mr. BERRY, of Kentucky.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to introduce my colleague, Hon. June W. Gayle, a Representative-elect from the Seventh Congressional district of the State of Kentucky.

The oath of office was accordingly administered to Mr. Gayle.

LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS.

Leave was granted Mr. MOODY of Oregon to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Wilbur F. Cogswell, Fifty-fourth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have a privileged report. By direction of the Committee on Appropriations I report a bill making appropriations to supply the urgent deficiencies in the appropriations of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and prior years.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois presents a privileged report, making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and prior years.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order.

Mr. PAYNE. I reserve all points of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas reserves all points of order. The bill will be ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to give notice that I will ask the House to take this bill under consideration to-morrow morning after the reading of the Journal.

COMMITTEE ON REVISION OF THE LAWS.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Revision of the Laws I present the following resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Revision of the Laws have leave to sit during the sessions of the House during the Fifty-sixth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Unanimous consent is asked for the present consideration of the resolution just read. Is there objection?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I observe that quite a number of the committees ask for this privilege, which is unusual. Unless there is some reason for it I do not think the committee should have this right to sit during the session.

Mr. WARNER. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that there is ample reason for this request. We have one bill containing 596 pages to go over, and it will be absolutely necessary to sit during the sessions of the House if we are to get through with the work.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Five hundred and ninety-six pages in one bill?

Mr. WARNER. In one bill, to say nothing of the others.

Mr. LLOYD. And there is another bill that has nearly 300 pages. So that we have two bills before us at the present time, covering nearly 1,000 pages, that must be carefully investigated, and we have not time to do it unless we sit during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries.

WAR VESSELS ON THE LAKES.

Mr. CLARKE of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a privileged report from the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The report will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to whom was referred the resolution (H. Res. No. 13) requesting the Secretary of State to furnish information to the House as to the status of the agreement between the United States and Great Britain which prohibits the building of or maintaining of more than a single war vessel on the Great Lakes, reports the same back with an amendment, as follows: In line 3 strike out the word "report" and insert in lieu thereof the word "communicate," and with the recommendation that the resolution as amended be adopted.

The original resolution is as follows:

"Whereas the Secretary of the Navy has decided that contractors owning or managing shipyards on the Great Lakes are not eligible to bid for the construction of war vessels because of the existence of a prohibitory agreement between the United States and Great Britain: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives*, That the Secretary of State be, and he hereby is, requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to report to the House the status of the agreement between the United States and Great Britain said to prohibit the building, arming, or maintaining of more than a single war vessel on the Great Lakes, such information to include all data bearing upon the subject now in the possession of the Department."

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from New Hampshire will permit me, he is doubtless aware of the fact that a full and exhaustive report was filed in December, 1892, upon this very question. Can he state whether other facts have developed since that time which make this resolution necessary?

Mr. CLARKE of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, the Committee have made the resolution broad enough to deal with the entire subject——

Mr. BURTON. I only ask the question, Mr. Speaker, because it seems to me that we have passed the inquiry stage in this matter and ought to act.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. CLARKE of New Hampshire, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries to report back the bill H. R. 4470, and to ask that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], the chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, is directed by that committee to report back to the House the bill H. R. 4470, and to recommend that the same be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Without objection, that order will be made.

There was no objection.

SCHOOLS IN THE INDIAN TERRITORY.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorial from white citizens of the Indian Territory, requesting Congress to provide an educational system for the Territory, and to make suitable appropriation therefor. I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD, so that the House may have information upon the subject.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] asks unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorial from citizens of the Indian Territory on the subject of education. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The memorial is as follows:

PROCEEDINGS OF THE INDIAN TERRITORY PUBLIC SCHOOLS ASSOCIATION IN CONVENTION ASSEMBLED AT PURCELL, IND. T., ON THE 2D DAY OF DECEMBER A. D. 1899.

RESOLUTIONS.

The Indian Territory Public Schools Association, in convention assembled at Purcell, Ind. T., on the 2d day of December, A. D. 1899, adopted the following resolutions:

Be it resolved by the people of the Indian Territory, assembled at the Public Schools Convention at Purcell, Ind. T., That

Whereas in every other State and Territory in the United States Congress and the State governments have abundantly provided for a permanent public-school fund by proceeds arising from sale and rental of vast areas of public lands; by proceeds of lands and other property and effects that may accrue by escheat, and from sale of estrays; from unclaimed dividends or distributive shares of the estates of deceased persons; also all grants, gifts, or devises that have been or may hereafter be made to the Government and not otherwise appropriated by the tenure of the grant, gift or devise, and by fines in many instances, which continually add to said permanent fund which

is invested or loaned and the interest or income each year distributed to counties or school districts, according to per capita, without regard to the wealth of such county or district, and being often sufficient to maintain a school in each district several months in each year, unaided by local taxation; and

Whereas in every other State and Territory in the United States local taxation may be voted or assessed by the people therein residing on the lands, and personal property, by a tax on occupation, and a per capita tax sufficient to maintain public schools from three to ten months in the year; and

Whereas the United States, on taking charge and control in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and Manila, in the Philippine Islands, have at once and without delay established public schools, free to all residents, and has provided for the maintenance thereof, showing its confidence and firm belief in the maxim, too true to be denied, viz, that intelligence and virtue are the safeguards of liberty and the bulwark of a free and good government; and that in order to establish and maintain a free and stable, good government, the youth must be properly educated and able soon to discharge intelligently and virtuously the duties of citizens and fitly handle affairs of state when the army and navy are withdrawn; and

Whereas there is now residing in the Indian Territory fully 200,000 white and negro people, not Indians, which number is rapidly increasing, and it is no longer questioned that these people will remain and be a permanent part of the population; and

Whereas Congress has the government and control of the Indian Territory, and especially of the white and negro people residing therein, and there is no permanent school fund to assist in maintaining public schools in the Territory; no provision or authority at all for establishing and maintaining public schools in the country districts; little or no real estate taxable for years to come; a people poor in wealth, whose children are growing up in ignorance, and too often in crime; whose cities and towns have no school houses or apparatus, and are handicapped by imperfect laws borrowed by job lot, regardless of applicability to conditions here: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we petition Congress for Federal aid to be granted at once; that in lieu of land grants made to other States and Territories a certain and specific sum be appropriated each year, or for a number of years, to be distributed to districts or communities per capita of persons between the ages of 6 and 21 years; that a more widely extended system of public schools be established—one that will reach all the children in town and country of school age.

We are living here. Our children are growing up to manhood and womanhood and are anxious to be educated. We earnestly desire that they shall be intelligent and virtuous and make good, useful, and respected American citizens. We are trying to help ourselves and are willing to be taxed, but ask and believe that we are entitled to that or its equivalent accorded the people in other States and Territories. We believe that if Federal aid is given us in a substantial and liberal way at once, crime will rapidly lessen and a great saving result in expenses of administering the criminal courts here.

In the cities and towns under the Curtis Act the highest aggregate rate of taxation is 2 per cent for all purposes whatever. The real estate is not taxable and can be only to a very limited extent for years to come. The improvements, in most instances, are not of a valuable or substantial nature, as most people have been unwilling to risk valuable buildings on lands belonging to an Indian tribe. It follows, therefore, that the bulk of the taxes must of necessity be raised for running the city government, public schools, keeping the streets in order, maintaining fire protection—a most difficult and costly problem here—providing for waterworks and sewerage, by a tax strictly on personal property. The bulk of this is in form of stocks of merchandise.

Under the Indian laws now being enforced by the United States Government all business men are required to pay a tax of 1 per cent or more on capital invested. The law is, in fact, more onerous, as it is 1 per cent on every invoice of goods handled; but the Indians exact it only on the capital invested and Uncle Sam winks, so to speak, at this liberal (?) concession.

The Indian governments in some nations require each non-citizen over the age of 18 years to pay $1 each year and a tax on horses and cattle and much other property where a family has more than two of a kind. As there are no laws for working the roads in the country leading to and from the towns, there is virtually a tax on business men of the town for the purpose of building and repairing the roads, bridges, etc., to encourage trade with the towns, and all towns act accordingly. The Indian governments do not provide for these matters at all. Therefore the business man figures, and rightfully, that he starts out with almost a 2 per cent tax before the city government gets hold of him.

We find our right to issue bonds in cities or towns for the purpose of building schoolhouses, etc., is doubtful, if not entirely denied, and ask a special law authorizing such bonds to be issued.

We believe the children living in the Indian Territory, in the heart of the United States, are entitled to at least as much consideration as those in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and Manila, and earnestly ask Congress to act promptly in their behalf.

Respectfully submitted.

H. C. POTTERF.
L. M. LOGAN.
G. W. GOODWIN.
J. W. HOCKER.
G. M. SNIDER.

Resolved, That the foregoing resolutions, together with the address of Hon. John D. Benedict, delivered before the association, be printed, and that copies of the same be sent to individual Congressmen of the United States and to the Committees on Indian Affairs of both the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, with special request that the same be presented to Congress and the resolutions and address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to the end that Congress may be made acquainted with the lamentable conditions existing in the Indian Territory, as set forth in said resolutions and address.

NEED OF EDUCATION.

[Address delivered by Hon. John D. Benedict, superintendent of schools, before the Public Schools Association at Purcell December 2, 1899.]

Generally speaking, there are two theories of government. The first is that in which all power is vested in the crown or monarch; the second is that in which all power is vested in the people and is exercised through representatives chosen by them.

Under the old monarchical form of government the people were considered as vassals or slaves, and the peace and permanence of the government depended largely upon the ability of the rulers to keep their subjects in ignorance. Education was not general, but was limited to the select few who were chosen to carry out the wishes of the of the king. When Charles I, who was King of England at the time of our earliest settlements in Massachusetts and Connecticut, stood upon the scaffold, sentenced to death by the English Parliament, it is said that in his dying breath he declared that the "people's right was only to have their life and property, a share in the Government being nothing pertaining to them." Persecuted by such a tyrant, it is no wonder that the Pilgrim Fathers were prompt in incorporating the other theory of government into their organic laws by proclaiming that the people are the rightful source of all power.

One of those early fathers wrote as follows: "After God had carried us safely to New England and we had builded our homes, provided necessaries for our livelihood, reared convenient places for God's worship, and settled the civil government, one of the next things we looked and longed after was to advance learning and perpetuate it to our posterity." Thus was the importance of an intelligent, educated citizenship recognized in the very beginning of our American governments. If the people were to rule, the people must be educated.

"We must educate or we must perish," exclaimed one of our early patriots, and the echoes of his voice have rolled down through the years, gathering added force and importance with each succeeding generation.

Why, it may be asked, did it become so necessary in America to educate all the people?

First. In a republican form of government the exercise of the right to vote demanded an intelligent citizenship; numerous and important political questions have arisen, and will continue to arise so long as free government exists, which require intelligence on the part of the voter to properly settle. As every citizen is alike affected by the legislation and policies of the government, it may be truthfully said that the welfare of every individual depends, in some degree, upon the degree of intelligence or education possessed by the voter. It has been and should continue to be the policy of our Government to increase and multiply the number of intelligent, educated citizens, so that they may be able to overcome the influence of those electors who are too often misguided by prejudice or ignorance.

Second. Our Constitution makes it the duty of every citizen, between certain ages, to bear arms in defense of his country in time of war, and I need only to refer to the events of our late war with Spain to prove the superiority of an educated soldiery, inspired by feelings of patriotism, over the standing armies of other nations, composed of ignorant or mercenary men, who are mere hirelings.

Third. The right and duty which the State imposes upon its citizens to act as jurors is a serious, solemn obligation which demands an intelligent citizenship. Your property, your reputation, your life may be placed in the hands of your neighbor who is summoned to sit in the jury box, and you have the right to demand that he possess that degree of intelligence necessary to enable him to carefully weigh the evidence and form his conclusions in accordance with right and justice.

Fourth. The right to hold office is another prerogative of the citizen, and whether the position is a minor or important one some degree of education is necessary in order to enable the official to properly perform the duties imposed upon him. The rights of the people are never secure in the hands of ignorant officials. Designing and unscrupulous men stand ever ready to misguide or corrupt the ignorant and the weak, and the politician who can not convert the thinking man with arguments too often endeavors to influence the ignorant with his unscrupulous appeals to prejudice and passion.

There are some of the solemn, responsible duties which our Government has imposed upon its citizens, and in the exercise of these duties the General Government has constantly urged the necessity of an educated, intelligent citizenship. But we hear it rumored that the Government can do nothing for the education of its future citizens whose lots have been cast in the Indian Territory. Let us hope that that will not be the serious, final decision of the powers that be, when their attention is properly called to the conditions that really exist in this land. Last week I had occasion to drive 35 miles from a certain railroad station in this Territory. On the way I passed through two villages and one well-settled farming community, and nowhere in all that long drive did I find a school of any kind. Within a radius of 2 miles from each of these villages could be found about 100 children, growing up in absolute ignorance. Perhaps it is needless for me to say that they were all white children, for the children of Indian blood have been provided with some educational facilities. Those little boys, who are now walking the streets of those villages or wandering aimlessly through the surrounding woods, will sooner or later be called upon by the Government to perform the solemn duties of citizenship which I have already enumerated.

Can the Government safely deem it a matter of indifference whether those boys are being properly fitted and trained for the performance of the important trusts? Will it not endanger the well-being of the community in which such an array of future citizens is allowed to grow up in ignorance? "Ignorance breeds crime," we often hear it said, and does not the Government find that crime is already too prevalent in this section of the country? I had occasion some weeks ago to show a Government official from Washington city some of the sights in and around Muskogee, and among other places of interest he visited the jail, where 250 men, accused of various crimes, were closely packed in a building not large enough to properly accommodate more than half that number. These unfortunate prisoners were projecting their heads through every available space in the doors and windows of the building, each one struggling to get a breath of pure air. As the visitor gazed upon that crowd, he exclaimed, "My God! I never expected to see such a sight as this anywhere in America." Sixty thousand dollars was appropriated by our last Congress for building new jails in the Territory, but not one penny for building new schoolhouses.

The Government is compelled to annually spend many thousands of dollars for catching and convicting criminals in the Territory, but it does not expend one dollar in the prevention of crime.

But it is said that some learned Congressman claims that the Government can not legally come to the rescue of the unfortunate white people of the Territory. Our Government has in the years past donated over 75,000,000 acres of land to the various colleges and universities of the country for the education of white college students, and the student of civil government will search in vain for any provision of our organic law which authorizes Congress to appropriate vast tracts of land while prohibiting it from appropriating money for the education of any class of its citizens. But we hear that some shrewd Congressman says "that it would be establishing a bad precedent to appropriate money for the education of the white children of the Territory; that the State or the Territory, and not the General Government, should provide the funds for establishing and maintaining free schools."

Webster says that "a precedent is something done or said that may authorize a similar subsequent act." So, Mr. Congressman, you need not fear the establishment of a vexatious precedent here, for nowhere else within the limits of our great country are the conditions "similar" to those now existing in this Territory.

You, Mr. Congressman, your associates, and predecessors are responsible for these existing conditions. You created them, and is it possible that you now propose to turn a deaf ear to the appeals of 200,000 white people who now reside in the Territory? Let us hope that some means will be devised by which the pall of ignorance which now enshrouds these people may be removed. The Indians of the Territory are fairly supplied with educational funds and facilities, but no part of their school funds can be used for the education of the white children of the Territory, and they are nontaxable.

The Government should sacredly keep its treaties and obligations with the

various Indian nations, but in doing so it need not necessarily ignore the rights and the needs of the white people. This Territory is peculiarly the home of the Indian. But the white man has been lawfully admitted here. He has paid his license to transact business here. He has builded homes and cities and developed farms, and they have vastly enhanced the Indian's allotments. He has built railroads, schoolhouses, churches, erected hotels and business houses. He has created a market for the native products, and if he proves true to his Anglo-Saxon characteristics he is here to stay. Since he has been admitted as a neighbor to the Indian, far better be it for the Indian to have him educated. An educated, intelligent white population can be of great benefit to the Indian, but an ignorant, degraded white man is the Indian's worst enemy.

The American common school is the greatest civilizing force in our midst. Follow the history, growth, and development of any State in the Union, and you will find that as fast as the free school has been reared upon its borders pillage and lawlessness have been crowded without. Not until the common school had gotten well established in Texas was it considered a safe place for a decent man to live. As fast as the little red schoolhouse appeared upon the hilltops and in the valleys of Kansas lawlessness, danger to life and property, disappeared. About a year ago I had occasion to visit the town of Holbrook, Ariz., a place once noted for its everyday crimes. While waiting for a train I sat upon a dry-goods box in front of a store which faced the principal street of the town, engaged in conversation with one of the old pioneers of the place. He told me of the times, not many years ago, when it seemed almost worth a man's life to walk the streets of the town beneath the midday sun. Many a time, he declared, he had seen wild, reckless cowboys gallop down the street, firing their revolvers right and left at everything in sight. Now all this is changed, and Holbrook is as quiet and orderly as the average Western town. "What, in your opinion, has been the cause of this change for the better?" I asked. "Didn't you hear that school bell ring around the corner there? That's it," he replied.

In my recent report to Washington, in referring to this sad condition of the white settlers, I used this language: "Congress ought to be induced to give this matter serious consideration, for conditions here are serious and anomalous. It can not be claimed that Congress would be establishing a dangerous precedent by affording relief to the residents of the Territory, for no other portion of the United States presents circumstances and conditions similar to those existing here. The jails of the Territory are filled to overflowing, and the Government is being urged to build more jails and penitentiaries. Let Congress make it possible to establish free schools in every town and township in the Territory, and crime and criminals will become less expensive to the Government.

The honorable Commissioner of Indian Affairs and Secretary of the Interior in their annual reports have urged Congressional action in this matter, but our Congressmen, in the midst of their multifarious duties, seldom have time to read and consider these reports.

I fear that not until the people cry aloud in the midst of their distress will relief come in any form.

As I look about over this lovely land, and see the numerous little cities and villages heroically struggling to establish free schools, my heart goes out in sympathy for them. If they could issue bonds with which to build schoolhouses, and could levy taxes upon real estate with which to maintain schools, as is customary in the States, they would scorn the idea of seeking aid from any outside source. But these things are impossible under present conditions. What, then, can be done?

First. There should be such an educational awakening aroused as will enlist the active interest of every parent in the Territory in the education of his children. Many are too careless and indifferent concerning the welfare of their children. Hundreds of boys are now aimlessly roaming the streets and woods, girls are being reared in indolence and ignorance, who might, even now, by proper exertion on the part of their parents, be in attendance at some good school. Every parent should be thoroughly impressed with the fact that it is a burning shame and an everlasting disgrace to bring up a child in ignorance, where, by any possible means, that child could be given any educational privileges or advantages. Prosperous and public-spirited men throughout the Territory should be encouraged and urged to contribute their means and their influence toward helping those who are helpless, and toward stirring up those who are indifferent.

Second. As to how Congress can be induced to come to our aid, it seems to me, can be answered in the words, organize, agitate. There ought to be such a united, determined appeal go up to Washington as will attract the attention of every member of Congress. Every city, village, and neighborhood in the Territory should organize, and every man and woman who is personally acquainted with a Congressman should write him a letter, describing existing conditions here. Every person who has a friend or relative back in the States who knows a Congressman should ask that friend or relative to appeal to such Congressman to lend his influence and his vote in support of this beneficent movement.

Congress is already being urged to establish public schools in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the far-away Philippines, and it will doubtless do it, for we all well know that no other agency can so thoroughly civilize, enlighten, transform, and Americanize those islands of the sea as the public school, and not until the American common school is thoroughly established there can order be restored or standing armies be dispensed with. If Congress is under obligation to provide free education in these far-away islands, whose civilization is foreign to ours, and who are not bound to us by any ties of race, history, tradition, or consanguinity, how much greater is its obligation to come to the relief of those in this Territory who are of our own blood, and who are entitled to every right, privilege, and prerogative of an American citizenship.

In the language of one of our old educational writers, "Let pride of military glory belong to foreign nations. Let the refined corruptions of the Old World attract the traveler to its splendid capitals. Let a fervid sun ripen for other countries the luxuries of a tropical clime, but let the schoolhouse and the church continue to be the boast of the American village. Let the American boy, whithersoever he may wander, leave that behind him which shall make him homesick for his native land. Let freedom and knowledge and morals and religion, as they are our birthright, continue to be the birthright of our children as long as time shall endure."

I, William H. Walker, secretary of the Indian Territory Public School Association, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the resolutions adopted by the association and the address delivered by Hon. John D. Benedict at the convention assembled at Purcell, Ind. T., the 2d day of December, A. D. 1899.

W. H. WALKER, *Secretary.*

Attest:
H. M. BUTLER,
President of Indian Territory Public School Association.

GEORGE JENISON.

Mr. BULL. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Accounts to present the following resolution and accompanying report and to ask for the immediate consideration of it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. BULL], chairman of the Committee on Accounts, presents the following privileged report and asks for its immediate consideration. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That George Jenison be continued as special messenger to serve in and about the House, under the direction of the Doorkeeper, at the same salary of $100 per month, to be paid out of the contingent fund, from January 4, 1900, until otherwise provided for.

The Committee on Accounts, to whom was referred House resolution No. 9, directing that George Jenison be continued as special messenger to serve in and about the House, under the direction of the Doorkeeper, at the same salary of $100 per month, to be paid out of the contingent fund, from January 4, 1900, until otherwise provided for, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to report as follows:

Mr. Jenison has been employed as a special messenger in and about the House since the Fifty-second Congress, under authority of resolutions identical in terms with the one herewith reported. Such resolutions have authorized payment out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided for. Payment out of the contingent fund ceased at the expiration of a session, and further provision for Mr. Jenison's employment and compensation was made either in the general deficiency bill or the legislative bill. The latter bill for the current fiscal year contains a provision which carried Mr. Jenison on the roll until the 4th day of January, 1900. The accompanying resolution continues his employment from that date. The resolution is reported favorably and its adoption recommended.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. BULL, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, is recognized.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin to yield to me for a moment to make a request for unanimous consent.

Mr. BABCOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the gentleman from Wisconsin to withhold the demand for the regular order for a moment. The gentleman from Ohio.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE DANFORD.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Friday next, from 1 o'clock in the afternoon, be set apart for eulogies upon the late LORENZO DANFORD, a member of Congress from Ohio.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] asks unanimous consent that Friday next, commencing at 1 o'clock, be set apart for eulogies on the life and services of the late Mr. DANFORD, of Ohio. Is there objection?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman to ask for Friday.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Under the rules every Friday is specially dedicated to certain work reported by the Committee on Claims and the Committee on War Claims, and I submit that the gentleman ought to take some other day than Friday. We have plenty of days other than Friday, to the setting apart of which no one will make objection.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I understand there is nothing from that committee ready for action.

Several MEMBERS. Oh, yes.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I understand there is. Some gentlemen on this side told me this morning that there was business from that committee which was ready. My colleague [Mr. SIMS], a member of that committee, sits in front of me, and he can state whether it is true or not.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will change my request, then, Mr. Speaker, and ask that Saturday be set apart.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio amends his request and asks that Saturday next, commencing at 1 o'clock, be set apart for eulogies on the life and character of the late Mr. DANFORD, of Ohio. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE BAIRD.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. I ask that Saturday, the 27th instant, commencing at 1 o'clock, be set apart for eulogies upon the Hon. SAMUEL T. BAIRD, late a Representative from Louisiana.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON] asks unanimous consent that Saturday, the 27th, commencing at 1 o'clock, be set apart for eulogies upon the late Mr. BAIRD, of Louisiana. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RIGHTS OF ALIENS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask consideration of the bill (H. R. 5297) to amend the act entitled "An act to better define and regulate the rights of aliens to hold and own real estate in the Territories," approved March 2, 1897.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to better define and regulate the rights of aliens to hold and own real estate in the Territories," approved March 2, 1897, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to extend to aliens the same privileges concerning the acquisition, holding, owning, and disposition of real estate in the District of Columbia as by that act are conferred upon them in respect of real estate in the Territories of the United States.

SEC. 2. That all laws and parts of laws so far as they conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr JENKINS] who reported the bill.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, this bill was brought to the attention of the House of Representatives by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. They were of the belief that two useful purposes would be served by the passage of this bill, one of which was to bring the present law in accordance with the spirit of the age and allow aliens to hold lands in the District of Columbia. The other was to save much valuable time in Congress.

Mr. LLOYD. I raise the point of order that we have no order.

Mr. JENKINS. Almost every week——

The SPEAKER. The Chair asks for order, so that members may understand what is being said.

Mr. JENKINS. Almost every week, Mr. Speaker, the attention of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and in consequence thereof the attention of the House, is invited to the claims of parties seeking relief from the present law; and the Attorney-General of the United States informs us that there never has been a single enforcement of the law of escheat in the District of Columbia, but that Congress has always been willing to afford relief to every alien that has come here and asked for it.

The sole purpose of the bill is to place alien ownership in the District of Columbia on the same legal basis as it exists in the Territories of the United States. I have carefully examined and brought together the laws on the subject, and will ask unanimous consent to have them submitted as a part of my remarks at this time.

Mr. RAY of New York. Under this amendment to the Territorial laws will it permit any alien to purchase, own, and hold real estate in the District of Columbia?

Mr. JENKINS. I did not hear what the gentleman from New York said.

Mr. RAY of New York. Under the law as proposed to amend it will it permit any alien to hold, own real estate in the District of Columbia?

Mr. JENKINS. It will, under certain limitations.

Mr. RAY of New York. Without any conditions or limitations whatever?

Mr. JENKINS. Oh, no; there are some conditions imposed. It simply makes the law of the Territories applicable to the District of Columbia and places them all on the same footing.

Mr. RAY of New York. Well, do you think that it is wise to extend the Territorial law to the District of Columbia?

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Speaker, a question of order. The House is in such disorder that we can not hear.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will call the attention of members to the fact that disorder frequently arises from the fact that gentlemen conduct their debates in a conversational tone, and the House can not hear.

Mr. RAY of New York. Mr. Speaker, with the permission——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to any gentleman.

Mr. RAY of New York. The point to which I was calling attention was simply this: I made inquiry whether or not this proposed amendment would permit any alien to purchase and own real estate in the District of Columbia, and the answer was in the affirmative. Then another inquiry was, were any limitations contained in the bill, and the gentleman answered that there were certain limitations; and then the inquiry was, whether he regarded it as wise to extend the Territorial law to the District of Columbia. I would like to have the gentleman point out, as briefly as he can, the limitations and restrictions, if there are any, upon this right different to those restrictions in the Territorial law?

Mr. JENKINS. It would take considerable time and require the production of the law of 1897. I could send and get it. This bill is practically in accordance with the legislation now of over forty States in the Union, and by an oversight, so we are informed, in the law of 1897, the District of Columbia was omitted. Now, then, the intention of this bill is simply to put aliens in the District of Columbia on the same footing with aliens in the Territories. It does not enlarge their rights in any single particular, but makes the laws of the Territories applicable to the District of Columbia.

Now, the bill has received the indorsement of the law department of the District of Columbia; the Commissioners prepared the bill and have recommended it. There can be no reason raised against it, because there is not a single instance where Congress has failed to relieve an alien where application has been made for relief, and it takes considerable time to do so. The Attorney-General of the United States has never enforced the rights of the United States.

Mr. HEPBURN. Why?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Will the gentleman state whether he considers the situation analogous between the Territories and the District of Columbia?

Mr. JENKINS. I do not see any reason, I will say in answer to the gentleman, why a man can not own property in the District of Columbia just as well as he can in any State of the Union or in one of the Territories of the United States, without reference to citizenship.

Mr. BABCOCK. I want to say to the gentleman from Michigan that the law in the Territories never applied to any town lots in any of the cities or villages of the Territories. When we speak of the Territorial law, the intention of Congress in 1897 was to prevent large ownership.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. But, as I understand it, this proposition was to permit an alien to own any class of property that he could acquire.

Mr. JENKINS. Yes, sir; by purchase or inheritance.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Will not this elaborate the old rule as it applies in the Territories?

Mr. JENKINS. Not at all; it simply applies the laws of the Territories to the District of Columbia.

By an act of Congress of 1801 the laws of the State of Virginia and of Maryland were continued in force in those parts, respectively, of the District of Columbia as had been ceded by each of those States to the General Government (act of February 27, 1801, section 1, 2 Statutes, 103, 104).

As by act of July 9, 1846 (9 Statutes, 35), President Polk, by proclamation of September 7, 1846, declared this act of full force as a result of the vote of the people of Alexandria County (9 Statutes, 1000). Congress retroceded to Virginia all of that portion of the District of Columbia which had been previously ceded to the United States; there are no State statutes in force in the District, as it now exists, except those of Maryland.

Among these is one which was passed by the legislature of Maryland in 1791, applicable to "the Territory of Columbia," materially modifying the common-law rule as to the acquisition of real estate by aliens (Maryland act of 1791, chapter 45, section 6; 2 Kilty, 321; 1 Dorsey, 272; cited in Dennis's Probat. Law, D. C., 8, 9). The act of Congress of July 16, 1790 (1 Stat., 130), establishing the seat of the Government, it should be said, provided for the appointment of commissioners to locate it, and for the removal of the public offices thereto on the first Monday in December, 1800.

It is said that engraved plans of the city of Washington were distributed abroad, and for a time lots brought high prices in London, as foreigners seemed to have more confidence than the natives in the success of the experiment. (The City of Washington; Its Origin and Administration, by John Addison Porter, Johns Hopkins University Studies, third series, XI, XII.)

The liberal act of 1791 was evidently meant to encourage these foreign investors. It provided:

That any foreigner may, by deed or will hereafter to be made, take and hold lands within that part of the said territory which lies within this State in the same manner as if he was a citizen of this State, and the same lands may be conveyed by him and transmitted to and be inherited by his heirs or relations as if he and they were citizens of this State: *Provided*, That no foreigner shall, in virtue hereof, be entitled to any further or other privilege of a citizen.

Until a few years ago it could be said of the District of Columbia that it was the only English-speaking political community that had from the beginning allowed aliens freely to acquire, hold, convey, and transmit real estate.

Maryland, though not herself excepting aliens from the disabilities of the common-law rule in this respect until 1859, and then only resident aliens, for all aliens were not excepted until 1874 (Bernheim, History of the Law of Aliens, 173), assumed an attitude toward them, so far as this part of her territory was concerned, as liberal as that of Jefferson, who declared that he did not believe that the rights of men were dependent upon the geography of their birth.

COMMON-LAW DISABILITIES.

At common law aliens could acquire real estate by purchase—that is, by any method except by descent—but as to such property they had only a defeasible title; it was liable to forfeiture to the Crown.

Until a judicial proceeding known as inquest of office was, however, undertaken and their title thereunto found defective, they could hold against the world. But by their conveyance only a defeasible title passed to the purchaser, and they could not transmit by descent at all. Nor could aliens inherit real estate, for the law would not do such a vain thing as to cast upon them

a title which the law itself would have to take away. (Bernheim, 125 et seq.: "Rights of aliens in England;" 11 Legal Observer, 192, and authorities cited.)

At common law personal property, which nowadays constitutes so large a part of the wealth of every civilized community, was for several reasons lightly regarded, and alien friends were freely permitted to acquire and hold this species of property. (1 Blackstone, 372; 3 Hume's Eng., 377 et seq.)

In modern times it must be confessed that if danger is to be apprehended from the ownership of our property by aliens it is in regard to the control of national funds and the stocks and bonds of corporations and not of land.

OPERATION OF THE MARYLAND STATUTE OF 1791.

The following cases relate to the ownership by aliens of land in the District of Columbia: Matthew *vs.* Rae (3 Cr. C. C., 699), Dixon *vs.* Walker (2 H. and H., 316), Walker *vs.* Potomac Ferry Co. (3 McA., 440), Dawson *vs.* Godfrey (4 Cr. (U. S.), 321), Orr *vs.* Hodgson (4 Wheat., 453), Spratt *vs.* Spratt (1 Pet., 343; 4 Pet., 393), Contee *vs.* Godfrey (1 Cr. C. C., 479), Jost *vs.* Jost (1 M., 487), Geofroy *vs.* Riggs (18 D. C., 33; reversed in 133 U. S., 250), and Pierce *vs.* Jacobs (18 D. C., 498).

At common law, as has been said, an alien could take land, except by descent or operation of law, and hold it until office found, for every one resident in England was presumed to be a natural-born subject owing an allegiance to the king until the contrary was judicially ascertained.

The hostility against the alien ownership of land is supposed by Blackstone to be due to the fear that the State might become subjected to foreign influences, but the real reason is traced by Bernheim to the policy of all early peoples, which recognizes citizens alone as having rights.

Under such a policy, strictly pursued, foreigners are enslaved and their property appropriated because they are not within the protection of the laws. The inhumane and discreditable operations of such a policy are visible in the attitude of England and these States, until a comparatively recent period, towards wrecks cast upon their shores.

This prejudice and hostility toward aliens naturally passed away with the growth of civilization. Maryland, in legislating for the Territory of Columbia, seems to have been the first State impressed with the importance of promoting trade and encouraging immigration by abolishing the antiquated rule of the common law. When Bernheim wrote his treatise on The History of the Law of Aliens in 1885, he was able to say that 33 of the States in this Union had in like manner brought their law in harmony with present conditions by permitting aliens to hold land (page 184).

No injury, inconvenience, or danger seems to have resulted from the Maryland act of 1791. So far as is known, there never was the slightest criticism of its provisions. In one respect it seems to have been subjected to a narrow construction.

The Supreme Court of the United States held (in Spratt *vs.* Spratt, 1 Pet., 343; 4 Pet., 393) that this act did not authorize the descent to alien heirs of land in the District which was acquired by the decedent after he had become a citizen of the United States.

This decision was favorable to the widow of the decedent, who, it may be said, should be permitted to inherit all of her husband's real estate when he dies without issue. There is a particularly strong reason for this favor to be shown all widows of aliens, whether they afterwards become citizens or not, because under the old statute of descents—which obtains in the District of Columbia—such widows might be left in partial if not total dependence upon the community, while the decedent's brothers or parents—aliens and nonresidents—might inherit the bulk of his realty.

RESTRICTIVE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1887.

Mr. Bernheim informs us that a few years before he wrote there had been considerable agitation and some discussion in Congress regarding the advisability of limiting the quantity of public land which nonresident aliens might hold.

As is well known, there was a disposition some years ago to prevent aliens, and especially foreign corporations, from acquiring large tracts of land in our Territories. On March 3, 1887 (24 Stat., 476), an act of Congress was approved which was meant, as its caption shows, "to restrict the ownership of real estate in the Territories to American citizens," etc. This act makes it—

unlawful for any person or persons not citizens of the United States, or who have not lawfully declared their intention to become such citizens, or for any corporation not created by or under the laws of the United States, or of some State or Territory of the United States, to hereafter acquire, hold, or own real estate so hereafter acquired, or any interest therein, in any of the Territories of the United States or in the District of Columbia, except such as may be acquired by inheritance—

Perhaps this merely preserves such right of inheritance as aliens have under the Maryland act of 1791. The act of 1887 is one containing, not grants, but limitations, and therefore aliens can not now take by inheritance except from each other, as was held in Spratt *vs.* Spratt, supra. (See De Geofrey *vs.* Riggs, 133 U. S., 258, 273)—

or in good faith in the ordinary course of justice in the collection of debts heretofore created: *Provided*, That the prohibition of this section shall not apply to cases in which the right to hold or dispose of lands in the United States is secured by existing treaties.

We have no such treaty with Great Britain. One is in process of negotiation.

to the citizens or subjects of foreign countries, etc.

Section 4 of the act declares—

that all property acquired, held, or owned in violation—

Of its provisions—

shall be forfeited to the United States, and it shall be the duty of the Attorney-General to enforce every such forfeiture by bill in equity or other proper process.

No such proceeding has ever been begun by him under this act.

This act went very much further than the mischief to be remedied required. We find that the next year it was so amended as to prevent it from applying to or operating in this District—

so far as relates to the ownership of legations, or the ownership of residences by representatives of foreign governments or attachés thereof. (Act of March 9, 1888, 25 Stat., 45.)

But the most remarkable amendment occurred ten years after its passage, urged apparently by the citizens of the very Territories who, it would appear, had procured the restriction. This act of March 2, 1897 (29 Stat., 618), contains the same prohibition as is found in the act of 1887, and saves as it does the rights of those to whom they have been guaranteed by treaties.

But it goes much further and provides that the restrictions shall not apply to land owned by aliens in the Territories which was acquired on or before March 3, 1887, so long as it is held by such owners, heirs, or legal representatives. This was doubtless inserted out of abundant caution. The court of appeals of the District of Columbia held, in Johnson *vs.* Elkins (1 App. D. C., 430, 441), that the act of 1887 applied only to titles acquired after the passage of the act.

It not only allows aliens who have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States the right to acquire and hold lands in the Territories, but also those who shall become bona fide residents of the United States, adding that if any of these should cease to be such residents, they shall have ten years from such time in which to alienate their lands. Moreover, it is provided that the restrictions of the act shall not be construed to prevent aliens from acquiring or holding lots of lands in cities, towns, or villages of any of the Territories.

Not only does it allow aliens to acquire lands by inheritance and, in the ordinary course of justice, in the collection of debts, but also by lending money and securing the same upon real estate. In this last-mentioned case, it is true, lands acquired by aliens through the enforcement of liens given as security for money lent are required to be sold within ten years after title is vested in such aliens, or they shall escheat to the United States.

This liberal act of 1897 allows even those aliens who may hold land in any of the Territories in contravention of the provisions of the act to convey their titles at any time before the institution of escheat proceedings, though it takes care, of course, to prohibit mere colorable conveyances meant to evade the provisions of the act.

Perhaps the most important concession to aliens contained in the act, and certainly the one which reflects most credit upon our policy, is that contained in section 6, which allows the proceeds of the sale of an alien's land acquired unlawfully and condemned by the court to be sold to remain in the hands of the clerk for one year, subject to the order of the alien owner of such lands or his heirs or legal representatives.

In other words, the treasury of the Territory in which the lands may be situated does not obtain the benefit of such confiscation unless the alien or his heirs or legal representatives sleep on their rights for one year. Finally, the act allows the alien, while the escheat proceedings are pending, to show to the court that he has become a bona fide resident of the United States or has declared his intention to become a citizen thereof, whereupon the suit is dismissed. It is distinctly enacted that the previous act (of 1887) shall remain in force and unchanged so far as it refers to or affects real estate in the District of Columbia.

RECENT LEGISLATION IN ENGLAND AND THE STATES.

We have, then, disabilities imposed upon aliens in the District of Columbia, though not in the other Territories of the United States, which nearly all other communities have removed by statute.

The parliamentary committee in Great Britain which sat in 1868 and 1869 recommended:

That the present disabilities of alienage in respect of the holding and inheritance of land should be abolished altogether. (Part III of the Report on Nationality, Parliamentary Papers of 1868 and 1869, volume XXV, cited by Bernheim, pages 131 et seq.)

This report was adopted, and the statute of 33 and 34 Victoria, chapter 14, was enacted in 1870, which declares that—

Real and personal property of every description may be taken, acquired, held, and disposed of by an alien in the same manner in all respects as by a natural-born British subject, and a title to real and personal property of every description may be derived through, from, or in succession to an alien in the same manner in all respects as through, from, or in succession to a natural-born British subject. (2 Am. and Eng. Encycl. Law, 2d ed., 80. See also 18 Am. Law Reg., N. S., 465.)

The common-law rules were adopted by all of these States except Louisiana, but they have been materially modified in nearly all of them. The American Encyclopædia of Law informs us that in many of them "resident aliens are placed on the same footing as natural-born citizens as to the right to acquire, hold, and transmit property, both real and personal," and in others "the same liberal policy has been pursued toward nonresident aliens." (2 Am. and Eng. Encycl. Law, 2d ed., 76.)

It has been found in Delaware and in New York, where the disabilities have been allowed to remain, that private acts relieving against them have come to be an invariable usage. (Bernheim, 169, 178.)

This, too, is the custom in the District of Columbia. An alien acquires real property in the District. The statute of 1887 is not self-executing, but makes it the duty of the Attorney-General to proceed against such property to enforce forfeiture. That officer usually has not the information upon which to proceed, and, it is likely, has no disposition to secure the confiscation. Yet until he takes such action "the title is not subject to attack by others." (Johnson *vs.* Elkins, 1 App. D. C., 430, 441.)

The alien owner wishes to convey and the title is found defeasible, or he dies and uncertainty as to the inheritance arises. At once upon request an enabling act is passed, such, for example, as that of March 18, 1897, "for the relief of the heirs of Pom K. Soh, deceased;" or that of April 4, 1896, which expressly relieves the real estate itself conveyed by an alien from the operations of the act of 1887, and exempts it from all forfeitures incurred under it. (29 Stat., 712.)

The time of Congress is thus unprofitably consumed, to the exclusion of much important business. The fact that relief against the act is always afforded individuals upon request is sufficient reason why the disabilities imposed upon them by it should be removed by a general statute such as adorns the legislative rolls of Great Britain, or that they should be materially lessened, as has been effected by our act of 1897 relating to the Territories.

As was said by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK], when the law was passed in 1887 to prevent foreigners coming to this country and purchasing large tracts of land and holding them adverse to what might be called Americanism, it was there provided that that should not apply to city lots, showing it to be the intention of Congress that aliens might acquire city lots.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I see no especial objection to the ownership of property in Territories by aliens, but I can see how it would work great detriment in the District of Columbia if the door were to be left wide open and foreigners permitted to come in and buy property that we might desire afterwards for public purposes.

Mr. JENKINS. They can do it in your State.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Yes; but that is not in the capital of the nation. Our State is vastly different from the District of Columbia, where the General Government exercises complete jurisdiction, over the territory and for the identical purpose of wholesome control. Foreigners owe no duty here and could not be made to defend this capital. Why should we give them rights in contravention of the common law?

Mr. JENKINS. After full consideration of this bill by the Commissioners of the District this morning and by the attorney of the District, the committee made this report, and we could not see the least objection, or the least particle of danger to this country, or to the capital of the nation, in allowing aliens to acquire property in the District of Columbia without limitation. As I have said, there has never been a single instance where Congress has refused relief.

Here is an instance that was called to our attention in the last Congress. A gentleman came here from Canada and brought his young son with him, and they both entered the Union army and served during the entire civil war. At the close of the civil war the old gentlemen returned to Canada and died. The young man made his home in the city of Washington, purchased a piece of property, which was very cheap at the time and subsequently became worth over $40,000 at a time when he wanted to sell it.

It was found that the title was defective from the fact that it had escheated to the Government because his father was an alien; that he was an alien and there was no proof whatever of the citizenship of either the young man or his father, and he had to lose the property or come to Congress to get the necessary relief. Upon the attention of Congress being called to it, it immediately passed a bill for his relief.

That is only one of the forty or fifty cases which have been called to the attention of the District Committee within the last two years.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. If the gentleman will permit me, I would like to ask whether the report that he stated was a part of his remarks is too long to be read for the information of the House. I would like to know the exact reasons for this departure from the old rule. I call for the reading of the report.

Mr. JENKINS. I have said nothing about any report. I said this morning I had gathered together the entire law on the subject, which is quite lengthy, and that I desired to submit that as a part of my remarks, showing the reason for making the change.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Oh, I misunderstood the gentleman. I thought he gave notice of his intention to incorporate a report in his remarks.

Mr. JENKINS. The report refers to three several acts.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to any gentleman.

Mr. LACEY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin in charge of the measure if he is prepared now to explain to the House what difference there is under the existing law between the District of Columbia and the Territory of Arizona or any other Territory—just what particular differences there are between the laws relating to the two?

Mr. JENKINS. I have sent for the act. I will ask that the act of 1897 be read from the Clerk's desk for the information of the House and particularly to answer the question of the gentleman from Iowa.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act to better define and regulate the rights of aliens to hold and own real estate in the Territories.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That an act entitled "An act to restrict the ownership of real estate in the Territories to American citizens," etc., approved March 3, 1887, except so far as it affects real estate in the District of Columbia, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"That no alien or person who is not a citizen of the United States, or who has not declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States in the manner provided by law, shall acquire title to or own any land in any of the Territories of the United States, except as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That the prohibition of this section shall not apply to cases in which the right to hold or dispose of lands in the United States is secured by existing treaties to citizens or subjects of foreign countries, which rights, so far as they may exist by force of any such treaty, shall continue to exist so long as such treaties are in force, and no longer.

"SEC. 2. That this act shall not apply to land now owned in any of the Territories of the United States by aliens, which was acquired on or before March 3, 1887, so long as it is held by the then owners, their heirs or legal representatives, nor to any alien who shall become a bona fide resident of the United States, and any alien who shall become a bona fide resident of the United States, or shall have declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States in the manner provided by law, shall have the right to acquire and hold lands in either of the Territories of the United States upon the same terms as citizens of the United States.

Provided, That if any such resident alien shall cease to be a bona fide resident of the United States, then such alien shall have ten years from the time he ceases to be such bona fide resident in which to alienate such lands. This act shall not be construed to prevent any persons not citizens of the United States from acquiring or holding lots or parcels of lands in any incorporated or platted city, town, or village, or in any mine or mining claim, in any of the Territories of the United States.

SEC. 3. That this act shall not prevent aliens from acquiring lands or any interests therein by inheritance or in the ordinary course of justice in the collection of debts, nor from acquiring liens on real estate or any interest therein, nor from lending money and securing the same upon real estate or any interest therein; nor from enforcing any such lien, nor from acquiring and holding title to such real estate, or any interest therein, upon which a lien may have heretofore or may hereafter be fixed, or upon which a loan of money may have been heretofore or hereafter may be made and secured: *Provided, however*, That all lands so acquired shall be sold within ten years after title shall be perfected in him under said sale or the same shall escheat to the United States and be forfeited as hereinafter provided.

"SEC. 4. That any alien who shall hereafter hold lands in any of the Territories of the United States in contravention of the provisions of this act may nevertheless convey his title thereto at any time before the institution of escheat proceedings as hereinafter provided: *Provided, however*, That if any such conveyance shall be made by such alien, either to an alien or to a citizen of the United States, in trust and for the purpose and with the intention of evading the provisions of this act, such conveyance shall be null and void, and any such lands so conveyed shall be forfeited and escheat to the United States.

"SEC. 5. That it shall be the duty of the Attorney-General of the United States, when he shall be informed or have reason to believe that land in any of the Territories of the United States are being held contrary to the provisions of this act, to institute or cause to be instituted suit in behalf of the United States in the district court of the Territory in the district where such land or a part thereof may be situated, praying for the escheat of the same on behalf of the United States to the United States:

"*Provided*, That before any such suit is instituted the Attorney-General shall give or cause to be given ninety days' notice by registered letter of his intention to sue, or by personal notice directed to or delivered to the owner

of said land, or to the person who last rendered the same for taxation, or his agent, and to all other persons having an interest in such lands of which he may have actual or constructive notice. In the event personal notice can not be obtained in some one of the modes above provided, then said notice shall be given by publication in some newspaper published in the county where the land is situate, and if no newspaper is published in said county then the said notice shall be published in some newspaper nearest said county.

"SEC. 6. That if it shall be determined upon the trial of any such escheat proceedings that the lands are held contrary to the provisions of this act, the court trying said cause shall render judgment condemning such lands, and shall order the same to be sold as under execution; and the proceeds of such sale, after deducting costs of such suit, shall be paid to the clerk of such court so rendering judgment, and said funds shall remain in the hands of such clerk for one year from the date of such payment, subject to the order of the alien owner of such lands, or his heirs or legal representatives; and if not claimed within the period of one year such clerk shall pay the same into the treasury of the Territory in which the lands may be situated, for the benefit of the available school fund of said Territory:

Provided, That the defendant in any such escheat proceedings may, at any time before final judgment, suggest and show to the court that he has conformed with the law, either becoming a bona fide resident of the United States, or by declaring his intention of becoming a citizen of the United States, or by the doing or happening of any other act which, under the provisions of this act would entitle him to hold or own real estate, which being admitted or proved, such suit shall be dismissed on payment of costs and a reasonable attorney fee to be fixed by the court.

SEC. 7. That this act shall not in any manner be construed to refer to the District of Columbia, nor to authorize aliens to acquire title from the United States to any of the public lands of the United States, or to in any manner affect or change the laws regulating the disposal of the public lands of the United States. And the act of which this act is an amendment shall remain in force and unchanged by this act so far as it refers to or affects real estate in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 8. That all laws and parts of laws, so far as they conflict with the provisions of this act, are hereby repealed.

Approved, March 2, 1897.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. The time for the discussion of this proposition appears to be under the control of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from Wisconsin. Am I correct in that?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin controls one hour of the time.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I would like to ask who controls the time in opposition to the measure?

The SPEAKER. After the gentleman from Wisconsin has exhausted his hour, if no other member of the committee rises in opposition, the gentleman from Michigan will be recognized.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the act of 1887 was practically declaratory of the common law upon this subject, with one or two exceptions, to which I desire to call attention. I have the act before me, but it takes so much time to read the lengthy statutes that I shall confine myself to a brief explanation of the law as it exists, and while I speak from memory I think I can give to the members of the House the exact condition of the law as it appears upon the statute books; and if in any respect I shall be incorrect, or my memory is at fault, I shall yield very gladly to any gentleman to make any statement of correction with reference to the matter.

The original act provided simply that aliens could not acquire title to real estate, as provided in the law, except by inheritance or in good faith in the ordinary course of justice for the recovery of debt.

Subsequently, in 1888, the statute was amended with a view to avoiding a violation of treaty stipulations with which it came in contact and to extend the rights of aliens to hold property here, such as the attachés of foreign legations and others who might in the course of their connection with such embassies acquire title to lands in the United States.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we come to the act of 1897, which has been read and to which I desire to call your special attention. This act extended the privileges of the former act to the Territories of the United States, but excluded the District of Columbia. The remedial provision in this act of 1897 provided that parties might loan money, for instance, and secure themselves, notwithstanding that they were aliens, and could enforce their right in the courts and obtain title for property so purchased or acquired.

But while this remedial provision extended the provisions of the law to the various States of the Union the District of Columbia was omitted, so that no provision exists for the acquisition of title here under such circumstances.

This bill, therefore, that the committee now recommends simply extends the remedial rights or privilege to parties living in the District of Columbia, and is intended to relieve Congress of the labor of looking after these various individual cases which come up from time to time.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia in conference with the committee this morning—because of what they regard as the importance of the measure—stated the necessity of the enactment and cited the cases of parties living here who had no remedy at all at law, notwithstanding the fact that aliens were coming here and acquiring property; and they brought to the attention of the committee ten or fifteen cases where Congress had been asked to relieve individuals from disabilities which the committee do not believe the law was originally designed to exclude from their rights so far as our investigation has been able to go.

Now, again, for fear that in the noise and confusion some gentlemen had not heard the statement, I will say that this bill is drawn by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and that it has the approval of the two legal gentlemen connected with the District. They are all Americans, and they have recommended to Congress that aliens living in the District of Columbia be put on the same footing as aliens owning land in the several Territories of the United States.

The fact that at the time the act of 1887 was passed those owning city lots and village lots were exempted is a clear indication that the Congress of the United States did not intend to deprive aliens of all rights. And then, again, Congress on its own motion passed the law of 1897, so remedial in its nature.

Now I will yield such time to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] as he requires.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to address the House particularly upon the merits of this bill, but I am moved to say what I am about to say by the kindliness of my heart, in the fear that in the noise and confusion some of our Populist friends have not yet ascertained what is going on in the House.

Mr. RIDGELY. Perhaps that is true.

Mr. HEPBURN. I do this because I know that this subject is very dear, indeed, to them. Only a few years ago, Mr. Speaker, this question of the alien ownership of lands was made by our Populist friends one of the burning questions. Their platforms used to declaim against it. Their speeches were full of the perils to the Republic because of the ownership by foreigners of our broad acres. They used to publish long lists showing that Lord A owned so much, and Lord B owned so much, and the Earl of something else owned so much, showing that millions of acres, as they claimed, were now in the hands of the foreigner, the enemy of the Republic; that this alien ownership was a process constantly going on, and that in a little while it would result in turning the American out and intalling the foreigner in his place as the owner of the lands of the United States.

I noticed that two or three years ago, when a modification of this law was sought looking to the possibility of these alien gentlemen in some of the Populistic territories being able to buy lands, although I then called their attention to the subject and to the great peril of it, not one of them had a word to say about it. Now I am afraid, from the silence thus far observed, that again they are going to forget what they have said in their platforms, what they have declaimed upon the stump, what they have led many people unfamiliar with the subject to believe was a great peril. In other words, I am afraid that they have on some occasions been using this bugaboo as a lever to hoist themselves into place, and that they are now forgetful of the means by which they arrived in place; that they are now forgetting the men whom they had wrought up to such a frenzy upon this subject.

I hope these gentlemen will not be silent when this outrage is being perpetrated upon the American citizen. I hope they will come to the front now with some of the vehemence which used to characterize them in the old campaigns of a very few years ago, and that they will not be forgetful of what they then said, now that there is a proposition to enlarge the power of the foreigner, not simply in the outlying Territories, not in remote districts, but right here in the very heart and capital of the Republic you are going to let the foreigner get a foothold.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. My attention was diverted at the moment, and I did not hear the reading of the bill. I judge, however, from the gentleman's remarks that it is a bill to permit the alien ownership of the soil in the District of Columbia. Am I to understand that the gentleman from Iowa is in favor of the bill?

Mr. HEPBURN. I am simply here now as a friend of the Populist. [Laughter.] I am not advocating or opposing the bill. I say in reply to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] that I have been fearful that in the noise and confusion he has been taken advantage of, and that he did not know what was going on, and I took my place on the floor, simply because my tones may sometimes be somewhat stentorian, for the purpose of waking him out of the lethargy in which he seems to be at this particular moment. [Laughter.]

Mr. RIDGELY. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Populist can tender his thanks after I am through. I desire to thank the gentleman from Iowa for having called my attention to the subject, because though by no means related to or affiliated with the Populists, I

believe in the old common-law doctrine that forbids an alien to own the soil, and I shall try to defeat this bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HEPBURN. The gentleman is entirely welcome to any service I have rendered to him, although I am sure I am not entitled to his thanks, because I did not for one moment think that he was at all allied to those gentlemen whom I had called the Populists. [Laughter.]

Mr. RIDGELY. Now will the gentleman permit a word?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. RIDGELY. I want also to thank the gentleman, and to call the attention of the House, and the Speaker especially, to the fact that we have twice called for order during the reading of this bill and its explanation by the gentleman in charge of it, and until this moment we did not know what was happening.

Mr. HEPBURN. Now, Mr. Speaker, having served the purpose for which I arose, and having awakened the gentleman, I will take my seat. [Laughter.]

Mr. RIDGELY. We thank you.

Mr. JENKINS. I now yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH].

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Mr. Speaker, the inquiry which I propounded to the gentleman in charge of this bill related solely to the reason for this departure from the settled rule that has heretofore applied in the District of Columbia, and I was prompted to do so because I believed in my own mind that it was an uncalled-for innovation, that it had not been properly understood, and that it would bear further consideration and study before it was acted upon.

Personally, I believe that the land in the District of Columbia is more sacred than almost any land in any State or Territory. It is territory that the General Government exercises jurisdiction over and every citizen of the country has an interest in. Distinct limitations apply to it. For one I do not believe that the door should be opened wide and aliens permitted to come in here and purchase or own this property in the District of Columbia. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill what is to hinder a foreign syndicate or a corporation from coming in here and acquiring large tracts of valuable property and holding it, and holding it, indeed, against the best interests of the District of Columbia and possibly of the General Government?

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that this departure would be wise. The gentleman from Wisconsin says that Congress never has failed to pass remedial legislation in matters of this kind, where estates have been acquired by aliens and title was sought to be perfected. I am perfectly willing to do that where the circumstances warrant it. A special bill introduced for the purpose of quieting any title or fixing a definite and distinct title in a person who acquires that property is, I think, a fit subject for Congressional consideration; but I do not believe it is wise at this time, or prudent, nor do I believe that the circumstances warrant us in opening the door so wide to alien ownership of District property, as is done in this bill.

Mr. LACEY. I would like to ask my friend from Michigan this question. At present an alien may acquire title to a town lot in Guthrie, Prescott, or Santa Fe?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Yes; by virtue of a special law of Congress.

Mr. LACEY (continuing). Or in any State or Territory?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Yes; in many of the States.

Mr. LACEY. But the States regulate that themselves?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Yes; Congress is not concerned.

Mr. LACEY. But, so far as the Territories are concerned, I would ask what is there so sacred about a town lot on Thirty-fifth street in the District of Columbia that would distinguish it from a town lot in Santa Fe or Guthrie?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. My answer to the gentleman is——

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Speaker, let us have order.

The SPEAKER. The House is in good order, but the Chair will ask for a little better order.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. The gentleman from Iowa asks what there is so sacred in the ownership of a town lot in this District of Columbia that should distinguish it from one in Arizona. My answer to that is this: That we have a Territory here fixed and limited, over which the United States exercises jurisdiction and authority, and we only pretend to exercise that jurisdiction over the Territory of Arizona or New Mexico temporarily.

Arizona may soon pass into the Union as a State. Who knows? It is in the province of this Congress to so decree whenever it pleases; and when it does pass, the supervision and control and direction of the State of Arizona will then apply to all of that land; but never in the history of the Republic will the Government of the United States qualify in the slightest degree the authority which it exercises at present over the District of Columbia. This is one spot in which the United States of America will always exercise supreme authority, and I hope it will make this city the pride of every citizen and the most attractive city in the world.

Mr. LACEY. I should like to ask my friend another question. May not a foreigner acquire title to a town lot in the capital of Michigan?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Yes; by the courtesy of legislative enactment.

Mr. LACEY. What is there so different about the capital of Michigan and the capital of the United States to make it safe for a foreigner to acquire title to a town lot in the capital of Michigan and yet be necessary to keep him out of the city of Washington?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. A foreigner, an alien, may acquire a town lot in the city of Lansing, but the government of the State of Michigan does not pretend to exercise jurisdiction or control over the town lots of the city of Lansing or extend unusual privileges to owners, as the General Government does here. If our State acquires any title, it must purchase it in the usual way; but here, in the District of Columbia, there is a territory of 60 square miles, as I believe, that is devoted to the purposes of the General Government, and everything is subservient thereto; and, Mr. Speaker, I would preserve the situation as it is, subservient to the wishes of the General Government, and not by any wholesale legislation of this character invite foreigners to come in here and take up desirable property and hold it, when they owe no allegiance to our country, pay no attention to our Government, and have no interest therein save to profit by our enterprise. Therefore I am opposed, utterly and completely, to this radical departure from the present principles that apply to the District of Columbia, and I hope the bill may be defeated.

Mr. BABCOCK. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that I can offer a suggestion that will obviate the objections of not only the gentleman from Michigan but also the gentleman from Texas. The object in introducing this bill and bringing it to the attention of Congress is to relieve the aliens in the District who are now owning property that they can neither dispose of, utilize, improve, nor mortgage. Since I have been connected with the District Committee we have passed somewhere in the neighborhood of fifty bills through this House for the relief of individual cases. In no instance has there ever been an objection. The committee now has a number of bills before it, and on the first bill the Commissioners have made this report and submitted a draft of this bill to cover all such cases, which the committee thought a good one. That is the object of it.

Now, to do away with the objection of the gentleman from Michigan, I will offer this amendment. The amendment is simply to relieve those that own real estate in the District and gives them no right to acquire real estate in the future. I will send the bill to the desk and ask that the amendment be read.

Mr. RAY of New York. Will you not have the bill read as it will be with the amendment in?

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks that the bill be read, and in connection therewith an amendment which he offers thereto. If there is no objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the act entitled "An act to better define and regulate the rights of aliens to hold and own real estate in the Territories," approved March 2, 1887, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to extend to aliens now owning real estate in the District of Columbia the same rights and privileges concerning the acquisition, holding, owning, and disposition of real estate in the District of Columbia as by that act are conferred upon them in respect of real estate in the Territories of the United States.

SEC. 2. That all laws and parts of laws so far as they conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

With the following amendment:

In line 7, after the word "aliens," insert the words "now owning real estate in the District of Columbia."

Mr. BABCOCK. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make an inquiry of the gentleman. In the first place, it seems to me that no alien could be owning real estate in the District of Columbia, except under some special dispensation of Congress.

Mr. BABCOCK. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that the abstracts of title from the title insurance companies and other instruments will show that aliens do own this real estate, but it is contrary to law.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Then the plain duty of the officers is to file proceedings of escheat. This bill would simply deprive the law officers of the Government of the power and the authority to enforce the law against men who are daily violating the law, and these men owe no allegiance to the Government of the United States.

Mr. BABCOCK. I do not understand that there is any case in

this city where there is any question about it. There is no question as to these parties having paid for, or given a consideration for, the real estate they are supposed to own.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. That is a matter between individuals, but the right of an alien to own and sell property is of much more importance.

Mr. BABCOCK. This bill, with my amendment, will not extend to aliens the right to acquire property in the future, but gives the right to those now holding it to dispose of it. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that unless we pass some measure of this kind, we are going to be confronted by more than fifty individual bills, not one of which will there be any objection to. They will consume the time of the committee and the time of the House, and this bill simply disposes of them in a bunch.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. If the gentleman will prepare a bill that will authorize these aliens to dispose of the property which they hold in violation of law, I will support it.

Mr. BABCOCK. That is what this bill does.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Your bill does not so state.

Mr. OLMSTED. You leave the word "acquisition" in.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS rose.

The SPEAKER. To which gentleman does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. BABCOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, in the report which accompanies this bill the committee used the following language:

> The act of 1887 forfeits to the United States all property held or owned in violation of its provisions, while the act of 1897 allows aliens to dispose of their real estate before the institution of escheat proceedings, and even after sale under such proceedings the proceeds are subject to the order of the alien owner for a period of one year.

Now, therefore, it follows if the object of this bill be to allow aliens to dispose of their real estate in the District of Columbia, the bill is absolutely useless, because they already have the right under the act of 1897.

Mr. BABCOCK. That law does not apply to the District of Columbia, but only to the Territories.

Mr. JENKINS. This bill undertakes to apply the Territorial law to this District. That is all this bill seeks to do.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think this matter can be settled without difficulty.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. I want to ask the gentleman in charge of this bill whether it is not true that, under its provisions, aliens now owning real estate in the city of Washington may increase their ownership by additional purchases?

Mr. BABCOCK. Not if the amendment which I have offered be adopted. This simply confirms the right of those who now own real estate, but does not give them the privilege of further acquiring property in the District.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. But does not the amendment, by its very terms, give the same right to own and acquire property in the District?

Mr. BABCOCK. I think, if the gentleman will allow me——

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BABCOCK. I do.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I desire to suggest to the gentleman that a careful reading of his amendment will show that it not only confirms the title in these aliens as a separate and distinct class, but will enable them to purchase property hereafter and acquire title to it. Now, if the gentleman will change the language of his amendment, and give simply the power to sell and dispose of property, there would be no trouble whatever about it.

Mr. BABCOCK. Very well, I will meet the wishes of gentlemen in that regard by asking to have the word "acquisition," in line 7, stricken out of the bill——

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Wisconsin that one or two members have asked to be heard in opposition to the pending bill. The gentleman from Wisconsin yielded a part of his time; but gentlemen who are not members of the committee have indicated a desire to be heard. The Chair is disposed to give all members a fair opportunity of discussing the matter, and if no member of the committee desires to be heard at this time, will recognize some one outside of the committee to occupy the floor under the rule.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think we can save time if the gentleman from Wisconsin simply desires to adopt the measure before the House to secure to the present owners of property the right to dispose of the same.

Speaking for myself, and I do not doubt that I speak for other gentlemen on this side of the House, we are perfectly willing to facilitate such a proceeding as that. But it seems to me that the only way to accomplish that purpose, in so far as the pending bill is concerned, is to make such an amendment to it as will make clear and definite the object sought to be accomplished—that is to say, that it shall contain a provision concerning the disposition of the real estate now held by these parties, and not a provision allowing them to acquire additional real estate. There is a provision to sell, and authority to receive the proceeds. That is no more than fair and just. Nobody objects to that.

Mr. JENKINS. This bill does not change the ordinary rule which prevails in reference to the acquisition of property in the District or in the Territories.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. All that I am concerned in, Mr. Speaker, is as to whether we shall provide some method by which these people may dispose of this property which they have in some way acquired.

Mr. JENKINS. This bill, I will state to the gentleman from Texas, does not change the former law in that regard.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. If by consent we can lay it aside for a little time, and let us have an opportunity of examining more carefully the act of 1897, which has been cited, it might be possible to save a good deal of time in the consideration of the matter.

Mr. JENKINS. I have no possible objection to that.

Mr. BABCOCK. Then I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that this bill be laid aside temporarily.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that this bill be laid aside temporarily for the purpose of enabling members to examine the law bearing upon the subject. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

TAX DEPARTMENTS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5042.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union to consider the bill (H. R. 5042) to provide for improvements in the tax departments of the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Speaker, before that motion is put I wish to say that this is a bill making an appropriation, and that it was not properly referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. The proper committee for this bill was the Committee on Appropriations. The two rules covering the matter are very explicit, and provide that the District Committee shall have charge of all matters relating to District affairs except bills carrying appropriations. Appropriations relating to the District should go to the Committee on Appropriations.

Now, it may be this is a measure that ought to be adopted. I am not going to say as to that, because the subject has never been before the Committee on Appropriations. It was not submitted to the committee at the last session. Many matters have been submitted, and have come over from session to session, but this was never submitted to the Committee on Appropriations and they have never investigated it.

You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that the bill, in the first place, authorizes the institution of the card system; but that is unnecessary. The power inheres in the Commissioners, by virtue of the organic act, to institute the system, and all they really want is the money.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. GROUT. Certainly.

Mr. JENKINS. I want to say to the gentleman from Vermont that after a conference with the Commissioners this morning, and the executive officers of the taxing department having charge of this matter, I feel certain that legislation is necessary to enable them to make this change, and the only justification which the committee has for dealing with this small appropriation is the fact that the amount is within the annual appropriation and does not increase the appropriation.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Speaker, on that point we can in no better way learn whether it is necessary than by referring to a parallel instance in one of the Departments of the Government. The card system was instituted in the War Department. General Ainsworth, the head of the Record and Pension Division of the War Department, came to the committee asking for an appropriation for additional clerks to institute that system, as he said, and clerks were given him for that purpose, but not a word was said about the card system. The authority to institute the system existed in the Department as a function of administration, and it so exists in the Commissioners in this case. It is not a matter requiring legislation at all. The proposition, it seems to me, is wholly unnecessary. If, however, gentlemen of the District Committee do not take this view and feel that the Committee on Appropriations have not the authority to deal with it without authority from Congress, why then they can strike out the appropriation and pass the bill, and have the appropriation to be made by the Committee on Appropriations, as the rules provide; but I assure the Speaker that the Committee on Appropriations are not

in doubt as to their authority to deal with the subject, and if they were satisfied upon investigation that this appropriation should be made, they would undoubtedly allow it.

I will say further that I do not rise to put myself in the attitude of opposing this bill. I simply call the attention of the House to the fact that this is a matter which should go to the Committee on Appropriations, and to suggest what will appear to everyone as proper in the premises; and that is that appropriations should be carried together and not scattered helter-skelter through bills which provide legislation. The Committee on Appropriations could deal with it in the regular order. If there is occasion for haste, let it be offered as an amendment to the urgent deficiency bill, which is reported this morning and will be before the House to-morrow. It will be germane to that bill. There are provisions for the District of Columbia in the urgent deficiency bill, and if there is special urgency for this it might properly go into that bill.

If gentlemen do not see fit to take this course, I am not going to array myself against the passage of this bill. I desire simply to call the attention of the House to the fact. I will not raise the point of order under the rule. If any other gentleman sees fit to do so, he can; but I only want to call the attention of those having charge of the matter to the fact that if this practice is continued we shall have to invoke the rule in the future.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The point of order made by the gentleman from Vermont, as the Chair understands, is that this committee—the Committee on the District of Columbia——

Mr. BABCOCK. I do not understand that the gentleman from Vermont makes the point of order.

The SPEAKER (continuing). Has no jurisdiction over this bill because it contains an appropriation. It has been said by Speaker Crisp, Speaker Reed, and others that an erroneous reference of a public bill, remaining uncorrected, in effect gives jurisdiction to the committee. The House has had its day in court to have the erroneous reference corrected and has failed to do so. The Chair is of the opinion, therefore, that this matter is properly within the control of this committee, and that it is within the power of the House, in considering the bill, to determine whether to leave the appropriation in the bill or to strike the appropriation out of the bill and leave only the matters of general legislation.

Mr. GROUT. If the Chair will permit me. I did not wish to be understood as raising the point of order. The Speaker was actively engaged in examining the authorities when I stated that I would not raise the point of order. I simply made a suggestion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not understand the remarks of the gentleman upon the point of order, and therefore the remarks of the Chair would not apply. The question is: Shall the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of this bill?

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. HOPKINS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill H. R. 5042. The Clerk will read the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5042) to provide for improvements in the tax departments of the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to enable the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enlarge the rooms now occupied by the assessor and collector of taxes of the District of Columbia and to rearrange the space so as to better accommodate the public who have occasion to transact business with those offices, and to provide fixtures and pay other necessary expenses incident thereto, and to put in operation the card system for the improvement of the business methods of those offices, including the temporary hire of clerks, the sum of $4,000, or so much thereof as may be needed, is hereby appropriated, one-half out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated and the other half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, to be immediately available.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, Mr. Chairman, as shown in the title, the bill is one to improve the condition of things in the tax department of the District of Columbia, The Commissioners, being advised that some change in the methods of doing business and some enlargement of the rooms down there are necessary, appointed a committee of four experts that have had long experience in the tax department of the District of Columbia, and directed them to make a close examination of the rooms and the condition of things, and the methods of doing business, and also as to the amount required to make the necessary change in order to facilitate the doing of business in that department.

The committee spent some time in making a very careful examination of the matters intrusted to them and went to several cities for the purpose of getting information in regard to the subject; and they found the most satisfactory plan in the city of Providence, in the State of Rhode Island; but they also visited the city of Boston and some other large cities, where a large amount of business of this kind was done, for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the Commissioners of the District the very best method of doing business here.

Now, they have reported back to the Commissioners, and the Commissioners themselves took the subject up, and then the matter was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. That committee also gave a hearing to the taxing officers here in the District, and also made a personal inspection of the methods and of the rooms where the change is contemplated, and the committee are unanimous, Mr. Chairman, in favor of the passage of this bill and a change in the system of doing business, and of making the appropriation of $4,000.

Now, it was not the intention of the committee to trench upon the rights of the Committee on Appropriations; but because of the fact that the legislation embraced in this bill properly belongs to the Committee on the District of Columbia and it was for that committee to say whether or not this bill should be favorably recommended to the House, they also included this question of appropriations, because the amount is within the annual appropriation for that department. Now, we are satisfied, from a careful inspection, as I have said, that it will not increase the cost or will not increase the expenses of the District a single dollar, but that in a year or two it will cheapen the cost of the collection of taxes in the District of Columbia.

Now, every three years there has been appropriated—and everything indicates that the appropriation will have to be continued—the sum of $3,000 for the purpose of preparing what is called the numerical book of the District of Columbia, which contains the names of all the owners of all the property here so far as it is possible to obtain that information, giving a description of the land, the value of the property, the value of the improvements, and a great many other things which are required by the law. The District Commissioners did not feel authorized to go on and complete that without the direction of Congress; and in fact the committee are of the opinion that under the law they can not go any further than they have done in the way of changing the methods. They have spent $1,500 in the purchase of cards for the purpose of introducing the card system here in the way of doing business.

Now, as the matter stands, it is very inconvenient to the owners of property here. It is almost impossible, under the present method, for parties to know whether they have paid their taxes or not. By the introduction of the card system it brings to the attention of the Commissioners every day the daily changes of ownership of property, and in a few minutes they can look up the ownership of any piece of property, and it enables them at a glance to know who is the owner, its value, and the amount of taxes, etc.

It is conceded by all gentlemen who have given this matter attention that the system of cards should be introduced, and that expense will be saved in the purchase of cards instead of the publication of books. That book is required by the law, and it is impossible to change it; and after that book is made out there is no way of ascertaining if there has been or there is any subdivision of the property, and the Commissioners have no way of keeping track of that except by putting out an annual. As will be understood, it is like an annual book instead of a codification, and it takes much time whenever it is necessary to look through the various books in order to give the taxpayer the information he requires.

At present, if a party goes down to the District building for the purpose of paying his taxes, the officers and clerks have to spend the time to examine some fourteen different volumes in order that they may know that the party has all the property described in the receipt. Now, all that they would have to do under the new system would be to pull out a card which tells at a glance the information required.

Now, the gentlemen down there have stated to us this morning, what they stated in the committee the other day, that there have been times within the last year when at least 5,000 people have been kept waiting trying to pay their taxes, and that two or three times over 500 people were required to remain out of doors at a stormy time, the rooms being insufficient to permit them to do the business.

Now, they simply propose, by making a few changes at an expenditure of $1,500, to put in two or three additional places to accommodate the taxpayers and to allow two lines of people to come in and go out at once without any confusion, while at present only one line can come in, and they have to jam against one another in endeavoring to get out. In other words, there will be one way for the taxpayer to get in and another for him to get out, and thus prevent confusion.

The appropriation of $4,000 includes the employment of a few temporary clerks for the purpose of making the change, but as soon as that is done no permanent clerks will be required. The committee are assured from this examination that in less than one year the annual appropriation for this branch of business will be decreased at least one-fourth, if not one-third. Now, if there is

any gentleman who desires any question answered, I shall be glad to do it.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentlemen state his amendment?

Mr. BINGHAM. It is to strike out the appropriation.

Mr. JENKINS. I will yield to the gentleman for the purpose of offering the amendment.

Mr. BINGHAM. But I desire to offer some remarks in connection therewith.

Mr. JENKINS. Certainly.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I desire in connection with the proposed legislation, fully recognizing the usefulness as well as the convenience of this proposed change, to emphasize to the House the necessity of what might be called a fair, orderly procedure in the business of the House. It is the function of the Committee on the District of Columbia to submit on the day assigned such legislation as they determine or consider will be for good administration in the District. I have no doubt this proposition is in favor of good administration. But I hold and claim that this very line of work can be done under the power that to-day rests with the District Commissioners through official administration. Further than that, should it be necessary, then the legislation is proper; but the right to appropriate on legislation does not belong to the Committee on the District of Columbia, but is a part of the appropriation bill that comes from the Committee on Appropriations.

Now, it is proposed by the Commissioners to inaugurate what is called the card system. General Ainsworth, of the War Department, introduced the card system that runs to every volunteer in the war of the rebellion, nearly three millions, covering claims of soldiers, as well as widows and orphans, by the simple addition in the general appropriation, the legislative bill—by an increased appropriation for stationery, as well as for such necessary clerks for that work. It is simply administrative, and therefore I think in the interest of orderly appropriation. The Committee on the District of Columbia should come into this House and recommend legislation for the District, and after that the Appropriation Committee should take up the legislation made statute by Congress and appropriate in the proper bill. I move to strike out the appropriation. In making the motion, Mr. Chairman, I submit to the committee in charge of the bill that I do not believe the legislation proposed is necessary, because I am of opinion the organic authority of the District will allow this; it is simply a change in the method of administration.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have a very high regard for the opinion of my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania who has just taken his seat, and I am exceedingly sorry that in the present instance I can not agree with him.

The Committee on the District of Columbia is confronted with many propositions which must be taken into consideration where new law is to be enacted, and where it becomes absolutely essential in order to carry such law into effect to couple with the law an appropriation for that purpose.

Now, in reply to the argument just made by the gentleman, I would say that the circumstances surrounding the present case are of a peculiar character. I would say further to the gentleman that if we were to adopt his suggestion and try to bring in this proposition as an amendment on an appropriation bill, it would be subject to the point of order.

In the very nature of the case this proposition requires an appropriation. It has been suggested, however, by various gentlemen that we pass the bill without the appropriation. But what would be the effect? It would be an absolute waste of time. The action would be useless. The legislation would have no effect. Gentlemen say that we can put it in the general deficiency bill and move it as an amendment, at the proper time, to cover the expenditure which the bill itself proposes. But I must beg to take issue with gentlemen on that point. There are difficulties in the way although they tell us that it will "make us feel better."

Now, I do not know the particular provision in the urgency deficiency bill where this subject would properly be included. I can not undertake to suggest where it should be embodied in that bill; and therefore I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] will not prevail. I will state frankly to the gentleman that it would be a great deal better to defeat the bill entirely, because if this amendment is adopted it would make it simply a farce and would not accomplish the purpose intended.

I ask a vote on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will submit the question.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin says it will be "a farce" if the appropriation is stricken out of the bill or if it is passed with the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I wish to say to him and to the House that it will simply confine the Committee on the District of Columbia to what the rule gives them—that is, to legislate for the District—and leave to the Committee on Appropriations the work assigned to that committee by the rule, namely, that of making appropriations for the expenses of the District under the law. That is all that the amendment of my friend from Pennsylvania seeks to accomplish. If it makes a farce of the proceedings, then the rules of the House are farcical, and we have no safe guide on which to predicate our action.

Mr. BABCOCK. Of course the gentleman from Vermont understands that if the appropriations for the District of Columbia are not sufficient or not specific for such a purpose there is no power in the Commissioners——

Mr. GROUT. But they are specific.

Mr. BABCOCK (continuing). And no appropriation can be expended by the Commissioners of the District excepting for a specific purpose which is authorized by Congress.

Mr. GROUT. Undoubtedly, but a sum of money is appropriated for clerical assistance, we will say, and is placed under the control of the District Commissioners.

Mr. BABCOCK. That is true, but unless provision is made in the law for an office to which the appropriation might apply the Commissioners would have no right to use the money for that purpose.

Mr. GROUT. Certainly not. The law is specific in that regard; but this is the question—and I have some delicacy in suggesting it, because I happen to be on the subcommittee in charge of District appropriations—whether the Committee on the District of Columbia shall be allowed to usurp the functions of the Committee on Appropriations and make appropriations in this desultory way; whether, in short, it is not better to have these appropriations brought before the House in one budget in accordance with the rules. If the gentleman thinks that there is not authority to appropriate this money, very well. Let him pass his bill and give the committee authority. That is within his proper province. His committee proposes legislation and the Committee on Appropriations appropriate the money. But for the sake of decency and good order in the business of the House, and for the sake of the observance of the rules of the House, let him drop out the appropriation and let the Committee on Appropriations deal with that.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, if this is a violation of the rules, I want to withdraw the bill. I do not want to present anything to this House that is a violation of the rules. The Speaker has ruled that it is not.

Mr. GROUT. Oh, no.

Mr. BABCOCK. And he stated that Speaker Crisp and Speaker Reed and others have held the same way.

Mr. GROUT. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. BABCOCK. The gentleman can have all the time he desires when I get through.

Now, I want to say another word, not only to the gentleman from Vermont, but to the House. I have endeavored to cull out from the bills referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia everything that other committees in this House have proper jurisdiction of, and have cautioned the clerk of our committee and the chairmen of the subcommittees to take up no matter that we could possibly turn over to any other committee.

Time and time again I have sent bills to the Appropriations Committee, as the gentleman from Vermont well knows. But this has been the practice of the House as long as it has considered District matters. This is a class of legislation which, if you pass at all, you must necessarily couple with an appropriation. Why, with the bills opening streets we have had to carry special appropriations to pay for the surveys and the general expense of the reports on those streets—not to pay for the property, because that is left with the Appropriations Committee. But if we pass a bill to open a street without making an appropriation for this incidental expense, we might just as well pass no bill at all. This is a measure of the same kind, and I am entirely satisfied to have the committee decide the matter.

Mr. BINGHAM. This is permanent establishment, to go on forever.

Mr. BABCOCK. If the House decides that the Committee on the District of Columbia has no authority under the rules to do this, I shall be satisfied. I claim that our committee have jurisdiction of the matter. I contend that the District appropriation bills proper and the continuing appropriations are the legislation which go to the Committee on Appropriations under the rules, not special things or new legislation. I claim that the committee are right in presenting this report, and that it is properly here under the rules. If you want to strike out the appropriation, gentlemen, strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, one word. The gentleman from Wisconsin says that the Speaker held that this is not in violation of the rule. He held no such thing. He merely held that because the point of order was not raised before the bill was considered and reported to the House, that then it was too late to make the point of order; that the reference was improper. That

would be the rule as to a public bill, though not as to a private bill. This being a public bill, that would apply. In fact, however, I made no point of order, but merely stated in a general way the objection to this procedure, and made a suggestion as to the way by which this bill could be disposed of in an orderly manner, namely, by letting it go into the urgent deficiency bill.

Now, one thing more with reference to what the gentleman from Wisconsin says. He says they have referred certain bills to other committees. Yes; they have. They have sent down to the Committee on Appropriations a bill which in every section and sentence provides legislation and says not a word about an appropriation, with which that committee has no power whatever to deal. That is a bill which we shall bring back into the House on the first opportunity and ask to have re-referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. It is a bill regulating the hours of policemen's work, which is totally outside the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations. It is sent to us by the District Committee on the ground that it involves an appropriation. Yes, if the bill were to become a law it would reduce the hours of policemen's work, and that would make necessary a larger number of policemen, and would of course require a larger appropriation.

So by that sort of reasoning they refuse to take jurisdiction of that bill and send it to the Committee on Appropriations, who can not deal with it; but they do take jurisdiction of this bill, with which they have no business whatever under the rule. Had the rule been invoked in season, the reference would have been canceled and the bill would have been sent to the Committee on Appropriations, for anything that the Speaker said, and the rules are explicit. The Speaker only held that the rule not having been taken advantage of in season, it was too late now to make the objection. That was the scope of his holding; but really no point of order had been made.

Mr. BABCOCK. I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman from Vermont, that the passage of the police bill will require a large appropriation, which will be continuous, and it is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations, and has been for years, to appropriate for the pay of policemen. If our committee should consent to handle that, and increasing the force, the legislation would be ineffective without an appropriation; it would be beyond our jurisdiction to provide for that.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Committee on Appropriations can not fix the hours of policemen's labor.

Mr. BABCOCK. The Committee on Appropriations not only do such things as that, but they fix the price of commodities, and other things of that sort.

Mr. BINGHAM. But not the hours of labor, though.

Mr. BABCOCK. And I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM], that I have yet to see any large appropriation bill pass this House that did not contain legislation on many subjects.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, the action of the Committee on the District of Columbia in referring what is called the police bill to the Committee on Appropriations shows how very careful that committee is with reference to assuming undue jurisdiction. In the last Congress the attention of the Committee on the District of Columbia was called by the Speaker to the fact that that bill was improperly referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and on the suggestion of the Speaker it was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, where the Speaker said it properly belonged.

Now, the Committee on the District of Columbia do not believe that they have fallen into any error so far as that is concerned; but it only shows, as I say, that there is no intention on the part of the Committee on the District of Columbia to assume powers that they do not properly enjoy under the rule. But that question is past so far as this bill is concerned. The gentleman representing the Committee on Appropriations had ample time to make the point of order if he had so desired. The gentleman very courteously said it was not the intention of that committee or his personal intention to make that point of order. But, as I understand, he was perfectly willing to leave it to the House, just as the rule of the House had, in fact, left it with the House.

Now, we are not very busy to-day. To-morrow we may be busy when that part of the urgent deficiency bill, or the proper bill, is reached, where they say we can indicate this as an amendment. It may not be possible for us to find out just when it would be reached. We may not be here; and, certainly, whether or not, and whether we had all the information necessary, it is clear that it would be subject to the point of order, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Vermont would be here to make that point of order, and the members of the Committee on the District of Columbia would have to acquiesce in it.

But the question is, If the House is competent to determine to-morrow, why not take time and determine it to-day? This committee has not to pass on any question of jurisdiction between the District of Columbia and the Committee on Appropriations. The only question is whether Congress will permit the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make this necessary change, and whether the House in its wisdom and judgment sees fit to say that the sum of $4,000 shall be appropriated; and it does not reflect on that great committee—the Committee on Appropriations—and it does not affect their rights; and the taking up this morning of this bill by the committee does not indicate that there can be any attempt on the part of the Committee on the District of Columbia or on the part of the House to take away any just powers of the Committee on Appropriations under the rule.

It is simply a question as to whether or not this bill should pass; or, perhaps, first, whether the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania shall prevail. As was well said by the chairman of this committee, the Committee on the District of Columbia would prefer that this bill should be beaten rather than that amendment should pass, because then we shall have perfected the legislation, and by withholding the appropriation they can not do anything at all until the Committee on Appropriations shall have made the necessary appropriation. Now, there is no reason why this should be divided now, so long as the bill is properly before the House and we have not invaded the jurisdiction of the committee.

If this were trenching upon the rights of the Committee on Appropriations, there would be great force in what has been said by the gentleman from Vermont and the gentleman from Pennsylvania; but there is absolutely no force in anything that the gentlemen have said, so far as that is concerned, because both concede the necessity for and the wisdom of the improvement, and both say the District Commissioners have ample power to make the change without any legislation; but they are compelled to withhold because of the want of the necessary appropriation.

But when the Commissioners feel that they have not got the power, and certainly, even if they had it, it ought to be done by the direct action of Congress, rather than the action of the Commissioners, so that the rules may not be changed when the change is a very radical one, a very important one, involving the title of all property here in the District of Columbia. In a matter of so much importance certainly it ought to be passed upon by the House, especially when the House is perfectly willing to do it.

Now, we have not got the guaranty of these very generous gentlemen that this appropriation will be made. They simply invite us to let go to-day, with the inducement that we may go on to some appropriation bill in the future. Now, if it was going to be taken up in a day or two, it would not make any difference. Perhaps a day or two would not make any difference, but certainly when we have got the cards and got the clerks ready to do the work, we may just as well be doing this work, if it is going to be done at all. The fact of the appropriation or the provision for the appropriation is not the important fact, because if the bill does not contain the appropriation the change will never be made.

The Commissioners, as I said just now, have gone as far as they thought they ought to under the law, and have already expended $1,500 of the public money in making this change, and can not go any further. They certainly can not make the change in the room down there without the appropriation, and it ought not to be withheld. I think the House is competent to pass upon the question, and is fully advised as to whether or not they will permit the change, and that is the only question we are interested in this morning; and if this committee is of the opinion that this appropriation shall be stricken out of the bill, I want to join with you in defeating the bill and let the responsibility rest with the Committee on Appropriations.

But I feel for my own part that the House is willing to take up this matter and competent to take it up without violating any rule, and that it ought to be taken up this morning and disposed of when the question is fresh in the minds of every gentleman who has listened to the debate, and not be deferred until it has gone out of our minds and when only one or two gentlemen will recollect anything about it.

The amount asked for is $4,000. The annual appropriation is $3,000, and, as we have stated this morning, after a careful examination we are satisfied that over $1,000 a year will be saved to the Government by making this change. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. NORTON].

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am confident that in the consideration of this matter there is a slight misunderstanding. I want to assure the gentlemen of the Appropriations Committee that their sensibilities were not overlooked even in our committee in the consideration of this bill. The matter was considered, and all the delicacy that could have been felt we also felt for them; but the bill being a necessity, an urgent one, I desire to say to the gentlemen on the Appropriations Committee that the bill interests every land owner and every taxpayer in the District of Columbia. It is not only for the purpose of saving money to the Government that we urge the passage of this bill, but we urge it for the reason of justice to the taxpayer.

On every occasion when there is an accounting for the payment of taxes there is a liability to mistakes. These mistakes have been onerous on the people. We ask this as an absolute necessity, in all fairness, to the taxpayers of the District. It was suggested that some member of our committee should call on the Appropriation Committee, from the very fear that this bill might be delayed; but after being assured that precedents were plenty with reference to certain matters, that there could be no reason why any member of that committee should complain, the bill was unanimously recommended.

The very argument the gentleman from Pennsylvania makes, the very citations he makes of the work of General Ainsworth, are the best argument on that for this bill, for it proposes to do for the taxpayers what General Ainsworth has done for the soldier and pensioner. Now, after the time we have occupied, after assuring the gentlemen on the Appropriations Committee that their matter was carefully considered, the delicacy of the matter was considered, and that there was no intention on the part of this committee to assault the rights of their committee, it seems to me, in justice, and in honor and fairness, that with that assurance they should not interpose these technical objections.

I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] and the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT] will consider it in that light and give us their support in the passage of this bill. I am opposed to killing this bill, Mr. Chairman; I am opposed to the delay of the bill. While I do not join my colleagues of the committee in the desire to urge the killing of the bill, I join in the desire to pass the bill, with the assurance that there was no intention, even if it could be so construed, to take from the Committee on Appropriations a single right that it possesses.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this amendment is exhausted.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. As to the usefulness of this measure proposed, I have no doubt it has been fully digested by the Commissioners and examined carefully by the committee having the bill in charge at this time. That it has been successfully administered and expedites work Mr. Ainsworth's records clearly prove. Nor am I a special stickler or extremist for the rights under the rules of the Committee on Appropriations. I ask that it have the same limit and privileges under the rules that we are willing to accord to every other committee, and especially the committee that has a multitude of questions coming before them, as has the committee before us to-day in the matters relating to this District.

I claim, sir, that this is nothing but a matter of administration under a system of bookkeeping which has been adopted in the District in connection with titles, taxes, and matters of that kind. It is simply a change for the convenience of the office, and not a matter for legislation at all. It is a matter within the control of the administration of the department of the District. Now, of course, when an additional officer shall have been created for such an office it is a change of the law, and will be referred, necessarily and properly, to the Committee on Appropriations to make the necessary appropriation.

The expenditure of this sum is not necessarily the work of the Committee on the District of Columbia, but properly pertains to the business of the Committee on Appropriations, whose duty it is to examine all of these expenditures and make provision to meet them. It is a question absolutely to be determined by that committee. It is not a question as to the right of the Committee on the District of Columbia to enact a law requiring an appropriation, but it is the direct duty of the Committee on Appropriations to appropriate, under the law, to meet this expenditure if it be necessary. If the appropriation is needed, when the urgent deficiency bill comes up for consideration to-morrow the gentleman himself can move an amendment, and I assure him for one that I will vote for it.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to say anything on this bill; but it seems to me a very strange matter, when I had heard the argument of gentlemen in opposition to the bill, that while they do not assert any doubt as to the merits of the bill itself, they base their opposition to it upon the ground that it comes from a committee which, as they allege, has no right under the rules to make the necessary appropriation to carry it into effect.

Mr. BINGHAM. It is simply the destruction of the orderly procedure of the House.

Mr. SIMS. And the gentleman is therefore a stickler for orderly procedure, especially in this case?

Mr. BINGHAM. Unquestionably; because each committee has its rights, powers, and privileges.

Mr. SIMS. Well, we will see whether that has been the case heretofore, or not. The gentleman will doubtless remember—certainly the House does—the sharp debate between the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. CANNON, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] last winter, in which it was charged that the Committee on Appropriations had deliberately and was daily violating the rules of the House, in that in the preparation of bills by the Appropriations Committee appropriations were made not authorized by existing law or ingrafting new legislation upon appropriation bills. In that debate, upon my inquiry, the distinguished chairman, Mr. CANNON, stated that the rules were operative only when invoked. If unanimous consent is asked for the consideration of a bill in this House and no objection is made, and consideration of the bill is accordingly begun, is it any argument against the bill on its merits that objection ought to have been made, but was not?

If the gentlemen opposing this bill because it carries an appropriation thought it violated the rules, why did they not make such objection at the proper time, as they are so contentious for orderly procedure? Not having made objection, the bill is now before the House in an orderly and proper way, and the House is competent to deal with it on its merits, and I can see no use in sending this bill to the Appropriations Committee to do what the House can now do without any circumlocution.

We have a proposition here which has received a great deal of consideration from some of the members of this body. If the legislation is good, we ought to adopt it. We come directly to you with the bill and the single proposition to carry it into effect.

Admitting that the objection would have been good if it had been made in time, it does seem to me that these gentlemen of the Appropriations Committee ought to be a little delicate now in asking the House to vote down a bill that they did not think worthy of their objection. While we do not wish to encroach upon the powers of the Committee on Appropriations, I do think that necessary legislation should not be defeated on the ground that we have not first knocked at that door. I hope gentlemen will either vote for or against this bill upon its merits. If it is wrong in principle, I am willing to vote against it, but I am not willing to vote against it simply because it may have been subject to a point of order which was not made. Therefore I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] will be voted down, as I think it ought to be.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, the very fact that, as stated by the gentleman, the Commissioners have already entered upon this work, shows that there is no necessity for this legislation. The only necessity is for the appropriation. Why, then, do the Commissioners go to the District Committee? Why did they not come to the Appropriations Committee? This bill was introduced by the Chairman of the District Committee, and he had it referred to his own committee. Then, as I stated before, he sent down to the Committee on Appropriations another bill with the indorsement, to use his own language, that it required an appropriation if passed. Now, there is not a dollar appropriated in the bill. The whole core of the provision of the bill is to extend the eight-hour law to policemen in this District. That is the whole story. Yet he sent it down to the Committee on Appropriations as an unfit thing for his committee to deal with. His committee is the only committee that can deal with it, and I notify the gentleman again that at the first opportunity I shall go into the House and ask to have this bill re-referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and not let them say that it is buried in the Committee on Appropriations, which can not deal with it.

Mr. JENKINS. I want to say to the gentleman that if his committee will release their hold upon that bill and refer it back to the District Committee, so that they can have a chance to act upon it, policemen in this District will not be subject to work more than eight hours a day.

Mr. GROUT. All right; let them settle with the policemen. We have no authority over that legislation; none whatever. For my part I do not see why the District Committee showed such promptness to take possession of a bill appropriating $4,000, and yet had referred to the Committee on Appropriations a bill which only in a very indirect way would call for an appropriation. It is true that, if the eight-hour law is inaugurated on the police force, it will make necessary more policemen, because the policemen work more hours than that now.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. GROUT. Certainly.

Mr. JENKINS. I think I hardly stated myself fairly a few moments ago. The only change that the Commissioners have made so far is to purchase the cards.

Mr. GROUT. What business had they to purchase the cards if they had not the authority to do it?

Mr. JENKINS. They had authority to purchase them out of their stationery account, and now they ask Congress for the necessary power to carry out the project.

Mr. GROUT. They had no authority, only as they exercised it under the organic act. As I told the House a moment since, the Commissioners have full authority to inaugurate the system whenever the money is given to them. They do not need this legislation.

One word in reply to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS]. We are not opposing this bill, so far as the granting of authority

is concerned. It is not necessary, but I do not object. We simply say drop out the appropriation. Let us act in accordance with the rules of the House. Let the appropriation be authorized by the Committee on Appropriations. Let this appropriation be presented either in the urgent deficiency bill, when it will receive just consideration by the House, or let it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and let the proper subcommittee deal with it. That is all we say.

Mr. LLOYD. I would like to ask the gentleman before he sits down whether this bill is meritorious or not.

Mr. GROUT. I am glad the gentleman asked me that, because I wish to say that I do not know. We have been quoted as conceding that this is a valuable system. I do not concede it. I do not know. The matter has never been before our committee. I have no information upon the subject. I know that in the War Department it is made available with great profit to the Government, but whether in the District office in tax matters it can be I do not know. I think it is a matter of question. I know some think it can not be made available.

Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. GROUT. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi. Can it possibly be a meritorious bill if it simply authorizes the Commissioners to do what they can already do?

Mr. GROUT. That is a question which it seems to me answers itself. There is no occasion whatever for the bill except the appropriation, and that should have gone to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BABCOCK. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BINGHAM) there were—ayes 24, noes 48.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BABCOCK. I move that the committee rise and report the bill back to the House with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOPKINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5042), and had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and, being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BABCOCK, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

RIGHTS OF ALIENS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago House bill 5297 was laid aside temporarily. I ask for the further consideration of that bill at this time.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5297) to amend the act entitled "An act to better define and regulate the rights of aliens to hold and own real estate in the Territories," approved March 2, 1897.

Mr. BABCOCK. Now, Mr. Speaker, since the bill was laid aside an amendment has been agreed upon which I think is satisfactory to everyone in the House that has considered it. It covers the point that the committee desire to cover, and that is this—it gives to those people that are now without power either to sell or dispose of their property here in the District of Columbia the right to do so for a period of ten years. Mr. Speaker, I offer this amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That aliens making claim to title of real estate in the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to sell and dispose of such claims to citizens of the United States within ten years from the passage of this act."

The SPEAKER. The question is first upon the amendment recommended by the committee to the text of the bill, and not the amendment just read.

Mr. RIDGELY. Can we not make some arrangement for a division of time for discussion? We certainly are not going to pass that without any discussion whatever.

Mr. BABCOCK. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. RIDGELY. I would like to have at least thirty minutes.

Mr. BABCOCK. This bill has been discussed nearly all the afternoon. I would be disposed to yield any reasonable time.

Mr. RIDGELY. What would you be disposed to yield?

Mr. BABCOCK. Five minutes.

Mr. RIDGELY. I will call the gentleman's attention to the fact that it was almost impossible for us to hear the reading of the bill or understand the discussion on it for some time, and in my effort to obtain the floor I was ruled out. I would like a few minutes. It may not take thirty minutes.

Mr. BABCOCK. I will yield the gentleman ten minutes. We have some other measures we want to dispose of.

Mr. RIDGELY. Very well; I will take that and trust to be able to obtain further time if I find it necessary.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the gentleman from Wisconsin to yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. BABCOCK. I do.

Mr. RIDGELY. Mr. Speaker, referring to an incident in the beginning of the consideration of this bill, I call attention to the fact that, through the kindness of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], who, by reason of his fortunate nearness to the gentleman in charge of the pending bill, believing that we on this side did not understand what was transpiring, very kindly favored us with a warning, and especially took pains to call the attention of Populists to the fact that it attacked one of our well-known and oft-declared principles—that alien ownership of real estate in this nation should be absolutely prohibited. In view of this favor, which I accept and again thank the gentleman for it; I take this opportunity to say to members here that it is one of the fundamental principles of the Populist party to abolish not only alien landlordism but alll andlordism; but I would also impress upon you the fact that it is to the shame of some other parties in this country that it has been necessary for the Populist party to remind the nation that it should always be an irrevocable principle of our Government to prohibit aliens from owning and controlling real estate.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman from Kansas permit an inquiry?

Mr. RIDGELY. I will, sir.

Mr. HEPBURN. Some two or three years ago, prior to the consideration of the bill to modify the act of 1887, is it not true that one of the Populist conventions in your district passed a resolution demanding the passage of the act of 1897?

Mr. RIDGELY. I have no recollection of any such action, nor do I believe any Populist convention ever indorsed alien ownership of anything in our country.

Mr. SIMS. That has nothing to do with the bill before the House.

Mr. RIDGELY (continuing). I cannot yield further unless my time is to be extended.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. RIDGELY. I will take the balance of my time now to remind members here that it is not only one of the doctrines of the Populist party that we exclude absolutely alien ownership of land within the United States, but we even go further and warn the country against permitting the titles to real estate or other property to be centralized in individuals or corporations, either home or foreign. It is now proposed by this pending legislation to legalize titles that are now illegal in the hands of alien owners in the District of Columbia. It is proposed to legalize them for ten years.

The bill does not say that if not then transferred to the ownership of citizens of this country we will then enforce our present rights and that the property shall then escheat to the Government. I shall offer, when the proper time comes, an amendment that will compel the transfer of these titles within a limited time or they shall escheat to the Government.

Gentlemen say that rather than do injustice to some foreign investor we had better extend the time and let them go on and collect the rents until the end of the ten years, when, forsooth, we may then conclude that we have extended the time long enough. I hope the country will understand this legislation, and I hope the representatives of the people of this nation here and now will be true to the well-known sentiment of this country and vote down this proposed measure or at least cut the time down. Two years is certainly sufficient; and then let us put into the legislation a positive order that if the title does not pass to some citizen of this country within that time it shall be forfeited to the Government of the United States. Let us prepare to enforce existing law after reasonable notice. At least let us act in accordance with fundamental principles.

I hope gentlemen will not fail to give this matter the attention that it demands, and the attention that the people of this country require at our hands. When the proper time comes I shall offer these amendments, believing that my time is too short to enter into a full discussion and to call the attention of the House to the position taken by the various political parties on this question of land titles. I only wish to emphasize my protest against the proposed legislation now before us, which indicates that there is a growing sentiment and a growing political force within capitalistic circles in this country that stands ready to begin to legalize alien ownership of real estate within our borders, even within the very capital of the nation itself, against which I believe the people generally, of all political parties, are emphatically opposed.

I wish to state, before I take my seat, that I shall offer the amendments I have spoken of, and if in order at this time I will offer them now.

Mr. JENKINS. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that

the amendments are not in order, as the floor was not yielded for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. RIDGELY. I will state in my time, then, what my amendments will be when the time comes for me to offer them. I shall offer to strike out the word "ten" in next to the last line and insert the word "two," and to add at the end of the last line a provision that the title to the property of all aliens shall escheat to the United States Government if not transferred to a citizen of this country within the two years' limit.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. JENKINS. I will.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas has reiterated his devotion to the principles of the Populist party. I had no doubt but that he would do so here. I want to call attention, however, to the fact that the Populist party that he speaks for has on many occasions, certainly one notable one, laid down the principle of nonownership when it suited their convenience and when he thought it was for their interest. They have declaimed year after year against alien ownership; they have made that one of the foundation planks of their platform, State and national; they have gone to the people insisting that under the laws as they were permitted to be by the Republican party, and by the Democratic party when it had power, there was large acquisition of lands by foreigners, harmful to the interests of the country and foreboding great danger.

I want him to remember that a few years ago, when they found that it was absolutely necessary that foreign capital should be invited into the Territories to secure their development, they came here asking modifications of the law so that this alien ownership might occur, in order that mortgages might be given, that bonds might be issued, that securities might be made whereby they could get the needed money to carry on enterprises and develop the Territories.

And when this modification, only two or three years ago, Mr. Speaker, was pending, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FLYNN] gave to the House some information upon the point, showing that in a Populist convention, in one of the counties of the district now represented by the gentleman from Kansas, there was a demand for the passage of just this very law, and insisting that we should abrogate these statutes forbidding the acquisition of property by foreigners. And why, Mr. Speaker? Simply because it was to the interest of certain parties in that State.

Mr. RIDGELY. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him just there?

Mr. HEPBURN. I always yield to the gentleman with pleasure.

Mr. RIDGELY. If such legislation was passed, was it not because of the fact that your policy of reducing the currency, contracting the circulating medium of the people, destroyed the credit of the whole country in their own country, compelled them to cross the seas to get money to develop our resources?

Mr. HEPBURN. Ah, Mr. Speaker, who was it that destroyed your credit in that country? Was it not the infamous threat that you made in your own State, that you would withdraw the facilities of the courts from your creditors and make it impossible for them to collect their debts? You threatened that there should be a stay of five years in your State between the suit and the collection of the claim and that the courts should not be used by the creditor who sought to enforce the law. Was it not you who introduced bills in the legislature allowing a period of three years between the inception of a suit and the trial of it? Was it not because you interposed this length of time between the trial of the suit and the collection of the debt that the trouble to which the gentleman has referred arose?

You yourself introduced bills making three years the time between the commencement of the suit and the possible satisfaction of the judgment. You proposed, in the first place, a stay of execution for five years. If such legislation was introduced, what could you expect other than the result which you finally accomplished? That is what destroyed your credit. It was your own attempt to rob your creditors after having secured their money. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, I simply want to call attention to the fact that these purists, these men "holier than thou," these men that up to four years ago were the denunciators of their own present allies, these men who insisted that all corruption was to be found in the two old parties and that all purity was to be found in theirs, these gentlemen who claimed the necessity for organizing a new party because the two old parties had forgotten their duty and were recreant to their obligations—these gentlemen, after announcing principles, after eulogizing them upon the stump, are always ready to sacrifice them, always ready to let them slip by if they can secure an advantage for themselves; just as the gentleman's own people, in one of his own counties, solemnly resolved—I am not quoting literally—that land ownership by foreigners was not so bad a thing if they could only secure money in their own locality for the purpose of carrying on local developments.

Mr. RIDGELY. Will the gentleman produce a copy of the resolution to which he refers?

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not know that I can, but the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FLYNN] made the statement here in the House, and had the resolution. I am not sure whether it was read or not; and neither the gentleman nor any of his colleagues had the temerity at that time to deny its authenticity.

Mr. JENKINS rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RIDGELY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for five minutes in which to reply.

Mr. JENKINS. I yield five minutes to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin yields to the gentleman from Kansas five minutes.

Mr. RIDGELY. I thank the gentleman for the time. Now, in reply to what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] has charged against my people and my State, I simply say that he has but repeated what, in the heat of a political contest, came as a charge from his party and his party press against our people, the charge that we had turned repudiators because we were demanding some legislation that might better protect the debtor.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman permit a question there?

Mr. RIDGELY. I yield for a question.

Mr. HEPBURN. I will ask you if, in your own legislature, bills of the character I have suggested were not introduced and their passage prevented solely because of the desertion of three of your people, who refused to carry them out?

Mr. RIDGELY. I answer emphatically no; that we never proposed repudiation, or any act that squinted toward it, in the State from which I come.

Mr. HEPBURN. Hold on; do not beg the question in that way. I did not use the word "repudiation."

Mr. RIDGELY. I call for the minutes.

Mr. HEPBURN. I said that you proposed that an interval of three years should elapse between the commencing of a suit and its day of trial in court. I said that you proposed a stay of execution for five years——

Mr. RIDGELY. I hope the gentleman will not take up all my time.

Mr. HEPBURN. I ask you if such legislation was not introduced in your legislature and supported by your people?

Mr. RIDGELY. I hope I may be permitted time enough to answer the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas declines to yield further.

Mr. RIDGELY. It is an old charge that is being again revived. For many years my State did not give the privilege to debtors that almost every State in this Union does give and that the gentleman's own State gives to the debtor—that is, the privilege of redemption when a foreclosure of a mortgage is made. We asked in Kansas that we might simply follow the well-known practice and law of other States, and give to our debtors the privilege of three years, the gentleman says.

Mr. HEPBURN. Five years.

Mr. RIDGELY. Well, I care not as to the difference between us as to the time, sir. [Derisive laughter on the Republican side.]

I say that the legislation in behalf of the debtor is as noble and worthy of defense as the eternal legislation in behalf of the creditor. Why, I wish to cite you to the fact that the law that finally was passed and is now upon the statute books of my State does give to the debtor eighteen months in which to redeem his home that has been foreclosed under a mortgage, and your State and others have similar laws, some of them running as long as three years.

And, forsooth, because we have done this little act of justice to struggling debtors you must arraign us here as tending in the direction of repudiators. This charge I resent. I say it is untrue of my people. There is no such sentiment in my State. All we ask is that the debtor shall be heard and recognized as having some rights and claims under and within the laws of the country, and that, too, without this eternal howling charge of repudiation.

The gentleman refers to a matter which he can not here substantiate. He makes the assertion that because under some conditions our people may have asked a chance to borrow foreign money that we are inconsistent because our general policy and plea is, and the plea that we make here to-day is, that alien ownership shall be restricted and absolutely forbid. He takes this occasion to air the old charge of his party and its press against the good people of Kansas, and in that arraignment and false charge you are hurting your own constituency in my State as well as all others.

Mr. HEPBURN. Allow me to correct the gentleman. Not against the good people of Kansas, but the Populists of Kansas. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RIDGELY. The good people of Kansas have already enacted the very law that you here condemn and arraign, and it stands there and will remain, no matter which party has charge of legislative affairs; nor has the credit of my people suffered by it; their credit is as good as that of any State in the Union.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to shut off any amendments; but during the discussion of this question this morning the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] had some opposition to the pending bill, and we referred the whole subject of amendment to that gentleman. I do not see him here; but I am informed by my colleague on the committee from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD] that this substitute, which is now in the hands of the Clerk, was prepared by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] or by the gentleman from Kentucky [Judge SMITH], and that it received the approval of the gentleman from Texas, and that all gentlemen who opposed the bill this morning were in favor of the amendment as drawn by the gentleman from Kentucky. Therefore, I prefer to submit the question to the House on the pending substitute, and I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that there is a committee amendment reported, and the vote must first be on that amendment to perfect the text of the bill. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. RIDGELY. I would ask for the reading of the amendment, please.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 7, after the word "same," insert the words "rights and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is now on the amendment last offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. JENKINS. That is a substitute for that section.

The SPEAKER. To strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Let us have that read.

The SPEAKER. It has already been read, but without objection the Clerk will again read it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That aliens making claim to title of real estate in the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to sell and dispose of such claims to citizens of the United States within ten years from the passage of this act."

The substitute was agreed to.

Mr. JENKINS. I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to reconsider the vote last taken, and also moves to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. RIDGELY. Mr. Speaker, we have simply agreed to the substitute. We have not yet passed the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood that the substitute was adopted and the bill was passed.

Mr. RIDGELY. I do not so understand the situation.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, the bill has not been read a third time, and has not been engrossed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The third reading and the engrossment of the bill has not been had.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was misinformed. The question recurs on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin to this. I was not here when the matter was discussed, but if I caught the reading of this substitute, if it should become law to-day, a foreigner might buy real estate here——

Mr. BABCOCK. No, sir.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Wait a minute—and hold that real estate for ten years, and then sell it.

Mr. BABCOCK. The intention of it is that it shall apply to real estate that is held throughout the city now.

Mr. GROSVENOR. For the satisfaction of a number of gentlemen around me, I ask that the substitute may be reread. It is very short.

The SPEAKER. The substitute has already been reported twice, but without objection it will be again reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That aliens making claim to title of real estate in the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to sell and dispose of such claims to citizens of the United States within ten years after the passage of this act."

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, Mr. Speaker, my objection is correctly taken. The word "now" should be put there, so that it would apply to real estate owned by aliens at present, but not to property that they may acquire at any time within ten years. I think my construction is correct.

Mr. JENKINS. I will ask unanimous consent to have the word "now" put in the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin will state his request.

Mr. JENKINS. I ask unanimous consent to have the word "now" placed in the substitute, being the first word of the substitute.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report, as requested by the gentleman from Wisconsin, for the information of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "aliens" insert the word "now;" so as to read, "that aliens now making claim," etc.

Mr. JENKINS. That will cover the case.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to insert the word "now" as indicated by the reading. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is agreed to. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. RIDGELY. I want to know at what stage of the proceedings it would be in order to move to recommit with instructions?

The SPEAKER. The previous question has not been asked for, but the gentleman from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. JENKINS. I move the previous question on the bill and amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Kansas that if the previous question is voted down, the matter will not then be in order; but if it is agreed to, a motion to recommit will then be in order after the engrossment and third reading of the bill?

The gentleman from Wisconsin asks for the previous question on the engrossment and passage of the bill.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly engrossed and read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. RIDGELY] that the motion to recommit is now in order.

Mr. RIDGELY. I will offer a motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the District of Columbia with instructions that they bring in an amendment limiting the time to two years, and that the title shall escheat to the Government on all alien claims after the expiration of the two years. At the suggestion of gentlemen here, Mr. Speaker, I will make it five years instead of two years.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Kansas, that he may see that he is correctly stated.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the word "ten" and insert "five;" so as to read, "within five years." Also, insert, "The title shall escheat to the Government of all alien titles to real estate after such period."

Mr. RIDGELY. That is my motion; to recommit with those instructions.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RIDGELY) there were—ayes 58, noes 88.

Mr. RIDGELY. I demand the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 88, nays 142, answered "present" 6, not voting 118; as follows:

YEAS—88.

Adamson,	Davey,	Lewis,	Salmon,
Allen, Ky.	Davis,	Little,	Shackleford,
Atwater,	Denny,	Lloyd,	Shafroth,
Bankhead,	Dougherty,	McDowell,	Small,
Barber,	Finley,	McLain,	Snodgrass,
Bell,	Fox,	Maddox,	Stephens, Tex.
Bellamy,	Gaston,	Moon,	Stokes,
Benton,	Gayle,	Naphen,	Sulzer,
Berry,	Glynn,	Neville,	Sutherland.
Brenner,	Gordon,	Newlands,	Swanson,
Brewer,	Green, Pa.	Norton, S. C.	Talbert,
Broussard,	Griffith,	Quarles,	Tate,
Brundidge,	Hedge,	Ransdell,	Terry,
Burleson,	Henry, Miss.	Rhea, Ky.	Thayer,
Caldwell,	Henry, Tex.	Ridgely,	Thomas, N. C.
Chanler,	Johnston,	Rixey,	Underwood.
Clark, Mo.	Jones, Va.	Robinson, Ind.	Williams, J. R.
Clayton, Ala.	Kitchin,	Robinson, Nebr.	Williams, W. E.
Cochran, Mo.	Kleberg,	Rucker,	Wilson, Idaho
Cooney,	Lamb,	Ruppert,	Wilson, N. Y.
Cooper, Tex.	Lanham,	Ryan, N. Y.	Young, Va.
Cox,	Lentz,	Ryan, Pa.	Zenor.

NAYS—142.

Alexander,	Bromwell,	Curtis,	Gardner, Mich.
Allen, Me.	Brosius,	Daly, N. J.	Gibson,
Allen, Miss.	Brown,	Dalzell,	Gill,
Babcock,	Bull,	Davidson,	Gillet, N. Y.
Bailey, Kans.	Burke, S. Dak.	Dayton,	Gillett, Mass.
Bailey, Tex.	Burke, Tex.	Dick,	Grosvenor,
Baker,	Burkett,	Dinsmore,	Grout,
Barham,	Burton,	Dolliver,	Grow,
Barney,	Butler,	Driscoll,	Hamilton,
Barthoidt,	Capron,	Eddy,	Haugen,
Bingham,	Clayton, N. Y.	Emerson,	Heatwole,
Bishop,	Cochrane, N. Y.	Epes,	Hemenway,
Boutell, Ill.	Connell,	Esch,	Henry, Conn.
Bowersock,	Cousins,	Faris,	Hepburn,
Brantley,	Cowherd,	Fletcher,	Hitt,
Breazeale,	Crump,	Foss,	Hoffecker,
Brick,	Crumpacker,	Gaines,	Hopkins,

Jack,	McPherson,	Polk,	Southard,
Jenkins,	Marsh,	Pugh,	Spalding,
Jones, Wash.	Mercer,	Ray,	Sperry,
Kahn,	Mesick,	Reeder,	Sprague,
Knox,	Meyer, La.	Richardson,	Steele,
Lacey,	Miller,	Robb,	Stewart, N. J.
Landis,	Minor,	Roberts, Mass.	Thomas, Iowa
Lane,	Mondell,	Robertson, La.	Thropp,
Latimer,	Moody, Oreg.	Rodenberg,	Tongue,
Lawrence,	Morgan,	Russell,	Turner,
Linney,	Mudd,	Shattuc,	Wanger,
Long,	Needham,	Shelden,	Warner,
Lorimer,	O'Grady,	Sheppard,	Watson,
Loudenslager,	Olmsted,	Sibley,	Weaver,
Lovering,	Overstreet,	Sims,	Weymouth,
Lybrand,	Packer, Pa.	Smith, Ky.	White,
McCall,	Parker, N. J.	Smith, H. C.	Williams, Miss.
McClellan,	Payne,	Smith, Samuel W.	
McCulloch,	Phillips,	Smith, Wm. Alden	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6.

Ball,	De Vries,	Hay,	Mann.
Brownlow,	Driggs,		

NOT VOTING—122.

Acheson,	Fitzgerald, Mass.	Littlefield,	Slayden,
Adams,	Fitzgerald, N. Y.	Livingston,	Smith, Ill.
Bartlett,	Fitzpatrick,	Loud,	Sparkman,
Boreing,	Fleming,	McAleer,	Spight,
Boutelle, Me.	Fordney,	McCleary,	Stallings,
Bradley,	Foster,	McRae,	Stark,
Burleigh,	Fowler,	Mahon,	Stevens, Minn.
Burnett,	Freer,	May,	Stewart, N. Y.
Calderhead,	Gamble,	Meekison,	Stewart, Wis.
Campbell,	Gardner, N. J.	Metcalf,	Sulloway,
Cannon,	Gilbert,	Miers, Ind.	Tawney,
Carmack,	Graff,	Moody, Mass.	Tayler, Ohio
Catchings,	Graham,	Morris,	Taylor, Ala.
Chickering,	Greene, Mass.	Muller,	Tompkins,
Clarke, N. H.	Griggs,	Noonan,	Underhill,
Cooper, Wis.	Hall,	Norton, Ohio	Vandiver,
Corliss,	Harmer,	Otey,	Van Voorhis,
Crawford,	Hawley,	Otjen,	Vreeland,
Cromer,	Hill,	Pearce, Mo.	Wachter,
Crowley,	Howard,	Pierce, Tenn.	Wadsworth,
Cummings,	Howell,	Pearre,	Waters,
Cusack,	Hull,	Powers,	Weeks,
Cushman,	Jett,	Prince,	Wheeler, Ala.
Dahle, Wis.	Joy,	Reeves,	Wheeler, Ky.
Davenport, S. A.	Kerr,	Rhea, Va.	Wilson, S. C.
Davenport, S. W.	Ketcham,	Riordan,	Wright,
De Armond,	Kluttz,	Robbins,	Young, Pa.
De Graffenreid,	Lester,	Scudder,	Ziegler.
Dovener,	Levy.	Sherman,	
Elliott,	Littauer,	Showalter.	

So the motion to recommit was not agreed to.

After the roll call the following took place:

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. HULL, and I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask for leave of absence for my colleague, Mr. VANDIVER, who is detained on business of importance.

The SPEAKER. That can not be done on a roll call.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. WHEELER, and I wish to withdraw my vote.

Mr. BALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to withdraw my vote in the affirmative, as I am paired with my colleague, Mr. HAWLEY.

The following pairs were announced until further notice:

Mr. FOWLER with Mr. BARTLETT.

Mr. SHERMAN with Mr. DRIGGS.

Mr. BISHOP with Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. MANN with Mr. JETT.

Mr. MAHON with Mr. OTEY.

Mr. MCCALL with Mr. JONES of Virginia.

Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania with Mr. BRADLEY.

Mr. LANDIS with Mr. BURNETT.

Mr. REEVES with Mr. SPARKMAN.

Mr. BROMWELL with Mr. MCDOWELL.

Mr. CROMER with Mr. MIERS of Indiana.

The following pairs were announced for this day:

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. TAWNEY with Mr. SPIGHT.

Mr. STEWART of New York with Mr. STARK.

Mr. DOVENER with Mr. CATCHINGS.

Mr. HOWELL with Mr. MULLER.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin with Mr. DE GRAFFENREID.

Mr. FREER with Mr. CUSACK.

Mr. GRAFF with Mr. CROWLEY.

Mr. POWERS with Mr. MAY.

Mr. LYBRAND with Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. MCCLEARY with Mr. UNDERHILL.

Mr. HAWLEY of Texas with Mr. BALL.

Mr. KERR with Mr. SCUDDER.

Mr. MORRIS with Mr. MCRAE.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri with Mr. NOONAN.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD with Mr. DE ARMOND.

Mr. TOMPKINS with Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts.

Mr. BROWNLOW with Mr. RHEA of Virginia.

Mr. METCALF with Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky.

Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. FITZGERALD of New York.

Mr. WEEKS with Mr. VANDIVER.

Mr. LOUD with Mr. DE VRIES.

Mr. BURLEIGH with Mr. STARK.

Mr. HILL with Mr. RYAN of Pennsylvania.

Mr. KETCHAM with Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey with Mr. CARMACK.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine with Mr. GILBERT.

Mr. SHOWALTER with Mr. RIORDAN.

Mr. HARMER with Mr. KLUTZ.

Mr. CORLISS with Mr. STALLINGS.

Mr. WRIGHT with Mr. HALL for the rest of the session.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I am paired with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WILSON]. I voted inadvertently and desire to withdraw my vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman that the vote has already been announced on the question to which he refers.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote just taken on the passage of the bill, and to lay that motion on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the title of the bill will be amended to conform to the action of the House.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of absence for my colleague from Missouri [Mr. VANDIVER] indefinitely, who is detained on account of important business.

There was no objection.

REFERENCE OF A HOUSE BILL.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection the bill (H. R. 2736) to change the name of The Potomac Insurance Company, of Georgetown, and for other purposes, will be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

There was no objection and it was so ordered.

And then, on motion of Mr. BABCOCK (at 3 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of the bay at Hudson, Pasco County, Fla.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the thirteenth annual report of the Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of David I. Lillard against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for the support of children at the Whitaker Orphan Home, Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, recommending an appropriation to pay George Green certain fees—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, recommending an authorization for the accounting officers of the Treasury to pass an account for the payment of William S. Yeatman for services rendered the Gettysburg National Military Park Commission—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Richard Poole, administrator of estate of Frederick S. Poole, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of William V. Rose against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy

of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, recommending the reimbursement of John E. Crane, United States Commissioner in Alaska, for expenses incurred by him in relieving destitute and sick Americans at Circle City, Alaska—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, recommending an appropriation for renting additional office room in the building known as the Hooe Building—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War, submitting an estimate of deficiency appropriation for military posts—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6237) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for prior years, and for other purposes, reported the same, accompanied by a report (No. 43); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4026) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to change the material to be used in the construction of the dry docks at the navy-yards at League Island, Pa., and Mare Island, Cal., from timber to concrete and stone, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 45); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 309) granting a pension to James M. Kercheval, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 38); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GASTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3072) to increase the pension of William W. Wharton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 39); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5229) granting a pension to Sarah Potter, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 40); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MINOR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4416) to increase the pension of Henry Geesen, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 41); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRIGGS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2749) granting a pension to Susan Garrison, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 42); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following joint resolution and bills; which were referred as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 109) to investigate charges of fraud in procuring passage of special act for the relief of William Robinson, approved February 26, 1885—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5870) for the relief of the Madison Female Institute, at Richmond, Ky.—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 1788) granting a pension to Nicholas C. Wilson, of Braxton County, W. Va.—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4678) granting a pension to James W. Edwards—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4679) granting a pension to Micager Philpot—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5508) granting an increase of pension to Jennie C. Taylor—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5509) to pension Malinda Jones—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5587) granting a pension to A. E. Rohrbough—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5821) for the relief of James W. B. Turk, of Potean, Ind. T.—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

A bill (H. R. 5842) granting a pension to W. W. Jewett—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5898) granting an increase of pension to George F. White—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5615) for the relief of Margaret A. Stuart, of Mount Vernon, Tenn.—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Appropriations: A bill (H. R. 6237) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for prior years, and for other purposes—committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. WILLIAM E. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 6238) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Jacksonville, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 6239) amending the civil-service law in relation to soldiers of the civil war—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 6240) for the preparation of plans or designs for a memorial or statue of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant on ground belonging to the United States Government in the city of Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 6241) to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of site and erection of public building at Lawrence, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 6242) providing the punishment for hazing at West Point Military Academy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 6243) to amend the charter of the Capital Traction Company, of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 6244) defining and enlarging the powers heretofore conferred upon the Choctaw, Oklahoma and Gulf Railroad—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 6245) extending the time for the completion of a wagon and motor bridge across the Missouri River at St. Charles, Mo., as provided by an act approved June 3, 1896—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROSIUS: A bill (H. R. 6246) for preventing the adulteration, misbranding, and imitation of foods and drugs in the District of Columbia and the Territories, and for regulating interstate traffic therein, providing for the inspection of food and drug products intended for export to foreign countries, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 6247) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," approved June 13, 1898—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 6248) to provide for the inspection and treatment of trees, buds, cuttings, grafts, scions, nursery stock, and fruit imported into the United States—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 6249) amending an act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 6250) extending the time for proof and payment on lands claimed under the desert-land law of the United States by the members of the Colorado Cooperative Colony in southwestern Colorado—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HENDERSON: A bill (H. R. 6251) authorizing construction of bridge—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 6252) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," approved June 13, 1898—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 6253) requiring all duties on imported goods after March 1, 1900, shall be paid in gold coin, and repealing all acts inconsistent, and so forth—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIBLEY: A bill (H. R. 6254) to amend act of June 27, 1890, for increase of widows' pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 6255) authorizing Arthur S. Hardy to accept a decoration from the Shah of Persia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 6256) amending section 5447 of the Revised Statutes of the United States of America—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHANLER: A bill (H. R. 6257) to extend the privileges of section 1226 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to all officers who served during the war with Spain in the campaign in the Philippine Islands as volunteers in the Army of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 6258) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," approved June 13, 1898—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BREAZEALE: A bill (H. R. 6259) making an appropriation for the repair of the Government road to the national cemetery at Pineville, La.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 6260) to extend to the commissioners of agriculture of the several States the franking privilege—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LESTER: A bill (H. R. 6261) to establish a subtreasury at Savannah, Ga.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON: A bill (H. R. 6262) to authorize the President of the United States to invite the International Congress of Navigation to hold its ninth session in Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARSH: A bill (H. R. 6263) to promote the efficiency of the militia—to the Committee on the Militia.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 6264) to provide for a public building at Crowley, La.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6265) to authorize the establishment of a fish-cultural and biological station on the Gulf of Mexico within the limits of the State of Louisiana—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 6266) for the relief of certain District of Columbia tax-sale certificates, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 6267) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act to suspend the operation of certain provisions of law relating to the War Department, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORTON of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 6268) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Florence, S. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 6269) extending the benefits of the act of June 27, 1890, to certain persons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 6270) to authorize the Secretary of War to cause to be investigated and to provide for the payment of all just claims against the United States for private property taken and used or destroyed by United States soldiers during the war with Spain—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 6271) to increase the limit of cost of public building at Boise City, Idaho—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 6272) fixing the salary of the postmaster at Washington City, D. C.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. COUSINS: A bill (H. R. 6273) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Marshalltown, in the State of Iowa—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 6327) for the payment of certain claims—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENKINS: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 119) to amend an act entitled "An act to extend Rhode Island avenue," approved February 10, 1899—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BELLAMY: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 11) for a survey and estimate for the improvements of the navigation of Livingston Creek, Columbus County, N. C.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 12) for a survey and estimate for the improvement of navigation of Lockwoods Folly River, North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A resolution (H. Res. 93) relative to the Committee on the District of Columbia appointing an assistant clerk—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HOFFECKER (by request): A resolution (H. Res. 94) relative to jurists versed in naval law—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Washington, favoring the improvement of the Columbia River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Washington, favoring the bill to promote commerce and foreign trade—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Washington, favoring relief to certain homestead settlers on certain railroad grants—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Washington, favoring the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Washington, favoring legislation for the encouragement of American shipping—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Washington, favoring an appropriation for the improvement of Snake River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Washington, asking for relief for certain citizens of Clark and Cowlitz counties, State of Washington—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Washington, urging the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Washington, favoring the removal of obstructions in Snake River near Asotin City, Wash.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Washington, favoring the improvement of the merchant marine of the United States—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Washington, asking for an appropriation for the removal of obstructions from the Columbia River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a memorial of the legislature of the State of Washington, urging the passage by the House of Senate bill entitled "A bill to promote the commerce and increase the foreign trade"—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 6274) for the relief of Oliver McIlhenny, of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 6275) granting a pension to Johanna Buse—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BAKER: A bill (H. R. 6276) for the relief of John Clemsen and John C. Cookson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARBER: A bill (H. R. 6277) granting a pension to Susan M. Wikoff—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 6278) to correct the military record and grant an honorable discharge to Charles Stierlin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BREAZEALE: A bill (H. R. 6279) for the relief of the Mansfield Baptist Church, of Mansfield, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 6280) for the relief of Perry A. Kinikin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BREWER: A bill (H. R. 6281) for the relief of A. J. Barnett—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: A bill (H. R. 6282) for relief of Charles W. Fowler, of Arkansas—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARMACK: A bill (H. R. 6283) to amend the military record of Samson Mead, late private of Company G, Third Regiment Michigan Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 6284) for the relief of James Crawley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6285) granting an increase of pension to James R. Green—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6286) to remove the charge of desertion against James Hickey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 6287) granting a pension to John Drew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHANLER: A bill (H. R. 6288) granting a pension to Fred. L. Budde—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6289) granting an increase of pension to Francis Jandrew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6290) granting a pension to James Griffith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6291) granting a pension to Cornelius Springer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6292) for the relief George W. Payne—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 6293) for the relief of Lloyd W. Emmart, surviving partner of the firm of Emmart, Dunbar & Co., of Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COWHERD: A bill (H. R. 6294) for the relief of the heirs of J. W. Deal—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6295) for the relief of J. H. Sanders, of Jackson County, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DENNY: A bill (H. R. 6296) for the relief of Robert F. Thompson, for services rendered by him for compilation of the laws relating to Indian affairs—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: A bill (H. R. 6297) for the relief of Jane Elliott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 6298) for the relief of John Burns—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 6299) to pension Margaret Quirk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 6300) for the relief of Charles Miller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 6301) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Ornas R. Doolittle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6302) making an appropriation for the support of the W. T. Whitaker Orphan Home, in the Indian Territory—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 6303) granting a pension to Angus Cameron—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GASTON: A bill (H. R. 6304) to increase the pension of James J. Lyons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6305) to restore the pension of Mrs. Lois M. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 6306) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Steele—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6307) to correct the military record of Ira S. Havens—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 6308) for the relief of the estate of Joseph Alstott, deceased, late of Knox County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 6309) to amend the military record of John H. Lamson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 6310) granting a pension to Roderick R. Ackley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6311) for the relief of Jacob F. Banks—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6312) for the relief of Hiram W. Bays—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6313) restoring pension to James A. Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6314) granting a pension to Sarah A. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6315) granting an increase of pension to Julia Weeks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 6316) granting a pension to George W. Noble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 6317) for the relief of Mrs. Rachael Vining—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6318) for the relief of the estate of George G. Noland, deceased, late of Jefferson County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HENDERSON: A bill (H. R. 6319) granting a pension to George W. Cox, of Horton, Iowa—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6320) for the relief of C. S. Lobdell, of Parkersburg, Iowa—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 6321) for the relief of Edmund E. Schreiner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 6322) to appropriate the sum of $281.15 to Diana Swift, of Rice Lake, Wis.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6323) for the relief of John McDonald, alias John Shannon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 6324) granting a pension to Adolf P. Vorholz, alias Albert Schneider—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 6325) granting increase of pension to Catherine Black—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KITCHIN: A bill (H. R. 6326) for the relief of Dr. J. W. Griffith, of Guilford County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 6328) for the relief of Felix G. Smith, administrator of Sarah J. Smith, deceased, of Jefferson County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 6329) to grant a pension to Charles A. Owens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6330) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Isaac S. Hodges—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 6331) to correct the military record of Leroy Q. Webber—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 6332) granting a pension to Minerva Sturgess—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6333) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary Keen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEVY (by request): A bill (H. R. 6334) granting a pension to Bianca Blenker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LYBRAND: A bill (H. R. 6335) granting a pension to Ella S. Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 6336) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ellen Lauriat—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARSH: A bill (H. R. 6337) to grant a pension to Henry C. Huff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6338) granting extension of time on Letters Patent No. 211585 to Wilbur Peck, inventor, Colchester, Ill.—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MAY: A bill (H. R. 6339) for the relief of Thomas Stack—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6340) to correct the naval record of Peter Hommes—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McDOWELL: A bill (H. R. 6341) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jacob Eckert—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6342) for the relief of Elijah Rowe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6343) to remove the charge of desertion against Philip Reiss—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MINOR: A bill (H. R. 6344) to remove the charges of desertion from the records of the War Department against Frederick Mehring—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McLAIN: A bill (H. R. 6345) for the relief of Milton S. Shirk—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6346) for the relief of John A. Brent, of Pike County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6347) for the relief of Mrs. M. J. Baynard, of Natchez, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6348) for the relief of James M. Newman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6349) for the relief of Hampton Wall, of Amite County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6350) for the relief of Irene E. Huddleston and sureties on her official bond as postmaster—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. METCALF: A bill (H. R. 6351) for the relief of James A. Hutton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAY: A bill (H. R. 6352) granting a pension to Lizzie B. Leitch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'GRADY: A bill (H. R. 6353) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Thomas Mott, Company E, Eighty-first New York Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6354) granting an increase of pension to William R. Bancroft—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PACKER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6355) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Bernhard Steuber—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: A bill (H. R. 6356) to grant an increase of pension to Lewis R. Armstrong—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARCE of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6357) for the relief of William S. Brinton—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PEREA: A bill (H. R. 6358) for the relief of Serapio Romero, late postmaster at Las Vegas, N. Mex.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 6359) for the relief of the heirs of William Heryford, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 6360) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. Gregory—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 6361) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Sarah C. Williams, of Schuyler, Nebr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 6362) granting an increase of pension to Frank Gibbons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANSDELL (by request): A bill (H. R. 6363) for the relief of Joe Carroll, of Ouachita Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 6364) for the relief of the estate of R. M. Scanlan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 6365) for the relief of the estate of Martha Keller, deceased, late of East Carroll Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 6366) for the relief of M. W. Stewart, of Bastrop, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 6367) for the relief of the estate of Samuel Richardson, deceased, late of East Carroll Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 6368) for the relief of the legal representatives of Mary C. Turner, deceased, late of Tullahoma, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6369) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Frank Rother $225, due him for service as route agent—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'GRADY: A bill (H. R. 6370) for the relief of Stephen R. Stafford, major, United States Army—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 6371) for the relief of Frederick See—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 6372) granting a pension to Abbie Webster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIBLEY: A bill (H. R. 6373) granting a pension to Frank Casey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6374) to pension Edward P. Shaw at rate of $50 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 6375) granting an increase of pension to Chester Willis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6376) to increase the pension of James N. Willett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6377) to increase the pension of Saturnin Jasnowski—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6378) granting a pension to Tracy M. Johnson, dependent son of Arthur M. Johnson, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6379) granting a pension to Janet L. P. Taylor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6380) to correct the military record of Stephen R. Thorpe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6381) granting an increase of pension to Israel Walter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6382) granting a pension to Harriet V. D. Cook—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6383) to correct the military record of Mason D. Chatterton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6384) to correct the military record of Timothy Way—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6385) to correct the military record of Maxwell Harris—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 6386) for the relief of the estate of Esau Berry, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6387) for the relief of the estate of Thomas A. Dough, deceased, late of Dare County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6388) for the relief of Walter T. Dough, of Dare County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6389) for the relief of Homer W. Styron—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6390) for the relief of Josiah L. Bell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6391) for the relief of L. T. Oglesby—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6392) for the relief of Mary E. Hughes, heir of D. L. Pritchard, deceased, late of Camden County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TALBERT: A bill (H. R. 6393) for the relief of Martha Cook, administratrix of the estate of William Cook, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 6394) referring to the Court of Claims, under the Tucker Act, the claim of Edward Wetherington, executor of Jane L. Daugherty, deceased, late of North Carolina—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6395) for the relief of John P. Clark, of Bladen County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 6396) granting an increase of pension to William H. H. Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6397) granting a pension to Richard Van Valkenburg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6398) for the relief of George G. Wortman—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THROPP: A bill (H. R. 6399) granting a pension to David V. Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 6400) granting a pension to Napoleon B. Greathouse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6401) for the relief of Sam. M. Nally—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6402) to increase the pension of Christian J. Lidaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6403) granting a pension to Alice Bozeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6404) granting a pension to Augustus Voigt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6405) for the relief of Alfred U. Whiffen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6406) to reimburse Jacob J. Talbott for personal property taken during the late war—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6407) to increase the pensions of Michael S. Brockett, George W. Williams, and Isaac N. Willhite—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6408) granting increase of pension to James M. Blades, of McLeansboro, Ill.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6409) granting a pension to M. E. Hamill—to the Committee on Invalid Pension.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6410) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Thomas D. Wagnon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6411) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of McCallister Edwards—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6412) granting a pension to Susana Mackey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6413) to increase the pension of Robert J. Tate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6414) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of George A. Crisel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6415) to increase the pension of Elias Whipple—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6416) to increase the pension of Aaron Robertson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6417) granting a pension to Eliza C. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAM E. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 6418) granting a pension to Josiah Booker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6419) for the relief of Sarah J. Richards, widow of Louis Richards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6420) for the relief of Stephen A. St. John—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6421) granting an increase of pension to John H. Dyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6422) granting an increase of pension to Patrick O'Sullivan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6423) granting an increase of pension to David Lynch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6424) for the relief of Charles S. Devine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6425) granting an increase of pension to William H. Wendell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6426) to pay Joseph Hunter certain arrearages of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6427) for the relief of Mairiam Taggart, widow of Capt. John Taggart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6428) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Zadoc J. Overby—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6429) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Henry Harmon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 6430) for the relief of Edward Henneberry, of Pearl, Idaho—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 6431) for the relief of Annie M. Miller and Mary Louise Latimer—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. YOUNG of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6432) for the relief of P. F. Eagan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6433) for the relief of James F. Carr—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUPPERT: A bill (H. R. 6434) granting a pension to George W. Farnum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 6435) for the relief of Hannah J. Jones, executrix of Emanuel Jones, deceased, a British subject—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Resolutions of the city council of Pella, Iowa, expressing sympathy for the Boer Republic in its present war—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of T. H. Johnson, of South McAlester, Ind. T., asking free deportation for colored people—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, petition of T. H. Gregg and others, of Manchester, Iowa, relating to the stamp tax on medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of O. R. Bersbee and other carriers of the post-office at Burlington, Iowa, for the passage of a bill for the equalization of the salaries of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of H. J. Harrison and other post-office clerks at Waterloo, Iowa, in favor of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition from the Dubuque Malting Company, of Dubuque, Iowa, asking for the passage of House bill No. 4727, abolishing eighth barrel stamps—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADAMS: Petition of the Marine Society of New York, favoring the passage of the "Shipping bill"—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ALLEN of Kentucky (by request): Petition of the Equal Rights Association of Kentucky, favoring a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution, prohibiting disfranchisement of women—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of E. D. Axton and others, of Owensboro, Ky., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: Petition of the Woman Suffrage Association of Maine, asking that perfect equality of rights, civil and political, shall be secured to the women of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Women's Foreign Missionary Society, of Gerry, N. Y., Free Methodist Church, of West Kendall, N. Y., and Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Cuba, N. Y., against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of the Missouri State Grange, praying for legislation against trusts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Missouri State Grange, in favor of the pure-food bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BELL: Petition of post-office clerks at Victor, Colo., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BELLAMY: Petition of H. R. Horne, B. E. Sidberry, and other citizens of Fayetteville, N. C., relating to the stamp tax on medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of E. F. Gordon, D. J. Watson, M. C. Guthrie, and sundry other citizens of Southport, N. C., relative to increase of pay and length of service of life-saving crews on the coast of North Carolina—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Dunbar Davis, keeper of Oak Island Life-Saving Station, and surfmen, and of J. S. Watts and surfmen on the coast of North Carolina, relative to increase of pay and length of service of life-saving crews, on an equal footing with the lake life-saving stations—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Petition of railway postal clerks in the First Congressional district of Pennsylvania, for the reclassification of the Railway Mail Service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: Petition of post-office clerks of Houlton, Me., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: Petition of druggists of Lawrence, Kans., asking for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROMWELL: Petition of Lytle Post, No. 47, Grand Army of the Republic, of Ohio, in regard to amendment to the civil-service law—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. BULL: Resolutions of the employees of the Brooklyn Navy-Yard, for the construction of gunboats and cruisers in Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of clerks of the post-office at Newport, R. I., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the classification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BURKETT: Resolutions of the Nebraska Live Stock Breeders' Association, against the anti-vivisection bill—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BURTON: Petition of Shipmasters' Association, Lodge No. 7, indorsing House bill No. 3988, for a reorganization of the Weather Bureau—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of John Drew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAPRON: Petitions of clerks employed in the Westerly and Pawtucket post-offices, R. I., asking for the passage of the bill No. 4351, for the classification of clerks in the first and second class post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: Resolutions of the Merchants' Exchange and the Cotton Exchange of St. Louis, Mo., asking for the reorganization of the Weather Bureau—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers Pilot Association, in favor of the Wadsworth bill for the reorganization of the Weather Bureau—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COWHERD: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of the heirs of J. W. Deal—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Petition of the Marine Society of New York City, for the passage of the shipping bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of 118 clerks employed in the post-office at New York City, for the classification of clerks in post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DAHLE of Wisconsin: Petition of clerks employed in the post-offices at Watertown and Portage, Wis., for the classification of clerks in post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Edward Williams and others, of Madison, Wis., for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS: Petition of J. F. Welborn and 29 others, of Sanford, Fla., against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. DE VRIES: Petition of druggists of Stockton, Cal., urging the repeal of the internal-revenue tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOVENER: Petition of J. S. Hyer and 37 other citizens of Braxton County, W. Va., to accompany House bill No. 1788, granting a pension to Nicholas C. Wilson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBLE: Petition of the Marine Society of New York, favoring the passage of the shipping bill—to the Committe on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Woman Suffrage Association of South Dakota, against the insertion of the word "male" in the constitution of Hawaii, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER of Michigan (by request): Petition of the Woman Suffrage Association of Michigan, asking that perfect equality of rights, civil and political, be secured to the women of Hawaii, etc.—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: Papers to accompany House bill to correct the military record of George W. Swaney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Resolutions of the Springfield, Mass., Board of Trade, favoring the passage of House bill No. 887, in the interest of manufacturing and commercial industries—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HENRY of Mississippi (by request): Petition of the Woman Suffrage Association of Mississippi, for equality of rights for the women of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of E. F. Cahill, W. L. Frye, and J. W. Ballon, postal clerks of Dixon, Ill., praying for the passage of the bill providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to George W. Noble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: Petition of Belle C. Schneider and 3 others, of Chippewa Falls, Wis., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: Petition of the Woman Suffragists of Washington, against the insertion of the word "male"

in the constitution framed for Hawaii, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 4245, for the relief of J. J. L. Peel—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNOX: Papers to accompany House bill No. 5155, to increase the pension of James Noonan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of F. E. McNabb, of Lowell, Mass., and C. Herbert Webster and other citizens of the Fifth Congressional district of Massachusetts, to repeal the stamp tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LACEY: Resolutions of a mass meeting at Keokuk, Iowa, sympathizing with the Boers in the present war—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Davenport, Iowa, Business Men's Association, favoring House bill No. 3988, to reorganize the Weather Bureau—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LITTAUER: Papers to accompany House bill for the removal of the charge of desertion against Isaac S. Hodges—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLE: Petitions of C. H. Andrews and others, of Fort Smith, Ark., and C. A. Illing and others, of Pine Bluff, Ark., favoring House bill No. 4351, for the classification of clerks in post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Petitions of K. K. Rankin, Cyrus M. Dunn, and others, of Rockland and Auburn, Me., urging the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the classification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition of post-office clerks of Bridgeton, N. J., and of Derby, Conn., for the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. McALEER: Petition of Hance Bros. & White, of Philadelphia, Pa., to repeal the stamp tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCALL: Petitions of post-office clerks of the city of Cambridge and North Cambridge, Mass., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the reclassification of postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Petition of W. B. Rogers and others, committee, for the adjustment of compensation of customs inspectors at the port of New York—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Marine Society of the City of New York, urging the passage of the so-called "shipping bill"—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Julius Laber, of New York City, relating to the stamp tax on medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARSH: Petition of John N. Reed and Reed Brothers, druggists, of Quincy, Ill., urging the repeal of the internal-revenue tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of retail merchants of Prairie City, Ill., against the passage of the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the employees of the New York Navy-Yard, in favor of the construction of gunboats and cruisers at the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MERCER: Petition of South Omaha (Nebr.) Live Stock Exchange, protesting against the passage of House bill No. 6, relating to the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine and kindred products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Nebraska Dairymen's Association, in regard to tax on oleomargarine—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULLER: Petition of the National Remedy Company, relating to the stamp tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of employees of Stapleton, N. Y., post-office, in behalf of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of the Thirty-third National Encampment, Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic, relating to civil-service appointments—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, resolution of employees of the New York Navy-Yard Lodge, No. 171, Brotherhood of Boiler Makers and Iron Ship Builders, of New York, protesting against discrimination against the New York Navy-Yard in governmental work—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor, relating to the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petition of the employees of the San Bernardino, Cal., post-office, urging the passage of House bill No. 4931, for the classification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 5444, for the relief of Albert William Brush—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 5193, for the relief of George C. Dean—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers in support of House bill No. 5690, for the relief of Jennie Blackburn Johnston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers of Thomas H. H. Gibbs, to accompany House bill No. 5688, for his relief—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 5687, for the relief of Patrick O'Neill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 5686, granting an increase of pension to James J. Marcher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 5443, granting a pension to Elizabeth Edwards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 5194, to correct the record of Peley T. Griffith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 5445, granting increase of pension to Joseph Stancliff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of a convention of fruit growers of California, in relation to the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of fruit growers of California, relating to reciprocity, treaties, etc.—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of post-office clerks of San Diego, Cal., for the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the classification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Escondido, Cal., against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, in favor of the bill for the inspection of trees, plants, etc., imported into the United States—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of the Fruit Growers, Shippers, and Buyers' Association of California, against the reduction of duty on citrus fruits—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTJEN: Resolutions of the Shipmasters' Association of Milwaukee, Branch No. 6, favoring the reorganization of the Weather Bureau—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring an appropriation for the establishment of a commission to investigate industrial conditions of China—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PEARCE of Missouri: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of William S. Brinton—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POLK: Two petitions of citizens of Pennsylvania, against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 4441, for the relief of Samuel C. Krickbaum, of Benton, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: Petition of druggists of Rutland and Brandon, Vt., relating to the stamp tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAY of New York: Petition of William Gleason, R. A. Scott, and 6 others, of Rochester, N. Y., for equality of rights for the women of Hawaii—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Various petitions of Union Veteran camps, various Grand Army of the Republic posts, Sons of Veterans, United Confederate Veterans, and citizens of the United States, urging the establishment of a military park on the battlefield of Stone River, at Murfreesboro, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers in support of House bill for the relief of Frank Rother—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petitions of the Teachers' Sunday School Association of Fremont, Ind., and of the Epworth League of Hoagland, Ind., in opposition to the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. RUCKER: Petition of citizens of Carroll County, Mo., to grant a pension to disabled soldiers in the enrolled militia of the State of Missouri—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Linn County, Mo., praying Congress to adopt a resolution offering the friendly offices of the United States in securing a cessation of war in South Africa—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of Bright's Chemical Company, Little Falls, N. Y., for the repeal or modification of the internal-revenue act, especially as it relates to drugs and proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMS: Petition of W. T. Huff and others, of Enid, Okla., citizens of the "Cherokee Strip," in favor of the free-homes bill—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petitions of S. R. Hurst, L. Lovell, M. McKeeley, and others, of Tennessee, in opposition to the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolutions of the pro-Boer meeting at New

Haven, Conn., January 4, expressing sympathy for the peoples of the South African and Orange Free State Republics—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, resolution of the employees of the New York Navy-Yard, protesting against discrimination against that yard in governmental work—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Branford, Conn., for a survey of Branford Harbor, Connecticut—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Illinois State Association of Letter Carriers, favoring the passage of House bill No. 4911, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the post-office clerks of Meriden, Conn., post-office, urging the passage of House bill No. 4931, for the classification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SPRAGUE: Petition of clerks of Newton Center, Mass., post-office, and Back Bay Station, Boston, favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Resolutions adopted by the citizens of St. Paul, Minn., favoring arbitration of the dispute between Great Britain and the Transvaal Republic—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Minneapolis Trade and Labor Council, protesting against the passage of a certain bill to modify the letter carriers' eight hours a day law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Woman's Suffrage Association of Minnesota, favoring a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution, granting suffrage to women—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of St. Clair Commandery, No. 6, Union Veterans' Union, of Stillwater, Minn., protesting against the passage of House bill No. 3899—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Petition of Edward Wetherington, executor of Jane L. Daugherty, deceased, praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THROPP: Petition of post-office clerks of Johnstown, Pa., in favor of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, papers in support of House bill for the relief of David V. Evans, of Hyndman, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS: Petition of post-office clerks of Port Huron, Mich., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the reclassification of postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Paper to accompany House bill correcting the record of Jessey Milan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill for the relief of Robert J. Tate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of James H. Grayson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Susana Mackey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for the relief of S. M. Nalley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers in support of House bill to correct the military record of George A. Crisel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill for the relief of N. P. Greathouse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of John D. Craig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Eliza C. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Elias Whipple—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: Papers relating to the claim of Mary F. Phipps, of Yazoo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Eliza J. Noble, widow of James D. Noble, surgeon, Fifty-first Regiment Volunteer Infantry, and assistant surgeon, United States Navy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Marine Society of the City of New York, in favor of the shipping bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of George H. Wilson and other employees of Harlan & Hollingsworth's Works, Wilmington, Del., relating to civil-service appointments—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of W. E. Hughes and other railway postal clerks of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring a bill providing for the reclassification of the Railway Mail Service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *January 16, 1900.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. GALLINGER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will, without objection, stand approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting certain information relative to a grant of land made September 25, 1689, by the Government of Spain to the Indians of the Pueblo of Zuñi, in the Territory of New Mexico, and recommending that the grant be formally and expressly confirmed by the Congress, together with copies of correspondence on the subject and a transcript of the record of the claim of these Indians from the files of the General Land Office and of a proposed bill to confirm the title in question; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 4th instant, a copy of the report of the Auditor for the War Department of the 9th instant, relative to the amount due the State of South Carolina growing out of the claim for moneys expended by that State for military purposes in the war of 1812 with Great Britain, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was, on motion of Mr. TILLMAN, ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the Senate of the 8th instant, certain information relative to the $50,000,000 appropriated by Congress under the act approved March 9, 1896, entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for prior years, and for other purposes," and stating that no portion of the appropriation was assigned to or expended by the Department of Agriculture; which, on motion of Mr. ALLEN, was ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 13th ultimo, a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and accompanying copy of report of Lieut. Col. G. J. Lydecker, Corps of Engineers, relative to the number of days during the season of 1899 on which navigation was blocked by reason of an accident occurring in St. Marys River and in the St. Clair Flats Canal, respectively, also the approximate money loss to the vessel interests by reason of such delays, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 5042) to provide for improvements in the tax departments of the District of Columbia; and

A bill (H. R. 5297) to authorize aliens to dispose of real estate holdings in the District of Columbia.

PROTECTION OF COLORED PEOPLE.

Mr. CULLOM. I present a petition signed by more than 3,200 colored persons, and as it is only three or four lines long I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the petition will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

To His Excellency William McKinley, President,
and the Congress of the United States:

The undersigned, whose names are signed to this petition, would most respectfully pray for the execution of such of our constitutional laws as shall protect the colored people and all citizens alike in and of these United States in life, civil and political liberty, which shall be effective in suppressing the barbarous custom of lynching and burning colored men.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, I suppose the petition ought to go to the Committee on the Judiciary, as it relates to such legislation as is proper in the premises. I desire to call the attention of the Judiciary Committee to it, in view of the fact that I feel interest in the question involved.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Illinois kindly have the petition read again? I did not hear it.

Mr. CULLOM. The Senator from Massachusetts asks that the petition be again read, so that he may hear what it is.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petition will again be read.

The Secretary again read the petition.

Mr. CULLOM. The petition technically simply calls for the execution of laws. I happen to know from the gentleman who sends the petition, and who is at the head of an organization, a gentleman by the name of Dr. Magee, of Chicago, that they desire such legislation, if it does not already exist, as will protect colored people from lynching and murder without the authority of law. I merely desire to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary to the petition in the hope that that committee may be able to do something that will, under the lead of the Senator, give greater protection to the colored people of this country in their rights as citizens.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petition will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HOAR. I think that class of questions has heretofore gone to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. CULLOM. I really was not aware as to what committee the petition ought to be referred.

Mr. HOAR. But I am not sure, of course. I wish the honorable Senator, who has had such large experience in legislation, would accompany his reference with some form or scheme of legislation.

I do not suppose that any Senator would be found in this body, of any party or from any State or of any shade of opinion, who would not be glad to have some proper measure adopted which would repress this wrongdoing and which would refer all offenses or alleged offenses to the orderly, peaceable, and certain course of the laws of the different States. Certainly, with a pretty large and intimate knowledge of the members of this body, I do not know a Senator on either side of this Chamber who would not earnestly agree to that as the proper policy.

But, of course, most of the offenses which come to our knowledge through the newspaper reports are matters of which the State laws now take cognizance. It is not for want of laws against riot, laws against assault, laws against murder, especially laws to prohibit bloody and brutal and cruel offenses of this sort, that they are committed; but by what constitutional method the United States can take action, which to be efficient must have the support of juries drawn from the vicinage and of courts held in the district where the offense is committed, a district previously ascertained by law, is a very difficult inquiry.

Before this matter, to which my honorable friend has called the attention of the Judiciary Committee, passes from the Senate I wish he would give us the benefit of his counsel and advice, not as to the enormity of the offense, but as to a method which will work for its suppression.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, it is a matter of indifference to me whether the petition is referred to the Committee on the Judiciary or the Committee on Privileges and Elections. It is best to be frank in the face of the increase of lynchings of colored people, and to say that under the Constitution, as it now reads, there is no power in Congress to prevent crimes in the States. If murders are committed from any motive or against any person and the States neglect to punish those crimes, there can not be Federal legislation to take the place of useful State laws or to repair the evil done by the nonenforcement of State laws.

The exception to that remark is, that under the fifteenth amendment, undoubtedly, in the case of crimes committed for the purpose of interfering with the right of impartial suffrage for all men, there may be national legislation to prevent crimes committed with the purpose of preventing colored people from voting.

Mr. SPOONER. There is.

Mr. CHANDLER. There is such a power?

Mr. SPOONER. There is such legislation, Federal legislation.

Mr. CHANDLER. There is not now, as I understand it, any Federal legislation upon the statute book enacted in pursuance of the fifteenth amendment. If there is, the Senator from Wisconsin will correct me. What are called the Federal election laws were wiped off the statute book in 1893, and there is now no legislation on that subject.

The point is that while Congress can undoubtedly, if it sees fit, enact laws intended to protect the right of suffrage under the fifteenth amendment, Congress has no constitutional power to punish crime, ordinary crimes, crimes of any sort in the States unless they are connected with the suppression of the right of suffrage.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Debate is out of order. It is proceeding by unanimous consent.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Chair will excuse me. I supposed when a petition was presented it was in order to debate the question of reference; otherwise I should have said nothing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the rule, petitions are presented and referred without debate.

Mr. CULLOM. If I may be allowed to say simply one word, Mr. President, as to the committee to which this petition shall go—it is a matter of no concern to me. It will be well taken care of either in the Committee on Privileges and Elections or the Judiciary Committee. It occurred to me, however, that possibly if new legislation seemed to be necessary and could be had under the Constitution at all, perhaps it ought to go to the Judiciary Committee.

Now, the Senator from Massachusetts calls upon me to suggest what legislation might be deemed necessary or constitutional. I thought, just as has been said, that it might be doubtful whether we could go any further than we have already gone under the Constitution without a constitutional amendment. But here comes a petition with 3,230 signers, all colored persons, I believe, making this petition. It seemed to me that it was incumbent upon the Senate, through its proper committee and through the Senate itself, if the committee could find that we have any power to do anything, to undertake to do it; and nobody, it seemed to me, was more able to discover what ought to be done and could be done than the Judiciary Committee, with its very able and long-experienced chairman, the Senator from Massachusetts. So I simply suggested that it go there for investigation and report at some early day if they find it consistent to do so.

These people realize that they are being badly treated; that they are killed, lynched, and punished in all kinds of ways without law in different parts of the country, and it ought to be stopped if it can be. Therefore they prepared this petition which I have presented, and which I hope will go to the Judiciary Committee, unless there is reason or objection to its going there.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator from Illinois tell us whether he knows what is the cause or immediate reason for this petition being presented? I understood him to say it was from some colored persons in Chicago.

Mr. CULLOM. Yes; the petition comes to me from a gentleman in Chicago; but, as I understand it, it is signed by people in different parts of the country, possibly out of the State of Illinois as well as in it.

Mr. TILLMAN. I wished to know whether the immediate reason for it was the treatment of colored people in Illinois or in the South.

Mr. CULLOM. I do not know that, sir. I do know, however—I am perfectly frank to state it—that there were five or six or eight colored people in my own State who were shot down on the street or on the common without cause; and I am gratified to say that thirty or forty men are already in jail, and some of the persons who were charged with the offense are being tried for the offense committed, and I trust that under the administration of the governor of Illinois the crowd of men guilty of that offense will be punished under the law of Illinois.

Mr. SPOONER rose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the Senator from Wisconsin discussing this question? The Chair hears none.

Mr. SPOONER. When the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] was asserting a few moments ago that there was power in Congress to enact legislation to give effect to the fifteenth amendment, I stated that there was some legislation on that subject upon the statute book, to which the Senator from New Hampshire replied that there was not; that it had been repealed. I rise simply for the purpose of bringing to his notice sections 5507, 5508, and 5509 of the Revised Statutes—one punishing any attempt to intimidate voters by bribery, by threats, or to deprive anyone of the rights guaranteed by the fifteenth amendment; section 5508 punishing conspiracy to injure or intimidate citizens because they have exercised rights or privileges or because they seek to exercise rights or privileges under that amendment; and section 5509 providing that if in the act of violating any provision in either of the two preceding sections any other felony or misdemeanor be committed the offender shall be punished as provided by the laws of the State for a similar felony. Does the Senator understand that those are repealed?

Mr. CHANDLER. I stand corrected. All the Federal election laws were repealed, but the sections which the Senator has read were originally enacted, I think, as a part of the civil-rights act, and they remain upon the statute book.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the Senator from Nebraska discussing the question?

Mr. ALLEN. I shall not detain the Senate long.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection, and the Senator from Nebraska will proceed.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator will look at the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution he will see that there can be no reasonable question about the power of Congress to protect this class of people in the exercise of their rights and privileges:

> All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside—

Says this amendment. I know, Mr. President, that my belief

may not be entirely popular with certain classes in the United States, but I hold to the doctrine that the power to make citizenship carries with it the power to protect that citizen in the exercise of his right, and that the constitutional shield and statutes enacted pursuant to the Constitution follow the individual in protecting him not only in the exercise of his political rights but in his person; and if he is a citizen of the United States as distinguished from a citizen of the State, a distinction created for the first time by this amendment to the Constitution, the Federal power may follow him wherever he may go within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government and protect him wherever he may be. If the States are derelict in the exercise of their power to protect him and punish crime against his rights, he being a citizen of the United States as distinguished from a citizen of a State or concurrently with the citizenship of a State, the Federal courts have power, or may be given power by statute, to afford that protection, and Congress ought not to undertake to shirk its responsibility and refuse to enact a proper statute.

Now, I know nothing about the merits of a controversy of this kind. I observe from time to time in the press accounts of what are looked upon, and properly so, as outrages against the rights of this class of people. I wish to say that no doubt in almost every instance, if not in every case, there is great provocation for the crime that is committed. It is within the power of the Congress of the United States to enact laws to protect citizens of the United States, white or black, and it is within the power of the executive branch of the Government to enforce those statutes on every foot of every State, Territory, and District within the jurisdiction of this country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petition will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. BATE presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Clarksville, Tenn., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of Butler Boyd and sundry other citizens of Clarksville, Tenn., and the petition of Jesse L. Nelson, of Jackson, Tenn., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TURLEY presented petitions of C. A. Dachsel, of Memphis; of the officers of the State Druggists' Association, and of the Thacher Medicine Company, of Chattanooga, all in the State of Tennessee, praying for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SEWELL presented a petition of the Woman Suffrage Association of Jersey City, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to omit the word "male" from the constitution of Hawaii, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

He also presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Redbank, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of Johnson & Johnson, of New Brunswick, N. J., and a petition of sundry druggists of Asbury Park, N. J., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Marine Society of New York City, praying for the enactment of legislation to increase American shipping; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New York, praying for an increase of the artillery force of the Army for coast defenses; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I present a petition of 328 inspectors of customs at the port of New York, praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 2006, regulating the compensation of customs inspectors at that port. I ask that the petition be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Petition for the readjustment of compensation of customs inspectors at the port of New York.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

The undersigned, a committee representing 328 inspectors of customs at the port of New York, respectfully submit to your honorable bodies the following memorial and statement for the purpose of inviting your attention to the injustice suffered by these officers, owing to their long service of three hundred and sixty-five days of each year, being subject to duty from sunrise to sunset of each day, being many hours of labor in excess of that of other per diem employees of the Government, which hardship and injustice your committee on behalf of the said 328 inspectors of customs respectfully pray may be corrected by the passage of Senate bill No. 2006 or House bill No. 5017, introduced respectively by Senator THOMAS C. PLATT and Representative GEORGE B. MCCLELLAN, entitled "A bill fixing the compensation of customs inspectors at the port of New York, in lieu of extra compensation for night services hereafter to be rendered in the examination of baggage, and for other purposes."

The following facts are stated in the hope and belief that your honorable bodies may pass one or the other of the said bills, which, if enacted into law, would increase the inspectors' compensation but $1 per day in lieu of extra compensation for night services hereafter to be rendered in the examination of baggage, for which they were formerly paid the sum of $2.50 extra per night. These officers are compelled, by reason of the nature of their services, to leave their homes at a very early hour in the morning and to incur an expense for meals and transportation of from 75 cents to $1 per day, which leaves their actual compensation about $3 per day—less than the average longshoreman receives for his services on the same docks where customs inspectors are required to supervise their work of unloading cargoes.

Customs inspectors who are competent to discharge a steamer and render a correct account of her cargo must be possessed of a high order of intelligence and deserve and should receive much higher pay than an ordinary clerk. The duties and responsibilities are certainly much greater than those of many clerks in the custom-house receiving from $1,800 to $2,500 per annum.

Inspectors detailed to discharge a steamer's cargo are required to be at their vessel ready for business never later than 7 o'clock in the morning from the time of her arrival until cargo is finally and completely disposed of. From early morning until sunset they must be skillful, alert, and unflagging in their duties. This would ordinarily be considered a long, hard day's work, but in addition they are frequently ordered to report at headquarters at the Barge Office after sunset and detailed for examination of incoming passengers' baggage at the various steamship docks, where they are often detained until midnight or even later, but it is absolutely necessary that they shall be at their several vessels promptly the next morning ready to resume the discharge of cargo.

The landing of passengers at night and the examination of their baggage has come to be a permanent practice, and certainly the United States Government should not compel its officers to perform these extra duties without an increase of compensation. The addition of $1 per day, as proposed by the bills referred to, to the present salaries, although inadequate, would be satisfactory, on the whole, to the customs inspectors.

The law regarding persons receiving per diem compensation in the service of the Government, limiting their hours of labor to eight hours per day, would seem to apply to inspectors, but if enforced in their case would necessitate the employment of more than double the number of officers now in the service.

Official statistics show that more than 60 per cent of the revenue from duties is collected at the port of New York, and over 90 per cent of the traveling public arrive at this port each year.

By a circular of the Treasury Department dated April 4, 1894 (Synopsis 14864), collectors of customs were authorized to permit the landing of passengers' baggage under the regulations governing the landing of cargoes at night under special license. This was to be done upon the application of agents or owners of steamships in the foreign trade, who were required to deposit a sufficient sum of money to cover the necessary disbursements of inspectors for this extra service, and the collectors were authorized to distribute the amount so deposited to the officers in accordance with the time in which they were employed, not to exceed $2.50 for each night. This practice continued for about one year, when it was decided by the Solicitor of the Treasury—as appears by Department Circular of April 18, 1895 (Synopsis, 15917)—that passengers' baggage was not included in the word "cargo" as used in section 2871, Revised Statutes, and therefore the collection of moneys for the steamship companies to pay for this extra service was illegal. The Department, however, continued the practice of examining baggage after sunset, but denied to the officers any compensation for their services in that connection, and such practice continues to this day, thus adding greatly to the onerous duties of inspectors and involving increased personal expense to them.

Prior to 1864 the pay of inspectors of customs was limited by law to $4 per diem (section 2733, Rev. Stat.). By section 2737, Revised Statutes, however, taken from the act of April 29, 1864, the Secretary was authorized to increase the compensation of inspectors, at such ports as he might deem advisable to do so, by adding to their compensation at that time a sum not exceeding $1 per day, so that under the law, as it now stands, $4 per diem is the maximum compensation an inspector can receive. But the business of the port of New York has since that time increased enormously, and the work required of inspectors has correspondingly increased in volume and importance. In 1866, and for a number of years thereafter, most of the importations came in sailing vessels of medium tonnage, the discharge of which was comparatively simple and easy. Now the great bulk of the business is done by large trans-Atlantic steamers carrying from 5,000 to 15,000 tons of freight, the discharge of which demands the services of two inspectors in each case, and the work of tallying and accounting for these great cargoes requires the exercise of great skill, discretion, and integrity. Besides the discharge of imports, the export business has grown to immense proportions, and in cases where drawback is claimed the work must be done under the constant supervision of an inspector in order that frauds may be prevented and the interests of the Government properly guarded.

The port of New York includes the river front of Jersey shore, Brooklyn, and Staten Island, as well as the frontages on North and East rivers, and includes all the territory as far south as Bayonne, involving considerable traveling expenses between the barge office and those points, being frequently repeated several times in one day.

The failure of the Government to reimburse them for transportation expenses and for meals necessarily obtained away from their homes is exceptional, other employees of customs being allowed such expenses.

Your committee respectfully submit that the foregoing statement fully establishes the merits of the application of the inspectors of customs at the port of New York for the additional compensation of $1 per day. Throughout the entire country, especially in large manufacturing centers, the wages of workmen are being increased on account of the increased cost of living, and this in cases where the great bulk of the employees are not skilled workmen or laborers. In nearly every branch or department of labor in private employ skilled labor is receiving greater compensation than a similar class of labor in the Government service, while in nearly all branches of such service the hours of labor are restricted to one-third of the day.

For the reasons and considerations herein stated, your committee respectfully ask the enactment into law of one of the bills designated, for which, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray, etc.

Mr. MCBRIDE presented the memorial of Abigail Scott Duniway, president, and Frances E. Gottshall, secretary, on behalf of

the Equal Suffrage Association of Oregon, remonstrating against the use of the word "male" in the suffrage clauses of the constitution for the government of Hawaii, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines, and praying for the adoption of a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the disfranchisement of citizens of the United States on account of sex; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

He also presented a petition of Camp No. 17, Indian War Veterans, of Albany, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation to pension Indian war veterans of the Pacific coast; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HANNA presented the petition of E. B. Howard & Co., of Akron, Ohio, and the petition of S. E. Allen and sundry other citizens of Akron, Ohio, praying for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of W. B. Tubbs and sundry other citizens of Ridgeville Corner, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the manufacture and sale or disposing of cigarettes or cigarette wrappers in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of the survivors of the First and Second Kentucky Regimental Association, held at Central Turner Hall, Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring the passage of a per diem pension bill; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry petitions of railway mail clerks of Delaware, Sidney, Wooster, Painesville, Lorain, Marion, and Mansfield, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of U. J. Favorite, of Tippecanoe City, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation allowing artificial limbs to pensioners; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WOLCOTT presented the petition of Mrs. Albert L. Welch, president, and Mrs. George A. Smith, secretary, on behalf of the non-Partisan Equal Suffrage Association of Colorado, praying for the adoption of a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the disfranchisement of citizens on account of sex, and remonstrating against the insertion of the word "male" in the suffrage clause of the constitution for the government of Hawaii, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. WETMORE. I present, by request, the petition of Helen Rand Tindall, president, and Henrietta C. Morrison, secretary, on behalf of the Equal Suffrage Association of the District of Columbia, praying for the adoption of a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the disfranchisement of United States citizens on account of sex. I move that the petition be referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS presented a petition of 83 railway mail clerks of Minneapolis, Minn., and a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Stillwater, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of Martha J. Thompson, president, and Ethel Edgerton Hurd, secretary, on behalf of the Woman Suffrage Association of Minnesota, praying for the adoption of a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the disfranchisement of United States citizens on account of sex; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. QUARLES presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Neenah, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Michigan City, Ind., and a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Fort Wayne, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. TILLMAN presented a petition of the Equal Rights Association of South Carolina, praying for the adoption of a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the disfranchisement of United States citizens on account of sex; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

He also presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Greenville, S. C., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I present a paper in the form of a protest of the Turtle Mountain Indians against Senate bill 161 and in favor of Senate bill 1932. The protest is not signed by any of the Indians interested, but it bears the signature of a person who claims to be the attorney for the Indians. I also submit a letter to accompany the statement. I move that the memorial and accompanying letter be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I present a petition of citizens of Buffalo County, S. Dak., praying to have the laws of the United States apply to all crimes committed on Indian reservations. As it is, a large class of the crimes committed on a reservation are subject to the laws of the State. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and at a future day I shall introduce a bill covering the subject. I did introduce such a bill a year or two ago, but nothing was done with it.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL presented the memorial of Ella Harrison, president, and Dr. Marie E. Adams, secretary, on behalf of the Woman's Suffrage Association of Missouri, remonstrating against the use of the word "male" in the suffrage clause of the Constitution for the government of Hawaii, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines, and praying for the adoption of a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the disfranchisement of United States citizens on account of sex; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

He also presented a memorial of the Missouri State Grange, remonstrating against the adulteration and misbranding of foods and drugs; which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented a petition of the Missouri Viava Company, of Kansas City, Mo., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the legislative committee of the Missouri State Grange, remonstrating against the operation of combinations or trusts; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CHILTON presented the petition of Maggie S. Beck and sundry other citizens of Hillsboro, Tex., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of the National Woman's Suffrage Association of Massachusetts, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting disfranchisement on account of sex; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. DANIEL presented the petition of Mary Male, widow of Robert Male, praying that her name be placed upon the pension roll; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of J. B. Hall and sundry other citizens of Fredericksburg, Va., and the petition of R. C. Petzold and sundry other citizens of Newport News, Va., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of J. Moten and sundry other citizens of Virginia, praying that an appropriation be made to pay the depositors in the Freedman's Savings Bank and Trust Company; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented sundry petitions of railway mail clerks of Lynchburg, Winchester, and Roanoke, all in the State of Virginia, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Marine Society of New York City, praying for the enactment of legislation to increase American shipping; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PAPER ON POLYGAMY.

Mr. RAWLINS. I present a statement which I ask to have read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. It relates to the subject of polygamy, and should be considered in connection with other papers on that subject.

There being no objection, the paper was read, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

POLYGAMY AND UNLAWFUL COHABITATION.

From the reading of the various editorials and articles of the public press it is evident that there is much misconstruction and misunderstanding as to the present attitude of our church respecting the subjects of polygamy and unlawful cohabitation, and, believing that many good and conscientious people have been misled and much adverse criticism occasioned thereby, I feel it but just to both "Mormons" and "non-Mormons" to state that, in accordance with the manifesto of the late president Wilford Woodruff, dated

September 25, 1890, which was presented to and unanimously accepted by our general conference on the 6th of October, 1890, the church has positively abandoned the practice of polygamy or the solemnization of plural marriages in this and every other State and that no member or officer thereof has any authority whatever to perform a plural marriage or enter into such a relation. Nor does the church advise or encourage unlawful cohabitation on the part of any of its members. If, therefore, any member disobeys the law, either as to polygamy or unlawful cohabitation, he must bear his own burden, or, in other words, be answerable to the tribunals of the land for his own action pertaining thereto.

With a sincere desire that the position of our church as to polygamy and unlawful cohabitation may be better understood, and with best wishes for the welfare and happiness of all, this statement is made, and is respectfully commended to the careful consideration of the public generally.

LORENZO SNOW,
President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints.

SALT LAKE CITY, *January 8, 1900.*

PENSION CLAIMS OF DEPENDENT PARENTS.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am directed by the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2336) repealing section 4716 of the Revised Statutes, so far as the same may be applicable to the claims of dependent parents of soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the Army or Navy of the United States during the war with Spain, to report it without amendment and to submit a report thereon. As it is a brief bill and is a matter of urgency, I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read for information.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the bill be read, and then let us have an explanation of it.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, I will make a brief statement.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the bill be read first.

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4716 of the Revised Statutes be, and the same is hereby, repealed, so far as the same may be applicable to the claims to pension of dependent parents of soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the Army or Navy of the United States during the war with Spain.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, section 4716 of the Revised Statutes reads as follows:

No money on account of pension shall be paid to any person, or to the widow, children, or heirs of any deceased person, who in any manner voluntarily engaged in or aided or abetted the late rebellion against the authority of the United States.

The brief report I have written is as follows:

So long as this section stands upon the statute books the Bureau of Pensions has no alternative but to reject all claims for dependent parents on behalf of sons who were killed or who died from disabilities incurred while serving in the war with Spain or in the Philippines. Several claims have been filed in the Bureau since the beginning of the war with Spain of this class, some of them being that of parents living in the South, where the father served in the Southern army during the civil war, or in other ways aided or abetted the Southern cause. They have of necessity been rejected under the statute as it now stands.

It seems to your committee that this condition of affairs should be promptly relieved and that so much of this section as applies to dependent parents who have lost sons while fighting under the flag during the late war should be repealed. Beyond a doubt the law was never intended to apply to cases of this kind.

Believing it to be a simple act of justice, your committee report the bill back favorably, with a recommendation that it pass.

Now, Mr. President, that is the purpose of the bill, and it is a good purpose. I trust it will be promptly passed.

Mr. TILLMAN. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire who is chairman of the Committee on Pensions if he will not include Mexican war veterans in the bill. There are only five or six thousand of those old people left, and even though they may have given comfort and aid to the rebellion there are men in this Chamber who were generals in the Confederate army, and they are not discriminated against in any shape, form, or fashion; and why should those old soldiers who fought in Mexico, and some of whom are in the poorhouse in my part of the country and can not get any increase of pension, be discriminated against on account of disability? Will he not now be liberal enough to let the Committee on Pensions accept an amendment allowing the dependent-pension act to apply to the Mexican war veterans?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I confess I do not exactly understand the drift of the suggestion made by the Senator from South Carolina. The Senator knows that I personally am willing to do almost anything that is reasonable in regard to these matters, but here is a specific provision in the Revised Statutes which we desire to have repealed for a specific purpose, and I am sure the Senator will not encumber it with amendments which have no relevancy to the question now under consideration.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator will pardon me, is it not relevant to ask that the discriminations against Mexican war veterans who participated or aided in the rebellion shall be removed when it is proposed that we shall remove those against men who participated in the Spanish war? I declare I can not see where the irrelevancy comes in.

Mr. GALLINGER. I confess I can not comprehend it. I will assure the Senator from South Carolina that if he presents a proper bill covering that point it will have the careful consideration of the committee of which I happen to be chairman; but I hope he will allow this bill to pass now, as it relates to a class of persons in his own section of the country who I think to-day are not being given their dues under the laws as they stand at the present time.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am directed by the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 750) granting a pension to Sarah T. Usher, to submit an adverse report thereon, as the beneficiary named in the bill is dead. I move that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. For the same reason I am directed by the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1367) granting an increase of pension to Jackson Osborn, to submit an adverse report thereon. I move that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1176) to provide pensions for freedmen, etc., submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1711) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Green;

A bill (S. 2368) granting a pension to Mary A. Randall;

A bill (S. 2367) granting a pension to Susan Stratton; and

A bill (S. 1713) granting an increase of pension to Alice S. Jordan.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 240) granting a pension to Nancy Ellen Bessom;

A bill (S. 1353) granting an increase of pension to Louisa M. Wright; and

A bill (S. 872) granting an increase of pension to William H. H. Nevitt.

Mr. SHOUP, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 266) granting an increase of pension to William Hamley, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 265) granting an increase of pension to Jane McMahon, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. ALLEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1296) granting a pension to Mary R. Bacon, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1003) granting a pension to Julia M. Johnson, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PRITCHARD, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 899) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. M. A. Dennis, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SEWELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 147) for the relief of Eunice Tripler, widow of Charles S. Tripler, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1387) to place Francis W. Seeley on the retired list of the Army, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1394) for the relief of Bvt. Col. Thomas P. O'Reilly, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. WELLINGTON, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1375) to increase the limit of cost of public building at Cumberland, Md., reported it without amendment, and submitteed a report thereon.

Mr. HANNA. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2175) to restore Lieut. Samuel

Howard to his proper rank, to report adversely thereon, and move its indefinite postponement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The lieutenant having died since the bill was introduced, the bill will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr HANNA, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 43) granting a life-saving medal of the first class to Lieut. Fidelio S. Carter, of the United States Navy, reported it without amendment.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 531) granting a pension to Henrietta Cummins, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 548) granting an increase of pension to John F. McMahon, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 517) granting a pension to Nancy E. Neely, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MORGAN, from the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1783) to provide for the construction of an interoceanic canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. HAWLEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1386) for the relief of Sarah K. McLean, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 2446) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Gibbons; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PROCTOR introduced a bill (S. 2447) to place Lieut. Col. and Bvt. Maj. Gen. Alexander Stewart Webb on the retired list of the United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WETMORE introduced a bill (S. 2448) for the relief of Jeremiah McCarthy and Bartholomew Shea, and for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of Patrick J. Sullivan and John B. Dillon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 2449) for the relief of the estates of John Flower and Thomas B. Flower, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. KYLE introduced a bill (S. 2450) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Pierre, in the State of South Dakota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. RAWLINS introduced a bill (S. 2451) granting a pension to Jennie P. Stover; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DANIEL introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (by request) (S. 2452) for the relief of Samuel G. Hunter (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (by request) (S. 2453) for the relief of the estate of Robert N. Blake (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2454) for the relief of the trustees of the Round Hill Methodist Episcopal Church South;

A bill (S. 2455) for the relief of the estate of Samuel R. Atwell;

A bill (S. 2456) for the relief of John H. Batte;

A bill (S. 2457) for the relief of the estate of John Cain, of Clarke County, Va., or his legal representatives;

A bill (S. 2458) for the relief of David W. Sherman, administrator N. I. Relph;

A bill (S. 2459) for the relief of Julia A. Lewis, widow and executrix of James Lewis, deceased; and

A bill (by request) (S. 2460) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen H. Smith.

Mr. DANIEL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2461) for the relief of Louis Weber; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. PETTUS introduced a bill (S. 2462) granting an increase of pension to Emma L. Du Bois; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PLATT of New York introduced a bill (S. 2463) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Leddy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 2464) to provide for allotments to Indians on White Earth Reservation, in Minnesota; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2465) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to fulfill certain treaty stipulations with the Chippewa Indians of the Mississippi and of Lake Superior, and making appropriation for the same; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. CHILTON introduced a bill (S. 2466) for the relief of Elijah Crudgington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McENERY introduced a bill (S. 2467) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to refund certain moneys collected by the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2468) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to refund certain moneys collected by the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DEPEW introduced a bill (S. 2469) for the relief of the Allaire Works, of New York; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2470) for the relief of G. G. Martin; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2471) for the relief of Olivia M. Clifford; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DEPEW introduced a bill (S. 2472) granting an increase of pension to Alice De Vecchj; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2473) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to cede a portion of cobdock, navy-yard, Brooklyn, N. Y., to the State of New York; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 2474) granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Fields; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 2475) granting an increase of pension to George W. Grant; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2476) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to fulfill certain treaty stipulations with the Chippewa Indians of Lake Superior and the Mississippi, and making appropriation for the same; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. ALLISON introduced a bill (S. 2477) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Dubuque, Iowa; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. ALLISON. I wish to state that the bridge which is desired to be constructed is a matter of local interest to the city of Dubuque. I move that the bill may be referred to the Committee on Commerce, and I hope the chairman will bring it before the committee at an early day, so that prompt action may be had upon it.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LINDSAY introduced a bill (S. 2478) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of James H. Dennis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2479) for the relief of Rev. William T. McElroy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 2480) granting an increase of pension to James H. Walton; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. To accompany the bill I present the petition of James H. Walton, together with the affidavits of J. J. Price, Clem Tyree, Dr. P. S. Fulkerson, and M. Drummond. I move that the bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2481) to place upon the retired list of the Army the names of the surviving officers who were mustered out under the provisions of the act of Congress approved July 15, 1870; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. To accompany the bill I present eleven petitions, which are in printed form, but I presume each of the petitions is signed by one of the proposed beneficiaries. I move that the bill and the petitions be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 2482) to provide for the location, erection, and maintenance of a home for women Army nurses, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WOLCOTT introduced the following bills; which were

severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2483) granting an increase of pension to Lewis C. Beard;

A bill (S. 2484) granting an increase of pension to Edward F. Parker;

A bill (S. 2485) granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Bennett; and

A bill (S. 2486) granting an increase of pension to Susan Daniels.

Mr. WOLCOTT introduced a bill (S. 2487) for the relief of G. B. Stimpson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 66) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay certain claims of the State of Indiana; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. NELSON introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 67) providing for the mounting and distribution of United States maps; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. DEPEW introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 68) to provide for the presentation of medals of honor to certain troops who volunteered their services in 1863, before the battle of Gettysburg, Pa.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BUTLER introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 69) to provide for the appointment of a commission to investigate and report upon the most desirable area in western North Carolina and eastern Tennessee for the establishment of a national park and forest reserve, to be known as the Appalachian National Park; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

POLICY REGARDING THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. WELLINGTON. I introduce a joint resolution, which I ask to have read at length.

The joint resolution (S. R. 65) declaring the purpose of the Government of the United States with reference to the Philippine Islands was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, First. That the Government of the United States does not consider the payment of the $20,000,000 to the Government of the Kingdom of Spain, stipulated by the treaty of Paris and made in accordance with the same, as a purchase either of lands, persons, or privileges of the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands, but that such payment was made with the friendly purpose of abrogating any claim of sovereignty that was then lodged in the Spanish Government, and to prevent the intervention of other foreign powers in Philippine affairs.

Second. That it is not the purpose of the Government of the people of the United States to deprive the people of the Philippine Islands of their right of self-government, and the war now being waged is not for conquest or for the permanent possession of the islands, but for the establishment of law and order, and shall cease when the Filipinos now under arms make overtures for peace, upon the condition that after the establishment of law and order the people of the island, or such islands as may desire, shall have the privilege, under the protection of the United States, of establishing a republic in which the principle of "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people" shall be absolutely preserved.

Mr. WELLINGTON. I ask that the joint resolution may lie on the table until Thursday immediately after the routine business has been finished, when I shall desire the leave of the Senate to submit some remarks on it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland asks that the joint resolution may lie on the table subject to his call. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. DAVIS submitted an amendment proposing an appropriation of $10,000 for envoy extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Netherlands, intended to be proposed by him to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HANSBROUGH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1706) for the reference of certain claims against the Government of the United States to the Court of Claims; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

GEN. JOHN M. PALMER.

Mr. CULLOM. On December 6, 1899, I introduced a bill (S. 219) for the relief of John M. Palmer, my late colleague in this body. The bill was handed to me by a friend of General Palmer, to be introduced, for the purpose of giving the General an increase of pension from $50 to $100 per month. I thought that such a bill ought to pass and that if there was anybody in this country entitled to a pension of $100 a month General Palmer was that man. Since the introduction of the bill I have received a letter, which I take occasion to read. It is addressed to a friend of General Palmer and has been handed to me. It is as follows:

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., *December 10, 1899.*

MY DEAR SIR: I have received your note of December 8. I could not accept an increase of my pension, because I have said to my friends that the present pension ($50) is what I desired.

I am greatly obliged to you for your effort in my behalf, because I know it was dictated by friendship for me.

Please inform Senator CULLOM of my wishes.

Yours, etc.,

JOHN M. PALMER.

THOMAS J. DONOVAN, Esq., *Washington, D. C.*

I have read this letter, Mr. President, because I think it is due General Palmer that it should be made public and for the purpose of asking an order that when the bill is reported by the Committee on Pensions it be indefinitely postponed by the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. I suggest that the Senator now ask that the Committee on Pensions be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be now acted upon.

Mr. CULLOM. I have no objection, and will make that request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois asks that the Committee on Pensions may be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 219) granting an increase of pension to John M. Palmer. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the committee is discharged from the further consideration of the bill. Without objection, the bill will be indefinitely postponed. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

PUBLIC RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES IN CUBA.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to send to the Senate an itemized statement of public receipts from taxation, customs, and all other sources, and also of public expenditures, including salaries paid to all officers and incidental expenses, in Cuba since the United States Government assumed control of that island.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that the resolution may go over for the present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being made, the resolution goes over under the rule.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

Mr. COCKRELL. I desire to have some orders made in regard to minority representation on the committees of the Senate.

Mr. CULBERSON. In order that proper committee assignments may be made on this side of the Chamber, I desire to ask to be excused from further service on the Committee on the Census.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Shall the Senator from Texas be excused from further service on the Committee on the Census? The Chair hears no objection, and he is excused.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. TALIAFERRO] be placed upon the Committee on the Census, in place of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], who has just been excused.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection, that order will be made.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask that the Senators whose names I send to the desk be appointed on the committees named.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The order presented by the Senator from Missouri will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

To Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service: Messrs. TURLEY, HEITFELD, and CULBERSON.
On Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands: Messrs. CHILTON and ALLEN.
On Education and Labor: Mr. DANIEL.
On Fisheries: Mr. KENNEY.
On Mines and Mining: Mr. BUTLER.
On Patents: Mr. HEITFELD.
On Transportation Routes to the Seaboard: Mr. MCLAURIN.
To Investigate the Condition of the Potomac River Front at Washington: Mr. BACON.
On Public Health and National Quarantine: Mr. CULBERSON.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the order asked for by him. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the order will be considered as agreed to. It is agreed to.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

A bill (H. R. 5042) to provide for improvements in the tax departments of the District of Columbia; and

A bill (H. R. 5297) to authorize aliens to dispose of real estate holdings in the District of Columbia.

AFFAIRS IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there are no further concurrent or other resolutions, the Chair lays before the Senate the resolution submitted by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW] on the 3d instant, which is on the table by virtue of an agreement. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. PETTIGREW January 3, 1900, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate whether General Torres, one of the officers of the Philippine army, came to General Otis with a flag of truce on February 5, 1899, the day after the fighing commenced between our forces and those of the Filipinos, and stated to General Otis that General Aguinaldo declared that fighting had been begun accidentally and was not authorized by him, and that Aguinaldo wished to have it stopped, and that to bring about a conclusion of hostilities he proposed the establishment of a neutral zone between the two armies of a width that would be agreeable to General Otis, so that during the peace negotiations there might be no further danger of conflict between the two armies, and whether General Otis replied that fighting having once begun must go on to the grim end. Was General Otis directed by the Secretary of War to make such an answer? Did General Otis telegraph the Secretary of War on February 9, 1899, as follows: "Aguinaldo now applies for a cessation of hostilities and conference. Have declined to answer." And did General Otis afterwards reply? Was he directed by the Secretary of War to reply; and what answer, if any, did he or the Secretary of War make to the application to cease fighting?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, that resolution asks for but one item in a great mass of information which is covered by the resolution offered by my colleague [Mr. HOAR], and I said the other day when the resolution of the Senator from South Dakota was reached I should move to lay it on the table, as well as the substitute which I offered for it. I understand the Senator from South Dakota has said all he desires to say in regard to liis resolution, and I now make that motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts moves that the resolution submitted by the Senator from South Dakota, which has been read, together with the substitute offered by himself, lie upon the table. The question is upon that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

INQUIRIES RELATIVE TO THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] on the 9th instant, which will be read.

Mr. LODGE. Let it be read with the amendments which I offered.

Mr. HOAR. I accept the amendments of my colleague as part of the original resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Then the amendments of the junior Senator from Massachusetts will be regarded as part of the resolution, and the resolution will be read as now modified.

The Secretary proceeded to read the resolution as modified, and read as follows:

Resolved, That the President be requested, if in his judgment not incompatible with the public interest, to communicate to the Senate all communications which have been received by him, or by any Department or officer, civil or military, from Aguinaldo or any other person undertaking to represent the people in arms against the United States in the Philippine Islands, or any alleged government or public authority of said people, and all replies to such communications;

Also, the proclamation sent by him to be issued to the people of the Philippine Islands, as actually directed by him to be issued, and the same as actually proclaimed by General Otis, if in any respect it was altered or any part of it was omitted;

Also, to inform the Senate whether any approval or disapproval was expressed by his authority, or that of the War Department, of such change, if any;

Also, all constitutions, forms of government, or proclamations issued by Aguinaldo, or any congress or legislative assembly or body claiming to be such, or convention of the people of the Philippine Islands, or any part thereof, or claiming to represent them, or any part thereof, of which information may have come to him or to any Department of the Government;

Also, all instructions given by him to the commissioners to the Philippine Islands, or either of them;

Also, any information which may have come to him since January 1, 1898, in regard to any plans of the people in arms against the United States for the pillage of Manila, for risings in the city, or for the destruction of foreign property and the massacre of foreign residents;

Also, any information that may have come to him of the treatment of the other inhabitants of the Philippines by those in arms against the authority of the United States, and of the attitude and feeling of such other inhabitants or tribes toward the so-called government of Aguinaldo and his armed followers;

Also, any information that may have come to him of the treatment of prisoners, either Spanish or American, by the people in arms against the authority of the United States;

Also, any information that may have come to him as to any aid or encouragement received by Aguinaldo and his followers from persons in the United States, as to what pamphlets, speeches, or other documents emanating from the United States, and adverse to its authority and to its policy, were circulated, in whole or in part, among the Filipinos in arms against the United States, among the other inhabitants of the islands, or among the soldiers of the United States, and any information as to the effect, if any, of such pamphlets, speeches, and other documents, or of similar utterances in the United States upon the course of the rebellion against the United States——

Mr. HOAR. In the first line of the last clause which has been read, after the words "any information that may have come to him," I wish to insert the words "or to any Department of the Government." I have no doubt my colleague will assent to that.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. Let the same words be inserted in the other clauses of the resolution where the President is called upon for any information that may come to him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the words referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts will be inserted.

The reading of the resolution as modified was resumed and concluded, as follows:

Also, any further or other information which would tend to throw light upon the conduct and events of the insurrection against the authority of the United States in the Philippine Islands, and of the military movements for its suppression since January 1, 1898;

And that the President be further requested to communicate, without delay, so much of said information as is now in his possession, or in that of any Department at Washington, without waiting to obtain so much of said information as may require considerable delay or communication with the Philippine Islands, and to communicate the remainder of the information as soon thereafter as it can be obtained.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I wish to amend the resolution by adding thereto a paragraph calling for all the instructions and communications upon the subject of the Spanish treaty.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota offers an amendment which he will be kind enough to repeat.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I move to insert:

Also, all instructions given to the commissioners who negotiated the Spanish treaty, or any of them, and all communications on the subject between the Government and the commissioners, or any of them, pending the negotiations.

Mr. DAVIS. I think that is a matter which pertains to executive business.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the resolution by inserting:

Also, all instructions given to the commissioners who negotiated the Spanish treaty, or any of them, and all communications between the Government and the commissioners to the Philippine Islands, or any of them.

Mr. PETTIGREW. "The commissioners, or any of them, who negotiated the treaty." I want the instructions given to the commissioners at Paris, who negotiated the treaty, together with the communications made to them while the consultations were going on.

Mr. DAVIS. I raise the point of order, that that is a matter which pertains to executive business, and is, therefore, not now in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will be obliged to overrule the point of order. The President will have the power, of course, to return as executive matter the reply to this proposed portion of the resolution.

Mr. DAVIS. Then, Mr. President, I desire to object in the strongest possible manner to the adoption of that amendment. So far as I am concerned, and so far as, I believe, any member of the commission which negotiated the treaty of Paris is concerned, there is nothing which passed between the President and any of us which any of us would fear to have disclosed or have exposed upon the pages of history.

Mr. President, I find it very difficult, under the ruling of the Chair, to speak appropriately upon this matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has his remedy under the rule.

Mr. DAVIS. And I therefore move that the doors be closed as for legislative session.

Mr. SPOONER. I believe that requires a second, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It does.

Mr. SPOONER. I second the motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion of the Senator from Minnesota being seconded, the doors will be closed, and the Sergeant-at-Arms will clear the galleries.

The doors were thereupon closed, and at the expiration of ten minutes were reopened.

Mr. DAVIS. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota moves to lay on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW].

Mr. PETTIGREW. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. VEST. I ask for the reading of the amendment.

Mr. CHANDLER. Let the amendment and the original resolution be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert as an amendment the following:

Also, all instructions given to the commissioners, or any of them, appointed to negotiate the Spanish treaty, and all communications between the Government and the commissioners, or any of them, while negotiations were pending at Paris that related to the negotiation of said treaty.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota to lay on the table the

amendment submitted by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW], on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COCKRELL (when Mr. GEAR's name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GEAR]. If he were present, he would vote "yea" and I should vote "nay."

Mr. MORGAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GEAR].

Mr. COCKRELL. I did not know that the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] was paired with the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GEAR]. I paired with him before he left, and I supposed the pair extended to this question. I will therefore vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. PROCTOR (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. MCCOMAS] and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BACON. I was not in the Chamber at the time when the amendment was read. I am informed, however, that the application for the information is made with the qualification if not deemed incompatible with the public interest, and I will therefore vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. HARRIS (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK], who, I believe, has not voted, and I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. ALLEN. I have a pair with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER]. If he were present, I should vote "nay." I also desire to announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER], who is absent, is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN].

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I will take the liberty of transferring my pair to the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE], who is also absent, and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. RAWLINS (after having voted in the negative). Has the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HANNA] voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that he has not.

Mr. RAWLINS. I have a general pair with that Senator, and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. BATE (after having voted in the negative). I understand that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. DEBOE] has not voted. I should like to know what the fact is.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that the Senator from Kentucky has not voted.

Mr. BATE. I shall have to withdraw my vote, then.

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 20; as follows:

YEAS—41.

Aldrich,	Frye,	McMillan,	Sewell,
Allison,	Gallinger,	Nelson,	Shoup,
Baker,	Hale,	Perkins,	Simon,
Burrows,	Hansbrough,	Pettus,	Spooner,
Carter,	Hawley,	Platt, Conn.	Stewart,
Chandler,	Kean,	Platt, N. Y.	Thurston,
Cullom,	Kyle,	Pritchard,	Wetmore,
Davis,	Lindsay,	Proctor,	Wolcott.
Depew,	Lodge,	Quarles,	
Fairbanks,	McBride,	Ross,	
Foster,	McLaurin,	Scott,	

NAYS—20.

Bacon,	Clay,	Jones, Ark.	Teller,
Berry,	Cockrell,	Martin,	Tillman,
Butler,	Culberson,	Money,	Turley,
Caffery,	Heitfeld,	Pettigrew,	Vest.
Chilton,	Hoar,	Taliaferro,	Wellington.

NOT VOTING—25.

Allen,	Elkins,	McComas,	Rawlins,
Bate,	Foraker,	McCumber,	Sullivan,
Beveridge,	Gear,	McEnery,	Turner,
Clark, Mont.	Hanna,	Mallory,	Warren.
Clark, Wyo.	Harris,	Mason,	
Daniel,	Jones, Nev.	Morgan,	
Deboe,	Kenney,	Penrose,	

So Mr. PETTIGREW's amendment was laid on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I voted "nay." I voted "nay" because it is in the power of the President, when he transmits any paper to us, to transmit it to us in secret as a proper subject for executive session. Also, it is within the power of the President, and that power can not be restricted by this body or any other, to decline, if he thinks the public interest will suffer, to transmit to us any document or any part of it. It is wholly and entirely within the province of the President to send us such information as can not in any wise interfere with the friendly relations between us and the power with which we were then negotiating, because I believe myself that all attempts to keep from the public any information which ought to go to the public has a tendency to create suspicion and engender a feeling that something they ought to know is purposely withheld.

I fully realize that there are public relations existing between us and other powers, diplomatic relations, of such a character that it would be bad faith for us to publish them to the world; and I think if any such condition exists with reference to the transactions to which the amendment refers, it would be much better for the public, much better for the Administration, much better for everybody who desires to have a friendly feeling in these matters, if the President should say to us, "In my judgment these are not matters to be made public."

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I understand that this resolution—and it can not be repeated too often—refers to the President the sole and undisputed judgment whether any information asked for can be made public without detriment to the public service. Now, a Senator asks for the correspondence between the President and the commissioners who negotiated an important treaty, or either of them, and the chairman of that commission rises in his place and says that so far as he personally is concerned and so far as his associates on that commission personally are concerned there is no objection, as he believes, but that the objections, if any, are public. So the supporters of this amendment stand in the position of desiring some important information which it is to be presumed the President will think the public ought to have, because they do not ask it unless he does so, and as to which no member of the commission personally knows any reason to object, but which the majority have just voted do not want the Senate to get or the public to get. It strikes me this is a very extraordinary transaction.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I have never understood that it was the right of any Senator that the Senate should adopt resolutions of inquiry because he chose to offer them. It is for the Senate; it is the Senate's inquiry when it is adopted: it is not the inquiry of any particular Senator, and it is for the Senate to judge, all things considered, whether it, as a body, will make the inquiry.

I voted in favor of laying the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota upon the table for the reason, among others, that I know, as every Senator in this Chamber knows, that as to the instructions requested here to be given to the public, and as to all the correspondence upon the subject upon the part of the commissioners, the President has been as frank with the Senate in another relation as it is possible for him to be. I can see no reason, in view of all the circumstances, which I can not give in detail, why this amendment should have been offered, except it be an attempt to put the President in the attitude of concealing something from the public. He certainly has not chosen to withhold anything upon the subject from the Senate.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I would vote in favor of almost any resolution of pure inquiry into public business done by the Departments or by the President, but it seems to me that in this amendment the Senator from South Dakota sought to go too far. I should doubt—and that is why I voted "yea"—whether it would be good policy now for the Senate to say to the President that it desired all the correspondence that took place between him and the negotiators of the Paris treaty, even with the discretion on his part to refuse it. I should doubt whether the Senate should commit itself to the proposition that it seeks all that information to be made public, referring either to communications by the President to a commission or commissioners, or by the commissioners back. I do not know what the communications were. I think the result of it all was calamitous.

I voted against the treaty, and I have never seen the day since that I regretted my vote; but it does not follow, because that is my position, that I would vote in favor of ransacking the correspondence at that time and producing it to the public. It is in relation to the negotiating of a treaty. It is not simply correspondence with reference to public affairs, but it is the fine relation which exists when men get together in secret, representing different governments, and under secret instructions and private instructions seek to produce a result. Now, even though the result was wrong and calamitous, as I believe, I can not vote to ask the President, as a part of the Senate, to give to the public everything that took place there.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I am not willing to allow the suggestion made by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] to pass without at least a disclaimer. So far as I am concerned, I have no desire to put the President in any unpleasant position or to intimate any lack of frankness on his part. I understand that the relation between the executive and the legislative departments when we are acting together is one of absolute independence except as the Constitution has provided how far we may control. I understand that we have no right to call on the President; that is to say, we have no means of enforcing a demand on him. We do not make any demand on him. We request him, usually with

this clause, "if not incompatible with the public interest." Now, we need not insert those words. The President is the judge whether or not it is incompatible with the public interest; and suppose he declines. There is no way to compel him to furnish the information. Nobody would think of compelling him. It is discretionary with him whether he gives to the public this information or not.

Mr. HALE. There is no way to enforce it.

Mr. TELLER. There would be no way to enforce it if he said, "I decline to give you anything." There are cases, undoubtedly, where the President would be justified in saying that he would not give it to us or anybody else. They are diplomatic secrets, which must be kept in the diplomatic office—that is, the executive office of the Government—but what I contend for is that inasmuch as the President has the absolute power of selection, of saying how much the public shall have, of saying whether the public shall have any or all, there can be no objection to calling upon the President for the information and allowing him to determine the matter.

There has been a great deal said about these instructions. Without violating the secrecy of any other place, I think I can say that I know what those instructions were. There may have been something withheld, but I think I know them all, and I do not believe there is anything that would bring us into any difficulty with another nation; but if the President should say he thought that might happen, I should say it was his duty, and I should be willing to uphold his judgment, to withhold it.

The public does not know as much about these instructions as we know, and the public are debating the question whether the commission he sent there acted in accordance with justice and propriety. The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] says he voted against the treaty. I voted for the treaty, and I think the most unfortunate thing which has happened to us in many years is that we did not ratify that treaty within the first week. I felt so then. I thought there was great danger in the postponement of the ratification of the treaty. I believe now there is great danger in concealing from the American people any information they may need touching the question. I do not believe that the commissioner did anything or that the President did anything or that anybody else did anything that we need to be afraid of having the American people know, and if it may be valuable to us and yet might be offensive to the other side, then let the President withhold it, as he has the right to do. I am one of those who believe that a republican government must proceed, if it is to retain the support of the people, with publicity. It is the very essential basis of a free people that they should know what is done, always, of course, with certain limitations, of which I have spoken.

I wish to say to the friends of this Administration here to-day—and I am very likely on very many questions to act with them—that they are not strengthening their ground, they are not helping themselves before the public by concealing or having the public think they are concealing anything that the public should know, or that the public believe they should know, whether they ought to know it or not. If there is nothing that ought to be concealed, except upon some public ground, of our relations with a foreign power, let us have it; and if any portion of it is of such a character that we might get into difficulty, or it might be considered disrespectful to that power, let the President take that out or say to us that so much of it as he sends here ought to be kept in the privacy of executive session.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am very anxious to dispose of these resolutions, to which there is no objection. I wish we could dispose of the resolutions. This debate which is going on very interestingly about an amendment we have already voted upon can continue exactly as well after the resolutions have passed as it does now, and I think it is very desirable before 2 o'clock to get these resolutions of inquiry off the table and disposed of. I hope the Senate will allow a vote on the resolutions, and then this discussion can go on just as well.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I desire to say one word now in response to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER]. I think this the most convenient time. I am as interested as anybody can be in the prompt passage of my resolution. The Senator from Wisconsin said what was very true, as he said it, that he did not understand every individual Senator has a right to make an inquiry; but it is the inquiry of the Senate; and that is true.

But, Mr. President, so far as I understand it, until very recent times there has been a uniform practice of the Senate to consider it a sufficient ground (there being no objection in principle or public policy to a resolution of inquiry) to make the inquiry that any single Senator thinks the information necessary for the discharge of his duty as a Senator, and the abrogation of that custom or rule, which has been universal, so far as I know, until within a few months, will, in my judgment, be a very serious diminution of the importance and dignity of the character of a Senator, which I think the course of public discussion and criticism outside of this body has tended somewhat to accomplish already, or at any rate there is danger that it may tend to accomplish it.

The ninety men who are gathered together in this Chamber have very great functions to perform. They are a body of men with whom is lodged, in conjunction with the House of Representatives and the Executive, the honor, the dignity, the interest, and the prosperity of a great people, inhabiting and controlling a great continent, now 80,000,000, and likely to be threefold that number before men who are now born and active upon the stage of life die. The Senators from New York, dividing their responsibility with each other, each alone is the representative of a people larger in numbers and infinitely greater in power and wealth than the people who fought and won the American Revolution and framed and set in operation the Constitution of the United States. I, myself, with my honored colleague, represent together a people tenfold as strong in all the elements of strength, moral and material, as the people who won our liberties in the beginning, and the men who, like the Senator who offered this amendment, represent the vast spaces in the interior are laying the foundations of a future empire, looking at their States alone, to which even that I have referred to is trivial.

It is a great thing, one of the greatest things in human history, to be a Senator of the United States, and when a man clothed with these duties, with these functions, with these responsibilties, says that he needs for the proper discharge of his duties certain public information it is no light thing to deny it; it ought to be granted. It ought to be granted by the Senate if you have the security on the one side of the Senator's affirmation that he needs it, presumed to be sincere, of course, from the character that is behind the information, and the security on the other of the Executive, who knows what we do not, that it will not be sent in if it can work the least harm to the public service.

Now, I understand that to be the rule on which the Senate has proceeded until this time, and I understand that to be the rule we have just broken in the exigencies of a bad cause.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I yield to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] if he wishes to speak on this subject. I myself have but a very few remarks to make.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Missouri allow the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the President of the United States before he proceeds?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

FOREIGN PENSION LAWS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read:

To the Senate:

I transmit herewith a report of the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, in response to the resolution of the Senate of January 28, 1899, directing him to "procure from the representatives of the Government abroad, for transmission to the Senate, a synopsis of the pension laws (not civil) of the leading nations of the world, with statements showing the aggregate amount of annual appropriation made by each country for the above purpose."

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, January 16, 1900.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, during the third session of the Fifty-fifth Congress I introduced a resolution asking for that information, and I have had great fears that it might not be obtained, so long a time has elapsed. I am very glad it has come to the Senate. I now ask that the statistics, whatever they may be, be printed and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is a large mass of papers connected with this inquiry, and the Chair is of opinion that perhaps it had better go to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. COCKRELL. Would it not be better to refer it to the Committee on Pensions? They would be better able to determine whether the matter ought to be printed or not.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think that would be the proper action, and I make the suggestion that, without printing, the message and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Pensions. If hereafter the Committee on Pensions should think there are documents which ought to be printed they can make that request later on.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire moves that the message and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Pensions without printing.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

Mr. HOAR. I take the liberty of suggesting, it being seven minutes before 2, that we deal with the resolution and pass it before that hour. This matter can be delayed until after 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If it is the desire of the Senate that these papers shall not be laid before the Senate, in order that the discussion may proceed, the Chair has no desire in relation to the matter. The Senator from Missouri will proceed.

INQUIRIES RELATIVE TO THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution submitted by Mr. HOAR on the 9th instant, requesting the President to communicate to the Senate certain information relative to the Philippine Islands.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, it seems to me most unfortunate that nothing can be said in regard to this Philippine war without improper motives being ascribed to any Senator who dares even to make an inquiry. I stated at the last session of the last Congress that the charge that I desired, directly or indirectly, to assist the enemies of the United States was a slander, whether made in this Chamber or outside of it, and I repeat that statement now. The friends of the President—and I am not his enemy—assume that any remark coming from those who opposed the Paris treaty, no matter what it may be, is an attack upon the President personally and his advisers.

Now, Mr. President, it is forgotten that at the last session of the last Congress, during the closing days of that session, the leading journals in the United States that were friendly to the policy of the Administration and the acquisition of the Philippine Archipelago by this country stated repeatedly that the President of the United States had instructed the commissioners to Paris, three of whom were members of this body at that time, there being two now remaining, that they should take Luzon, no matter what became of the balance of that archipelago.

It was also stated that the question of indemnity had entered into the negotiations at Paris, and I had the temerity to ask in open session, when there were three members of that commission in the Senate, whether these statements were true or not. The President pro tempore of the Senate, one of the commissioners to Paris, responded most emphatically that the President had said nothing about indemnity, but that he had instructed the commissioners to take Luzon; and there the discussion ended. Now, it seems to me that the friends of the Administration should desire the whole of that correspondence to be placed before the American people.

As the matter now stands, the President of the United States first instructed the commissioners before they left Washington to acquire or take the island of Luzon. Afterwards the President—and I am not indulging in hypercriticism—stated repeatedly in his Western tour that he was an instrument of Providence, or words to that effect, and that the whole of the archipelago fell as a ripe apple into the lap of the United States, and what are we to do with it? Were we, he said, to abandon the archipelago to become the prey of some foreign power; were we to leave these people to anarchy and bloodshed and rapine, or were we to accept, as the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] so eloquently said the other day, the office of trustee under God to lift these people to a higher plane of civilization? If it be true that the President was willing to take Luzon, and so instructed his commissioners, what was to become of the balance of that archipelago?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BACON in the chair). The Senator from Missouri will suspend for a moment at least. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it becomes the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I merely wish, before the Senator from Missouri goes on, to have it understood that the resolutions we are now on do not go to the Calendar. I should like to ask that they hold their place without prejudice, as before. I hope some time to get them passed, because, although the Senators who are so anxious for more information seem indisposed to let resolutions asking for some to go through, I am in hopes they may pass, and so I do not want them to lose their place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator that it will be necessary to take some action to prevent their going to the Calendar.

Mr. LODGE. Then I ask unanimous consent, as I have done before, that the resolutions may not lose their place, but may come up to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the resolutions do not lose their place; in other words, that they do not go to the Calendar.

Mr. LODGE. That they go over, as before.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That they stand in the same position they occupied prior to the arrival of the hour of 2 o'clock.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Missouri may be allowed to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa will please permit the Chair to ask if there is objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLISON. Now I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Missouri may have an opportunity to complete his observations.

Mr. ALDRICH. If he desires to proceed further now. That is the question I was about to ask.

Mr. ALLISON. If he desires to do so to-day; or does he prefer to go on to-morrow?

Mr. VEST. I am obliged to the Senator from Iowa. I desire to detain the Senate but a moment longer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the Senator from Missouri may be allowed to complete his remarks. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Missouri will proceed.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I hardly know in what language to characterize this continued imputation that there are friends of Aguinaldo upon this floor, giving aid and comfort to the enemies of our country. I have already characterized that charge as I think it deserves; but to show its manifest injustice to those of us who opposed that treaty I call attention to the fact that none of us has ever made any statement upon this floor so strong as that made by the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] in public session during the last Congress. I take it for granted that no man will question the loyalty of the senior Senator from New Jersey, a gallant soldier, who fought in the civil war and was tendered the commission of major-general during the Spanish war. I take it for granted no man living will question his loyalty to this country or to the principles of the Republican party; but the senior Senator from New Jersey, from his place in open session, declared that after the destruction of the Spanish fleet in the bay of Manila he had gone to the President and said—I quote his own language—"For God's sake, Mr. President, withdraw Dewey and let these islands alone." Was he an enemy to his country and a friend to Aguinaldo? And yet what could have been stronger than this expression of opinion to the President of the United States that the policy he was now pursuing should be then and there abandoned?

As the Congressional record stands to-day, what is the position of the President of the United States? It appears that he directed the commissioners to take one island, and, as a matter of course, to leave the others to their fate, whatever it might be. It appears also from the public utterances of the President and his friends that after abandoning this policy of taking but one island he has stated repeatedly, and they have stated, that it was the act of Providence, and it would have been a crime to leave any portion of the people of the Philippines to the uncertain fate that awaited them in the future.

Mr. President, this whole Philippine question is in a nebulous and cloudy condition that befogs the public mind and the councils even of the leaders of public opinion in the dominant party in this country to-day. We adopted at the last session what is known as the McEnery resolution. In the McEnery resolution we declared that the Philippines should never become States of this Union and the people of the Philippines should not be citizens of the United States; but that the United States would give them self-government. That resolution was adopted and sent to the House of Representatives, and it was certainly the expression of opinion, emphatic and distinct, upon the part of the Senate of the United States.

Now, to-day where stand the men who are responsible for the adoption of this treaty? A resolution is offered by the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] which declares that we are to take the Philippines and hold them forever as property of the United States. What has become of the declaration in the McEnery resolution for self-government to the Philippines? Is it abandoned? Do those who control to-day the destinies of this country mean to hold those islands and the people thereof without regard to the wishes of the inhabitants of the islands and without regard to the solemn declaration made by the Senate of the United States that they are never to become States of the Union nor their people citizens, but should have self-government?

But, Mr. President, I am almost afraid to say so much in view of the sensitive condition that seems to prevail here and throughout the country as to any declaration in regard to the Philippine Islands or their future. I disclaim now positively any intention to indulge in any line of remarks that may encourage opposition to the authority of the United States anywhere. But as a Senator of the United States, representing in part a sovereign State, I deny the right of any man in this Chamber or out of it to muzzle me and prevent an honest expression of opinion in regard to the policy of this country, for fear that I may be denominated a traitor and a public enemy.

I am sorry our foreign relations are in the condition we find them to-day, and yet all the world knows that so far we have been most unfortunate. We have the bubonic plague added to the leprosy in Hawaii, starvation in Puerto Rico, unrest and disquiet in Cuba, and a war of indefinite length, so far as human foresight is concerned, in the Philippines. Is it treason to make this statement, or shall we who opposed the Paris treaty and predicted the disasters that have come and will come be so cowardly and recreant to the trust reposed in us by a free people as to sit here silent

for fear of a vitriolic denunciation on the other side and decline to discharge our duty as the fearless representatives of a great people?

It is said that this war must continue. I have no argument to make on that question. I said publicly here, after the treaty against my will and vote was confirmed, that to pass resolutions was like sending for a first-class physician after the patient was dead. When that treaty was ratified by the Senate of the United States certain logical results ensued, known to every Senator here before he cast his vote, because there was a battle in the Philippines, in front of Manila, between Aguinaldo and our forces on Saturday, and we voted upon that treaty on Tuesday. Every man who voted for it knew then that he voted for a war. Every Senator knew then, as he knows now, that we were paying $20,000,000 for a war in the archipelago, the end of which might come in a month and might not come in ten years.

I do not say this in order to reopen that discussion as to the treaty which was approved by the Senate. I simply put before the Senate and the country this proposition: Are we to remain silent, refraining even from ordinary criticism as to the conduct of the war, for fear that we are to be denounced as the allies of Aguinaldo and opposed to the authority of our country?

Mr. President, I have nothing else to say, and I am very sure that what I have said will be misconstrued, because it seems to be the policy in certain quarters to brand every man who does not give his unqualified assent to all that is done in this Philippine war as unworthy the confidence of the public. That is all.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. President, I shall ask the indulgence of the Senate at this time to present a few thoughts on the merits of the amendment introduced by me to the currency bill for the repeal of the 10 per cent tax on State banks of issue.

Mr. President, it is claimed by the Senator from Rhode Island in his speech that this bill has been framed for the purpose of placing all of our money upon a sound basis and so remedying the defects of our present national banking system that the smaller places may have the benefits of whatever good may flow out of the national banking law. It is useless at this time for me to discuss the question of the comparative merits of gold and silver as money metals. It is useless for me to discuss the merits of the present national-bank system.

AN EXISTING DEFECT ADMITTED.

The Republicans in the Senate are convinced that the present national-bank law is defective, in that it does not adequately circulate money in the smaller places, or they would never have introduced this bill. There must be a recognized evil, or they would not seek to provide a remedy. They propose in their bill to remedy the situation by giving us more banks under the national banking law, and to allow those banks to issue a little larger circulation. This remedy might give us more hope were it not for the fact that in many sections of the United States the national banking business has never paid and can not pay under the present national banking law. The avenues of profit through which the national banks are allowed to derive their sustenance do not exist to a sufficient extent in many localities of the United States to make them profitable. In the New England States and the Eastern States, where the forms of securities in which national banks can deal constitute a considerable proportion of the property of the people, these banks can make money. In the West and South, where such securities form but a small portion of the business assets, national banks are not profitable.

NATIONAL BANKS INADEQUATE IN AGRICULTURAL SECTIONS.

Mr. President, no legislation can enable these banks in such localities to make money without changing the form of property with which they are allowed to deal or the nature of the assets the people possess. Under the present banking law, as shown by the last statement of the Comptroller of the Currency, 47 per cent of the national banks in the Western States have either failed or gone into liquidation. With this record before the business men, what inducement can be held out for the establishment of new banks? The chances are even that the bank will go out of existence, and far more than even that, it will fail to make money. In the Pacific States, according to the same authority, 44 per cent of the national banks organized have failed or gone into liquidation. In the Middle States 36 per cent of the banks organized under the national-banking law have failed or gone into liquidation. In the Southern States 31 per cent of the banks organized under the national-banking law have either failed or gone into liquidation. In the Eastern States 20 per cent have failed, and in the New England States only 16 per cent.

Mr. President, the success of the national banks depends not upon the number of the banks nor their distribution, but upon the character of the investments in the communities in which these banks do business. They have not paid in the South or West, and they will not pay in the South or West. More banks will only create a greater competition for a kind of business that now has simply a bare existence, and will make it harder for any national bank to continue in existence. The multiplication of banks will end only in an increase of bank failures in the sections to which national banks are not adapted.

Mr. President, it matters not what our circulating medium may be per capita if that circulating medium is not equally distributed throughout the country. If there is $25 per capita, so distributed that it is $150 in New York and $15 in South Carolina, the business of the East will continue to be done at the expense of other sections of the country, which is not only unjust but denotes a very unhealthy condition of the body politic. It has been truthfully said that the circulating medium constitutes the blood of the financial body; the banks are the arteries through which it is distributed, and the Federal Government is the heart, the duty of which it is to pump the blood into all parts of the body. In the physical body, if certain arteries have too much blood and others too little, the result is sickness, paralysis, and death. That is just the trouble to-day with our financial system.

Some of the arteries are overcharged with blood, while others have too little; hence certain parts of the body suffer from defective circulation. The present bill is the prescription for this trouble. We are in consultation as to whether or not this remedy is proper and sufficient. It provides for more arteries in the parts of the body which now suffer from lack of circulation, but does not provide for introducing the blood into those arteries. The trouble is not that we have not enough arteries, but that the arteries we now have are not acting properly from want of nourishment.

TANGIBLE PROPERTY BETTER SECURITY THAN FLUCTUATING VALUES.

Mr. President, my amendment is for the purpose of providing new blood and not new arteries. The people of the South have cotton, rice, and sugar. They do not have stocks and bonds. The people of the West have cattle, grain, and minerals. They do not have stocks and bonds.

We want some way in which we can use our cotton and sugar, they their cattle and grain, for the purpose of securing a circulating medium with which to do business. The people of the East have stocks and bonds. They now have a way to secure the necessary circulating medium. More banks may benefit them. More national banks will not benefit us, because we do not own the kind of property upon which the national banks do business. The East has practically a monopoly of that class of property, and consequently when the Southern banks want money with which to move and handle the cotton crop they must go East to get it. When the Western bankers want to move the cattle or the grain, they go East to get the money. The circulating medium is in the East, and the West and South, when they require fresh blood, have to call upon the East for it, and within twelve months it is all congested in the East again.

Mr. President, the tax books of the South and of the West show that the people of those sections are not insolvent; they are wealthy. They are not lacking in property; they are not lacking in business ability; they are not lacking in enterprise; they produce three-fourths of the products of the United States, and yet they have less money than any other sections.

The last statement of the Comptroller of the Currency shows that the banks in the Eastern States held $164,341,336 of stocks and securities. Those of the Southern States held $16,849,465; those of the Western States held $10,995,759. The banks of the Eastern States held more than one-half of all the stocks and securities in the United States.

ASSETS OF INDUSTRIAL VS. SPECULATIVE SECTIONS.

The same statement shows that the banks of the Southern States had overdrafts amounting to $8,513,646, while those of the Eastern States had only $1,494,784. These overdrafts were of perfectly solvent men or the bank examiner would not have approved them. It shows conclusively that the Southern people, with all their wealth, did not have enough money with which to do business. The same statement shows that the Eastern banks had of individual deposits $1,077,387,290. At the same time the Southern States had upon deposit $181,377,705, thus showing a little over six times the amount of deposits in the Eastern States that there were in the Southern States. And yet the assessed valuation of property in the Eastern States was $8,088,579,925, while in the Southern States it was $4,089,433,349. In other words, while the people of the East had more than six times the amount of cash possessed by the people of the South, they had less than twice as much wealth. The circulating medium in the East must therefore be three times as great in proportion to the property as the circulating medium in the South. The population of the Eastern States, according to the census of 1890, was 14,142,075, while the population of the Southern States was 18,327,704.

The 14,000,000 in the East had six times as much money in the

banks as had the 18,000,000 people in the South, yet the products of the South far exceeded those of the Eastern States. The disproportion was not caused by the poverty of the South, as is shown by the assessed valuation of the two sections. The Eastern States had about one-half of the deposits of the entire United States, another fact that strikes me most forcibly in this connection. The total deposits were $2,450,725,595, while the Treasury statement of the same date shows that there was in existence of all forms of money in the United States at that time but $1,985,930,964, thus showing on deposit in the banks $600,000,000 more than there was in existence, not counting the reserve held by the banks. This shows that the credits to the depositors largely consisted of other forms of money than the actual cash. It is to the fact that the banks of the East do business largely with paper that this great disparity in the circulating medium is due.

For seventy-five years this trouble did not exist. There were some mistakes made by allowing loose wildcat banking, but the legitimate State bank institutions were more sound than are the national banks to-day. Those State banks still exist, but by reason of the 10 per cent tax upon their circulation they are not allowed to issue notes. The tax is greater than the interest they would receive. The State banks now make money by borrowing money in New York and loaning it out at an increased rate of interest. This rate of interest is necessarily so high as to handicap all development. A concern can not be established in South Carolina or Georgia and compete upon equal terms with another concern which pays only one-half the rate of interest in one of the other States.

If State banks under proper State restrictions were allowed to issue circulation the rates of interest would be reduced one-half, money would be plentiful, and the South and West would have enough circulating medium to develop their wonderful resources. The South is just entering upon a wonderful era of progress and development. We are handicapped by scarcity of money and high interest rates. Her people want to use their assets in upbuilding their country. This they are not allowed to do. They have the values and all else that constitute the means with which to accomplish their object except a cash medium. They want this tax upon the circulation of State banks repealed, because they want an actual circulating form of money, and they have just as much confidence in money which is based upon actual values in wheat, corn, cattle, or cotton as they have in a money based upon credit, as is the money which is used in the Eastern States and placed to the credit of depositors by the banks as cash.

They believe that cotton in sight is just as good a basis for money as problematical earnings of a railroad company. They are not after any wild-cat speculation; they simply want a legitimate medium of exchange. They have discovered by sad experience that the circulating medium is controlled by speculators. They remember the days of 1873, when Jay Cooke & Co., a perfectly solvent concern, made a temporary assignment, which caused a panic from the Atlantic to the Pacific, the Lakes to the Gulf, and stagnated all business, because the bonds of the Northern Pacific Railroad Company suffered a slump in the market. They have observed the intimate relations which exist between the price of speculative stocks and the scarcity or plentitude of the circulating medium. They don't want a money that is plentiful when stocks are high and scarce when stocks are low, or vice versa. They are not interested in stocks. They want to raise corn and wheat and cotton; they want to cut timber; they want to dig coal. They want the money that is based upon these actual values. They are satisfied with the money of the United States, including that of the national banks, because they believe it is based upon sound principle and have faith in the Government. But experience has shown them that they can not get that money except through the hands of those interested in stocks and dependent upon the fluctuations of the stock market. They do not want their money to fluctuate that way. Here is a bank with tangible property. They own corn and wheat and cotton; they own timber and coal. The States have required them to give security. The man who holds one of their bills can go and look at the tangible property pledged for redemption of that bill. He knows the property is there, and he accepts without hesitation the security that is offered him. He knows when he takes it that the failure of a railroad company or a large corporation or a flurry in the stock market is not going to affect either the quantity or the value of the circulating medium. He knows that if he has a legitimate enterprise he can obtain the money necessary to carry it on. He knows that if he has not a legitimate enterprise he don't get any money from his neighbors, who know all about him and his scheme. The speculator would get his money in New York, as he does now. The legitimate business man would get his money at home. The State-bank circulation would not interfere with the national-bank circulation, but would be a valuable auxiliary to it.

A DIRECT TAX AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL.

At the time this war measure of a tax upon State-bank circulation was passed the best constitutional lawyers believed that it was a direct tax and unconstitutional. The same arguments were used in favor of it that were used to support the income tax. The United States Supreme Court decided at that time in favor of the income tax, but the present court decided against it; and if the State-bank question were again brought before the Supreme Court, it is at least very doubtful if it would be upheld.

During the discussion of this bill in the Senate its leading features were discussed by Senator Collamer, of Vermont, in the following manner; and when it is remembered that Senator Collamer was a leading New England Republican, we are impressed with the old adage that "time brings great changes:"

To induce people to take $300,000,000 of stock on interest, set up these banks, put out their circulation as a national currency, and we guarantee its payment. Wherein is that any better than the paper we have got out now? I will ask the gentlemen to put that question to themselves, Is it any better? What is it founded on? United States credit, United States stocks. Whom do the bill holders look to for final redemption? The United States Treasury we say will redeem them; the system has no other foundation; all these fictitious contrivances about the responsibility of the individual stockholders amount to just nothing at all.

As to the provision retaining 25 per cent of their circulation, they can put that into their own pockets whenever they please, and there is nobody to question them about it. It is simply and singly founded upon the public responsibility, and, indeed, the honorable Senator from Ohio deems that to be its great feature of excellence. Instead of circulating that amount of our own currency upon our own responsibility and paying nothing, we are to hire them to circulate that amount of our currency and pay them $12,000,000 a year in gold for doing it. Yankee as I am, I am unable to perceive how it is possible that that can be a good trade for us, or how any shrewd man would think o entering into an agreement of that kind.

These means forced the people of this country to accept the debts of the nation with but 45 cents on the dollar as security for their circulating medium in the place of actual property with double the value of the circulating notes.

It absolutely destroyed the business and property rights of one class of citizens in order to build up and enforce the business and profits of another class.

A SAFE PROPOSITION.

Let each State control its own banking system. Let its legislature determine what kind of security shall be held and how much currency can be issued and what kind of money it shall be redeemed in. Such action will furnish a domestic currency for the use of the people of that State among themselves.

They only seek to have a medium for their own business. They do not care to have a currency that will go outside of their State. The object is not to have it go away from home. Whatever other pretenses may be made, this means will be antagonized by only one class of people, the money-owning and consequently the money-loaning class, since it stands for the best interests and welfare of all others.

Gen. M. C. Butler, who formerly represented in this body the State which I in part now represent, used the following strong language recently in an open letter to a friend in South Carolina:

I regard the repeal of the 10 per cent tax of far more value to the welfare of the great masses of the people than the free coinage of silver. The present evil in our monetary system is the inadequacy in the volume of currency and the inequality of its distribution—the latter the greater of the two evils. This inequality of distribution would be corrected if we could have local State banks of issue, under proper safeguards, and just so much currency would be put out by them as the local demands required. It has always struck me as very absurd to suppose that any State would or could permit "wildcat banking," which is about the only argument ever urged against State banks of issue. No State, under our modern methods of transacting business through quick correspondence by mail and wire and the vigilance of the commercial and business agencies, could tolerate loose or "wildcat banking" for forty-eight hours, and there is no good reason why State-bank currency could not be made as sound and safe as the present national-bank currency.

I have said the free coinage of silver would inevitably follow the reopening of State banks, and for this reason: These banks would absorb every dollar of coin, both gold and silver, as security for their circulation and to maintain whatever reserve the law might require. For domestic purposes, as a domestic currency, silver is to-day as good as gold. Silver only becomes embarrassing when transactions are had with foreign countries. Like gold, it passes only for its bullion value in foreign countries; but at home it is taken at par of its present weight and fineness. I say, therefore, for all domestic purposes, silver is as good as gold, and there is no reason why it should not be admitted to free coinage and used by local banks as a redemption and reserve fund.

This scheme of circulation does not require the issuance of a single bond or the payment of a dollar by the United States Treasury in interest. The bonds issued during President Cleveland's Administration amounted to $262,315,400. There was received for the bonds the sum of $293,454,286.74. The quotation of Fiske & Robinson shows that these bonds are worth to-day in the market $349,753,866. This makes a profit to the banks of $36,299,580. The last issue of bonds are now quoted at $1.10, which gives the banks a profit of $19,800,000 upon the issue. The bonds are now quoted in New York at $1.10, at which figure the income is only 1¼ per cent. They meet with ready sale, which shows that the Government can borrow money at that figure and that the banks who receive $6,000,000 a year make a net profit of $2,500,000 a year upon the last issue of bonds alone. Since 1892 the increase in interest paid annually by the United States has been $17,000,000. It is now proposed to increase it still further.

These enormous sums are direct subsidies to the Eastern banks.

The total indebtedness of the United States is less than it was in 1892, while the interest charged is over 70 per cent greater.

During President Harrison's Administration the interest-bearing debt of the United States was $585,029,330. The noninterest-bearing debt was $1,000,648,939.37. In the Treasury statement of the public debt for the month of November, 1899, the interest-bearing debt has been increased to $1,037,049,690. The noninterest-bearing debt has been decreased to $388,048,760.16. The proposition in this currency bill is to wipe out this noninterest-bearing debt by replacing it with interest-bearing debt. The interest paid by the United States Government in 1892 was $22,893,883. The interest paid for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899, was $39,896,925.02.

A GLARING DISCRIMINATION.

During the panic of 1893 it was impossible for the banks of the South to obtain money in New York with which to handle the cotton crop, and the banks of the West experienced the same difficulty as to the grain of that section. The banks of New York relieved the financial stringency there by the issuance of clearing-house certificates, and in this they were assisted by the United States Treasury. The banks of the South and the banks of the West immediately formed clearing-house associations and issued clearing-house certificates in regular form, as is shown by the one which I will now read to the Senate:

CLEARING-HOUSE CERTIFICATE OF THE ASSOCIATED BANKS OF ROCK HILL, S. C.

The First National Bank of Rock Hill, S. C., Cashier.
The Savings Bank of Rock Hill, S. C., Cashier.

No. ——.

SEPT. 4TH, 1893.

This certifies that the First National Bank of Rock Hill, S. C., and the Savings Bank of Rock Hill, S. C., have deposited with this committee securities in accordance with the proceedings of a meeting of the association, held September 4th, 1893, upon which this certificate is issued. This certificate will be received in payment of balances at the clearing house for the sum of $10

TEN DOLLARS

from any member of the Clearing-House Association.

On the surrender of this certificate by the depositing banks above named, the committee will endorse the amount as a payment on the obligation of said banks held by them and surrender a proportionate share of the collateral securities held therefor.

——, ——,
——, ——,
——, ——,
Committee.

Countersigned by—
——, *Secretary.*

The effect was electrical. Business improved at once and the crops began to move. The New York banks became alarmed. If the South and the West should become able to utilize their wealth in providing a means with which their communities could do business, the absolute control of the finances of the United States had passed out of the hands of the New York banks. Something had to be done and done at once. The Treasury, which looked with the utmost favor upon clearing-house certificates based upon stocks and bonds of uncertain and fluctuating value, promptly decided that clearing-house certificates with actual tangible values back of them constituted a State-bank circulation and were subject to taxation. If these were bank circulation, then the issues of the New York banks constituted bank circulation, and yet they were allowed to issue them without complying with the statute concerning the issue of circulation. This ruling of the Treasury riveted the bonds of financial slavery on the people of the South and West, and the sudden light of liberty was rudely extinguished.

I want at the proper time a vote upon the question as to whether or not the people of the South and West are to be allowed to use their wealth for the upbuilding of their sections or whether the discrimination is to be continued forever. I want a vote upon this question squarely and without any other question intervening. We have the property, we have the resources, and we want to know whether or not those who have less resources in the way of products and whose aggregate property is less than that of the South and West combined shall have all the money.

STATE BANKS CAN BE CONDUCTED IN HARMONY WITH PRESENT NATIONAL BANKING SYSTEM.

I have no fight to make upon national-bank circulation but that circulation has been cornered. I want for my people a circulation that has not been cornered. I want it issued under the wisest restrictions of the State in which it is to circulate, but I do not want the element of speculation that has so disastrously affected the purchasing power of Federal money to have anything to do with this money which is to issue upon the basis of real values and tangible property. We wish to do business to the mutual advantage of all sections and upon terms of equality. We do not want to do business under the dictatorship of New York banks. We do not want for our section to have the present disproportion of circulating medium to the amount of wealth it possesses. We ask for nothing but exact and equal justice, and we will be content with nothing less.

REPAIR OF CABLES.

Mr. DAVIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair requests the Senator from Minnesota to withhold the motion for a moment, that a message from the President may be laid before the Senate.

Mr. DAVIS. I withdraw the motion for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, with accompanying papers. The message will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, with reference to the claim of the Eastern Extension Australasian and China Telegraph Company, Limited, for compensation on account of expenses incurred in repairing its Manila-Hongkong and Manila-Capiz cables, which were cut by United States forces during the war with Spain.

I recommend that, as an act of equity and comity, provision be made by the Congress for reimbursement to the company of the actual expenses incurred by it in the repair of the cables.

WILLIAM McKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, January 16, 1900.

Mr. DAVIS. I think the message should be referred to the Committee on the Philippines and printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unless there be objection, the message, with the accompanying papers, will be referred to the Committee on the Philippines and printed. The Chair hears no objection, and that order will be made.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. DAVIS. I renew the motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After two hours and eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 17, 1900, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 16, 1900.

CONSUL.

Robert W. McWade, of Pennsylvania, to be consul of the United States at Canton, China, vice Edward Bedloe, resigned.

SUPERVISOR OF CENSUS.

George M. French, of Hot Springs, Garland County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Arkansas.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Commander William W. Kimball, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 8th day of December, 1899, vice Commander Charles P. Howell, deceased.

Lieut. Commander William P. Day, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 12th day of December, 1899, vice Commander Edward P. Wood, deceased.

Lieut. Commander John C. Wilson, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 29th day of December, 1899, vice Commander John F. Merry, promoted.

P. A. Surg. Hatton N. T. Harris, to be a surgeon in the Navy, from the 25th day of October, 1899, vice Surg. John C. Boyd, promoted.

Lieut. Col. Henry C. Cochrane, to be a colonel in the Marine Corps, from the 11th day of January, 1900, vice Col. Robert W. Huntington, retired.

Maj. Allan C. Kelton, to be a lieutenant-colonel in the Marine Corps, from the 11th day of January, 1900 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Lieut. Col. Henry C. Cochrane, promoted.

Capt. Lincoln Karmany, to be a major in the Marine Corps, from the 11th day of January, 1900, vice Maj. Allan C. Kelton, promoted.

Mr. Samuel A. W. Patterson, a citizen of Pennsylvania, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, from the 11th day of January, 1900, to fill a vacancy existing in that corps.

Mr. Herbert J. Hirshinger, a citizen of North Carolina, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, from the 11th day of January, 1900, to fill a vacancy existing in that corps.

Surg. Howard Wells, to be a medical inspector in the Navy, from the 15th day of January, 1900, vice Medical Inspector Charles A. Siegfried, deceased.

TO BE ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS IN THE NAVY.

John D. Robnett, a citizen of Texas.
Stewart Rhodes, a citizen of California.

George W. Pigman, jr., a citizen of Indiana.
Perry G. Kennard, a citizen of Illinois.

POSTMASTERS.

Jacob F. Shuler, to be postmaster at El Dorado, in the county of Union and State of Arkansas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

John C. Twombly, to be postmaster at Denver, in the county of Arapahoe and State of Colorado, in the place of H. A. W. Tabor, deceased. (Through error Mr. Twombly was nominated and confirmed as John C. Twombley.)

George C. Bell, to be postmaster at Portland, in the county of Middlesex and State of Connecticut, in the place of J. A. Butler, whose commission expires January 30, 1900.

Edward B. Bennett, to be postmaster at Hartford, in the county of Hartford and State of Connecticut, in the place of F. P. Furlong, whose commission expires January 21, 1900.

Sanford E. Chaffee, to be postmaster at Derby, in the county of New Haven and State of Connecticut, in the place of T. J. O'Sullivan, whose commission expires February 11, 1900.

George H. Ford, to be postmaster at Waterville, in the county of New Haven and State of Connecticut, in the place of George H. Ford, whose commission expired January 15, 1900. (Reappointed.)

Charles Harris, to be postmaster at Westport, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut, in the place of S. B. Wheeler, whose commission expires February 13, 1900.

Robert J. Morrison, to be postmaster at Newark, in the county of Newcastle and State of Delaware, in the place of W. H. Smith, removed.

Isaac A. Smith, to be postmaster at Tennille, in the county of Washington and State of Georgia, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Francis Ball, to be postmaster at Pocatello, in the county of Bannock and State of Idaho, in the place of A. F. Caldwell, resigned.

John W. Campbell, to be postmaster at Morrisonville, in the county of Christian and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Frederick Dilg, to be postmaster at Mascoutah, in the county of St. Clair and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Charles W. Fleming, to be postmaster at Arthur, in the county of Moultrie and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

John F. Newlin, to be postmaster at Chrisman, in the county of Edgar and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Joel P. Watson, to be postmaster at Ashley, in the county of Washington and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

John A. Hall, to be postmaster at Cicero, in the county of Hamilton and State of Indiana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Japhet F. Lehman, to be postmaster at Berne, in the county of Adams and State of Indiana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Daniel Anderson, to be postmaster at Lamoni, in the county of Decatur and State of Iowa, in the place of G. W. Blair, whose commission expired January 15, 1900.

Thomas J. Ochiltree, to be postmaster at Morning Sun, in the county of Louisa and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

William Hobson, to be postmaster at Campbellsville, in the county of Taylor and State of Kentucky, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Daniel O'Riley, to be postmaster at Leitchfield, in the county of Grayson and State of Kentucky, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

L. F. Sinclair, to be postmaster at Georgetown, in the county of Scott and State of Kentucky, in the place of D. A. Adams, whose commission expired January 7, 1900.

John N. Sandlin, to be postmaster at Minden, in the county of Webster and State of Louisiana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Arthur A. Dinsmore, to be postmaster at Dover, in the county of Piscataquis and State of Maine, in the place of D. F. Ayer, whose commission expired January 9, 1900.

George R. Foster, to be postmaster at Lisbon Falls, in the county of Androscoggin and State of Maine, in the place of G. W. Beal, whose commission expired January 15, 1900.

Rufus C. Reed, to be postmaster at Damariscotta, in the county of Lincoln and State of Maine, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Charles Newhall, to be postmaster at Danvers, in the county of Essex and State of Massachusetts, in the place of C. N. Perley, whose commission expired January 7, 1900.

Abbie H. Souther, to be postmaster at Cohasset, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts, in the place of H. W. Souther, deceased.

Elisha N. Clink, to be postmaster at East Jordan, in the county of Charlevoix and State of Michigan, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

John P. Scott, jr., to be postmaster at Delray, in the county of Wayne and State of Michigan, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Henry C. Whitmer, to be postmaster at Colon, in the county of St. Joseph and State of Michigan, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Warren D. Harden, to be postmaster at Le Roy, in the county of Mower and State of Minnesota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Ira C. Richardson, to be postmaster at Thief River Falls, in the county of Red Lake and State of Minnesota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Samuel C. Stanchfield, to be postmaster at Camden Place, in the county of Hennepin and State of Minnesota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Through error Mr. Stanchfield was nominated to the Senate and confirmed as Samuel L. Stanchfield.

William B. Strom, to be postmaster at Hector, in the county of Renville and State of Minnesota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Minnie M. Cox, to be postmaster at Indianola, in the county of Sunflower and State of Mississippi, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Henry J. Crider, to be postmaster at Maitland, in the county of Holt and State of Missouri, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Walter Alderson, to be postmaster at Red Lodge, in the county of Carbon and State of Montana, in the place of J. R. Andrews, whose commission expires February 11, 1900.

Jesse C. Ricker, to be postmaster at Havre, in the county of Choteau and State of Montana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

John S. Hoover, to be postmaster at Blue Hill, in the county of Webster and State of Nebraska, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

James L. Lashbrook, to be postmaster at Oxford, in the county of Furnas and State of Nebraska, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

John M. Mills, to be postmaster at Laurel, in the county of Cedar and State of Nebraska, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Rufus Pryer, to be postmaster at Newman Grove, in the county of Madison and State of Nebraska, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Sanford R. Razee, to be postmaster at Curtis, in the county of Frontier and State of Nebraska, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Richard F. Williams, to be postmaster at St. Edward, in the county of Boone and State of Nebraska, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Henry E. Merrick, to be postmaster at Henniker, in the county of Merrimack and State of New Hampshire, the appointment of

a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Evan F. Benners, to be postmaster at Moorestown, in the county of Burlington and State of New Jersey, in the place of A. L. Brock, whose commission expired January 9, 1900.

Thomas Moritz, to be postmaster at Glenridge, in the county of Essex and State of New Jersey, in the place of Thomas Moritz, whose commission expired February 7, 1899. (Reappointed.)

Louis O. Fullen, to be postmaster at Carlsbad (late Eddy), in the county of Eddy and Territory of New Mexico, in the place of Louis O. Fullen, reappointed on change in name of office. (Through error Mr. Fullen was nominated and confirmed as Lewis O. Fullen.)

Robert G. Anderson, to be postmaster at Freeport, in the county of Nassau and State of New York, in the place of C. S. Powell, removed.

Charles H. Griffin, to be postmaster at Oakfield, in the county of Genesee and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

William J. Guthrie, to be postmaster at Philadelphia, in the county of Jefferson and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Dudley S. Mersereau, to be postmaster at Union, in the county of Broome and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Wesley Mulford, to be postmaster at Unadilla, in the county of Otsego and State of New York, in place of M. B. Gregory, whose commission expires January 30, 1900.

George P. Schryver, to be postmaster at Port Jefferson, in the county of Suffolk and State of New York, in the place of W. B. Dayton, whose commission expires February 26, 1900.

Robert P. Caldwell, to be postmaster at Newton, in the county of Catawba and State of North Carolina, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Richard M. Norment, to be postmaster at Lumberton, in the county of Robeson and State of North Carolina, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

John S. Ellen, to be postmaster at Willoughby, in the county of Lake and State of Ohio, in the place of John S. Ellen, whose commission expired December 30, 1899. (Reappointed.)

Carlton A. Lafferty, to be postmaster at Bellville, in the county of Richland and State of Ohio, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

John P. Yockey, to be postmaster at Canal Fulton, in the county of Stark and State of Ohio, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Hayward H. Riddell, to be postmaster at The Dalles, in the county of Wasco and State of Oregon, in the place of J. A. Crossen, removed. Mr. Riddell is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John R. Smith, to be postmaster at Lebanon, in the county of Linn and State of Oregon, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Ezra H. Woodward, to be postmaster at Newberg, in the county of Yamhill and State of Oregon, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

J. M. Brothers, to be postmaster at Knox, in the county of Clarion and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Lewis W. Snyder, to be postmaster at Bethlehem, in the county of Northampton and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of C. L. Shimer, whose commission expired December 20, 1899.

John C. White, to be postmaster at Knoxville, in the county of Tioga and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Cadwallader J. Pride, to be postmaster at Rockhill, in the county of York and State of South Carolina, in the place of E. E. Poag, whose commission expired January 15, 1900.

Casper Kennedy, to be postmaster at Sisseton, in the county of Roberts and State of South Dakota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Edmund D. Hughes, to be postmaster at Mountpleasant, in the county of Maury and State of Tennessee, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

John B. Stong, to be postmaster at Bellbuckle, in the county of Bedford and State of Tennessee, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Charles R. Bone, to be postmaster at Beaumont, in the county of Jefferson and State of Texas, in the place of J. P. Armstrong, removed.

Kittie L. Edwards, to be postmaster at Smithville, in the county of Bastrop and State of Texas, in the place of E. G. Winston, whose commission expired January 15, 1900.

Clinton J. Farrell, to be postmaster at Vernon, in the county of Wilbarger and State of Texas, in the place of C. M. Ralston, removed.

Frankie Houssels, to be postmaster at Childress, in the county of Childress and State of Texas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Jeannette D. McConnell, to be postmaster at Jacksboro, in the county of Jack and State of Texas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

J. W. Shotwell, to be postmaster at Lufkin, in the county of Angelina, and State of Texas, in the place of W. L. Vinson, removed.

Charles E. Haddox, to be postmaster at Cairo, in the county of Ritchie and State of West Virginia, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

George A. Blakeley, to be postmaster at Albany, in the county of Green and State of Wisconsin, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Charles Frantz, to be postmaster at Kenosha, in the county of Kenosha and State of Wisconsin, in the place of A. J. Burg, whose commission expires January 30, 1900.

Joseph E. Parmelee, to be postmaster at West Salem, in the county of Lacrosse and State of Wisconsin, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Joseph E. Parry, to be postmaster at Florence, in the county of Florence and State of Wisconsin, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and aftar January 1, 1900.

Charles Settergren, to be postmaster at Baldwin, in the county of St. Croix and State of Wisconsin, the appointment of a postmaster for said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

Frank Tucker, to be postmaster at Princeton, in the county of Green Lake and State of Wisconsin, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1900.

John A. Watson, to be postmaster at Kaukauna, in the county of Outagamie and State of Wisconsin, in the place of D. J. Brothers, whose commission expired January 9, 1900.

CONFIRMATION.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 16, 1900.

SUPERVISOR OF THE TWELFTH CENSUS.

Asa Smith, of Parsons, Labette County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Kansas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *January 16, 1900.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

CORRECTION OF VOTES.

Mr. LYBRAND. On the motion yesterday to recommit the bill H. R. 5297, I voted "no." I wish to change my vote to "present."

The SPEAKER. That can not be done, but the gentleman's statement will stand.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. On the roll call yesterday I am recorded as voting "no." I was paired with the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. GRIGGS, and should have voted "present."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Journal will stand as approved.

There was no objection.

CORRECTION.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to correct the RECORD of January 4. On page 666, in the second column, I am made to declare that the number of cattle in this country in 1892 was ten millions more than in 1897. An examination of the stenographic report shows that I said seven millions more. My own recollection is distinct on that point, because I know that was the shortage.

How this mistake occurred I will not undertake to say, for I do not know whether it was a careless revision of the stenographic report, or whether it occurred in the Printing Office. At any rate, I am not willing to allow that kind of a discrepancy to remain in the RECORD without a correction. I should not have troubled the House to correct it, and intended simply to make the correction in the permanent RECORD, but when I went to the Printing Office to do this I found that the permanent RECORD had already been made up, and there was nothing left for me except to incorporate in the RECORD of to-day this statement.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction will be made.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a third report on the investigations of the agricultural capabilities of Alaska for the year 1899, in accordance with the acts of Congress making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1899, and June 30, 1900.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *January 15, 1900.*

The message, with the accompanying documents, was ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

USELESS PAPERS IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

The SPEAKER announced as House members of the Joint Committee on the Disposal of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, Messrs. MINOR of Wisconsin and COCHRAN of Missouri.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering general appropriation bills.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Pending that, I desire to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations what time he is willing to allow for general debate? Should not that be fixed in the House?

Mr. CANNON. I think it just as well to fix it now, if we can, by agreement, if the Chair will for a moment suspend the putting of the question.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I hope the gentleman is willing to let general debate proceed until the close of to-day's session, which will be only about four hours, and take the bill up in the morning under the five-minute rule.

Mr. CANNON. I understand the gentleman to suggust that we have general debate to-day, and that it be closed to-day, and that to-morrow the bill be discussed under the five-minute rule?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is my suggestion.

Mr. CANNON. That is, on the deficiency bill?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I am quite content. I think that is fair, and I ask unanimous consent.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That the time be evenly divided between the two sides of the House?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that this day be devoted to general debate. Does the Chair state the question correctly, "this day?"

Mr. CANNON. "This day."

The SPEAKER. That this day be devoted to the general debate on the appropriation bill to be considered, the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and the gentlemam from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON]. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON. That general debate close with this day's session, and then the bill to be taken up by the committee, of course, under the ordinary five-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question now is on the motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of general appropriation bills.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. DALZELL in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of general appropriation bills. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6237) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I can say in a very few moments all I desire to say by way of explanation of this bill. If gentlemen will consult the report, No. 43, they will find, substantially, an explanation of the same. The bill provides for the public service, substantially, for the remainder of this fiscal year, covering what is believed to be all urgent items, and many items that are not urgent, but will be required before the expiration of the fiscal year. On the first page of the report gentlemen will find items covering $8,525,000 in the aggregate. Appropriations for these items are recommended. In addition to the $8,500,000 of direct appropriations, the bill authorizes the reappropriations, or extensions, during the fiscal year 1900, of the balance remaining unexpended on July 1, 1899, of appropriations made for the military and naval establishments for the fiscal year ending 1898 and 1899.

On the second page of the report these items are stated, aggregating $45,752,000, in round numbers, for the military establishment, and $1,850,000 for the naval establishment, making a total of $47,602,332.61 of reappropriations for the public service. Then follows a statement of the unexpended balances for the military and naval establishments for the fiscal year ending 1898 and 1899, aggregating $57,600,000, in round numbers. I believe that is all I desire to say. The bill has been prepared with much care, and there is no recommendation in it but what is believed to be necessary for the public service. There are some items in it that an urgent deficiency bill ordinarily does not carry. One I will call attention to are judgments of the Court of Claims, $2,123,000, in round numbers.

Ordinarily this item would come at the end of the fiscal year instead of at this time; but the judgments being final, the time for appeal having elapsed, your committee thought it was proper that the money should be appropriated. It is due to the citizen, by the judgment of the court of last resort, and ought to be paid.

Now, unless there is some question that some gentleman desires to ask touching the bill, I will yield the floor, reserving the remainder of my time.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question respecting the item on page 739 in relation to the rural free delivery service, as to whether it is a deficiency or whether a part of it is a deficiency and the other is an additional appropriation asked for, and what motives, if he feels disposed to give them, prompted the committee to insert this item here?

Mr. CANNON. If the gentlemen will turn to page 39, they will find the following item about which the gentleman from California queries:

For experimental rural free delivery, including pay of carriers, horse-hire allowance, supplies, and mechanical appliances, $150,000: *Provided*, That in administering the service under this appropriation no deficiency shall be created therein.

Your committee gave very careful investigation touching this item, and I will say to the gentleman from California, the chairman of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, that we gave it perhaps more careful investigation than we would have done from the fact that the general policy of the Post-Office Department, not only in legislation, but in appropriations as well, is considered primarily under the rules by the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads; and we found on examination that for experimental rural free-delivery service, under the lead of the gentleman from California and his committee, there was appropriated for the service of this year in the Post-Office appropriation bill $300,000.

Now, it seems that this money has been largely expended and only half of the fiscal year has passed by; and, on inquiry, we found that unless an additional appropriation was made by Congress in a deficiency bill (and that is the proper place for it, if it is made), much of the service of rural free delivery that had been heretofore instituted or commenced would have to be discontinued before the end of the fiscal year; in other words, that the service had been so extended that it could not be continued as extended until the 1st day of July next without additional appropriation.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. CANNON. In a moment. So that the committee saw that it was absolutely necessary to recommend an additional

appropriation for the continuance of this service for the remaining six months, or, in the event that Congress failed to do so, the Post-Office Department would have to discontinue a portion of the service already entered upon. Now I will yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GAINES. In what portion of the country, if any particular portion, is this rural delivery now in use?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. In every State except three.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from Indiana says every State except three. I do not know; I did not inquire about that. I think it is quite generally in use throughout the country.

Mr. BROWN. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. BROWN. In reference to this appropriation of $150,000, I understood the gentleman from Illinois to say that unless this appropriation should be made a number of free delivery service routes already instituted would have to be discontinued, or some statement substantially like that. Now, if that is a fact, I wish to ask whether the House correctly understood the gentleman or whether the $150,000 may be sufficient to continue the service already instituted and establish others? I ask that for the reason that the First Assistant Postmaster-General has frequently said to me that petitions which I have filed with him for the service in my Congressional district would be considered by him if Congress made appropriations to supply the deficiency. The matter is an exceedingly important one in my district.

Mr. CANNON. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio, in reply to his question, that I had a telegram from the Post-Office Department bearing upon that matter, but one of the members of the committee has it, and it is not on the files at this moment.

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I have a detailed answer to the question by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from Georgia has a telegram, and he may have it read in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; I desire that the telegram may be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT, *January 16, 1900.*

Hon. J. M. GRIGGS:

Replying to your inquiry about item for rural free delivery in urgent deficiency bill, I have to state if experimental service as it stands to-day is continued until June 30, 1900, it will require about $50,000 to prevent a deficiency on that date. Service is entirely experimental, and may be discontinued at will of Postmaster-General. If Congress finds it inadvisable to provide additional funds for service this year, it is intention of Department to reduce service sufficiently to keep expenditure on its account within appropriation of $300,000. To establish new service for which there are now on file in Department complete reports, including selection and bonding of carriers, it would require $50,000 more. Then, to comply with applications of members which are not yet fully reported upon by special agents, it would require still $50,000 additional. These amounts you will see make up item of $150,000 reported in urgent deficiency bill.

A. W. MACHEN, *Superintendent.*

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for forwarding the telegram. The Committee on Appropriations upon yesterday had a similar telegram, and when you analyze it, it states that $50,000 of the $150,000 appropriated will continue the service in being; $50,000 will put the service upon routes that have been determined upon, and there will still be $50,000 for routes that have not been passed upon.

Now, I am frank to say, in reply to the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD], that this expenditure, or rather the manner of the expenditure, does not meet my approval, for the reason that under positive law the Executive in most cases, and this is one of them, has no power to expend money or create liabilities beyond the appropriations made by Congress.

Now, under the lead of your Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads $300,000 was appropriated, and that has been so expended and the service has been so placed that it will require $50,000 more than the $300,000 to continue that service to the 1st day of July next. So that Congress comes up against the proposition of either giving this money in whole or in part by the way of appropriation or discontinuing service that has been commenced. I do not believe that is a wise method of administration, to say the mildest thing about it I can say. I believe it is the duty of the Executive to cut the garment according to the legislative cloth that is furnished. It is the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, with the approval of the President, that make appropriations.

Mr. STEELE. Will the gentleman from Illinois allow me an interruption?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that it is only fair to the Post-Office Department to say that they have not made any permanent arrangement for service. It is experimental, and they do not intend to exceed the amount appropriated. The whole thing is experimental, but it has been so satisfactory to the people of the country that it is being cried for all over the country and its extension demanded.

Mr. CANNON. Now, then, in reply to the gentleman, without discussing at this time in the slightest degree the merits of the rural free delivery—I am not discussing its merits at all, but am discussing the situation to which the gentleman from California has asked my attention—I state again that $300,000 for experimental free delivery in the regular Post-Office appropriation bill was an increase of that much over the prior year.

Mr. LOUD. An increase of 100 per cent.

Mr. CANNON. Just double the amount appropriated for the prior fiscal year. Now, then, I do say that the Post-Office Department has gone on experimenting with the rural free-delivery service actually existing throughout the country to that degree that unless Congress comes in and appropriates $50,000 more that experiment will have to be discontinued between this and the 1st day of next July. Perhaps that may be keeping the law in the letter, but it is violating the law in substance.

Wherever this service goes—wherever there is a threat of discontinuance next May—there comes a protest; and this is a representative government; and when the protest comes from our various districts, as was the case once before, touching letter-carrier service in our cities, where there was a similar condition, and protests came from chambers of commerce and from residents of those cities under substantially similar conditions to the present, Congress felt compelled to make the appropriation. That is to say, the Executive, departing from the substance of the law, had so conducted the public service as to create circumstances that Congress was practically coerced into making the appropriations, whether they thought them wise or not.

I do not believe that such a situation ought to exist. It is for the Congress of the United States to make appropriations. If they are not wisely made, Congress is responsible; if wisely made, Congress has the credit. The Constitution places the power in the hands of Congress, and, without discussing the merits of the rural free delivery, I have no language too strong in which to disapprove of this method of expenditure, however meritorious the service may be.

Mr. POWERS. I understand the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the committee, to say that he protests against this expenditure of money, which has created a deficiency in the appropriation for rural free delivery, and that his proposition is that the Department ought to be limited to the exact amount carried by the general appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman misunderstands me. I say that under the law—well ascertained and of many years' standing—the Executive has no right to make a deficiency. Of course there are certain exceptions—for instance, in the expenditures for the Army and the Navy and the military establishment, and so on—but I am stating the rule as applied to this service and most other branches of the public service.

Now, I do say that under this appropriation there has been so large an expenditure that there is to be presented the alternative of a deficiency or a discontinuance of the service. Now, in my judgment, without regard to the merits of the free-delivery system, that action of the Executive Department was not proper.

Mr. POWERS. I notice that the gentleman is very careful not to say that this appropriation ought to be defeated.

Mr. CANNON. I have not said so; and I will say to the gentleman, first, it may be a meritorious service; second, I suspect I am exactly in the same condition as most members on the floor of this House. This service, I may say, has been begun, extending to different parts of the country, and already come remonstrances against the local discontinuance from this place and that place and the other place. Now, then, I say as a matter of general practice and particular practice that the Executive, under the law, keeping it, in substance, ought not to so administer the appropriations as to produce such a condition.

I might say further, that under these conditions the fact of the necessity of making this appropriation is evidenced by the action of the Committee on Appropriations, because they report favorably for the consideration of the House this item of $150,000.

Mr. POWERS. Then am I right in assuming that the honorable chairman of the committee, who guards the Treasury with so much jealousy, really thinks this appropriation ought, under the circumstances, to be made in order to meet the expectations of the people on the routes already in operation?

Mr. CANNON. I will say to the gentleman that I shall vote for this appropriation, as I did for the appropriation for letter carriers two or three years ago, when there was a threatened decrease of service unless Congress would come to the rescue.

But in doing this I will say, in answer to the honorable gentleman from California, I should fail to do my duty unless as strongly as I could, without regard to the merit of this service or any other service, I called attention in this respect to what I believe to be maladministration on the part of the Department.

Mr. BERRY. Does this appropriation contemplate the extension of this service to districts that do not now have it, or does it apply only to those where it already exists?

Mr. CANNON. Fifty thousand dollars is for the service already in existence. Fifty thousand dollars and a small sum additional is to pay for service favorably considered and which is an extension, and then there will remain $50,000 for other service that may be agreed upon between now and the 30th day of June.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I wish to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question in regard to the extraordinary limitation following this appropriation. After the words "one hundred and fifty thousand dollars," in line 6, page 39, the language of the bill is as follows:

Provided, That in administering the service under this appropriation no deficiency shall be created——

Mr. CANNON. That is unusual.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I want to know whether that is usual or unusual and why it is applied to the Post-Office Department.

Mr. CANNON. Unusual.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Then why should it be applied in this case?

Mr. CANNON. Well, I will say to the gentleman that that question will come up if he sees proper to make a point of order on it, but I will say further to him now that that is the law to-day.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Well, then, why reassert it?

Mr. CANNON. I want to reassert it in this connection so as to show that the judgment of the House of Representatives is that, in the expenditure of this money, the law that is upon the statute books shall not be violated.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Well, now, if the gentleman will permit me, why should that limitation be made to apply specifically to the Post-Office Department in the administration of this particular branch of the public service?

Mr. CANNON. Because there has been a specific and a substantial violation of the law.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I do not believe there has been any violation of law. Experiments have been made at the request of members of Congress all over this country, and what has been done by the Post-Office Department, in my opinion, meets the approval of almost every man who has given it any thought or any attention, and will, in my judgment, be sustained by this House. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted, there has not been established within my recollection a more popular branch of the public service than the rural free mail delivery for the farmers of the country. You have again and again created deficiencies in other branches of the Government. Why not do it freely in this instance when you are serving the great agricultural interests of the country, who are to-day being benefited by rural free mail delivery as they have been by no other expenditure of the Government? And I hope to see it extended to every farmer in the country. It is already self-supporting in many States and a complete success in Michigan. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to answer the gentleman from Michigan, at least in part—the gentleman to whom I always yield and who always when yielded to either clarifies the atmosphere or puts a searchlight upon the situation. [Laughter.]

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I suppose that depends on the point of view. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. He goes off and talks about the merits of the rural free delivery service and says that individual members of Congress have gone and insisted that the law shall be violated.

Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the American Congress. I have great respect for the House of Representatives, which is frequently stated, and believed by me, to be perhaps—no, not perhaps—to be the greatest popular assembly on earth. But it takes us all together to make the House of Representatives, sitting with the Speaker in the chair, the measures before the House, and a record of a majority vote to exercise the will of that great body.

And when it is exercised, I for one never have stood, nor will I ever stand, excusing a dodging of the issue by saying that here is a very nice service and a very popular service, and that the constitutional will of Congress shall be, and ought to be, nullified because the gentleman from Michigan believes that the service is so important that it should give way at his request.

Now, I want to state, in order that I may not be misunderstood, that this appropriation is favorably reported from the committee over which I have the honor to preside on this bill, which I reported by direction of that committee. I stand ready, and expect, as I did in the instance that he referred to before, to vote for it.

But I should be recreant to my duty as a Representative and as a member of this body if, in answering these questions, I did not call the attention of the House to what the administration of this fund had been.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. HEPBURN. These various items of appropriation are all to make good deficiencies, as I understand.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no. My friend from Iowa will see in a moment that "deficiencies" is merely a word to refer to additional appropriations, if the deficiency is a proper one.

Mr. HEPBURN. Then, I perhaps may simplify the matter by asking if there are several deficiencies provided for here?

Mr. CANNON. In some instances, where the law calls for the service, yes. My friend from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] knows that the military establishment and the naval establishment, in many of their departments, call for service without reference to appropriation and authorize an obligation. Now, there is something of that here. Then, again, take it in the Post-Office Department; the law calls for the transportation of the mails upon the railways. It may be there is not a deficiency on that in this bill; but there is frequently a deficiency there. Then in the item of the payment of postmasters' salaries; the law provides for the appointment of postmasters and provides for that service, and they would have a legal claim against the Government under the law, although there was no money appropriated. But for this service, and most of the public service, the law is that service shall be according to the appropriation, and that the performing of the service not within the appropriation is against the law.

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes; in all cases. Then wherever a deficiency is created there is a violation of the statute.

Mr. CANNON. Not in all cases, but in most cases.

Mr. HEPBURN. Then I want to ask the gentleman why he has distinguished this particular case with a proviso? There is no proviso, such as is attached to this provision, attached to any other provision in this bill.

Mr. CANNON. I will say to my friend, as I said before—and he could not have been giving me his full attention at that time——

Mr. HEPBURN. No; it was the confusion. I always listen to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON (continuing). That this is the only appropriation upon this bill where a service has been undertaken that was not provided for by appropriations or by law; and having favorably reported this appropriation notwithstanding that fact, the Committee on Appropriations felt that it was their duty to report the proviso to the House, so that with the appropriation might go the protest.

Now, I will reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I wish to unite with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in saying that the subcommittee in framing this bill have excluded everything that was not clearly and practically a deficiency, and an urgent one, with one or two exceptions.

It is true that the bill carries quite a large sum of money for an urgent deficiency bill—$56,000,000 and more. I want to say in regard to the matter that has been under discussion for the last thirty minutes that perhaps this House is not aware of the fact that the Post-Office Department went to the proper committee last winter—I mean the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads—and asked for this identical amount of money, specifying that they would have to have $150,000 more. They were notified by that committee that they were too late.

Mr. LOUD. Where does the gentleman find that? I should like to see it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I got it from a member of the committee, who sits on my left [Mr. GRIGGS]. They were told that there was no time. I do not know whether there was a disposition on the part of that committee to grant the appropriation or not. I am not questioning that.

Mr. LOUD. Will the gentleman yield right there, as there may be a question of fact? Does not the gentleman very well know that there can be no request for an appropriation unless it be made in an official manner, certified from the Secretary of the Treasury or, if made subsequent to that certification, by an official letter from the Postmaster-General?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I am very well aware of that.

Mr. LOUD. And nothing of that kind exists in this case.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Technically, perhaps, you are right.

Mr. LOUD. No; truthfully I am right.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Practically, perhaps, my information is correct. I understand the fact, Mr. Chairman, that unless an estimate is made and comes down through the formal channels, it can not be entertained by any Appropriation Committee. I understand that.

Mr. GRIGGS. Will my colleague yield to me for a moment or two?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes.

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I have been present in the House

only a few days during this session, but this morning, when this matter came to my attention, I went to the Post-Office Department and made inquiry with reference to it. I was there informed by the First Assistant Postmaster-General that a request had been made by the Post-Office Department of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads to report a bill carrying this extra $150,000; that he was informed that it could not at this session of Congress be acted upon by the Post-Office Committee, because under the rule this committee could only recommend appropriations during this Congress for the next fiscal year. Therefore it went from that Committee to the Committee on Appropriations, not because a deficiency already existed, but because a deficiency was in prospect provided this service was carried out as contemplated by the Post-Office Department, and the request was made of the Committee on Appropriations of the House to make an appropriation of this $150,000.

Mr. LOUD. The gentleman refers simply to this appropriation, which is correct.

Mr. GRIGGS. Yes.

Mr. LOUD. They did come to our committee, and asked us to appropriate simply this $150,000.

Mr. GRIGGS. Yes.

Mr. LOUD. But the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] said that last year they came before our committee and stated that it would be necessary to appropriate $450,000 for this service, which is not true.

Mr. GRIGGS. I made an effort during the remarks of my colleague [Mr. LIVINGSTON], who clearly misapprehended me, to correct that statement, but he did not hear me, and therefore I am compelled, in self-defense, to put the matter correctly before the House.

Mr. Chairman, I can not understand why this proviso that no other deficiency shall occur during this fiscal year should be put in this bill on this particular item. I can not understand why, with deficiencies in every department, with other deficiencies probably in the Post-Office Department, this particular item, in which so many of the people in the rural districts of the United States are interested, should be made subject to this proviso when it is not applied elsewhere.

It is a reflection on the Department. It is a restriction upon the administration of this particular law and this very appropriation by the Post-Office Department. It is a harsh criticism and wholly undeserved. It is practically an announcement to the First Assistant Postmaster-General, "You have willfully violated the law, and we therefore propose to put a check on your future conduct in this respect." Mr. Chairman, there is no deficiency in that service; it is not a deficiency at all. This service is wholly experimental. They have $300,000 with which to experiment upon it this year. They could have spent that in thirty days if in the opinion of the Postmaster-General it was proper to be so expended and experimented with for only thirty days. He saw fit to extend the experiment further, and the Department has experimented until the money appropriated will last only until the middle of May.

Now, then, unless we do appropriate it now, unless this item stands in this bill, then from the 15th of May the service may be discontinued in order to confine the expenditures to the appropriation already made. No gentleman wants that. The Department has violated no law. The Postmaster-General could discontinue the entire service at his will; he could have spent it all by the 1st day of January, or he could spend it by the 1st day of February or any other date during this year. Therefore there has been no violation of law on his part, and it does not seem to me proper, Mr. Chairman, to cast a reflection upon the efficient administration of that official.

If this bill is as meritorious in every item as this item is meritorious, I would not hesitate to say that it is the best bill ever presented in the House of Representatives. I would not hesitate to say that if every item is as meritorious as that, it is an absolutely perfect bill, and the able gentleman who conducts the office of First Assistant Postmaster-General ought to be commended rather than criticised for his action. [Applause.] I shall not take up the time of the House to read again the telegram received by me from Mr. Machen, superintendent of free delivery, relating to this subject, which was read to the House in the time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. I shall insert it in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. It fully, candidly, and completely answers, to my mind, any objections offered to the small sum proposed to be appropriated in the interest of the great farming class of our people. I thank my colleague for the time so generously given me.

Hon. J. M. GRIGGS:

Replying to your inquiry about the item for rural free delivery in urgent deficiency bill, I have to state, if experimental service as it stands to-day is continued until June 30, 1900, it will require about $50,000 to prevent a deficiency on that date. The service is entirely experimental, and may be discontinued at will of Postmaster-General. If Congress finds it inadvisable to provide additional funds for service this year, it is the intention of the Department to reduce service sufficiently to keep expenditure on its account within the appropriation of $300,000. To establish new service, for which there are now on file in the Department complete reports, including selection and bonding of carriers, it would require $50,000 more. Then, to comply with applications of members which are not yet fully reported upon by special agents, it would require still $50,000 additional. These amounts, you will see, make up the item of $150,000 reported in urgent deficiency bill.

A. W. MACHEN, *Superintendent.*

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I will say that perhaps the House does not understand this appropriation of $150,000 and this experimental work being done by the Department. I thank my colleague for the explanation that he has offered. I want to say to the chairman of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads that it has been demonstrated beyond the question of a doubt in many instances already by these experiments that it is a cheaper service to the Government than the star route; and I want to say if the Post-Office Department is not interfered with by Congress it will settle that fact beyond the question of a doubt—that we could take down every fourth-class post-office in the United States and save money by it. There is an experiment being made to-day in the State of Maryland, bounded by the county lines, one entire county, for this particular purpose of settling the question of whether it is not economy to put this in the place of the star-route service.

The gentleman in charge of this bill says this is a representative government, and I want to repeat what my colleague intimated a moment ago—there is nothing in this bill, and nothing will come in any other bill, that comes nearer to your constituency and mine, outside of the large cities and towns, than this item. If the wealthy, the business part of the world, as denominated in this our day and time, are to have their mail dumped into their office or into their laps from two to five times a day, the rural people of this country are asking themselves the question, What can we get in the way of amendments in the matter of facilities for more frequent mail, more certain mail, all through this country of ours?

As evidence, Mr. Chairman, that it is popular not only to Congressmen but to the people that they represent, there are to-day 800 reports on examinations settled and waiting action now in the Department. There are coming in every day from ten to fifteen for action. In some instances where the experiment has been made, where the fourth-class post-office has been dismantled and this rural free delivery put in place of it, from 20 to 50 per cent has been saved. It is true the instances given here in the hearings are of some of the large fourth-class offices—in one instance the postmaster got $1,000—and perhaps that is not a fair test; but the Maryland experiment now being carried on by the Government will be a fair test, including one entire county.

You will find from the hearings, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that this question was asked Mr. Machen of this free rural delivery: "What was the increase in mail wherever this rural-delivery practice had obtained?" He said from 20 to 50 per cent increase in mail. Therefore, it is one of the most potent educational facilities that Congress could put abroad in this country, for a man who lives in the country, remote from the towns and cities, by this system is enabled to read the daily papers, and if the mail increases as it has, from 20 to 50 per cent, with this short experiment, what will it be ten, twenty, or thirty years from now, when it obtains fully? I do not hesitate to say, Mr. Chairman, that it never will down. You may circumscribe it and limit it by the amendment to this appropriation or by this action, which is subject to the point of order, and must go out if the point is made, being new legislation. You may hedge it as you please, the people of this country—I mean the rural people of this country—intend to have it, they will have it, and ought to have it.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that my colleague from Georgia has made one point very clear—that it is not a deficiency in the ordinary sense of a deficiency. I will agree with the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Iowa, this limitation ought not to be put in here unless it is placed in every other appropriation bill.

I agree with the chairman of the committee that the Department for which appropriation is made ought to keep within the limit. There is no question about that. But it is the practice in all the Departments to spend the money outside of the appropriation and then come back to Congress and ask for a deficiency. Ever since I have been connected with this House that has been the practice. I am voting for this new legislation in this bill with the distinct understanding that it must go in all the other appropriation bills from every committee that appropriates money in this House. It is not right to make this an exception.

One more thought, and I am through. The criticism against the Department has been pretty severe. Why did they go out and involve a deficiency here of $150,000? Why, gentlemen, it was an experiment, purely and simply an experiment; and in cutting the cloth, as the chairman states it, it was impossible in a new and undeveloped work to cut that cloth exactly according to the appropriation. They took on, at the pressing instance of Congressmen here from all over the country, more work than could be completed within the appropriation. This must be the case until

the experiment is settled and there comes a business proposition from a practical standpoint.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Will the gentleman from Georgia allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not deem this system past the experimental stage?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I do. I want to say that there is not over two instances now in the Department where the experiments have been made, scattered as they have been in sparsely settled sections, that has not proven a decided and unquestioned success.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Is not the opinion of the gentleman from Georgia held also by the First Assistant Postmaster-General, that it has passed its experimental stage?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It is. I said a moment ago that it was no longer an experiment; that the people of this country understood it, and, as an evidence of it, there were 800 cases awaiting action to-day. I do not believe that these cases have been prepared by interested parties. The people have simply become informed of this system and think it is preferable to the old, and they are clamoring for it, and they will have it, and have it at your hands and my hands, and we may just as well face the fact. I want to say again, for one I am satisfied that it will not be more expensive, but less expensive, than the present star-route system and far more satisfactory.

Mr. BERRY. Will the gentleman from Georgia allow me an interruption?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Certainly.

Mr. BERRY. Is it contemplated that this shall be universal all over the United States?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is the intention.

Mr. BERRY. If successful it is to be instituted all over the country?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman from Georgia allow me an interruption? I understood the gentleman to say that there had been a large increase, 50 per cent, I think he said. I want to know whether that increase is in the revenue of the Post-Office Department or in the amount of second-class mail matter that it carries.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It is not second-class mail matter. It is not revenue. It is mail matter that usually goes through on the star-route system.

Mr. HEPBURN. In what part of the four classes has this increase been noticed? Is it in the first or second class?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I do not think the committee had any information on that line.

Mr. HEPBURN. I would like to know if the gentleman can give the House some idea of the cost of the service.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. We ascertained this fact, that it is not so costly as the free delivery in the small towns and villages. It is not so costly as that.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. If the gentleman from Georgia will permit me, I desire to call attention——

Mr. LIVINGSTON. In a moment. I think this statement will answer the question of the gentleman from Iowa, that it is self-sustaining wherever it has been properly and economically instituted. Wherever it has been in operation six months it has been self-sustaining. Now, let me suggest how it works. A country boy from the farm, 16 years old, is hired on a circuit of 20 or 30 miles. He is given $400. He furnishes his own horse and his own buggy and his father perhaps raises the corn fodder and the hay that feeds the horse. You can see how it is a cheap system. Not only that, but it brings in relations to the Government a class of people that needs to get nearer to the flag and to the country. [Applause.]

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. If the gentleman from Georgia will permit me, I desire to read, for the information of the House, six or seven lines from the report of First Assistant Postmaster-General Heath upon this subject, which will answer the question of the gentleman from Iowa.

He says:

> It will thus be seen that with an additional expenditure of $150,000 rural free delivery has been extended to nearly 180,000 persons, at an annual cost of about 84 cents per capita. No account is taken in this estimate of the great increase of postal receipts (averaging from 50 to 75 per cent) which always follows the establishment of rural delivery, nor is any reduction made for the cost of fourth-class post-offices and star routes, practically superseded by the new service, which have been or might be discontinued.

This report of the First Assistant Postmaster-General gives us the maximum cost—it is far from being the minimum cost of that service—it fixes the maximum in this experimental stage at 84 cents per capita. No account was taken at all of the large increase in receipts from rural free delivery by the Post-Office Department. Why, Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand a detailed report of the experimental service that has been made at Grand Rapids, Mich., in my district. I am surprised and gratified at the progress that has been made in that service. The mail matter distributed to the farmers on these routes has increased almost 100 per cent, in this experimental stage, since it was started, the best possible mail facilities being enjoyed by the agricultural class of our community. They get their daily mail and their daily newspapers with commendable promptness and regularity.

This is certainly a service that we owe the farmer; it keeps him in touch with the market, and commends itself to every man who has given any thought or attention to the subject; and rather than blame or criticise the Post-Office officials for their enterprise in putting this service into effect, they ought to be complimented for it, and, indeed, I believe they will be by a large appropriation when the general Post-Office bill comes up.

And, sir, I resent the insinuation of the gentleman from Illinois that I would, for one moment, advocate the violation of any law. On the contrary, sir, I would advise keeping within the law. I do not concede that any law has been violated, and, therefore, I have been ready and willing to aid in the establishment of this service in my district and State, and have been glad to learn that the people appreciate it and stand ready to sustain it. The Post-Office Department has never been administered with greater ability than now. The officials, from the highest to the lowest, are accommodating, vigilant, progressive, and public spirited, and deserve the confidence of Congress; and if this question could be left to the sturdy farmers of the country they would tell you to economize in other directions less meritorious and give to them the best mail facilities practicable. [Applause.]

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I think I understand the purpose of this experiment. I have had more or less connection with it from its infancy until now. It originated, I believe, in the Fifty-first or Fifty-second Congress. I believe the first appropriation for this purpose—the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will correct me if I am inaccurate—was an appropriation of $10,000, made in the Fifty-first Congress.

The purpose of this whole experiment was simply to see if we could give to the masses of our people better mail facilities on reasonable and economical terms. Until the success of the experiment, as demonstrated by the Department, is conceded by this House there will be, of course, trouble in making this appropriation. If gentlemen will ask for information at the proper branch of the Department they will find that this is no longer an experiment.

The officials are thoroughly satisfied; and the only question now remaining is whether all these fourth-class offices can be abolished or not, or whether a portion of them will have to be retained in every locality as feeders, from which these carriers can get their bags of mail to be carried into the country. That is the question now being settled by experiment in the State of Maryland.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MCRAE], such time as he may wish, and then I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MCRAE. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the total appropriations, including postal expenses, for the last year. They amounted to $674,981,022.20. The estimates for the coming year, including postal expenses, aggregate $738,855,247.78, and no doubt they will be increased from time to time.

The President in his late message states to Congress and the country that the deficiency for the last fiscal year was $89,111,559.67, and he only reaches the conclusion that there will be a surplus from the revenue of the present year by stating that the expense will reach only $600,958,122, while the official estimate of the Secretary of the Treasury is $138,000,000 more than that sum, including postal expenses.

I call attention to these facts for the purpose of asking the House of Representatives, and particularly this side, to do what it can to prevent extravagant appropriations, and thereby avoid another bond issue. But for the sale of bonds under the last and present Administrations we would have no money in the Treasury. If we continue as we have gone on for the last two or three years, spending more than is collected, we will bankrupt the Treasury; and the result will be that under the act passed by the last Congress, or under the one to be passed by this, we shall have another large bond issue. It may be said by some that we are not responsible for the legislation of this Congress, and that reckless appropriations would help us in a political sense; but we shall be responsible unless we firmly put ourselves in opposition to such appropriations. If we would avoid a further bonded debt we must economize at every point where it is possible to do so.

So far as this particular bill is concerned, I want to say that in the main I believe it ought to pass. The appropriations asked for the Army and Navy are necessary, in the judgment of the committee. So far as this side of the House is concerned, we tried to prevent the increase in the Army which makes this bill necessary. Many of us do not approve of the course pursued by the Administration; but our soldiers are already in the field under a law passed by a majority of Congress, and whatever we now think of

the law or the war, in my judgment we can not refuse to pay, feed, and clothe the soldiers who carry our flag by order of the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy.

We might avoid the expenditure of $150,000 for the experimental rural free delivery mail service. Mr. Chairman, how long do we propose to continue this experiment? It began in the Fifty-first Congress, ten years ago, and now you are asked to increase the appropriations of the last Congress 50 per cent for further experiment. I am in favor of free rural delivery if practicable and we can afford it; but I want it equitably and justly distributed among all the people, and it is not so at present.

The Department is in most cases experimenting in thickly settled communities. It is experimenting with people who live within a mile or two of post-offices. Back in the interior, 5, 10, 15 miles from any post-office, it is not proposed to carry the mail free. There are scores, hundreds, and thousands of neighborhoods in which no experiments have been made, and I understand, notwithstanding this, that in the State of Maryland a whole county has been included in a thickly populated free-delivery district. And yet you require people in the West and in the Southwest to go 5 and 10 miles for their mail. My idea is that these are the people who should have this service first, if there is to be any preference shown.

Now, if the Department has reached the point where it can say to the country that free rural delivery is economical and practicable, let it be extended to all parts of the country, but do not continue this system of favoritism by putting it in this and that district because of political influence. If good for a part of the people, it ought to be good for all. It must be fair and be just if it is to last. As has been said, this is not really a deficiency, but a new appropriation to continue free-delivery service in a few favored localities.

We might also save the $169,000 appropriated for the Paris Exposition. The limit for that was extended by the last Congress. We have now, if this bill passes, appropriated nearly twice as much as the limit fixed by the Congress which initiated the scheme.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him just for a moment? This morning, at the beginning of this debate, I asked the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON] where this special delivery rural service was in use. He said he did not know; but I was answered by my friend from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON], who said that it was all over the country, except three States. Now, if he is correct, I want to say that some very watchful members of this body have been unable to see the service in operation. If he is correct, then I am forced to believe there are "pet" sections that have been served with it to the detriment of the less favored. Is my friend from Indiana correct in his statement?

Mr. RICHARDSON. And some very fine districts.

Mr. GAINES. You say it is found in spots, which is something like this war-time prosperity they have talked about.

Mr. McRAE. So far as I know and am informed, there is only one place in the State of Arkansas where they have attempted to experiment with it, although Arkansas has a million and a half of people.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. But I may suggest to the gentleman from Arkansas, as the First Assistant Postmaster-General, in his last report, says, on the 1st of November, 1899, rural free delivery was in successful operation from 383 distributing points, radiating over 40 States and Territories, including the gentleman's own State.

Mr. McRAE. I said I thought there was only one district there now, and that does not radiate very far. It radiates about 10 miles from one place.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I think it is doing very well, when it is in an experimental stage, with only $300,000 appropriated.

Mr. McRAE. My friend from Georgia has had the candor to say that we have passed the experimental stage, and those who have such service expect to keep it.

Mr. BARNEY. I will say to my friend that I hold in my hand a statement showing that his State of Arkansas at the present time has three rural free delivery routes in operation.

Mr. McRAE. That may be true. I have only heard of one.

Mr. BARNEY. And I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] that that State has twenty-three routes in operation.

Mr. GAINES. Which end of the State, the Republican end, East Tennessee, or the Democratic end, middle and west Tennessee?

Mr. BARNEY. I understood that they were both Republican.

Mr. GAINES. No, sir, and never will be. I will be very frank and say to you that I have never heard of it operating down in my country, although we have tried to get it for the past year.

Mr. McRAE. As I have stated, I have only been informed of one, but admit we have three. We have 75 counties in Arkansas, to say nothing about distributing points, and you can not with $300,000 extend this service as it ought to be, if it is to be permanent and general.

Now, if we have passed the experimental stage and propose to enter upon this system of serving the people with their mails free, then appropriate money enough to do it in the regular way; but I am opposed to this system of favoritism, which will allow some officer to select one county or one district, or three counties, if you please, in a State to the exclusion of over seventy. I say that in the southern part of my State there has not been a solitary attempt to experiment with a view to free delivery. Then we are told that the roads are not good enough. Must we wait until we can get macadamized roads? The present mail carriers manage to get over the roads for very small pay.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Let me suggest to the gentleman from Arkansas that the report of the First Assistant Postmaster-General, the same one from which I quoted a short time ago, says:

> It has implanted itself so firmly upon the postal administration that it can no longer be considered in the light of an experiment.

Mr. McRAE. If that be true, and I grant it, why continue this appropriation for "experimental" purposes? Mark the language of the paragraph. It is to increase the appropriation for experimental rural free delivery service. If this statement is true it is a false pretense to ask it for experimental service, and it is not enough for permanent service in all the States. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] will not tell me that the amount is sufficient to meet the demands of the whole people. Then if it is not experimental, it is wrong to carry it into a few districts in the thickly settled parts of the country, like Georgia, Indiana, and various other States, and leave out the West and the South.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. But this system is said by the proper authorities to be one of the best systems that has of late years been adopted by the Department.

Mr. McRAE. If they have reached that conclusion, then why continue it as an experiment, and why not extend it to all alike?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. It was so good that he has exceeded the appropriation at the solicitation of members of Congress from every State.

Mr. GAINES. Is he treating it as an experiment or as a fixity?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. As a fixity.

Mr. GAINES. Then why call or treat it as an experiment?

Mr. McRAE. If it is the fixed policy of the Post-Office Department to supply the people in that way, why is it not done and in a fair and just way?

Mr. GAINES. That would be right.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. When the appropriation bill comes up for the Post-Office Department we shall be asked for a million dollars.

Mr. GAINES. Then you ought to strike out now the word "experimental." A million dollars to experiment with when it has already proven to be a "success!"

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. It was not in the last bill when it left the House.

Mr. McRAE. I repeat that the Department has had ten years in which to make experiments. If this is not for experiment, then the amount appropriated is not enough. The Department, having decided that the free-delivery system can be used in the rural districts, should now see to it that all sections of the country are treated alike and get a fair proportion of the money appropriated for that purpose. It is not the system against which I complain, but the administration and disbursement of the funds.

Mr. BARNEY. Mr. Chairman, before submitting any remarks of my own I will yield ten minutes, or such time as he may desire, to the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD], reserving the balance of my time.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, it is very clear that in the temper of the House as demonstrated here today this appropriation is going to be made, and I myself have no serious objection to the appropriation, but I do have objection to the methods that have been used in the expenditure of money relating to this rural free delivery service. I have been quite familiar with this subject, and, without taking any pride to myself, I will say that probably to my own efforts, in conjunction with those of the then Postmaster-General, Mr. Wilson—to our joint efforts the present rural free delivery service is due. In consultation with him we advised the establishment of the service, which would gradually permeate through the country, taking the most populous sections at first and gradually extending it.

The objection that I have to this appropriation—and it is one that does not seem to strike the House—is that the Executive Departments have defied the legislative department. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] satisfies his conscience, and various other gentlemen satisfy theirs, with the fact that this is an experimental service. Technically so, yes; but only technically so. There are many influences, Mr. Chairman, that retain this as an experimental service, and I can not believe that our Democratic friends can commend the continuance of the word "experimental" when they fully understand why that word is continued there.

Strike out the word "experimental" and quite a number of agents who are employed in establishing this service throughout the country, probably very good and efficient Republican workers, who are of great advantage to us and to our party, would be stricken from the pay roll, because the service will have become permanent. When you remove the word "experimental" the rural carriers will become civil-service employees of this Government. These are some of the reasons why the word "experimental" is continued. Last year the committee reported it with the word out, but the Senate, at the other end of the Capitol, for reasons best known to itself, insisted that the word "experimental" should be continued.

Well, now, this is not an experimental service. We have experimented with this service for ten years. We have come to that point where we have demonstrated that it is either a success or a failure. The House has treated it as a permanent appropriation, two years ago appropriating $50,000, one year ago appropriating $150,000, and the last year—for the current fiscal year—appropriating $300,000. What did the House mean when it appropriated $300,000 for rural free delivery service? It meant that the Department were authorized to establish such service as would cost $300,000. Now, this brings us back to two years ago, the first time in my recollection, and I think in the recollection of the gentleman who was chairman of this committee for some years preceding myself, that the Post-Office Department have ever created a deficiency upon an item or upon a service not warranted by statute.

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations well said this morning that there are certain items, such as postmasters' salaries, such as the railway mail pay, such as the Army and Navy, where we provide for so many men in the Army and so many men in the Navy, and they must be paid, and could go to the Court of Claims and recover if we did not appropriate the money. But when it comes to clerk hire in post-offices, when it comes to the clerks in the Railway Mail Service, when it comes to the letter carriers, when it comes to the employees in the Post-Office Department, in the War Department, in the Navy Department, and every Department in Washington, Congress in its wisdom provides that so much money may be used by that Department for that purpose, not specified by statute.

Now, let us suppose, for instance, that any Department in Washington, after having an appropriation, we will say, to illustrate, of $500,000 for clerk hire, should go on and expend all that money in three months and come to Congress and say: "Well, unless you give us more, we will have to shut up shop." Is Congress to meekly bow to the executive and permit them, year after year, to say that, regardless of the action of the legislative body, we will employ such help and such persons as in our judgment seems fitting to us.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. LOUD. Certainly.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. Would the alternative which you have stated be as bad as you say when the people of the country have good rural service, and they want it, because the Postmaster-General has made a mistake we are going to shut up shop and take this service away from them?

Mr. LOUD. Oh, let me say to the gentleman I do not think so; because when you touch a member's district you are touching a very tender point, as we found in the House two years ago when the Post-Office Department had put on more letter carriers in the cities to perform the service than the appropriation would permit. They then said to Congress, "We will run this service until next spring, and we will shut it off." What did you do? Why, you could not have the letter-carrier service shut off in your city! So you became an earnest advocate and approved the position of the Executive Departments, which had employed help in defiance of your mandate. Let us see how they will do this.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. LOUD. I do not like to take up all the gentleman's [Mr. BARNEY'S] time, but I would like to yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. LOUD. I do.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. It is just a question for those of us who do not represent any rural districts. You say that this system has passed the experimental stage, and is either a success or a failure. What is it in the opinion of the Department?

Mr. LOUD. It is a success beyond the possibility of doubt, in my own opinion. Now, let us see what the Department will do and how they can influence Congress. If you want to approve it, I can stand it as well as you, but it may come to a legislative body in which it will plague you. They had $300,000 for rural free delivery service, and they extended it beyond the limit of that appropriation. It is giving great satisfaction where it is inaugurated. Many members of Congress think, perhaps, their nomination and election to Congress depend upon the continuance of that service.

Now they have put on enough to create a deficiency of $50,000, and they say to us: "Well, here, if you do not give us this money, we will run all the rural free delivery service, some that has been established for years, until some time in May, when we will not have any money, and we will have to shut it off." Do you not see where you are placed? The executive coerces the legislative body, as it has done once before. Now, they are our fellows this time. This is a Republican Administration; and the strange spectacle is presented here of the Democratic party en masse rising up here and commending the breaking of the law and the defiance of the legislative body, and only two, who happen to be upon the Republican side, are condemning the action of the Republican Executive Department.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The gentleman from California will admit we are not advocating a violation of the law, but in this instance, as the First Assistant Postmaster-General is extending a system of which the gentleman from California is the father, or at least the godfather, we think there are mitigating circumstances for this departure.

Mr. LOUD. I am glad to see that the gentleman places himself in the position at once as being the judge and jury, and determines whether there are circumstances warranting the course of the Department; and say once more, we do not care whether you obey the mandates of the legislative body or not.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. LOUD. Now, some gentlemen hide themselves under the word "experimental." It is hiding, because they say themselves in the next breath it is permanent; but they excuse the Executive because the word "experimental" was used. It does not change the conditions, Mr. Chairman, whether the word be used or not. I do condemn and will condemn every Administration that will create a liability not authorized by statute beyond what Congress in its wisdom proposes to give. Now, let us see how easy it would have been to obviate this. There was no necessity for it. Let us see how easy it would have been for them to provide for an expenditure for the full $300,000 and come to Congress at its session in December and said, "This is a good service; we have many demands for its extension, and we leave to your wisdom as to whether you desire to expend a greater amount of money than was appropriated last session."

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. Does the gentleman from California think the propriety of an appropriation to extend this service from May to July has any proper relation to the question of whether the Postmaster-General has exceeded his authority or not? Is there not some other way to punish an official for exceeding his authority than discontinuing a service which is a benefit to the people?

Mr. LOUD. Of course there is. The Postmaster-General, I suppose, could be impeached and perhaps removed from office. I do not know—I am not competent to judge—whether this is an offense of sufficient gravity or not, but I do not believe he will be impeached. [Laughter.] I am only calling the attention of Congress to the gravity of this condition, which is liable to go on. If Congress will repeatedly, year after year, say to the executive branches of this Government by its action, "You can expend as much money for any purpose as you see fit and we will make it up in the end"—if Congress says that, let it say so after it understands the conditions that confront it. Fifty thousand dollars is not much, but the offense looks as great in my eyes as though it were fifty millions, because they have defied the legislative branch of this Government.

Of course rural delivery is in most of our districts. You are going to vote to condone the offense because you are afraid you are going to lose a little rural delivery.

Mr. BARHAM. Will the gentleman allow me an interruption?

Mr. LOUD. Yes.

Mr. BARHAM. If this is still in the experimental stage, then has the Department violated the law?

Mr. LOUD. Technically, no; but do not let us quibble over that.

Mr. BARHAM. Now, if it is still experimental—you say no, technically—can Congress say this is not experimental, when in the very act itself it says it is?

Mr. LOUD. Oh, no.

Mr. BARHAM. Then why should we abuse the Department? It is the technical position you are taking.

Mr. LOUD. Perhaps it is my dullness in expressing myself that the House does not understand. The House is quibbling again over the word "experimental."

Mr. GAINES. Which side is the gentleman from California on? [Laughter.]

Mr. SOUTHARD. May I ask the gentleman from California a question?

Mr. LOUD. One moment. This House will appropriate, but let us be fair with one another. Do not let us endeavor to hide ourselves under the word "experimental." The House appropriated $300,000 for rural delivery service, and we said you are authorized to expend that during the next fiscal year, and the

statute provided that they could neither expend nor create any further liability.

Mr. SOUTHARD. I want to ask the gentleman from California a question upon that point.

Mr. LOUD. I have not concluded my sentence. Now, then, a service is established which you and I know is going to continue. It has been in existence in some districts three or four years. They go on and extend the service and create such a liability against the Government that they must come to Congress and say, "We will destroy the whole service next May if you do not grant this appropriation."

Mr. BARHAM. Why did we not be honest with the Department and take out the word "experimental?" Why are not we the fellows that are dishonest? [Laughter.]

Mr. GRIGGS. Will the gentleman from California allow me an interruption?

Mr. LOUD. I would like to stay here and answer questions for half an hour, but I am using up the gentleman's time, and I do not know but that he is getting nervous. How much time have I used, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Eighteen minutes.

Mr. SOUTHARD. I want to ask the gentleman from California when this service became other than "experimental?" So far as I know, there has not been a route established in Ohio, except those established under the last appropriation, and I think the same thing can be truly said of a great many States. I would like to ask when the service became other than experimental?

Mr. LOUD. I think the gentleman is mistaken about Ohio. I think Ohio gets about all the good things going, and I never knew her to be behind. [Laughter.]

Mr. GRIGGS. I understand the gentleman from California is advocating the application of the strict letter of the law with reference to appropriations. Is that true?

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who yielded to me suggests that I occupy five minutes more.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Chairman, I want the gentleman to answer my question.

Mr. GRIGGS. I want to say——

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, who has the floor? [Laughter.]

Mr. GRIGGS. The gentleman has said that this House is hiding behind the word "experimental."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California declines to yield.

Mr. GRIGGS. I understood the gentleman from California to yield to me.

Mr. LOUD. I did, but I could not hear what the gentleman said.

Mr. GRIGGS. I used the word "experimental," saying that the service was wholly experimental, excusing the Department for that reason. Now, the gentleman says the service is not experimental, and says it is a "quibble."

Mr. LOUD. No doubt about that in my mind.

Mr. GRIGGS. When it suits the gentleman's purpose in arguing a strict enforcement of the letter of the law, and gentlemen reply in the letter of the law, using the exact language, then the gentleman charges that they are quibbling. It appears to me that he is the quibbler.

Mr. LOUD. No, Mr. Chairman, I am not so much a stickler for the strict letter of the law, but I do ask for the enforcement of the law in its spirit, and what I desired to call the attention of this House to is this: This is the second time you have been confronted with this very proposition. You will be confronted with similar propositions in days to come. While Congress may give this $50,000 or $100,000, if they wish, I have no objection to that, but the House must understand that it is confronted with the fact that this Department has exceeded the authority vested in it by law. All I would have Congress do is to express its disapproval of that thing, so that we shall not have a repetition of it in the future.

Mr. GRIGGS. Why not put that in at the conclusion of the bill instead of the conclusion of that item?

Mr. LOUD. Because, as the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations said, this is the only item in the bill where there has been a violation of the law of Congress. I will not say myself as to that, because I do not know, but he says that all the other deficiencies are such deficiencies as could be created by statute.

Mr. BARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman exceedingly for his courtesy in referring to me as being nervous on account of having a "speech in my stomach," and I suppose he speaks from his own long personal experience in that respect.

Mr. LOUD. I have got my speech out.

Mr. BARNEY. I desire to occupy, however, but a very few moments in calling attention to some matters in this bill relating to the subject of free rural mail delivery.

In the first place, I think it is well for the committee to know about how many of these rural free delivery routes there are at the present time established in the United States and their location. I have the information from the office of the First Assistant Postmaster-General that there are some 700 postal rural free delivery routes in operation in this country at present. Now, while I sympathize much in what was said by the distinguished chairman of this committee in reference to the Post-Office Department going further than the original appropriation, and I fully agree with him upon the general proposition that this body ought not to allow to go unrebuked the creation of the necessity of a deficiency contrary to law, at the same time I believe that other gentlemen upon the floor were technically correct and were actually right in saying that there has been no actual deficiency in this service.

The appropriation, in other words, has been for an experiment, and I believe it has been truthfully said that the First Assistant Postmaster-General had the right, legally and technically, to appropriate all of that fund, if he saw fit, for use in the first three months. And I want to say right here that I think that any rural free delivery route established within the last three months has just as good a right to continuance as one that was established four years ago. They are all thus far experiments, and one just as much so as the other.

Mr. SWANSON. That is right.

Mr. BARNEY. That is the point I make, and when they are claiming that this is a great wrong in establishing these new routes and then coming in here and asking to provide for them, my answer is, Go back and discontinue the routes which were organized three or four years ago and continue those which were organized within the last year, and then there will be no deficiency. I apprehend, however, that those who were in "on the first floor" would not agree to this proposition.

It may be of some interest to this committee to know something about how these postal delivery routes are distributed. The distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] said that he was in favor of enforcing this law "according to its spirit." Mr. Chairman, it is true he has been in favor of the enforcement of this law "according to its spirit," because the records show that to-day, while there are only 700 of these routes in the United States, giving on an average about 2 to each Congressional district, there are organized and in operation in his district 13 of these rural free delivery routes.

Now, if that is true, was he not correct in saying that he has always been in favor of the enforcement of this provision of law "according to its spirit" and according to all of its technicalities? That appears to me to be correct, and I say to him now that if he complains because of this expenditure in excess of the appropriation—I have no doubt that his routes have been in operation for several years—all he has to do is to agree to the discontinuance of those 13 routes, and that will save the Government something like five or six thousand dollars.

Again, I call attention to the fact that if every member of this House had secured for his constituents the same privileges in proportion which the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] has secured for his, this deficiency, instead of being $150,000, would have been $5,000,000.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. It would not have been experimental.

Mr. BARNEY. That is so, and that is what comes from the enforcement of this law according to its spirit, by the distinguished gentleman from California. Now, I say while we may criticise the Post-Office Department for its action in this respect, in my judgment members in this House are more open to criticism than the Post-Office Department. Why? Because we all agree that technically the First Assistant Postmaster-General had the right to expend all of this amount within the first three months, or within the first sixty days, or the first thirty days. Such being the case, he knowing of that technicality, and we knowing of that technicality, if we have gone to him and asked him for extensions of that privilege within our district, we are to blame, and not he, for his being compelled to come in here asking us for an additional appropriation of $150,000 for the purpose of carrying out what we ourselves have initiated. Now, is not that correct?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. May I suggest one thing to my colleague right there?

Mr. BARNEY. Certainly.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Suppose it had taken the Postmaster-General two years, or ten years, to make the experiment, was not that appropriation available?

Mr. BARNEY. Certainly.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Is it limited to days or months at all?

Mr. BARNEY. Not at all.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I am asking for information. Was that $300,000 limited to this fiscal year?

Mr. BARNEY. It was limited to this fiscal year, but he could have expended it within the first thirty days, within the first three months, or have expended it during the whole year, in his discretion.

Mr. Chairman, this free rural mail delivery system has already gone beyond the experimental stage, and is now so only in name upon our statute books. We give free delivery in cities where the population exceeds 10,000, and have done so for many years. I find no fault with this, for I believe that service is just

and proper; but I call your attention to the fact that nearly all of the patrons of these large post-offices live comparatively near the office of general distribution, and yet their mail is brought to their doors, while the rural patrons of our post-offices live miles away from the offices of general distribution, and yet no such service is given to them. Our farmers bear their full proportion of the burdens of Government, and in my judgment they are entitled to a just share of its favors. Extend to them this privilege and they will have an object lesson before them every day that they are objects of the nation's regard.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. BARNEY. Certainly.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. According to your statement, then, if a Cabinet officer violated the law or his authority when solicited to do so by an individual member of Congress, would we be bound by it as a body?

Mr. BARNEY. Certainly not; because, as I have already said, the First Assistant Postmaster-General has not violated the law in expending the larger portion of this money in the first six months, and therefore in appropriating for this deficiency we are not approving of any violation of law.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the gentleman right in that connection allow me to make a suggestion? The Postmaster-General to-day could say, "I am allowed $300,000 for experimental rural free delivery. I have tested it during the first six months of the present fiscal year. I have reached a conclusion as to that experiment with reference to that appropriation," and therefore there would be no violation of the law. In other words, he could expend the whole sum in three months, in four months, or in six months; but he comes now to Congress and says, "I want this to continue through the year, and in order to do that I ask Congress for this additional sum."

What I want to make clear is that as you state it is wholly within the province of the Postmaster-General to say that in the town where he locates his experimental free delivery, that experiment can run for three or six months, just as he may determine.

Mr. BARNEY. Certainly.

Mr. BINGHAM. And then he can close it out?

Mr. BARNEY. Certainly.

Mr. BINGHAM. And would not have to come to Congress for a deficiency.

Mr. BARNEY. And that is what in substance he does say. He says he has at the present time established 700 different routes, and if we want those to continue, and if we want to have others established where there are petitions for the same, that we must give him $150,000 additional. If we are not in favor of it, if we are opposed to this rural free delivery, all we have got to say is that we will not give him any more money, and then it will all stop about the 1st of May, including the 13 in the district of the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] and the one established within my district within the last thirty days.

Mr. LATIMER. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. BARNEY. Yes.

Mr. LATIMER. I want to know if there is a deficiency now? That is, if all these rural free deliveries were to stop to-day, is there a deficiency?

Mr. BARNEY. No.

Mr. LATIMER. Then he has not violated the law.

Mr. BARNEY. There is no deficiency at the present time, and will be none, as I am informed, until about the 1st of May.

Mr. MILLER. The 15th.

Mr. BARNEY. The 15th of May, I am informed by the gentleman on my left. That is to say, that the present appropriation will continue the present routes until about the 15th of May.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. You say there have been about 700 routes established. Have you got them classified by States?

Mr. BARNEY. I have; and before I close my remarks I desire to have a tabulated statement of that classification incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. How many of these rural free delivery routes has the State of Indiana at the present time?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Like Ohio, Indiana usually gets its share.

Mr. BARNEY. Indiana has 63.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. How many has Ohio?

Mr. BARNEY. Eighty-three.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. How many has the State of Texas?

Mr. BARNEY. Two.

Mr. HEMENWAY. How many applications has the State of Texas made?

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Quite a number.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. How many of these rural free-delivery routes has the State of Mississippi?

Mr. BARNEY. Unless your eyes are better than mine, I do not think you can find any in the State of Mississippi.

Mr. GAINES. How many has the State of Tennessee?

Mr. BARNEY. The State of Tennessee has a pretty good share. It has 24.

Mr. GAINES. Are not those in the Republican end of the State?

Mr. BARNEY. I do not know; but I think that when the other end has the benefit of improved mail facilities it will be Republican also.

Mr. GAINES. You admit that your Executive has dominated and controlled the Representatives of Congress and ought to be impeached. This body—the House—is the forum to file articles of impeachment. Now, we will see if this House, ruled by a Republican majority, will fail to do its duty.

Mr. BARNEY. I am going to have this statement incorporated as a part of my remarks, and I do not think it advisable to ask any more questions as to its contents.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I am free to admit that the Department has been free from partiality in my Democratic district in Indiana.

Mr. LATIMER. As a member from the State of South Carolina, I wish to say there has been no partiality with reference to this system there.

Mr. BARNEY. The record shows that the State of South Carolina has a larger percentage of its population supplied with the free delivery than any other State in the Union, and this, I presume, because its Representatives went to the Department and asked for it. No doubt they were more diligent than some others have been; but there has been no partisanship in the distribution of this favor, for there is no State which is more essentially Democratic than the State of South Carolina.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Are we to understand that these routes are established, not in accordance with the public need or the judgment of the Department, but in accordance with the importunity of members?

Mr. BARNEY. Certainly the gentleman will understand if you want favors of this kind and will call the attention of the Department to the fact and to the needs of your constituents, you will be more likely to get them than you otherwise would.

Mr. BENTON. The question I want to ask the gentleman is if I am right in understanding him to state that he has had a route established within the last thirty days?

Mr. BARNEY. Perhaps I said so. If I did, I made a mistake, for I think it was some time in the month of November.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have this statement from the Post-Office Department concerning free-delivery service incorporated as a part of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to incorporate in his remarks a certain statement. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The statement is as follows:

Rural free delivery service.

State.	Population.	Number of routes.	Cost of service.	Number served.	Proportion of population served.
Arkansas	1,128,179	3	$1,200	1,200	0.0006
Alabama	1,513,017	1	400	750	.0049
Arizona	59,620	2	800	676	.013
California	1,208,130	24	9,600	17,003	.014
Connecticut	746,258	10	4,000	8,800	.0117
Colorado	412,198	5	2,000	2,315	.056
Delaware	168,493	7	2,800	4,725	.028
Florida	391,422	1	400	575	.0046
Georgia	1,837,353	6	2,400	4,900	.0026
Illinois	3,826,351	34	13,600	26,090	.0068
Indiana	2,192,404	63	25,200	39,919	.018
Iowa	1,911,896	53	21,200	16,080	.0084
Kansas	1,427,096	20	8,000	6,250	.0043
Kentucky	1,858,635	6	2,400	1,704	.0091
Louisiana	1,118,587	2	800	750	.0006
Maine	661,086	11	4,400	4,153	.0062
Maryland	1,042,390	48	19,200	33,811	.032
Massachusetts	2,238,943	13	5,200	4,579	.0024
Michigan	1,636,889	30	12,000	31,803	.019
Minnesota	1,301,826	17	6,800	10,200	.007
Missouri	2,679,184	18	7,200	6,288	.0023
Nebraska	1,058,910	6	2,400	2,050	.0019
New Hampshire	376,530	15	6,000	7,000	.0108
New Jersey	1,444,933	10	4,000	6,785	.0047
New York	5,082,871	39	15,600	25,999	.0051
North Carolina	1,617,947	1	400	500	.00038
North Dakota	182,719	3	1,200	1,730	.0096
Ohio	3,672,316	83	33,200	57,408	.015
Oregon	313,767	5	2,000	1,653	.0052
Pennsylvania	5,258,014	43	17,200	33,640	.0063
Rhode Island	345,506	9	3,600	5,692	.016
South Carolina	1,151,149	21	8,400	45,852	.039
South Dakota	328,808	2	800	1,000	.00304
Tennessee	1,707,518	23	9,200	15,708	.0091
Vermont	332,422	7	2,800	2,975	.0089
Virginia	1,855,980	8	3,200	6,868	.0041
Washington	349,390	2	800	1,600	.0045
West Virginia	762,794	20	8,000	8,025	.011
Wisconsin	1,686,880	23	10,400	8,450	.00509
Texas	2,235,523	2	800	900	.0004
Utah	35,954	1	400	450	.01001
Total		716			

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. Would you tell to us—some of us have no free-delivery enterprise in our districts—in brief, how this system has increased and what effect it has been proven to have on the post-office?

Mr. BARNEY. From what I can learn of the matter—and most I have learned of it is by asking the Post-Office Department, for I have little personal experience in the matter—I think it is believed that on account of the saving in the expense of the star routes through the extension of the system, and in the increase of the postal service through the delivery of mail, letters, papers, etc., it will be substantially self-sustaining; and I am told that experience shows it is self-sustaining in all places where it has been in operation six months or more.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment, so I may directly answer the question of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. Where do the routes start for this rural free delivery?

Mr. BARNEY. Anywhere designated by the Post-Office Department. It may be a first-class, a second-class, a third-class, or fourth-class post-office.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Is it not generally from a post-office on a railroad?

Mr. BARNEY. Almost universally. I will now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, reserving the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTLER. I would like to answer the question put by the gentleman from Illinois. The town in which I live, Westchester, is in a thoroughly rural community. Fairer or more fertile lands can not be found anywhere within the United States, and the records will sustain my statement. Within a circle of 5 miles from the court-house steeple at Westchester and beyond the borough boundaries there is not an institution containing more than an ordinary family in size and one village perhaps of 150 people. A year ago this service was established in that territory. It was established because everybody asked for it.

I presented the petition, and an examination was made of the surroundings, and the report of a post-office inspector was such as to lead the Department to order the service. On page 85 of the First Assistant Postmaster-General's report is found a very comprehensive and lucid statement of the result of the operation at this point. For the information of the gentleman from Illinois I would like to have the opportunity of giving him a few figures. The gentlemen of the committee will understand that the mail in this community is neither served to nor collected from any institution or any advertising concern. It is important that this statement should be made and accepted in order to add to the force of the figures which I am about to submit. An early morning mail is delivered by a carrier to a school, unimportant, and should not be considered as bearing upon or adding to the success of the experiment in this district. All the rest of the mail is delivered to the farmers, storekeepers, laborers, and mechanics, as well as the people of leisure who live in this community. The experience of the Department here shows a remarkable figure and proves the disposition of the people to patronize the service.

This experiment is cited by the First Assistant Postmaster-General to show the advantages of the service to country districts, as well as to show the profit the Government may expect to reap from similar services. By this report he shows that this is a great accommodation to the farmer and a good thing for the Government. In January, 1899, the routes were established, 6 in number, and 6 letter carriers start at 9 o'clock each morning and distribute the mails 5 miles from the town, and on their routes they also make the collections. In January, 1899, the month in which the service was established, each carrier handled 1,933 pieces of mail. That was considered by the Department a very remarkable exhibition.

In the month of September, the same year, each carrier handled 6,481 pieces of mail, traveling over the same routes. In the same territory the same carriers, each, in a daily distribution and collection only, went from a thousand and some pieces in January to six thousand and some pieces in September, attesting the intelligence of the patrons of the service as well as their determination to use it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. What was the time?

Mr. BUTLER. From January to September. The First Assistant Postmaster-General in his report says—and by the way, I hope the gentlemen will allow me to suggest that they examine this report, on page 85, where they will find a map of the territory where the service is located, showing the location of the different boxes to accommodate the people—the Department has made a fair estimate of the value of the postage on the matter collected at 2 cents per piece, amounting on the 119,668 pieces collected to $2,393.26. This not only pays for the service, but leaves a balance of $593.36 in favor of the Government in those few months. This is the report in full and is a much more intelligent and concise statement than I can hope to make in the few minutes allotted me:

HOW THE RURAL SERVICE CAN BE MADE TO PAY.

As a practical illustration of how rural free delivery, when carefully established, can be made self-supporting, the following tabulated statement has been prepared:

Summary of rural free delivery at Westchester, Chester County, Pa., six carriers, January to September, inclusive.

1899.	Delivered.	Collected.	Total.	Average per carrier.
January	9,133	2,468	11,601	1,933
February	12,490	6,353	18,832	3,142
March	13,864	7,097	23,861	3,977
April	16,031	8,985	25,016	4,169
May	18,063	20,882	38,945	6,491
June	19,648	23,145	42,793	7,132
July	16,598	18,602	37,200	6,200
August	21,592	16,621	38,213	6,369
September	24,277	14,610	38,887	6,481
Total	155,805	119,668	275,468	5,099

This service was instituted January 1, 1899. No post-offices or star routes were discontinued. Two fourth-class post-offices have ceased to exist in consequence of their patrons being supplied by rural delivery. The cost of the service for the nine months it has been in existence has been $1,800. A fair estimate of the value of the postage on matter collected is 2 cents per piece, amounting on the 119,668 pieces collected to $2,393.36, thus not only paying for the service but leaving a balance of $593.36, after affording the people a much appreciated free delivery and collection service which they had not heretofore possessed.

If it had not been for the rural collection service, practically all the above sum would have been absorbed by fourth-class postmasters and the people would have been compelled to send to Westchester or some other office for the 155,805 pieces of mail delivered without charge almost at their doors. The thoroughness with which the district adjacent to Westchester has been covered by rural free delivery is shown in the accompanying map.

Now, later than this is the report by the postmaster at Westchester, made to a reporter of the Philadelphia Press, a very reliable paper, and I would like to have the opportunity to read it, for I think it will satisfy gentlemen as to the accommodation this free delivery furnishes the farmers and its value to the Government. This paper is dated January 11, 1900.

The article is as follows:

WESTCHESTER, *January 11.*

Postmaster Harry G. Smith this morning forwarded to the Post-Office Department at Washington, D. C., his report upon the first year of rural free delivery in Chester County, and finds that the experiment has been a pronounced success. Chester County it is expected will furnish the best data from the districts in the United States where the experiment has been introduced, and will offer abundant evidence for the extension of the system.

Postmaster Smith's report shows that the rural free delivery system here covers the entire country surrounding Westchester for about 9 miles in every direction, and that six suburban carriers are required for the work. The cost to the Government for this service for the year has been $2,400, and the revenues, estimated at 2 cents per piece upon 176,651 pieces collected, $3,531.22, leaving a balance in favor of the Government of $1,131.22.

Had it not been for the rural collection service all this sum would have been absorbed by fourth-class postmasters, and the people would have been compelled to send to Westchester or some other office for 233,083 pieces of mail matter delivered at their doors.

The farmers on these routes regard the service as indispensable, and not only want it continued, but are at the same time clamoring for an afternoon delivery, which has been ordered by the Department, but which will not be introduced until Congress appropriates the necessary funds.

More than this, Postmaster Smith reports an increase in the business of the Westchester office of over $8,000 for the past year, and reports that, with the improved facilities for delivering and collecting the mail, people patronize the postal service more extensively than ever before.

The total number of patrons on the rural routes is 2,137; total number of families, 676; total number of registered letters, 86; total number of special delivery letters, 32.

The total business of the Westchester office for the year amounted to $34,000, which is greater than that of any city of the size of Westchester in the State.

During the reading the following occurred:

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. I ask that my time be extended two minutes.

Mr. BARNEY. I do not want it extended out of my time, because I have promised to yield it all, and I can not afford it.

Mr. BUTLER. I only ask for two minutes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I will yield to the gentleman two minutes out of my time.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, I want to impress upon the members of the committee the absolute reliability of the statement that this report is not padded and that this community, composed of 647 families (as I have heretofore described), large farmers, small farmers, people who make a profit out of their farms and who will continue to make profit out of them, industrious laborers, mechanics, and storekeepers, has furnished to this Government during the last year a profit of $1,200 on these six carriers. It is estimated by the Department that should the necessity arise to double the mails twice a day the Government will receive $2,400 profit each year.

Another surprising statement, which is true, is that some of the post-offices in this circuit show an increase of business. Having

lived in this town nearly all my life, I know the name and face of every man, woman, and child in the territory covered by this service, and I know the personnel has not changed in the last year, but that the same people live there who lived there the year before. They are people who feel the prosperity, if there is any prosperity, in their own precincts, people of superior intelligence, and I simply point to their record, made by themselves, to verify my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the gentleman from Georgia, and I hope I shall have the opportunity some time to return the favor. I guess I never shall, however, for I suppose I shall not be here long enough to induce the Speaker to trust me with the disposition of the time of the House. [Laughter.] I make this statement to show that all this increase in the mails in that circuit comes from the disposition to read and write, to take the newspapers, and to receive and send mail. This service gives the people the facilities they want. They have used them and will continue to use them to their own great advantage and to the profit of the Government. The farmers in my district are united in their demand that this system be continued and additional services established, and I am here for the purpose of securing them such assistance as I may be able to reach, that their accommodations may be enlarged and continued. There is no reason why they should not have some of this Government's patronage and the conveniences furnished by it as well as the people who live in brick houses and behind brick pavements. [Applause.]

It is about the only real direct accommodation which the Government can offer those who live in rural districts, and there should be no hesitation in Congress to make a sufficient appropriation for the purpose of continuing these experiments, which are bound to result in a permanent system of rural free deliveries in every locality where they are requested and in which the Department will be justified in establishing them.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The committee informally rose, and, Mr. ADAMS having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BARNEY. I now yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS].

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on this bill, but since the action of the First Assistant Postmaster-General in extending this service beyond the point contemplated by the original appropriation has been made the subject of criticism I feel that I should say a few words. If he be guilty, I am also guilty. I believe that an examination of the record of the Post-Office Department will disclose the fact that the district which I have the honor of representing has more free rural delivery routes than any other district in the United States. Soon after this experiment was decided upon, the people in my district commenced petitioning for the service. I at once interested myself in the matter, urged upon the Post-Office Department its importance, and because I was on the ground early, rather than because I was specially favored by those in authority, is due the fact that the people of my district have this service to a greater extent than any other district and possibly have more petitions on file for additional service.

I want to say that no money expended by this Government is better expended than that which goes to this service. I have watched its working closely. It is admirable in every respect. For instance, routes leading out from the various county seats in my district show not only a gratifying increase in postal patronage, but show advantages in other directions. A real-estate man recently told me that farms along these free-delivery routes were worth $3 to $5 more an acre than farming land off the free-delivery routes. Every dollar that goes into this appropriation encourages the building of better roads. There are scores of farmers with teams at work to-day building turnpikes, because they see, in the near future, the postman calling at the door of the farmhouse every morning delivering letters and daily papers.

This service, if extended, will do more for this Republic than many gentlemen on the floor now anticipate. Nine out of ten of the men who have directed the affairs of this nation since its organization were born on the farm; there they learned to work; there they learned the value of time and money; there they learned lessons of thrift and economy. Of recent years the farmer's boy has shown an inclination to turn his back on the fields; he is to-day seeking the cities. Why? He tires of the monotony; he longs for society. Place in his hands the magazine, give him the daily paper, cheer him with a package of letters, and you will reconcile him to the farm. I contend that in this Republic the farm is the nursery of greatness, and that Congress can do nothing wiser than to make an annual appropriation that will do so much to brighten the daily life of those who toil in the fields.

Another thing—this system is a great educator. It stimulates and fosters education. The farmer's boy and the farmer's girl are ambitious. And I want to say that they are, with fewer advantages, to-day better informed than the city boy and girl. I have been surprised at the number of letters I have received this winter from school-teachers in my district living along these routes, asking for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, stating that they are keeping advised in matters of legislation, that the children were studying the science of government. So that not only is this system of advantage to those living in the country in the matter of receiving the daily letter and the daily paper, but it is a source of additional education and enlightenment.

The gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] seeks to reprimand the Post-Office Department. As my friend has just stated, he has 13 of the 700 routes. His district is made up of two counties, possibly three. San Francisco is a part of his district. Thirteen free rural delivery routes would almost entirely cover the remainder of his district. Then it is safe to say that nearly every man, woman, and child in his district has a free mail delivery service. I do not object to being scolded. I do not think the Post-Office Department objects to being scolded, but we do object to being scolded by people whose entire constituency have the benefit of this service.

I am in favor of this service. I am in favor of it because it reaches a class of people in this country who appreciate it and who receive direct advantages from this Government in no other way. Take my own Congressional district, made up of seven counties, agricultural communities. We have never received a dollar from the river and harbor bill. The people in my district never received a dollar from a public-building bill. There is no city in that district of more than 12,000 population. Yet none of us who live in these agricultural communities begrudge the cities the improvements that go along the seaboard; none of us begrudge you what you get for your public buildings. The farmers are not found objecting.

Neither do we want you to object when we ask for a miserable pittance in order that we may have some of the advantages which come to people who live in the large cities. This is a good way to get in touch with the man who lives on the farm, away from town, away from the city. He is lonesome. He works all day. At night, if he gets his daily paper, he is compelled to send his boy, or go himself, 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 miles. The man in town is near the post-office and has his mail served to him. I believe that people in towns of 10,000 to 30,000 population should be made secondary in free mail service to the man who lives on the farm, because they are near the post-office and the man in the country is distant from the post-office.

You talk about the farmer. He is no longer distinctively a farmer. He is also a business man. The farmer of to-day not only tills the soil but he reads the newspaper and keeps in touch with the markets more closely than he ever did before. He gets quotations every morning. Out in the district which I represent the entire country is threaded with the telephone wire, running everywhere throughout those seven counties. Hundreds of farmers in my district have telephones in their homes. They keep in touch with their neighbors; they keep in touch with the cities; they keep in touch with what is going on throughout the country.

The farmer of to-day is a business man and he demands modern advantages; he asks for the same opportunities accorded his brother in the city; he insists on being considered by the American Congress when the appropriation bill is brought in, and as far as I am concerned I will not only gladly vote for this additional appropriation of $150,000, but I should take great pleasure in trebling that appropriation right now and right here. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Make it a million.

Mr. LANDIS. I would be in favor of making it a million dollars, and I say that the gentleman who officiates as First Assistant Postmaster-General, in anticipating this matter, in providing possibly for the expenditure of more money than has been contemplated by the Committee on Appropriations, simply demonstrates the fact that he is in harmony with the times; that he is keeping up with the procession; that he is in touch with the people, and I am for his appropriation.

I do not know how long I shall remain in Congress, but I hope to remain here long enough to vote for a free rural postal appropriation large enough to deliver to every farmer in the United States of America, where it is at all practicable, at least one mail every day. [Applause.]

Mr. BARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SPERRY].

Mr. SPERRY. Mr. Chairman, this matter which we have been discussing here to-day is no new matter to me. I remember in the sixties when free deliveries were established in the cities, it was said that the person who instigated free delivery, or the postmaster

who favored free delivery at that time (we being in the midst of a war)—that postmaster ought to be hung, because he was spending the people's money in a reckless manner. He was putting up letter boxes throughout the city, he was employing carriers at the rate of a thousand dollars a year, when that money was needed for the support of the Government. This prophecy turned out to be incorrect, as it will in this matter of rural delivery. In many of the towns already this service has been self-sustaining, and it will continue to be, in my judgment.

Let me say that within a very few months after free-delivery service went into operation the free-delivery service more than doubled and the receipts were largely in excess of the increased expenditure. So much for that. I simply speak of this to show that it is no new matter. Now, the people of the country towns, seeing the cities having free deliveries by carriers, are demanding that they themselves shall have the same rights and privileges that the people of the cities have, and I honor them for standing for that which they believe to be their right.

Now, you talk about the Postmaster-General acting without authority by going further in expenditure in rural delivery than he ought to. Why, it has been thoroughly proven here to-day that he has not exceeded his authority. He has gone so far, and he has called a halt, and now he says, "Unless you give us $150,000 more I have got to stop this service." The Postmaster-General is entirely right. It has been said here that it is highly important, and in my opinion it is highly important, that the Postmaster-General should obey the law, but at the same time gentlemen fail to tell me where he has broken the law in any single instance. He simply calls to our attention the fact that more money is needed if this valuable service is to continue. I commend him for the action he has taken and can not see wherein any wrong has been done on his part.

Now, you take the farmer, who lives in the country, miles away from a post-office. He is in the midst of harvest, if you please. He has to get up his horse, and he rides for one or two hours to the post-office for the mail for himself and family. His people are expecting a letter; but when he arrives at the post-office he finds no mail for himself or family. He repeats his visits day after day. There is a loss of valuable time in the midst of the harvest season, whereas, under the rural free delivery system, if a letter comes for him, why, the carrier takes it to him, and it is a time-saving machine all around.

I certainly regret the course that this debate has taken, in attempting to charge upon the Post-Office Department a violation of the law. In my judgment there has been none; and if there has been any, it is because the representatives of the people go to the Post-Office Department and get them to break the laws; and if the Department did not provide that service you would call it a pretty mean Department. If the law has been technically violated, which I do not believe it has been, it is because you members have importuned the Department to break it. But the law has not been broken. The rural free delivery service has come to stay; it is in the line of progress, and it will stay, in my judgment, as long as grass grows and water runs. [Loud applause.]

Mr. BARNEY. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I believe I state aright the sentiment here when I say that this appropriation for the extension of rural free delivery will receive the unanimous support of the House. Indeed, as Congress must pass this bill before the moneys appropriated can be used to continue routes established, it would seem that this legislative sanction of the service would entirely free the Department from any charge of having exceeded its authority in establishing the more recent routes.

I appreciate the situation of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], who, as "watchdog of the Treasury," feels that there may have been an undue extension of power, but who joins his committee in reporting favorably this item and who declares he will vote in favor of it. Under the sentiment that pervades here, this duty that he feels he owes must needs be performed half-hearted.

The distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] has many times shown himself a conservator of the public interest, but in no way more pronounced than as one of the fathers of this system of rural delivery. I hope he will follow his distinguished chief and his own feelings, as I believe he will, and vote for this appropriation. He has received unbounded thanks of gratitude from the people, and still more praise and promise is in store for him by an extension of the system of free rural delivery. He receives the most generous encouragement from that able and alert First Assistant Postmaster-General, Hon. Perry S. Heath, who in his recent report elaborately explains in all its details this system, and gives it as his opinion that it is one of the most beneficent policies of the Government. The following is found in his recent report:

"There has been nothing in the history of the postal service of the United States so remarkable as the growth of the rural free delivery system. Within the past two years, largely by the aid of the people themselves, who, in appreciation of the helping hand which the Government extended to them, have met these advances halfway, it has implanted itself so firmly upon postal administration that it can no longer be considered in the light of an experiment, but has to be dealt with as an established agency of progress, awaiting only the action of the Congress to determine how rapidly it shall be developed.

"The facts hereinafter set forth, with some elaboration of detail which the importance of the subject seems to me to warrant, will demonstrate—

"'That the free delivery of mails in rural communities can be widely extended with great benefit to the people and with little cost to the revenue.

"'That whenever the system has been judiciously inaugurated with a sincere purpose to make it a success it has been followed by these beneficial results:

"'I. Increased postal receipts. More letters are written and received. More newspapers and magazines are subscribed for. So marked is this advancement that quite a number of rural routes already pay for themselves by the additional business they bring.

"'II. Enhancement of the value of farm lands reached by rural free delivery. This increase of value has been estimated at as high as $5 per acre in some States. A moderate estimate is from $2 to $3 per acre.

"'III. A general improvement of the condition of the roads traversed by the rural carrier. In the Western States, especially, the construction of good roads has been a prerequisite to the establishment of rural free-delivery service. In one county in Indiana a special agent reports that the farmers incurred an expense of over $2,600 to grade and gravel a road in order to obtain rural free delivery.

"'IV. Better prices obtained for farm products, the producers being brought into daily touch with the state of the markets, and thus being enabled to take advantage of information heretofore unattainable.

"'V. To these material advantages may be added the educational benefits conferred by relieving the monotony of farm life through ready access to wholesome literature, and the keeping of all rural residents, the young people as well as their elders, fully informed as to the stirring events of the day. The moral value of these civilizing influences can not be too highly rated.'"

It is clear that rural free delivery has gone beyond its experimental stage and has become an established fact and system. This is alike proven by the needs of the people, their wishes, and the duty of Government. The field of experimentation has covered the States of—

Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin.

On November 1, 1899, in my State, Indiana, there were 44 of these routes in successful operation, as they were indeed everywhere where favorably established.

I desire especially to call to the attention of the House the able and intelligent report of Special Agent E. H. Hathaway and the other special agents, embodied in the report of the First Assistant Postmaster-General, which show clearly the efficacy and utility of the system. A careful reading of all the history furnished bearing on this subject convinces me that with its proper development it will become a revenue producer to the Government.

Time will not permit me to elaborate its great benefit to the people served. It brings the farmer and his family, who for years have borne the principal burden of taxation, closer in touch with cities and city advantages, giving them newspapers early, and postal facilities to awaken and encourage them on, not to speak of the time saved for useful pursuits that heretofore has been spent in going distances after mail. This system encourages the building of good roads, always a proof of progress. Mr. Francis M. Dice, special agent of the western division, well said in a recent address:

Rural free delivery of mail, so much needed among our farmers, can never obtain except in localities possessing good thoroughfares, insuring rapid transit at all seasons of the year.

As shown by the report referred to, it has received the support and cooperation of State Granges, Patrons of Husbandry, and of farmers generally, and it might be stated here that this class has not heretofore been too generously treated. The "good roads convention" held in October, 1890, in Iowa, passed resolutions favoring such an appropriation by Congress as would speedily and permanently establish the service throughout the country where the conditions as to good roads and population would justify, and asked the favorable consideration of the House and the Senate to that end.

The First Assistant Postmaster-General informs us that postmasters of the distributing offices have rendered the Department valuable aid in advancing the service.

From questions asked during the debate some inference might arise that politics entered into the subject. Speaking for my Democratic district in Indiana, after a careful investigation of this phase, I must free the Department from this reflection, as observation and experience have shown me that the Department's action so far has been patriotic and nonpartisan.

Mr. Chairman, the merit of this system, its strong and uniform indorsement by the Department having it in charge and by the people who have received its benefit, appeal to every member of this House to sustain the routes already established, and it is my hope, based upon the causes stated, that the Congress this session will appropriate not less than a million dollars for the further extension of rural free delivery.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that there is some misunderstanding about the bill, or was a misunderstanding in the beginning. Now, the Department has not gone beyond the appropriaation. That wants to be kept in mind. But the Post-Office Department believes the experiment will prove successful. The man in charge of rural free delivery earnestly and sincerely believes it is to become the general policy of the Government, and from every point where men have come and complied with the law, regardless of the State or country, he has gone forth and examined, and if the conditions were such as to justify he has put the machinery in force.

He has now on his table 700 or 800 petitions filed, ready for action; but he refuses to act until he sees what Congress will do. If we refuse this appropriation, then there is no harm done so far as he is concerned, because he has simply circumscribed the experiment that he is making and comes within the appropriation, and when the fiscal year ends his accounts will balance exactly. Furthermore, while this man has been accused of going beyond his jurisdiction, he has not done so; but he has started certain experiments that if run up to the end of the year would go beyond the appropriation.

A part of the appropriation is to enable him to continue the service that he has started up to the end of the year. A portion of it is to go over fields where he is satisfied that it will not only be a success and self-sustaining, but will make a little revenue for the Government. That is what he asked, and as to any trenching or supposed trenching upon the powers of Congress in this case, it is in the direct interest of the American people, and while we boast, and rightfully, of the great exports of this country, the farmer, who gets less benefit from governmental favors than any other class in the country, produced and furnished over two-thirds of the exports during the past year, when we had such a balance of trade in favor of our country.

It is the farmer who demands that he should have his mail daily, the same as the city man. What does it mean to him? It means that he reads more; it means that he takes more literature; it means that he becomes better posted, and I wish to say to-day that the real education of this country is going on on the farm, in the shop, and among the laborers, rather than among your town people. It is with the laborers, it is with the farmers, that you will get the education that will drift this Government back to the circumscribed lines that were so wisely drawn for it in the beginning. I hope there is no one on this side who will raise his voice against extending this delivery to every portion of the country where the conditions are such as to make the present experiment successful.

As soon as you fill the places where the conditions of the country are such as to make it self-sustaining, then, like the post-office of to-day, we will take the revenues of these places and extend the system to points that are not self-sustaining. The result will be that we will get the mail to the countrymen in every part of this country without a loss to the Government of the United States. We will double the mail sent to the countryman, we will increase his intelligence, and let him go on developing his mind as he is doing now more rapidly than any other portion of the population of this great country.

Therefore I am in favor, directly and wholly, of this part of the appropriation, and I regret that there is a charge or intimation that the Postmaster-General, or assistant in charge of this portion of the service, has violated any law. I say he has done his full duty, and it is his conviction and earnestness and desire to make this a success in every part of the United States that has caused him to go as far as he has. But he has not gone beyond the point where he can come in on the 1st day of July and balance his books and show that he is not deficient a single cent in his Department. By refusing this appropriation we stop the progress of the experiment that has proved successful and most beneficial to the people of the United States.

Now, sir, I appreciate the position of our chairman of the Committee of Appropriations, Mr. CANNON, when he opposes the executive department, or any officer of it, trespassing upon the jurisdiction of any other department of this Government. I agree with our friend from California [Mr. LOUD], and there is a gentleman whom I admire on this floor for his convictions and the courage of his convictions. He always stands up and says what he means, whether it affects the practice and policy of his party or not. His objection, as I understand it, is not so much against extension of free delivery as it is against encroachment by the executive officer upon the legislative branch and overstepping the bounds of his legal duties.

Now, I appreciate that. I would like to join with him all along the line and curb the executive department from beginning to end. But I would not begin on a little petty sale department of the Government. I would go higher in the ranks. I would go to the Executive and say: "The Constitution of this Government provides that there shall be three coequal departments of the Government, neither one of which shall encroach on the jurisdiction or domain of the other."

I would say to the Executive: "You have no power or privilege in the House of Representatives or any right to bring any influence, beyond your usual messages, of any kind whatever to exert a power or influence over any other department." I want to say to you that since the days, at least, of President Cleveland the executive department of this Government has been pretty nearly the whole thing. The executive department of this Government is absorbing the powers and privileges of the other departments; and while I agree with the gentleman, I would begin higher up the line.

When Mr. Carlisle was Secretary of the Treasury, he was required to buy an amount of silver monthly, under the Sherman Act, and during the last week I was on a committee who went to him and said: "Mr. Carlisle, you have purchased one-half of the silver this month that the law requires that you should purchase· we want to know if you propose to purchase the remainder?" "Well," he said, "I don't know. I think you gentlemen out West are asking a little too much for your silver." Then we said: "Are you going to try to bear the price of silver, and does the statute of the United States say if you think the price is sufficient, you may buy?" "Well," he said, "I have got a week yet."

On the last day we returned to him and said, "Mr. Carlisle, are you going to buy the amount of silver that the law requires you to buy this month?" He said, "I have concluded not to buy." He threw down a telegram from an assayer in New York that said some silver had sold there that day for a price named, that I now forget, but it was away below the market price, and said, "I will buy all the law requires at that price." We reminded him that it was away below the market price, and was probably gotten up purposely to bear the price of silver, or rather to give the Treasury Department some kind of a pretense or excuse for not complying with the statute.

We further asked:

"Why have you concluded not to buy it in the face of a mandatory statute?"

He pulled down a report of Secretary Sherman under the Bland Act and said, "Here is my authority. Secretary Sherman, from month to month, under the old act, refused to buy it because he thought you gentlemen asked too much for your silver, and I am going to refuse to buy this month because I think you are asking more than your silver is worth." He did that, beyond any question, in the face of a mandatory statute. He did it in direct opposition to the laws passed by this body.

He did it for the purpose of destroying silver and of putting on this country a gold standard, in which he believed. That was the second highest Department in the Government. He cited like breaches of the law on the part of his predecessors, and when that same authority came to executing the Chinese-exclusion act he did not believe in it and he refused to execute it. The executive department of this Government to-day is executing laws whenever such execution suits its ideas of what ought to be executed, and is brushing them aside when it does not please it to execute them. I say I am in harmony with the idea of holding these gentlemen to the limit of the law and the Constitution of this country, but I would begin with bigger game.

Now, there are other parts of this bill of which I am also in favor. But I am not in favor of the causes which created the expenditures. I am in favor of paying the Army and the Navy, not because they are wisely used for the purpose of confiscating the political liberties of other people, but because the Government, through its machinery, has obligated itself and owes the debt, and we are in honor bound to pay it. Therefore I am supporting that portion of the bill, although they have made a debt of forty-seven millions that I do not think they should have created and was wholly unnecessary if civil diplomacy, instead of arrogant militarism, had been exercised.

I want to say that upon yesterday a good Republican living in my neighborhood called upon me to know what I thought of the way the Civil Service Commission executed the laws in its department. I said, "My friend, it does not execute them at all.

Ever since I have been in Washington I have believed it to be a good law but never executed." She said, "I was examined for a certain department in this Government. I know that I stood in advance of five other persons. I did not have a boss of the great Republican party behind me, though I did have a Republican member, and those five persons are working in that department and I am sitting around here in my room sucking my thumbs."

I said, "How and why are they there?" She said, "I will tell you. They put them on as common laborers, not required to be examined, and then they transfer them or put them to work on employment that does require examination." Others have told me that in departments here, supposed to be filled by civil-service examination, employees are put in temporarily for three months and then reappointed, reappointed, reappointed throughout the years, and these things are done and done at the instance of what are supposed to be the bosses of the party in power. If I had to say to-day what is the greatest menace to the Government of the United States, I should immediately reply "bossism in politics."

I want now, for one moment, to refer to what took place the other night in Philadelphia. I am not here to make an argument for the Democratic party; but I take it that when a man assaults the Democratic party he means the party that is headed by William Jennings Bryan, and I am as good a supporter of Mr. Bryan as any Democrat that draws the breath of life, and have as great an admiration for him. [Applause.]

Therefore, I take it that any assault on the Democratic party at this day means an assault upon the Bryan Democratic party. Now here is what the national chairman of the dominant party said the other night in Philadelphia, according to his own organ, the Washington Evening Star. In the first place, he appealed to the Republicans of Philadelphia that they should at once pay the $100,000 they had pledged for the privilege of entertaining the Republican convention. He said, "We must have it for the purpose of counteracting what the Democratic party is doing." He said:

The Democratic party is already at work on the Philippine question throughout the western part of our country. They have engaged numerous labor agitators—

Now, think of that—

to foment among the working people of the entire West as much dissatisfaction with the existing conditions as lies in their power.

Now, sir, I will venture to say there is not a man in the broad West who is impartial and honest who will not pronounce that an absolute falsehood. Such a thing has never been heard of there. He further says:

The Republican campaign management is now meeting the agitators on their own ground by the employment of men to counteract that influence.

Admitting that they are employing laboring men at this early day and putting them under wages to go out and try to inveigle their fellow-laborers to vote the ticket that will politically enslave the people of the Philippine Islands and ultimately destroy the privileges and independence of the laborers of this country.

He says further:

Our men are of better character—

Now, you might say that that was at least a little egotistical—

and of higher standing.

More dollar marks on them, according to his estimation.

But the Democrats have supplemented the work of these labor agitators by the distribution of a great quantity of campaign literature. We need the Philadelphia campaign fund of $100,000 in order to distribute literature at once which shall counteract the effect of the Democratic campaign material. I say to you, one dollar of campaign fund to-day is worth five dollars three months from to-day.

Now, I want you to listen to this:

The Democrats are bent upon making a most bitter campaign. It is their object to create strikes and paralyze the industries of the country. It is for this purpose their agitators are working throughout the West.

I pronounce that as an unqualified falsehood, and it is a stigma upon the West that is undeserved. The idea that the Democratic party or any portion of the people of this country are trying to create strikes and disturb business is ridiculous, and such a charge ought to be beneath an ordinary street scavenger. Trying to create strikes; trying to disturb business! Has American manhood become so low and depraved that any man of common sense could have such an idea of his brother man who did not wear the brass collar himself?

Is it possible that the chairman of this great party judges other men's aspirations and groveling propensities by his own measure?

Now, sir, there are some other questions that I wish I had the time to consider. One thing I should like to know is what the gentleman who sends that article understands by the "best classes." He measures them by dollars. He measures them by the amount of aggregated wealth they can pile up. And what has he, with the aid of his crew, done for the American people? They have built trust upon top of trust, until they are now impoverishing the laboring man whom they claim they are benefiting. Take the laboring man of the West, of whom he speaks. Those laboring men are coming forward to-day and saying to the railroads and manufacturers in the West, "We demand more pay, because through these trusts and syndicates we must pay more for everything we purchase, and our wages have not been raised. You have raised your prices on iron, on steel, on coal, and everything else you deal in except labor. Now we demand that you raise the price upon that."

They call that an agitation for the purpose of working up strikes. That is the logical evolution of the system. Another thing that is now a great public curse is the numerous trusts that are now permitted to throttle every legitimate industry. They are coming daily. I notice a very few days ago this item in a newspaper from a Western town where they have a broom factory.

Brooms, that a few weeks ago sold at wholesale at $3 per dozen have now advanced to $4.50. The commercial travelers say that the broom-corn trust has bought up all the broom corn in the country and also all the seed. This trust even declines to sell seed unless the prospective grower promises to give the trust an option on the product he may raise next year.

I also received two letters this morning from leading newspaper publishers of my State, whose names I withhold because their letters are presumed to be private, but they so cogently state the facts that I shall adopt their statements:

DEAR SIR: Can not something be done to remove what one paper has aptly termed "a tax on intelligence?"

The tariff on white paper has enabled the paper trust to advance paper to where the newspapers are obliged to raise the price of subscriptions or suspend.

One year ago we bought paper at the Mississippi River or common points with Chicago for $1.55 in car lots. Now the best I can do is $2.70, and the paper houses freely predict that before the end of the year it will cost us $3.75. The only way the trust can be bursted and paper reduced to where it was a year ago is to take off the tax.

The second one reads:

MY DEAR MR. BELL: In common with other publishers, we are ground down by the paper trust, which is forcing a raise in the price of subscription all over the country.

We have not raised our price, nor do we wish to do so; but the rate on paper is getting to be frightful.

If something could be done to take the tariff off of white print paper, the trust would collapse in a night, I believe.

The present tariff is, as I am informed and believe, $6 per ton, which enables the home manufacturer to throttle the papers. White paper dealers predict that it will go to 5 cents a pound before the end of the year.

It certainly looks to me as though the Government was levying a tax on intelligence.

Now, sir, I received another letter this morning from a leading citizen, who has just built a great sugar-refining plant in my district. He says to me:

I wish you would use your endeavors to see that sugar from Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the other islands does not come to our shores free. I wish you would see that this menial labor from these islands does not drive out the great sugar plant that we have built at Grand Junction.

I wrote back to him:

MY DEAR SIR: I will aid you all I can. I would like to see no product of the menial labor of those islands come in conflict with your labor, but without my consent and against my protest, as well as of others in this country, the Administration has gone forth; they have taken those islands; they have confiscated the sovereignty of the people.

They have made them, in other words, political slaves, and they can not have free access to the markets of the world nor the world to their markets, and if we cut them off on this side and cut them off on the other and suspend them between this and the Old World, then your pity for the reconcentrado ought to be doubled for the poor starving masses of Puerto Rico and the Hawaiian Islands." But there comes your appeals; they are coming from every part of the country; and I want to say to you that you may rightfully say to your laboring men that the necessary evolution of annexing or taking the sovereignty from these islands will be to bring the peoples of those islands in direct competition with your own industry, and not only that, they will be working side by side with your laborers.

Go out to-day on the western coast, and after you pass the line of Colorado what do you strike? You do not find the Americans working on the railroad grade or in the lumber camp. You do not find the Irish on the railroad grade. You find there the lowest type of Japanese. You find the Chinese. You do not even find Italians. That is past. The Japanese and South Sea Islanders can successfully compete with any Chinamen on the face of the earth.

Take them to-day. They are lining up on every railroad from the Colorado line to the western coast. We have kept them out of Colorado so far. But I saw there last fall, when a bridge was washed out, a white foreman who was the only American there, when they built up the bridge while we lay at Green River. They were all Japanese except the boss. That will be distributed to every portion of this country, as sure as things progress.

Now, another thing I wish to mention, and I have mentioned it often before this difficulty came up.

Mr. REEDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I want to agree that the gentleman's delivery is sufficiently free to satisfy. It is clearly rural; but it is very much of a strain on an ordinary mind to connect the subject discussed by the gentleman in his speech with the subject under consideration of the committee.

Mr. BELL. I am on the general subject. Gentlemen will bear in mind that the whole expenditures of this Government, the Army and the Navy, the means of collecting revenue, and everything else is involved in this general deficiency bill. I think it is quite fair; if we have good free delivery, let us have something else free now.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what I started to say is this. I have made the point here twice before, and I hate to be repeating so often. I have introduced a bill into two Congresses and have been unable, seemingly, to get a report on it, and that is in its effect that this Government from the beginning has held that no man interested in a national banking association or in circulating or issuing currency was entitled to hold the position of Secretary of the Treasury. I have called your attention now twice during this Congress to that, and the only reason I call your attention to it again is to apply some things that have been occurring within the last few weeks.

Section 243 of the Revised Statutes provides that—

No Secretary of the Treasury shall directly or indirectly be concerned or interested in carrying on the business of trade or commerce, or be the owner in whole or in part of any sea vessels, or purchase by himself or another in trust for him any lands or other public property, or be concerned in the purchase or disposal of any public securities of any State or of the United States.

National banking associations are all based upon national bonds, and they have notes issued on these bonds, and, as shown by Mr. WOLCOTT in the Senate, many of the bonds sold by the Treasury went into the banks in which the Secretary of the Treasury is interested. At every point along the line his private interest conflicts with his public duty, and it seems to me that not only public policy but the above statute ought to prohibit a person so interested from occupying this office.

Sections 324, 325, 326, and 327 of the United States Statutes provides:

The Comptroller of the Currency shall be appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury, and he shall give a bond to the United States, to be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, conditioned for the faithful discharge of the duties of his office; and that it shall be unlawful for the Comptroller or the deputy, either directly or indirectly, to be interested in any association issuing national currency under the laws of the United States.

And provides that he shall perform his duties under the general direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

It would be absurd and ridiculous that the smaller officers should be prohibited from owning bank interests, and the Secretary who directs them, approves their bonds, recommends their appointment, and has full charge of them should be permitted to own such interest. The same reasons apply to both, but much stronger to the Secretary of the Treasury.

The press so understood that, and I observe that the party press of the present Secretary of the Treasury, when he was appointed, the papers of the great East, said it was very unusual to take a national banker and put him at the head of the Treasury. They said that a precedent had been set in the case of McCulloch. I noticed that at the time in some of the Philadelphia papers, and I saved the article, but I have not it here at present.

I notice again that recently the papers in New York, and especially the World, cite the statute that it is claimed prohibits him from occupying this place.

Now, I am not going to say one word against the personal character or the general character of our Secretary of the Treasury, but I say the last few weeks have demonstrated the fact that you can not afford to put a man in this high position whose personal interest is in conflict directly with his public duties.

You must bear in mind that we have contended from the beginning, and the people have contended from the foundation of this Government, that the most dangerous thing that could ever exist in a Republic, outside of a great standing army, was a great banking institution that could issue and control the currency, make it abundant at one time when it wanted to sell property and make it scarce at another when it might want to buy property, or to make money scarce when it wanted to coerce Congress or the legislature and make it bountiful if everything was harmonious. These principles have been ground into the people of the United States from the beginning.

Now, what have we had in the last few weeks? We have a Secretary of the Treasury letting to banks fifty and one hundred millions of public funds. What for? Gratuitously; and I want to say to you that it offers a direct premium to the banks of the country to organize a panic. It offers a direct premium to the bankers of New York to create a money panic. Why? Because this Treasurer of the United States walks in and fills the coffers with free money that they may lend it at a high rate of interest and thereby make the panic profitable to them.

Mr. HILL. If that is true, why is it that only 69 banks out of the 3,600 availed themselves of this privilege?

Mr. BELL. My dear sir, how many are able to comply with the conditions? That is one of the faults. It makes the rich richer and the poor poorer. That is the result of this policy. Now, take it in every State, practically, of this Union, 45 States and 3 Territories, and God only knows how many colonies [laughter], and what is the practice? The practice is for the treasurer of the State to go to the depositories and arrange for the use of the people's money, and they pay the interest on the people's money.

Take the Government of the United States, with its coffers of hundreds of millions and interest worth millions, and the great money centers get it all. You may make the rich richer and the powerful more powerful and the weak weaker.

Mr. BALL. If the gentleman will allow me, in answer to the gentleman from Connecticut as to the number of banks that took advantage of the offer of the Secretary of the Treasury, I would suggest to the gentleman from Colorado that only those who owned or controlled the bonds were favored.

Mr. BELL. Certainly. The ordinary banks had no bonds and they could get no money. Now, your financial bill containing the funding scheme in the Senate is for the very purpose of enabling these men to get these bonds for the purpose of allowing the national banks to hold them as security. Everybody can not buy them. Everybody is not a bondholder. We can not all go into one business. I concede to the bondholder and to the banker every right and every good motive that I accord to myself; but I want to say that with their great power and prestige, and their organization of over sixty banks in the money centers, they control the destiny of the country.

Take the great bank of New York the other day, and when applying for funds it graciously reminded the Secretary of the Treasury that he knew what the institution did in the last campaign—held him up right there for the contribution they made—and that is why I say it is so dangerous to have a banker Secretary of the Treasury. Why? Because the idea that the banks should issue and control the currency is in every fiber of his being; because the banks ought not to issue or control the currency of the country. He is an adept at banking, but knows nothing about Government currency. He goes in with a prejudice in favor of letting the banks operate the whole financial policy of the Government.

And if you had a man who was versed, on the other hand, in Government currency, who was not an adept at manipulating public bonds for great private profits, he would say, "What is the best money for all the people?" And he would hold the banks within their just limits. Now, take a banker like our Secretary of the Treasury, who was president of the great Bankers' Association of the United States and president of one of the greatest banks of the country. Here is an associate of his interested back and forth in banking. They have been accustomed to deal with each other, and they are both elegant gentlemen unquestionably.

They deal with one another as bankers, evidently taking it for the best interests of the Government, while if a man was working for the Government alone he would be suggesting to Congress, "Here we have about $100,000,000 in these banks annually, only a few great banks in the money centers that get the use of this money. We pay them interest upon their bonds that lie in our Treasury. They let out our money, as was said by some of the other bankers of New York the other day, at an average of 6 per cent. Now, let them pay us 2 or 3 per cent."

Why, my friend, talk about your free delivery, if you will make the banks of the Government—the national banks—pay you 2 per cent upon all the money they hold longer than thirty days, it will give you funds enough to establish free-delivery routes all over this country, and it will be exacting only a just tribute. Why should they have your money for nothing? Why should these banks have fifty or a hundred million dollars of Government funds from day to day and month to month and throughout the year for nothing, when a private citizen has to pay for the use of every dollar he gets and when every dollar has a market value in every market of the United States? No one who does not look through the eye of a national banker see any reason or justice in the rule.

Not only that, but it congests your money in the great money centers. You take the great bank that got this money. Its stockholders represent untold millions in United States bonds. They gather them up from this man's investment and from that man's investment, from that rich widow's investment, and they lend them around, and they get fifteen or sixteen million dollars of the Government's funds, worth 6 per cent in the market throughout the year, for nothing, and it means millions of the people's money thrown in their coffers without money and without price.

Now, these are some of the things that I want to begin to see reformed, and not the pittance the farming community or that farming community may get out of this little item.

It seems passing strange that men in general always want to attack evils in some petty place. If one people by wholesale murders another or confiscates its ships, its goods, and its country, or if a great money king wrecks a great railroad or some other mammoth institution and takes it in at one fell swoop, it seems that the grand proportions of the crime and the audacity of the perpetrator so bedazzles and so awe-inspires the individual citizen that he is hypnotized and rendered incapable of seeing the turpitude involved.

Mr. Chairman, I believe as a member of the committee I have an hour. I beg pardon for having occupied so much time, and I

will yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. RIDGELY] the balance of my time, ten minutes.

[Mr. RIDGELY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

During the reading of the foregoing the time of the gentleman from Kansas expired.

Mr. RIDGELY. I ask that the Clerk be allowed to read the remaining sentence.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has no control of the time.

Mr. RIDGELY. I ask that the remaining sentence or two be read, or that I be permitted to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BALL] for ten minutes.

Mr. BALL. Mr. Chairman, the very large sum carried by this deficiency bill for the maintenance of the military arm of the Government greatly overshadows the comparatively small sum appropriated to extend the rural free delivery system in this country. The first runs into many millions, while the latter is counted by thousands, and yet nearly the entire day has been consumed in discussing the item carried in the bill for rural free delivery here, while little has been said about the appropriation to slaughter the Filipinos.

The expenses for rural free delivery for the past year have been about $300,000; to carry on the war in the Orient has cost about three hundred million.

Mr. Chairman, it is a long way from the scattered rural free-delivery experiments in this country to the seat of war in the Philippine Islands, but the distance is infinitesimal compared with the gulf which divides our own wars for liberty and the one we now wage to strike the liberty-loving spirit of our late allies to the earth, compared with the great departure we have made from the doctrines and sacrifices of the founders of this Republic to the carrying on of war in those islands without constitutional warrant or authority. In order to emphasize this departure I desire to have read at the desk of the Clerk that which will doubtless appear very antiquated doctrine to the Republican majority on the other side of this Chamber.

The Clerk read as follows:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.

Mr. BALL. Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of gentlemen on the other side I will state that the extract just read is from the Declaration of Independence. [Laughter on the Democratic side and applause on the Republican side.] I am glad that you recognize the document after the explanation. [Renewed laughter on the Democratic side.] Mr. Chairman, when that document which is to that side of the Chamber, next to the Declaration of Independence, most nearly out of date was being discussed in the Pennsylvania convention, Mr. James Wilson gave expression to views touching the possibilities and objects of the Government then being established. Let the Clerk read.

The clerk read as follows:

James Wilson, in the Pennsylvania convention which adopted the Constitution, said:

"By adopting this system we shall probably lay a foundation for erecting temples of liberty in every part of the earth. It has been thought by many that on the success of the struggle America has made for freedom will depend the exertions of the brave and enlightened of other nations. The advantages resulting from this system will not be confined to the United States, but will draw from Europe many worthy characters who pant for the enjoyment of freedom. It will induce princes, in order to preserve their subjects, to restore to them a portion of that liberty of which they have for many years been deprived."

Mr. BALL. Mr. Chairman, we had a great civil war in this country, which cost precious blood and untold treasure. The victors in that contest claimed to be waging a war to preserve the Union and establish universal liberty in this land. It may not be out of place here to quote from the oration of a great American, delivered upon the blood-stained heights of Gettysburg, in order to learn his conception of the purposes and end of our form of government. I send to the Clerk's desk this quotation.

The Clerk read as follows:

It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.

Mr. BALL. Mr. Chairman, for the information of those upon the other side of the aisle, let me say the words read are from the address of Mr. Lincoln at Gettysburg. I commend them to you now.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. You press the button and we do the rest.

Mr. BALL. You can not "do the rest" as he would have you. You have departed so far from the memory, faith, and practice of Abraham Lincoln that were his embodied spirit to return now it would be as a stranger, and his doctrines addressed to you and your side would fall upon deaf ears were he to come from the dead. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is a long step from Abraham Lincoln and his tenets to the present Administration and its policies; and yet so late as the outbreak of the war with Spain his teachings had not fallen upon barren ground, and patriotic thought and action was not a stranger to our President and his party. I quote from President McKinley's message:

Of the untried measures there remain only: Recognition of the insurgents as belligerents; recognition of the independence of Cuba; neutral intervention to end the war by imposing a rational compromise between the contestants, and intervention in favor of one or the other party. I speak not of forcible annexation, for that can not be thought of. That by our code of morality would be criminal aggression.

How then stood Congress, which voted without dissent $50,000,000 to prepare for war? Let the resolutions voted for by Democrats and Republicans alike speak for themselves:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, First. That the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

* * * * * * *

Fourth. That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

Then we went to war. Who will deny that we thereby recognized the rights of liberty-loving people to an independent government of their own choosing, and that it was not our purpose to wage a war of conquest or for annexation of territory? We published to the world the holiness of our purpose in waging a war for "human liberty based upon human rights." That "forcible annexation" or "criminal aggression" was not our purpose we plighted our nation's faith. We consecrated this pledge by the splendid heroism and sacrifice of our soldiers and sailors who carried our flag to glorious victory upon land and sea.

But, Mr. Chairman, before the smoke of battle had cleared away the bony fingers of greed and avarice began to reach out to throttle unto death the nation's faith and tarnish the luster of American valor and patriotism. The rich fields of Cuba caught the eyes of syndicates and speculators as a promising vineyard for plunder. Garcia, Gomez, and their compatriots were pronounced thieves and assassins and the Spaniards declared to be the best citizens of that island.

But, Mr. Chairman, men such as Fitzhugh Lee, General Wood, and General Wilson were not lost to American honor and Cuban rights. They declare the Cubans to be the best citizens of the island and assert their capacity for self-government.

While our pledges to Cuba have not been carried out as yet, let us assume that they will be and that the powerful agencies, avaricious hands, and capacious maws which stand between the President and the American people may yet be defeated in their nefarious schemes. The situation in the far Orient is fraught with far greater danger. There we summoned the Filipinos to our aid against the common enemy. To say that they were not our allies and were not so treated is to stultify ourselves. If we believed that the people of Cuba were entitled to their freedom as a matter of right, were not the Filipinos also? If we disclaimed any intentions to rob the Cubans of their country, which was more nearly controlled by the Spaniards when we went to war than was the Philippine Archipelago when Manila fell, what right had we to rob the Filipinos, who were our allies, of their country?

The truth is that unholy greed saw an opening in that unhappy land to line plutocratic pockets, regardless of what it cost the American people in blood and treasure. Witness the gradual surrender of President McKinley, who started out with such high purpose. The Paris commission was instructed, first, to demand only the island of Luzon; finally, in council with the enemy, where our allies, the Filipinos, were denied an audience, we bought for $20,000,000 the sovereignty which Spain once partially owned, but had wholly lost.

Men quibble now in puerile fashion as to where the responsibility rests for the outbreak of hostilities.

Mr. Chairman, every honest man who is well informed knows that this war was caused by the determination of President McKinley's Administration to forcibly annex the Philippine Islands without the consent of its people. If it would have been "criminal aggression" and "contrary to our code of morals" to take such action in Cuba, have we a different code of morals for islands and peoples in the far east? Sir, when the Fifty-fifth Congress adjourned not five Republican members of this House would admit that they favored the acquisition and forcible annexation of the

Philippine Islands. Now we have entered upon a new era, a wonderful transition has taken place that might be aptly called the

EVOLUTION OF IMPERIALISM.

Those who love liberty less than they love gold appear to be in the saddle. Washington, Jefferson, Monroe, Jackson, and Lincoln no longer impress, through their lives, tenets, and memories, those charged with the administration of affairs. Like the Declaration of Independence and Constitution of the United States, they are out of date and no longer to be followed. Contrast, if you will, the extracts I have quoted from the Declaration of Independence, the debate on the adoption of the Constitution, the oration of Mr. Lincoln, and the words of President McKinley to Congress before the war with Spain with the utterances of the new and breezy young man from the West, as the spokesman of the Administration at the other end of the Capitol, if you would learn the greatness of our fall. Hear the brutal frankness of the "advance agent of imperialism" contained in the resolutions offered by Mr. BEVERIDGE in the Senate of the United States:

Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Philippine Islands are territory belonging to the United States; that it is the intention of the United States to retain them as such and to establish and maintain such governmental control throughout the archipelago as the situation may demand.

No hope for independence there; no promise of possible freedom; no guaranty of constitutional government; no expression to indicate whether it shall be military government, a colonial system, a despotism, or a monarchy; nothing to indicate that it is not our intention to extend the polygamous and slave-owning system recognized by the President in the agreement with the Sultan of Sulu to the entire Philippine group.

Go read the utterances of the young Senator in his entire speech, which is throughout an appeal to "sordid greed." Until I read this speech I was at a loss to know why any sane man wanted the islands, either from the standpoint of government as a commercial proposition or from the standpoint of the laboring classes, who will be thrown into competition with millions of laborers working for the lowest possible wages. Since reading the speech I know why the Republican party wants the islands. The Senator interviewed a number of people over there. Listen to some he quoted:

A highly educated and bright Spanish mestizo, claiming to be pure Filipino, employed in Iloilo, said:

"No one can tell when the fighting will cease. It all depends upon what Aguinaldo says. The common people have absolute faith in him. His order among those now in rebellion in this island would be promptly obeyed. The common people say they are fighting for their independence. They mean by this the right to manage their own goverment; make and execute their own laws. Their ideas of a proper relation between the Philippine Islands and people of the United States is that of a protectorate. The leaders absolutely control the people. A man of property expects his working people to have the same opinion as he has. I do myself."

A rich planter of Panay, pure Filipino, but moderate in views, said:

"The common people have no opinions and are not capable of voting. If the Filipinos established a government, of course the property and educated class would, beyond doubt, run such government. Not more than 25 per cent of the people are fitted to take part in the selection of public officers. The people are at present incapable of self-government, though they might be intrusted with purely municipal affairs. Establish precisely the same laws through the archipelago. English should be universally taught. The common people know and care nothing about self-government or any other government. They are principally interested in simply living. Self-government can only mean government by the upper classes."

Pure Filipino and large planter of Negros:

"I have working for me about 400 men. They are good, average examples of the common people of the island. I should say that not over 3 or 4 per cent of them are capable of self-government or in any true sense understand the term. If the ballot were given them, or even if it were restricted to those 3 or 4 per cent, I should expect them to vote as the leaders might indicate. I think the English language should be immediately adopted throughout the entire archipelago. It would simplify matters incalculably. No, I do not believe the same laws should prevail everywhere. We of Negros are more cultivated than in Panay. We deserve better laws."

Prominent Filipino of Cebu:

"The island of Cebu can yield greatly more than it has. The people are disturbed by what they have been through and what they fear. Very few are capable of self-government now. My brother employs a large number of men. If given the ballot they would most certainly vote as he said. I am sure the better classes would control the voting of the poorer classes. We should expect to hold positions under any government you establish."

Pablo Majia, pure Filipino, rich, able, honest, and moderate. He was stabbed to death in Cebu, and this is why I withhold the names of the others:

"I am sorry to say that very few of our population are capable of self-government. Of course the wealthy and educated classes are entirely competent to run the government. I do not expect nor desire any government except one founded on and directed by America. Oh, yes; to such extent as the ballot may be given there is no doubt that we of the upper class can control. I employ 100 men now; in good times more. All these would vote as I say."

Mr. Chairman, now we have solved the problem of Republican desire for these islands. The conditions there, from interviews quoted with such gusto by the Senator from Indiana, are such that the so-called upper classes, composing 3 or 4 per cent of the population would control, hold the offices, and vote their laborers blindly. There you find an ideal field for latter-day Republicanism. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And yet, Mr. Chairman, Pablo Majia, whom the Senator pronounces rich, able, honest, and moderate, and all the others, were traitors to their own country, as much as were the tories of the Revolutionary war, and merited ostracism as much as did they.

Mr. Chairman, the Indiana Senator, speaking for the President, was even less frank than the great newspaper published here, which disdains to shelter itself behind pretended patriotism and providential responsibility. I refer to the following editorial from the Washington Post:

LET US BE HONEST.

Why can not we be honest in our utterances touching the territories we have recently acquired? Really it would save time and trouble, to say nothing of life and treasure, to come out frankly with the announcement that we have annexed these possessions in cold blood and that we intend to utilize them to our profit and advantage. All this talk about benevolent assimilation; all this hypocritical pretense of anxiety for the moral, social, and intellectual exaltation of the natives; all this transparent parade of responsibility and deep-seated purpose; all this deceives nobody, avails nothing, helps us not an inch in the direction of profit, dignity, and honor. We all know down in our hearts that these islands, groups, etc., are important to us only in the ratio of their practical possibilities. We value them by the standard of their commercial usefulness, and by no other. All this gabble about civilizing and uplifting the benighted barbarians of Cuba and Luzon is mere sound and fury, signifying nothing. Foolishly or wisely, we want these newly acquired territories, not for any missionary or altruistic purposes, but for the trade, the commerce, the power, and the money there are in them. Why beat about the bush and promise and protest all sorts of things? Why not be honest? It will pay.

As a matter of fact, we are not concerned in the ethical or religious uplifting of the Filipinos. After all, the difference between a breech clout and a starched shirt front is a mere matter of climate and personal opinion. Dishonesty, untruth, crime, and general wickedness are here in our midst—present with us as part of our daily life and growing with our growth. We need not go to the West Indies or the Philippines in search of material for moral rescue. Our own slums abound with opportunities for missionary zeal. Why not tell the truth and say—what is the fact—that we want Cuba, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and Luzon, together with any other islands in either ocean that may hereafter commend themselves to our appetite, because we believe they will add to our national strength, and because we hope they will some day become purchasers at our bargain counters? We might as well throw off the pious mask and indulge ourselves in a little honest candor. It will cost us nothing, and it may profit much. At any rate, we shall have the comfort and satisfaction of being honest with ourselves and the privilege of looking into the mirror without blushing.

I commend this editorial as the true and only reason for the policy now pursued. Had we given the Filipinos assurance, as we gave the Cubans, there would have been no war with them. Were satisfactory assurances of honest purposes given them now they would lay down their arms.

Mr. Chairman, while I honor our brave men fighting under orders in a distant clime for our flag, I do not honor those whose sordid policy and disregard for the ancient faith, sheltered from danger themselves, are compelling "the bravest of the brave" to fall victims to tropical disease and Filipino bullets. What a culmination to the peace conference called by the Czar of Russia—the two great English-speaking nations of the world, Great Britain and the United States, carrying on oriental wars against the Boers and Filipinos, struggling for their liberty!

We have come to the "parting of the ways." The American people are to choose between the government set out in the resolutions of Mr. BEVERIDGE and the purposes plainly set forth by the Washington Post, backed by the Republican party, and the government declared for in the Declaration of Independence and prayed for by Mr. Lincoln.

There is yet opportunity for us to follow in the "paths our fathers trod." May we find courage to turn aside from glittering dreams of world-wide empire, and hold fast to the old Republic which has survived the shock of foreign and civil war, worthy that which our fathers hoped and taught. [Applause.]

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the "war-revenue law" be repealed or even reasonably modified at this session of Congress? This law was passed and approved June 13, 1898, now more than a year and a half ago, and was intended to meet the emergency of a war with Spain. When it was under consideration it will be remembered that we on this side of the Chamber protested against many of its features and contended that it imposed unnecessary burdens upon the people. We asserted our belief that the war would be a short one and that the bill carried too much taxation for so brief a struggle as we were likely to have. The lamented Mr. Dingley, then the Republican leader of the House and the chairman of the committee which reported this measure, said, in reply:

But it is evident that the war upon which we have entered, unless all signs fail, as I hope they may, is not to be simply a sixty days' affair, is not to be simply a three months' affair, is not to be even a six months' affair, and the more earnest we are in our preparations, the more united we stand, the more means we provide for defense and offense, the more we arm the Government with the means of carrying on this war, the shorter it will be.

In point of fact, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fears of the distinguished gentleman whose language I have just quoted, the war proved to be "simply a sixty days' affair," or, at best, so far as actual hostilities are concerned, "simply a three months' affair."

Let me quote from another very distinguished gentleman of the majority who engaged in that memorable debate. I allude to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. In reply to the objection raised by Democrats against the bond feature of the bill, he said, April 29, 1898:

Not one dollar will be raised by taxation; not one dollar will be raised by borrowing, except as it is needed. If the war ends in six months, as the gentleman from Kentucky thinks it will, then we shall be in a position six months from now to repeal this taxation.

Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, this language was uttered on this floor more than a year and a half ago. The war ended in less than six months, "as the gentleman from Kentucky" thought it would, and the country is interested in knowing now whether we are "in a position to repeal this taxation" or even to reasonably modify it.

I quote again from another very distinguished member of the majority. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], who succeeded to the leadership after the death of the lamented Mr. Dingley and who became and is now chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, on April 29, 1898, used this language:

The proposition of the gentleman from Massachusetts is that we provide here for a set of bonds that would be payable in three years, because, he says, he wants to continue these war taxes and pay these bonds. The proposition of the committee is that when the war is over we cut off the war taxes [applause], and that we pay the bonds as we paid the bonds of the late war—out of the usual and ordinary taxes of the Government.

And so I might go on culling from that debate other assurances, equally as pointed and unequivocal, made by other gentlemen on that side of the House, that with the end of the war, unless its magnitude should be unexpectedly great, would end war taxes. It had all along been the proud boast of Republican members that the "Dingley tariff act" would soon supply all needed revenues, and so, if we had only a short war, we should need no excessive war taxes.

War was formally declared on April 25, and on May 1 Dewey paralyzed Spain and startled the world with his unprecedented victory at Manila. On July 3 Spain's remaining fleet went down before the guns of Schley and Sampson at Santiago. Then came the intrepid charge up San Juan Hill and the surrender of the Spanish army. A few days more and Miles had marched across Puerto Rico. Spain capitulated, and on August 12, 1898, preliminary terms of peace were agreed upon. Our warships came to anchor and our armies were commanded to halt.

It appears, therefore, that when the "war-revenue bill" was passed the conflict for which we were preparing was already half over. That the final and exact terms of peace were not agreed upon and ratified by the belligerents until a latter date, that peace commissions were slower in coming to terms from a diplomatic point of view than our soldiers and sailors had been in achieving victory on land and sea, makes little difference. The war was over when the swords were sheathed and the guns had ceased to roar. There has been a session of Congress since then, and we heard no suggestion of even a modification of the war tax. Congress is again in session; do we hear any suggestion of a modification or repeal now?

A SURPLUS IN THE TREASURY.

We have an abundance of money in the Treasury. The voters were told in the recent election in some of the States that all this was because of excellent Republican financial management. Very recently we found ourselves with so much surplus money and with so little immediate use for it that we "relieved the distress in financial circles" by anticipating, discounting, and paying interest on our bonded indebtedness long in advance of its maturity. As long ago as October last the Washington Post contained an interview with the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, from which I take this extract:

"The Treasury is in a position to undertake very readily the prepayment of all the interest due during this fiscal year, large as is that amount," said Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Vanderlip yesterday. "The cash balance is an extraordinarily large one, being now nearly $290,000,000. It was larger than this a year ago, but we were then just receiving the payments for the $200,000,000 war loan. Our cash balance now, however, is far larger than it has averaged for many years, and if receipts continue to bear anything like so favorable a relation to expenditures as they have recently it promises to be still larger instead of being reduced."

The Secretary of the Treasury, in his annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899, tells us that—

The transactions of the fiscal year, as shown by the report of the Treasurer of the United States, were of unusual magnitude, the net ordinary receipts having been exceeded in any like period but once, in 1866, and the net ordinary expenditures but thrice, in 1863, 1864, and 1865. Inclusive of the amounts involved in the issue and redemption of bonds, notes, and certificates, the gross receipts, under warrant, were $1,038,451,340.18, and the gross expenditures $946,222,148.83. There was, in consequence, an addition of $92,229,191.35 to the general Treasury balance, which increased from $775,751,368.11 to $867,980,559.46. These operations were conducted through the offices of the Treasury, numbering 10; those of the mint, increased during the year from 11 to 12, and the depositary banks, of which there were 172 at the beginning of the year and 357 at the close. The aggregate of money handled by the Treasury offices alone was $2,393,199,747 in the receipts and $2,371,283,629 in the disbursements.

While there was a deficiency of $89,111,589.67 in the ordinary revenues, the excess of receipts over disbursements on account of loans was sufficient to realize a net surplus of $100,791,521.35 as the result of the fiscal operations of the year. This substantial addition to the available resources, together with the steady advance of the receipts from taxation to an actual excess over current needs, has relieved the Treasury of all danger of difficulty from sudden emergency. Nor was the growth of the available cash balance, which stood at $284,498,516.20 at the close of the year, more wholesome than the improvement in the character of the assets, which were converted into gold as far as statutory and other limitations would permit.

Within the last few days the Secretary of the Treasury, in his reply to resolutions passed by Congress calling on him for information, again tells us that money is rapidly accumulating in the Treasury from the operation of the revenue law. The country has been assured time and time again that the Dingley tariff law was adequate to the easy support of the Government. This assurance was given when the law was passed and it was repeated on this floor during the discussion of the war-revenue bill. It was said that if peace conditions had continued the ordinary revenues of the Government would, in a short time, have been in excess of the expenditures.

One enthusiastic member of the majority [Mr. BROWN of Ohio] said:

In fact, during the months of February and March of the present year (1898) our revenues exceeded our expenditures by the sum of about $3,000,000, and it is as good as certain that if peace conditions had continued we would now be in the early days of a period wherein our revenues would equal and, indeed, exceed our expenditures. The tariff of July 24, 1897, has already justified the hopes of its friends. As a measure for producing revenue needed for all the wants of the Government in time of peace, that act is already an established and undisputed success.

NOT AN EXPANSIONIST.

Mr. Speaker, I am not an expansionist. I deplore the spirit of expansion. I regret that this new idea of extending our territory beyond the seas has crept into the minds of many of my countrymen. I fear its final consequences to our republican institutions. It was the undoubted purpose of the founders of this Republic to plant here on these shores, between the two great oceans, a government of free people, a government of the people, a government ever under the control of the people.

It was the evident purpose of our fathers that our Government should be made free and be kept free from foreign alliances and foreign complications. Under that policy we have prospered as no people ever prospered. We have grown great and rich and strong. But great and rich and strong as we are, our country is yet undeveloped. We have rich valleys yet untilled, mountains whose treasures are yet unopened, streams that yet turn no wheel. Why should we turn away from the course through which we have prospered and are prospering to follow new and untried ways which lead whither we know not?

STAND BY OUR SOLDIERS.

But, though I am not an expansionist, though I deplore the evident purpose of the Administration and the great party behind the Administration to make the Philippine Islands and Puerto Rico integral parts of our Government, and thereby possibly, and even probably, change the whole aim and purpose of our patriot fathers, I still would not for all the world withhold from our brave soldiers now struggling, bleeding, and dying in the Philippines all possible support, moral and financial. If we need the money derived from the operation of this war-revenue law to support our soldiers, then let the law stand. The people will pay these taxes unmurmuringly and gladly.

DO WE NEED THE TAXES?

But do we need the taxes? I have already shown that we have more money now in the Treasury than we need, and it is accumulating more and more day by day. It is accumulating there because of the operation of an extraordinary tax law, made to carry on a war with a foreign power, which war is long since over. It is evidently not needed for the suppression of the "insurrection" in the archipelago, because it is not all being used for that purpose. It is accumulating or being used to anticipate interest on Government bonds. Money is being piled up in the Treasury and taken out of circulation. Are you piling it there because you need it or merely that you may boast, during the approaching political campaign, of the splendid financiering of the Republican party? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has six minutes remaining.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. How much time has this side of the House?

The CHAIRMAN. There have been twenty-seven minutes more used on this side of the House than on the other side.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. How much time have we remaining on this side of the House?

The CHAIRMAN. One hundred and twenty-five minutes have been consumed by the Democratic side and ninety-eight minutes on the other side.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I have twenty-one minutes remaining, then, to my credit, and I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee as much as he may desire.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is mistaken; he will have sixteen minutes.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on this side?

The CHAIRMAN. Forty-three minutes.

Mr. BINGHAM. The gentleman from Georgia generously yielded to me, and I will yield back to him his own time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Thank you. I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention for a moment to something of the expense made necessary by the

condition of affairs we are in, brought about by the Republican legislation in order to maintain the military establishment of this country for the present fiscal year. As I understand it, this appropriation bill carries a deficiency for the military establishment of $47,602,032.61. Now, of course, to this deficiency should be added an amount already heretofore appropriated and expended, which I understand to be $75,247,811.

The two sums when added together make the enormous sum of $121,000,000 in round numbers, to be necessary, in the opinion of the Committee on Appropriations, and not controverted, it seems, by any gentleman on the floor on either side of the House. The enormous sum of $121,000,000 is said to be necessary for the maintenance of the military establishment of this country in a time of peace. It is not improper to ask, Whither are we drifting, Mr. Chairman? It seems we are to spend one hundred and forty-odd million dollars year by year for pensions, and then by reason of the policy of the Republican party we are to expend $121,000,000 to meet the military expenses of this Government. I take the time now only to call attention to this fact.

I also want to speak upon another matter and shall not address myself further at this time to the items in this bill. It is well known to the House and to the country that recently the management of the Treasury of the United States has been challenged by some of the great papers and by many of the thinking people of this country. I am not inclined to join in a wanton attack upon public officers. I do not believe that that kind of attack ought to be encouraged.

I believe as a general thing public officers of either party are inclined to be honest, that they put forward the best efforts they have and use all their capacity and ability to administer the affairs of great offices which are committed to their hands. So, I say, I would not join in a mere partisan attack upon the Secretary of the Treasury or any other officer clothed with a great public trust. But certain facts have been developed, and certain information has been sent to Congress by reason of a resolution of inquiry, and I deem it not out of the way to call the attention of this House and the attention of the country to some of those facts.

I know it has been charged that the Secretary of the Treasury has publicly and openly violated the section of the Revised Statutes which reads as follows:

Every officer or other person charged by any act of Congress with the safe-keeping of the public moneys who fails to safely keep the same without depositing in banks or exchanging for other funds than as specially allowed by law shall be guilty of embezzlement of the money so deposited or exchanged, and shall be imprisoned not less than six months nor more than ten years, and fined in a sum of money equal to the amount so embezzled.

It has been charged also in some of the great newspapers of the country that the Secretary of the Treasury is guilty of embezzlement, and that he should be impeached by this House. I am not going to that extent. In fact, I do not think it is necessary to do it. The matter to which I call attention specifically is the conduct of the Secretary of the Treasury in reference to the sale of the custom-house property in the city of New York. The sale of this property was by authority of an act of Congress approved March 2, 1899. He was authorized to sell this property at not less than $3,000,000 and to deposit the net proceeds of sale in the United States Treasury as miscellaneous receipts derived from the sale of Government property. This act of Congress contains, among other things, the following provisions:

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to sell at public or private sale, to the highest bidder, after due advertisement, but for not less than $3,000,000, the present custom-house property in the city of New York, bounded by Wall, William, and Hanover streets, and Exchange place, and to deposit the proceeds of the sale, after payment of the usual incidental expenses, in the United States Treasury as miscellaneous receipts derived from the sale of Government property; and in case of such sale the Secretary of Treasury shall lease said premises from the purchaser or purchasers thereof, at a rental which shall not exceed 4 per cent per annum on the purchase price, for use as a custom-house until the new custom-house shall be ready for occupancy, upon such terms as he may deem advantageous, and such sale shall be subject to such right of lease; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to accept the said purchase price in several payments, from time to time, as he may deem most advantageous: *Provided, however*, That the use, occupation, and possession of said property shall not be surrendered until the new custom-house is ready for occupation and final payment is fully made.

SEC. 5. That the appropriation of $750,000, made in section 1 of this act, in addition to the balance in the Treasury remaining unexpended under the provisions of the act of Congress approved September 14, 1888, for the acquisition of the Bowling Green site, and the further sum of $1,000,000 for the preparation of plans and the commencement of the work of construction, appropriated in section 2 of this act, shall be reimbursed out of the proceeds of the sale of the present custom-house property, provided for in section 4 of this act, when such proceeds have been covered into the Treasury.

Now, it is well known to us that recently a resolution of inquiry was sent to the Secretary of the Treasury and certain information called for in respect to this sale of the custom-house property and some other matters, such as the depositing of public moneys in national banks. In answer to that resolution, which only covered a few lines, the Secretary of the Treasury has made answer, and I hold his answer in my hand, a document covering 348 printed pages. It may have been necessary for him to make his answer in this way, to cover it up in this great record, but it seems to me that he could have made a plain and simple answer to the inquiries which were propounded without so much of language.

But inasmuch as the matter has been followed up by a gentleman on this floor by the introduction of a further resolution of inquiry, and while that resolution is pending before one of the committees of the House, I do not intend to enter into a discussion of what might be discovered or brought to light by that investigation, if one is ordered, or what is developed by the answer of the Secretary of the Treasury as to that part of the resolution of inquiry which relates to the handling of the public moneys and the depositing of the internal-revenue receipts in the national banks of this country.

I say I will not discuss that feature of the object of the inquiry; because if there is an investigation, it will be time enough to do so after the facts are fully developed by that investigation.

But this one feature, to which I propose to devote a few moments, is covered fully by the Secretary of the Treasury in his answer now before us, and that is the sale of the custom-house property in the city of New York. Inasmuch as his answer covers this action upon his part, I take it that possibly it would not be necessary to further investigate that one item or matter. Therefore it is legitimate now to comment upon the action of the Secretary of the Treasury in reference to it.

I say I would not encourage a wanton assault upon the Secretary of the Treasury, and I am willing to have the admission made for the purposes of this argument that he has not violated the strict letter of the law in his handling of the proceeds of the sale of that custom-house property. It may not be known to every gentleman how this sale was made by the Secretary. He made the sale on the 3d day of July, 1899. The law which authorized him to make that sale provided a minimum price at which the property should be sold, and that minimum was $3,000,000. He had very full discretion as to the sale.

Mr. BERRY. What did he get for it?

Mr. RICHARDSON. The property was sold on the 3d day of July, 1899, for $3,265,000, to the National City Bank of New York.

Mr. GAINES. Will my colleague allow me to interrupt him right there?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes.

Mr. GAINES. And that was $40,000 less than it cost.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Three million two hundred and sixty-five thousand dollars was the purchase price. I say it is charged by some that he is guilty of embezzlement of this money, technically, under section 5940 of the Revised Statutes, because according to his own statement he did not deposit this money directly in the Treasury of the United States, but did deposit it in the bank to which he had sold it, the contention being that the depositing of this money in that bank, which was a United States depository in the city of New York, was not depositing it in the Treasury.

I have seen it stated in some of the papers that the Supreme Court of the United States, as recently as last November, held that a deposit by an officer of the Government of public money in a national bank which was a depository was not a deposit or a payment into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. HOPKINS. One moment right there. Does the gentleman state that that deposit in one of the national banks that was a Government depository was not in compliance with the law?

Mr. RICHARDSON. No, I do not say that. I say, let it be conceded that that is not embezzlement, properly speaking. Let it be conceded that under the law he had the right to deposit it in that bank. I want to come to what occurred. As I understand the decision of last November—the style of the case being Coudert, executor, *vs.* The United States, which has been quoted in some of the newspapers—it is assumed that it was decided by Justice McKenna, of the Supreme Court, that a public officer could not deposit money which he had collected—public money—in a national bank which was a depository, and when sued for the money, the bank having failed, plead that he had deposited the money in the Treasury of the United States. As I understand that decision—

Mr. DOLLIVER. I should be very glad to have the gentleman refer more definitely to that decision.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have the decision here and will do so.

Mr. HEPBURN. If the gentleman wishes to know exactly what was decided, I can refer him to the page.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I know exactly what it decided.

Mr. HEPBURN. It is not as intimated, however. There is nothing in the decision like what the gentleman has intimated.

Mr. RICHARDSON. What intimation did I make?

Mr. HEPBURN. You intimated this. You used this as an illustration: You said the Supreme Court had decided that an officer could not deposit public moneys in a national depository.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Well, I say that is what this case decides.

Mr. HEPBURN. But it decided that that was not public money.

Mr. SULZER. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I must decline to yield. I say this, Mr.

Chairman: The decision is just as I have stated. The officer who deposited this money in the case cited by me was a marshal. He had sold certain property of the United States. He had deposited the money to his own credit in a depository, and when that depository failed and he undertook to acquit himself, the Supreme Court said that was not depositing the money in the Treasury of the United States. That is what this case decides, and I say when gentlemen make the claim against the Secretary that he had no right to deposit that money in a national depository, they are not sustained by this decision of Justice McKenna.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman allow me for a moment?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not want to get up a controversy, because I am trying to say that the Secretary of the Treasury is not guilty of embezzlement under this decision of the Supreme Court.

Mr. HEPBURN. But the court held in that case that it was not public money; that that was money within the custody of the court; that the marshal, an officer of the court, had deposited it there, and therefore it was not public money.

Mr. RICHARDSON. There is no controversy between us on that. I am saying that the Secretary of the Treasury is not guilty of embezzlement under this decision. Now, that is all you want me to say, I take it. That is what I do say. I am not seeking to hold the Secretary of the Treasury guilty of embezzlement under this decision, because the decision does not sustain such contention.

Mr. SULZER rose.

Mr. HOPKINS. Will not the gentleman go a step further and say what the law is—that the Secretary of the Treasury having deposited that money in that national bank, which was a Government depository, he was complying with the strict letter as well as the spirit of the law?

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. RICHARDSON. What is it that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] desires?

Mr. SULZER. I want to say that in the act for the sale of the custom-house property in New York City it was specifically provided that that money should be paid into the Treasury and not into a national bank.

Mr. HOPKINS. It is paid into the Treasury when it is paid into a Government depository.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Now, I decline to yield further, because there is no controversy between the gentleman from Iowa or from Illinois and myself. I say that under that decision, under the last utterance of the Supreme Court of the United States on this subject, the Secretary of the Treasury, in my judgment, would not have been guilty of a violation of the law if he deposited this money in the City National Bank of New York, it being a Government depository.

Now, what more can I say upon that? I know, as my friend from New York [Mr. SULZER] says, that he was required to cover the money into the Treasury; but I say this decision last November of Mr. Justice McKenna does not decide that he did not cover this money into the Treasury when he put it into a depository in the city of New York. Justice McKenna's opinion does not make the Secretary of the Treasury an embezzler or violator of the law, because it may be that if the Secretary of the Treasury puts money into a public depository—a national bank which is a public depository—to his own credit and which he can check out at pleasure, he has complied with the law. Now, that is all any of you contend for.

But I want to go beyond that. There is more in the Secretary's action than this. What is this transaction, Mr. Chairman? On the 3d of July the Secretary of the Treasury, by the authority and power vested in him by law, undertook to sell, and did sell, the custom-house property in the city of New York for $3,265,000. Now, sir, just before he did that, the Secretary of the Treasury received a letter from one A. B. Hepburn, vice-president of the National City Bank of New York, and I propose to quote about three lines of that letter, because it bears upon the subsequent action of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to ask for time, but I would like to have a few minutes if the House will indulge me. Has the gentleman from Georgia any further time?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I think I have some.

The CHAIRMAN. All the time remaining belongs to the other side of the House—forty-three minutes.

Mr. BINGHAM. I will yield the gentleman some time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania to give some time to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. BINGHAM. If I have any time, I will yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. SULZER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have ten minutes.

Mr. BINGHAM. Assuming that I have the time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VAN VOORHIS], I yield five minutes.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I can hardly get through in five minutes. I should like to have ten.

Mr. BINGHAM. Very, well; go on; I yield the gentleman ten minutes.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Now, then, what Mr. Hepburn wrote the Secretary of the Treasury on the 5th day of June is shown by the following letter:

THE NATIONAL CITY BANK OF NEW YORK,
New York, June 5, 1897.

MY DEAR MR. GAGE: The National City Bank of this city, of which I recently became vice-president through the consolidation of the business of the Third National with it, is one of the banks designated as a United States depository, and I write to request that in any changes which may be made under the Administration we may not be disturbed in this respect.

We should like to remain a United States depository as at present. Of course the bank is very strong, and if you will take the pains to look at our list of directors you will see that we also have very great political claims in view of what was done during the canvass last year.

Yours, very truly,

A. B. HEPBURN.

Hon. LYMAN J. GAGE,
United States Treasury, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Chairman, mark these words:

Of course the bank is very strong, and if you will take pains to look at the list of our directors you will see that we also have very great political claims in view of what was done during the canvass last year.

Now, here is the letter of Mr. Hepburn, vice-president of the National City Bank, calling upon the Secretary of the Treasury for assistance for his bank, based upon what they, the directors of his bank, did for the Republican party in 1896.

At that time there was deposited in this National City Bank only a small sum of Government money. The amount on the 14th of May, which is before this letter was written, it is charged and not denied, was only $200,000. Mr. Chairman, I must hurry along. After that date, and not very long afterwards, in the same year, the National City Bank received of the $58,000,000 paid in the settlement of the Union Pacific debt $24,000,000 on deposit. On July 14, 1898, the balance of the Government money deposited without interest in the National City Bank, it is charged and not denied, was $19,579,000.

On September 20, 1899, likewise, the balance was $29,000,000. In the floating of the war loan of $200,000,000 in June, 1898, in which 348 banks participated, the National City Bank received $14,000,000. On July 8, 1898, the balance was $10,500,000, showing that the bank had the free use of over $10,000,000 for six months. Very soon after this appeal made by Mr. Hepburn to Mr. Gage, Secretary of the Treasury, for help, the deposits of public money rapidly increased in this bank.

On the 3d day of July the custom-house property was sold, and very soon thereafter we find that Mr. Hepburn, acting for his bank, called upon Secretary Gage for authority to deposit with the Treasury United States bonds, in order that he might pay the purchase price of this property by a simple credit of the amount of the purchase price on the bank's books. It did deposit, we are told, $3,865,000 of Government bonds with the Treasury.

These bonds, of course, were bearing interest to the bank. What followed? Instead of paying $3,265,000, the purchase price of the property, the Secretary says he simply required the bank to give him a credit on its books for $3,215,000, leaving only the pitiful sum of $50,000 unpaid. He allowed the bank to deposit with the Secretary of the Treasury $3,865,000 of bonds, on which it was to get interest, leaving as a deposit with the bank $3,215,000, a portion of the purchase price, which sum the bank could put at interest, and then turned around immediately and rented from the bank the same property which he had sold to it, agreeing to pay the bank a rental for the property, a sum equal to 4 per cent of the purchase price. Here it is not inappropriate to inquire, What, by this juggling, did the bank get, and what did the Treasury get?

The Treasury got nothing except the deposit on paper of the $3,215,000, a mere credit on the bank's books. What did the bank get? It had deposited bonds upon which it got 4 or 5 per cent interest, or whatever the interest is on the bonds. It kept the money, $3,215,000—the purchase price—in its own vaults, which they doubtless loaned at any rate of interest they could get, and I am told by the public press that during the late panic banks in New York loaned money as high as 100 per cent.

Mr. SULZER. One hundred and eighty per cent.

Mr. RICHARDSON. One hundred and eighty per cent. They kept the $3,215,000 in the bank, and did not turn it over to the United States Treasury except in so far as that bank as a public depository is the Treasury; and then turned round immediately and charged the Treasury of the United States, or the Government of the United States, rent for the use and occupation of this property for which it had not paid a dollar.

Mr. SULZER. And left taxes to be paid to the State of New York.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Not only that, but they left unpaid $50-000, as the correspondence shows, in order not to pass the title to the bank and make it liable for taxes to the State and city of New York.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have got but a moment, am talking rapidly, and I can not yield. I am stating the facts. The only object, if I can understand the matter, in holding back the $50,000 was, as stated in this correspondence, that the title would not pass from the Government to this National City Bank. That is, that the title would not pass until the entire purchase money was paid. What reason was there for holding back that pitiful sum of $50,000 when they took the credit for $3,215,000? They paid no money. Why not take credit for all the purchase price—$3,265,000? The inference is clear, and part of the correspondence of the bank shows that they said, "We do not want to begin to pay taxes on this property until you pass the title."

The agreement was that the title was not to be passed until all the purchase money was paid. Therefore, by an agreement with the Secretary of the Treasury, this bank that was appealing for help because of the money its officers had paid to the Republican campaign fund in 1896 was exempted from paying fifty or sixty thousand dollars to the city and State of New York for taxes. The Government sells the property and gets no money for it, but simply a transfer of credit on paper, and the bank reserves the money in its vault and loans it out at any rate of interest it can get and then charges the Government 4 per cent on the purchase money for the use and occupation of this very property. Now, I ask, and I want to know if any fair-minded man, even the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS], who has just risen to confront me with a question—if he will stand up here and say that is dealing properly with trust money of the United States? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HOPKINS. Does not the gentleman from Tennessee know that from the time the bank leased this property to the Government it will be responsible for the taxes?

Mr. RICHARDSON. No; the contention is that they are not liable for the taxes so long as the title remains in the Government of the United States.

Mr. HOPKINS. The title has passed when they leased the property.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The title has not passed.

Mr. HOPKINS. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I beg your pardon. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOPKINS. How could they lease property the title to which they did not have? The mere fact that the deed had not been made would make no difference; the bank would be responsible for the taxes.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Then by your own statement you have got your Secretary of the Treasury liable to impeachment in this House and before the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I will tell you why.

Mr. HOPKINS. Will the gentleman allow me.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I decline to yield further. I say you have made him liable, because he says in this letter that he did agree to pay the bank a rental equal to 4 per cent on the purchase price from the date of the sale. You say he did not have to do it unless the bank had the title. He says the title was not passed to the bank, and by your own reasoning he did what was unlawful and for which he ought to be impeached. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS].

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, it was not my purpose to engage in this discussion, and I should not had the gentleman from Tennessee who has just addressed the committee drawn fair inferences from the facts presented by him. The Secretary of the Treasury can meet any facts in connection with this transaction, and they show that his conduct has been honest and fair, and that he has shown great ability in looking out for the interests of the Government of the United States. [Derisive laughter on the Democratic side.]

He could not provide against the insinuations, dishonest in my judgment, that are hurled against him by the gentlemen from the other side of the Chamber. The gentleman says that under the statement that I made the Secretary of the Treasury is liable to impeachment. I deny it, and any man who has a thimble full of brains or any knowledge of law ought to know better than to make a statement of that character.

Mr. Chairman, my statement was predicated upon the statement made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] that the bank would not be required to pay taxes upon this property until the deed was passed. I undertook to call his attention to the fact that the moment that the bank took possession of the custom-house under the contract of sale and executed a lease to the Government of the United States, the mere fact that the paper deed had not been made would make no difference so far as its title to the property was concerned, and its liability to pay taxes to the city of New York and to the State of New York.

The deed is not the sale. It is only an evidence of such sale. Possession and acts of ownership, such as the execution of a lease of the custom-house, is also evidence of purchase and ownership. And for that reason the argument that the gentleman has made, that the Government of the United States has been paying interest at 4 per cent upon the purchase price of a piece of property when the title was still in the Government of the United States, falls to the ground, at least among gentlemen who know anything about legal transactions. Now, sir, anybody who has read——

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOPKINS. I can not, Mr. Chairman, now.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yielded to the gentleman.

Mr. HOPKINS. The gentleman declined to yield to me.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yielded to you for a question. Does the gentleman from Illinois decline to yield? All right.

Mr. HOPKINS. I decline to yield. Now, I say this answer of the Secretary of the Treasury, which is here in the possession of every member of this House, exonerates the Secretary of the Treasury from any misconduct whatever.

Mr. SULZER. On the contrary, it is a confession.

Mr. HOPKINS. It shows, Mr. Chairman, that this bank was selected as a Government depository long before the present Secretary of the Treasury held the high position which he now honors. It shows that this bank had been selected by a Democratic Secretary of the Treasury and used by a Democratic Secretary of the Treasury because of its well-known financial standing and ability to meet all of the requirements of the Government of the United States, and the present Secretary of the Treasury, finding that its course had been honorable and just toward the Government of the United States, simply continued it as a Government depository.

But instead of following the example of his predecessor and making a few of these banks his pet banks for the purpose of benefiting them the record that has been presented to this House shows that he selected nearly three hundred of these banks all over the country, situated in forty-three different States, for the purpose of benefiting the Government of the United States and to provide against such false and malicious charges as have been made against him here to-day.

And this record shows that with reference to this money that was deposited there in payment of the custom-house, instead of having it so that it could be used by the bank for the purposes indicated by the gentleman from Tennessee, it was just the contrary. It shows that that money was subject to check day by day, and that bank was compelled to transact its business in a manner so that all of this money at any moment, without any notice whatever, could be withdrawn from that bank and placed in the subtreasury in the city of New York or in any other place where it would best benefit the people of the United States. Why is it that any outcry should be made here? Is not this money in this bank as safe as it would be in the Treasury building, in the capital of our country? Does anybody deny that?

Mr. SULZER. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. HOPKINS. Is it not as safe as it would be in the subtreasury in the city of New York? Does anybody deny that? Where, Mr. Chairman, has the Government of the United States been injured by any transaction of the Secretary of the Treasury in regard to any of these deposits. I say, Mr. Chairman, that he is entitled to the approbation of his countrymen for the splendid manner in which he has handled the finances of the Government I care not what their political affiliations may be. Secretary Gage has made a record that every American ought to praise instead of denounce. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

[Mr. BINGHAM addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, if no one desires to take the floor, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DALZELL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 6237 and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask unanimous consent that those who have addressed the committee on this bill be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD, provided it is done within five days.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that gentlemen who have addressed the committee on the bill this afternoon may have five days within which to extend their remarks.

Mr. SULZER. I ask also that that leave may extend to gentlemen who may speak to-morrow.

Mr. CANNON. Let each day take care for itself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

TWELFTH CENSUS.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on the Twelfth Census to report Senate bill 2179 with sundry amendments; and I will state to the House that I desire to take this bill up and pass it, if possible, immediately after the conclusion of the consideration of the bill which is now being considered by the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on the Twelfth Census, reports the following bill, which the Clerk will read by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2179) relating to the Twelfth and subsequent censuses, and giving to the Director thereof additional power and authority in certain cases, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman gives notice that he will call the bill up for consideration immediately after the consideration of the urgent deficiency bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, does he present this as a privileged report?

The SPEAKER. Yes; as a privileged report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Chair hold that it is a privileged report?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman make the point of order that it is not privileged?

Mr. RUSSELL. I raise the point of order that it is not a privileged matter.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of the opinion that it is privileged.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I want to make the point of order. I do not know what makes this a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. There is a point of order pending. If any gentleman desires to be heard, the Chair will gladly hear him.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut, if he desires to discuss the point of order. I want to say that the burden of proof is upon the gentleman who presents measures here and claims they are matters of privilege, and not upon those who oppose it. I do not understand that there is any general rule, or any special rule, that makes a report from the Committee on Census privileged. If there is, it has escaped my notice up to this time. I state here now that there is no rule that makes a report from the Committee on Census privileged, I do not care in what shape it comes, or that gives it privilege over other bills.

Mr. SULZER. May I ask the gentleman from Illinois a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes.

Mr. SULZER. I would like to ask whether a number of representatives from labor organizations did not ask for a hearing on this bill?

Mr. HOPKINS. What of it? [Laughter.]

Mr. SULZER. I assume from the answer of the gentleman that they did, and that they were refused.

Mr. HOPKINS. I am not responsible for what the gentleman assumes. When we come to consider the bill, if the gentleman has anything to say on that subject, if it is worthy a reply, there will be a reply made to it.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon the point of order, and gentlemen must confine their remarks to it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not object to this bill being considered next in order after the urgent deficiency bill, but what I do object to is establishing a precedent that a report from the Committee on Census is a privileged one. If the gentleman wants unanimous consent to take the bill up immediately after the consideration of the present one, he has it so far as I am concerned; but I do most earnestly protest against the establishment of a precedent that makes this bill, or any report from the Committee on Census, privileged under the rule.

Mr. HOPKINS. I will state to the gentleman from Tennessee that this is not establishing a precedent; it is following what has already been established by previous Congresses.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not understand what authority the gentleman has for that statement.

Mr. HOPKINS. It has been held by previous Speakers that bills of this character are privileged bills.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not think there will be any objection to taking it up by unanimous consent after the present bill is disposed of. Nobody on this side will object.

Mr. SULZER. I shall object unless you give the representatives of the labor organizations a hearing.

Mr. HOPKINS. Evidently the gentleman in charge of the other side does not control it. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman's statement in that respect is gratuitous. The gentleman from Connecticut was the first who made a statement challenging it on that side of the House, and he is not following the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HOPKINS. "The gentleman from Illinois" is not trying to act as leader.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen will be in order. The question under discussion is the point of order. Does the gentleman from Connecticut wish to be heard?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed, the bill comes from the Committee on Census, of which I happen to be a member. It is a bill which proposes certain amendments to the general census law which was passed in the last Congress. The bill was considered in committee, and no suggestion was made in that committee that there was anything in it which gave it a privileged character. For myself I do not know of any single item or provision in the bill which makes it privileged.

If my colleague, the chairman of the committee, has any statement to make of its privileged character, I would like to hear it. I should have expected to have heard it in committee. I should have expected to have heard the suggestion when we were considering the bill in committee that it was to be presented as a privileged matter. On the contrary, late this afternoon the chairman of the committee did not intimate that it was to be so considered or that it was to be brought up as a privileged matter.

I am not opposed to the early consideration of the bill. A good portion of the bill is an emergency bill, and the Director of the Census is anxious for its early passage. For that reason I called the attention of the Chair to the fact that I did not think it was a privileged matter. I do not antagonize the early consideration of the bill. The chairman of the committee states that similar bills have been held to be privileged matter. It is not in my memory that that is the case.

Mr. HOPKINS. I am a little surprised that my colleague on the committee makes any reflection upon the fact that this matter was not discussed in committee, because our committee does not determine the constitutional right that this bill has as a privileged matter. I was simply directed by the committee to report the bill. The Committee on the Twelfth Census would have no authority by any vote that might be taken in that committee to make it a privileged matter or a nonprivileged matter, as the case might be, and certainly everything that has been said by my colleage on that subject is entirely foreign to the question which is now before the House.

This is a high constitutional privilege, and the legislation that is proposed in this bill is in accordance with the requirements of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States. It is above all rules of this House, and when it is reported here the committee having it in charge have the clear right to call it up at any time as a matter of privilege under the Constitution of the United States and have it considered by the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, if my colleague will allow me, in the last Congress was it held that our general census bill was a privileged matter?

Mr. HOPKINS. In the last Congress I did not present it as such because it happened to be reported so that I could take it up and have it passed under a suspension of the rules; but had it not been for the fact that I could get an earlier and better hearing under the rules of the House at that time, I should have done in that case as I do now, and have asked to have the bill reported as a privileged matter, and so notified the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Illinois I want to say that it is not the Constitution with which we are dealing, but it is the rules of this House, and under our rules certain measures are made privileged, and the rules expressly provide what those matters are. In the absence of any provision that a certain matter is privileged, no matter if it is a bill that ought to be passed, no matter if it is a bill provided for in the Constitution, it is not privileged, and in our rules which expressly provides that this measure shall be privileged.

There is the rule which makes it privileged. We act under special rules. There is no provision here that a report from the Committee on Census upon measures referred to that committee shall be privileged. The rules say that reports from the Committee on Ways and Means on matters referred to that committee affecting the revenues shall be privileged, and the rules also say that reports from the Committee on Appropriations are privileged. Reports from the Committee on Printing on matters referred to it—printing for the House or the two Houses of Congress—under the rules are privileged. But there is nothing that says a report on matters referred to the Committee on Census shall be privileged, and in the absence of any such provision it seems to me, with all due respect to my able friend from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS], I must say that I do not find any authority for his contention, and I think it would be monstrous to hold that this report would be a privileged one. In order that we may preserve the integrity of our proceedings, in order that we may not establish a bad precedent, it does seem to me that we ought not to hold that this is privileged.

It may be that it ought to be considered. Conceding that, the

rules are ample under which it can be brought up. A special report from the Committee on Rules will bring it up in a moment, and it can be called up in the morning hour. That can be done immediately after the passage of this bill. There are many ways in which it can be considered. There is no difficulty about that. The course stated by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RUSSELL] may be taken. He is not opposing the early consideration of the bill, nor am I; but I do object most earnestly to an infraction of the rules of the House in holding a bill to be privileged when there is no law, no provision in our rules, no provision anywhere, that makes it privileged.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOPKINS. One moment. I do not contend that in the rules as adopted there is any provision in any specific rule saying that this bill is a privileged bill. My contention is far beyond that. I hold that any constitutional right guaranteed to a member of this House, or any constitutional rights that are guaranteed to any measure, can not be taken away from the member or from the committee reporting a measure of that kind by the rules of the House. And this measure is something that is authorized and required by the Constitution of the United States, and as such I maintain that it is a privileged matter.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule upon the question.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. How does this question arise now?

The SPEAKER. The question arises by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS], chairman of the Special Committee on the Twelfth Census, bringing in his report.

Were this an original question that had not been passed upon, the Chair might rule differently than he feels constrained to rule at this time.

The Constitution of the United States makes it mandatory upon Congress to take a census of the people every ten years. It also requires the Congress to make an apportionment of the members of Congress for each State. The Constitution also authorizes the Congress to adopt rules for its procedure.

If this were an original question, the Chair would be inclined to hold that if the House adopts rules of procedure and leaves out any committee from the list of committees whose reports are privileged that that committee would be remitted to those rules of procedure adopted by the House for its guidance. But the Chair finds that a question which the Chair thinks is identical in every particular was ruled upon in the Fifty-first Congress. I quote:

A bill making an apportionment of Representatives presents a privileged question. On December 16, 1890, Mr. Mark H. Dunnell, of Minnesota, as a privileged question, moved that the House proceed to the consideration of the bill of the House (H. R. 8500) making an apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Eleventh Census. The bill having been read at length, Mr. James H. Blount, of Georgia, made the point of order that under the rule the Committee on the Eleventh Census was not included among those having the right to report at any time such business as would properly come before said committee, and that, therefore, the consideration of the bill at this time was not a privileged question.

The House will see that it could not be more fairly and squarely stated than Mr. Blount stated it:

The Speaker, Mr. Reed, being in the chair, overruled the point of order, on the ground that a bill making an apportionment is a privileged question, and it being a constitutional duty imposed on Congress, the consideration of the bill was clearly a privileged question.

At that time the Fifty-first Congress had its Committee on Rules, and probably there never was one more active than the Committee on Rules of that Congress. It was equipped with all the rules of procedure, and yet the Committee on the Eleventh Census was not clothed with the power to report at any time. Now, the Chair is unable to see any distinction in principle between an apportionment bill and a bill for taking the Twelfth Census. The Chair has examined this bill. It is amendatory of the act which we passed in the last Congress for taking the Twelfth Census. It is supplemental to that act. It contains simply provisions for taking the Twelfth Census, all in the same line, and all required by the Constitution.

If the decision made in regard to the consideration of the apportionment bill was sound law, it seems to the Chair clear that it ought to be a sound ruling that this is privileged. The Chair thinks gentlemen of the House will all agree that when decisions are made it is well, unless they are clearly in abuse of the rules of the House, that these precedents should be followed. It is a guide to all members and will aid them in their work.

Now, when the bill for the Twelfth Census was first brought up the gentleman in charge of the bill, the same gentleman as now presents this, offered it as a privileged report. The Speaker did not rule upon it. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] reserved all rights against the bill, saying that he was not clear that it was a privileged bill at all, and with that reservation the bill was considered as introduced in the House, to be printed for the information of the House, and the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois, gave notice that he would call it up the following Monday.

That being suspension day, it was passed under suspension of the rules, and the suggested questions of the week before, or some days before, were not passed on. But the Chair is clearly of the opinion that the decision made in the Fifty-first Congress is sufficient warrant for holding this to be a privileged question.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I desire to say that if this were a bill to enumerate the people, then I would agree to the Chair's proposition; if it were a bill to apportion Representatives in accordance with a census which had already been taken, I would agree with the Speaker's proposition, because both duties are plainly enjoined by the Constitution. The Constitution provides that Representatives shall be apportioned according to numbers, and the numbers are ascertained by a census taken every ten years.

The duty of taking the census is one enjoined by the Constitution; the duty of apportioning the Representatives according to that census is also enjoined upon Congress by the Constitution; but as to all other matters they are not enjoined by the Constitution, and the mere question of printing such data as may be collected is not by a constitutional injunction. Now, sir, the Constitution nowhere requires that the census shall go further than a mere enumeration of the people.

Mr. HOPKINS. Will the gentleman allow me? He evidently misapprehends some portion of this bill. This bill that I have reported provides——

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state to the gentleman from Texas that the Chair has ruled on this question.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. In order that I may be in order, then, I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas appeals from the decision of the Chair, and the question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I desire to be heard on the appeal. Now I shall be glad to hear the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HOPKINS. I judge from the remark the gentleman was making that he has misapprehended the character of the bill just reported by the Committee on the Census. I will say to him that it provides, among other things, for enumeration as well as some of the provisions stated by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. If this were an enumeration of the people for the purpose of apportioning the Representatives the bill would be privileged.

The committee, however—and that was the point I desired to call the attention of the Chair to—the committee is not a privileged committee, and no committee is, as suggested by my distinguished friend from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], except the rule makes it so; but there are matters which are privileged. For instance, I doubt if there is any provision of the rule which requires the immediate consideration of a veto message of the President, yet it has been held so, inasmuch as the Constitution says, "They shall proceed at once to consider it;" and that is a privileged matter.

The impeachment of any member of the Government, I take it, is not made privileged by the rules, though I have not specially investigated for the purpose of ascertaining; but the impeachment of any civil officer of the Government is not specially made a privileged matter by the rules; yet no gentleman on either side of the Chamber would doubt for a moment that if a member should rise and propose the impeachment of any civil officer of the Government it would be a privileged matter.

So, undoubtedly, if a bill to apportion the Representatives in the case stated by the Speaker, or a bill to enumerate the people in every decennial period, could be presented to the House, it and both of them are privileged; but the point to which I desire to call the attention of the Chair is that the committee is not a privileged committee, and that nothing from the committee except, first, a proposition to take a census of the people, to enumerate the people; next, to apportion the Representatives in accordance with that enumeration, could possibly be privileged, because no other two propositions are enjoined either in express terms or by fair implication by the Constitution.

Now, if the gentleman from Illinois has embarrassed his privileged proposition by incorporating into his bill other matter which is not so privileged, then he has reduced the whole proposition from privileged to unprivileged matter. I would be the last one, here or elsewhere, to insist that we needed the permission of the rules of the House to proceed with the plain constitutional duty to enumerate the people once every ten years.

I would be the last here, or elsewhere, to raise an objection against an apportionment in accordance with that enumeration, because that is a duty Congress can not refuse to perform if it keeps its oath; but, as to other matters, as to the question of printing, as to the question of details, classification of the people, their occupation, their infirmities and misfortunes, they are nowhere comprehended within the constitutional provision, and any matter relating to that really is not a matter of privilege.

If the Speaker shall insist that because it comes from the committee, because it relates to the taking of the census, therefore it must be privileged, I take it that our friends on this side of the House would feel compelled to save that point by appealing from the decision of the Chair. I desire it to be distinctly understood that the appeal does not rest upon the objection that a bill to enumerate the people or to apportion Representatives would not be privileged.

Mr. HOPKINS. The gentleman does not care to press his motion?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take any further time, except to make one illustration. As has been well stated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], whenever you couple matter that is not privileged with matter privileged, no matter how highly, you take away the privileged character. For illustration, a report from the Committee on Printing has always been held, where the printing is for the use of the House, or the two Houses, to be privileged; but if you insert in that resolution a proposition for a few hundred copies of the matter you have printed for one of the Departments, immediately the privileged character of the resolution is gone.

Now, this bill may be privileged, under the ruling of the Chair, for the enumeration of the people, but when you couple with it unprivileged matter it takes away the privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that the point made by him is clearly well made; but there is not an element in this bill but that might have properly been in the original bill. What the judgment of the House may be as to the elements of this bill is another question, but it is all germane and pertinent to the enumeration of the Twelfth Census. The members of the House may differ as to the propriety of some of these provisions, but whether they do or not, they are all in line with the demands of the Constitution which require this body to take the census every ten years and to provide the manner for doing the same.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. May I suggest that the Constitution plainly indicates the purpose for which it commands the census to be taken, and that is for the purpose of the apportionment of Representatives among the several States. Now, surely the question whether they are blind, lame, or halt does not reach that question, and I do not think it is in response to the constitutional injunction of making an enumeration once every ten years.

The SPEAKER. The language of the Constitution is this:

> The actual enumeration shall be made within three years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent term of ten years, in such manner as they shall by law direct.

Now, taking the census is the basis of apportionment, and the apportionment follows. Both are absolutely and explicitly commanded by the Constitution. If the decision about the apportionment was a correct decision, there can be no escape from the Chair's holding that the provision of law for taking the census is also within the constitutional provision.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I would suggest to the Chair that the Chair omitted to read the first part, which provides for the apportionment of Representatives and direct taxes. Now, as a means of ascertaining the basis of that apportionment, it directs the census to be taken.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not read that because that has been repealed.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Only by the fourteenth amendment, and the fourteenth amendment simply leaves out the direct taxes. But in view of the decision of the Supreme Court on the income-tax case, it is hardly safe to assert that this part of the section has been repealed, for they held that law invalid because it did not apportion the tax according to the method prescribed in that provision. And surely the Supreme Court overlooked a very important thing if that has been repealed.

Mr. MORRIS. Will the gentleman from Texas permit a question?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. MORRIS. I wish to ask my friend from Texas this question: If the original bill providing for the taking of the census was a privileged bill, would not any bill to amend that have the same privilege?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. If it only related to the enumeration of the people, it would; but the trouble here is that they have complicated that constitutional requirement with matter not required by the Constitution. For instance, I have no question that Congress, in the exercise of its power, can direct that they ascertain the number of red-headed people in the country, but they are not required to do that by the Constitution.

Now, the number of people in the country is the basis of representation, and they are required to ascertain the number of people for the purpose of apportioning representation. But as to the physical infirmities, the complexion of the inhabitants—I see my friends smiling at the expense of my distinguished friend from Illinois, and I wish to say that my remark was to be entirely impersonal—beyond that it is purely a matter of the discretion of Congress, and not the performance of a duty enjoined by the Constitution. The only thing that is privileged in a bill relating to the census is that it is a bill to execute a constitutional command to enumerate the people. A bill that does that is plainly privileged.

Mr. MORRIS. Will my friend allow me to interrupt him right there?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. One word. Now, by adding something that is not commanded by the Constitution, it reduces the proposition from a privileged one to a nonprivileged one, because the nonprivileged matter taints the whole proposition.

Mr. MORRIS. The Constitution provides, if I have read it correctly, that that census shall be taken in such manner as may be provided by law, does it not?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. The enumeration of the people, yes.

Mr. MORRIS. That the census shall be taken, that is what it says; that the census shall be taken as shall be provided by law, as I understand it.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. No; not that. The word "census" is not used in the Constitution. The Constitution says:

> The actual enumeration shall be made within three years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent term of ten years, in such manner as they shall by law direct.

If you want to enumerate the people, to ascertain the number of them, I grant you that Congress can determine the manner of doing that.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, I will say to the gentleman from Texas that it seems to me that that question might arise when the law under consideration for taking the enumeration was being considered. He might object to anything being put into that bill except a mere enumeration; but when that bill providing for an enumeration is allowed to pass with other provisions in it, if that bill has the privilege of the Constitution, would not an amendment to that bill have the privilege of the Constitution?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Not at all.

Mr. CANNON. As it is now half past 5, I will ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] if he will not yield for a motion to adjourn?

Mr. RICHARDSON. That will leave the matter pending.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Of course the gentleman from Tennessee is entitled to that.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It need not be decided now.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold his motion for a moment to allow the Chair to lay before the House a message from the President of the United States?

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, with reference to the claim of the Eastern Extension Australasian and China Telegraph Company, Limited, for compensation on account of expenses incurred in repairing its Manila-Hongkong and Manila-Cadiz cables, which were cut by United States forces during the war with Spain.

I recommend that, as an act of equity and comity, provision be made by the Congress for reimbursement to the company of the actual expenses incurred by it in the repair of the cables.

WILLIAM McKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, January 16, 1900.

The message, with the accompanying documents, was ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

CHANGE OF COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, January 10, 1900.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to request that I be relieved from further service as a member of the Committee on Claims of the House.

I wish to retire from this committee for the reasons set forth in the conversation I had with you a few days ago.

Very respectfully, yours,

L. FLETCHER.

Hon. DAVID B. HENDERSON,
Speaker House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The question is on excusing the gentleman from Minnesota from acting on the Committee on Claims. If there is no objection, it will be held that he is excused. The Chair hears no objection.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment to the Committee on Claims of Mr. WEEKS of Michigan.

And then, on motion of Mr. CANNON (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, recommending an

appropriation to replace the light-house at Sapelo, Ga.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, submitting claims of certain collectors of internal revenue for money deposited to make good certain stamp accounts—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, relating to the disposal of certain papers in the office of the Weather Bureau—to the Joint Committee on Disposal of Waste Papers in Executive Departments.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a communication from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, recommending that the land grant of the Indians of the pueblo of Zuni be confirmed to them by legislative act—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting communications relating to the issue of a duplicate check to replace one drawn by Lieut. Col. E. B. Atwood in favor of Alfred C. Cass—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. HULL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution of the House (H. J. Res. 6) authorizing the Secretary of War to use $100,000 of the appropriations for the support of the Regular and Volunteer Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, for the construction of a modern military hospital at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 66); which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 149) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of William E. Woodbridge for compensation for the use by the United States of his invention relating to projectiles, for which letters patent were ordered to issue to him March 25, 1852, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 47); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1889) for the relief of the trustees of Holston Seminary, at Newmarket, Tenn., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 48); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred House bill 4066, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 95) for the relief of R. A. Schellhous, accompanied by a report (No. 49); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1871) for the relief of E. B. Crozier, executrix of the last will of Dr. C. W. Crozier, of Tennessee, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 50); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6230) for the relief of Robert Smalls, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 51); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1992) for the relief of Mathias Pederson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 53); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5196) for the relief of Claude A. Swanson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 55); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MINOR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 438) granting a pension to Emma M. Kitt, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 56); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRIGGS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2391) granting a pension to Elizabeth R. Holt, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 57); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5188) granting a pension to David C. Dane, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 58); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1885) granting a pension to Harvey Grant, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 59); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3067) granting an increase of pension to Melvina Bottles, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 60); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. COCHRANE of New York, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3260) granting a pension to Mrs. S. M. Button, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 61); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GASTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3071) to increase the pension of Capt. John F. Nelson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 62); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MINOR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2597) to increase the pension of Charles Kauffung, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 63); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. COCHRANE of New York, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2321) granting an increase of pension to Horatio H. Warren, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 64); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HENRY of Mississippi, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred House bill 4949, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 96) for the relief of the estate of W. W. Dunton, deceased, late of Hinds County, Miss., accompanied by a report (No. 65); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, adverse reports were delivered to the Clerk, and laid on the table, as follows:

Mr. BRENNER, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3872) for the relief of the estate of Adaliza Snodgrass, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 52); which said bill and report were ordered to lie on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the document of the House (H. Doc. No. 253), letter from the Secretary of War transmitting claim of Lieut. Joseph S. Gillow, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 54); which said document and report were ordered to lie on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6085) to restore Henry D. Hall to the Revenue-Cutter Service—Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

A bill (H. R. 3511) to inspect and correct the accounts of certain employees of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—Committee on the District of Columbia discharged, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

A bill (H. R. 6097) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Cavanaugh—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6162) granting an increase of pension to Warren L. Eaton—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 6436) to amend

section 17 of an act making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1867, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Mileage.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6437) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant permission to cut timber from the public lands in the State of Mississippi, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 6438) to amend an act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States, passed July 24, 1897—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENNY: A bill (H. R. 6439) authorizing a light-house and fog-signal station at or near the mouths of the Manokin and Big Annamessex rivers, in Maryland—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRIS: A bill (H. R. 6440) to amend the act of Congress approved May 14, 1880, entitled "An act for the relief of settlers on the public lands"—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PUGH: A bill (H. R. 6441) to direct the Secretary of War to appoint a commission to ascertain and report the facts concerning the taking of property for the use of the Army of the United States and destroyed at Cynthiana, Ky., June 11, 1864—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 6442) to protect foreign and interstate commerce and to prevent a false branding of food and dairy products—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BREWER: A bill (H. R. 6443) to grant land to the State of Alabama for the use of public schools—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ALLEN of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6444) for the erection of a public building in the city of Henderson, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 6445) to limit the effect of the regulations of commerce between the several States and of foreign countries in certain cases—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin (by request): A bill (H. R. 6446) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to fulfill certain treaty stipulations with the Chippewa Indians of Lake Superior and the Mississippi, and making appropriation for the same—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BELLAMY: A bill (H. R. 6447) to establish and provide for a clerk for the circuit and district courts of the United States held at Wilmington, N. C.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZENOR: A bill (H. R. 6448) to extend the provisions of the pension laws to the Indiana State Militia, known and designated as the "Indiana Legion," and to the widows, children, and dependent relatives of deceased members of the Indiana Legion who rendered service to the United States during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINNEY: A bill (H. R. 6607) to amend chapter 4, Title XIII, Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 6608) for the relief of certain State militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BREAZEALE: A bill (H. R. 6609) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make a preliminary examination and survey of Cane River, in the State of Louisiana—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 6610) placing West Virginia State militia who were in actual service under command of United States officers during the late war of the rebellion on the same standing as United States soldiers in the matter of pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEVILLE: A bill (H. R. 6611) for the relief of the homestead settlers on that portion of the Great Sioux Reservation lying and being in the State of Nebraska, formerly in the Territory of Dakota (now State of South Dakota), and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of New York (by request): A bill (H. R. 6612) to amend the act of June 13, 1898, entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Ways on Means.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: A bill (H. R. 6613) to provide for the location, erection, and maintenance of a home for women Army nurses, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 6614) making the Sabbath nearest the 15th of February Maine memorial day—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE VRIES: A bill (H. R. 6615) to amend certain acts and to restore to the public domain certain lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6616) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 6617) for the erection of a post-office building at Battle Creek, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 6618) establishing a board of public health, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6619) to amend an act entitled "An act for the erection of a public building for the use of the custom-house and post-office at Newport News, in the district of Newport News, Va.," approved February 21, 1899—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BAILEY of Texas: A bill (H. R. 6621) in relation to contempts of court—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZENOR: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 120) authorizing the Secretary of War to pay certain employees and laborers, workmen, workwomen, and mechanics at United States Government depots of the Quartermaster's Department for additional work performed in excess of eight hours per day—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOY: A resolution (H. Res. 97) to pay Edward Reichard for extra services performed in the office of the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 6449) for the relief of the estate of R. C. Bumpass, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6450) for the relief of A. W. McClure, of Alcorn County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6451) for the relief of Isabella Rowsey, of Alcorn County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6452) for relief of George Kimberley, heir of M. P. Kimberley, deceased, late of Tishomingo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6453) for relief of John W. Williams, heir of H. G. Williams, deceased, late of Tishomingo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6454) for the relief of the estate of Richard D. Fielder, of Tishomingo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6455) for the relief of the trustees of Cumberland Presbyterian Church of Corinth, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6456) granting a pension to Martha E. Kennon—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6457) granting a pension to John C. Tennison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6458) for the relief of Matilda H. Reed, of Iuka, Tishomingo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6459) for the relief of Andrew Brown, heir of David Brown, deceased, late of Tishomingo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6460) for the relief of the trustees of the Baptist Church of Corinth, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6461) for the relief of M. G. Cumby—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6462) for the relief of Mrs. E. A. Hubbard, of Tishomingo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6463) for the relief of David Ingram, of Itawamba County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6464) for the relief of the Christian Church of Corinth, Alcorn County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6465) for the relief of Dr. O. R. Early, of Lowndes County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6466) for the relief of Francis E. Whitfield and Lucy G. Whitfield, of Alcorn County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6467) for the relief of Mrs. Mollie A. Smith, of Tishomingo County, Miss.—to the Committe on War Claims.

By Mr. BRENNER: A bill (H. R. 6468) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Patrick Coyle, late of Company I, Fourth New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6469) to relieve Ezekiel W. Cohn from the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6470) granting pension to Patrick Bergen, late of Company A, Twenty-sixth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6471) granting pension to Andrew A. Mathews, late Company K, Tenth Kentucky Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6472) to relieve Henry Halteman from the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: A bill (H. R. 6473) for relief of estate of Romain Verdin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6474) for the relief of the estate of F. O. Darby, of Vermilion Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6475) for the relief of the estate of Henry E. Ledet—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6476) for relief of legal representatives of Nathaniel and William Offutt, of St. Martin Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6477) for the relief of Alexis Lague, of St. Landry Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6478) for the relief of Samuel Carey, of the parish of St. Mary, State of Louisiana—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6479) for the relief of Pierre Breaux, of Terre Bonne Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6480) for the relief of Mrs. E. H. Briant, of La Fourche Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6481) for the relief of Mrs. Joseph Kittredge—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARNEY: A bill (H. R. 6482) to pension Stanton R. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 6483) for the relief of Stephen T. Hamer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6484) for the relief of Jesse K. Sirlott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6485) for the relief of Mrs. Esther B. Moulton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 6486) to increase the pension of Orange F. Berdan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 6487) to increase the pension of Samuel George Fletcher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6488) removing charge of desertion from record of Nicholas Clarkson, a sailor in war of rebellion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DENNY: A bill (H. R. 6489) granting an honorable discharge to Charles H. Rarick—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6490) granting a pension to Martha E. Horn, widow of Col. John W. Horn, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 6491) for the relief of Charles H. Callender—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 6492) to correct the military record of James Donahue—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 6493) for the relief of John Anderson, a Pottawatomie Indian, and his adult children—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 6494) to increase the pension of Dorus M. Fox, late colonel Twenty-seventh Michigan Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 6495) for the relief of W. W. Morris—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JACK: A bill (H. R. 6496) to increase the pension of Mrs. Helen G. Heiner, widow of the late Capt. R. G. Heiner, Company A, First United States Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 6497) for the relief of the heirs at law of the late Duncan H. Campbell—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 6498) for the relief of the Atlanta, Ga., Female Institute—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6499) for relief of Livinia Cook—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. METCALF: A bill (H. R. 6500) granting a pension to Elisha T. Bisbee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6501) to correct the military record of Conrad Hyne—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6502) for the relief of John H. Liening—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 6503) granting an increase of pension to William Gross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRIS: A bill (H. R. 6504) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John J. Robinson and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 6505) to increase the pension of Ann Comins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MUDD (by request): A bill (H. R. 6506) to place the name of Edith Lockwood Sturdy on the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 6507) granting a pension to Mrs. Ellen S. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 6508) granting a pension to Mrs. Sarah A. Aspold—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 6509) for the relief of Mrs. Thomas S. Ferral—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 6510) for the relief of the heirs of John H. Waring—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 6511) for the relief of Mary L. McCormick—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEEKISON: A bill (H. R. 6512) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John Doan, late of Company C, One hundred and sixty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6513) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Thomas Burk, Company D, Fourteenth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6514) to remove charge of desertion from record of Levi Leveck, Company E, Forty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6515) to remove charge of desertion from record of William L. Wiler, Company K, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6516) to remove charge of desertion from the record of David F. Fortney, late of Company E, One hundred and first Regiment of Ohio Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6517) granting a pension to Jennie Burns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6518) granting a pension to Charles M. Younger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6519) granting a pension to Sarah C. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6520) granting a pension to Susan De Long—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEYER of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 6521) for the relief of the heirs of Pierre Sauvé—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6522) for the relief of the heirs of Pierre Sauvé—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NEVILLE: A bill (H. R. 6523) granting a pension to Joseph W. Skelton, of Brokenbow, Nebr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 6524) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Andrew Carney and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 6525) for the relief of the heirs of William A. Viers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6526) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of James Irwin, alias James Williamson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PARKER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 6527) granting a pension to George Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PUGH: A bill (H. R. 6528) for the relief of W. H. Copley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6529) for the relief of James C. Brickley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6530) for the relief of George W. Taylor's administrator—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6531) for the relief of Robert Ross—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6532) for the relief of Thomas H. Stapleton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6533) for the relief of Gabriel R. Bartley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6534) for the relief of James H. C. Mann—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6535) for the relief of Ann Stewart, administratrix of William Stewart, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6536) for the relief of Thomas V. Stirman's estate—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6537) for the relief of James S. Frizzell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6538) for the relief of Joseph B. McClintock, of Harrison County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6539) for the relief of the administrator of the estate of Marcus L. Broadwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6540) for the relief of Thomas C. Isgrigg—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 6541) to correct the military record of Ernst Ebert—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6542) granting a pension to John T. Burriss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6543) to correct the military record of C. J. J. Martyr—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6544) granting a pension to Hannah Lee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 6545) for the relief of Capt. George A. Armes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 6546) for the relief of Francis H. McLaughlin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6547) for relief of Reuben Randall—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6548) for the relief of Samuel G. H. Whitley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6549) for the relief of John Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 6550) for relief of Calvin Johnson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6551) for the relief of James Stringer—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHOWALTER: A bill (H. R. 6552) to increase the pension of A. P. Pew, late a member of Companies I and D, Fifty-seventh Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 6553) granting a pension to Plumy E. Marden—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6554) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Carlton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 6555) for the relief of William Thorpe, trustee—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 6556) granting an increase of pension to J. T. Alexander—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATERS: A bill (H. R. 6557) to increase the pension of James Ferguson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6558) for the relief of Annie McNamara—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6559) granting a pension to Genevieve Laighton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 6560) to grant an honorable discharge to James M. Schofield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6561) to remove the charge of desertion against Henry Bischoff—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6562) to remove the charge of desertion against John C. Partlow—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6563) granting a pension to Eliza J. Steele—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6564) granting a pension to Anna M. Starr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6565) granting a pension to Emeline S. Conner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6566) to increase the pension of Henry W. Ridlen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6567) granting an increase of pension to Simeon T. Yancy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6568) to increase the pension of Noah Jarvis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 6569) to increase the pension of Michael Doyle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6570) granting a pension to William H. McKeny—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6571) granting a pension to Hudson M. Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE (by request): A bill (H. R. 6572) granting a pension to Travis Glascoe, and also directing the Secretary of War to pay just compensation to him for service rendered Union officers during the civil war, from October 15, 1862, to July 1, 1864—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6573) for the relief of P. B. S. Pinchback—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ZENOR: A bill (H. R. 6574) granting a pension to Hiram J. Reamer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRUMP: A bill (H. R. 6575) for the relief of Mrs. Matilda G. Higbee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6576) for the relief of Albert F. Wakefield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DINSMORE: A bill (H. R. 6577) for the relief of Henry T. Cate, of Washington County, Ark., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DENNY: A bill (H. R. 6578) granting an increase of pension to Anna B. McCurley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 6579) to remove the sentence of court-martial now standing against Lieut. A. F. Washburn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6580) granting a pension to Burton Packard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 6581) for the relief of George F. Schild—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 6582) granting relief to Levi Melvin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 6583) for the removal of the charge of desertion now standing against Andrew J. Heagney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 6584) for the increase of pension of Andrew H. Hazlett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6585) for the increase of pension of Joseph Cramer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MUDD (by request): A bill (H. R. 6586) for the relief of Annie R. Cheseldine, River Springs, St. Marys County, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEWART of New York: A bill (H. R. 6587) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Daniel Mosher—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6588) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William H. Neill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6589) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Daniel A. Odell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6590) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Soloman Snell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6591) for the relief of Austin A. Yates—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SWANSON: A bill (H. R. 6592) for the relief of Robert N. Blake, deceased, late of Stafford County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6593) for the relief of W. D. Haynes—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6594) for relief of R. C. Payne—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6595) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of the legal heirs of John Harper, deceased, to certain lands in the State of Virginia—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6596) to pension Christina Wilson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6597) for the relief of the legal representatives of G. B. Lamar, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6598) for the relief of Charles L. Boone, of Virginia—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TATE: A bill (H. R. 6599) for relief of James B. Fowler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6600) for relief of William T. Edwards—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6601) for relief of Russell Savage—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6602) for relief of Joseph Thomas—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6603) for relief of Hix Patterson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6604) for the relief of Newton Coker—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6605) for the relief of Jasper N. Martin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TERRY: A bill (H. R. 6606) to remove the charge of desertion from David A. Nichols—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 6620) to correct the military record of David M. Foust, Fayette County, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 6622) granting an extension of Letters Patent No. 244898—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 6623) granting a pension to Sarah E. Wall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6624) granting an increase of pension to John C. Bradley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 6625) to correct the military record of David B. Whistler, alias Charles Thomas—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6626) to correct the military record of Henry M. Holmes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHATTUC: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 121) for the relief of the heirs of Capt. W. W. Withenbury, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Papers to accompany House bill No. 6251, authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Dubuque, Iowa—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 6319, granting a pension to George W. Cox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN of Kentucky: Petition of the Business Men's Association of Henderson, Ky., to accompany House bill No. 6444, for the erection of a public building in the city of Henderson, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BERRY: Petition of the Equal Rights Association of Kentucky, against the insertion of the word "male" in the constitution of Hawaii, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: Report to accompany House bill relating to granting an extension of Letters Patent No. 244898—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: Petition of H. P. Crowe and others, of Arcola, Miss., against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. CRUMP: Petition of Clark Bennetts and other clerks of the Bay City, Mich., post-office, favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DENNY: Petition of the Woman's Board of Foreign Missions, against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Martha A. Horn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICK: Sundry petitions of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of Cortland, Ohio, home and foreign missionary societies of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Ashtabula, Ohio, together with petitions of numerous citizens of various towns in the State of Ohio, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah, and for an amendment to the Constitution making polygamy a crime—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. DINSMORE: Paper in support of House bill to correct the military record of William Bolin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Resolution of a meeting of citizens of St. Paul, Minn., relative to the war between Great Britain and the Transvaal Republic—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Memorial of James B. Angell and prominent officials and citizens of the United States, relating to the pending treaty for the settlement of international disputes—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Marine Society of New York City, for the passage of the shipping bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the Fourth Presbyterian Church, Galveston, Tex., against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. HOPKINS: Petition of the post-office clerks of Elgin, Ill., post-office, urging the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the classification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. JOHNSTON: Petition of S. P. Capehart, of Mason County, W. Va., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEVY: Memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of New York, urging an increase of the artillery force of the Army for coast defense—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Petition of the Norway (Me.) Medicine Company and others, asking for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCALL: Petition of post-office clerks of Cambridge Station, Boston, Mass., in favor of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. McCLEARY: Letter of Supt. James N. Tate, of the Minnesota Institute for the Deaf and Dumb, urging that statistics of deaf, dumb, and blind not in institutions be taken in the coming census—to the Committee on the Census.

Also, petition of J. F. Herold and other post-office clerks at Mankato, Minn., in favor of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Petition of clerks employed in the Madison Square branch of the New York City post-office, asking for the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the classification of clerks in the first and second class post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MERCER: Resolution of the Omaha city council, asking for the macadamizing of the military boulevard from Fort Crook, Nebr., to Omaha, Nebr.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Marine Society of New York, requesting the passage of the shipping bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MOON: Affidavit of J. B. Greenhut to accompany House bill No. 2121, for the relief of C. W. Biese—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MUDD (by request): Evidence to accompany House bill for the relief of Edith Lockwood Surdy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petition of the San Joaquin Valley Commercial Association, for the improvement of the Sequoia National Park, California—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PEARCE of Missouri: Petition of George L. Stull, of Frederick County, Md., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RAY of New York: Petition of citizens of Tompkins County, N. Y., for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Resolutions of the First Division, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Norwich, Conn., expressing sympathy for the Boer Republic in its present war—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHATTUC: Protest of the Pork Packers and Provision Dealers' Association of Cincinnati, Ohio, against the discrimination in the classification of freights upon shippers of less than carload lots—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Lytle Post, No. 47, Grand Army of the Republic, of Ohio, in regard to amendment to the civil-service law—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. SHOWALTER: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of A. P. Pew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Joseph L. Roberts and 2 others, favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and United Presbyterian, Lutheran, Methodist, and Welsh churches, of Elwood, Pa., against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. SNODGRASS: Papers relating to the claim of Elvina Cunningham, of Rhea County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEWART of New York: Papers to accompany House bill to remove the charge of desertion against the military record of William H. Neill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the removal of the charge of desertion against Solomon Snell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill to remove the charge of desertion against the military record of Daniel A. Odell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill to remove the charge of desertion against the military record of Daniel Mosher—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: Resolutions of the Shipmasters' Association of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the adoption of the Wadsworth bill, No. 3988, to reorganize and improve the Weather Bureau—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of post-office clerks of Merrill, Wis., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the reclassification of postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Milwaukee, in favor of the appointment of a commission to study the industrial and commercial conditions of the Chinese Empire—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of the California Citrus Growers' Tariff Convention, against any reduction in the rates imposed by the Dingley tariff law on citrus fruits—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of John E. Smith, of Portsmouth, N. H., and other railway postal clerks, favoring a bill providing for the reclassification of the Railway Mail Service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Manchester, N. H., Board of Trade, urging the appointment of a commission to study and report upon the industrial and commercial conditions in China—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Woman Suffragists of New Hampshire, against the insertion of the word "male" in the suffrage clauses of the constitutions of Hawaii, Cuba, etc.—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, petition of the druggists of Exeter, N. H., asking for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWANSON: Petition of the heirs of Meshack Griffith, of Franklin County, Va., for reference of war claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WATSON: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Eliza J. Steele—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers in support of House bill for the relief of Anna M. Starr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Noah Jarvis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Emeline S. Connor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Henry W. Ridlen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill correcting the record of John C. Partlow—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill to correct the military record of Henry Bischoff—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill to correct the military record of James M. Schofield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE (by request): Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Travis Glascoe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina: Petition of Annie M. Wilbur and Mary Louisa Latimer, to accompany House bill for compensation for the use of certain lots in Greenville, S. C., by United States troops—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: Petition of Pork Packers and Provision Dealers' Association of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against discrimination of freight charges upon shippers of less than carload lots—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Hudson Pharmacy, H. L. Stiles, and other druggists of Philadelphia, Pa., to modify the existing internal-revenue law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *January 17, 1900.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. HOAR, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal, without objection, will stand approved.

REPORT ON REINDEER IN ALASKA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 4th instant, the report of Dr. Sheldon Jackson upon "The introduction of domestic reindeer into the district of Alaska in 1899," together with its accompanying maps and illustrations.

This information is communicated in response to a resolution offered by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER].

Mr. TELLER. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Printing. I suppose it ought to go there, although it is often printed without such a reference.

The motion was agreed to.

LAWS RELATING TO COURTS-MARTIAL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a copy of a bill to prevent the failure of military justice, and for other purposes, prepared by the Judge-Advocate-General of the Army, and stating that it meets with his approval; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

FRENCH SPOLIATION CLAIM.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting conclusions of fact and of law filed under the act of January 2, 1885, in the French spoliation claims, set out in the annexed findings of the court, relative to the brig *Lady Walterstorff*, John Gutterson, master; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. TURNER. I present a petition of the legislature of Washington, relative to the Northern Pacific Railway lands, declaring some to be forfeited, etc. I ask that the petition be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House memorial No. 4. State of Washington. Sixth regular session.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:

Your memorialists, the legislature of the State of Washington, respectfully represent that a large number of citizens of Clark and Cowlitz counties, in the State of Washington, are actual settlers and home builders upon certain odd-numbered sections of public land within the forfeited limits of the grant to the "Northern Pacific Railroad Company," opposite to and coterminous with the line of said road not constructed between Wallula, Wash., and Portland, Oreg.

That said settlers established their homes on said lands after the time expired within which, under the grant, said road was to have been completed and after it had become apparent said line would not be built down the Columbia River between said points by said company, and fully expecting to derive title to said lands from the Government of the United States under the homestead laws.

That said settlers number about 600 and are mostly heads of families, and, although poor and without capital, they have, by hard labor and self-denial, made extensive and valuable improvements on said lands, consisting largely in clearing off timber, stumps, logs, and brush, at great labor and expense of time, amounting in many instances to $100 per acre, and in building dwellings and other structures thereon as homes for themselves and families.

That the grant to said company from "Wallula to Portland" was made July 2, 1864. That an additional and new grant was made to said company May 31, 1870, on its line from Portland to Tacoma, which line was definitely located September 22, 1882, but was not constructed until the year 1884.

That the technical limits of these two grants overlapped northeast of Portland into both Clark and Cowlitz counties. That a general withdrawal of lands was made under said grants by the Interior Department on August 13, 1870, and maintained regardless of the Congressional act of forfeiture of September 29, 1890, until the 18th day of July, 1895, when in a decision known as the Spaulding case (21 Land Decisions, page 57), the Secretary of the Interior held, in conformity with a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States (152 U. S., 284), that no lands included in the prior grant of July 2, 1864, were or could be granted in the subsequent grant of May 31, 1870, and that all said lands, pursuant to said forfeiture act, were therefore public lands and subject to entry under the laws of the United States.

That homestead entries were thereafter allowed on said lands in all cases, except where the railroad company had obtained patents thereto.

That patents were procured by said company for a large part of said lands in May, 1895, notwithstanding the then pending homestead applications of said settlers and the fact that the Spaulding decision above referred to was then being formulated.

That subsequently the Secretary of the Interior determined that these patents were wrongfully issued and requested the Attorney-General to bring suits for their cancellation.

That said settlers were threatened by the railroad company with eviction from their homes on said lands, and, before the Spaulding decision, many of them were driven against their protest into making contracts with the company for the purchase of their homes, in which they had invested years of toil, but to defend which they had no money or other resources to carry on litigation with a powerful corporation.

That common justice and humanity calls for legislative relief.

That attempts of this kind have been made, but so far they have been ineffectual.

That the act of Congress of March 3, 1896, extending the time for bringing suits to cancel patents has resulted in nothing for the benefit of said settlers, but has, on the contrary, apparently confirmed the company's title and to an extent aided the company in enforcing said contracts.

That the act of Congress of July 1, 1898, gives the company the right to select other lands in lieu of all lands it desires to relinquish in these limits, but does not require it to relinquish any lands it has sold or contracted to sell. That said last-mentioned act does not appear applicable to the lands of said settlers situated in forfeited limits, and, if it did, would be fatally injurious to hundreds of their number who have been compelled to contract with the railroad company under the erroneous rulings of the Land Department prior to the Spaulding decision and by the threats of the company to eject them from their homes. That the practical effect of said act is to confuse and embarrass the rights of said settlers and ought to be amended.

Your memorialists therefore ask, in behalf of said settlers, that said act of Congress of July 1, 1898, be amended by eliminating from the second proviso thereof the provision that the company shall not be bound to relinquish lands sold or contracted by it, and that an act be passed declaring that the forfeiture act of September 29, 1890, applies to and includes the lands within the limits of the grant to the Northern Pacific Railroad Company opposite to and coterminous with the line of said road not constructed between Wallula, Wash., and Portland, Oreg., within which limits, extending to or near the Willamette meridian, are situated the lands of said settlers, and directing the immediate institution of suits by the Attorney-General of the United States for the cancellation of the patents to said lands wrongfully issued as aforesaid to said railroad company. And we request our Senators and Representatives in Congress to do all in their power to that end, and hereby direct that copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

Passed the house January 17, 1899.

Passed the senate February 9, 1899.

CERTIFICATE.

STATE OF WASHINGTON, OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE,
Olympia, Wash., December 2, 1899.

I, Will D. Jenkins, secretary of state of the State of Washington and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the enrolled document now on file in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State of Washington the day and year above written.

[SEAL.] WILL D. JENKINS,
Secretary of State.

Mr. TURNER. I present a memorial of the legislature of Washington, remonstrating against the cession of territory in Alaska. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate memorial No. 5. State of Washington. Sixth regular session.

To the President of the United States:

Your memorialists, the legislature of the State of Washington, would respectfully represent that in 1825 the Governments of Russia and Great Britain, by clear and formal treaty, determined the intervening line between their respective possessions on the continent of North America. Great Britain then acknowledged the right of Russia to all of the Pacific coast north of 54° 40′ and Portland Canal and west of the summits of the range of mountains nearest to the coast. If such mountains were far from the shore, then the

line was to be drawn 10 marine leagues from the ocean. During the following forty-two years Russia remained in undisputed ownership of all that region known then as Russian America, and until in 1867 her title thereto was passed to the United States for $7,000,000.

At that time the white inhabitants numbered about 1,000, all of whom, save a few engaged in the fur trade, were reliant upon the Russian Government for their means of living. There were no fisheries, no manufactures, no mining, no farming, no business or relations with any other country and people than Russia and the Russians.

With the advent of the Americans came a change. Steamers began to run there from California, Oregon, and Washington ports; people of the world were invited to take advantage of the opportunities on every hand; military and naval protection was given against the savages of the land; mail services were established and Government explorations undertaken; the fur-seal fishery employed scores of vessels and hundreds of men and became worth millions of dollars; salmon were found off the coast, and great fisheries were established, employing hundreds of men, who put up now 25,000,000 to 40,000,000 1-pound cans of fish each summer for the Australian, European, and American markets; quartz was found; mines were opened and mills built, one of them, with 880 stamps, being the largest in the world; placers were also found, and from the two sources upward of $5,000,000 of gold were obtained during the year 1898.

Two hundred and fifty American steamers were engaged in the Alaska trade last year, and an average of more than one vessel a day departed from Seattle alone for ports in that Territory. Sawmills have been started there, some farming done, a halibut fishery begun, and in the summer a great number of tourists go to those interesting shores.

All this development of resources has involved the opening of the country, the civilizing of the natives, and the establishment there of a large population of American citizens, with two cities of at least 3,000 inhabitants each, and many smaller towns. In these cities are daily newspapers, electric lights, telephones, street cars, and a railroad to the interior. In the whole Territory are over 30,000 citizens of our country, an average gain since 1867 of 1,000 per annum.

With its practically untouched timber, its coal, petroleum, codfish, whale, fur-bearing animals, etc., added to its seal, salmon, gold, and other resources as attractions, there is reason to believe that Alaska, with its half million square miles of territory, will support comfortably a half million people a half century hence. It is no Greenland, but rather a Sweden and Norway, and like those countries will be a great factor in the commerce of the world.

While Russia held the country Great Britain apparently cared nothing for it. Beyond a fur-trading privilege no attempt was made to avail of it. Taken during the Crimean war, it was cheerfully relinquished at the close as of no value.

Not until the citizens of the United States showed its worth in fish, in timber, in gold, and in trade did the Britons and Canadians evince interest in and desire for it. Then by insidious methods attempts began to fix a claim upon the country. The old maps were discarded, and new maps issued, upon which the boundary line began further north and was located nearer the sea, taking into the Dominion a considerable area of the best portion of southeastern Alaska.

The next step was to get the newspapers to publish the claim and to fix it in the public mind as a proper and regular thing contemplated even by the treaty makers of 1825. From this it was easy to cause a contention, first local, and then international, in consequence of which their claim could be placed before the British-American joint high commission, where nothing could be lost, but where something might be gained in the making of concessions and exchanges common to such bodies. It was a clever scheme, but one without honesty, justice, or merit.

In accordance with this plan, it is now proposed to cede to the Canadians a portion of Alaska. It is said that the ceded portion will include the head of Lynn Canal, made world-famous during the past two years by the rush of 50,000 gold miners to the Klondike. It will wholly include the town of Dyea, with its inhabitants, its aerial tramway, and its United States military garrison; and it will also include one-half the city of Skagway, with 4,000 more inhabitants, its 20 miles of American-built railway, its four large wharves, its trade, and growing importance.

Again, it is reported that the ceded portion is to be other than that above described, and is to include the head of Pyramid Harbor, from which [it] takes inland the route to the Yukon, known as the Dalton trail, established by and heretofore solely used by Americans.

The cession of either of these places or of any other Alaskan port will transfer from the United States to a foreign power the sole and absolute control of intercourse with the great interior, in which is involved a traffic of enormous proportions and of great wealth. Such cession will injure every citizen of the United States from San Diego to Sitka, and will humiliate the country from ocean to ocean and end to end. For the first time in our history our flag will be hauled down and the land over which it has long floated will be given away, sold, or surrendered; this, too, without considering the wishes, wants, or rights of the people most affected, and this, too, for either no consideration or for a consideration of trifling character. That such an act can be perpetrated in these days of national glory, of patriotism, and expansion is incredible. Against its commission the protests of the people should prevail, and that of the State of Washington is here and now earnestly and respectfully presented.

Your memorialists respectfully ask that after consideration of this, their memorial, by the President, is to be transmitted to the joint high commission for the adjustment of Canadian questions.

And your memorialists will ever pray.

Passed the senate February 11, 1899.

Passed the house February 11, 1899.

Approved February 16, 1899.

CERTIFICATE.

STATE OF WASHINGTON, OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE,
Olympia, Wash., December 2, 1899.

I, Will D. Jenkins, secretary of state of the State of Washington and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the enrolled document now on file in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State of Washington the day and year above written.

[SEAL.] WILL D. JENKINS,
Secretary of State.

Mr. TURNER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Spokane, Wash., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Skamania County, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a change in the forest reserve boundary; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. SIMON presented a petition of the Oregon Viavi Company, of Portland, Oreg., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ALDRICH presented a petition of the Woman Suffrage Association of Rhode Island, praying that the word "male" be not inserted in the suffrage clause of the constitution of Hawaii, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines, and praying for the adoption of a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the disfranchisement of United States citizens on account of sex; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

He also presented the petitions of J. Sanford Davis and 10 other railway mail clerks of Pawtucket, Charles B. Butler and 2 other railway mail clerks of Westerly, and of Christopher H. Carpenter and 45 other railway mail clerks of Providence, all in the State of Rhode Island, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. THURSTON presented a petition of the Woman Suffrage Association of Nebraska, praying for the omission of the word "male" from the suffrage clause of the constitution providing for the annexation of Hawaii, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines, and for the adoption of a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution prohibiting disfranchisement on account of sex; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented the petition of Henry L. Loomis, of Union Mills, Ind., and the petition of Theo. E. Otto and sundry other citizens of Columbus, Ind., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1243) for the relief of the owner or owners of the schooner *Bergen*;

A bill (S. 879) for the relief of Levi Stoltz;

A bill (S. 1934) for the relief of the Globe Works, of Boston, Mass.;

A bill (S. 189) for the relief of the owners of the British ship *Foscolia* and cargo;

A bill (S. 32) for the relief of George W. Weston; and

A bill (S. 1744) for the relief of the Atlantic Works, of Boston, Mass.

Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 795) for the relief of The William Cramp & Sons Ship and Engine Building Company, of Philadelphia, Pa., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PETTIGREW, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 102) for the relief of John O'Keane, of the State of Washington, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2258) to authorize the Union Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Monongahela River, reported it without amendment.

Mr. QUARLES, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1771) granting a pension to Ellie Kee, reported it with amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

EGBERT C. SAMMIS.

Mr. TALIAFERRO, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3) for the relief of Egbert C. Sammis, administrator of the estate of John S. Sammis, deceased, late of Duval County, Fla., reported the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 3) entitled "A bill for the relief of Egbert C. Sammis, administrator of the estate of John S. Sammis," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," approved March 3, 1887. And the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act, and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] December 14, 1899, to report it with amendments; and I ask for its present consideration.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

The amendments of the Committee on Printing were, in line 2, to strike out "fifteen thousand" and insert "seven thousand five hundred;" in line 7 to strike out "five thousand" and insert

"twenty-five hundred," and in line 8 to strike out "ten thousand" and insert "five thousand," so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 7,500 additional copies of Senate Document No. 164, third session Fifty-fifth Congress, being the report of the Daughters of the American Revolution, 1890-1897, of which 2,500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 5,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

DAUGHTERS OF ARTHUR BARNES, DECEASED.

Mr. JONES of Nevada, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. BUTLER on the 10th instant, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay to May Barnes, Blanche Barnes, and Maud Bynum, daughters of Arthur Barnes, deceased, late a messenger on the rolls of the Senate, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate paid by law to said messenger, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE.

Mr. JONES of Nevada, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. LODGE on the 9th instant, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Philippines be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $1,800 per annum until otherwise provided by law.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 2488) granting a pension to John Eckland; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2489) to provide for the further distribution of the reports of the Supreme Court; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 2490) granting a pension to Margaret A. Miner; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BATE introduced a bill (S. 2491) for the relief of George H. Morton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McBRIDE introduced a bill (S. 2492) granting an increase of pension to C. Cunningham; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 2493) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for land in certain cases; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce two very extended bills having relation to the Post-Office Department. One of them has reference to the civil administration of the Department and the other is a codification of the criminal laws pertaining to offenses against the postal service, with, I think, some amendments. The bills are introduced (and I make this brief explanation because the chairman of the Judiciary Committee is here) in two separate measures with the idea of referring so much of the subject as affects the criminal statutes to the Committee on the Judiciary, and to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads so much as affects the civil administration of the Department, with the hope that after the Judiciary Committee has, as it will, carefully considered the measure, then it may be reported to the Senate and the two bills be consolidated into one measure.

There has been no attempt ever to codify the laws of the Post-Office Department, and for nearly thirty years the different laws affecting its administration and offenses against it have been scattered through hundreds of pages of our statute books. The Attorney-General for the Post-Office Department has, with the commission assisting him, at great pains prepared a summary and codification of all the laws with the idea that perhaps at this session of Congress we may be able to whip them into shape and get them in the form of one chapter of our statutes. This is especially important from the fact that there is from all over the country a demand for the codification of the postal rules and regulations, which are found necessarily very difficult of acquirement by postmasters and others.

Therefore, in introducing these bills, one of which is for reference to the Post-Office Committee and the other to the Judiciary Committee, I venture to call the attention of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee to them.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from Colorado is doubtless aware, as the Senate is doubtless well aware, that two years ago there was passed a bill, and it became a law, for the codification of all the criminal and penal statutes of the United States. The commission was appointed by President McKinley, and their work, I suppose, is nearly completed. At any rate, the additional duty was imposed upon them of codifying the statutes in regard to the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and that portion of the work is complete and it has been reported to the Senate. I think the measure about to be introduced by the Senator from Colorado will be a great aid to the Senate. I think it will be necessary, however, to compare it with the work of the commission.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. HOAR. And then I think the idea suggested by the Senator, instead of having the whole work of the commission taken up at once, to have this substituted for that portion, is a very convenient way of proceeding.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am obliged to the Senator. I know they will dovetail together.

The bill (S. 2494) to revise and codify the laws relating to the Post-Office Department and the postal service, and to amend the same, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

The bill (S. 2495) to revise and codify the laws relating to offenses against the postal service, and to amend the same, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WOLCOTT introduced a bill (S. 2496) granting certain lands to the town of Manitou, Colo.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. ALDRICH introduced a bill (S. 2497) granting an increase of pension to Sarah W. Rowell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BUTLER introduced a bill (S. 2498) for the relief of John F. Foard; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. BUTLER. To accompany the bill I present a petition signed by a number of citizens of North Carolina, requesting that the bill for the relief of Dr. John F. Foard be passed, and a number of papers establishing this claim. I move that the petition and papers be referred with the bill to the Committee on Claims.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER introduced a bill (S. 2499) to authorize needed repairs of the graveled or macadamized road from the city of Newbern, N. C., to the national cemetery near said city; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TILLMAN introduced a bill (S. 2500) for the repeal of section 4716 of the Revised Statutes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2501) granting increase of pension to soldiers of the Mexican war; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. THURSTON introduced a bill (S. 2502) for the establishment of a general depot of the Quartermaster's Department of the United States Army, at Omaha, Nebr.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WELLINGTON introduced a bill (S. 2503) for the relief of Deford & Co., of Baltimore, Md.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 2504) for the relief of Holy Cross College; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2505) granting an increase of pension to James C. Carlton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SPOONER introduced a bill (S. 2506) granting an increase of pension to Michael Dillon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. TURNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1676) for the payment of certain claims; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TURLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1676) for the payment of certain claims; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

MITCHELL F. JAMAR.

On motion of Mr. CAFFERY it was

Ordered, That the Committee on Claims be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1668) for the relief of Mitchell F. Jamar, and that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

JUDGMENTS IN INDIAN DEPREDATION CLAIMS.

Mr. CULBERSON submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Attorney-General be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the Senate all judgments for Indian depredations that have been rendered by the Court of Claims that are not included in his last report.

IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION IN NORTH CAROLINA.

Mr. BUTLER submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to have a survey made and to submit a report of the survey and an estimate for the improvement of navigation of the Livingston Creek, in Columbus County, N. C., and Lockwood Folly River, in Brunswick County, N. C.

THE RAMIE INDUSTRY.

Mr. ELKINS submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That Senate Document No. 47, and Senate Document No. 57, Fifty-fourth Congress, second session, be reprinted for the use of the Senate, together with certain additional matter pertaining to the ramie industry, to be revised by Mr. Slaught, with information for the farmers' uses.

Then, that the Public Printer be authorized to present Mr. S. H. Slaught with the stereotype and plates of his ramie documents, Nos. 47 and 57, Fifty-fourth Congress, second session, and the articles published on the ramie industry by the Government in the May and September, 1897, numbers of the American Republics Bulletin, to be used in his work for the promotion of the ramie industry, free of charge to him.

INQUIRIES RELATIVE TO THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. By agreement certain resolutions were permitted to lie on the table, and those resolutions are now in order.

Mr. BERRY. There is a bill which I am informed is especially important——

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator allow this resolution, which is in order, to pass? I believe it will be passed now without debate and without being read.

Mr. BERRY. Certainly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution submitted by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] on the 8th instant. It has been read in full.

Mr. VEST. I should like to hear the amendment read.

Mr. HOAR. The amendment has been agreed to by myself and my colleague, and it has been read. Does the Senator desire to have it read once more?

Mr. VEST. I was not in the Senate when that amendment was read, and I simply want to understand what it is.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the amendment which was accepted as a part of the resolution by the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

The SECRETARY. After line 7 in the original resolution the following amendment was inserted:

Also, all instructions given by him to the commissioners to the Philippine Islands, or either of them;

Also, any information which may have come to him or any Department of the Government since January 1, 1898, in regard to any plans of the people in arms against the United States for the pillage of Manila, for risings in the city, or for the destruction of foreign property and the massacre of foreign residents;

Also, any information that may have come to him or any Department of the Government of the treatment of the other inhabitants of the Philippines by those in arms against the authority of the United States, and of the attitude and feeling of such other inhabitants or tribes toward the so-called government of Aguinaldo and his armed followers;

Also, any information that may have come to him or any Department of the Government of the treatment of prisoners, either Spanish or American, by the people in arms against the authority of the United States;

Also, any information that may have come to him or any Department of the Government as to any aid or encouragement received by Aguinaldo and his followers from persons in the United States, as to what pamphlets, speeches, or other documents emanating from the United States, and adverse to its authority and to its policy, were circulated, in whole or in part, among the Filipinos in arms against the United States, among the other inhabitants of the islands, or among the soldiers of the United States, and any information as to the effect, if any, of such pamphlets, speeches, and other documents, or of similar utterances in the United States, upon the course of the rebellion against the United States;

Also, any further or other information which would tend to throw light upon the conduct and events of the insurrection against the authority of the United States in the Philippine Islands, and of the military movements for its suppression since January 1, 1898.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, I wish briefly to address the Senate on this subject.

The resolution is in the discretion of the President. Such information as he chooses to send us we are to receive under this resolution. I am in favor of passing the resolution. I am desirous of securing whatever information we can upon this subject.

Early in the session, nearly a month ago, I introduced a resolution asking whether the vessels of our Navy, the officers of our Navy, had saluted the flag of the Philippine republic; whether two of our vessels accompanied a Filipino vessel to Subig Bay for the purpose of capturing a Spanish garrison, and whether after the surrender of that garrison we turned the prisoners over to Aguinaldo's forces. That resolution was tabled by the Senate without allowing me the privilege of speaking upon it. The facts contained in that resolution, in my opinion, were true. We made Aguinaldo and his forces our ally by saluting their flag and by accompanying them in the capture of a Spanish garrison, the prisoners of which we turned over to them.

I introduced the resolution in good faith. I was not sure then, but I feel sure now, that the facts contained in the resolution were true, and I wanted the record evidence. Information has come to my knowledge since—the statement of an officer who accompanied this expedition to Subig Bay—corroborating the facts contained in the resolution, and thus is disclosed the reason why the information was denied. The resolution was in the proper form; it was a proper question.

The storm of indignation on the part of the American people and many of the Republican newspapers throughout the country at the suppression of this resolution led to a change of tactics, and then I introduced the second resolution, asking if the insurgents, after fighting had commenced, did not send General Torres with a flag of truce and ask that fighting be stopped, and that a neutral zone should be agreed upon, the boundaries of which were to be established by General Otis and satisfactory to him, until negotiations could be had to see whether the difficulties could be settled, and I also asked in that resolution what reply was made and whether General Otis did not reply that fighting having once commenced, it must go on to the grim end.

That resolution was not laid upon the table at the time, but an amendment or a substitute was offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] asking for all the information and all the dispatches which may have passed between our officers and the insurgents, as they are called. But on yesterday my second resolution calling for these facts was laid upon the table. I conceived these facts to be pertinent. If we had recognized Aguinaldo's forces and Aguinaldo's government by saluting their flag, and had acted with them and made them our allies, then we are now fighting our allies.

If we began the war, as General Otis indicates in his report, by killing the first man and then acting on the aggressive while the enemy acted upon the defensive, it seems to me the proof is conclusive that the war was commenced by us, and if, after two days' fighting, the insurgents wanted to stop the war, to stop the killing, and we said it must go on to the grim end, then I assert, Mr. President, that the blood of every soldier who has fallen since that time is on the head of this Administration and there is no escape from it; the puerile and silly talk about those who oppose the policy of the Administration being guilty of the death of our brave men disappears absolutely, and the responsibility goes where it belongs; the sixty boys from South Dakota who lost their lives, conscripted into an unwilling service, retained after their term had expired, lies at the doors of the Administration, and there is no chance to avoid it.

This information has been withheld. My resolution to acquire it has been laid upon the table. I hope the resolution which we are now to pass will bring the information. It is pertinent to the issue.

But, Mr. President, I offered another resolution yesterday—a resolution calling for all the instructions to our commissioners at Paris and the correspondence between the Administration and the commissioners at Paris; but that was laid upon the table, and then the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] charged me with trying to put the Administration in a hole.

Mr. President, it seems to me, in the light of the facts which have been developed in this contest to secure information, that the only thing that can put the Administration in a hole is the truth and that it is the purpose to keep the truth from the American people in order to keep from putting the Administration in a hole. If getting the truth before the people of the United States will embarrass the Administration, I can not help it, and I shall try to get it. I charge that this censorship of the press, this concealment of facts, was for the purpose of protecting the interests of the Administration for reelection, and now I am charged, because I tried to get the facts by a proper resolution, with trying to put the Administration in a hole.

Now, let us see. It is asserted by the imperialists that this situation was brought upon us by an act of God; that these islands are in our hands by the act of Providence. The President alludes to this fact in his message, and in speeches he has stated that God has placed a duty upon us, or similar language. Many of those who advocate this policy, not of expansion but of imperialism—the government of colonies against their will and by conquest—declare that we are doing God's service.

Now, Mr. President, if this information which is asked for by this last resolution discloses the fact that the President of the United States immediately upon the signing of the protocol which led finally to the treaty of peace instructed our commissioners to take nothing less than the island of Luzon, and if afterwards he instructed them to take the whole group, the only way I can see that God's hand is in this work is that He must have made Mr. McKinley His prophet. He must have appeared in a vision to the President. Of course, if this is true, the disclosure of these instructions and this information would put the Administration in a hole.

What are the facts which led up to the treaty with Spain? I find in the report of the Secretary of the Navy for 1898, on page 122, volume 2, the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, *August 13, 1898.*

DEWEY (care American consul), *Hongkong:*

The President desires to receive from you any important information you may have of the Philippines; the desirability of the several islands; the character of their population; coal and other mineral deposits; their harbor and commercial advantages, and in a naval and commercial sense which would be the most advantageous. If you have other information which may be of value to the Government in their negotiations, the President may desire your presence here. If he should request you to come, take the quickest route of travel.

ALLEN.

Here, then, is a telegram the day Manila fell and the day after the protocol was signed, sent by Mr. Allen, the First Assistant Secretary of the Navy, to Mr. Dewey to know which island or whether all the islands were worth grabbing or not. Dewey answered as follows:

MANILA, *August 20, 1898.*

SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, *Washington:*

Referring to the Department's telegram of August 13, important islands are: Colon, Luzon, Panay, Cebu, Negros, Leyte. Others, owing to the nature of the inhabitants, have a small amount of civilization, want of cultivation. They may be neglected, especially isles of southern group.

The isles of the southern group are where the Sultan of Sulu reigned, where they have polygamy and slavery. Dewey said, "They may be neglected, especially the isles of the southern group."

Luzon is in all respects the most desirable to retain. Contains most important commercial ports. Manila is farthest north. Produces all of the good tobacco. Friendly natives. Civilization somewhat advanced. Not yet developed. Possible rich minerals. Population, 825,000. Subic Bay best harbor for coaling purposes and military. Water deep; landlocked; easily defended. Strategically, command of bay and city of Manila, with arsenal at Cavite, most valuable.

Panay, Cebu, Negros thickly populated, most civilized, and well cultivated. Iloilo second commercial port; center of sugar trade; a good harbor strategically; in view of the situation, good for defense. Cebu third commercial port; a good harbor, very desirable. No coal of good quality can be procured in Philippine Islands. Some has been mined on Cebu, English company. I trust it may not be necessary to order me to Washington. Should regret very much to leave here while matters remain in present critical condition.

DEWEY.

Now, Mr. President, it appears that immediately upon signing the protocol the President attempted to ascertain the value of these islands, whether they had coal and mineral, etc.—their resources. Was it an inspiration that led the President to make this inquiry? Certainly if God had anything to do with this transaction the inspiration must have come to the person who had the power and did direct that we should take nothing less than the island of Luzon.

Afterwards we took all the group, polygamy and everything else. Who directed that? Was that God's work also? Who insisted that our flag should fly above a harem and a slave market? Why, Mr. President, it seems to me that if a man did a philanthropic act, if he did something prompted by the better nature of man, it would be well to charge it to the Supreme Being. But if a man is going to plunder somebody else and wants to know whether what he has is worth stealing or not, the inspiration ought to come from the devil and not from God.

But, Mr. President, this extreme philanthropic view of the subject, this extreme responsibility thrown upon the Deity, is not shared in by all men. They are divided on the subject. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] is extremely intense in this direction, and also in the direction of taking the islands, because they are rich and will be so profitable to have, while the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] objects to the sordid view of the Senator from Indiana and does not want quite so much philanthropy mixed up with the transaction.

Now, what I want to ascertain is what the argument is on the part of the imperialists. Are we going to rely on the doctrine that we are going to bless those people with our civilization against their will, and that God has ordered us to do a great work? That is the English doctrine, the doctrine which has justified the plunder of every colony she has conquered on earth. Are we going to do that, or are we going, after all, to fall back on half of the position of the Senator from Indiana and the whole position of the Washington Post on this subject, and are we simply going to say, "They are rich and worth seizing, and therefore we will seize them, no matter how much blood and treasure it costs"? If the contest is to settle down to this proposition, then perhaps the information asked by my amendment which was tabled yesterday, for the instructions to the commissioners, is immaterial.

If we are going to settle down to the proposition that here is a foothold from which we can join the other robber nations of the world in plundering China, and the foothold itself is worth having, then I am prepared to show, Mr. President, that the islands are not worth having; that they will confer no happiness upon the people of the United States; that they will simply increase the burden of the men who produce the wealth of this country, for we raise our taxes by a per capita levy upon consumption.

It will simply lay a burden upon the people who raise the revenue and pay the taxes, and compel them not only to furnish the money, but to furnish the common soldiers, to be officered by the wealthy classes, who own and control the Administration. Our boys will look forward to a career to end in unknown graves in a tropical land. A high aspiration, is it not, for the descendants of men who established, as they believed, a perpetual and eternal republic in this country?

No revenue can come from these islands to the United States. We have spent more money already than every dollar of the commerce, if their commerce is no greater than it has been in the past, that those islands will have for the next fifteen or twenty years. Their total commerce, their imports and their exports, were not to exceed $15,000,000 a year. We have spent $200,000,000 already, besides the $20,000,000 we gave Spain.

Did Spain insist on our taking the Sulu Islands, with its slavery and polygamy, when we offered her $20,000,000 for these islands? The correspondence would show. We are in the dark on that subject.

If she did, with what irony, with what concealed satisfaction, she must look upon the act! I imagine the Spanish people enjoying great satisfaction at the wonderful victory which they have gained over us by the overthrow of every principle we ever advocated and the adoption of the Spanish policy. Did Spain force upon us this Sulu group? I should like to have known that fact. But if, after all, this debate is simply to be that this is a profitable venture and the elements of philanthropy are to be discarded and abandoned, if cant and hypocrisy are no longer to be the chief reason given, before this debate is over we shall show that a constant loss and drain must come to the people of the United States if we undertake to hold the group.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate——

Mr. HOAR. I ask leave to make one statement, which I did not wish to make before, I was so anxious to have the resolution adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator desire a reconsidertion of the vote by which the resolution was adopted?

Mr. HOAR. I will move to reconsider the vote in form, and I make it now. I merely wish to say that there are one or two phrases in the amendment of my colleague which do not commend themselves to my judgment as fitting phrases, but I did not wish to make any point on them or to delay the resolution by discussing them. I do not want them quoted against me hereafter as expressing my belief of the present condition of things; that is all. I withdraw the motion to reconsider.

SEIZURES IN AND NEAR DELAGOA BAY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution submitted by the senior Senator from Maine, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. HALE on the 10th instant, as follows:

Whereas property of citizens of the United States not contraband of war has been lately seized by the military authorities of Great Britain in and near Delagoa Bay, South Africa, without good reason for the same and contrary to the accepted principles of international law; and

Whereas said property is now unjustly detained by the military authorities of Great Britain, in disregard of the rights of the owners of the same: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the Secretary of State is hereby requested to send to the Senate all information in possession of the State Department relating to said seizure and detention; and also to inform the Senate what steps have been taken in requesting the restoration of property taken and detained as aforesaid, and whether or not the Department has informed the proper British authorities that, if said detention is persisted in, such act will be considered as without warrant and offensive to the Government and people of the United States.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I do not suppose that there is any objection to the resolution; but, at the suggestion of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], I wish to amend the second whereas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has the right to modify the resolution.

Mr. HALE. The second whereas reads:

Whereas said property is now unjustly detained, etc.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I have not the resolution before me, but I suggest to the Senator from Maine that as I recollect it it alleges as a matter of fact and law, of course, that the property was improperly and unjustly seized. That is just the question at issue. I do not think we ought to be concluded on that point. I suggest the same amendment with regard to the first whereas.

Mr. HALE. Let the second be amended first so as to read:

Whereas it is alleged said property is now unjustly detained, etc.

The SECRETARY. After the word "whereas" insert the words "it is alleged."

Mr. WOLCOTT. I should like to have the resolution read.

Mr. HALE. As soon as we get it modified it will be read, of course. The first whereas reads:

Whereas property of the citizens of the United States not contraband of war has been lately seized by the military authorities of Great Britain—

There is no question about that—

in and near Delagoa Bay, South Africa.

I think that is all right.

Mr. DAVIS. How does it read now?

Mr. HALE. Now let the resolution as amended be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution as modified will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution as modified, as follows:

Whereas property of citizens of the United States not contraband of war has been lately seized by the military authorities of Great Britain in and near Delagoa Bay, South Africa, without good reason for the same, and contrary to the accepted principles of international law; and

Whereas it is alleged said property is now unjustly detained by the military authorities of Great Britain, in disregard of the rights of the owners of the same: Therefore,

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the Secretary of State is hereby requested to send to the Senate all information in possession of the State Department relating to said seizure and detention, and also to inform the Senate what steps have been taken in requesting the restoration of property taken and detained as aforesaid, and whether or not the Department has informed the proper British authorities that if said detention is persisted in such act will be considered as without warrant and offensive to the Government and people of the United States.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I wish to be heard for a few moments on the motives which impel me to make that motion.

It is my present impression that this resolution or any resolutions on this subject are prematurely introduced. The event to which this resolution relates is not a month old; it is in course of diplomatic consideration. Nothing has appeared yet to indicate that the negotiations are not proceeding in the most satisfactory manner. But, Mr. President, irrespective of that, I think it is gravely to be considered whether the absolute assertion in the first "whereas" of this resolution is correct or may not be incorrect as a principle of law under all the circumstances as now understood. It is asserted in the first line of the first "whereas" of this resolution that—

Whereas property of citizens of the United States not contraband of war has been lately seized—

That is well understood to relate to American flour seized upon British vessels; and here the declaration is that this flour under any circumstances, or under the circumstances involved in that case, not fully understood as yet, not yet reported upon, is absolutely not contraband of war.

Mr. President, in regard to that, the principle, as I understand it, is that flour or any product of that character may or may not be contraband under the particular circumstances of the case. As a general rule, the products, like flour, of a neutral country are not contraband; but it is a question of fact whether the immediate destination of such flour is for hostile purposes, namely, the sustenance of a belligerent army. That is a question of fact. If it is so immediately destined it is contraband of war.

The first recital proceeds still further:

without good reason for the same, and contrary to the accepted principles of international law.

That is a declaration by the Senate deciding the very question in dispute, the question concerning which the two Governments are now negotiating—whether in this particular case, this special situation, that seizure has been a departure from or contrary to the principles of international law. My impression, as at present advised, is that it will not be wise for the Senate to make an explicit statement of that kind when such a matter is under negotiation, and when, after all, the determination of a clear question of fact must be made before the question of law can possibly arise.

This event is not a month old; it is being negotiated about. No information has been given that the negotiations are not progressing satisfactorily. Let us wait and see before we pass resolutions of this character, authoritatively determining as an absolute principle of law that which we do not know and can not know is applicable to the yet unascertained facts of this particular case.

But, Mr. President, what strikes me as the thing most to be criticised in this resolution—and I do not want to vote upon it under present conditions without more consideration being given to it—is the concluding paragraph, which reads:

And whether or not the Department has informed the proper British authorities that if said detention is persisted in such act will be considered as without warrant and offensive to the Government and people of the United States.

I venture to say that no declaration of that kind was ever given out by a government, either through its executive organs or its legislative bodies, until negotiations had failed and as an immediate preliminary warning that the situation had become so irremediable by negotiation as to probably require the invocation of hostile acts.

To require the Secretary of State or the President, in regard to any negotiation which is all around understood to be progressing satisfactorily so far and not yet concluded, to inform another Government in limine that unless the very thing which the two Governments are contesting about diplomatically is yielded at once refusal shall be "considered as without warrant and offensive to the Government and people of the United States" is very serious and offensive language. It means, in substance, in effect, and by all usage, it is nothing but a threat of resort to the last reason of kings.

I think, Mr. President, the resolution would best be referred. The Senate ought not, at the present amicable stage of the controversy, to decide as an absolute principle of law the very question that is under negotiation; it ought not, above all things, to make the declaration with which this resolution concludes.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the circumstances that gave rise to this resolution are found in the statement which I ask may be read from the Secretary's desk touching the seizure of American property.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

Mr. DAVIS. May I ask the Senator what it is he desires to have read?

Mr. HALE. It is an extract from a report in one of the daily New York papers at the time of the transaction.

Mr. DAVIS. What is the date?

Mr. HALE. I do not remember. It was at the time of the seizure, perhaps the next day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The date of the dispatch is December 26, the Chair is informed. The Secretary will proceed with the reading.

The Secretary read as follows:

TWENTY THOUSAND BARRELS OF FLOUR ABOARD.

Three steamships sailing from New York for South African ports, including Lourenzo Marquez, in Delagoa Bay, in Portuguese territory, have been held up by the British within three months. The Dutch steamship *Maria*, which sailed from this port on August 30, arrived at Cape Town on October 4, at East London on November 6, and at Delagoa Bay on November 12; the British steamer *Beatrice* sailed from New York on October 17 for Algoa Bay, East London, and Delagoa Bay, and the British steamer *Mashona* left New York on November 3 for Algoa Bay and Port Natal.

Each of these vessels carried American flour consigned to Portuguese merchants at Lourenzo Marquez. The total amount was about 20,000 barrels. Norton & Son, of the Produce Exchange Annex, are the agents for all three of these ships.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I drew the resolution with some care, intending to limit it in its effects to an inquiry. The Senate is entitled to know what the situation is; the country is entitled to know what the situation is. It does not know, and there is to-day profound ignorance as to what is going on in asserting the rights of the United States which have been infringed by the military authorities of Great Britain.

The statements of fact in the resolution are borne out by the situation that this property of citizens of the United States—not arms, not explosives, not munitions of war, but flour—proceeding to a foreign port, belonging to American citizens, has been seized and that this property is not contraband of war. No lawyer can doubt it. We do not need the investigation of a committee to determine that.

It is no light event. Property of our citizens transported in the line of peaceful trade, seized by one of the armed powers in a war that is going on, is a thing which profoundly affects the American people; it affects every corn grower, every wheat farmer, the owner of the cattle on a thousand hills, the mill man, the middleman—everybody who is interested in producing and exporting the products of the farm and the field is interested in this question and is entitled to know what has been done in this case.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, says that we shall not know and that the Department shall not be asked until his committee has taken the resolution and passed upon it, as it would upon a statute or upon a treaty; and many Senators believe if it goes to that committee, that will be the end of it. The majority of the Senate, Mr. President, can send the resolution to the committee—can stifle the resolution—but it can go there in no other way. A yea-and-nay vote of the Senate can declare that this Senate is not enough interested in the subject-matter to send this inquiry to the Secretary of State.

I might have made the resolution very much stronger. The Senator from Minnesota objects to the following language:

And whether or not the Department has informed the proper British authorities that if said detention is persisted in such act will be considered as without warrant and offensive to the Government and people of the United States.

I might have put into the resolution a monition to the Secretary of State that it is the sense of the Senate that he should so state to the British foreign office, but I have done nothing of that kind. I have simply asked the Secretary of State to report to us whether he has done that or not. In his reply, if he says that he has not, that ends it. I do not know, Mr. President, but what personally I should have been willing to have put in the stronger

language of suggesting to or directing the Secretary of State to go as far as this, but I did not think in the scope of a resolution of inquiry I ought to do that. The Secretary of State is not instructed in any way in the matter. The resolution reads:

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the Secretary of State is hereby requested—

That should be, of course, "directed." Such resolutions are always put in that way; and I will modify the resolution by making that change now.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. What is that?

Mr. HALE. I modify the resolution by putting in the word "directed" instead of "requested," because that is the form the Senate always uses in resolutions touching the Departments.

That the Secretary of State is hereby directed to send to the Senate all information in the possession of the State Department relating to said seizure and detention—

Can anybody object to that?—

and also to inform the Senate what steps have been taken in requesting the restoration of property taken and detained as aforesaid.

Not demanding——

Mr. HAWLEY. Why not stop right there?

Mr. CHANDLER. I suggest to the Senator to stop at that point; to strike out the remainder of the paragraph after the words "detained as aforesaid."

Mr. HALE. Certainly. I do not consider that the resolution is giving any instruction to the Department. I am entirely willing the resolution shall stop with the words "detained as aforesaid," and I will modify it in that way.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Is the Senator sure that the flour which has been taken is the property of American citizens? It has been stated again and again in the press that this flour was taken from an English ship, and was sent from here by a commission house which claims and asserts without dispute that its responsibility ceased when it sent its bill of lading to its English correspondents; that the whole controversy is between English subjects and the English Crown; that the flour was taken upon an English vessel, and that no American is making the slightest claim whatever for any damages by reason of the seizure of the flour. I ask the Senator if he has any information about that?

Mr. HALE. That is precisely what I am trying to find out. If the State Department has found that the facts are as indicated by the Senator from Colorado, it will send us that information at once, and we ought to have it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. But that is not what the Senator says in his resolution. The Senator says, "Whereas property of citizens of the United States not contraband of war has been lately seized." If such property has not been so seized, we are a little premature.

Mr. HALE. But it is necessary to make certain statements as the foundation of a resolution. I have no question whatever that this property—I do not say that I know it, but I have no question—that it was the property of citizens of the United States, and it was so alleged in the newspapers at the time of the seizure.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The New York World, or whatever paper it was, published that; but I understand the American consignors disavow any responsibility, and it is a question whether title did not pass upon the bill of lading being furnished to the English correspondents. I merely want the facts.

Mr. STEWART. Will the Senator from Maine allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. STEWART. I suggest that the Senator modify the first clause so as to read, "Whereas it is alleged;" then strike out all of the preamble after the word "Africa," and then strike out all of the resolution after the word "aforesaid," in line 6. I think with these changes the resolution would be passed by unanimous consent. It would then read:

Whereas it is alleged that property of citizens of the United States not contraband of war has been lately seized by the military authorities of Great Britain in or near Delagoa Bay, South Africa: Therefore,

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of State is hereby directed, etc.

Then let the language of the resolution stand as it now does down to the word "aforesaid," in line 6, and there stop.

Mr. HALE. That amendment has already been made.

Mr. STEWART. The last part has been amended, but not the first, I think.

Mr. DAVIS. Not in the first part.

Mr. COCKRELL. The first clause of the preamble has not been changed.

Mr. HALE. That was suggested by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], and I agreed to it.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. What I wanted—I do not know whether or not it has been done—was, after the word "whereas," to insert "it is alleged that."

Mr. HALE. I agreed to that.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. So that the first "whereas" should read:

Whereas it is alleged that property of citizens of the United States, etc.

Mr. DAVIS. How about the second "whereas?"

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. That has been amended.

Mr. HALE. Yes; and I agreed to the other amendment, too.

Mr. DAVIS. Has the last clause of the resolution been stricken out?

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. Then I have no objection to it.

Mr. HOAR. I should like at some time to put a question to the Senator from Maine, if I can get the opportunity.

Mr. STEWART. I wish to suggest that——

Mr. HALE. Let us have the changes in the resolution stated.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the resolution be read as it has been modified.

Mr. STEWART. My suggestion was to strike out all after the words "South Africa," in the first "whereas," and that the amendment suggested by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] be inserted. Then I am sure there will be no objection to the resolution.

Mr. HALE. The amendment suggested by the Senator from Connecticut was, after the first word "whereas," to insert "it is alleged." I agreed to that, and the same words can be inserted after the word "whereas" in the second clause of the preamble.

Mr. STEWART. My suggestion is to strike out all after the words "South Africa."

Mr. HALE. You can not do that, because putting in the word "alleged" covers all that follows. It now reads that "it is alleged" that such and such has been done. That covers everything.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Let the first "whereas" be read as it now stands.

Mr. LODGE. I hope that will be done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read as requested.

Mr. FORAKER. Let the whole resolution be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the entire resolution as it has been modified.

The Secretary read as follows:

Whereas it is alleged that property of citizens of the United States not contraband of war has been lately seized by the military authorities of Great Britain in and near Delagoa Bay, South Africa, without good reason for the same, and contrary to the accepted principles of international law; and

Whereas it is alleged that said property is now unjustly detained by the military authorities of Great Britain, in disregard of the rights of the owners of the same: Therefore,

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the Secretary of State is hereby directed to send to the Senate all information in possession of the State Department relating to said seizure and detention, and also to inform the Senate what steps have been taken in requesting the restoration of property taken and detained as aforesaid.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Maine a question, if I may be permitted——

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. Does the Senator understand that it is in accordance either with the usage of the Senate or with the proper conduct of our foreign relations to address such a direction as this to the Secretary of State? Do not such resolutions always go to the President, and do they not always reserve the President's discretion as to the interests of the public service?

It may be that an apparently harmless statement by the Senate, which is a part of the diplomatic authority of the Government, may, by reason of some misunderstanding, seriously and injuriously affect pending negotiations. A minister of the United States was removed on the alleged ground that he had stated on his own authority to a foreign Government that if they took a certain position, of course they would take it under their responsibility for the consequences. That was all. It was a position which the United States was combating and which the Administration, if necessary, would combat by force; but such a communication made it very difficult for the other party to yield.

I suppose, in deference to other Senators who are charged with the foreign relations of the country more particularly in the first instance, that the uniform course of the Senate in regard to matters affecting our foreign relations and under diplomatic discussion is to address a request to the President; that we should not intrude upon such a diplomacy by a peremptory direction to the Secretary of State to make public the negotiations in a pending case or other information of more or less importance. I have understood that that has been the custom of the Senate.

I wish to ask the Senator from Maine, Would it not be better to address this resolution to the President, with the usual reservation that he shall communicate the information if not incompatible with the interests of the public service, instead of going to the Secretary of State with this direction?

Mr. HALE. I thought of that in drawing the resolution, but I find that there are plenty of precedents, where information is sought simply as to current events, for directing the Secretary of

State, like any other member of the Cabinet, to convey information to the Senate; and under those conditions I prefer that the resolution, which has now the formal matters connected with it adjusted and made satisfactory, I believe, to everybody, shall remain in its present form.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have no objection to the resolution in its present modified form, as I understand it, but I want to ask the Senator from Maine if I understood him to say that food products could not be contraband of war?

Mr. HALE. I do not know, Mr. President, that I should say that under any circumstances and conditions food products may not be contraband of war, but it would take a very extreme condition to make contraband of war flour, corn, meat, things which are purely articles of commerce, not, as I have said, munitions of war nor arms nor explosives. I do not know but that such a case may be found where flour had been purchased for an army and was being transported directly to that army. It may be that under those conditions food products might be contraband. But I must remind the Senator that if any American Administration should go so far as to yield that point, it would be fraught with the greatest danger to us, not now but in any future war.

During the whole time when the empire, now the Republic, of France was overrun by the German armies, when war was going on in French territory and when France was raising armies in order to meet the Germans and to drive them off, if possible, we kept exporting flour, corn, and all sorts of breadstuffs and meat into French ports without Germany questioning it. I have no doubt that at that time such was the need of the French armies that if a cargo of flour was unloaded at Marseilles the French Government at once purchased, or, perhaps, before that time had purchased, it for their army, and yet Germany never thought of invoking this doctrine of "contraband of war" applying to food stuffs. While my answer to the Senator is that there might possibly be a case—an extreme case—where the powers of the world would agree that flour might be contraband, I can hardly imagine it, and I do not imagine that the State Department to-day is yielding that principle and is doing anything that in the future will get us into trouble in wars that may be waged by the European powers. I do not intimate that, but I do want the information, and as the resolution has been modified I hope it will pass.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I asked the question because, if my memory serves me correctly, we took very strong ground in regard to that subject at the time of the civil war, and I think we carried the doctrine a good deal further than Lord Stowell carried it when we made serious objections prior to the war of 1812, and I think the doctrine of "continuous voyage" has never been carried so far as we have carried it in the *Springbok* case and in some others.

Mr. HALE. The Senator will bear in mind that if we took, as he has stated, strong ground in this direction in the war of the rebellion, it was because we had established a blockade. That introduced a new feature, undoubtedly.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator can not remember the cases to which I refer. These were cases where articles held to be contraband of war were taken to Nassau and Matamoras, to neutral ports, and our courts held that that only constituted a stage in the voyage; and as to the fact that they were sent to neutral ports, I think the language used was that it was simply one plank in the same wharf.

Mr. HALE. Undoubtedly. It was on the way to break the blockade.

Mr. LODGE. Precisely; but that was a question of fact and a matter of proof. If it could be shown that those products were for the use of the enemy in arms, we held the doctrine that they became contraband of war.

Now, I did not rise for the purpose of discussing the validity of that doctrine, but the fact that we send flour to the Boers to-day or that we send flour to England to-day, as we are doing every day—we have an undoubted right to do it—does not affect the question of its being contraband of war, supposing either belligerent party think they can prove that it is to be used for a military purpose; that is, if we adhere to our own decisions. It seems to me that it opens up a somewhat delicate and doubtful case in view of the attitude on which we ourselves have insisted with great elaboration.

As I said, I have no objection to the resolution as it stands. I do think—I agree with my colleague entirely—that it ought to be addressed, as all of these diplomatic inquiries are addressed, to the President of the United States, because it is through him that we receive all our diplomatic information. It seems to me that it ought to be put in the usual form, to the President of the United States, if not inconsistent with the public interest, and I hope that modification may be made.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, the preamble and the resolution have been very considerably modified by putting in the words "it is alleged" in the two branches of the preamble, and by striking out the concluding phrase in the resolution styling the conduct of Great Britain, in a certain contingency, as "without warrant and offensive to the Government and people of the United States." But I do not like it now. If we are beginning a serious discussion with Great Britain, which may have serious results, we should do it in that dignified and courteous style which befits a great nation in the face of possible serious eventualities. This is not a diplomatic paper, as it stands now, and it was worse before, of course, because it conveyed a veiled threat of war, and that is not the way to meet an argument with European powers, especially Great Britain.

Now, I have no doubt that that Government will be disposed to do anything within reason to maintain friendly relations with us. There now exists between these two countries that courtesy which, as the poet says, "befits nations ancient foes, turned friends."

I wish to make a suggestion to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. In view of the relations that the committee holds to the President and Secretary of State, it would not be difficult, in a private, informal conference, to find out the condition of this affair, and whether it would be agreeable to the Administration to disclose the present situation of the negotiations. And that brings me to another criticism.

Most unquestionably this inquiry ought to be directed to the President of the United States, with the usual caveat, because as it stands now the President of the United States might be very well aware of certain facts, certain language, etc., which it would not be wise to give to the public, but he can not exercise that discretion under the resolution as it reads now. It "directs" the Secretary of State to send to the Senate certain information. The President can not command the Secretary of State under this to omit certain parts of the correspondence. I think it is quite wrong, and I think the better way is to put the resolution in the hands of the Committee on Foreign Relations, that it may study the true situation and advise us as to what is the wisest thing for us to say.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] is laboring under a false impression as to the power of the Executive in this matter. I understand that the Secretary of State, like every other member of the Cabinet, is subordinate to the President of the United States. Of course there are thousands of things done in the Departments about which the President knows nothing, but they are supposed to be done by his authority. A very important matter of any kind coming before a Cabinet officer—I mean involving a question that might get us into trouble with a foreign power and things of that kind—would naturally go to the President. The Cabinet officer would go there with it and consult the President. The President has the authority to say to any Cabinet officer, "You decline to answer that if you think it ought not to be answered."

I wish to suggest to the Senator another thing. The words we put in—to inform us, if he does not think it incompatible with the public interest—are words simply of courtesy and nothing else, and the resolution goes to the President with exactly the same force, and no more, with the words out than it would with the words in. We could not compel the President of the United States to send us information that he believed it contrary to the public interest to send. There is no way in which we can do that. Yet, of course, if we found that he was withholding that which we thought ought to be sent here, we could impeach him, and we could impeach him just as well with those words out of the resolution as with the words in. We should keep in mind all the time that we direct these officers simply because it is supposed to be a little more in accord with our dignity to say to a Cabinet officer, "You do this," and we request the President when we address him personally because it is more dignified and proper with reference to his high office that we should request of him.

There is no difficulty about this matter. If the Secretary of State thinks there is any trouble about it, he will consult the President, and if the President thinks there is any impropriety in the request, we will find it out by a declaration from the Secretary of State that it is considered incompatible with the public interest to give the information.

I want to say one word now about the contraband question—not that I am going into any discussion of it. Food may be contraband of war under certain conditions, as the Senator from Maine says. Those conditions are pretty well understood. Our relations with the commerce of the world during the war of the rebellion were very different from those of most nations, because there were two things we were asserting: First, that this was our country, and while certain governments had recognized the belligerency of these people, we insisted all the time that their relations existing with us were different from those which would exist if it were a foreign war; and we maintained a blockade on the coast, which we had to do after the declaration that these people were entitled to belligerent rights.

Now, I do not understand that when we ship to Europe food of any kind it is contraband of war because somebody in Europe may ship it to a country engaged in war; and the Senator from Massachusetts will have to hunt a good deal to find that we have

laid down any such international law as that. We can not afford to do that. Mr. President, there will not be any difficulty about this matter. If Great Britain has seized our flour which was on its way to a neutral port, although she may think it is going into a hostile region to feed some people, she is not going to hold it. If there are any people in the world who are interested in maintaining the principle that food is not contraband of war it is Great Britain. She is not going to say, for the purpose of this affair down there, which is a small affair, that food is contraband on the high seas. If food is contraband so are mules, and Great Britain is buying mules in this country and shipping them directly to Africa for use in the army; and if anybody should complain of our shipping flour we may complain of their shipping mules also.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BACON. It is for a question.

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. I desire to inquire of the Senator from Colorado whether he understands the language "and contrary to the accepted principles of international law" to be an announcement on the part of the Senate that we consider it a breach of international law, or does that come in under the general phrase "it is alleged?"

Mr. HALE. That is right; that is it.

Mr. TELLER. I suppose it would come under the general phrase "it is alleged." There are conditions where food is contraband of war. For instance, where a fort is besieged the rule is that you can not introduce it into that fort. That is contraband of war.

Mr. WOLCOTT. You can not introduce what?

Mr. TELLER. Food.

Mr. BACON. The question I desire to ask the Senator is this: If that is the construction which it is intended by the author of the resolution shall be put, simply that it is alleged to be contrary to the accepted principles of international law——

Mr. TELLER. Certainly; it is alleged to be contrary, and if the Department shows us a condition of affairs which makes it contraband that is the end of it.

Mr. BACON. I do not understand, in other words, that this resolution announces as a proposition adjudicated by the Senate that it is contraband of war.

Mr. TELLER. No; I do not think so.

Mr. HALE. I should have put in those words in drawing the resolution if I had thought of them. The moment the Senator from Connecticut yesterday or the other day suggested them, I agreed that they ought to go in; and they cover all that follows.

Mr. TELLER. I think so.

Mr. President, this question of contraband articles of war has been somewhat modified and enlarged of late years. There has been a disposition to hold that coal is contraband of war, as well as other things. But I do not myself have any uneasiness about what will happen. I am satisfied, from what I see in the public press, that the Government has taken steps in this matter. The newspapers tell us that our Government has submitted the whole matter to the British Government, and they have agreed to reply when they become familiar with the facts. The newspapers tell us that they have already returned the flour to the parties who claimed it. Whether that is true or not we do not know. We will know when we get the answer to this resolution.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, the resolution as it has now been modified seems to be unobjectionable in form, but the question whether it is wise to adopt the resolution at this time still remains, and the more I think of it the more I think it is unwise for the Senate, while a contention of this kind is pending between the Executive Departments and the representatives of the British Government, for the Senate to interfere, not that we do not have the right to do so, although I think we ought to address our resolution to the President of the United States, with the usual qualification, that if he does not think it incompatible with the interest of the public service he shall communicate the information to the Senate.

The Secretary of State does not stand exactly in the same relation to the legislative department that the other Secretaries of Departments do. The Secretary of State is not required by law to report to Congress. All other Cabinet officers, if I am not mistaken, are required by law to report to Congress. The Secretary of State has been exempted from that requirement for the very reason that his duties are mainly diplomatic, carried on with foreign countries and upon matters which may be very delicate and which may involve us in serious embarrassments if the negotiations during their pendency are reported to Congress.

Mr. President, is there anything in this case which makes it necessary that the Senate shall depart from its usual custom and call upon the Secretary of State to report the exact conditions of the negotiations which are pending between our diplomatic officers and the diplomatic officers of Great Britain? I think not. I think, on the contrary, from all that we hear, that the negotiations are being conducted with propriety and with earnestness and in a way which is likely to lead to a satisfactory conclusion. Under all these circumstances, I think it is unwise to pass the resolution. If there was any disposition apparent in any way on the part of the Secretary of State, representing the President, not to deal energetically with this matter, that might be a reason why we should ask that all the information in his possession should be communicated to the Senate.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. I presume, of course, that the Senator from Connecticut is aware that the newspapers contain reports, more or less largely circulated, that there is an agreement or understanding between the United States and Great Britain, and it is at least suspected by some Americans that that is true. There is, furthermore, an idea that this Administration is more friendly to Great Britain than it is to the Boers, and with that view I presume the Senator from Maine desired to have the direct information as to whether those newspaper insinuations had any foundation in fact. We can get that in no other way so clearly and so positively as by letting the diplomatic officers of this Government tell us just what they have done, so as to find out whether the rights of American commerce have been invaded, and whether the American Administration is taking the necessary steps to see that the right of search, for which the war of 1812 was fought, is not being set up here at this late day, or that we are submitting to even greater indignities than we did then.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. It is quite a long inquiry, Mr. President.

Mr. TILLMAN. I did not make it as an inquiry, but as throwing some light on the course of the Senator's remarks.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I would very much prefer that the Senator from South Carolina should illuminate my remarks after they are entirely completed. But if, as the Senator from South Carolina intimates, the motive for the introduction of the resolution is founded upon a suspicion that our Government will not assert its rights as against the English Government, then it is an additional reason why I do not wish to vote for this resolution. I have no such suspicion. I believe that the President and Secretary of State will vigorously and rigorously insist upon the rights of the citizens of this country. I am rather glad to be illuminated by the Senator from South Carolina as to the motive which underlies, as he supposes, the introduction of this resolution, which is that there is a suspicion that our Government will not deal earnestly and vigorously in upholding the rights of commerce of American citizens.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator allow me again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. I presume the Senator has seen in the papers that we are shipping mules to the British army for purposes purely military, and that our markets are open to Great Britain because she has a fleet and can get her supplies across the ocean without any interruption, whereas Delagoa Bay is in Portuguese territory and is the only outlet or port of the Boers. It does seem to me that every American is interested in having equality of trade and equality of opportunity on the part of the Boers to get munitions of war, whether flour or what not, in the same way that England is getting them here in the open market without any protest or effort on the part of this Government or anybody else to restrain them. And England should not be permitted to interfere with our commerce to a neutral port.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. If I understand international law, there is no inhibition upon any American citizen selling and shipping supplies of any sort to governments or to individuals representing governments who are engaged in war. They do it at their own risk. If the goods are seized in transitu, then the question arises whether they are contraband of war. This is a question which our Government considers.

But I am not to be diverted from the point I was making, that I do not believe it wise, just at this stage of the negotiations, to call upon the Secretary of State or the President to tell us exactly what representations he has made and exactly what replies he is getting from the representatives of the English Government in the discussion which is going on between the two Governments.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will my colleague pardon me an interruption? He says "call or request." He will note that this is a demand and a command.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Exact'y. I have said all that I desire to say.

Mr. HALE obtained the floor.

Mr. FORAKER. Will the Senator from Maine allow me for just a moment?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. FORAKER. I wish to inquire of the Senator from Maine if he has objection to further amending his resolution so as to address the inquiry to the President instead of the Secretary of State? I think there are a good many Senators here who would have no objection at all to the resolution in that form who do object to it in its present form. I myself would prefer to vote for the resolution, if I vote for it at all, in the amended form suggested.

I have no idea that there is any alliance such as has been suggested, and I have no sympathy with the theory that there are any grounds for suspicion as to motive or anything else. I assume that the Senator from Maine introduced the resolution simply because he wanted this information, and it was certainly competent for him to ask the Senate to make the inquiry if he saw fit. The only objection I have to his resolution is the form in which he puts it. I think, as he has already suggested as to another part of it, that this is accidental. Therefore, I suggest to him that we amend by striking out the words "Secretary of State" in line 2 and inserting the word "President;" then, at the beginning of line 3, insert "if not, in his opinion, incompatible with the public interest;" and in line 4, after the word "said" and before the word "seizure," insert the word "alleged." That will not change at all the spirit or purposes or scope of the resolution.

Mr. ALDRICH. "Directed" should be changed to "requested."

Mr. FORAKER. It reads "requested."

Mr. DAVIS. That was changed. It should be changed back.

Mr. FORAKER. I did not know that it had been changed. The word "requested" should remain. If it was stricken out and the word "directed" inserted, I ask that it be changed back to the word originally used.

Mr. HALE. Is the Senator from Ohio through?

Mr. FORAKER. Yes. Has the Senator from Maine any objection to those changes?

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, there never was presented to the Senate a clearer resolution simply of inquiry, propounding no facts, but merely stating that there were allegations upon which to base the resolution, than the one I hold in my hand. Every amendment which has been suggested to me has been readily accepted, because the amendments were of form and somewhat of substance; and yet they tended to shear the resolution of any possible objection. Still Senators are not satisfied. It is said that we should not put inquiries now while negotiations are going on with Great Britain. Negotiations! There is no treaty being negotiated. The Government undoubtedly has presented its request for the restoration of this property, and it is not a matter of give and take between the two powers, the Government of the United States and Great Britain. It is simply whether or not Great Britain is to-day disposed, instead of yielding to this request of ours, to delay and procrastinate after the fashion of British diplomacy; and if that is so, I want to know it. I think the Senate wants to know it. I know the country wants to know it.

I am not afraid, as the Senator from Connecticut is, that we shall overstep the bounds by passing this resolution, one simply of inquiry for information. I am not afraid we shall be doing the undiplomatic thing when we do this. But Senators are not content, no matter how the resolution is framed or is drawn or amended; but the determination is that it shall not pass the Senate. I do not know that it will pass the Senate. I for one will consent to no further amendments. I should like a vote of the Senate at once, and if we can get it I will take no more time upon this proposition to stifle the resolution by referring it to the Committee on Foreign Relations. If the Senate wants to do that, let it do it.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. FORAKER. I hope the Senator from Maine will not think I had in view any purpose of stifling his resolution. On the contrary, I tried to facilitate the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. HALE. I did not refer to the Senator from Ohio, of course.

Mr. FORAKER. I regret to hear the Senator announce that he will not accept the amendments which I suggested on the floor a moment ago. I trust he will reconsider that. It does not affect the substance of the resolution, and if he does not accept them, it will necessitate my moving that the resolution be so amended.

Mr. HALE. I will not. I like it better in its present form. The Senator can move the amendments, and if the Senate adopts them, that ends it. I want a vote of the Senate.

Mr. FORAKER. I move, then——

Mr. CHANDLER. A motion to refer is pending.

Mr. FORAKER. Does the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. FORAKER. I move to strike out, in line 2, the words "Secretary of State" and insert "President;" at the beginning of line 3, to insert the words "if not, in his opinion, incompatible with the public interest;" and by inserting the word "alleged" after the word "said" in line 4 and before the word "seizure."

Mr. DAVIS. At the present stage of the question I withdraw, with leave, the motion to refer the resolution to the committee.

Mr. HALE. I did not hear the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota withdraws the motion to refer the resolution to the committee. The resolution is now before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BACON. I thought the Senator was through.

Mr. CHANDLER. The amendments of the Senator from Ohio are pending.

Mr. FORAKER. I had the floor to move an amendment.

Mr. BACON. I beg pardon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments proposed by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. CHANDLER. Let them be reported.

Mr. DAVIS. Let them be read.

Mr. HALE. Let them be read, but treated as one amendment instead of voting on each clause.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read for information.

The SECRETARY. In line 2, strike out the words "Secretary of State" and insert the word "President;" in the same line, strike out the word "directed" and insert "requested;" at the end of the line, after the word "Senate," insert "if not, in his opinion, incompatible with the public interests;" and in line 4, before the word "seizure," insert the word "alleged;" so that if amended the resolution would read:

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the President is hereby requested to send to the Senate, if not, in his opinion, incompatible with the public interest, all information in possession of the State Department relating to said alleged seizure and detention, and also to inform the Senate what steps have been taken in requesting the restoration of property taken and detained as aforesaid.

Mr. HALE. Now let us have a vote.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I simply desire to say one word. I favor the amendment directing a request to the President.

I wish to suggest to the Senator from Maine that the practical effect is the same. I do not question whatever our right to direct the Secretary of State to furnish information, but in a matter whenever, in the opinion of the President, the information directed to be furnished by a Cabinet officer should not be conveyed to the Senate, there would doubtless be received by us from the President a communication to the effect that the information could not, in his opinion, be properly communicated to the Senate at this time. So, practically, it would be the same thing.

I do not conceive that the Senator from Colorado is entirely correct in his statement that in a case where the Senate directs a Cabinet officer, if it should be deemed by him improper or incompatible with the public interest that the information should be given, we would receive a reply of that kind from the Cabinet officer. A Cabinet officer should certainly never be considered as authorized to return such a reply.

I think that the reason why the Senate directs a Cabinet officer is not simply that this is a legislative body, but because it is also a part of the executive branch. Whenever that direction to a Cabinet officer would, if complied with, work a public harm, we would receive that information through the President. So, practically, it is the same, and I think, as originally was suggested by the senior Senator from Massachusetts, and as has been again suggested by the Senator from Ohio and others, it is decidedly better that this resolution should be made to accord with what is more proper usage, relating, as it does, to a matter concerning our foreign relations.

I hope, therefore, that the Senator from Maine will himself consent to this change, or rather not oppose it, in order that the resolution may be in such form as will meet the approval of all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand the Senator from Maine to accept the amendments?

Mr. HALE. It is a question for the Senate to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendments proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER].

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon the preamble, the Chair is informed.

Mr. HALE. That will go with the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, such will be taken as the sense of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BERRY. I asked unanimous consent that the Senate might consider a bill that will take only a few minutes, and I gave way to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR]. I now ask that the bill be considered.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator from Arkansas will allow me, I wish to make a privileged motion. It will take but a moment.

Mr. BERRY. I have given way three times, but if the Senator insists——

Mr. CHANDLER. Then I shall have to make it as a privileged motion. It is only that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet at 1 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I have another resolution on the table which came over from yesterday.

Mr. BERRY. I hope the Senator from South Dakota will let me have my bill passed. It will take but a few minutes. I will yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. CHANDLER. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet at 1 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to.

PUBLIC RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES IN CUBA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which he will indicate.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I do not wish to have the resolution to which I refer displaced and go to the Calender at 2 o'clock; that is all.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will say to the Senator from Arkansas that the resolution which the Senator from South Dakota wants to have taken up is not objected to now, and it will take but a few moments, I think.

Mr. BERRY. All right; I will yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the resolution coming over from yesterday.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. PETTIGREW, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to send to the Senate an itemized statement of public receipts from taxation, customs, and all other sources, and also of public expenditures, including salaries paid to all officers and incidental expenses, in Cuba since the United States Government assumed control of that island.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendments for information.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed in line 3 of the resolution, after the word "sources," to insert the words "collected in Cuba;" and in line 5, after the word "Cuba," to insert "out of revenue so collected."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the Senator from South Dakota will modify his own resolution, and the amendments are accepted as a part of the original resolution. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

CUBAN VESSELS.

Mr. BERRY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 734) relating to Cuban vessels. I will state that the bill is a unanimous report from the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read for information.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That vessels owned by citizens of Cuba and documented as such by officers of the United States shall hereafter be entitled in ports of the United States to the rights and privileges of vessels of the most favored nation, and they and their cargoes shall be subject to no higher charges in ports of the United States than are imposed on the vessels and cargoes of the most favored nation in the same trade.

Mr. BERRY. The committee recommend that the second section be stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection to the consideration of the bill at this time?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment, to strike out section 2 in the following words:

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to refund, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, upon application and satisfactory evidence, tonnage taxes and light dues which have been imposed on vessels owned by citizens of Cuba entering ports of the United States since January 1, 1899, which have been in excess of the tonnage taxes prescribed by section 11 of the act of June 19, 1886.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. With regard to the bill which has just passed, I see no objection to it, but I do want to say that I think all measures relating to the island of Cuba and our relations to it should hereafter be referred to the committee which has that matter in charge.

Mr. BERRY. The bill was introduced by the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE], the Presiding Officer of the Senate; it was referred to the Committee on Commerce; it was taken up there for consideration; and I understood him to say, either about this bill or some other, that he had conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Relations with Cuba, and that that chairman had said it was best to let the Committee on Commerce dispose of the bill. It was unanimously recommended by all the members of the committee, after striking out the section which directed the repayment of the fees to the parties, and I was requested by the chairman to report it. That is all I know about it.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I am making no complaint, only I hope in the future that such bills will go to the proper committee.

AGREEMENT WITH BANNOCK AND SHOSHONE INDIANS.

Mr. SHOUP. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 255) to ratify an agreement made with the Indians of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, in Idaho, and making appropriation to carry the same into effect.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is that a bill on the Calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is No. 72 upon the Calendar. Is there any objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be read for information, subject to objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read for information.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. LODGE. This bill, I understand, has passed the Senate at a previous session, and I ask that the further reading may be dispensed with. It is very nearly 2 o'clock.

Mr. COCKRELL. That can not be done. We can not dispense with its reading because of the fact that it was passed at a former session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rules of the Senate will not permit the reading to be dispensed with. The Secretary will proceed.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill and was interrupted by

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it becomes the duty of the Chair to place before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. SHOUP. I ask unanimous consent that the regular order be laid aside, so that the consideration of this bill may be concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent is asked that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the purpose of finishing the consideration of the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. ALDRICH. I feel obliged to object to that, Mr. President. Let this bill come up to-morrow.

Mr. SHOUP. Then I make the request that immediately after the routine business to-morrow morning the bill be taken up, the reading completed, and that it be put upon its passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Notice will be taken.

Mr. WELLINGTON. I beg leave to say in this connection that yesterday I gave notice that immediately after the morning business to-morrow I should desire to submit some remarks to the Senate on the joint resolution which I introduced, and I understood that that was the order.

Mr. SHOUP. I will say to the Senator from Maryland that, in my judgment, this bill will not occupy five minutes.

Mr. WELLINGTON. I understand that the Senate has agreed that when it adjourns to-day it shall be to meet at 1 o'clock to-morrow, and I should not like to be interfered with by this measure, as the time will be short.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of opinion that the special notice given by the Senator from Maryland will take precedence when the time arrives. The unfinished business will now be proceeded with.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, in view of the great pressure thrown upon the Senate by the consideration of various measures, I feel it my duty to ask the Senate to fix a time for taking the vote upon the pending bill. I am sure this course will meet the convenience of all Senators, and I trust there will be no objection to the suggestion which I shall make.

I request that the vote may be taken upon the pending bill and

amendments on Thursday, the 1st day of February, at some time during the legislative day.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The Senator from Rhode Island knows very well that there are a number of Senators on this side who desire to be heard on this bill. A good many of them are engaged with matters of public importance that makes it impossible for them to prepare at once, as they might do if there was nothing before the Senate but this bill. But there are a number of other public questions of great importance in which almost all Senators are interested, and I do not think it is possible for this side of the Senate to be ready to take a vote on the bill as early as the time indicated by the Senator from Rhode Island. I suggest, as a substitute, that we agree to vote on the 15th of February, which I think will be satisfactory to all sides.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am extremely anxious to consult the convenience of Senators in regard to this matter and I understand the force of the remarks made by the Senator from Arkansas. With that in view, I accept the suggestion made by that Senator and will agree that the time shall be fixed for Thursday, the 15th of February, at some time during the legislative day.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That will be entirely satisfactory, I think, to this side. There ought to be the further understanding, however, that the time after 2 o'clock from now until then shall be devoted to the consideration of this bill, if gentlemen desire to occupy the floor at any time.

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; that should be the understanding. I agree with the Senator from Arkansas that that should be the understanding.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. There should be another thing understood, I think, Mr. President. There should be one or two days devoted to the discussion of amendments proposed to the bill under the ten-minute rule.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is right.

Mr. TELLER. Two days.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should think we ought to have two full days on which amendments are to be discussed under the ten-minute rule. We all understand that as we approach the hour to vote it is often the case that there is not sufficient time to consider amendments that gentlemen desire to offer.

Mr. ALDRICH. I agree to that suggestion. I think it is very wise that there should be time given for the discussion of amendments under the ten-minute rule.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. With this understanding, I do not think there will be any difficulty about an agreement.

Mr. ALDRICH. Then the understanding, as I understand it, is that we shall vote upon this bill and pending amendments on Thursday—some time during Thursday—the 15th of February, and that two days prior to that time shall be given to the discussion——

Mr. ALLISON. Including the 15th.

Mr. ALDRICH. That two days, including the 15th, shall be given to the discussion of amendments under the ten-minute rule, with the further understanding that pending that time, or during the time between now and the 15th of February, this bill shall remain the unfinished business after 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state the request. It is that by unanimous consent it be agreed that the pending financial bill, House bill No. 1, shall be discussed from time to time as it is found expedient to do so, and that the final vote shall be taken upon its passage on February 15——

Mr. ALDRICH. Hardly "discussed from time to time as may be found expedient," Mr. President. It should be the regular order, as before.

Mr. SPOONER. Let the request be stated in the words in which it was taken down.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the request made by me be read by the stenographer. I think there will be no trouble about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Reporter will please read the request of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The Reporter read as follows:

Mr. ALDRICH. Then the understanding, as I understand it, is that we shall vote upon this bill and pending amendments on Thursday—some time during Thursday—the 15th of February, and that two days prior to that time shall be given to the discussion——

Mr. ALLISON. Including the 15th.

Mr. ALDRICH. That two days, including the 15th, shall be given to the discussion of amendments under the ten-minute rule, with the further understanding that pending that time, or during the time between now and the 15th of February, this bill shall remain the unfinished business after 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection to the proposed agreement as read?

Mr. BURROWS. I suggest to the Senator from Rhode Island whether it would not be well that we fix some time for the final vote on that day?

Mr. COCKRELL and others. No, no.

Mr. BURROWS. If it includes the legislative day, the legislative day may last a week or longer, and I suggest whether it would not be well to fix an hour for the final vote.

Mr. TELLER. We will vote before adjournment.

Mr. BURROWS. But I think we should fix some hour.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. As it has been agreed to discuss amendments for two days under the ten-minute rule, I think the Senate will get through the discussion on the amendments and there will be no reason then for postponing the vote a single hour; but if there should be amendments which Senators think of sufficient importance to be offered and which they wish to discuss, they are to be discussed on that day under the ten-minute rule, and I think the Senate ought to remain in session until the bill is disposed of.

Mr. BURROWS. I merely made the suggestion. I am afraid that the agreement will lead to a very protracted session on that day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection to the agreement as read by the Reporter, the same will be taken as the sense of the Senate. It is so ordered.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, the financial question has been before the American people for a quarter of a century. Other great questions are now coming to the front. These are questions that will tax our best efforts—questions so great that errors in judgment or a lack of conscience and courage to do our duty in respect to them may imperil our national existence, and concerning which if our mistakes are not fatal they are likely to be at least injurious to the American people.

But with all these other great questions before us we can not get rid of the monetary question, the greatest of all, because our ability to settle these other problems rightfully may depend on our success in dealing with the financial problem. This is true because a great number of intelligent men throughout the world believe the best interests of mankind require that the world should return to the bimetallic system; because all the commercial world is now disturbed by the attempt to displace nearly one-half of the metal money of the world without providing anything to take its place; because, in the language of the Republican platform of 1892, "the American people from tradition and interest are in favor of bimetallism;" because the American people are opposed to the gold standard and believe in the use of gold and silver as standard money.

Those who have been crying out for a decade that the silver question is dead and will "no longer vex the people of this or any other country," should remember, to use a trite phrase, that in free countries no question is settled until it is settled right.

It is possible the continued agitation of this question may disturb commerce and trade, that it may make the holders of money fear that the purchasing power of the dollar may be reduced, and their grip on the industrial energies and production of the country be weakened; but, be this as it may, the contest will go on. It will go on, because righteousness and justice are with those who contend for a system of finance that shall not impoverish one class, and that class the great bulk of society, that another and a smaller class may be enriched.

Mr. President, I always have some delicacy in discussing this question, because of the oft-repeated charge which has been made against myself and others who come from the silver-producing regions of the country, that we are controlled in our support of the bimetallic system by our local interests. That charge has been made against me repeatedly in the public press and sometimes on the floor of the Senate.

I represent in part one of the great precious-metal States of this Union—the greatest of them all at the present time. When I first came into this Chamber there was a greater production of gold in the State of Colorado than of silver, and for many years thereafter there was a greater production of silver than of gold; but upon this question I took my position when I came here, and I have not had occasion to doubt the correctness of my judgment at that time on the policy which the Government ought to pursue with reference to its finances.

At the present time Colorado is the greatest gold-producing State in the Union, having produced last year between thirty-three and thirty-four million dollars' worth of that metal. The State produced more than twice as much in value of gold as it did of silver. Indeed, Colorado is not only a great gold and silver producing State, but it is rich in all the metals, precious and otherwise. It contains great quantities of lead, copper, manganese, and zinc. Besides these, it has other great interests. Its agricultural interest is equal, if not greater, even at the present time, than its mining interest. I have thought it well to state these facts to convince you that the silver interest of the State is not paramount. If I know myself, I do not come here to discuss this question because the interests of the people of Colorado are involved in it.

I know, of course, that if silver was at its old price some of the mines in Colorado which are now closed would be opened; and I know, even though the amount of silver produced were no greater in weight than now, it would be worth in the markets of the world more than twice as much as it was last year. But, as I have said before, this is not a question for the people of one locality. It is not a question of what are the interests of the silver-producing

States, although I believe that may properly be kept in mind in legislating upon this subject.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND BIMETALLISM.

It has been my fortune to be in public life since this question became an active one. I recall the debates in the Senate and in the House of Representatives in 1877 and 1878. And looking back over the field, I think I may assert here without fear of contradiction that the American people are now and have been in favor of bimetallism.

Until very recently there was no political organization willing to take the position before the people of this country in opposition to bimetallism. The Republican party, with which I had been connected from its organization and with which I had acted during most of my public life, was until within the past few years a pronounced bimetallic party. Twenty-three years ago, if there was any distinction between the parties on this great question, the Republican party was the most enthusiastic and aggressive. I am speaking now of the rank and file of the people. All of our public men of both the great political parties have been declaring that they were opposed to the single gold standard. I know that a high and great question of this kind is to some extent belittled by considering, and it would seem beneath the dignity of this body to consider, what has been the action of a political organization on this subject.

Yet, Mr. President, because of my relations to it and because I have felt compelled, on account of the attitude of the political party with which I acted for so many years on this subject, to abandon it, I think it will not be inappropriate or out of place if I shall call attention to the course of the Republican party on this question during the last twenty-odd years. Whatever may be thought of the propriety or the policy of it, I feel that I must at least refer to it.

Mr. President, I represent a constituency who have studied this question. I represent a people composed of those who formerly were citizens of all sections of the United States, and I venture to say here, now, that there is to-day no more cosmopolitan society within the borders of the United States than that found in the State of Colorado; and, if it be not considered out of place, I would say that there is not to be found a greater number of men in any other section of the country who have more intelligence, more patriotism, and more learning than have the people of Colorado.

We are bimetallists in Colorado. There is no political organization there that does not declare for bimetallism. The Republican party there in their political conventions vie with the Democratic party, with the Silver Republicans, and the Populists in asserting that they are for bimetallism.

I recall that only a few years ago the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], standing in this Chamber, declared that 90 per cent of the people of the United States were in favor of bimetallism. The Senator from Massachusetts must have reconsidered his position, or else he must feel that this bill, offered by the party to which he belongs, is out of place in this body.

ORIGIN OF THE BILL.

I said the other day that this was a caucus measure. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] took me to task for that statement. I know, Mr. President, that in discussing a great measure of this kind to say that it is a caucus measure is not sufficient to condemn it. The question will be upon the merits of the proposition, and those I propose eventually to discuss. But there was something said by the chairman of the Committee on Finance in his discussion of the bill the other day, coupled with the subsequent declaration he made that he knew of nobody else on his side of the Chamber who intended to discuss the measure, which will justify me in speaking of this as a caucus measure.

I said then, and I now repeat, that perhaps it is not a caucus measure of Republicans who have got together and presented the bill as the result of their best judgment; but it is a measure that a junta of self-constituted political economists, as they call themselves, in the city of Indianapolis prepared for this Senate and House of Representatives. A Republican commission, appointed by the Republican caucus, accepted this, and it came to the House of Representatives—I speak now of the House bill—as the work, not of any one House committee, but as the work of a committee sitting at some watering place. It did not have the courtesy of the consideration of any House committee or of any member of a House committee. I do not think it is either out of place or improper to characterize this proceeding as the most remarkable in the history of legislative bodies.

Mr. President, the student of history will declare that this is a departure from and an abdication of legislative judgment, when a committee composed of half a dozen men ignorant upon this question—for their ignorance is shown by almost every line that they have ever written—shall be able to present a bill to the great legislature of the United States and it will accept it without even the consideration of a committee. If this is not an abandonment of the legislative function and a surrender to outside political influences there never was an abandonment or a surrender.

This bill came from the other House to this body after only a week's discussion there. In the Senate it went to the Committee on Finance, which we have selected to pass upon financial questions. I do not think I shall be outside the bounds of truth if I say that that committee, as a committee, never considered the pending bill an hour; that it was never considered in committee with the cooperation of those of its members of different political faith than its framers.

Mr. President, this bill is here dictated by influences not legislative; and when I stand here to protest against it, no man knows better than I do that the great political party in power and dominating this Senate and the country has surrendered its judgment and its conscience to that outside influence, and yet that it will receive the almost united support of that political organization.

I know very well that the policy of the bill is contrary to the repeated declarations of that party in convention and out. It will be different from their action in this Chamber and in the other for twenty years. But that party is in the hands of a power from which it can not escape, and it will go on and put upon the statute books this legislation, because it is impotent to resist that power, although the proposed legislation may be, and I know is, against the judgment of very many Senators of that political party.

Up to 1896 the Republican party in this country was a bimetallic party. In 1888 it declared for silver. I will go back of that time and I call attention to the legislation of 1876, when a large number of Republicans, a majority of them in the House of Representatives, were in favor of the free coinage of silver. I will call attention to the fact that the most prominent men then sitting in the other House voted for that measure. I will also call attention to the further fact that the present Chief Executive of the nation as late as 1890 was writing letters to his constituents in the State of Ohio and asserting as a merit in his public service that he had voted for that bill.

In 1890 the country was suffering from a lack of money, and when the House of Representatives was not in full accord with the Senate upon this question, when the Senate passed the free-coinage bill, the Republican party as a party, acting together in this body and in the other House, framed and secured the passage of the statute known as the Sherman Act of July 14, 1890. That was an act professedly in the interest of bimetallism; but I did not believe then that it was a judicious act to pass. Still it had in it some redeeming qualities. It was professedly, I say, in the interest of bimetallism. The Republican party was then vying with the Democratic party as to which should be the most extreme in favor of bimetallism. The only objection made here against free coinage by Republicans in the twenty-odd years I have been familiar with this legislation has been simply that it was a hindrance to bimetallism. The most extreme gold men of to-day who were then in this Chamber were wont to assert that we were rendering it impossible to secure bimetallism by our extreme action. That end, they said, was not to be attained through free coinage.

I have a few extracts from the platforms of the different Republican conventions of the United States from time to time on this question, but I do not care to read them. I will ask permission that I may put them in the RECORD. I ask this privilege in justification of what I have here said, and also in justification of my continuance in the Republican party so long as I did remain in it. If the Republican party in 1880 had declared it was a gold-standard party, I should have severed my connection with it then. There are few men in public life who have had more honors at the hands of their political party than I have had at the hands of the Republican party; but I received those honors, Mr. President, because I was supposed to represent Republican ideas and Republican principles. I have advocated the free coinage of silver on every stump in the State from which I come, and there has never until within the last two years been a convention in Colorado of either Democrats or Republicans that has not declared for the free coinage of silver; and while there has been some letting down, perhaps, in one direction, still all parties now declare for bimetallism.

I will say that I have here the declarations of the Republican conventions of Iowa, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, Oregon, and Pennsylvania. I will not say that Pennsylvania declared for free coinage, but that State did declare for "the use of silver and gold." I have also the declarations of South Dakota, Tennessee, Wyoming, California, Colorado, Michigan, and others.

Mr. President, I will now send up the extracts which I desire to have printed as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). The extracts referred to by the Senator from Colorado will, without objection, be printed as a part of his remarks.

The extracts referred to are as follows:

Michigan Republicans in 1890: We indorse the action of Congress upon the silver question and favor the unlimited use of gold and silver as the basis of legal-tender paper currency interchangeable with coin.

Nebraska, 1890 or 1891: The Republican party has given the people an elastic currency of gold, silver, and paper, and has raised the credit of the nation to one of the highest pitch of any country in the world, and its efforts to fully remonetize silver should be continued until it is on a perfect equality as a money metal with gold.

The New York Republican State convention in 1890-91 commended the Administration for "the prompt restoration of silver to its normal place in the commercial world."

Ohio, 1891: Approved of the action of Congress in fulfilling pledges of the party in legislation upon the coinage of silver, revision of the tariff, etc.

Oregon, April 16, 1891: We declare ourselves in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver and denounce any attempt to discriminate against silver as unwise and unjust.

Pennsylvania, June 25, 1891: Favored the use of both gold and silver.

Iowa Republicans in their platform of 1893: We are in favor of maintaining both gold and silver money as unlimited legal tender for the payment of debts; and in doing this Congress shall provide that every dollar, whether gold, silver, or paper, shall be kept of equal value.

Kansas, 1892: Favors such laws as will increase the coinage of silver. Approval of international bimetallism.

Missouri Republican convention, 1892: Favors international bimetallism.

Montana, 1892: Free and unlimited coinage of silver.

Nebraska, 1893: Adopts the national platform of 1892 as to the silver question.

Nevada: Free and unlimited coinage of silver.

Oregon: Indorses the Sherman bill.

Pennsylvania, 1893: Reaffirms the national platform on the money question and demands $40 per capita.

South Dakota, 1892: Reaffirms the national platform on silver.

Tennessee, 1892: Approves of the Sherman Act.

Wyoming, 1892: The money of the country should be founded on gold and silver, and this may be achieved by timely legislation—international conference.

California, 1892: We believe silver, equally with gold, to be the money of the people.

Colorado, 1892: Free and unlimited coinage of silver.

THE ST. LOUIS CONVENTION AND THE PRESIDENT'S ATTITUDE.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, with this record I remained in the Republican party. I went to St. Louis as a delegate to the national Republican convention, authorized by the people of my State to go there, instructed by them to stand for the free coinage of silver. That there should be no misunderstanding where I stood, I telegraphed the convention that under no circumstances, whether I was a delegate or not, would I support a candidate who did not stand on a bimetallic platform and who did not favor the use of silver and gold on equal terms.

I had doubted before I went to St. Louis whether such a declaration would be made by that convention, but this was not because the candidate who it was recognized would be nominated was opposed to silver, for all his utterances in public and in private life had been in favor of bimetallism. As I have said, he had voted for free coinage, and when the bill was amended here in this body so as not to be a free-coinage bill, but yet to be a bill that was claimed to be more in the line of securing what we all wanted, the concurrent action of mankind on this question, the international obligation of all people to continue the use of silver—when it was said that was more potent in that direction than the other, and when the President of the United States vetoed the bill, because he said its passage and its execution would be a breach of public faith—the present Executive, then a member of the House of Representatives, voted to pass that bill over the veto.

I think before the convention met at St. Louis it was as well understood that Mr. McKinley would be the Republican candidate for the Presidency as it was when the convention adjourned. We had a right from his declarations to suppose that his influence would be in favor of bimetallism. The State from which he came, in its convention, had passed a resolution on that subject, which I shall read. It was passed on the 11th day of March, 1896, and is as follows:

> We contend for honest money, for a currency of gold, silver, and paper with which to measure our exchanges that shall be as sound as the Government and as untarnished as its honor; and to that end we favor bimetallism and demand the use of both gold and silver as standard money, either in accordance with a ratio to be fixed by an international agreement, if that can be obtained, or under such restrictions and such provisions to be determined by legislation as will secure the maintenance of the parities of value of the two metals, so that the purchasing and debt-paying power of the dollar, whether of silver, gold, or paper, shall be at all times equal.

That was a bimetallic declaration, which went out from the State of Ohio, where the Presidential candidate lived, and we had some right to suppose that that might be the national declaration. When I reached St. Louis I was told by a number of prominent men that that would be the platform. There are men I can recall who remember that conversation, to whom I said, "No such declaration will be in your platform; your party is under the control and in the hands of men who do not intend to have bimetallism, either national or international."

Mr. President, of late there has been a quarrel among leading Republicans of this country as to who should be awarded the honor of securing this change in the policy of that great political party; as to who should have the honor of repudiating the Ohio resolution and adopting one recognizing, in the first place, the gold standard as existing in this country, and then declaring that it shall be maintained, at the same time asserting that it is not the most desirable standard in the world, but that when somebody else, some foreign power, shall be kind enough to allow us, the greatest people in the world, to direct our own financial system, then it may be changed and we should have the bimetallic standard. The convention of 1888 had declared for silver. I believe I can put my eye upon that declaration, and I will read it. In 1888 at Chicago—I believe I shall commit no impropriety if I say it—the distinguished Senator from Nevada who sits nearest me [Mr. STEWART] procured the insertion in the platform of this provision:

> The Republican party is in favor of the use of both gold and silver as money, and condemns the policy of the Democratic Administration in its efforts to demonetize silver.

That was in the closing part of Mr. Cleveland's first Administration. Everybody who has kept at all in touch with the history of this country well understands that Mr. Cleveland's principal object in financial affairs was to put this country on a gold basis. I know that there was some pretense even then with Mr. Cleveland and his party that they wanted to put this country on a gold basis that they might eventually get to the bimetallic standard; and that is about the proposition advanced by the Senator from Rhode Island in the speech made by him the other day. He is not quite willing to admit that he has given up the idea of the bimetallic system, but he hopes to get it through the adoption of the gold standard first.

In 1892, when Mr. Harrison was renominated for the Presidency, this is what the Republican party declared:

> The American people, from tradition and interest, favor bimetallism, and the Republican party demands the use of both gold and silver as standard money, with such restrictions and under such provisions, to be determined by legislation, as will secure the maintenance of the parity of values of the two metals so that the purchasing and debt-paying power of the dollar, whether of silver, gold, or paper, shall be at all times equal.

When Mr. Harrison wrote his letter of acceptance September 3, 1892, he said:

> The resolution of the convention in favor of bimetallism declares, I think, the true and necessary condition of a movement that has upon these lines my cordial adherence and support. I am thoroughly convinced that the free coinage of silver at such a ratio to gold as will maintain the equality in their commercial uses of the two coined dollars would conduce to the prosperity of all the great producing and commercial nations of the world. * * *

With that declaration Mr. Harrison received the support, in the State of Colorado, of very many Republicans who had doubted his fidelity, perhaps, to the bimetallic system. In fact, there has never yet been a Republican President until the present Executive who has declared in favor of the single gold standard. Every one of them has been a bimetallist since I have been in public life.

I have a quotation from Mr. Garfield's inaugural address:

> By the experience of commercial nations in all ages it has been found that gold and silver afford the only safe foundation for a monetary system.

I suppose nobody will dispute that the Republican party up to 1896 asserted itself as a bimetallic party. I do not suppose that anybody who has read this bill will contend that it is now a bimetallic party, and especially when it is known that the party has surrendered to the Indianapolis junta. The President of the United States surrendered to that concern in 1897. I will have occasion later to refer to the message he sent here, in which he recommended for our consideration the action of this intelligent convention, which, he said, had given "two whole days" to this great question and had concluded that gold was the only safe standard.

The campaign of 1896 was not made by the Republican party on a gold-standard basis. I speak whereof I know. I made speeches in ten States of the Union, and I alleged everywhere I went that that was not an honest declaration which said we will maintain the gold standard in this country until the principal commercial nations shall agree to an international arrangement, which we promise to promote. Everywhere I went I was challenged. It was said that I was slandering the Republican party; that the Republican party was a bimetallic party; that the only way to get bimetallism was through international agreement.

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT.

I wish to say a word on the question of international agreement. I have repeatedly said in the Senate that if we could secure an international agreement, it was the most desirable thing in the world to do. I am one of those who recognize the fact that if we can maintain bimetallism alone, all the world can maintain it better by acting in accord, and so, from time to time, I have favored and have done my part, I believe, to secure international bimetallism through international conferences. I did not object to that provision in itself, but I did object to it because it seemed to me to be utterly inconsistent with the other provision—that the gold standard should be maintained.

If the gold standard was not the best standard, if the gold-standard system was one that we desired to get rid of, why should we not get rid of it? It was a declaration in the national platform of the lack of power on our part to control our own affairs. I said in the convention that it was the first time in the history of this country that the American people had declared their inability to take care of themselves. We fix our tariff as we choose. We frame our foreign-intercourse laws as we think they ought to be;

but when it comes to the question of finance, which touches the people more closely than any other, we abdicate our great power and turn it over, so far as metallic money is concerned, to foreign nations. When we shall have enacted this bill, which turns over to the banks of the country the balance of the money control in this country, we will be a people to be despised by all mankind.

There is a great deal of—I will not say ignorance, but perhaps I might use that word—there is a great deal of misrepresentation, at least, as to this question, growing out of ignorance or what is worse; and it is in this that we have found one trouble in dealing with it. We have had people stand before us ex cathedra, as if there was no questioning their statements, and tell us that we could not maintain the double standard, or silver and gold, in this country unless we had the assistance of somebody else. Then they have misrepresented history. They have declared over and over again that we could not point to any condition that existed anywhere where bimetallism has prevailed where there was not an alternating system of gold one year and silver the next.

GOLD AND SILVER IN HISTORY.

If I may refer to some other place, recently in debate it was declared that certain persons stood for gold, unchangeable gold, gold that was always a dollar. The man who makes that statement writes himself down as unacquainted with history, financial and otherwise.

Not long ago, in 1896, in the great city of Boston, a man who had sat in this Chamber, a man who had presided over the Treasury Department, who had twice been governor of his State, before as intelligent an audience as could be assembled in the United States, declared that gold has always been the standard of value—the standard, he said, amongst the highly civilized and amongst the savages alike, the only measure of value in the present and in the past. Those people had a right to believe that he was telling the truth. They had the right to suppose that his statements were based on historical facts. There was not a word of truth in the statement. History denies every assertion he made on this point. It can be shown by the most indisputable authority that for nearly eight hundred years practically no gold was coined in all Europe. It can be shown that when he was governor of Massachusetts the great majority of mankind was standing on the silver standard.

It could be shown from authorities not to be disputed or maligned that gold was but merchandise in Europe, outside of England and Portugal, until 1848. History declares that the English people never coined a dollar of gold until after the year 1300. Rogers, a great authority upon this question, in his Industrial and Commercial History of England, declares that no gold was coined in that country until 1326, and practically none until after the beginning of the seventeenth century. Gold was not the standard in England until 1816; it was practically not the standard, only by law, till 1821. The other day I looked over the testimony taken before the committee of Parliament in 1810—and if anybody wants to challenge the authority, I will bring it here and show it to him.

Before that committee it was stated repeatedly that gold was but an article of merchandise in Holland, in Germany, practically in all continental Europe; that the Bank of Hamburg had declined to loan money on gold bars, because the authorities said they would be called upon to pay silver, and they could not always get silver with gold. I do not mean to say that gold did not do money duty. It has done money duty more or less, in my judgment, since before any history records the transactions of men. I believe I can demonstrate that more than two thousand two hundred years before the Christian era it had a relation established by law in China, and it is indisputably proved that fifteen hundred years before the Christian era law had fixed the relation in India between gold and silver; but silver from that time to 1848 was the standard of the majority of mankind.

These are not unsustained assertions of mine; no man who is acquainted with the political and economic history of the world can deny them. They can be proved by all history. Gold was preferred, I will admit, in the Asiatic countries, not because it was money, but because it was an article of adornment and beauty. It was used as a valuable measure of exchange in the early history of the world, and yet silver has been the money of the great majority of the peoples.

And to-day the man who declares that gold is the standard of the world and measures the values of the world makes a statement that he can not support. To-day there are more men who look to silver as money to measure the relations of commodities to each other than there are who look to gold.

We are told often that gold is the money of the rich and respectable nations and that we must put ourself in line; that we must get a relation to that metal because it is used by the wealthy people of the world. There is nothing in that. Up to 1871 the great commercial nations of the world were on the silver standard. Great Britain, as I said, went to the gold standard nominally in 1816; Portugal, I think, in 1854, if my memory is correct, but the date is immaterial. In 1870 there were two Christian nations of the world that had gold as their standard. One was Great Britain, and the other was Portugal, and there was no other nation, heathen or Christian, that had that standard.

Yet we are repeatedly told by public officials, and the people have been led to believe that it is true, that we are attempting to force upon the country a metal which has been discredited for all time, a money that is incapable of doing money duty, when, I repeat, the history of the world shows that silver has been the money of commerce; silver has been the money under which the human race has made its progress and its upheaval and uplifting, and not gold. It is the money of the masses, it is the money of mankind, and to-day, I repeat, it is the money of more than one-half the human race.

THE HOUSE BILL.

Mr. President, I had not intended to be very lengthy in some things which I wished to say to-day. There is another feature to this case which I shall present at some other time. I want to take up this bill, omitting some things that I should say; for I think if I were to attempt to go into all the points that present themselves, I would lengthen my remarks beyond what I desire. I shall avail myself of the privilege which fortunately we all have, and which I hope we shall maintain in this body, of freely expressing our sentiments when a bill is before the body. If free expression can be thwarted in committee or in caucus, when a measure comes here it can have the untrammeled consideration of the American Senate.

I want to deal with the House bill, and I mean to deal with it as rapidly as I can. I had thought I would take up one phase of the subject on which the public perhaps has been somewhat misinformed. Every little while you see in public prints a reference to "prophecies unrealized." It is stated that we predicted that immense disasters would come to this country from the gold standard and that those predictions have not been realized. On some other occasion I think I will consider that subject. I have some prophecies on the other side which have not been realized to which I desire to refer, but I will not do so this afternoon, because I am somewhat hoarse, and because I think if I attempted it I would go to greater length than I should.

I want to ask before I take up the bill—it seems to me it is a proper and pertinent inquiry—what is the demand for it? Whence does it come? Who is pressing it? Is the gold standard here now? Have we the gold standard? The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] would tell me we have. The Secretary of the Treasury declares we have. He is the mouthpiece of the President on all these questions. The gold-standard press declare we have it; but they are not all united on this question. For instance, the New York Sun, formerly a Democratic paper, but now a very strong Republican Administration paper, has repeatedly in its columns declared that there is no sense in the bill. Have the toilers and laborers of the country demanded this legislation, this renewed agitation that we hear so much about, which disturbs the business of the country? We have been told for many years, every time we introduced a bill touching the currency, that it had a tendency to disturb business affairs, and that we ought not to do it. Is it in accordance with the Republican platform of 1896? The Republicans simply said the gold standard should be maintained. That is a declaration that it is here.

Mr. President, there is more in this bill than the maintenance of the gold standard. The gold standard, if the Secretary of the Treasury is correct, does not need any further legislation. It is already fixed, and I know some people say it is fixed by Executive act. But if that is true, it is not here. The Executive has no right to fix the gold standard on this country. If it is here, it is here by virtue of law, or it is not here at all. But the party that asserts that it is here ought to give some excuse why it wants to reaffirm the fact. Why do you want to repeat it? Why do you want to say, as is said in the House bill, "that the standard unit of value shall, as now, be the dollar, and shall consist of 25.8 grains of gold?" It is now the dollar. It has been a dollar of gold since 1873, but it did not make the gold standard. The first dollar that we ever had was a silver dollar. That did not make the silver standard.

Does anybody mean to say here in this Chamber that because Congress adopted the gold dollar as the unit it gave us the gold standard? If so, we must have had a silver standard from 1792 to 1873. We did not have. We had the bimetallic standard. We had a silver dollar that stood as the unit. The dollar was the unit. The dollar is the unit now, and it does not make any difference what it is made of. The silver dollar is not the unit. It is the dollar which is the unit of expression—a place to start from, to make the calculations from. The pound sterling for hundreds of years had no representative at all in coin. The pound sterling was the measure by which anything was calculated, and yet there was no such coin in England until modern times, since the gold standard was established, when the sovereign was created.

I do not care whether we have got the gold standard—and I am not now going to discuss it—but we have not got the gold standard as we will have it under this bill. We have about $500,000,000 of silver doing money duty, and doing it well and nobly. I hope to show, before we get through, that it will no longer be doing money duty as it is now doing, measuring values, the equal of gold, every dollar of the same value, every dollar equal to a gold dollar. What is the matter with the silver dollar now, that both the Senate bill and the House bill should provide that it shall be practically destroyed?

The silver dollar has bought from the day it was first coined in this country as much as any gold dollar ever bought, and part of the time it bought 3 per cent more. We prepared for the issue of silver dollars in 1878, under the direction of the Senator who sits before me [Mr. ALLISON]. We heard then in this Chamber that those would be cheap dollars. We heard a distinguished Senator from Vermont say to the Senate with great solemnity, "If you pass this bill, you will sell no more United States bonds except at a great discount. All your customs and revenues; internal and otherwise, will be paid in this depreciated money." We commenced coining these despised dollars when there was a difference of between 8 and 12 per cent between the greenback and the gold dollar, and I state what can not be denied now, that the first dollar which came out of the mint under that law was equal to any gold dollar in this land and that the Treasury Department began to exchange these dollars at once for gold.

And yet there was never a Secretary who did not tell us that we ought to stop coining silver for fear it would be cheap. The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Sherman, on the 4th day of April (this act had passed on the 28th of February), stated before the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which Mr. Bruckner was at that time the chairman, that he was exchanging silver dollars for gold. The Senator from Missouri in 1893 called upon the Secretary of the Treasury to tell us how many of the silver dollars and silver certificates had been exchanged for gold, and he said he could not tell how much had been exchanged for gold between the passage of the bill and 1880, and so there he commences. Mr. Carlisle, in a communication that he made to this body while Secretary, stated that from 1879 up to that hour there had been frequent interchanges of silver for gold, not to redeem the silver, but that men who had gold had gone to the Treasury and put it in and taken out silver.

Let me read what Mr. Sherman said. I know the impression has gone out to many people that it has been difficult to keep silver on an equality with gold and that there has been an effort in that direction, and I have heard Senators say that it could not have been done but by the declaration of the act of 1893. That act, so far as that is concerned, had no influence whatever on this question.

Not a dollar of silver has ever yet been redeemed in gold. Mr. Sherman was asked by Mr. Ewing, of Ohio:

> Do you expect to pay out the silver dollar coined by you for current expenses, or only for coin liabilities, or to hoard it for resumption?

Now, mind you, at that time, in the spring of 1878, we had not resumed specie payments, and there was still a divergence between the greenback and gold, but, I repeat, none between silver and gold. Let us see what Mr. Sherman said about it:

> I expect to pay it out now only in exchange for gold coin or for silver bullion. I am perfectly free to answer the question fully, because on that point, after consulting with many members of both Houses, I have made up my mind what the law requires me to do. I propose to issue all the silver dollars that are demanded in exchange for gold coin. That has been going on to some extent; how far I can not tell. Then I propose to use the silver in payment for silver bullion, which I can do at par with gold. I then propose to buy all the rest of the silver bullion which I need under the law with silver coin.

Now, I state a fact that nobody will deny—if anyone does deny it, I will furnish the proof—that from that hour there has never been a time when there has been any difference between silver and gold except during the panic of 1893, when silver was sold in the city of New York for 3 per cent more than gold. Why, Mr. President? Simply because it was the most convenient money to use for the people who wanted to pay their workmen, not because they had any greater desire to use it.

I refer to the report from the Secretary of the Treasury on the call of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL]. I will say to Senators if they want to see it, it is Executive Document No. 29, Fifty-third Congress, first session. This report shows that between September 18, 1880, and the last day of the year 1884 the exchanges of silver dollars for gold was $80,403,910. In 1880 the Treasury Department issued a circular saying that it would exchange if anybody brought his gold. I do not remember the exact terms; but they said if persons brought their gold to the Treasury, they could get silver dollars for it, and it is under that circular that this deposit was made.

In January, 1885, that circular was withdrawn; the public were denied the opportunity of carrying their gold to the Treasury and exchanging it for silver dollars. That year, 1885, is only credited with the amount that came in during the month of January, which is $575,090, but afterwards the exchange seems to have been resumed.

Mr. President, during that time the Treasury had plenty of gold to pay for the greenbacks, if anybody wanted them, and during that time, when the public were taking their gold and going to the Treasury Department and getting silver dollars, they could have taken their greenbacks and coin to the Treasury and got gold. During that whole time the total amount of greenbacks that went to the Treasury in exchange for gold was only $4,167,388.

Now, then, during the years 1887, when this exchange began, and in 1888 and 1889, the report No. 29, which I have referred to, shows that there were $11,457,842 of silver certificates exchanged for gold. Secretary Carlisle says:

> For subsequent years—

that is, after 1889—

> there is no data to determine the amount so exchanged

But he thinks not over $2,000,000 per annum.

He further says:

> Silver dollars have been exchanged for gold or paper redeemable in gold from 1879 to the present time—

That was in 1893 when he was writing—

> but the amount of the various classes previous to 1887 can not be given.

When a man took gold to the Treasury and got a silver certificate, he got practically a silver dollar, for he got the paper that called for a silver dollar; but these are standard silver dollars. Between 1887 and 1889, inclusive, three years, the total amount of standard silver dollars so exchanged for gold was $29,021,280. The Secretary says "for subsequent years the data is not complete," but he thinks about the same as in the last three years, or about $9,673,763 per annum.

The Secretary then gives the total amount of silver certificates exchanged for gold at $100,436,842, and the total number of silver dollars exchanged for gold at $67,421,290, or a total of silver certificates and silver dollars exchanged for gold at $167,858,132.

Now, Mr. President, all this time every Secretary of the Treasury, acting under an influence that does not emanate in Washington, had been telling us that the silver dollar was not an honest dollar and had been predicting that it would fall in its value in a little while, and that its purchasing power then being equal to gold it could not be maintained. And yet the people who had $167,000,000 of gold went to the Treasury with it and turned it into the Treasury and said, "Let us have these cheap silver dollars." Why? They knew that the statement that they were cheap was false. They knew that as long as this great country needed money, with its immense commerce and its immense trade, there was no trouble but what the silver dollar would be the equal of the gold dollar as long as it was equal in debt-paying power.

PARITY.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado a question.

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Did the Treasury Department ever redeem a silver dollar or a silver certificate in gold?

Mr. TELLER. Never, not up to this time, Mr. President. That has never been done to this hour. Mr. Carlisle did say that if it were necessary to maintain the parity, he would do it, but there was no necessity to do it to maintain the parity.

People talk a good deal about maintaining the parity as if there was some great obligation of the Government to maintain the parity between these two kinds of metals. Now, the interchangeability between metals should be left to commerce. It is left there by every well-regulated government. You can not go to the Bank of France and take your silver there and get gold, nor can you take your gold there and get silver unless you make a merchandise affair of the exchange. If you carry your gold there and say you want silver, they will charge you for giving you silver; but if you carry the bank notes there, the bank officers will give you whichever they think you ought to have, and that depends upon which they have the most of and which they think they can spare the easiest.

Mr. President, in spite of the slander and misrepresentation that has been uttered from this Chamber and the other and from the officials, the parity of our silver dollars has been maintained because the country needed them as money, because they knew that they would perform the great function of interchange in this country in every commercial center, and because they knew more than that. We knew there was not a country on the face of the earth where civilized men live where it was not the equal of a gold dollar. I recall that one year Henry Clews & Co. issued a circular in which they said the value of the silver dollar in London is, well, I will say, 90 cents. I do not know what it was; it may have been 80 cents. I wrote a note to that distinguished house and said if they knew of any chance to buy silver dollars over there at that figure I would be very glad to have the entire lot; that I could find people who would take them. "Oh, well,"

they said, "they meant the price paid for the silver in a dollar and not the dollar itself."

Well, Mr. President, it may be that when that dollar gets over there it is no longer a dollar, but the man who holds it in his hands knows there is a place where it is a dollar. He knows that back in the United States anything that he wants he can buy with that dollar. Do you suppose he is going to be fool enough to carry it to a broker and sell it at a figure that practically reduces it to bullion? Not at all, Mr. President. I will admit that that would not be the condition if this country were a small, one-horse affair, if we did not have a great commerce, and all the world was not wanting to trade with us. In that case it could not be done; but I beg the Senate to understand that from my standpoint the American nation is a bigger nation than most of the nations of the world.

I have not lost sight of the fact myself that we have almost 80,000,000 people; I have not lost sight of the fact that our internal and external commerce beats that of any other 80,000,000 people on the face of the earth two to one; and we count in the world's affairs in commerce as if there were a population of 200,000,000 here. We are consumers and producers as no other people in the world are. The best authorities that I have seen, and I believe they are reliable, declare that American consumption is two and a half times greater per capita than that of the other most-favored nations of the world. It has been so, Mr. President, for all time almost since we have been a nation, and why? Because we have had a condition here under every Administration that ever existed better than they have had anywhere else in the world. We have had a great uncultivated continent; we have had wealth such as no other three and one-half million square miles have had. Here was the place where every man who wanted to labor could get compensation for his labor; here was the place for the man who would not labor and wanted to use his brains.

Oh, Mr. President, when people talk about waiting until the principal commercial nations of the earth agree that we may do this or that, I want to say to them the American people are big enough and great enough to do anything that their judgment tells them they ought to do, and they are righteous enough never to do that which would dishonor them or degrade them in the estimation of the decent elements of mankind.

If we should go to the use of silver and find it was not honest, we would back out. But we are not willing that the chairman of the Committee on Finance and his associates shall assume a condition and then say to us, as he said the other day, "You are not bimetallists; you are for the single silver standard." He did not include me, because he said the Democrats were of that stamp, but he might have included me, because he knew that on this question I am in accord with them. Now, sir, I do not believe that here or anywhere else the Senator will say that there is anything in my public life that leads him to believe I am not as sensitive of American honor as he or any other man, wherever he may live.

I may be mistaken as to what would be the result if we went to free coinage, but the history of the ages is with me. We have tried it. It has been tried by almost every country in the world. Every civilized land has tried it, and it has never failed.

Mr. President, at some other time I mean to take up this phase of the question, "Can a nation maintain silver and gold in its currency at the same time?" and I will prove to you and to the world that the repeated assertion made in this Chamber and elsewhere that we could not do it and that we did not do it is not true. We did it magnificently until the demand for silver was so great in Asia that they had there a ratio of 15 ounces of silver to 1 of gold, and they took away ours because it was more profitable to send it there than to keep it here.

I will prove that France, England, and the United States, all those countries, maintained the circulation of both coins of silver and gold, and that this repeated statement that you can not do it is not supported by history. There is not time to go into that question to-night. The next section of this bill reads:

SEC. 2. That all interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the payment of money, now existing or hereafter to be entered into, and all United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the law of July 14, 1890, shall be deemed and held to be payable in the gold coin of the United States as defined in section 1 of this act; and all other obligations, public and private, for the payment of money shall be performed in conformity with the standard established in said section.

Now, that provision takes all our bonds and our greenbacks. It takes every obligation that this Government has out, it does not make any difference what it is. All obligations are to be paid in gold. Of course I know that in the first section there is the following provision:

Nothing herein contained shall be construed or held to affect the present legal-tender quality of the silver dollar, or of the subsidiary or minor coins, or of the paper currency of the United States, or the laws making national-bank notes receivable and payable for certain public debts and dues and obligations between national banks.

This is absolutely contradictory; it is the exception, perhaps it may be said; but before I get through I shall attempt to show that there is a way and that it is the intent of this bill to make every obligation exchangeable for gold.

SEC. 3. That there be established in the Treasury Department, as a part of the office of the Treasurer of the United States, a division to be designated and known as the division of issue and redemption.

Then it provides what shall be transferred to it. I think, perhaps, as a matter of working affairs in the Treasury, the formation of a division and the reference to it of some things may be right. I have no complaint of that.

There shall be transferred from the general fund in the Treasury of the United States and taken up on the books of said division as a redemption fund the amount of gold coin and bullion held against outstanding gold certificates, the amount of United States notes held against outstanding currency certificates, the amount of silver dollars held against outstanding silver certificates, the amount in silver dollars and silver bullion held against outstanding Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890; and an amount of gold coin and bullion to constitute a reserve fund equal to 25 per cent of the amount.

Mr. President, if there is no objection, I should like to suspend here and take this subject up to-morrow. I do not want to intrude upon anyone else, but there is one phase of this question that I intended to have taken up which I have omitted and to which I shall devote some time in the morning, perhaps, or perhaps I shall not take it up at all. If it is necessary for me to go on so as not to be in the way of some one else, I can continue; but I do not know that anyone cares to go on to-night or that anyone cares to go on to-morrow. If they do, I should not want to be in the way of anyone to-morrow, and I should prefer to go on now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not advised that any reservations have been made for to-morrow on this bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. No notice has been given, and I know of no other Senator who expects to speak on the bill to-morrow.

Mr. TELLER. I wish to say to the Senator from Rhode Island that I do not desire to delay anything, and I do not want to postpone my remarks until others who are not yet ready may be at all inconvenienced. But I have talked for some time to-day, and I am ready to suspend.

Mr. ALDRICH. So far as I know, there will be no objection at all to the Senator from Colorado going on at 2 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. TELLER. Of course I can go on now if it is at all desired.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I know of no one on this side who wants to take the floor to-morrow. I think there will be no difficulty in the Senator from Colorado getting the floor to-morrow.

Mr. TELLER. Then I will suspend until to-morrow.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twenty-seven minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 18, 1900, at 1 o'clock p. m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 17, 1900.

CONSULS.

Martin J. Carter, of Pennsylvania, to be consul of the United States at St. Johns, Newfoundland.

Alexander Wood, of Pennsylvania, to be consul of the United States at Kehl, Germany.

George L. Darte, of Pennsylvania, now consul at Martinique, to be consul of the United States at Patras, Greece.

Alonzo C. Yates, of Virginia, now consul at Patras, to be consul of the United States at Martinique, West Indies.

PROMOTION IN THE MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

P. A. Surg. George M. Magruder, of New York, to be a surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Frederick E. Trotter, of New York, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Frank J. Thornbury, of New York, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Joseph W. Schereschewsky, of New York, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Thomas B. McClintic, of New York, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

John M. Holt, of New York, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Clarence W. Wille, of Pennsylvania, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Dunlop Moore, of Pennsylvania, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Carroll Fox, of Pennsylvania, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Joseph Goldberger, of Pennsylvania, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Third Lieut. William E. AtLee, of New York, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Asst. Engineer Denis F. Bowen, of New York, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

Second Lieut. Llewellyn W. Oliver, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, January 3, 1900, with rank from February 16, 1899.

CAVALRY ARM.

E. Holland Rubottom, of California, to be second lieutenant, June 1, 1899.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

TO BE SURGEON WITH THE RANK OF MAJOR.

Frank H. Titus, of California, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, January 4, 1900.

TO BE ADDITIONAL PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF MAJOR.

Charles Newbold, of the District of Columbia, March 11, 1899.
Bradner D. Slaughter, of Nebraska, March 11, 1899.

PROMOTIONS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

FORTY-FOURTH INFANTRY.

Second Lieut. Benjamin R. Hall, Forty-fourth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, November 29, 1899.

Second Lieut. Howard M. Koontz, Forty-fourth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, November 30, 1899.

TO BE DEPUTY PAYMASTERS-GENERAL WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT-COLONEL.

Maj. Culver C. Sniffen, paymaster, March 31, 1899.
Maj. George W. Baird, paymaster, July 12, 1899.

PAY DEPARTMENT.

To be paymasters with the rank of major.

Webster Vinson, of Virginia, April 3, 1899.

Capt. John Murphy (since retired from active service), Fourteenth Infantry, July 12, 1899.

Charles Newbold, of District of Columbia, July 22, 1899.

Hamilton S. Wallace, of District of Columbia, September 9, 1899.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

W. Frank Kinney, of Connecticut, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Connecticut.

GENERAL APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Israel F. Fischer, of New York, to be general appraiser of merchandise.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Henry S. Hill, of New York, to be appraiser of merchandise in the district of Buffalo Creek, in the State of New York.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Charles J. Greene, of Ruston, La., who was appointed April 1, 1899, during the recess of the Senate, to be receiver of public moneys at Natchitoches, La.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Horace Speed, of Oklahoma Territory, to be attorney of the United States for the Territory of Oklahoma.

MARSHAL.

Frank Simmons, of Alabama, to be marshal of the United States for the southern district of Alabama.

INDIAN AGENT.

Andrew F. Caldwell, of Pocatello, Idaho, to be agent for the Indians of the Fort Hall Agency, in Idaho.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Louis J. Winston, of Mississippi, to be collector of customs for the district of Natchez, in the State of Mississippi.

Walter C. Witherbee, of New York, to be collector of customs for the district of Champlain, in the State of New York.

Henry Harrison, of New York, to be collector of customs for the district of Genesee, in the State of New York.

John Bourne, of New York, to be collector of customs for the district of Dunkirk, in the State of New York.

POSTMASTERS.

Albert T. Williams, to be postmaster at Port Tampa City, in the county of Hillsboro and State of Florida.

George B. Patterson, to be postmaster at Key West, in the county of Monroe and State of Florida.

William A. Murat, to be postmaster at Apalachicola, in the county of Franklin and State of Florida.

Henry C. Groves, to be postmaster at Ocala, in the county of Marion and State of Florida.

Ellen S. Griffin, to be postmaster at Franklin, in the county of Merrimack and State of New Hampshire.

George Glass, to be postmaster at High Springs, in the county of Alachua and State of Florida.

Alexander Zipperer, to be postmaster at Madison, in the county of Madison and State of Florida.

Harry L. Cooper, to be postmaster at Edinboro, in the county of Erie and State of Pennsylvania.

David E. Ward, to be postmaster at Dell Rapids, in the county of Minnehaha and State of South Dakota.

Fred S. Huckins, to be postmaster at Ashland, in the county of Grafton and State of New Hampshire.

George A. McIntire, to be postmaster at Milford, in the county of Hillsboro and State of New Hampshire.

Charles E. Buzzell, to be postmaster at Lakeport, in the county of Belknap and State of New Hampshire.

Charles Graffin, to be postmaster at Catasauqua, in the county of Lehigh and State of Pennsylvania.

William Kelly, to be postmaster at Lockhart, in the county of Caldwell and State of Texas.

Frank L. Bradley, to be postmaster at Gilmer, in the county of Upshur and State of Texas.

Charles A. Edwards, to be postmaster at Prattville, in the county of Autauga and State of Alabama.

Thomas F. Griswold, to be postmaster at Covina, in the county of Los Angeles and State of California.

George F. Beales, to be postmaster at Visalia, in the county of Tulare and State of California.

Lorena Hays, to be postmaster at Cullman, in the county of Cullman and State of Alabama.

Augustus G. Ising, to be postmaster at Danbury, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut.

John W. Wood, to be postmaster at Pasadena, in the county of Los Angeles and State of California.

John W. Loyd, to be postmaster at Portersville, in the county of Tulare and State of California.

Henry L. Kramer, to be postmaster at Indiana Mineral Springs, in the county of Warren and State of Indiana.

Jesse S. Birch, to be postmaster at Oxford, in the county of Benton and State of Indiana.

William H. Kenyon, to be postmaster at Moosup, in the county of Windham and State of Connecticut.

F. A. Christensen, to be postmaster at Lake Mills, in the county of Winnebago and State of Iowa.

Lars E. Bladine, to be postmaster at Marathon, in the county of Buena Vista and State of Iowa.

Frank M. Pickerl, to be postmaster at Argos, in the county of Marshall and State of Indiana.

Charles L. Hartinger, to be postmaster at Alden, in the county of Hardin and State of Iowa.

Wellington H. Gowdy, to be postmaster at Corwith, in the county of Hancock and State of Iowa.

George S. Crandall, to be postmaster at Schaller, in the county of Sac and State of Iowa.

Gilbert Knudson, to be postmaster at Jewell, in the county of Hamilton and State of Iowa.

B. F. Keables, to be postmaster at Pella, in the county of Marion and State of Iowa.

William David Junkin, to be postmaster at Rock Rapids, in the county of Lyon and State of Iowa.

William L. McWilliams, to be postmaster at Miami, in the Ottawa Nation, of Indian Territory.

Caleb H. Wickersham, to be postmaster at West Branch, in the county of Cedar and State of Iowa.

William C. Marsh, to be postmaster at Aurelia, in the county of Cherokee and State of Iowa.

Charles F. Reed, to be postmaster at Whitman, in the county of Plymouth and State of Massachusetts.

Charles F. Hammond, to be postmaster at Nantucket, in the county of Nantucket and State of Massachusetts.

Henry S. Mueller, to be postmaster at Sedgwick, in the county of Harvey and State of Kansas.

Jonathan F. Jefferds, to be postmaster at Livermore Falls, in the county of Androscoggin and State of Maine.

Eldridge H. Bryant, to be postmaster at Machias, in the county of Washington and State of Maine.

Samuel Hambleton, to be postmaster at Rising Sun, in the county of Cecil and State of Maryland.

Bangs F. Warner, to be postmaster at Paw Paw, in the county of Van Buren and State of Michigan.

George Preston, to be postmaster at Grass Lake, in the county of Jackson and State of Michigan.

John M. Thurlough, to be postmaster at Fort Fairfield, in the county of Aroostook and State of Maine.

Fred N. Corey, to be postmaster at Elk River, in the county of Sherburne and State of Minnesota.

John Y. Breckenridge, to be postmaster at Pine City, in the county of Pine and State of Minnesota.

Harlow D. Wells, to be postmaster at Ypsilanti, in the county of Washtenaw and State of Michigan.

Isaac H. Lutterloh, to be postmaster at Sanford, in the county of Moore and State of North Carolina.

Hakon E. Glasoe, to be postmaster at Lanesboro, in the county of Fillmore and State of Minnesota.

Ole C. Enge, to be postmaster at Elmore, in the county of Faribault and State of Minnesota.

Charles C. Jessup, to be postmaster at Woodbury, in the county of Gloucester and State of New Jersey.

Thomas W. Collier, to be postmaster at Raton, in the county of Colfax and Territory of New Mexico.

Joseph Powles, to be postmaster at Milton, in the county of Cavalier and State of North Dakota.

Patrick W. Carr, to be postmaster at Flandreau, in the county of Moody and State of South Dakota.

George F. Merriman, to be postmaster at Medford, in the county of Jackson and State of Oregon.

John Heald, to be postmaster at Wappingers Falls, in the county of Dutchess and State of New York.

Edward B. Bennett, to be postmaster at Hartford, in the county of Hartford and State of Connecticut.

Theodore Riel, to be postmaster at Burlington, in the county of Racine and State of Wisconsin.

Robert Murdock, to be postmaster at Logan, in the county of Cache and State of Utah.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *January 17, 1900.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read, corrected, and approved.

HOURS OF POLICEMEN, FIREMEN, AND OFFICERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations to report back the bill (H. R. 3343) to regulate the service and fix the hours of service for persons employed as policemen, firemen, and officers in the District of Columbia, and to ask that it be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont, under instructions of his committee, reports back the bill H. R. 3343 and asks that it shall be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. Without objection, that order will be made.

There was no objection.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations to report the bill (H. R. 6627) making appropriations for invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin presents the following privileged report from the Committee on Appropriations:

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6627) making appropriations for invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and printed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I desire to reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman reserves all points of order on the bill.

Mr. BARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I will give notice later at what time I will call up the bill for consideration.

TWELFTH CENSUS.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned last night we were considering an appeal which had been taken by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] from the ruling of the Speaker on the bill that was presented as a privileged bill from the Committee on the Twelfth Census. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RUSSELL], when I presented the bill yesterday as a privileged bill, raised the point against it that there was no provision in the rules of the House that made it a privileged matter, and contended that in view of that it must go upon the Calendar, the same as bills from other committees that are not privileged under the rules. The Speaker held it was a privileged bill, because it is carrying out a duty imposed on Congress by the Constitution, and hence, regardless of the question as to whether the rules specifically provided that it shall be privileged, that it is a matter of the highest privilege under the Constitution.

The gentleman from Connecticut, and in that position he was seconded by my honored friend from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], took the position that the rules must govern, and insisted that inasmuch as there was no specific rule that covers the case, the bill presented by the Committee on the Census therefore was not privileged. The Speaker, in making his decision yesterday, called the attention of the House to a ruling of Speaker Reed in the Fifty-first Congress, when Mr. Dunnell, of Minnesota, the then chairman of the Committee on the Census, presented a bill for apportionment, and it was contended then, as it is now, that that committee was not a privileged committee, and the bill itself was not a privileged bill; and Speaker Reed held in that instance it was privileged, and the House acquiesced in the ruling of the Speaker; and the present occupant of the chair, in rendering his decision, followed the precedent that was there established. Since the adjournment of the House my attention has been called to two other decisions of this House that cover this point, namely, that any matter that under the Constitution is a matter of high privilege can be brought into the House and considered regardless of the question whether the rules of the House make the proposition itself a privileged matter.

I desire, Mr. Speaker, to call to the attention of the members of the House the decision that was rendered by Mr. Speaker Randall in 1877:

On February 12, 1877, Mr. David Dudley Field, of New York, from the Committee on the Privileges, Powers, and Duties of the House of Representatives in Counting the Vote for President and Vice-President of the United States, reported a bill (H. R. 4693) to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States in respect to vacancies in the offices of President and Vice-President, and demanded the previous question thereon.

Mr. Horatio C. Burchard, of Illinois, made the point of order that the committee had no authority to report the said bill.

The Speaker overruled the point of order, on the ground that the resolution creating the said committee authorized it "to ascertain and report what are the privileges, powers, and duties of the House of Representatives in counting the votes for President and Vice-President of the United States," and also gave the committee the right to report at any time. The Speaker further stated that he could not conceive of a question of higher constitutional and parliamentary privilege than was involved in the bill under consideration, and he therefore held the bill to be in order at this time.

Mr. RICHARDSON. What section is that?

Mr. HOPKINS. I am reading from page 90 of the Compilation, section 143;

On January 10, 1843, Mr. John M. Botts, of Virginia, as a privileged subject, submitted the following:

"I do impeach John Tyler, Vice-President, acting as President of the United States, of the following high crimes and misdemeanors."

Then he cites the charges that he made.

Mr. Everett, of Vermont, submitted that the proposition of Mr. Botts could not take precedence on the ground of privilege, and therefore was not in order according to the routine of business as established by the rule. The Speaker decided that as by the Constitution it was a privilege of the House of Representatives to institute proceedings against the President, he considered that the present was a privileged proceeding and took precedence of other proceedings.

These two cases, in addition to the decision cited by the Speaker last night, namely, the decision of Speaker Reed in the Fifty-first Congress, in my judgment, establish beyond peradventure that it is not necessary, where the question is a constitutional question, that there should be a specific rule of the House to determine the privileged character of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Will my colleague yield a moment to call attention to one other noted ruling? In 1875 or 1876—when Mr. Randall was Speaker of the House—the House was engaged in canvassing the vote of electors for the Presidency, and pending the coming together of the House and the Senate, under the lead, as I recollect, of my distinguished colleague, Mr. Springer, and others upon that side of the House, dilatory motions, which had always been held in order, were being made. It was one of the most memorable scenes I ever witnessed in this House. A point of order was made that they were not in order because the House

was engaged in the performance of a duty directed by the Constitution. The gavel of Speaker Randall came down, and he sustained the point of order and disregarded the then rule of the House because the Constitution called for the performance of the duty.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, Article I, section 2, of the Constitution of the United States requires that Congress shall, every ten years, make an enumeration of the people of the United States as shall be directed by law. In the Fifty-first Congress a bill was prepared by the Census Committee and presented to the House, organizing the machinery for the purpose of taking this enumeration.

Now, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the position taken by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], who so ably argued this position yesterday afternoon, is in entire harmony with the position of the Speaker when the bill is taken into consideration. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] stated in his remarks in opposition to the ruling of the Speaker as follows:

If there were an enumeration of the people for the purpose of apportioning the Representatives, the bill would be privileged.

Clearly showing that he recognizes the force and effect of the decision to which I have already adverted and the ruling of Speaker Reed in the Fifty-first Congress. Now, that brings us squarely to the question as to what is an enumeration. Is it simply a count of the people? Not at all. The Constitution says we must make an enumeration as provided by law. How do we do that? We do it by establishing a Census Bureau, by creating a Director of the Census, an assistant director, and a number of statisticians, a large clerical force, for the purpose of tabulating the facts collected. We create the offices of supervisor and enumerators and special agents and all this great force for what purpose? For the specific purpose of carrying out these provisions of the Constitution to which I have just referred.

Now, what is the other part of it? Why, Mr. Speaker, the printing of the tabulated facts collected for the benefit of Congress is just as much a part of the enumeration as it is to appoint a supervisor. The enumerators go out and gather the facts; but how can the enumerators act without having the printing done?

They take the instructions given to them prepared by the Director and his able corps of assistants. It requires tons of printing to do that, so that the clause in the law which relates to printing clearly comes within the provision of the Constitution just referred to. If I understood the gentleman from Texas correctly yesterday, he concedes that the bill that was presented in the Fifty-fifth Congress is in strict accordance with the Constitution and was a privileged matter. I now desire to have the Clerk read from the desk the bill that is proposed by the committee at this time, to show to the members of the House that it is in strict accordance with the provisions of the original bill; that it is simply to amend certain deficiencies that are found to exist in that law.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 2179) relating to the Twelfth and subsequent censuses, and giving to the Director thereof additional power and authority in certain cases, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in addition to the power and authority conferred upon the Director of the Census by an act entitled "An act to provide for taking the Twelfth and subsequent censuses," approved March 3, 1899, said Director of the Census shall have power, and is hereby authorized, to appoint and employ, as the necessity therefor may arise, one purchasing agent, at an annual salary of $2,500; two chiefs of division, at an annual salary of $2,000 each; five clerks of class 4; six clerks of class 3, and eight clerks of class 2; to employ such number of special agents, not exceeding 35 in all, as may be proper and necessary for the purpose of gathering any information or data in relation to or required by the agricultural schedules; to employ special agents to assist the supervisors in large cities whenever he may deem it proper, in connection with the work of preparation for, or during the progress of, the enumeration, or in connection with the reenumeration of any district, or a part thereof; to employ as special agents such of the supervisors of census as he may deem wise and proper, at the compensation provided for in section 17 of said act, the intent and purpose being that the supervisors of census may be appointed special agents at the time they are acting as supervisors, and receive the compensation to which they are entitled as supervisors and also as special agents. And the Director of the Census is authorized and directed to collect statistics relating to all of the deaf, dumb, and blind, notwithstanding the restrictions and limitations contained in section 8 of said act entitled "An act to provide for taking the Twelfth and subsequent censuses;" and the Director of the Census is hereby specifically authorized to pay such supervisors for their services as special agents the compensation which he may authorize out of any general or special appropriation which may be made for the payment of special agents, and to allow any supervisor of census, in addition to the contingencies provided for in section 11 of said act, actual and necessary traveling expenses and an allowance in lieu of subsistence not exceeding $3 per day during his necessary absence from his usual place of residence in connection with the work of preparation for the enumeration; to allow, in fixing the compensation of enumerators, not more than 5 cents for each death reported, to purchase any and all law books, books of reference, or periodicals which may be required from time to time in the Census Office, and pay for the same out of the sum appropriated by the said act of March 3, 1899, or any other appropriation hereafter made for the census work, whether there be a specific authorization for such purchases or not: *Provided*, That the aggregate amount of such purchases shall not exceed the sum of $2,000.

SEC. 2. That in addition to the other statistics required to be collected by section 7 of said act approved March 3, 1899, there shall be collected on the agricultural schedules information concerning the number and kinds of live stock not on farms; and the Director of the Census shall have power to pay the enumerators for collecting such information, in his discretion, not less than 5 nor more than 10 cents for each barn or inclosure visited in which such live stock may be found: *Provided, however*, That the Director of the Census may appoint special agents to gather the information required by this section whenever he may deem it proper.

SEC. 3. That in the event of the death of any supervisor or enumerator after his appointment and entrance on his duties, the Director of the Census be, and he is, authorized to pay to his widow, if there be one, and if not to his legal representative, such sum as may be just and fair for the services rendered by said supervisor or enumerator prior to his death.

SEC. 4. That the Director of the Census, whenever he shall find that there is a probability of delay in the printing or publishing of the census reports beyond the period required by the said act of March 3, 1899, be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to contract with any individual, copartnership, or corporation for the printing and binding, or either, of any of said reports, in the manner prescribed by law for the letting of public contracts.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, if the members of the House followed carefully the reading of the bill they will see that its sole and only object is to carry out this provision of the Constitution which imposes the duty upon this House and the Senate to provide the machinery for enumerating the people of this country, in order that an apportionment may be made as contemplated in the Constitution itself.

The first portion of the bill relates to increasing the power and efficiency of the clerical force in the office of the Director of the Census. The second relates to the appointment of special agents to aid the supervisors in laying out the enumeration districts, so that the enumeration may be made more efficiently and accurately than could be done under the original bill.

The third section relates to an increased power in taking the census of mutes, blind people, and other unfortunates.

I apprehend, Mr. Speaker, had it not been for the adoption of section 4 in the amended bill, which relates to printing, this question that is now before the House would not have been raised at all. I desire, however, to say to gentlemen upon both sides of the Chamber that in sustaining the Speaker it commits no man to that section of the proposed bill. When that bill is considered upon its merits, those who stand with the majority of the committee can vote to sustain that section. Those who are opposed to it can vote against it, and whatever the action may be in that regard, it will be the action of the House and we must bow to the mandate of the House. But so far as this appeal is concerned, and the question that is now pending, it is as much a part of the enumeration as any branch of the bill that is already the law of the land, or as any part of the bill which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] concede to be germane to the original bill and to be privileged matter.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, with the explanation I have made here today, there will be no hesitancy and no doubt among my Republican colleagues as to the correctness of the ruling of the Speaker. I trust that my Democratic friends on the other side of the Chamber will feel that the decision of Speaker Reed and the decision of Speaker Randall are in harmony with the decision made by the present Speaker, and that the motion which I now make, Mr. Speaker, to lay this appeal on the table will be approved by the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I hope the gentleman will not make that motion until I have an opportunity to be heard.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] moves to lay the appeal on the table.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I appeal to the gentleman that it is not fair to move to lay the appeal on the table after making a long speech himself.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] both discussed this matter at length yesterday.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes; but you have presented new matter——

Mr. HOPKINS. I must insist on my motion.

Mr. RICHARDSON. You have presented new matter, and I submit that the motion to lay an appeal on the table is never made by a gentleman at the conclusion of a long speech in which he has presented new matter. Now, I want to comment upon that briefly——

Mr. HOPKINS. I insist upon my motion.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I want to comment upon the new authorities to which you have referred, and to show that they do not apply. I appeal to the gentleman's sense of fairness——

Mr. HOPKINS. There has been more discussion on that side of the House than on this, and I must insist upon my motion.

Mr. GAINES. The bill was not read until this morning.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois insists upon his motion.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have never known a motion of that kind to be made when new matter has been introduced. I have never known that to be done in all my experience here.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee will please suspend. The gentleman from Illinois insists upon his motion, and it becomes the duty of the Chair to submit it. The gentleman from Illinois moves to lay the pending appeal upon the table.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that he was in doubt.

Mr. MERCER. The yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of laying the appeal on the table will, as their names are called, vote aye; those opposed, no; and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 165, nays 138, answered "present" 2, not voting 49; as follows:

YEAS—165.

Acheson,	Dolliver,	Kerr,	Ray,
Alexander,	Dovener,	Ketcham,	Reeder,
Allen, Me.	Driscoll,	Knox,	Reeves,
Babcock,	Eddy,	Lacey,	Roberts, Mass.
Bailey, Kans.	Emerson,	Landis,	Rodenberg,
Baker,	Esch,	Lane,	Russell,
Barham,	Faris,	Linney,	Shattuc,
Barney,	Fletcher,	Littauer,	Shelden,
Bartholdt,	Fordney,	Littlefield,	Showalter,
Bingham,	Foss,	Long,	Small,
Bishop,	Fowler,	Lorimer,	Smith, Ill.
Boreing,	Freer,	Loud,	Smith, H. C.
Boutell, Ill.	Gamble,	Loudenslager,	Smith, Samuel W.
Bowersock,	Gardner, Mich.	Lovering,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Brick,	Gardner, N. J.	Lybrand,	Southard,
Bromwell,	Gibson,	McCleary,	Sperry,
Brosius,	Gill,	McPherson,	Sprague,
Brownlow,	Gillet, N. Y.	Marsh,	Steele.
Bull,	Graff,	Mercer,	Stevens, Minn.
Burke, S. Dak.	Graham,	Mesick,	Stewart, N. J.
Burkett,	Grosvenor,	Metcalf,	Stewart, N. Y.
Burleigh,	Grout,	Miller,	Stewart, Wis.
Burton,	Grow,	Minor,	Sulloway,
Butler,	Hamilton,	Mondell,	Tayler, Ohio
Calderhead,	Haugen,	Moody, Mass.	Thomas, Iowa
Cannon,	Hawley,	Moody, Oreg.	Thropp,
Capron,	Heatwole,	Morgan,	Tompkins,
Clarke, N. H.	Hedge,	Morris,	Tongue.
Cochrane, N. Y.	Hemenway,	Mudd,	Van Voorhis,
Connell,	Henry, Conn.	Needham,	Vreeland,
Cooper, Wis.	Hepburn,	O'Grady,	Wadsworth,
Corliss,	Hill,	Olmsted,	Wanger,
Cromer,	Hitt,	Otjen,	Warner,
Crump,	Hoffecker,	Overstreet,	Waters,
Crumpacker,	Hopkins,	Parker, N. J.	Watson,
Curtis,	Howell,	Payne,	Weaver,
Dahle, Wis.	Hull,	Pearce, Mo.	Weeks,
Dalzell,	Jack,	Pearre,	White,
Davenport, S. A.	Jenkins,	Phillips,	Wright.
Davidson,	Jones, Wash.	Powers,	
Dayton,	Joy,	Prince,	
Dick,	Kahn,	Pugh,	

NAYS—138.

Adamson,	Davey,	Levy,	Ruppert,
Allen, Ky.	Davis,	Lewis,	Ryan, N. Y.
Allen, Miss.	De Armond,	Little,	Ryan, Pa.
Atwater,	De Vries,	Livingston,	Salmon,
Bailey, Tex.	Denny,	Lloyd,	Scudder,
Ball,	Dinsmore,	McClellan,	Shackleford,
Bankhead,	Dougherty,	McCulloch,	Sheppard,
Barber,	Elliott,	McDowell,	Sibley,
Bartlett,	Epes,	McLain,	Sims,
Bell,	Finley,	McRae,	Slayden,
Bellamy,	Fitzgerald, Mass.	Maddox,	Smith, Ky.
Benton,	Fitzpatrick,	May,	Snodgrass,
Berry,	Foster,	Meekison,	Sparkman,
Brantley,	Fox,	Meyer, La.	Stephens, Tex.
Breazeale,	Gaines,	Miers, Ind.	Stokes,
Brenner,	Gaston,	Moon,	Sulzer,
Brewer,	Gayle,	Muller,	Sutherland,
Broussard,	Glynn,	Naphen,	Swanson,
Brundidge,	Gordon,	Neville,	Talbert,
Burke, Tex.	Griffith,	Norton, Ohio	Taylor, Ala.
Burleson,	Griggs,	Norton, S. C.	Thayer,
Caldwell,	Hall,	Pierce, Tenn.	Thomas, N. C.
Campbell,	Hay,	Quarles,	Turner,
Catchings,	Henry, Miss.	Ransdell,	Underwood,
Clark, Mo.	Henry, Tex.	Rhea, Ky.	Wheeler, Ky.
Clayton, Ala.	Howard,	Rhea, Va.	Williams, J. R.
Clayton, N. Y.	Johnston,	Richardson,	Williams, W. E.
Cochran, Mo.	Jones, Va.	Ridgely,	Williams, Miss.
Cooper, Tex.	Kitchin,	Riordon,	Wilson, Idaho
Cowherd,	Kleberg,	Rixey,	Wilson, N. Y.
Cox,	Klutts,	Robbins,	Wilson, S. C.
Crawford,	Lamb,	Robertson, La.	Zenor,
Cummings,	Lanham,	Robinson, Ind.	Ziegler.
Daly, N. J.	Latimer,	Robinson, Nebr.	
Davenport, S. W.	Lester,	Rucker,	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Driggs,	Packer, Pa.

NOT VOTING—49.

Adams,	De Graffenreid,	Mahon,	Tate,
Boutelle, Me.	Fitzgerald, N. Y.	Mann,	Tawney,
Bradley,	Fleming,	Newlands,	Terry,
Brown,	Gilbert,	Noonan,	Underhill,
Burnett,	Gillett, Mass.	Otey,	Vandiver,
Carmack,	Green, Pa.	Polk,	Wachter,
Chanler,	Greene, Mass.	Robb,	Weymouth,
Chickering,	Harmer,	Shafroth,	Wheeler, Ala.
Cooney,	Jett,	Sherman,	Young, Pa.
Cousins,	Lawrence,	Spalding,	Young, Va.
Crowley,	Lentz,	Spight,	
Cusack,	McAleer,	Stallings,	
Cushman,	McCall,	Stark,	

So the motion to lay the appeal on the table was agreed to.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. LANDIS with Mr. BURNETT.

Mr. MAHON with Mr. OTEY.

Mr. SHERMAN with Mr. DRIGGS.

Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania with Mr. BRADLEY.

Mr. MANN with Mr. JETT.

Mr. MCCALL with Mr. JONES of Virginia.

Mr. PACKER of Pennsylvania with Mr. POLK, during the session.

For this day:

Mr. LAWRENCE with Mr. GILBERT.

Mr. WACHTER with Mr. UNDERHILL.

Mr. BOREING with Mr. SPIGHT.

Mr. BAKER with Mr. CROWLEY.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts with Mr. CARMACK.

Mr. CHICKERING with Mr. STARK.

Mr. WEYMOUTH with Mr. DE GRAFFENREID.

Mr. HARMER with Mr. VANDIVER.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine with Mr. NOONAN.

Mr. TAWNEY with Mr. ROBB.

Mr. SPALDING with Mr. FITZGERALD of New York.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts with Mr. LENTZ.

Mr. CUSHMAN with Mr. TERRY.

Mr. COUSINS with Mr. FLEMING.

Mr. BROWN with Mr. CHANLER.

Mr. ADAMS with Mr. MCALEER.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, did I understand the Clerk to read that I was paired with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY]? I would like to know how the gentleman voted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is paired, but the gentleman from Virginia voted.

Mr. HULL. Then I want my vote to stand.

Mr. PACKER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. POLK]. I desire to withdraw my vote, and to be recorded "present."

Mr. ADAMS. Did the Clerk announce my name as paired?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not recorded.

Mr. ADAMS. I am paired with my colleague [Mr. MCALEER].

The SPEAKER. Neither voted.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to inquire whether Mr. RYAN voted?

The SPEAKER. Both Mr. RYANS voted.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. HOPKINS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the appeal was laid on the table was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and resolution of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 2284. An act extending the time for the completion of a wagon and motor bridge across the Missouri River at St. Charles, Mo., as provided by an act approved June 3, 1896;

S. 2336. An act repealing section 4716 of the Revised Statutes so far as the same may be applicable to the claims of dependent parents of soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the Army or Navy of the United States during the war with Spain; and

Senate concurrent resolution No. 9:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 3,000 additional copies of Senate Miscellaneous Document 278, second session Fifty-third Congress, the same being a "Digest of decisions and precedents of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, relating to their powers and privileges respecting their members and officers, and to investigations, contempts, libels, contumacious witnesses, expulsions, etc.," as revised and new matter added, together with decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and other courts, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

SENATE BILL AND RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a Senate bill and resolution of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 2336. An act repealing section 4716 of the Revised Statutes so far as the same may be applicable to the claims of dependent parents of soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the Army or Navy of the United States during the war with Spain—to the Committee on Pensions.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 9:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 3,000 additional copies of Senate Miscellaneous Document 278, second session Fifty third Congress, the same being a "Digest of Decisions and precedents of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, relating to their powers and privileges respecting their members and officers, and to investigations, contumacious witnesses, expulsions, etc.," as revised and new matter added, together with decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and other courts, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives—

to the Committee on Printing.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the urgent deficiency bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. DALZELL in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill 6237. By order of the House general debate was closed at 5 o'clock last evening. The Clerk will report the bill by paragraphs.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums be, and the same are hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year 1900, and for prior years, and for other objects hereinafter stated, namely:

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I avail myself of this opportunity to say a few words in regard to a resolution I introduced on the 12th day of this month for the appointment of a special committee of nine to make a rigid and thorough investigation of the transactions of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Treasury Department with the Standard Oil Trust bank, namely, the National City Bank, and the Hanover National Bank, of New York, and other national banks, from the 4th day of March, 1897, down to the present time.

Thus far I am informed no action has been taken by the partisan Committee on Rules in regard to that resolution. If I am reliably informed, from what I read in the newspapers I understand MARK HANNA, the great boss of the Republican party, has said this investigation of the charges against the Secretary of the Treasury is "all rot;" and that the President—the mere agent of the money trust—has given orders to suppress the investigation; and that the Republicans in this House intend to do nothing further in regard to these grave and serious charges, involving, as they do, the Administration with the Standard Oil Trust and its agents.

If that is so we want to know it, and we ought to know it. If you intend to smother this investigation, say so honestly and let the people know it. If you do not intend to take cognizance of these scandalous charges against the Secretary of the Treasury and his administration of the Treasury Department, we on this side of the House want to know it and ought to know it. And if you say that you intend to suppress all further investigation in regard to this matter we will see what we can do about it.

If you suppress that resolution for a thorough and rigid investigation I believe you will regret it. I know you have the physical power and the votes in this House to suppress this investigation; but if you do there is another remedy we can pursue, and for one I unhesitatingly say that you shall not escape responsibility and that, if necessary, the severer remedy will be resorted to.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask for order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend for a moment, and the committee will be in order. Gentlemen will please be seated.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I now desire to read the resolution for an investigation introduced by me on the 12th day of January, 1900. It is as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee, consisting of nine members of the House of Representatives, be immediately appointed by the Speaker to make a thorough and complete investigation of all dealings and transactions between the Secretary of the Treasury or the Treasury Department of the United States and the National City Bank and the Hanover National Bank, of the city of New York, or any other national bank of the United States, from the 4th day of March, 1897, to the present time, and especially in regard to all letters, agreements, papers, or documents between the Treasury Department of the United States, or any person connected therewith, and the National City Bank and the Hanover National Bank, of the city of New York, or any person acting for them, or either of them, since the 4th day of March, 1897, relating to the depositing of public funds, bonds, or revenues in said bank or banks or any other relations or business transactions now existing or heretofore had between the Government and the said banks, or either of them, and the amount of public money, bonds, or revenue deposited with said banks, or either of them, or with any national bank, by the Government, upon what security, for what length of time, and the reasons therefor, and whether said banks, or any of them, have paid the Government any interest on said deposits, and if so, how much, and all other information concerning the same or in any way relating thereto; and also the date of the sale of the custom-house property of the United States in New York City to said National City Bank, the date of the execution of the deed thereto, the date and manner of payment of the purchase money therefor, the disposition of the proceeds of said sale, and whether or not the Government has paid any rents for said property, or any portion thereof, for any purpose since the day of sale, and if so, to whom, and all facts relating to said transaction, and all other matters in connection therewith or in any way relating thereto; and said committee is authorized to send for persons, books, letters, telegrams, papers, documents, and agreements, administer oaths, and hold open sessions, and sit at any time in any place in the city of Washington, New York, or Chicago, the expense for the same to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, and the Sergeant-at-Arms, or some one acting for him, shall attend said committee and carry out its mandates; and said committee is instructed to make a report to the House of Representatives, with testimony and exhibits, with all convenient speed.

This resolution speaks for itself, and expresses the scope of the investigation we demand. We insist that you take action in regard to it in the interest of truth and publicity.

Mr. Chairman, let me say here that I disclaim any personal animosity toward the Secretary of the Treasury, or any desire to seek partisan advantage or to make political capital for myself or my party out of this investigation. I believe, however, that the action of the Secretary of the Treasury is subject to severe criticism and open to grave public censure and condemnation. The charges against the Secretary of the Treasury can not be hushed up and they will not down. Make no mistake about that.

The Treasury Department, it seems, is no longer the safe of the Republic. It is a mere agency of the national banks, and responsive to their will and pliable to their manipulations. It seems that the Standard Oil trust owns, controls, and dominates this Administration. Read the answer of the Secretary of the Treasury to the resolution of inquiry of this House and no fair-minded man can doubt it for a moment.

We want the facts; we want to get at the truth; we want to unearth all the transactions between the Treasury Department and the Standard Oil trust. We want a searching, rigid, and thorough investigation; and if we get it, we believe that the facts will show a much worse condition of public affairs in the Treasury Department than anyone imagines.

Mr. Chairman, the charge is made and not denied that the Secretary of the Treasury has violated the law knowingly and intentionally to carry out apparently an infamous political bargain.

The charge is made and not denied that the Secretary of the Treasury has practically turned the Treasury funds of the Government over to the Standard Oil trust and its bank, the most gigantic and cold-blooded monopoly the world has ever seen, and has permitted it and its agents to rob and swindle the people. You can not cover up this scandal.

In the first place, the charge is made by reputable newspapers and by reputable citizens that the Secretary of the Treasury clearly and distinctly violated the law in regard to the sale of the custom-house in the city of New York and in regard to the disposition of the proceeds of that sale. On the 2d day of March, 1899, this House passed an act for the sale of the custom-house property in the city of New York.

By section 4 of that act it was specifically enjoined on the Secretary of the Treasury that the proceeds of the sale should be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. That is the law, and the fact is, according to the admission of the Secretary himself, that he deliberately violated the law by leaving the proceeds of the sale in the Standard Oil national bank. Let us look at the matter for just a moment. The Secretary sold the custom-house property in New York City to the National City Bank, owned and controlled by the Standard Oil people. The sale was made on the 3d day of last July, and not one dollar of the money has ever found its way into the Treasury, but has remained all the time in the National City Bank.

This was a clear violation of the law, and if I can read the statute right it makes the Secretary of the Treasury guilty of embezzlement. Section 5490 of the Revised Statutes plainly says that every officer charged by an act of Congress with the performance of a duty who does what the Secretary of the Treasury did in this instance is guilty of embezzlement. That is the law, and the facts applicable to it are conceded. There can be no question about the liability of the Secretary.

Now, I say that you can not afford to ignore this grave and serious matter; you can not afford to suppress this investigation, and if you do the responsibility will be on you, and you will hear more about it before many weeks come and go. This scandal must be probed to the bottom, in the interest of truth and publicity, and I undertake to say that the more you try to cover it up, the more you will hear about it between now and the next election.

Section 4 of the act of March 2, 1899, being the act for the sale of the custom-house in New York City, says:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to deposit the proceeds of the sale, after the payment of the usual incidental expenses, in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

And section 5490 of the Revised Statutes of the United States says:

Every officer or other person charged by any act of Congress with the safe-keeping of public money who fails to fully keep the same without loaning, using, or converting the same to his own use, or depositing in bank, is guilty of embezzlement.

The facts of the case are clear and admitted. The law speaks for itself, and is capable of only one construction.

If the Secretary of the Treasury is innocent, he should welcome and demand an investigation to clear himself. If he is guilty, he should be impeached and removed from office. The more you try to cover up this matter the worse it will be.

That, sir, is the law and the duty enjoined on the Secretary of the Treasury; and to-day, according to his own answer to the resolution of inquiry of this House, he admits that he has violated

that law. He did not deposit the proceeds of that sale in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts. Let us see what he did. On the 3d of last July he sold the custom-house property. He sold it to the bank of the Standard Oil trust—the National City Bank—and instead of depositing the money in the Treasury he left it in the bank. Not one dollar ever passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SULZER. I ask that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks for five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, while I do not think the gentleman's remarks are upon the bill, yet I hope the five minutes will be given to him.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SULZER. I thank the gentleman from Illinois, but let me say to him that if his party does not probe to the bottom this great national scandal involving the Administration with the Standard Oil trust—the greatest monopoly in all the world—he will hear a good deal more about it on the stump between now and election day. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of the Treasury did not deposit one dollar of the proceeds of the sale in the Treasury of the United States. On the contrary, he left every dollar of the purchase price of this property with the purchaser, the National City Bank—that is to say, the Standard Oil bank—and it has been there from the day of its purchase down to the present time. Under the law of this country, in my judgment and in the judgment of other good and sound lawyers, this failure on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury to obey the statute, his failure to deposit the money in the Treasury Department, constitutes embezzlement.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the country very briefly to a speech made by William McKinley, member of Congress from the State of Ohio, on the floor of this House on February 29, 1888. At that time he was charging a Democratic Secretary of the Treasury with political favoritism in depositing Government funds in pet national banks. The amount on deposit at that time with national banks was about $59,000,000, and this is what Mr. McKinley said:

> That surplus money ought to be in the Treasury to-day. It is now out among the banks and held by them, they giving to the Government bonds as security for the deposit and are getting the money without interest. I charge the President of the United States and his Administration with being responsible for this condition of affairs and for whatever congested condition we have in the Treasury and whatever alarm prevails about the finances of the country. Every dollar of this money should be paid to redeem the Government debt.

What a difference between now and then! What a spectacle the record presents between William McKinley, the fearless representative of the people from the State of Ohio in 1888, and William McKinley, President of the United States in 1900, the mere agent of the Standard Oil trust, the most dangerous monopoly in all the land, and the greatest menace to-day to the stability of our finances and our free institutions. To-day there are over a hundred millions of dollars of the people's money deposited by the Secretary of the Treasury with pet national banks and not drawing a penny interest so far as the people are concerned.

The national banks, it is true, deposit with the Government bonds to secure these loans, but the national banks continue to draw interest on the bonds, and at the same time they loan out the people's money to the people and charge them on call loans in Wall street and other places interest from 6 to 186 per cent.

The national banks are oppressing the people and robbing them going and coming. The national banks are making hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars every year through the instrumentality of the Secretary of the Treasury. This outrage should be thoroughly investigated and remedial legislation speedily enacted. This is a most important matter and can not be ignored.

The answer of the Secretary of the Treasury to the resolution of inquiry of this House is a most remarkable document, and to me it seems to be a humiliating confession of dereliction of duty. Every citizen in the country should read the answer of the Secretary of the Treasury. It presents a sad condition of public affairs that should bring the blush of shame to the cheek of every honest and patriotic citizen.

His whole conduct in this matter from the beginning to the end is indefensible, suspicious, and reprehensible. No honest man can justify it or condone it. It demands the most searching and rigid investigation, and if the Secretary is the man his friends say he is he will insist, in justice to himself and to his reputation, on this investigation.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SULZER. I ask for five minutes more; I could not get time yesterday.

Mr. CANNON. I do not see any prospect of this ceasing, but I hope my friend can have five minutes more.

Mr. SULZER. Give me five minutes more and I will try to conclude what I have to say.

Mr. CANNON. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. SULZER. Now, sir, under the law, I doubt if the National City Bank could buy the custom-house property. It is very questionable if it could under its charter. But be that as it may, it has held title to the property and held the purchase money of the people, not paid a cent of interest on it, charged the Government rent for the use of the building, and escaped the payment of taxes to the city and State of New York.

Mr. Chairman, let me read you an extract from a letter written to the Secretary of the Treasury by A. B. Hepburn, the vice-president of the Standard Oil bank, as long ago as June, 1897. It begins very familiarly:

> MY DEAR MR. GAGE: * * * We would like to remain a United States depository. Of course the bank is very strong, *and if you will take the pains to look at our list of directors you will see that we also have very great political claims in view of what was done during the canvass of last year.*
>
> A. B. HEPBURN.

Now, we want an investigation to find out who the directors of the Standard Oil bank are and what they did in the campaign of 1896 that they have very great political claims on the present Republican Administration.

I undertake to say that a fair and full investigation of the Treasury Department will expose the most deplorable condition of affairs ever known in the history of this country. Read the answer of the Secretary and refuse this investigation if you dare.

In that answer he practically confesses and admits the charges made against him. Let me read you another letter, written by James Stillman, the president of the National City Bank, and a relative, I am informed, of John D. Rockefeller. This letter is as follows:

> THE NATIONAL CITY BANK OF NEW YORK,
> *New York, November 12, 1897.*
>
> DEAR SIR: Again referring to your letter of November 10, in which you advise us that a deposit will be made with this bank on the 22d instant of $13,645,250, and also advise us that we will be directed, by the usual transfer order, to deposit with other designated depositaries a part of this fund, in proportion to the securities they have lodged with the United States Treasurer for the purpose of qualifying themselves, permit me to say that, not knowing the extent to which other banks have deposited bonds for the sake of qualifying themselves as depositaries, we are unable to estimate the proportion of such funds that will remain with us and therefore be subject to our use in current business.
>
> We would esteem it a very great favor, therefore, if you can advise us approximately what percentage of the $13,645,250 will remain with this bank. You, as a banker, can appreciate our desire to possess this information.
>
> Yours, very respectfully,
>
> JAS. STILLMAN, *President.*
>
> Hon. LYMAN J. GAGE,
> *Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.*

Yes, indeed, he seems to have appreciated it, and his connection with it is one of the most discreditable things that has happened in the administration of public affairs in this country since the Belknap scandal and the whisky frauds. Mr. Gage, I am informed, is a national banker and is very familiar with the schemes of national banks to make money by taking advantage of the unsuspecting public. I am informed that Mr. Gage admits that he is still connected with national banks and owns stock in one.

There is a law on the statute books which prevents a man engaged in the importation business from acting as Secretary of the Treasury, and there ought to be a law that a man engaged in the banking business and owning stock in a national bank should not be eligible to act as the Secretary of the Treasury.

If I had the time, I could read from the letters sent to us by Mr. Gage many of a very suspicious character. The answer of the Secretary demands action by this House, and immediate action.

This matter will not down. The people are thoroughly aroused. They demand the right to know the entire truth, and they will insist on that demand until it is granted. The Standard Oil trust must not control the Treasury of the people, and no agent of the Rockefellers must be the Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Gage's answer is very unsatisfactory, and the investigation must follow as a matter of right. If it does not, harsher measures looking to his impeachment will be instituted by honest and fearless representatives of the people. [Applause on Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIBLEY. I regret exceedingly to be compelled to take a contrary view from my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. SULZER], whom I supported with great loyalty and zeal for the Democratic leadership of this House. I regret to differ with my friend, who is my choice for the second place on the Democratic ticket this year. Nevertheless, I must differ, and I will state briefly some of my reasons.

The New York World telegraphed me as follows:

> NEW YORK, *December 26, 1899.*
>
> Hon. JOSEPH C. SIBLEY, *Franklin, Pa.:*
>
> The action of the Administration in making the National City Bank of Wall street, which is a Standard Oil concern, the center to which must flow all internal-revenue receipts is plainly a move toward monopoly and centralization. Kindly wire at World's expense your opinion of the move. Will you introduce a resolution to investigate? If so, please wire your draft or an outline of it, that we may print.
>
> THE WORLD.

To which I replied:

FRANKLIN, PA., *December 26, 1899.*

The WORLD, *New York:*

Confronted with financial emergency, Secretary of Treasury has acted with promptness and prudence along legal lines. In my opinion the American Congress will always uphold the Administration authorities in protecting by legal methods our commercial and industrial prosperity from threatened disaster.

JOSEPH C. SIBLEY.

That was my individual opinion then, and I have not changed that opinion to this hour. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I have read the answer of the Secretary of the Treasury, and as a fair-minded man I accept it as a full, free, and frank statement of the conditions that justified him in each and all of these transactions. There was a conflagration existing in the city of New York, and a conflagration is easier stopped at the beginning than after it has met with the full sweep of the storm of adversity.

I glory in the fact that he had the courage and the will to check that conflagration at its inception, and that the panic which was then prevailing in the city of New York, when, as my friend [Mr. SULZER] says, money loaned up to 186 per cent, did not extend to all of the cities of this Union, north, south, east, and west. I would rather see business prosperity than partisan success [applause on the Republican side], and any triumph which must come to us as a party through the distress and suffering of the commercial, financial, and industrial interests of this country will come to us rather as a curse than as a help upon our onward way. [Applause on the Republican side.]

They have criticised the Secretary of the Treasury because he did not send money to Chicago and New Orleans and all the other cities of the nation. Why, you might as well criticise the chief of the fire department of the city of Washington, if the Treasury is on fire, because he does not send half the engines over to the navy-yard or some other portion of the city. He directed the water upon the place where the fire was kindling and he stopped the conflagration, and to-day money is loaning in New York at from 3 to 6 per cent, and the industrial enterprises of this nation are moving forward and employing labor, and labor is receiving its fair meed of reward, or if it is not it should do so, for it has the opportunity so to do.

I for one, voicing only my individual opinion, want to say with emphasis that I am glad, that I rejoice in the action of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States for those acts for which he has been criticised on the floor of this House. [Applause on the Republican side.]

To my mind he is entitled to receive from all who love the prosperity of their country, whose representatives we are, rather a vote of commendation than of condemnation.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do not desire to enter into a discussion of the character or action of the Secretary of the Treasury. The answer that he made to the resolutions which were originally introduced carried conviction to the mind of every fair-minded man in this country that the Secretary of the Treasury was justified in all that he has done, that he not only stood personally vindicated at the end of the controversy, but had fully vindicated the conduct of the Administration in that behalf.

But I desire to refer to some complaints, or criticisms I might possibly term them, made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] against the Committee on Rules, because it had not made a report upon the resolutions which he has seen fit to introduce. It is fair that the Committee on Rules should be heard now upon this question briefly. The Committee on Rules is not a political machine, and the membership of this House has a right to have a fair and impartial action by that committee upon every resolution and matter that comes before it.

As I have already said—and I predicate my entire remarks upon the fact that I have alleged—the answer of the Secretary of the Treasury was a complete answer to all that had been alleged and was received with entire satisfaction, in my judgment, by the intelligent thinking men of the whole country.

Following that came another resolution, in substance a rehash of the same question. It may not be in the same language, but the purport and direction of the blow was for the same general purpose.

Now, shall the House hold that it is the duty of the Committee on Rules to put into motion an investigation every time that a member of this House sees fit to introduce a resolution for that purpose?

I am authorized by the chairman of the Committee on Rules to say that since the introduction of that resolution by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] no man has come to the Committee on Rules and asked to be heard in furtherance of the purpose manifested therein.

No man has come to the Committee on Rules and said, "This is the answer of the Secretary of the Treasury, but there is some of it that is not true; some of it is evasive; some of it is not fair." Nobody has said that. Shall the Committee on Rules be censured because they have seen fit thus far to put an end to a repetition of this character? Why, gentlemen, there is not a place in the United States where you would put the humblest, the poorest, the most degraded citizen upon trial on the mere allegation of somebody that he had done something wrong. Let somebody come to the Committee on Rules and state that within his personal knowledge something here is not truthfully stated—not come and make general statements—and there will be no difficulty about a report from that committee instantly.

But while all the facts are disclosed, what is the opportunity of the House. Gentlemen may criticise this answer. They may say that there ought to be some action taken because of some of the admitted facts; but until those facts are disputed by somebody, what good to put the House of Representatives to the expense, from its contingent fund, of another investigation? The Committee on Rules should at least have as much information as an ordinary grand jury or prosecutor would have before the filing of an indictment or an information, and certainly that ought to be so after a full and complete report such as this one that we have here now.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I remember a great day in this House, when my friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. SIBLEY, did not have to go to the other side of the big aisle for his applause. [Applause on the Democratic side.] There is not a man in this body for whom I have more personal affection than I entertain for him. But his present position has put me in an extremely awkward attitude, for two reasons: In the first place, the newspaper men have discovered a fanciful physical resemblance between him and me, so much so that we are frequently mistaken for each other.

Mr. SIBLEY. Let me interrupt you to say that a gentleman just now, who was looking for Mr. CLARK of Missouri, came up and addressed me as Mr. CLARK.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, that is precisely the trouble about it. I should hate exceedingly to have the present speeches of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIBLEY] orated around over the country as mine. [Laughter.] But the chief difficulty about it is that in writing occasionally for the newspapers I devoted three whole columns not very long ago, before I knew of his change of base, to urging him as the Democratic nominee for Vice-President of the United States [laughter]; and while I do not withdraw my personal affection, I wish in this distinguished presence to withdraw that nomination and confer it on my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. SULZER], who is faithful to the cause at all times, in all places, and under all circumstances. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I honor Mr. SULZER for his courage and his fidelity exhibited amid environments which would discourage, dishearten, and appall a more timid man. His example is well worthy of imitation by Democrats everywhere.

In the Fifty-third Congress my friend from Pennsylvania occupied a position of exceeding glory. He was more exploited by Democratic newspapers than any other member of that body. I think nothing more splendid was ever uttered in this House than the first speech that my brother from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIBLEY] delivered here, in which he stated, if I mistake not, that he had been ostracized by the plutocrats of the East in his social relations and cut in his business relations because, as a matter of conscience, of reason, of patriotism, and of humanity he was in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at 16 to 1. We hailed him as a hero and a martyr, because he was the only Congressman north of the Potomac River and east of the Allegheny Mountains who in the Fifty-third Congress stood faithful under all circumstances to the kind of Democracy that we preach in the Mississippi Valley. Even the Presidency itself was not beyond his reach that day. Members crowded about him—Democrats to applaud, Republicans to admire, and the Cleveland cuckoos to deride. That historic scene of which my friend was the central figure was worthy to be placed on immortal canvas by the pencil of a master artist.

Now all the applause that he can get is from the rank and historic enemies of the Democratic party, and my honest opinion is, without intending to be disrespectful or unkind, that his place in this House, and the place of those who entertain similar opinions, is on the other side of the big aisle. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Individually, I believe in the principles of the Democratic party as a matter of conscience, and I would rather fight ten Republicans in the open than fight one man masquerading in Democratic uniform and preaching Republican doctrines. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

A man has a right to be a Republican, if he can reconcile it with his conscience and love of country; I have no quarrel with him; but he should frankly avow himself a Republican and not place the burden of his sins on Democratic shoulders by improperly calling himself a Democrat.

LYMAN J. GAGE AND HEPBURN.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words about this bill. On the 5th day of June, 1897, Mr. A. B. Hepburn, vice-president

of the National City Bank of New York, wrote a letter to Hon. Lyman J. Gage, the Secretary of the Treasury, which I undertake to say, if unrebuked, is a disgrace to every American citizen Democrat or Republican. It is the grossest piece of effrontery in our vernacular. I will quote you part of that letter:

We should like to remain a United States depository as at present.

That is a laudable desire.

Of course the bank is very strong.

That is a good reason why it should be a depository. I wish to ask, if you gentlemen here have any conscience left, any reason, any decency, or any love for the principles underlying this splendid Republic, the last hope of constitutional government on the face of the earth, how you like this sentence from that letter?

If you will take the pains—

Says Mr. Hepburn—

to look at the list of directors, you will see we also have very great political claims in view of what was done during the campaign last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to have five minutes more.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, I put this question and press it home upon your minds and consciences: Is there a man in this House, on either side of the Chamber, who can conceive it to have been possible that in the days of Alexander Hamilton, Albert Gallatin, and Salmon P. Chase any man within the broad confines of this Republic would have had the gall to address such a letter as that to any one of those illustrious statesmen? Do you believe it? I do not. Of course Lyman J. Gage could not keep Hepburn from writing this letter; but he could have rebuked him for writing the letter, and it was his duty as an American citizen and chief financial officer of this Government to have rebuked him; but Mr. Gage seems to have thought the letter right and proper.

Mr. RICHARDSON. And he did not have to do what was asked him.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; he did not have to do it, but he did do it, nevertheless.

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If you will give me five minutes, you can ask me all the questions you want.

Mr. LACEY. It would take longer than that to answer this. What did Andrew Jackson do as to the distribution of the deposits?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Andrew Jackson took the deposits of the United States Government away from a lot of corruptionists just such as this man Hepburn [loud applause on the Democratic side] and put them in the hands of honest men. [Renewed applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. He put them in the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. LACEY. He put them in some pet State banks?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. He put them in the Treasury of the United States, and that is the beginning of the Treasury system we have to-day. Now, if you want to ask another question, crack in. I would be glad for you to do so.

Mr. LACEY. You have not answered that fully. Did not he put those deposits with a lot of pet State banks?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not care anything about pet State banks or anything of the kind. Did Mr. Gage rebuke Mr. Hepburn? Nothing of the sort. Instead of rebuking Hepburn, he did the specific thing that Hepburn wanted him to do and conferred upon that bank the greatest favor that was ever conferred by any Government officer upon any bank since banks were instituted among men. Hepburn demanded this largess from Mr. Gage because he contributed boodle in 1896!

Now, I submit, if Mr. Hepburn had great claims on account of what they did for President McKinley in the campaign of 1896 by reason of the comparatively small favors that Lyman had conferred upon that bank prior to this last stupendous deal, then it will take a lightning calculator to estimate the amount of boodle which that bank will contribute to the Republican campaign in 1900 by reason of the colossal favors conferred by Mr. Gage recently. The plan seems to be between this bank and Mr. Gage, "You tickle me and I will tickle you" [laughter], because with $300,000,000 of deposits at 6 per cent the bank will rake in $18,000,000 per annum, and it can afford to give several millions to the Republican campaign fund this year.

Not only that; this bank is part and parcel of the Standard Oil Company of the United States, and perhaps Lyman J. Gage knows where to go and get some more boodle when it is needed. I undertake to say this, Mr. Chairman, that this letter of Mr. Hepburn will be the most widely circulated letter ever penned since pens were first invented—discounting in that respect all the letters written by soldiers, statesmen, authors, travelers, and philosophers for the delight and instruction of mankind. Hepburn did not know exactly what he was doing when he wrote that letter, except that he was getting the swag. [Laughter.] I will tell you what else he has done. He has "damned himself to everlasting fame:" and while he was doing it he has also "damned Lyman J. Gage to everlasting fame."

EXAMPLE OF JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not abuse people because they differ with me politically. I will cite you a case of a man that I never was enamored of, to show what he did on a certain occasion, and which proves how jealous the old patriots were of their reputation. According to all the historians John Quincy Adams in a great many respects was one of the most disagreeable men, personally, that ever sat in the White House, always excepting the one immediately preceding William McKinley. [Laughter.] But John Quincy Adams was a patriot. He was clean. He was exceedingly careful of his reputation. He was above suspicion. When he was elected Senator of the United States he happened to own a small block of stock in the old United States Bank, of which Nick Biddle was president. So sensitive was John Quincy Adams as to his good name that before he would take his seat as Senator, believing that legislation might be required touching the interests of the bank, that he went and sold that stock, an example which I commend to the statesmen of all parties on both sides of this Chamber. Evidently Lyman J. Gage is not a close blood relation of John Quincy Adams. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SIBLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am obliged to my complimentary friend from Missouri. Of course, being publicly notified that I am out of the Vice-Presidential race would have been somewhat humiliating had I not in my remarks voluntarily withdrawn in favor of my friend from New York. [Laughter.] But when my good friend speaks so kindly of my attitude in the past and reprovingly of my position in the present, permit me to tell him I claim equal honesty for both positions.

I believed then that bimetallism was sacred, that it rose above the dignity of a mere party measure; but events over which no political party has control have so changed conditions that we produced last year more gold alone that was added to the whole world's stock of money, more than has been added in both gold and silver since the history of man was first written. Responsive to that increase, the world's price level has risen. I believe a cause may be sacred in one hour and ridiculous at a later period.

I believe that if we elect a Democratic President in the year 1900, that man's term will begin and expire without the possibility of writing one line in the Federal statutes of this nation contrary to the will of the Republican majority insured for six years in the United States Senate. I am not fighting because I love to fight, but desire, so far as lies in my power, to do something practical and something helpful. When my friend commends me to take my seat on the other side of the Chamber, located here as pleasantly as I am, with good friends and neighbors who overlook my idiosyncrasies, I do not know as I shall accept that invitation; but, Mr. Chairman, if I do, I shall not feel altogether out of place.

Sir, sitting over here, as we do, upon the eastern side of the Chamber, I have thought there possibly might be a very great party advantage accruing to us if the Democrats could change sides, that we might thus be able to catch the morning sun shining in our faces; but sitting over here it shines on our backs until about 4 o'clock in the afternoon, and we rarely catch its beams until about the time it is setting. [Applause on the Republican side.]

My opinion is that if the Democratic party is going to achieve success, or deserve it, we must have a policy of our own. We must show something in the line of constructive statesmanship. [Applause on the Republican side.] Announce your Democratic policy, promulgate your measures, and if they commend themselves to my reason, and in their tendencies make for the uplifting of our country and our common humanity, I will keep step as near as possible with those who march in the front ranks. But if you invite me to a banquet of carping, criticising, and faultfinding, you will excuse me if I do not go along, but as politely as possible decline your invitation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this amendment is exhausted.

Mr. HEPBURN. I move to strike out the last two words. Mr. Chairman, there is rather a serious phase to this subject that I want to call attention to. The gentleman who began this debate saw fit to indulge in a grave, serious charge against one of the most prominent officers of this Government. I know that sometimes thoughtless people do not pay as much attention to the utterances of that gentleman as perhaps they ought. They are apt not to regard it, but when in his Representative capacity on the floor of this House he makes the grave charge that the Secretary of the

Treasury has admitted that he has violated the statutes and thereby has committed a crime, that charge ought to receive some rebuke. He makes that statement, sir, in the presence of a full and complete statement by the Secretary of the Treasury, accompanied by every scrap of correspondence upon this whole subject. The gentleman makes that statement simply because of a possible difference between him and others as to the construction of the statutes and the authority of the officer to act under that statute. He reads from a recent enactment requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to deposit a fund in the Treasury.

The Secretary, who, he says, admitted that he violated the law, specifically says that he has done what that act directed. And he is supported in that statement, and he gives all the facts and details of what he has done, by two decisions of the Supreme Court, by the opinion of the Attorney-General, by the opinion of the Comptroller of the Currency, and by the opinions of two of the most competent officers in the employ of the United States, all of them stating, in their judgment, that he has complied with the statute. And yet that gentleman, as a Representative here, has the temerity to declare that the Secretary has admitted that he has committed the crime of embezzlement.

I think that there ought not to be an investigation of the Secretary of the Treasury, because everything that he has done has been exhibited here. No man has intimated that other facts can be discovered than those that are now before the House and the country; and while it would seem to me that there is no call for an investigation of him, there ought to be some kind of rebuke to that member of Congress who will thus distort reports, distort facts, and in his place here slander honored officials of the Government. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS and Mr. CANNON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, have I the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not see the gentleman from Illinois on the left.

Mr. CANNON. As I want only about a half a minute and then shall ask to have the debate closed, and as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] last occupied the floor, I will yield, and hope the Chair will recognize me afterwards for five minutes.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the defense of the Secretary of the Treasury, submitted by Republicans on either side of this Chamber, I desire to have read an article from the Chicago Tribune of yesterday, one of the leading Republican papers of Illinois.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Is that a Republican paper?

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. Yes; well known to be.

The Clerk read as follows:

EVIL DAYS FOR SECRETARY GAGE.

There was a disposition in many quarters to let the curtain fall upon the acts of the Treasury Department with reference to the recent stock panic in Wall street and to draw the mantle of charity around Secretary Gage's official measures with reference thereto. Whatever opinion the people may have had as to the wisdom of those measures, it was admitted by candid men that Mr. Gage had been actuated only by unselfish motives. That opinion remains unchanged. Mr. Gage's personal and official integrity in private or public acts can not be assailed successfully among the people who know him.

It must be said, however, that in responding to the Democratic resolution calling for information in regard to the relations of the Treasury Department to the Standard Oil bank he has put some ugly weapons in the hands of his enemies. His response, including, as it does, some letters not strictly official in their nature, and which might have been withheld as purely private, reminds one forcibly of Emory Storrs's characterization of an old and lamented member of the Cook County bar. Mr. Storrs said of him: "I do not need to look up authorities to bring into court when I have him for an opponent, as I know well he will have all there are on both sides, and I can select from them all I may need to prove my case." Mr. Gage certainly has brought all the authorities into court in this instance, including those which were most against him.

He sent to the Senate two letters which can not easily be explained away, and Republican newspapers in the East are not even attempting to explain them away. One of them was from ex-Controller A. P. Hepburn, of the National City Bank, and the other from Mr. Stillman, president of that bank. Both these letters were printed in the Tribune yesterday.

Mr. Hepburn, in his letter, asked that his bank be allowed to remain a United States depository, one reason being that "our list of directors" will show "we have great political claims, in view of what was done during the canvass last year"—1896.

Mr. Stillman, in his letter, said the call loans of the bank, then out in Wall street, were $56,000,000, and suggested that if the Secretary would defer the payments to be made by the bank to the Government on account of the Central Pacific road it would "help matters"—that is, the operations of the bank in Wall street would not be restricted by a decrease in loanable funds.

It has passed into a proverb that a cat may look at a king. So anybody may write a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury. The important fact is not that these two letters were written to Secretary Gage, but that he proceeded to act in both instances in accordance with the suggestions made to him. The public deposits in the National City Bank were increased—as Mr. Hepburn desired they should be. Those deposits rose from a few hundreds of thousands of dollars, at which sum they then stood, to ten or twelve millions per month. Furthermore, the payment to the Treasury Department of the Central Pacific money was deferred, in accordance with Mr. Stillman's suggestion, until it became convenient for the bank to hand the money over.

By his unsophisticated, guileless, and innocent transmission of these two letters to Congress Mr. Gage has convicted himself out of his own mouth and has established as true some of the gravest accusations made against the Administration by unfriendly critics. Mr. Gage has gone far, for example, to show that the National City Bank of New York deserves to be called, as it has been called by some Democratic newspapers, a "favored bank;" that the relations of the Standard Oil Company to the Treasury Department, owing to the loan of bonds to the National City Bank, upon which deposits were based (of which advances the Treasury Department was specifically informed), are not remote, and, finally, that the Treasury Department has, on occasions when it should not justly have done so, meddled and muddled in Wall street stock operations, with which the Government of the United States has properly nothing to do.

What answer Mr. Gage will make to these accusations we can not say, but it is manifest that the Treasury Department needs a censor, so that the next time it is called on to transmit a mass of correspondence to either House of Congress that correspondence may be discreetly and discriminatingly edited.

What was it or what could it be to Mr. Gage that the Standard Oil bank had immense sums loaned out in Wall street on call? How can Mr. Gage explain the fact that Government money was loaned in large sums to the Standard Oil bank when he knew it to be such and when he had been advised in official correspondence that the bonds which qualified the National City Bank to act as a depository were obtained directly from the Standard Oil Company?

How can Mr. Gage justify that letter (also officially printed) in which he suggested that the visit of Mr. Stillman or Mr. Morgan to Washington might "be more disturbing than an order on the banks to transfer all their money to the subtreasury," and consequently the Secretary of the Treasury offered to meet them in Philadelphia at the Walton Hotel in private and clandestinely at a particular time?

Was it becoming in the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to abscond from Washington to Philadelphia to meet the representatives of the Standard Oil bank or of any other financial institution in order to avoid possible public comment? Where should those representatives confer with him on business which would bear the light of day save at the office of the Secretary in the Treasury Department at the seat of Government?

We find it extremely awkward and difficult to answer some of these questions. The whole official course of Mr. Gage has been viewed by the Tribune "more in sorrow than in anger." He has fallen into every pit dug for his unwary feet by political and financial jobbers. They have taken continual advantage of his lack of experience in public affairs. Mr. Gage personally is as incorruptible as Aristides. Nobody for one instant questions his desire to serve the public faithfully and well. But owing to a one-sided education which taught him all a banker should know and little of what a public man should know, he has considered to be expedient and just things astute politicians would shrink from as imperiling their public and private reputations.

Mr. Gage has done nothing unbecoming a reputable banker. He has never asked whether any of his acts were unbecoming a Secretary of the Treasury. Any man who stood less high in the community than he does would unquestionably have subjected himself to grave suspicion. His only failing is that he has not exhibited in the conduct of public affairs the discretion of the politician as he displayed constantly in the management of a private financial institution the discretion of the banker.

The correspondent of the Chicago Record, a paper not unfriendly to Mr. Gage, said in its issue of yesterday that "it is quite safe to say Mr. Gage will not be in the next Cabinet if President McKinley should be reelected." It is perhaps as well that this information should be widely disseminated. The Republican party can not afford to stand for the policy which has been announced and thus far executed through the Treasury Department. Its affiliations with the Standard Oil Company and Wall street operators have been most unfortunate. "In spite of the callousness of so many of our business men," as the New York Evening Post says, "there is a great volume of popular wrath at and loathing for plutocracy."

During the reading of the foregoing, the time of Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS having expired, by unanimous consent, it was extended to allow the completion of the reading.

Mr. CANNON and Mr. CORLISS rose.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, a single word.

Mr. CORLISS. I ask the gentleman to yield to me for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that debate on this amendment is closed.

Mr. CANNON. I should like to get ahead with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CORLISS. Very well; if I may be recognized after the reading of the next paragraph.

Mr. CANNON. I want to say a word, and then I want to ask the House to permit this bill to be read in good faith for amendment. I started out on the supposition that a little leeway, even although remarks might not be in order if the point of order were made, would, after a little while, clear the air and that we could make progress. I hope that that may be done.

Mr. CORLISS. With the assurance that I shall have permission to move to amend further on, I will wait.

Mr. CANNON. I do not desire to answer at length the attack of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER], or the attack of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], or anybody else, upon the Secretary of the Treasury, for the report of the Secretary of the Treasury speaks for itself. I have read it with care. I believe it is true, and for one man and one Representative I indorse every act of the Secretary of the Treasury in connection therewith. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, why go on and try to answer about Standard Oil, and about this man having committed an impeachable offense, and all that kind of thing. It is multiplying words, not worthy, in my judgment, of an answer. I can best illustrate how I feel about it by stating a recollection that I have when a boy out on the Wabash, before the day of railroads. They sometimes had religious discussions, and there was a three days' discussion between great religious lights in the neighborhood on the doctrine of election.

The old hard-shell Presbyterian of the old school took occasion in his remarks, as I recollect it, in discussing this matter of election, to say that the Lord had ordered everything from the beginning, and that there were infants in hell not a span long. There was a good old Methodist sister sitting by, and she did not go into any argument about it. She could not have disproved it any more than he could prove it, but she answered him by jumping up and

crying out, "I thank my God that is a lie." [Laughter.] There is no use in multiplying words with our friends. They are just mistaken, that is all.

Now I ask that progress may be made by reading the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this amendment has been closed, and without objection the formal amendment will be considered withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For contingent expenses of the Executive Office, including stationery therefor, as well as record books, telegrams, telephones, books for library, miscellaneous items, and furniture and carpets for offices, care of office carriage, horses, and harness, being for the fiscal years as follows:

For the fiscal year 1900, $2,279.18.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN.]

[Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to discuss the question being considered here, but to call the attention of the chairman of the committee and the House to a paragraph in this bill further along and make some remarks pertaining to the department that has reference thereto.

On page 2 of the bill you will find a provision authorizing an increase in the appropriations for the Supervising Architect's Department of $40,000. We find that whenever a department has become ineffective by the dry rot of civil service it comes to Congress for an additional appropriation in order to inject a little life into that department without trying to remedy the evil within the department, and if you will bear with me for about ten minutes, as I will require that time, I desire to give to the members of this House my experience with this department of the Government, in order that they may know what the people of their districts must endure unless that department is changed to some extent.

Many of the members here have secured appropriations for the erection of public buildings in their district. One was granted to my district fourteen years ago, and at the expiration of twelve years the building was completed. When we moved into the new building it was found that the different departments were too large to go into the building, and the old public building was required. In order to utilize it it had to be repaired. Congress considered the matter and authorized the building to be retained, and in June, 1898, an appropriation of $20,000 was granted for the proper repair of that building.

The Supervising Architect's Office is entirely under the civil-service law, and the Supervising Architect, when appointed by the President, was eulogized by the Civil Service Reform League as a man entirely worthy and competent to fill that position; and I want time enough to present to this House facts that can be substantiated, in order that the people of my district, at least, will not hold me responsible for the incapacity of the Supervising Architect's Office.

In June, 1898, Congress appropriated $20,000 to repair an old public building. The plans had been submitted to the Supervising Architect upon which to base the estimate of the repairs needed. The public were paying for accommodation for public offices, the appraiser, the pension office, the Light-House Board, and other departments in my city, $7,000 a year for rental in private buildings, and we were very anxious to utilize the old building for the purpose of cutting off these expenses.

That building is not completed to-day, notwithstanding the fact that eighteen months have expired, and almost every day, every month at least, the Supervising Architect has been asked and urged and entreated to proceed to the completion of that building for the benefit of the public. He has had eighteen months to expend $20,000 for the repair of the old public building that any private owner could put in proper repair for the accommodation of the public department in that city in sixty days' time.

I believe it is my duty, sir, standing here representing the people of my city, to state these facts. This building is in the heart of our city, in one of the best business sections. The building has been closed for two years, and the merchants and business men surrounding it have complained because the building is there silent and idle when the public service requires its use.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CORLISS. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

Mr. CANNON. I do hope my friend will content himself with moving to amend this section, if such is his intention, when it is reached.

Mr. CORLISS. I move to strike it out.

Mr. CANNON. But it has not been reached.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to stand in the position of opposing an appropriation here if the chairman and the committee's investigation of it show that it ought to be granted.

Mr. CANNON. Will my friend want to be heard on this section again when it is reached?

Mr. CORLISS. Not if I am granted sufficient time to cover the facts now.

Mr. CANNON. With that statement I will not object to an extension of five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks an extension of five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CORLISS. My purpose, Mr. Chairman, in talking to the committee now is because from the discussion that is going on I am afraid the paragraph will not be reached. I do not wish to eliminate this appropriation if upon investigation the committee believes it ought to be made. I rather encourage it, but I desire to call attention of the officials of the Treasury Department to the absolute incapacity or lack of proper attention of the officers of the Architect's Department.

Now, one other step along the lines of the improvement here. Not only eighteen months have been wasted and an expenditure of $9,000 paid out by our Government for rent of private quarters because this building is not completed, but in a new public building completed and occupied by the Post-Office Department it was found that in the rear, where the mail had to come into the building, an addition should be constructed at a cost of about $500, in order to protect the mail men who come up with their carriages and unload the mail and carry it in the post-office. To-day, and for the last two years, they have been doing that work exposed to the rain and the storm, with no cover for their protection.

The Supervising Architect was asked by the postmaster and the custodian of the building and by myself and a Senator to make an extension that would cost $500 for the protection of the clerks in that new building. The money has been appropriated. He promised to do the work. He has repeatedly promised for two years to do it, but to-day the men are standing there working in the rain storms because of the incapacity or the indifference of the Supervising Architect; and I submit that such a man ought to be compelled to do the work of his department properly and for the proper economy of the people and for the interests of the section in which the building is located or he should be removed from office.

One other point. Ninety days ago, when one elevator in the new building—the one nearest the center of the city—where 90 per cent of the people enter the building for the purpose of reaching the courts and the departments above, the elevator became out of repair, and that elevator has been permitted to stand idle for ninety days, and every person who goes into the building, to the court room, and to the collector of customs' office, and to the collector of internal revenue's office is compelled to travel nearly 400 feet through the building to reach the further elevator.

I call attention to these matters because, Mr. Chairman, I have called the attention of the Supervising Architect to it and his lack of attention to these matters until I am tired, and I desire the people of my district to know that when I find a department in Washington neglecting its duty and not expending the public money in the interest of the people—for the economy of the people—I will stand upon this floor and criticise him, whether it be the Supervising Architect or any other member of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I want publicly to ask the attention of the Secretary of the Treasury to the facts that I have stated. I desire the committee, in the consideration of other matters that will come up with reference to the Supervising Architect, to take into consideration the statements that I have made here and to ask him whether or not he has been guilty of the charges that I make. And unless he can show greater efficiency in some other direction—in some other buildings—to overcome such neglect of public interests, I submit it is high time that he should be removed from office.

Mr. GROSVENOR. You can not do it.

Mr. CORLISS. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] says we can not do it, and I suppose he means because he is under the civil-service law. I submit, Mr. Chairman, there is a power to reach men in public life, notwithstanding the fact that they are under the civil-service law, and that power is here, and unless it is exercised pretty quickly the voice of the people will come here and demand that the entire civil-service law be repealed.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this amendment is exhausted. Without objection, the formal amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of the Secretary: For two clerks, at the rate of $900 per annum each; and six paper counters and laborers, at the rate of $620 per annum each, in the division of loans and currency; in all, $1,380.

[Mr. QUARLES addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia, that he may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] made his remarks here this morning, criticising the action of the Secretary of the Treasury, my attention has been called to a very able editorial that appeared recently in the Greenville News, of South Carolina, a leading Democratic paper of that State, which shows clearly and conclusively that the Democracy of South Carolina is not in harmony with the views of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] in his tirade of abuse against Mr. Gage. And to show to my Democratic friends and my Republican colleagues how the rank and file of the Democracy view the action of Secretary Gage, I ask the Clerk to read such portions of the editorial as I have marked.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TO BRETHREN.

One of the most pressing needs of the South is breadth of view and modern thought in our newspapers. It is a depressing fact that most of the local newspapers in this section are running in the ruts of thirty years ago. They have not caught the spirit of freedom and independence that guides and governs the world of to-day. They hark back to old and dead issues, stick to old methods, are apparently unable to comprehend the changes that have come. Our observation is that the newspapers are far behind the people. In cities and towns and the country alike we find men and women thinking for themselves and considering political conditions from businesslike points of view, studying the effects of public issues and matters on the interests of themselves and their surroundings. Most of the newspapers, on the other hand, are thinking the thoughts of dead men or flocking along blindly after leaders, more or less blind, following empty names and guiding themselves by unmeaning and useless sentiment.

We are moved to these observations by the dismay, bewilderment, and anger which many of our esteemed contemporaries express from time to time because of things said and done by the Greenville News. They can not understand how it is that a Democratic newspaper warmly approves many of the policies and acts of a Republican Administration and disapproves the policies and acts of men who call themselves Democrats and of a God-forsaken band of political vagrants who blasphemously call themselves the Democratic party. In the honest opinion of many of these contemporaries such a thing is impossible. A newspaper which does not decry and snarl at, misrepresent, and belittle every act of a Republican Administration and abuse every Republican official must, they think, be Republican.

* * * * * * *

It [a contemporary] can not understand why this newspaper should defend Mr. Gage, the Republican Secretary of the Treasury, against Mr. SULZER, the Democratic Congressman from New York. Mr. Gage is a man who, by his integrity, ability, and energy, put himself at the head of the banking business in one of the world's largest cities. He is recognized by the whole world as an authority on finance. He has proved that his knowledge is accurate and practical by successfully managing great financial enterprises. Considering Mr. Gage's history, we find it hard to believe that he has made any very serious error in financial management or has joined in with anybody to rob the Government or to openly and flagrantly use Government funds to enrich himself or his friends. On the other hand, we know Mr. SULZER, of New York, to be a cheap and frothy East Side Tammany politician, a man who has never given any evidence of talent or learning or ability of any kind.

[Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

We know that the attack on Mr. Gage was led by the New York World and Journal, newspapers which live by being sensational and which notoriously disregard truth. Using this general knowledge of the men concerned and applying common sense, we said that when Mr. Gage's actions were investigated it would be found that he had acted wisely and honestly. We can not accept the fact that Mr. Gage is part of a Republican Administration as proof that he is fool or knave or both; nor can we regard Mr. SULZER as a statesman and master of finance because he calls himself a Democrat. Now, Mr. Gage's answer is before the public. It seems to us to prove that he had sound reasons for placing the Government money as he did and to make the clamor against him absurd. We think the business men of the whole country, who study affairs in a businesslike and open-minded way, will have the same opinion. Of course, the newspapers which hold blind partisanship to be their first and whole duty will continue to demand Mr. Gage's impeachment.

The weakness and folly of the partisanship of most of the Southern newspapers will be best understood if we suppose the case reversed. Suppose Mr. McKinley proceeded on the theory that no Democrat could be honest or trustworthy. There would not be a Democratic postmaster of any grade or census official or any other Federal officer anywhere in the country. If he chose to show the feeling toward the South which so many Southern newspapers show toward him, he could make this a hell on earth.

The Administration has fought and won a war and has treated the South kindly in every way. The whole country is prospering as it has not prospered in years. Our State is going ahead with a rush. We have every reason to be satisfied. The Greenville News will not deny these plain facts, nor, because the men under whose guidance these facts are developed are called Republicans, snarl at or abuse or belittle them. Nor will we cry out to try the experiment of handing the Government over to a lot of men because they call themselves Democrats, whose methods and principles we believe would bring disaster on the country. We are following common sense and principles, not names and empty sentiments; we are dealing with the facts as they are now, not with facts as they were in reconstruction days, or the memories of wrongs done by men who are dead. We are living in to-day and looking to to-morrow, and are not living in 1876 and looking to 1865. We are going forward, not backward, looking around at the world and seeing; not raking in old muck heaps, like the man in Pilgrim's Progress.

The Greenville News is a Democratic newspaper because it believes in Democratic principles and holds to them; it approves most of the policies and methods of the Administration because they accord with those principles and the country is prospering, booming, growing under them. It will not, because Bryan, Altgeld, and Tillman call themselves Democrats, go with them into the Populist camp or help to hand a machine which is running smoothly and beautifully to them to tamper and tinker and try fool experiments with.

We would be glad to have many Southern contemporaries study the situation and stand with us.

[Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Does not the gentleman know that that was a paper that supported President McKinley in 1896?

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I sought to introduce on the 4th of January seems to be no longer necessary to elicit the facts which I then desired from the Secretary of the Treasury. I believed at that time that the Secretary of the Treasury neither appreciated nor understood the financial situation in New York and elsewhere during the last three months of 1899. I have read his voluminous report, and I find no reason therein for changing my belief.

To his failure to act at the right time, when repeatedly requested to do so, may be charged the late stringency in the money market, so largely affecting banking and business interests, and the facts admitted in his report prove that he is directly responsible for the serious conditions existing at that time.

I thought it was proper that the people of the United States, and especially the citizens of New York, should know why the Secretary delayed in exercising the power which section 5153 of the Revised Statutes gives him, and which he now invokes in his defense, and why he finally availed himself of this authority when the panic was over.

That a severe stringency of money has lately affected business interests in New York and throughout the country no one who reads can doubt. That the Secretary was advised of its approach and its causes no one can dispute. If the means of averting the panic were available at all times, why did the Secretary lack the foresight or neglect to make use of them?

As early as September 27, 1899, I urged the Secretary of the Treasury to relieve the threatened stringency and sent him the following telegram:

I respectfully urge that you use every means possible to relieve the present tension in the money market. That in the midst of such prosperity there should be a dearth of money to transact the country's business, the same being due solely to absorption by the Treasury, through taxation, of the surplus, would be ludicrous were it not so costly to the farmer, mechanic, and business man alike. Every resource should be exhausted to promptly end the present stringency.

The Secretary replied through his Assistant Secretary that the Government was not absorbing money needed in business circles; that the receipts and expenditures of the Government almost balanced from day to day, and that he had relieved the situation by anticipating the October interest. And in further response to my inquiry, wherein I warned him that every day's delay in affording relief meant a month's delay in the progress of the prosperity of the people, and that the larger national banks with deposits of $25,000,000 and over had a selfish interest in maintaining a close money market—as everyone at that time knew, and as subsequent events prove—he replied that "it does not appear at this time that there is any great necessity for increasing deposits in national banks, and to do so in the case of New York banks would likely invite criticism of unfair discrimination against other sections of the country desiring also to be the recipients of deposits." And, further, that "whatever stringency there is in the market at this season of the year must therefore be attributed to some other reason than the absorption of the money of the country by the Treasury." This letter was written on the 6th of November, 1899.

The Secretary, in these letters, would neither admit a stringency nor permit himself to believe that it was due to the accumulation of the surplus in the Treasury. In fact he denied that there was a surplus.

Within three weeks thereafter he offered to purchase $25,000,000 of bonds, thereby admitting that some relief was necessary and proving that a surplus did exist. And in his reply to the Senate resolution of inquiry he further shows that his statement in his letter was erroneous, when he declares that revenue receipts are increasing from month to month and that the business world demanded assurances that this surplus should be diverted from Treasury vaults to public depositaries.

The business world had been demanding this for some months prior to the Secretary's action, but he was not prepared or was unwilling to comply with its demands. The prepayment of the October interest was trifling, while the purchase of bonds did not afford relief to the business world, but did advance the price of these bonds $20,000,000, which the Government will have to pay when the generally announced refunding plan is put in operation.

The Secretary either erred in judgment or was illy advised by those most interested in a continuance of the stringency in the money market, and every citizen who has contributed through taxation to make possible the surplus in the Treasury is compelled to criticise the grave blunder—for it is nothing less—which the Secretary committed in his subsequent action.

Forgetful of, or ignoring entirely, his written statement that a surplus did not exist and that, even if it did, unfavorable criticism would be invited if he deposited Government receipts in New York banks, when the panic was at its acutest stage, when the enormous rate of 186 per cent was charged for call money, when the tension was so great that private relief came to the assistance of banks, then the Secretary selected the very institution which by reason of its large deposits and financial ramifications was able to dictate the price of money until prohibitive rates had been reached, and that institution was made the chief depositary of Government funds.

I do not charge collusion, but I do maintain that the Secretary lacked financial judgment.

However, the Secretary was too late, and the evil which he failed to avert had already overwhelmed banking and business houses. One instance of its far-reaching result may be cited from New England.

During the months of October, November, and December banking failures in New England aggregated in amount $14,000,000, while for the entire year failures in the same section of the country amounted to $14,207,585; or, in other words, for nine months failures only reached the sum of $207,585, while for the three months during which time the Secretary refused to grant relief failures aggregated $14,000,000.

The Secretary, in his reply to the Senate resolution of inquiry, gives as his second reason for depositing internal-revenue receipts and utilizing national banks as depositaries the following:

Second. * * * That the revenues are now largely exceeding disbursements from month to month and seem likely to do so for an indefinite period. This condition would be a menace to the business world if assurance were not given that this surplus would be diverted from Treasury vaults to public depositaries, where, while secure to the Government, it would remain available to public use.

This is precisely what the Secretary had been urged to do on November 6, 1899, and had refused to do, saying "that there was no necessity for increased deposits in national banks," and "that the stringency in the money market must not be attributed to the absorption of money of the country by the Treasury."

I am not one of those who criticise the Secretary for depositing the internal-revenue receipts in national banks—as he had authority to do—but I desire to emphasize and insist upon this fact, that his delay in making such deposits brought on the late stringency, and that he was either ignorant of the true situation or carelessly refused to heed the warnings given to him, and willfully neglected to take steps to prevent a panic. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Secretary, by his great and serious blunder, and by his failure to grasp the recent financial situation, has not only involved his Department and this Administration in a scandal which can not be explained, but has deliberately interfered with the progress of our prosperity. Fortunately, this country is so great and resourceful that it will only halt in its advance to wonder at the blindness of the Secretary and then progress with renewed activity.

The world depends upon us for bread. The East needs our cotton and manufactures. As we have expanded as a nation, in that direction will we expand as a mercantile power. We will supply Europe with iron, and I believe the day is not far distant when we will supply her with coal. The day has passed when we are compelled to appeal to the money centers of Europe for money to aid our enterprises. New York is fast becoming the financial center of the world, and with a liberal but discriminating hand she extends aid to all parts of the United States. If, however, we are to be subjected to the favoritism and mistakes in financial policy such as we have witnessed during the closing months of the past year, confidence will be shaken in our financial system at home and abroad, and other crises will be precipitated, each more disastrous in its effect.

The lesson which this short-sighted policy of the Secretary of the Treasury teaches is that when the reason for a tax ceases to exist, the tax should be abolished if the surplus derived therefrom becomes a menace to industrial and commercial enterprises, and pending its abolition the surplus should be controlled by some able financier. To lock it up in the vaults of the Treasury withdraws it from business channels. The Secretary can not go on indefinitely purchasing bonds and depositing receipts without charging interest therefor in national banks. The money belongs to the people, who contributed it to the Government through taxation; and if a surplus is gradually accumulating, the tax which is responsible for it should be decreased in proportion as the surplus has increased. If the Secretary of the Treasury is able to deposit $30,000,000 to $40,000,000, which will represent the surplus for this year, as he says in his reply, and if in addition thereto he is able to purchase $25,000,000 of bonds, this surplus should be returned to the people by reducing the war tax by exactly that amount. [Applause.]

During the delivery of the above remarks the time of Mr. LEVY expired.

Mr. LEVY. I ask for five minutes' more time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to continue for five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. As this is the closing speech of debate by consent, I hope it will be given.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. LEVY resumed and concluded his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate upon the pending amendment has been exhausted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Auditor for Treasury Department: For three clerks of class 1, $900.

Mr. DRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I sat here a few moments ago and listened with a great deal of interest to the debate that occurred between the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania and the equally distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON rose.

Mr. DRIGGS. I believe that is the end of the paragraph?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; it is the end of the paragraph.

Mr. DRIGGS. I only ask for five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. But no amendment is offered, and I do want to conclude this bill to-day.

Mr. DRIGGS. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CANNON. Now, the gentleman is proceeding out of order except by unanimous consent. I will ask unanimous consent for five minutes for debate that is not relevant to the bill on that side and five minutes to this side, and then we proceed with the bill in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. RICHARDSON. That applies to this section, as I understand.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no; I want to go on with the bill.

Mr. GAINES. I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. We have a census bill to-morrow and a pension bill the next day, when the gentlemen can get in their speeches.

Mr. DRIGGS. The opportunity will be lost if we have to wait. The opportunity is here. I believe I am recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Why, then I absolutely give notice, so that there may be no mistake about it, that after ten minutes further debate——

Mr. DRIGGS. Does this come out of my time?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, not at all. (Continuing:) By consent, and I will insist upon the enforcement of the rule.

Mr. DRIGGS. To proceed, then. With the controversy between the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania and the distinguished gentleman from Missouri I have no desire to take issue, for each of them are trumps in their respective ways. I might say that one is the ace of hearts and the other is the ace of diamonds, for one is all heart as a Democrat, and the other a bright diamond in the principles of the Democracy in which he believes.

But, sir, I do take issue with the remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois a few minutes ago when he alluded to the Republicans on that side of the House and the Republicans on this side. I intend to apply that to myself, for he unquestionably alludes to the so-called Gold Democrats on this side of the Chamber. I intend to say, if you please, that whenever the issue about circulation of money comes up, or whenever any debate may occur in this House, wherever any question is raised on any financial matters, it seems that some Democrat on this side of the House takes an opportunity to attack some of their fellow-Democrats who do not chance to believe with them in the theory of the free and unlimited coinage of silver.

I say now, Mr. Chairman, in that much-misused phrase, "I am a Democrat," that I am as good a Democrat as there is on the floor of this House. And my colleagues who stood with me on this side of the House in support of the gold-currency measure, introduced by the other side, are as good Democrats as there are on this side of the House.

Now, then, Mr. Chairman, to what are we entitled in our Democracy, and what do we believe in as Democrats? There is no man on this side of the House who is a firmer believer in a constitutional amendment for the purpose of establishing an income tax than I. There is no man on this side of the House who is more bitterly opposed to the doctrines of the President, and for which the Republican party is solid, for the passage of a ship subsidy bill.

There is no Democrat on this side of the House who is more opposed to the increase of the standing army; and I believe absolutely that the welfare and the future integrity and the strength of this nation are to be placed in the Volunteer Army, that army in which Jackson and Jefferson and all our great generals have had implicit confidence, and, sir, there is no Representative on this side of the House more opposed to the trusts than I.

Coming now to the present question, I hold, sir, when certain Democrats would set themselves on a pedestal of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 and say to every class of Democrat, "Unless you fall down and worship this idol you are no Democrat," they are the violators of the first principles of Democracy, for these principles are free speech, freedom of action, freedom of right, and freedom of debate; and my constituents of the Third Congressional district in the State of New York, more than 21,000 of whom, out of a total vote of 41,000 votes cast, told me on election day of November 8, 1898, that I was a Democrat, and as a Democrat was elected to this House of Representatives. I care not what you may say about my Republicanism, and my Democratic constituency will tell this House this coming November whether my Democracy is satisfactory to them.

I am not a Republican. "I am a Democrat."

As such I believe in the gold standard, and I can be as radical in that belief as you, my colleagues, in your free and unlimited coinage ideas, for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at a ratio of 16 to 1 is not bimetallism; it is silver monometallism. Now that this debate has come up here to-day, should we of the Democracy not be willing to concede something?

Why should we not be willing to say, "You go a certain way and we will go a certain way?" And surely we can meet on common ground somewhere instead of going before the country as we do, and as members have done on this side, calling us Republicans when we are not. For one, I say it is unfair to certain Democrats on this side of the House. And we are all Democrats; not one Republican can be found sitting here, excepting in the "Cherokee Strip." If there is any breach in our ranks, let us close, not widen, it. Why not make a serious and earnest attempt to meet on some common ground that will absolutely unite and not disunite the great Democratic party?

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

Furnishing new post-office building, Washington, D. C.: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to provide the new post-office building, Washington, D. C., with furniture, including gas and electric-light fixtures, carpets, awnings, window shades, $5,500.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Add, after the word "dollars," in line 6, page 4, the following: "Also, to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to provide the new post-office building in Kansas City, Mo., with elevators to complete that building, $35,000."

Mr. CANNON. To that, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order, and for the following reason: The limit of cost of the public building in Kansas City has been appropriated for, and this breaks the limit, goes clear beyond the limit, and because it changes existing law; therefore it is not in order under the rule in relation to general appropriation bills.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, I thought the gentleman from Illinois was through.

Mr. CANNON. I want the point of order disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped the gentleman from Illinois might withhold the point of order on that amendment, because of the very urgent need of the Government for the appropriation. Permit me to say in passing, while it is not just on the point of order, that if this appropriation is held up, as it probably must be for several months unless it goes in this bill, every month of that time will cost the Government from six to eight hundred dollars additional. The new post-office building at Kansas City is practically completed excepting elevators and some finishing work. A portion of the Government offices will be moved into it in the spring, and some must move as soon as possible, as they are now occupying rented premises and their leases either have expired or soon will expire. Other officials, and especially the courts, can not move until the elevators are in place. Thus the Government will be compelled to maintain both buildings, necessitating a double force of janitors and engineers and a largely increased cost of maintenance.

Now, on the point of order, I contend that an urgent deficiency bill is not a general appropriation bill, and therefore is not included in the bills mentioned in the second section of Rule XXI. If I remember rightly, in the rule as it stood originally the general appropriation bills were specifically mentioned, and later the rule was changed so as to include deficiency bills with general appropriation bills.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a deficiency bill is a general appropriation bill, but I contend that it must be a general deficiency bill, not a special deficiency bill. When the gentleman brought in the deficiency bill at the last Congress appropriating $50,000,000 for the support of the Army, he did not bring it in as a general bill under the rule, but asked unanimous consent for its consideration. When he brought in a deficiency bill appropriating about $40,000, $5,000 for the payment of special and temporary clerks in this House, and something over $30,000 for the payment of clerks under the revenue department, and $1,900 for the payment of election expenses, three or four different items appropriating about $40,000, it was not contended that it was a deficiency appropriation bill that would come under the rule that is raised in this case.

Now, there can be but one deficiency bill, and that is a general appropriation bill. Otherwise, Mr. Chairman, where will you draw the line?

If they can bring in an urgent deficiency appropriation bill, then they can bring in a special urgent deficiency appropriation bill. If they can not include three items, as was specially held on the floor of the House, I ask you whether twenty items make a general deficiency bill? General appropriation bills are those named in the old rule and one or two added since, one of which is the general deficiency bill, and I contend, therefore, that the rule as laid down is not applicable to items enumerated in this bill, because this is not one of the general appropriation bills.

Next, this is public work already in progress, a work appropriated for, a work that has almost reached completion. The Chair will remember that in the last House, when the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MUDD] offered an amendment on an appropriation bill providing for the erection of new buildings at Annapolis, at the Naval Academy, it was held to be in order, after a long and exhaustive debate, because it was a work already in progress.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, a single word in reply to the gentleman from Missouri. Rule XI, fixing the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations, says:

To appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government as herein provided, viz, for legislative, executive, and judicial expenses; for sundry civil expenses; for fortifications and coast defenses; for the District of Columbia; for pensions, and for all deficiencies: to the Committee on Appropriations.

Now, this bill on inspection—and the Chair must inspect it—speaks for itself. It is entitled "A bill making appropriation to supply urgent deficiencies," etc., "and for other purposes," covering some 40 or 50 pages, carrying between fifty and sixty million dollars. It is, in fact, the principal deficiency bill. Now, under this grant of jurisdiction, I do not understand that you are confined to one bill. You may report several deficiency bills. There is nothing in the rule that would prevent the reporting of two so-called sundry civil bills or two legislative bills. You could make a general bill for each Department, if you saw proper, under this rule. As to the other point, that this is a public work in progress——

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not want to take the floor to say anything, but I want to ask the gentlemen if the rule does not define what a general appropriation bill is?

Mr. CANNON. It does not.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Does it not mention the general appropriation bills?

Mr. CANNON. No.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think the gentleman will find that the general appropriation bills are mentioned.

Mr. CANNON (reading). "And for all deficiencies."

Mr. RICHARDSON. I understand that, but look at Rule XXI and see if it does not mention the general appropriation bills.

Mr. CANNON. I am speaking of the grant of power. This says "and for all deficiencies."

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not want to be understood as either favoring or opposing the point of order, because it is a matter that I have seen decided here, and I was rather inclined to be in favor of the position the gentleman is taking, when the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD] first mentioned it to me; but you will find that general appropriation bills are mentioned there.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is speaking of Rule XXI now?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I have been reading from Rule XI.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I know that, but Rule XXI mentions the general appropriation bills, and says they shall be in order when reported from the Committee on Appropriations. The question is whether the urgent deficiency bill is a general appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. I will read clause 2 of Rule XXI:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law.

Now, this is a general deficiency appropriation bill; or, if the gentleman sees proper to look at it in that way, a general urgent deficiency appropriation bill, consisting of many items, and I think it comes within the letter of the rule, and certainly within the spirit of it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman at all, but on that line would you not find some difficulty in that position, when you consider that there is a general deficiency bill?

Mr. CANNON. Not at all.

Mr. RICHARDSON. A bill that you call the general deficiency bill?

Mr. CANNON. Not at all. There may be two.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If the gentleman is correct in saying that there can be two general deficiency bills, and that an urgent deficiency bill is one of the two general deficiency bills, then he would have no difficulty in his position.

Mr. CANNON. I have no doubt of that.

Mr. RICHARDSON. You do not call it that in the rule. Why do you not call it a general deficiency bill? You come and call it an urgent deficiency bill and make no provision that that shall be privileged.

Mr. CANNON. Rule XI does not speak of any general deficiency bill. It is peculiar in that respect. I will again read clause 3 of Rule XI:

To appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government, as herein provided, viz, for legislative, executive, and judicial expenses; for sundry civil expenses; for fortifications and coast defenses; for the District

of Columbia; for pensions, and for all deficiencies: to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. COWHERD. I hope the gentleman has not misunderstood my argument. I do not contend that this matter would not properly come before the Committee on Appropriations, but I contended that it would not come in under Rule XXI, because this was not a general appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. Well, now, I say it is a general appropriation bill, and in point of fact, on inspection, I think it is the most general deficiency appropriation that has been reported for many a long year in the House.

Mr. BARTLETT. It is the biggest one.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; covering fifty or sixty pages, and that it is within both the letter and spirit of the rule. What was the object of clause 2 of Rule XXI? It was to prevent legislation upon the great money bills, because there was an evil attending such legislation, namely, that the great money bills must pass or the Government must stop. Therefore it was not good legislation to hitch on legislative provisions to the money bills that must pass and let them drag through obnoxious legislative provisions or legislative provisions not carefully considered. Therefore this rule was made. Now, it comes within the letter and spirit of the prohibition in clause 2. As to the gentleman's other point, a word, and then I will close:

Unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress; nor shall any provision changing existing law be in order in any general appropriation bill.

Now, what is the existing law? That there shall be constructed at Kansas City a public building expressly provided for, not exceeding a certain limit. Now, that limit has been appropriated for; and when you go beyond the legislation, and appropriate additional money for that public building, it changes the existing law, namely, that the building shall not cost exceeding $2,000,000, if that is the limit.

Then there is another class of public works that abound in appropriation, and clause 2 refers to that class of works, where they are in progress, where a beginning has been made without limitation, and then appropriations for such public works are in order upon appropriation bills. But this is not one of the class referred to.

I am ready to have the Chair rule.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, one further word. In regard to the question of the work being in progress, I am willing to admit that it has been ruled by former occupants of the chair that such an appropriation as this did not come within the exceptions to the rule of a work in progress. But I want to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that that ruling was opposed by no less a parliamentarian than Thomas B. Reed, the late Speaker of this House, when it was made.

Now, in regard to the question whether this is a general appropriation bill or not, the gentleman says they might bring in several general appropriation bills. I submit to the Chair that they can not bring in several general appropriation bills affecting one particular subject. They can not bring in several general deficiency bills, because one general deficiency bill covers the general deficiencies, and others like this are special deficiencies; and the gentleman recognized that twice in the last House, when he brought in bills of that nature before this House and asked unanimous consent for their passage instead of putting them upon the question of privilege.

Mr. CANNON. My friend can not claim that such action makes a concession upon my part that he is correct in that argument. During the Spanish war I did, every day or two, come in and report bills carrying sometimes one item, sometimes two or three, sometimes without printing. And for convenience—because it was the quickest and easiest way, without raising any question—I asked unanimous consent to consider them; and, so far as I recollect, without regard to the rules, with a patriotic spirit on both sides, we did not stop to inquire what the rules were, but the subject itself carried the unanimous consent.

Mr. COWHERD. Will the gentleman answer a question?

Mr. CANNON. If I can.

Mr. COWHERD. Is it not a fact that a few years ago—I do not know just when—when there was a deficiency in the payment of fees to marshals and jurors in the United States courts—did not the gentleman bring in a bill appropriating some $375,000, and was it not ruled that that was not a general appropriation bill and did not come under the rule?

Mr. CANNON. I do not recollect such a ruling. The gentleman may be right. I do not say that it is not so, but I do not recollect it. But even if it were so, that is nothing; it sheds no light upon this point of order, in my judgment.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. BERRY. I am interested in this proposition, and I desire to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will listen to the gentleman.

Mr. BERRY. In the Fifty-third Congress there was an appropriation of $75,000 made for the construction of a building at Newport, Ky. The Government has only started the foundation at that point after a delay of six years, perhaps. Owing to the dilatory methods of the preceding Secretary of the Treasury nothing was done during his administration, or during the present Administration, I suppose from the fact that the office of the Secretary of the Treasury is overcharged with work. For if I have discovered anything in the six or seven years that I have been coming to Washington it is the fact that the Treasury Department has too much work to do. They take charge of the lighthouses upon the seaboard; they take charge of the revenue cutters; they take charge of a dozen things with which the Treasury Department has really no business and which ought to be committed to some other department of the Government.

The lights on the seaboard and certain harbors and the Geodetic Survey belong to the Navy and ought to be attended to by the Navy Department. That is the reason why the Treasury Department does not have ample time to do the work which is submitted to it by Congress. Mr. Gage sent a person to Newport who was very incompetent, and they located upon a place that had been dug half way to China heretofore, and about 20 per cent perhaps of the cost of the building has been consumed in finding a foundation. The Secretary submitted the matter to an eminent engineer named Mr. Heuer, and Mr. Heuer sent somebody else, and he sent somebody else, to determine whether or not that was proper ground for the construction of the building, and they finally determined it was proper ground on which to construct the building.

A large part of the appropriation for the building has been consumed in finding a foundation upon ground that was improperly selected and by people who knew nothing about it. One of the consequences has been that while the building that was designed could have been built within the appropriation, the whole amount of which was $75,000, they have now but $62,000 left to construct the building. It could have been constructed within the appropriation, but owing to the rise in the price of material and labor that building has had to be curtailed until it will not be a respectable building for the United States.

They have taken off the glazed bricks with which it was intended to make it beautiful and make it a respectable building; and I think that this urgent deficiency bill is the proper place to include an appropriation of $10,000 to make that building such as it was originally intended to be, and to make it creditable to our Government. I would like, therefore, that this point should not be sustained. Although not authorized by law, it is authorized by the necessity of the case, because it will enable the Government to erect a building that will be a credit to it. That is what I want done, and there are a number of other places in the same position.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment to the pending paragraph, to which the gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that it is not in order because of the provisions of Rule XXI, section 2, which reads:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress; nor shall any provision changing existing law be in order in any general appropriation bill or in any amendment thereto.

In the opinion of the Chair, following the precedents, the point of order must be sustained if the pending bill is a general appropriation bill. The gentleman from Missouri, however, urges that the pending bill is not a general appropriation bill, and therefore that section 2 of Rule XXI does not apply; and in support of his position he cites the introduction into the House on two previous occasions of deficiency appropriation bills that were admitted, according to the method then pursued, not to be general appropriation bills. In each of those cases, however, it will be observed that the subject-matter of the bill could have been covered in a single paragraph. In other words, the bill covered but a single subject, and it was beyond pretense that they could be regarded as general appropriation bills.

Mr. COWHERD. If the Chair will pardon me, I cited one instance where the bill covered the payment of clerks of the House, the payment of election expenses, and the payment of new clerks brought into the revenue department in connection with oleomargarine.

The CHAIRMAN. What the gentleman says may be true, but it is also true there was no pretense that the bills contained subject-matter relating to the Departments of the Government or a majority of the Departments of the Government. There is a vast distinction between the bills to which the gentleman refers and the bill before the House. This bill carries the sum of $58,000,000. It deals with the executive department, the War Department, the Navy Department, the District of Columbia, and various other subjects. It is manifestly on its face a general bill, and in the opinion of the Chair must be so considered.

It is urged that the Committee on Appropriations can not

present more than one general appropriation bill under any particular heading. There is nothing, so far as the judgment of the Chair goes, to prevent the Committee on Appropriations from dividing their general appropriation bills in case of necessity for such action on their part. The reason for the adoption of Rule XXI, section 2, was to prevent general legislation upon appropriation bills, and there is no reason why Rule XXI should be applicable to any general appropriation bill that does not apply with equal force to the one that is now before the House.

Without undertaking to put the decision at all upon this proposition, the Chair suggests that it may be a question whether or not the point made by the gentleman from Missouri can now be entertained. This bill was introduced into the House as a general appropriation bill. The right to so introduce it was recognized as a privileged right; it was submitted to the Committee of the Whole as a general appropriation bill. No member rose in his place, either when the bill was presented or when it was committed to the Committee of the Whole House, to object that it was not a general appropriation bill, and it may very well be held that it is now too late to raise that question.

The House went into Committee of the Whole to consider it under the rules, and without placing the decision upon that ground at all, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would suggest to the Chair that at the time the bill was introduced all points of order were reserved, and it would include this point.

The CHAIRMAN. While that is true, this point of order should have been made in the House when the House resolved to go into Committee of the Whole to consider this bill.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

For rent of building now occupied by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for storage and other purposes, at a rental of $60 a month, $720.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I think that this is an opportune moment to call the attention of the House to certain other conditions now existing, which seem to me ought to have consideration and given as much weight as the grave charges that have been brought against the Secretary of the Treasury.

We have, on this side of the House at least, ideas and opinions regarding the action of the Secretary, but we have been told, and of course are fully satisfied, that any facts, arguments, or illustrations we may bring can be decisively answered, in the language of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], by any Republican simply saying "it isn't so." [Laughter.]

We have the further assurance of my genial colleague from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] that all of our rights will be preserved and that we can be made perfectly happy if we will only come into the presence of the omnipotent Committee on Rules. With these most gratifying and generous assurances, I am content to remark that just at this present moment the New York bank scandal may rest in the background, as I hold in my hand, Mr. Chairman, another specimen of wrong and outrage. There is in this special case no vast amount of money involved, but it is an instance where an injustice has been done and a fraud perpetrated.

In the administration of the business affairs of a great nation like ours, those who are connected with such administration, and especially those who legislate for the general country, become accustomed to the consideration of large amounts. When we speak of millions on this floor no attention is paid to it, even if those millions are connected with fraudulent transactions on the part of high officials. It is true that when we charge specific acts, name the time, place, and amount, my esteemed friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] rises to deny the charge, and the rosy red of indignation upon his brow, as he contemplates our temerity, is almost as sincere as his New York banker namesake when he wrote his famous, or notorious, letter to the honorable Secretary of the Treasury on their personal affairs; but this which I hold in my hands is a contract a small star-route subcontract, but it is a case of a specific act of wrong, outrage, combination, and conspiracy on the part of men who to-day hold contracts under this Government, men who are committing acts that if they were to commit in the ordinary course of business, and were drawn before the ordinary court of justice, would lead them to the penitentiary. And yet, when I go to the head of the great Post-Office Department, I am told that they are powerless, that they can not correct the wrong, that the remedy lies here with us, in Congress assembled, and that the Postmaster-General has appealed to us year after year and no action has been taken to provide a remedy.

He admits that under the star-route system, as now established by law, there has been continuous swindling, day after day and year after year.

In this special instance from my own district a contract was made, through fraudulent representations, in which it is required that a carrier shall travel over 6,000 miles per annum for the paltry sum of $200. The agent of the contractor came, hunted up a boy 16 years of age, and by falsehood induced him to try to do the work. To succeed, he wrote broadly across the margin of the copy of the contract given to the boy, "This contract is for six months," while in the body of the instrument it reads "for four years." Then when the six months had expired, by letters threatening the boy that if he throws up the job the Federal officers will arrest him and put him in prison, and his father, who is on his bond, will lose his little home, the agent compels the boy to continue. As I said, I appealed to the Postmaster-General, and was told that the Department could take no action, so I wrote the boy to quit.

I spoke to the gentleman having charge of the legislation affecting post-roads, and was told that he objected to any legislation in this direction, because it is the desire of the Department to control the star routes itself, but he preferred to have the work being done, as now, under the subcontract system. I am not condemning the action of the Department. I am trying to arouse this body to a realization of conditions that exist all over the country, and an evil which Congress alone can remedy.

It is well known to every member of this House that there exist star-route syndicates—"speculative bidders" is their official designation—who, according to the estimate of the Postmaster-General, secure a profit of nearly $150,000 per year on subcontracts, to the detriment of the mail service.

I appeal to the members of this House, among whom there are at least one hundred who are cognizant of similar cases in their own district, to come to the relief of the Post-Office Department in this particular. Give it authority to act, so that the National Government may not continue to be, morally at least, if not legally, particeps criminis in fraud and outrage. Let us enact some law that will enable the Postmaster-General to stop these scandals, which have been riotous in our mail service from the days of President Grant to the present hour, and which even now are worse than in the earlier days of star-route investigations.

I do not propose or care at this time to go more fully into details of the star-route system. It has been of a cancerous growth and is affecting our whole body politic. The time is now ripe, it seems to me, to make such change as will tend to its purification. While there are greater evils existing and questions of more profound moment, yet let not the righting of this one wrong be overshadowed and forgotten.

I hope that some time during this session we may have the opportunity, through the kindness and courtesy of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads and the Committee on Rules, to take some decisive action on this question.

The Clerk read as follows:

MINTS AND ASSAY OFFICES.

For freight on bullion and coin, by registered mail or otherwise, between mints and assay offices, $50,000.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Chairman, on page 5 of this bill we find that there is a deficiency because of the "transportation of minor coin," and now we are on a provision at page 8 where a deficiency of $50,000 appears for freight on bullion and coin.

A few weeks ago, on my way to San Francisco to bring back our gallant First Tennessee Regiment to their native heath, our party stopped at New Orleans. We were carried through the mint, and while I was there there drove up at least one and I think two heavily laden express wagons of the Adams or Southern Express Company, one or the other. I asked, "What is the immense load on the wagons?" The mint officer present in charge said it was silver bullion that was being brought from Philadelphia to be coined into money at the New Orleans mint. I said, "Do you mean to tell me that the United States Government is transporting for the purpose of mintage bullion from the mint at Philadelphia?"

He told me it was an everyday business and seemed to be very much surprised that such was the law and that such was the fact. He was not any more surprised than I was, because I remember only a few months back the Democratic party on the floor of this House opposed the closing of the mint at New Orleans, which the Republicans seemed to be determined upon, and it was only by a fierce fight that we saved it.

The Republicans undertook to shut up that mint because they said it was of no use, which we see is untrue. Mr. Chairman, is it possible that the silver bullion or the silver bars which come from what the Republican party seeks to call the unpatriotic States, "rotten boroughs" of the West—States which the Republican party, by the way, admitted into the Union and which they are now constantly denouncing because those States support the free coinage of silver—I say is it possible that this law is to be perpetuated for the transportation of bullion from the far West to Philadelphia and then transported to New Orleans for the purpose of coinage?

The Democrats fought to keep open this mint to avoid, among others, this very thing—this long haul from the West to the East, thence south to New Orleans—at the expense of the Government. Here is a deficit, Mr. Chairman, a deficit superinduced by hauling this bullion from the far West to the far East, that seems to want

everything or nothing, and then the transportation to almost the very last point on the southern shore of our country.

I am proud, Mr. Chairman, to have a chance to bring to the attention of this House and to exploit the record of my party on this question and to rehearse the illustrious reasons the Democratic party gave for keeping that mint open, which is turning out millions of dollars of silver money—showing it is necessary—helping us on in our patriotic aims at home and abroad. But I ask myself the question again to-day, as I did in New Orleans, is it possible that the Republican party can do anything in this country which is not done in the interests of trusts or railroads that perpetuate that party in power?

Why should the silver bullion be brought from the far West to Philadelphia and then sent to New Orleans for coinage? Why not send it from the West to New Orleans at first, as we suggested, thus saving time and money to the Government? But no. The railroads above the Ohio, operating from the West to the East, must have a chance and get it. They have a "pull" with the Republicans, and hence get to haul this freight, first East to the mint, then their Atlantic and Gulf allies finish up the "job" by hauling it to the far South, and the Government foots the bill—a deficit which we are now considering. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT.

For continuing the employment during the three months beginning April 1, 1900, of such additional temporary force of clerks, messengers, laborers, and other assistants as in the judgment of the Secretary of War may be proper and necessary to the prompt, efficient, and accurate dispatch of official business in the War Department and its bureaus, to be allotted by the Secretary of War to such bureaus and offices as the exigencies of the needs of the service may demand, $150,000. Persons in the classified service of the Government shall not be eligible to appointment under this appropriation, or to be transferred from any position in the classified service to positions paid hereunder.

For postage stamps for the War Department and its bureaus, as required under the Postal Union, to prepay postage on matters addressed to Postal Union countries, $500.

During the reading of the foregoing, Mr. LLOYD rose and addressed the Chair.

Mr. RIXEY. I desire to offer an amendment to the concluding portion of the paragraph just passed. I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out, after the word "dollars," in line 22, page 11, the residue of the paragraph and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Appointments under this appropriation shall be made in compliance with existing law."

Mr. CANNON. I reserve the point of order; in fact, make the point of order, first, that that paragraph has been passed, and second, that this is in compliance with existing law for this temporary force. I will say to the gentleman that there was the same provision last year, and for nine months this year, and this continues the status of this temporary force for the remaining three months of the year. For both reasons it seems to me the amendment is not in order.

Mr. RIXEY. As I understand, Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. One moment. What does the gentleman from Virginia have to say to the first objection that is made, that the paragraph had been passed.

Mr. RIXEY. I have this to say: I intended to offer that amendment to this paragraph, but before the Clerk had concluded the reading of the paragraph the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] was upon his feet addressing the Chair. It was my intention to offer the amendment as soon as I could get the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. RIXEY. As I understand the paragraph, Mr. Chairman, it places the sum of $150,000 at the disposal of the Secretary of War for the employment of clerks and other employees of the Government. I am not here to defend the civil-service law, and I would be perfectly willing to let this paragraph stand, provided we could have any assurance that the money would be disbursed in a fair way to both sides.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Will the gentleman permit me a moment?

Mr. RIXEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. This is for temporary clerks, who were employed only about a year ago; and if the gentleman will look at the hearings before the committee, he will find that it is shown that they are equally efficient with those who might be supplied through the classified service. This is for the purpose of continuing them for three months longer. There can be no harm in continuing for twelve months clerks who are equally as proficient and perhaps more efficient than those that may be secured through the civil service.

Mr. RIXEY. Will the gentleman now answer me a question?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes.

Mr. RIXEY. Under this provision can not the Secretary of War appoint additional clerks?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If he needs them.

Mr. RIXEY. Certainly. I do not deny he can get as good clerks out of the civil service as he can get through that service, but what I contend is, we have a law upon the subject and we ought to follow it. I see no reason why we should place $150,000 at the disposal of the Secretary of War, who will naturally use it for the appointment of clerks, chiefly the friends of his own political party.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. RIXEY. Certainly.

Mr. HULL. The amount of the appropriation for the temporary clerks heretofore is larger than this amount. The force has been organized since the breaking out of the war by the appointment of temporary clerks only. That force is being largely reduced from month to month, and this appropriation is much smaller than if the original number had been kept. Now, then, if you put them in the classified service, how are you going to get rid of them? They are temporary clerks; and if you put them in the classified service, you will have to find work for them or pass a law to reduce the number.

Mr. RIXEY. Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, I am not particularly enamored of the civil service; but I would like to have some assurance that the appointments of these men will not be made in a partisan way.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I do not think they have been made in a partisan sense. I can not say what proportion of Republicans or Democrats have been appointed under the Secretary of War; but I know a great many Democrats are employed on the temporary roll, and I know they are being dropped as they can be disposed of from day to day and month to month. The roll is being lessened all the while and no new men put on; but if an emergency should come up owing to the situation in the Philippine Islands, under this bill he can appoint them, and he ought to appoint them. Now you know the facts, and you can take one horn of the dilemma or the other. You have got to give him the right to get them through the civil service and do this work, or do this work as he has been doing it and take men from the outside.

Mr. LENTZ. Will the gentleman from Georgia allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Certainly.

Mr. LENTZ. Do you know of any Democrats from any Northern State that have been appointed?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I believe that there is a very much larger number from your State than any other. [Laughter.]

Mr. LENTZ. I do not believe there is a Democrat from my State on that roll.

Mr. RIXEY. While I have no doubt the gentleman from Georgia has had a fair share of the appointments, what I am after is to get a fair share of the appointments for myself. [Laughter.]

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I wish to say to the gentleman that if there is anything I can do for him at the War Department, it will be done.

Mr. RIXEY. With that assurance, I think I might very well withdraw my amendment. [Laughter.]

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him another question?

Mr. RIXEY. Certainly.

Mr. HULL. I desire to ask the gentleman now, as he has withdrawn his amendment——

Mr. RIXEY. I would like to test my friend in a direct way before I withdraw it.

Mr. HULL. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Of the 42,000 that were put under the civil service by President Cleveland before he went out of office, how many were Republicans?

Mr. RIXEY. I can not tell you, and I do not think you can.

Mr. HULL. My understanding is there was none.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I want to say candidly to my friend that I was informed by the officials that the question of Democracy or Republicanism or Populism had not entered into consideration in the appointments of these temporary clerks. This I do know, there are a good many Democrats there.

Mr. RIXEY. It seems to me perfectly fair to all parties that, as we have a law regulating these appointments, it should be followed. I do not see any reason why we should make an exception in this case and place $150,000 under the control of any member of the Government, to be used in making appointments as he sees proper. I say it is perfectly natural that the Secretary of War, a Republican, in a Republican Administration, with $150,000 with which he can give employment, should give the preference to people of his own political party.

I should say here the Democratic party would do the same thing. I do not believe that the Secretary of War in making these appointments will make them irrespective of their political preferences. If my friend wants to do away with the civil-service law, I may be with him; and if he can give me assurances upon which I can rely that political views will make no difference in the selection of these clerks I will be satisfied.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is not in order. I think we passed that provision and I think my point of order is good.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from

Illinois that when the gentleman from Virginia says that he was on his feet ready to take the point of order the Chair does not feel disposed to take advantage of the fact that two or three lines beyond that were read.

Mr. CANNON. Does the Chair hold that it is in time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is disposed to hold that the amendment was offered in time.

Mr. CANNON. Well, the easiest way is to vote on it, and I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois withdraw his point of order?

Mr. CANNON. No; I understood the Chair to overrule the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overruled the portion that related to the time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I ask for the reading of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. CANNON. That changes existing law, Mr. Chairman, beyond question. The object of this legislation—and it is already the law that persons in the classified service of the Government shall not be eligible to appointment under this appropriation, or to be transferred from any position in the classified service to a position made thereunder. Now, that law was enacted a year ago, and enacted under legislative and executive appropriation, in connection with the appropriation for this identical temporary force. The object of the enactment of that law we have repeated here was to cure an abuse that existed in the Department, namely, that from this temporary appropriation, that was intended to be temporary in its nature to meet the war exigencies, the Department had in many cases transferred $1,200, $1,400, and $1,600 clerks in the classified service under this rule and promoted them. Now, then, it was the sense of Congress at that time to cure that abuse; and this legislation, in these identical words, was had during the last session of Congress in connection with this temporary force. Now we come to make a deficiency appropriation for this temporary force containing the law as it is, still keeping it out of the power to make this detail from the classified service. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted it changes the law, and you can go on and detail from that classified service $1,200 clerks and promote them to $1,800 clerks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if, in his judgment, without the insertion of these lines in the paragraph, that would be the law?

Mr. CANNON. Undoubtedly; these lines but repeat the law that was enacted last winter, and the striking out of these lines and inserting the gentleman's provision changes the law. It strikes out existing law and introduces a new provision.

Mr. RIXEY. Why, in the paragraph providing for this appropriation, do you insert the latter part of the paragraph at all?

Mr. CANNON. Out of abundant caution we repeat the parent law. It is often done, and in fact it is done all through this bill, in almost every item.

Mr. RIXEY. The amendment that I propose states that this appropriation for the employment shall be in compliance with existing law. How can you contend that a provision of that kind is contradictory of existing law and changes existing law?

Mr. CANNON. It repeals existing law.

Mr. RIXEY. I can not see how that is when it is in compliance with existing law.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman strikes out these lines and his provision is inserted, then the evil is possible that Congress attempted to remedy at the last session.

The CHAIRMAN. Upon the ground that this is simply a reenactment of existing law, the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

Vicksburg National Military Park: For such engineering and topographical work in connection with the Vicksburg National Military Park as may be proper and necessary, and for the payment of salaries and clerical expenses and such other incidental expenses as are provided for in the act of February 21, 1899, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the sum of $5,000, or so much of said amount as may be necessary, may be expended, with the approval of the Secretary of War, in the purchase of lands to be used as a part of the site of said park, $20,000.

Mr. COUSINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 13, in line 10, after the word "war," insert "in addition to the amount authorized by section 1 of the act approved February 21, 1899.

Mr. COUSINS. I think that will commend itself to the judgment of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CANNON. I will say that this embodies beyond question what the committee intended to report. I think it does not change it, but there can be no question about it with the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, let the amendment be read again.

The amendment was again read.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For construction of balloon house and administration and instruction building at the Signal Corps post, at Fort Myer, Va., $18,500.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if this is not new legislation?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no. You mean in reference to Fort Myer?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. No; it is not.

Mr. LLOYD. It provides for the construction of a balloon house. Is there any balloon house there now?

Mr. CANNON. No; but there is a fort there.

Mr. LLOYD. Is there any balloon house authorized by law at the present time?

Mr. CANNON. This is a public work in progress.

Mr. LLOYD. I understood you that there was no balloon house there.

Mr. CANNON. But the fort is there; the barracks and quarters are there. The signal office is there, and this is a mere incident to enable the Signal Service to properly conduct its educational work. We had a very full hearing about it. But the rule does not require, under conditions of that kind, and estimates, that there should be separate legislative action before you can build an outhouse or before you can construct a building as an incident to the work.

Mr. LLOYD. I should like to inquire what is the necessity for this expenditure?

Mr. CANNON. Well, the necessity for the expenditure is stated at length in the hearings. It is this: The Signal Service, since the commencement of the war with Spain, has very greatly increased, and it is almost impossible to get efficient signal-service men or minor officers except as they are enlisted and educated. For instance, take telegraph operators and the various signal-service men. They command better salaries elsewhere, and it has been found necessary, here at Fort Myer, to concentrate the enlisted men and let them go into a school of instruction. That covers ballooning, it covers telegraphy, it covers the code of signals, and many other things that I do not know about.

Mr. LLOYD. Is ballooning taught in any other place in the military department?

Mr. CANNON. No; they formerly taught it somewhat at the Presidio, and perhaps at some other point, but it has been concentrated at Fort Myer.

Mr. LLOYD. Is it so urgently necessary that we teach ballooning in the military establishment of the United States Government that upon an urgent deficiency bill we should make an appropriation of $18,500 for it?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, well, this is an urgent deficiency bill. It is wider than that. It is a bill for the public service, substantially, for the remainder of this fiscal year, and has gathered many items into it that are not urgent, some which might wait, but all necessary during the fiscal year. But as to this particular item, the sooner the appropriation is made the sooner the necessary improvement will be made.

Mr. LLOYD. I understood the distinguished gentleman, with reference to the amendment that was sought to be offered by which the post-office building in Kansas City might be completed, to object on the ground that it was new legislation. It seems to me certainly that was nothing like as new legislation as this would be.

Mr. CANNON. I will say to my friend that the distinction is right here, so that I think my friend will see it at once: In the case of Kansas City, the law that authorized the erection of a public building there expressly provided that it should not exceed a certain limit of cost. Now, all the money within that limit has been appropriated. The law in reference to Fort Myer, the Presidio, Fortress Monroe, and other military posts in the United States, did not fix a limitation, and can not, in the nature of things, fix a limitation, and they are public works that come within clause 2 of Rule XXI, relating to works in progress.

Mr. LLOYD. Is not this the distinction: At Kansas City there was an appropriation made for a post-office building, and the amount appropriated has been expended; here it is sought to create a new enterprise, to build a balloon house and to teach a system of ballooning, which has not been taught under the United States Government?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no.

Mr. LLOYD. One is an appropriation in aid of an enterprise upon which money has been expended, the other is to make an appropriation, as I understand it, for something that has never been undertaken and is entirely a new enterprise.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no. I will state it again. At Kansas City there was a certain limit, and that limit is exhausted.

Mr. LLOYD. In this case there is no limit.

Mr. CANNON. Under the law here there is no limit. It is a public work in progress, and the appropriation is, in my judgment and in the judgment of your committee, in order, it being a public work in progress and part and parcel of the military establishment. But if the gentleman desires to make the point of order against it, I hope he will make it and let the Chair pass upon it.

Mr. LLOYD. I am not disposed to make the point of order, but I am merely calling attention to the fact that here you are undertaking an entirely new enterprise, when objection was made in the case of the Kansas City post-office to an enterprise already under way and necessary to be constructed.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, well, the evidence shows that they have got $15,000 worth of balloons over there at Fort Myer, and that this school of instruction is established. Now, I am quite content to let the committee pass upon the criticism of the gentleman. I hope the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of enlisted men, $3,000,197,140.

Mr. SULZER. I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. CANNON. In line 10, page 15?

Mr. SULZER. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, during my absence from the House this afternoon I am informed that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] sent to the Clerk's desk and had read a part of an editorial from the Greenville, S. C., Daily News of Thursday, January 11, 1900, criticising the New York Journal, the New York World, and myself regarding the investigation of Secretary Lyman J. Gage, of the Treasury Department.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will allow me, how much time does the gentleman require?

Mr. SULZER. Only a moment or two.

Mr. CANNON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have not to exceed five minutes.

Mr. SULZER. I have the floor and it will only take a moment or two.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman's discussion is out of order. Therefore, as I gave notice that I would enforce the rule, I acknowledge the equity of the gentleman having an opportunity to reply and I hope there will be unanimous consent.

Mr. SULZER. Well, I hear no objection. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman from New York have five minutes. Is their objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULZER. I have read over the part of the editorial which has been put in the RECORD, and in justice to myself I want to say a few words in regard to it.

During the time that I have been a member of this House I have never sent to the Clerk's desk a newspaper clipping criticising a colleague, and I hope I never will. Whatever I have to say I have the courage to say myself and on my own responsibility. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] did not have the courage to say on his own responsibility what this editorial alleges. He took a mean advantage to hide himself behind a newspaper clipping. The article is written by an entire stranger to me. I never saw him; I do not know him; I never heard of him, and, so far as I know, I never did him an injury in my life.

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that my public acts and my public utterances are the subject of legitimate criticism by the newspapers of this country. I have made it a rule of my life never to deny anything about myself that appears in the newspapers, whether it is good, bad, or indifferent. Life is too short to do so, and a newspaper lie travels so fast that the truth seldom overtakes it, and if it does it is too late to do any good.

I am informed by a colleague that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS], when he sent this editorial to the desk, made the deliberate assertion that it was from a Democratic newspaper and that the editor was a Democrat. I am informed by my colleague from South Carolina that the Greenville Daily News is not a Democratic newspaper and that the editor is not a Democrat. From the tone of the editorial it would seem to me that the man who wrote it is a Republican of the Hanna stripe.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. He was a Democrat before he sold out.

Mr. SULZER. Yes, I am nformed so. And his abuse of me is the very best praise I can have for doing my duty and telling the truth about the iniquity of the Republican party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I am informed that the editor and his newspaper supported the Republican party in 1896, and that he has been vociferously shouting for the Republican party ever since. That contemptible editorial would seem to bear this out. Prior to 1896, I am informed and believe, the editor and his newspaper were Democratic, but in that memorable year it is said the editor sold his political principles and political convictions for a mess of pottage to MARK HANNA, and his paper is now and ever since has been a Hannaized and a subsidized sheet. The paper is now employed, it is said, by HANNA and other Republicans to abuse loyal, honest, and conscientious Democrats.

Let me say right here that this abuse of me is very high praise, coming from the source it does. I have the courage to do my duty, and will continue to do it and to tell the truth about the iniquity of the Republican party. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I will do this to the best of my ability, notwithstanding slanderous and hypocritical criticisms from subsidized sheets in the interests of MARK HANNA and the Republican party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I am a Democrat, and I stand by my party. I believe in its principles and will do my best to voice them and to vindicate them. I have the courage of my political convictions and dare to express them. I know that the Republicans hate me for telling the truth, and I know that I am abused all over the country—ridiculed and maligned—because I dare to stand up here and in the city of New York, in the very heart of plutocracy, and tell the truth regarding great financial and economic questions.

HANNA and his cohorts, however, with all their power and with all their money, have not been able to defeat me. My constituents know me and they believe in me. They elected me five times to the legislature of my State, and they have elected me three times to Congress, and every time by an increased majority. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In 1894 I carried my district by a little over 800 majority. In 1896 I carried it by over 1,800 majority, and in 1898 I carried it by over 8,000 majority [loud applause on the Democratic side], and ran over 3,000 votes ahead of the ticket. The record speaks for itself, and is the people's commendation of my public career. The editorial is beneath my contempt, and I will not dignify it by talking about it or myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SULZER. Just a few moments more. Let me say now that I shall continue to do my duty as I see it, and tell the truth regarding matters of public moment. MARK HANNA and his hirelings, the agents of the trusts, and the plutocrats can not frighten me, can not intimidate me, and can not prevent me from voicing the sentiments of the people; and I know the people pay very little attention to ridiculous and scurrilous articles written about public men by insignificant and irresponsible persons. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I have no controversy with the man who wrote the article. He is entitled to his opinion of me. My controversy is with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS]. I believe he will regret the action he has taken to-day. When he deliberately declared the newspaper and the editor belonged to the Democratic party he stated what was not true. I say here and now, on information given me by Representatives from South Carolina, that that statement is absolutely untrue, and if the gentleman had taken the trouble to inform himself about it he would not have made the reckless statement he did. He should be more careful hereafter.

The editorial also reflects on the New York Journal and the New York World. They are great newspapers, conducted in the interest of the people, and they will and can take care of themselves. They need no eulogy from me or any other man. Let me say, however, that MARK HANNA and the Republican party never had money enough, and never will have money enough, to buy them, or either of them. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

And you will find both of them supporting the Democratic party and the Democratic candidate for President in the next political contest. They stand for the common weal, they fight the battle of the plain people, and they can not be intimidated or swerved from the path of duty. In the interest of truth and publicity they will unearth the scandals of the Treasury Department and expose to the world Republican iniquity in high places, notwithstanding the Greenville News or the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS]. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, a single word. If that speech is not good for the nomination for the Vice-Presidency of you Democrats, then you are a very ungrateful set. [General laughter.] I hope the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Transportation of the Army and its supplies: For transportation of the Army, including baggage of the troops when moving either by land or water, and including also the transportation of recruits and recruiting parties heretofore paid from the appropriation for "Expenses for recruiting;" of supplies to the militia furnished by the War Department; of the necessary agents and employees; of clothing, camp and garrison equipage, and other quartermaster stores, from Army depots or places of purchase or delivery to the several posts and Army depots, and from those depots to the troops in the field; of horse equipments and subsistence stores from the places of purchase, and from the places of delivery under contract to such places as the circumstances of the service may require them to be sent; of ordnance, ordnance stores, and small arms from the foundries and armories to the arsenals, fortifications, frontier posts, and Army depots; freights, wharfage, tolls, and ferriages; the purchase and hire of draft and pack animals and harness, and the purchase and repair of wagons, carts, and drays, and of ships and other seagoing vessels and boats required for the transportation of supplies and for garrison purposes; for drayage and cartage at the several posts; hire of teamsters and other employees; transportation of funds of the Army; the expenses of sailing public transports on the various rivers, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Atlantic and Pacific oceans; for procuring water, and introducing the same to buildings, at such posts as from their situation require it to be brought from a distance, and for the disposal of sewage and drainage, and for constructing roads and wharves; including not exceeding $750,000 for transportation of Spanish prisoners held by the United States and by the insurgents in the Philippine Islands from those islands to Spain, as provided by the treaty of Paris; for the payment of Army transportations lawfully due

such land-grant railroads as have not received aid in Government bonds (to be adjusted in accordance with the decisions of the Supreme Court in cases decided under such land-grant acts), but in no case shall more than 50 per cent of full amount of service be paid: *Provided*, That such compensation shall be computed upon the basis of the tariff or lower special rates for like transportation performed for the public at large, and shall be accepted as in full for all demands for such service: *Provided further*, That in expending the money appropriated by this act, a railroad company which has not received aid in bonds of the United States, and which obtained a grant of public land to aid in the construction of its railroad on condition that such railroad should be a post route and military road, subject to the use of the United States for postal, military, naval, and other Government services, and also subject to such regulations as Congress may impose restricting the charge for such Government transportation, having claims against the United States for transportation of troops and munitions of war and military supplies and property over such aided railroads, shall be paid out of the moneys appropriated by the foregoing provision only on the basis of such rate for the transportation of such troops and munitions of war and military supplies and property as the Secretary of War shall deem just and reasonable under the foregoing provision, such rate not to exceed 50 per cent of the compensation for such Government transportation as shall at the time be charged to and paid by private parties to any such company for like and similar transportation; and the amount so fixed to be paid shall be accepted as in full for all demands for such service, $30,750,000.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations how much there is contained in this urgent deficiency bill in excess of the ordinary appropriations for military purposes?

Mr. CANNON. Well, I will say to the gentleman, for transportation, which item we are now upon——

Mr. TERRY. The military department generally.

Mr. CANNON. I will get the gentleman the report in a moment. The report shows that there is reappropriated for the military establishment $45,752,000.

Mr. TERRY. In this bill?

Mr. CANNON. In this bill, reappropriated.

Mr. TERRY. How much is that over the usual appropriation as appropriated heretofore?

Mr. CANNON. Not nearly as much as we had a year ago.

Mr. TERRY. That was when we were engaged in a war authorized by Congress, and not one initiated and conducted without the direct approval of the representatives of the people.

Mr. CANNON. We had over a hundred million a year ago.

Mr. TERRY. That was to carry on a war that Congress authorized in favor of freedom for Cuba. Now I want to see how much we are to expend for the Administration war.

Mr. CANNON. The Army appropriation for the current year, in round numbers, reported and enacted under the lead of the Committee on Military Affairs, is $80,000,000. Now, then, this appropriation for the Army makes available $45,000,000 from balances heretofore appropriated, last year, and not expended. Now, if you will add $45,000,000 to the $80,000,000——

Mr. TERRY. That makes one hundred and twenty-odd millions——

Mr. CANNON. Yes; one hundred and twenty-five millions.

Mr. TERRY (continuing). To carry on this Administration and political war.

Mr. CANNON. Oh!

Mr. TERRY (continuing). Waged outside of the Constitution. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. Oh!

Mr. TERRY. I know that you say "No;" but the people of the country do not say "No."

Mr. CANNON. To support the Army, to uphold the flag, to enforce the law, to suppress insurrection. [Applause on the Republican side.] That is what it is, and I will stake my individual political fortunes and those of my party upon the indorsement of the American people; and if you dare stake yours upon a repudiation of that policy, well, you can stake it and go on.

Mr. TERRY. I dare to say this, that in respect to this war that is now being waged, and whilst we deplore the way we got into it, my people are willing to support the flag. But they condemn the policy that put the flag there in a war of criminal aggression when it ought not to have been placed there in such a cause. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We condemn the policy that is forcing us into an un-American position in order to support the flag.

Let me tell you if Congress or this Administration would declare its policy, as it declared in the case of Cuba, the insurrectionists, as you call them, would lay down their arms in less than two weeks and end this criminal war. This is a criminal war and is going on because you did not declare what your policy and purposes were to be; and yet when you have entered upon such a partisan course you try to divert public attention by wrapping yourselves up in the flag and crying out about "patriotism," as you do every time you seek to depart from the fundamental principles of the American Government. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. One word only in reply. This bill appropriates $45,000,000 to sustain the Army for the balance of this fiscal year. If anybody wants to move to strike the appropriation out, here is the place and now is the time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CANNON. Let me complete my sentence.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. You have issued a challenge.

Mr. CANNON. Now is the time and here is the place. So far as disturbing the air is concerned, criticism and declamation that do not affect the legislation concern me but little. We used to have an old saying that the court decided, the judgment was entered, and the party that lost had one remedy—he could stand and swear at the court. [Laughter.]

Now, I do not desire upon this bill, at this time, under the five-minute rule, so far as I am concerned, to enter upon a discussion of the policy touching our outlying territory; there is a time to do that; but I stand ready to oppose any motion that comes from anywhere that will decrease this appropriation one cent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I ask the gentleman from Illinois to yield to me.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. May I interrupt the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I presume that there is not an American citizen anywhere, upon either side of this Chamber or outside of this Chamber, who is worthy of mention as an American citizen, who wants to be disloyal to the flag or to the cause of his country in war. The gentleman from Illinois, with his accustomed shrewdness and cunning, has uttered a challenge which he knows will not be accepted, because he knows that there is not a man on the Democratic side of this Chamber, however violently opposed to the present imperialistic policy of the Administration, who will undertake to weaken the arm of an American soldier while he is fighting, whether the foe is right or whether the foe is wrong, whether the foe is fighting for liberty in reality or for liberty in imagination. I believe that these people out there in the Philippines are fighting for liberty in reality; but when my country declares war and I am called upon to line myself up upon the one side or the other, I have never yet proposed to decrease the amount of money, the number of guns, or the number of soldiers that are necessary to carry out that policy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me go a step further. The gentleman from Illinois has uttered his challenge safely, because with his accustomed shrewdness and cunning he has put it on a safe ground. I am tired, in the words of Professor McLaughlin, of Chicago, a time-honored Republican, I believe—I am tired of the miserable subterfuges whereby it is attempted to confuse loyalty to the flag with loyalty to a policy that disgraces the flag. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, if it were once uttered as a fundamental principle of patriotism that no man could remain a patriot and at the same time oppose the methods of the Administration, either in inaugurating or carrying on war, what then would become of civilization? What of humanity? What would become, sir, of the Government that we have attempted to establish in this country? What would become of Burke, of Chatham, and all the great men who never refused to vote supplies for the British army while it was attempting to subjugate our ancestors, but who did stand in the House of Commons day after day and night after night and enter their protests within the nation, but not outside of it, against the policy which was carrying the nation's flag in a wrong cause?

Ah, Mr. Chairman, this world is an old world and it has an old history, a history that repeats itself all the time, and the history of all the nations is summed up in one sentence, as some great man, whose name I have forg otten, has said, "First liberty, then glory, then splendor, then corruption, and then decay, and barbarism at last."

Mr. BELL and other members. Byron.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I fear we have a people who are forgetting that a free country, the Government of a free people, was established for the purpose of rendering the individual citizen free and happy, and beginning to believe that government was established for the purpose of rendering the Government itself splendid or the flag glorious. Such a people are upon the very first rung of the ladder in their descent, and I defy the gentleman from Illinois and I defy anybody within the length and breadth of the United States to pursue the history of any people anywhere who have started out with devotion to liberty and have wound up with devotion to glory that have not gone down to death and barbarism.

There is a glory that is glory indeed. There is a glory of the flag that is glory indeed, and that is carrying it as the emblem of all that is precious, of all that is free, of all that is right, of all that is just. But there is a pseudo glory that is glory for the time being. Its advocates may seemingly press into the service for the time being those who do not believe in its ultimate results nor in its ultimate intents. But it is none the less a pseudo and a false glory, and that is the worship of the flag simply because it is a flag, because the flag is there, regardless of whether it ought to be there, regardless of whether the cause of liberty,

humanity, civilization, justice, and righteousness demand that it should be there or not.

Now, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that in my opinion there will not be a vote upon this side against all the guns and all the men and all the ammunition that are needed, because, although we have terms to make with the Filipinos, terms, I hope, besides unconditional surrender, those terms are not to be made until peace is established. Just one word more. I do not intend to weary the House. I did not even intend to say what I am saying now; had not the remotest idea of it.

Some time ago I introduced some resolutions into this House, expressing at least my own opinion of what we ought to do, and in this one sentence I will round it out: First, accomplish peace. Before we do that, however, announce to the civilized world and to the Filipinos what our policy will be with regard to the Filipinos and their territory. This is my challenge, our challenge, to the gentleman from Illinois. I believe with the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY], that if we announce that policy we will have peace within two years. But do not execute that policy, do not consummate that policy, until peace is established. And then when peace is established, let the great American Republic—the great Republic of all the ages and of all the world—declare to these brown men, half clad and half civilized, this policy: "For a limited length of time we will stand by you while you learn how to stand up. At the expiration of that time we will leave you your liberty, your independence, your autonomy, provided only that you enter into treaty to do what is just and right by us in consideration of what we have accomplished for you, namely, this, your proposed liberty and independence." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I will take a very brief time to say a word or two. I did not have any supposition that remarks of the kind that have been made were to be made. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] arose in his place while we were considering a money bill to provide for the support of the Army and proceeded to interrogate the gentleman in charge of the bill. I answered his question as well as I could. He then, in substance, said that this was money by the one hundred and twenty-five millions of dollars to carry on a political war, if not a wicked war, etc.

And, as I am apt to do in the heat of conversation, having charge of the bill, I answered; and then the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] comes and makes a splendid talk, as he always does, an absolute oration to liberty, to justice, to law, to order, and he refers to the rocks upon which ancient governments and civilizations have split, and all that kind of thing. It was done as well, I will say to my honored friend from Mississippi, as I ever heard anybody do it before in the House or out of the House. I want to compliment the gentleman.

But, after all said and done, what is this bill? It is a bill taking money from the Treasury to support the Army, which is used in the enforcing of law and the putting down of insurrection. What is the practical question? Shall the money be appropriated or not? That is the only practical question. If it is to be appropriated at all, then the sooner it is appropriated and the more directly it is expended to the end in view, with the least confusion of counsel, the better—the better for saving life, the better for the Filipinos, the better for the Americans, the better for the enforcement of law.

And pending that time the more of a unit we can be in voting this money, and the more of a unit we can be in supporting this policy—if we are to enforce law and order and to put down the insurrection, the more of a unit we can be the better. Now, that is all that I aim to say. But the gentleman says that with my cunning I have defied anybody to move to strike out a dollar of this appropriation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Declare your policy. That is what we want.

Mr. CANNON. The policy, here and now, that I am addressing myself to is to appropriate the money to support the Army that will put down the insurrection. Now, if you are not for it, vote against it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. We are with you on that.

Mr. CANNON. If you are for it, vote for it. "But," says my friend, "some time or other, in the distant future, I expect to criticise the method in which these affairs have been carried on." And then he says we should declare a policy, and so on. Well, I have always found it safe, out in the Mississippi Valley, not to cross a stream until you come to it.

Therefore I am not here to say exactly what legislation shall be had in the future, when we come to make a civil establishment for the Philippine Islands, because, forsooth, the circumstances and conditions may change, so that the exact remedy, determined now for a year hence, or six months hence, or two years hence, might not be apt.

Now, one single word as to the propriety of saying by word in this great legislative body, or by word in the great metropolitan press, or by word in the great meetings throughout the country, that which will encourage the enemy. You all recollect that Aguinaldo during last fall, before the election, issued that proclamation asking his people to stand firm and resist the Army of the United States, because, he said, the election was coming on over there and there would be a reversal of policy.

Now, thank God, I never have said anything, while I was voting for the Army or otherwise, that authorized Aguinaldo to make such a proclamation as that. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. TERRY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois——

Mr. CANNON. I can not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. CANNON. Ordinarily I yield to my distinguished friend, but just at this moment I can not. Now, that is all I want to say. I have no desire to criticise the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] nor the honorable gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS.] They are Representatives; they are of full age; they are answerable to their constituents. But when they criticise me, I must at least defend the measure that I have in hand, and I would have them with me, at least for the present, if I had supreme power, not only in voting for this bill, but in withholding counsel that would make $2 necessary to put down the insurrection in the Philippines instead of $1. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That is just exactly what Lord North said to Edmund Burke.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, but I will say to the gentleman I was not there at that time. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. But history was there, and history is eternal.

The Clerk read as follows:

For repairing and preserving ordnance and ordnance stores in the hands of troops, and for issue at the arsenals and depots, $30,000.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after line 3, page 26, the following:

"The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to deliver to the order of J. H. Wood, chairman of the general committee of the Thirty-fourth National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, to be held at Chicago next summer, two dismounted condemned cannon, used in the late civil war, to be used for the purpose of furnishing memorial badges commemorative of the holding of such encampment: *Provided*, That no expense shall be caused to the United States for the delivery of said condemned cannon."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this is the usual provision that is made from year to year with reference to the annual meeting of the Grand Army, and I am inclined, so far as I am concerned, to accept the amendment.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For experimental rural free delivery, including pay of carriers, horse-hire allowance, supplies, and mechanical appliances, $150,000: *Provided*, That in administering the service under this appropriation no deficiency shall be created therein.

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend page 39, line 6, by striking out the proviso in lines 6, 7, and 8.

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will allow me, as that is already the law, this does not change it. To save time, as I want to complete this bill to-night, so far as I am concerned, the amendment may be adopted.

Mr. GRIGGS. That is satisfactory to me, Mr. Chairman.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BENTON. I have an amendment to offer to this section.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out, in line 6, on page 39, the words "and fifty."

Mr. BENTON. I want it understood that in offering this amendment I am not opposed to rural free delivery. I am willing to vote all the money necessary for its maintenance. I am striking at a wrong that has been done with the money already appropriated by Congress. There was appropriated $300,000 at the last Congress for rural free delivery. After several months passed, establishing routes in some districts stopped, because the Assistant Postmaster-General said the appropriation was exhausted, and we find now that the Department has spent $25,000 more than was permissible for the half year of that time. It is argued by some gentlemen here that this appropriation is intended to be spent by the Postmaster-General as he pleases and that he could spend the whole sum in a month in experiment. That is not the language of the act under which it was appropriated. That act says:

Appropriations for the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900.

What I claim is that the Post-Office Department, at the behest or request of members of Congress, has gone beyond the appropriation and has spent $25,000 more than they were authorized to spend for the six months. I say it is all right for men in Congress

to importune the Department, but those in charge of rural free delivery should have told them, as I was told, that the money was exhausted and not have been persuaded to violate the law. The precedent is evil. Permit the executive officer to go beyond the authority granted by Congress and come in and ask for money to make up a deficiency and get it, and the door is opened for a repetition of the same thing. It is all right for Congressmen to beg for these routes to be established who want this rural free delivery. I am for rural delivery myself, but I say this question goes beyond that. It is fundamental that our executive officer should be bound by the specific appropriation, and whatever gentlemen on the other side may do, I say it is wrong to go beyond it.

I was sorry and surprised to find that the chairman of the committee, after condemning this policy as strongly as I did, closed up his speech with the declaration that he would vote for the bill notwithstanding he knew a wrong had been committed. What I want to call the attention of the House to is that we on this side of the House have always prided ourselves as being strict constructionists, both of the law and the Constitution; and I want to know whether Democrats are going to permit themselves to indorse the acts of any official in violation of law because such violation may benefit their districts?

This rural delivery depends upon a particular act of Congress. The life and virility of this rural delivery depends upon the specific act which appropriated the $300,000. You are asked to indorse the executive act of going beyond the amount permitted, and what I want to know is whether men on this side of the House, because they may be able to get an extra route, are going to indorse the action of the Department, which was openly and notoriously in violation of law.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I would like to ask the gentleman if this is not the situation: Routes have been organized which, unless this appropriation is continued, will be suspended?

Mr. BENTON. Yes; it would suspend those established within the last few weeks. I know the claim has been made here a half a dozen times that it would suspend them all, but it is not true. I know there is a clamor for these free-delivery routes, but I shall insist on this question being voted upon, so that Democrats who want to vote according to law can stand up, and those who want to be counted as violating the law can have the opportunity.

It is an unfair construction of the law to say that the Post-Office Department could have expended the whole sum in six months or in one month. This appropriation was for the whole fiscal year. When the half of the sum appropriated was exhausted in the half year, other members should have been told, as I was, that no more money was available till appropriated. Then the Department could come to Congress and say, "We need $150,000 to establish and maintain new routes for the remainder of the fiscal year." Under the Constitution Congress is invested with the power to appropriate money, and not executive officers. If the Department can exceed its authority in the sum of $50,000, then it can do so a million of dollars. People whom I have the honor to represent want these routes, but they do not want them without authority of law.

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 39, by striking out, in lines 5 and 6, the word "one" and inserting the word "two;" so as to make it read "$200,000."

Mr. LENTZ. The gentleman from Missouri proposes to strike out the $50,000, and I desire to strike out the "fifty," and change the "one" to "two."

Mr. CANNON. May I suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that we vote on the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri first?

Mr. LENTZ. I am willing to vote down this amendment of the gentleman from Missouri. I think we have not got enough money in there, and I want to say so. I am willing to withhold my amendment until this amendment is voted on. I think this reduction ought to be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LENTZ. Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to renew the offer of my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 6 strike out the word "one" and the words "and fifty" and insert in place of the word "one" the word "two;" so as to read "$200,000."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas offers the following amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "dollars," in line 6, page 39, add the following language: "Such service shall be justly and equally apportioned among the several States and Territories."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I think that is subject to a point of order, and while I would not make it, I want to finish the bill to-night and I am compelled to make it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I desire to strike out the last word. The Fiftieth Congress began the work of preparing appropriations for experimental village free delivery. Upon that subject my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] outlined the history of legislation this morning.

The Fifty-third Congress made an appropriation of $10,000 for rural free delivery. Now, village free delivery never amounted to anything and never will, for the simple reason that the people who live in the villages are within ten minutes' walk of their mail all the time. The Fifty-third Congress went further. I had something to do with that, because it happened that I had seen, in many countries of the world much less densely populated than Mississippi is, the mail being delivered along to the boxes upon the mail routes. The Fifty-third Congress voted $10,000, but left its expenditure discretionary with the Postmaster-General. Postmaster-General Bissell expressed the opinion that there was more politics than postal service in that particular appropriation and absolutely declined to exercise the discretion with which Congress had vested him. After that a cohort of gentlemen here interested in the question, with whom I am proud to number myself as one, made an appropriation and made it mandatory.

Notwithstanding the mandatory provision, the Postmaster-General still refused to exercise the power vested in him at that time. Later on, under Mr. Wilson, who became Postmaster-General, this service began to grow a little bit. He began to be told about what was possible and about what had been accomplished elsewhere. I myself wrote to him a letter, which is upon file there now, telling him what I knew about free delivery elsewhere, and about the evolution of free delivery without governmental aid in a part of my own district.

Later on the postmaster took hold of it, and I want to congratulate the House to-day—and that is the purpose for which I rose—upon the fact that with this small beginning we have arrived now at the present proportions of this appropriation and at the present proportions of this public service; and to express the hope that my friends upon both sides of this Chamber who are interested in the ultimate welfare of this service, a service which in my opinion is of the utmost importance to the farming communities, not only on account of their commerce, not only on account of their social letters, but as a great educational provision, superior in my opinion to the facilities that could be furnished by any university in the United States, merely as an educational matter—I wish to express the hope that they will let this clause of this bill, just as it is, go through the House, and that later on, when we come to make an appropriation for the next fiscal year, we may remember the lessons of progress which we have learned, and that we may especially remember the magnificent lessons which are included in this rural free-delivery report of the First Assistant Postmaster-General, fully illustrated, fully explained in every respect; that we may not encumber this bill with our efforts to further the service, but that we may remember what has been accomplished, what has been successfully experimented with and brought to a point where it is no longer a matter of expense; and then, when we come to the appropriation bill for the next fiscal year, that we may remember that the rural communities of this country, the farmers of this country, who pay a great part of the taxes, who are over half of the population of this country, who are expected to furnish the main material in time of war, are entitled to something under our Administration. And I hope that when the time comes we may appropriate $1,000,000 to this purpose, while we are appropriating millions to little buildings in large cities. [Applause.] We appropriated $3,000,000 here not long ago for one building in one city, and yet I find men who do not want to appropriate $1,000,000 to allow the farmers of this country to have rural free delivery.

Mr. MERCER. I hope, Mr. Chairman, it will increase the vote in Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well, Mr. Chairman, if education would increase the Republican vote, this would increase it; but my historical recollection is that any educational qualification always decreases the Republican vote in Mississippi. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MERCER. Something is the matter with it, I know.

Mr. CANNON. Now I hope the Clerk may be permitted to read.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. I ask unanimous consent to return to page 12, and to offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to return to page 12, and to offer an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The amendment was read, as follows:

On page 12, after line 4, insert:

"For payment of the expenses connected with the investigation of the claims of the members of the Fourth Arkansas Mounted Infantry, including pay of clerk, stenographer, cost of printing, advertising, and stationery, traveling and hotel expenses, expenses of witnesses, and all other incidental expenses actually and necessarily incurred under the provisions of the act of Congress approved February 27, 1899, for the relief of the Fourth Arkansas Mounted Infantry, $2,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

And then, on motion of Mr. CANNON, the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DALZELL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6237) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for prior years, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, and with the recommendation that as amended the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendments? If not, they will be voted upon in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CANNON, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I ask unanimous consent to report back from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk and to ask a re-reference of the same.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] asks unanimous consent to change the reference of a bill the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4470) granting pensions to certain officers and enlisted men of the Life-Saving Service and to their widows and minor children.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the reference of this bill will be changed to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MEETING AT 1 O'CLOCK TO-MORROW.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, gentlemen on each side of the Chamber have suggested that they desire to attend the exercises to-morrow connected with the unveiling of the Webster statue. This will necessarily take till 12 o'clock or later, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet at 1 o'clock to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourn to-day it be to meet at 1 o'clock to-morrow. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS.

Mr. BULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Accounts is hereby granted leave to sit during the sessions of the House during the present Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until 1 o'clock p. m. to-morrow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the draft of a bill to prevent the failure of military justice, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of the brig *Lady Walterstorff*, John Gutterson, master, against the United States—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Supervising Architect, submitting an estimate of appropriation for repairs of the post-office and subtreasury building at Boston, Mass.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Supervising Surgeon-General of the Marine-Hospital Service, submitting an estimate of appropriation for a laundry at the hospital at Detroit, Mich.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of State, submitting an estimate of appropriation for increase of salary of United States consul at Port Stanley, Falkland Islands—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, relating to the printing of the report on the agricultural capabilities of Alaska—to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. BARNEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6627) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes, reported the same, accompanied by a report (No. 68); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2956) to extend the time for the completion of the incline railway on West Mountain, Hot Springs Reservation, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 69); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MINOR, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1040) to amend section 4445 of Title LII of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to the licensing of officers of steam vessels, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 71); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WARNER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5493) for the relief of claimants having suits against the United States pending in the circuit and district courts of the United States affected by the act of June 27, 1898, amending the act of March 3, 1887, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 72); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. ROBB, from the Committee oa Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4686) for the relief of J. A. Ware, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 67); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6382) granting a pension to Harriet V. D. Cook—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6381) granting an increase of pension to Israel Walter—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6379) granting a pension to Janet L. P. Taylor—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6292) for the relief of George W. Payne—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BARNEY: A bill (H. R. 6627) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 6628) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Brighton, in the State of New Jersey—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 6629) to provide for and create a judicial district in the State of Michigan, to be designated as the northeastern district of Michigan, and for the appointment of a district judge and other officers therein, and for the holding of courts therein—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 6630) for a post-office building at Adrian, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6631) for a post-office building at Ann Arbor, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: A bill (H. R. 6632) to create a commission to adjudicate the claims of citizens of the United States growing out of the destruction of property and for other depredations committed on the island of Cuba during the late insurrection on said island—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 6633) to fix the salaries of the Chief Justice and judges of the Court of Claims—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 6634) to enlarge the powers of the Department of Agriculture, prohibit the transportation by interstate commerce of game killed in violation of local laws, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 6635) to prohibit railroad companies from charging more than 3 cents per mile for carrying passengers through the Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 6636) to extend the time for presenting claims for additional bounties—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CHICKERING: A bill (H. R. 6637) providing for the sale of a certain water lot in the village of Sacketts Harbor, N. Y.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TONGUE: A bill (H. R. 6638) to amend section 1 of chapter 1914 of page 450, volume 25, of the United States Statutes at Large, and approved August 27, 1888, and entitled "An act to provide aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of United States"—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 6639) to continue experiments with free rural mail delivery—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6640) for a public building at the city of Albany, Ga., and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 6641) defining and limiting the cases in which an absolute divorce may be granted, and providing for declaring marriages void in certain cases in the District of Columbia and the Territories—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROUSSARD (by request): A bill (H. R. 6642) for the establishment of a light-house at Sabine Pass, Louisiana and Texas—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARMER: A bill (H. R. 6643) to place officers of the Army upon the same footing as regards retirement with officers of the Navy, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 6644) to amend an act entitled "An act to extend Rhode Island avenue," approved February 10, 1899—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STOKES: A bill (H. R. 6645) to extend the free mail-delivery service, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 6646) for the relief of the Kickapoo tribe of Indians in Oklahoma Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BAKER: A bill (H. R. 6647) providing for the extension of the Loudon Park National Cemetery, near Baltimore, Md.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DINSMORE: A bill (H. R. 6756) for the erection of a public building at Harrison, Ark.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 6757) to repeal subdivision 12 of section 2238 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BURKETT: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 122) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer a certain piece of land in the State of Nebraska to the city of Lincoln—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GRIGGS: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 123) to amend the Constitution of the United States so as to provide for taxing incomes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 124) providing for a preliminary survey of channels in Boston Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ACHESON: A resolution of the legislature of Pennsylvania, in relation to the election of United States Senators by popular vote—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. MERCER: A resolution by the legislature of Pennsylvania, providing for the appointment of a committee to confer with the legislatures of other States of the Union regarding an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which shall provide for the election of United States Senators by popular vote—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 6648) granting a pension to Sarah J. Taylor—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 6649) granting an increase of pension to Orpha W. Reynolds—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BENTON: A bill (H. R. 6650) to place Daniel M. Page, late first lieutenant, Thirty-eighth United States Infantry, on the retired list of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 6651) for the relief of Oliver P. Perry, administrator of the estate of Mary Scott, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARBER: A bill (H. R. 6652) to correct the military record of John Sailer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6653) to increase the pension of Levi Moser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAKER: A bill (H. R. 6654) for the relief of Thomas J. Benson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6655) granting a pension to Sarah A. North—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6656) for the relief of the legal representatives of Henry W. Archer, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6657) for relief of David E. Haller, Company D, Third Regiment Guard Mount Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6658) for the relief of the heirs of Edmund Wolf—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6659) to remove the charge of desertion from Patrick H. McCall, late an enlisted man in the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6660) for the relief of Robert E. Morgan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6661) for the relief of the legal representatives of Robert R. Vandiver, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6662) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of James Herron—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6663) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of William G. Burke, deceased, late of Harford County, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6664) for the relief of James S. Crawford—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: A bill (H. R. 6665) for the relief of the estate of Harry H. Beard, deceased, late of Coahoma County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6666) for the relief of the estate of Joel Hullum, deceased, late of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6667) for the relief of the estate of F. C. Henderson, deceased, late of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6668) for the relief of the estate of Samuel Worthington, deceased, late of Washington County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6669) for the relief of the estate of S. A. Snodgrass, deceased, late of Bolivar County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6670) for the relief of Frank Harris, of Bovina, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6671) for the relief of Adeline L. Hebron, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6672) for the relief of Grace Ann Mitchell, of Jonestown, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6673) for the relief of Mary Ann Nagle, of Vicksburg, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6674) for the relief of Sallie A. Woolfolk, of Bolivar County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6675) for the relief of Margaret Young, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COCHRANE of New York: A bill (H. R. 6676) for the relief of Edward G. Garner, Company E, One hundred and twenty-eighth New York Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 6677) for the relief of Calvin Nelson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DAVEY: A bill (H. R. 6678) granting an increase of pension to Agnes Capron—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 6679) for the relief of John Nay, of Shinnston, Harrison County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DICK: A bill (H. R. 6680) granting a pension to Ellen D. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DINSMORE: A bill (H. R. 6681) for the relief of George W. Pierce, of Berryville, Carroll County, Ark.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6682) for the relief of Mary A. Hancock, widow of Samuel Tow, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 6683) for the relief of Edward A. Scott, of Crawford County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6684) for the payment of the claim of Mary J. McCall, of Eureka Springs, Ark., administratrix of the estate of James Bridgman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6685) for the relief of Mary Hutchens—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6686) for a pension for Catherine Robards Stirman, of Fayetteville, Ark.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6687) for the relief John Miser—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6688) for the relief of the estate of Albert L. Berry, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6689) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Standwix H. Mayfield—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6690) for the relief of the heirs at law of J. Woolum—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6691) for the relief of estate of Jesse Hollingshead, deceased, late of Benton County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6692) to grant a pension to Lavina Smith, widow of Pry Amos Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6693) for the relief of the estate of Nathan P. English—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6694) for the relief of A. M. Webb, of Green Forest, Carroll County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6695) for the relief of Daniel McKeever, of Fayetteville, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FREER: A bill (H. R. 6696) for the relief of Ammon McLaughlin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6697) for the relief of Josiah Chinn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 6698) granting a pension to Syrena Whitcomb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of New York: A bill (H. R. 6699) for the relief of Frank G. Osborn—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 6700) to increase the pension of Maria Andrews—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6701) granting a pension to Serelda C. McGrew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts (by request): A bill (H. R. 6702) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca P. Quint—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 6703) for the relief of Corinne Strickland—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6704) granting a pension to Corinne Strickland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 6705) for the relief of Mrs. Susan A. Diedrich—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6706) granting a pension to Mrs. Sarah Grove Hall—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 6707) for the relief of Carolina Carter, of Charlottesville, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HARMER: A bill (H. R. 6708) to correct the military record of John McKinley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6709) to correct the military record of Calvin Hough—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6710) to correct the military record of William H. Greenfield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSTON: A bill (H. R. 6711) to pay trustees of Baptist Church at Beckley, W. Va., for their property destroyed by United States Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6712) to pay trustees of Baptist Church at Sutton, W. Va., for their property destroyed by United States Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 6713) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Annie Duncan Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6714) granting a pension to Matilda Zimmerman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6715) granting a pension to Mary E. Sargeant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 6716) for the relief of Charles M. Peirce—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 6717) for the benefit of the legal representatives of Asbury Dickins—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 6718) granting an increase of pension to John B. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LENTZ: A bill (H. R. 6719) to increase pension of Elias Barker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6720) to correct the military record of Charles Dagenfield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6721) to increase pension of Edward A. Cavin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6722) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin E. Styles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6723) to amend the military record of William G. Alspach—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6724) to correct the military record of Mathias Keith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6725) to pension Mary E. Beaton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6726) to correct the military record of Peter Kramer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIDGELY: A bill (H. R. 6727) for the relief of David Hogan—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LANE: A bill (H. R. 6728) granting an increase of pension to Esek B. Chandler—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McDOWELL: A bill (H. R. 6729) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Peter R. Eddy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 6730) for relief of the heirs at law of Thomas Eames, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6731) granting a pension to William F. Tait—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6732) granting a pension to Asa W. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 6733) to extend Letters Patent No. 290958, for a new and useful improvement in suspenders, in favor of the Atwood Suspender Company, of Swanton, Vt.—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 6734) granting an increase of pension to Julius S. Haradon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 6735) for the relief of the legal personal representatives of Henry H. Sibley, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBB: A bill (H. R. 6736) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas J. Cavender—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHATTUC: A bill (H. R. 6737) to remove the charge of desertion against Frank Wempe and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 6738) to increase the pension of Daniel F. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6739) to pension Samuel W. Gilliland, of Miller County, Mo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6740) to pension J. C. Vanpool, of Miller County, Mo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6741) to pension Alexander A. Simpson, of Miller County, Mo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6742) to correct the military record of Henry Shull, and so forth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6743) to amend and correct the record of Company C, Ninth Regiment Missouri State Militia, by including the name of Alfred H. Tipton therein, with the dates of his enlistment and discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6744) for the relief of Samuel P. Dresser, of Miller County, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 6745) to grant a pension to A. J. Caffey, a veteran of the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCUDDER: A bill (H. R. 6746) for the relief of Christen Woldike—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6747) to remove the charge of desertion against John Skillicam, late of the First Excelsior Regiment, subsequently the Seventieth Regiment New York Volunteers, and authorize his honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6748) for the relief of the next kin of Chester Hatfield, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 6749) for the relief of Mary A. Swift—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STOKES: A bill (H. R. 6750) for the relief of J. H. Williams—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 6751) for the relief of Sarah F. Trenwith, executrix of Clifford W. Simpson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THROPP: A bill (H. R. 6752) to correct military record of Abraham Gibson and to remove the charge of desertion therefrom—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 6753) to amend the military record of Hiram Sheldon, late of Company G, One hundred and sixteenth Ohio Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6754) to amend the military record of William Warner, late private, Company H, Fourth Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ZENOR: A bill (H. R. 6755) granting a pension to Sarah L. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: A bill (H. R. 6758) for the relief of Mrs. Eugenia M. Allen, née Rossman—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 6759) for the relief of Andrew A. Colter—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6760) granting a pension to Nancy Cate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 6761) granting an increase of pension to Michael Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADDOX: A bill (H. R. 6762) for the relief of Charles R. Johnson, trustee of Elizabeth Johnson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOON (by request): A bill (H. R. 6763) for the relief of Narcissa T. Byrd, of Chatata, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6764) for relief of Shiloh Presbyterian Church, Calhoun, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6765) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, Calhoun, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of Rev. M. L. Tibbetts and other citizens of Butler County, Iowa, against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, resolutions of five railway organizations represented at union meeting at Carnegie, Pa., in favor of certain legislation in the interest of railroad employees—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BARTLETT: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Atlanta, Ga., relative to the improvement of the St. Johns River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Campbell T. King and 30 other druggists of Macon, Ga., urging the repeal of the internal-revenue tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: Petitions of F. W. Keniston and others, of Guilford, Me., and L. B. Berritt and others, of Houlton, Me., against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Petition of 65 clerks employed in the New York post-office, in favor of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DALZELL: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, Pa., favoring the passage of a bill granting a competing submarine cable line between the United States and Cuba—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the druggists of Washington, Pa., asking for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Marine Society of New York City, for the passage of the shipping bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the New York Chamber of Commerce, in favor of the increase of coast artillery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOVENER: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to John Nay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDDY: Resolution of the Trades' League of Philadelphia, Pa., for cable facilities between the United States and Cuba—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the St. Paul Chamber of Commerce, in favor of placing hides on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Northwestern Manufacturers' Association, favoring the passage of House bill No. 887, in the interest of manufacturing and commercial industries—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of retail druggists of Alexandria, Minn., for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Minneapolis Trades and Labor Council, against modifying the letter carriers' eight-hours-a-day bill—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: Petition of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, asking that Highland light be changed from a fixed white light to an intermittent light—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring the passage of the shipping bill—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the brewing industry of the United States, asking for a reduction of the tax upon fermented liquors—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of the Pork Packers and Provision Dealers' Association of Cincinnati, Ohio, against the discrimination in the classification of freights upon shippers of less than carload lots—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Resolutions of the Winona County Medical Society, urging the passage of Senate bill No. 34, relating to the prevention of cruelty to animals in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, resolution of the Minneapolis Trade and Labor Council, protesting against the passage of a certain bill to modify the letter carriers' eight-hours-a-day law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of post-office clerks at Wheaton, Ill., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of James H. Brisbin, of Allegheny, Pa., and other railway postal clerks in the Twenty-third Congressional district of Pennsylvania, for the reclassification of the Railway Mail Service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of the Central Labor Union of Washington, D. C., in opposition to section 3 of House bill No. 5486—to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts (by request): Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Rebecca P. Quint—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, requesting the passage of the shipping bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARMER: Papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Mary W. Kilborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of the Philadelphia Local Preachers' Association of the Methodist Episcopal Church, against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, petition of W. R. Warner & Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., asking for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of George W. Jaques, of South Amboy, N. J., relating to the stamp tax on medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENTZ: Paper to accompany House bill to correct the military record of Peter Kramer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS: Resolution of the Georgia Bankers' Association, favoring the establishment of a subtreasury by the Government in the central or southeastern Atlantic States, preferably at Savannah, Ga.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the post-office clerks of Americus, Ga., post-office, urging the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the classification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Macon, Ga., for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the letter carriers of Atlanta, Ga., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4911, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LONG: Petition of Levi Ferguson and 99 citizens of Wellington, Kans., urging the continued support of the Government in preserving the lines of battle, etc., at Gettysburg—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, resolutions of Union Veterans' Union, of Garden City, Kans., and of the Second Regiment, Union Veterans' Union, of Wichita, Kans., protesting against the passage of House bill No. 3899—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McALEER: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New York for equipment of coast artillery for defense—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Petitions of druggists of the city of New York, asking for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MADDOX: Petition of Charles R. Johnson, trustee of Elizabeth Johnson, deceased, praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOON: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Shiloh Presbyterian Church, Calhoun, Tenn., and for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church of South Calhoun, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Papers to accompany House bill No. 5443, for the relief of Elizabeth Edwards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRINCE: Petitions of clerks of the post-offices at Moline and Sterling, Ill., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the classification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RAY of New York: Petition of citizens of Earlville, N. Y., for the passage of a bill relating to dairy food and products—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBB: Papers to accompany House bill to remove the charge of desertion against the military record of J. Cavender—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 5712, for the relief of Charles Maschmeyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHATTUC: Papers to accompany House bill to remove the charge of desertion against the military record of Frank Wempe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to A. J. Coffey—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Petition of Sarah F. Trenwith, executrix of Clifford W. Simpson, deceased, for reference of war claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THROPP: Statement to accompany House bill to correct the military record of Abraham Gibson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring the passage of the shipping bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Andrew Morton and Hugo Seaberg, of Springer, N. Mex., objecting to the admission of New Mexico as a State—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of Sarah Clay Bennett and Martha E. Root, of the Woman's Suffrage Association, favoring a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution granting suffrage to women—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, urging the increase of the coast artillery—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Central Labor Union of Washington, D. C., relating to section 3 of House bill No. 5486—to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. ZIEGLER: Four petitions of druggists of Cumberland County, Pa., and one petition of 18 druggists of the city of York, Pa., relating to the stamp tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *January 18, 1900.*

The Senate met at 1 o'clock p. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. NELSON, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal, without objection, will stand approved.

INDEX OF REPORTS OF SECRETARIES OF SENATE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, in response to a resolution of March 3, 1899, a complete alphabetical index of the annual reports of the Secretaries of the Senate; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

SUBSISTENCE FUNDS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from Acting Commissary-General of Subsistence urging the importance of securing legislation to authorize all officers who disburse subsistence funds to keep in their personal possession, for disbursement, such unrestricted amounts as may be authorized from time to time by the Secretary of War; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6237) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for prior years, and for other purposes; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a memorial of the Luzerne County Medical Society, of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for the further prevention of cruelty to animals in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to define and fix the standard of value and to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NELSON presented a memorial of the State Agricultural Society of Minnesota, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to promote commerce and increase the foreign trade of the United States, and to provide auxiliary cruisers, transports, and seamen for Government use when necessary; which was referred to Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Dr. Koch Vegetable Tea Company, of Winona, Minn., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McMILLAN presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Menominee, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the memorial of Dr. H. J. Stauffer and sundry other citizens of Jeannette, Pa., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for the further prevention of cruelty to animals in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. McBRIDE presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Salem, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. CLAY presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Atlanta, Ga., praying that an appropriation be made providing for the deepening of the channel of the St. Johns River from Jacksonville to the ocean; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Augusta, Ga., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the reorganization of the United States Weather Bureau; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ALLEN presented a memorial of the First Regiment, Vicksburg Command, Division of Nebraska, Union Veterans Union, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing the age limit for entering the Weather Service of the Government; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., and the Board of Trade of Pasadena, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the inspection and treatment of trees, plants, buds, cuttings, grafts, scions, nursery stock, and fruit imported into the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Merchants' Exchange of Oakland, Cal., praying for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., and of the Merchants' Exchange Association of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the insertion of an item in the deficiency appropriation bill to prevent the discontinuance of the hydrographic branch of the United States Geological Survey; which was referred to the Committee on the Geological Survey.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Pasadena, Cal., remonstrating against the reduction of the present tariff on citrus fruit importations, and remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocity treaty with the British West Indies; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Pasadena, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the construction of a canal through the Central American Isthmus; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the memorial of J. J. Moore & Co., of San Francisco, Cal., relative to the American shipping laws as applied to the Hawaiian Islands; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PENROSE presented the petition of sundry druggists of Washington, Pa., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Corry, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Woman Suffrage Association of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the disfranchisement of United States citizens on account of sex, and remonstrating against the insertion of the word "male" in the suffrage clause of the constitution framed for the government of Cuba, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. SPOONER presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Chippewa Falls, Wis., and a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Merrill, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of Fulton & Fulton and sundry other citizens of Superior, Wis., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WETMORE presented the petition of W. A. Reynolds and 74 other citizens of Rhode Island, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1712) granting a pension to Arminda D. Davis, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I am directed by the Committee on Printing to report back a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the Senate of March 3, 1899, a letter from the Acting Commissary-General of Subsistence, together with a copy of a contract with the C. A. Gambrill Manufacturing Company, of Baltimore, Md., and to recommend that the letter and accompanying papers be printed as a document.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. TURNER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 354) granting a pension to Vincent de Frietas; and

A bill (S. 349) granting an increase of pension to James H. Coventon.

Mr. TURNER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 343) granting a pension to Mary J. Freeman, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1484) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to change the material to be used in the construction of the dry docks at the navy-yards at League Island, Pa., and Mare Island, Cal., from timber to concrete and stone, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 256) for the relief of Albert C. Brown, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 8) for the correction of muster of Adolph von Haake, late major Sixty-eighth Regiment New York Veteran Volunteer Infantry; and

A bill (S. 41) to authorize the President to place Andrew Geddes on the retired list with the rank of captain.

Mr. MORGAN, from the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, submitted a report to accompany the bill (S. 1783) to provide for the construction of an interoceanic canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans heretofore reported by him.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 156) to amend sections 2304 and 2305 of the Revised Statutes, relating to soldiers' and sailors' homesteads, reported it with amendments.

STENOGRAPHER TO COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. JONES of Nevada, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. HALE on the 3d instant, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs is hereby authorized to employ a stenographer in hearings before such committee, the expense of the same to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE.

Mr. JONES of Nevada, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. MCMILLAN on the 4th instant, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $1,440 per annum during the Fifty-sixth Congress.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 2507) to correct the military record of Timothy McKean; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2508) to provide for the location, erection, and maintenance of a home for women Army nurses, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HOAR. That is a substitute for the bill (S. 2482) to provide for the location, erection, and maintenance of a home for women Army nurses, and for other purposes, which I introduced several days ago and which was referred to the Committee on Pensions. I ask that that bill be recalled from the committee and indefinitely postponed. There was a blank left in the bill which is now filled in the one I have introduced.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Massachusetts will be complied with.

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2509) granting a pension to Isabella C. Swisher;

A bill (S. 2510) granting an increase of pension to Caroline C. Townsend;

A bill (S. 2511) granting a pension to Ellen Downs, formerly Ellen Bowen;

A bill (S. 2512) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Joseph;

A bill (S. 2513) granting pensions to Kate Scott, Mary Gardner, and Mary Priscilla Barry;

A bill (S. 2514) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Ashton;

A bill (S. 2515) granting a pension to Jeremiah Eltz; and

A bill (S. 2516) granting a pension to Randolph Hayman (with accompanying papers).

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 2517) to authorize the President to place the name of Archibald K. Eddowes on the retired list of the United States Navy with the rank of chief engineer, United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2518) for relief of Darius E. Blose;

A bill (S. 2519) for the relief of Mrs. A. C. Wagner; and

A bill (S. 2520) providing for the adjudication of certain claims by the Court of Claims.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 2521) authorizing the Postmaster-General to refund a certain sum of money to the Balfour Publishing Company, of Philadelphia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 2522) to correct the military record of Abraham B. Myers (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2523) to correct the military record of John L. O'Mara (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2524) to correct the military record of William Warner (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2525) to correct the military record of Absolom Sponsellor (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 2526) to correct the military record of William Brocious.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 2527) granting a pension to Robert E. Patterson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PRITCHARD introduced a bill (S. 2528) for the relief of M. L. Skidmore; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2529) for the relief of

John D. Thorne; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2530) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Earp; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2531) granting a pension to J. L. McDowell, alias Leander Dickey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2532) for the relief of Levi Jones; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut introduced a bill (S. 2533) to restrict grounds of divorce and improve the procedure in the District of Columbia and the Territories, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 2534) for the relief of Frank B. Crosthwaite; which was read twice by its title, and, with an accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. McLAURIN introduced a bill (S. 2535) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of James H. Dennis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2536) to pay the State of South Carolina for money expended in the purchase of blankets in mobilizing volunteer troops in the late war with Spain; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SCOTT introduced a bill (S. 2537) for the relief of Elijah M. Hart; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BEVERIDGE introduced a bill (S. 2538) fixing the salary and compensation of the chief justices and associate justices of the supreme courts in the Territories of Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma, and making appropriations to pay the same; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2539) granting an increase of pension to Capt. Milton H. Daniels; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2540) granting an increase of pension to Byron Kurtz; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2541) to correct the military record of Jonas Albert; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2542) to correct the military record of William B. Young; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 2543) granting an increase of pension to Edward A. Parmalee; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WETMORE (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2544) to establish an art commission of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. QUARLES introduced a bill (S. 2545) granting a pension to Nellie A. West; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SPOONER introduced a bill (S. 2546) to remove the charge of desertion against Philip Pflueger, late of Company G, Twenty-fourth Wisconsin Infantry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2547) granting an increase of pension to Michael Dillon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 2548) to provide for the inspection and treatment of trees, plants, buds, cuttings, grafts, scions, nursery stock, and fruit imported into the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 2549) granting a pension to Sayer Jensen; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FOSTER introduced a bill (S. 2550) granting a pension to C. W. Hobart; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 2551) for the establishment of an inebriate asylum in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CLAY introduced a bill (S. 2552) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Elizabeth Overby Williams; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TALIAFERRO introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 70) diverting and setting apart $50,000 out of the sums heretofore appropriated for jetty work at Cumberland Sound, in the States of Florida and Georgia, for sluicing and dredging at the entrance of said sound; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENTS TO URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment proposing an appropriation of $200 to be used in the Treasury bindery for material for binding important written records, intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PENROSE submitted an amendment proposing an appropriation not exceeding $10,000 for condemnation of land for the extension of Massachusetts avenue across the valley of Rock Creek and to provide footings for the embankments which may be necessary in connection therewith, intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATIVE OF THE TRANSVAAL.

Mr. ALLEN. I submit a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate if any person has been accredited representative in any capacity to the United States of America by the South African Republic, commonly known as the Transvaal, and if such person was officially accepted and recognized as such representative by the Government of the United States, and if he was not, for what reason official acceptance and recognition were refused him; and the Secretary of State is further directed to inform the Senate of the name of such person, and when he applied for official recognition, and when and for what reason official recognition was refused him, and if any other government, and, if so, what government, or its official representative or representatives, objected or protested against the official recognition of such proposed representative of said South African or Transvaal Republic by the Government of the United States.

Mr. SPOONER. Let the resolution be printed and go over in the usual course.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the rule the resolution goes over.

OUTLYING DEPENDENCIES.

Mr. ROSS. I offer a resolution which I ask may lie on the table subject to call, and I give notice that I shall ask unanimous consent at the conclusion of the routine morning business on Tuesday next to call up the resolution and make it the occasion of some remarks.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the provisions of the Constitution do not, unaided by act of Congress, extend over Puerto Rico and the Philippine Islands.

That by the recent treaty with Spain the United States takes the sovereignty over Puerto Rico and over the Philippine Islands under the duty to use and exercise it for the general welfare and highest interest of the people of the United States and the inhabitants of the islands, unrestrained by the provisions of the Constitution, and over Cuba under the duty to exercise it for the pacification of the island.

That the successful discharge of this duty demands the establishment of a separate department of government to take charge of all outlying dependencies of the United States and the passage of a general law making appointments therein nonpolitical.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont asks that the resolution may lie on the table subject to his call. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CALIFORNIA STATE CLAIMS.

Mr. PERKINS submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Claims:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1798) entitled "A bill referring to the Court of Claims certain claims arising in California in the years 1846 and 1848," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," approved March 3, 1887; and the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of said act and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE.

Mr. FORAKER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, at the rate of $1,800 per annum, until otherwise provided by law.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 6237) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for prior years, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

POLICY REGARDING THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. WELLINGTON. Mr. President, I gave notice the other day when I introduced Senate joint resolution No. 65 that to-day I would ask the privilege of addressing the Senate upon it. I now ask leave to call up the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays the joint resolution before the Senate. It will be read.

The Secretary read the joint resolution (S. R. 65) declaring the purpose of the Government of the United States with reference to the Philippine Islands, introduced by Mr. WELLINGTON on the 16th instant, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, First. That the Government of the United States does not consider the payment of the $20,000,000 to the Government of the Kingdom of Spain, stipulated by the treaty of Paris and made in accordance with the same, as a purchase either of lands, persons, or privileges of the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands, but that such payment was made with the friendly purpose of abrogating any claim of sovereignty that was then lodged in the Spanish Government, and to prevent the intervention of other foreign powers in Philippine affairs.

Second. That it is not the purpose of the Government or the people of the United States to deprive the people of the Philippine Islands of their right of self-government, and the war now being waged is not for conquest or for the permanent possession of the islands, but for the establishment of law and order, and shall cease when the Filipinos now under arms make overtures for peace upon the condition that after the establishment of law and order the people of the islands, or such islands as may desire, shall have the privilege, under the protection of the United States, of establishing a republic in which the principle of "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people" shall be absolutely preserved—

Mr. WELLINGTON. Mr. President, I ask the indulgence of the Senate for trespassing upon its time. I have long hesitated, and even now enter upon this discussion with reluctance and regret; but I feel my justification lies in the importance of the question which has been forced to the front and may well become the greatest issue now engaging the attention of our people.

The trend of events for several months past has led me to believe that some of the leaders of the Republican party are about to commit themselves to a new departure in the foreign policy of the Government. This feeling has been strengthened by the resolution offered by the junior Senator from Indiana and the very eloquent but radical speech which he made advocating it in this Chamber some days ago. The extreme position he assumed seemed to meet with favorable response, and the plaudits of Administration Senators indicated that perhaps it echoed the sentiment felt in other important circles. If that be true, and the Republican party, through the Administration, is about to pledge itself to the policy therein outlined, I deem it a duty which I owe to myself and the party which I have served, as well as to my country, to sound a note of warning that it would be well to consider carefully, not in the forum of the passions, but before the calm judgment seat of reason, present conditions and future possibilities, before embarking on an unknown sea upon a voyage of discovery which will perhaps bring us nothing better than national tribulation.

I for one am not ready to enter upon a policy of expansion, the first exemplification of which is to be the taking, by force of arms, of the lands, persons, and privileges of the Philippine Islanders.

One of the phrases which seems to have a pleasant sound to many of our friends is that of "the imperial destiny of the Republic." Such phrases and the pictures they form in the imagination are exceeding beautiful, and act as a blandishment which would lead us to the path they point to. To my mind, however, the Republic can not have an imperial destiny. Imperial destiny, surrounded by all the panoply of war, of wealth and power, can not wander hand in hand upon the same highway with the simplicity of a Republic such as ours. One must be sacrified to the other. For myself, I would choose the latter.

History, as we unroll the canvas upon which the memorable events she records are painted in ineffaceable colors, shows us that along the pathaway of nations are the wrecks of many republics who sought imperial destiny.

The republics of Greece were strong until they surrendered to kingly power and allowed the son of Philip to consolidate them for the purpose of invading the Persian Empire. In the glory of the victories of Alexander came imperial destiny, but with it the extinction of Greek liberty and the beginning of the decadence of the power of the republics.

The same story will be found upon the pages of Roman history. Rome, having grown strong and powerful as a republic, listened to the voice which spoke of conquest, of extension of power, and expansion of territory. Cæsar came, and the world bowed its neck to the Roman arms; but in the hour of its greatest glory came also the first note to the Roman citizen of the loss of his greatest privilege, for no nation ever yet robbed a weaker people of its right of self-government that in the end fate or Providence did not cause the blow to rebound and strike the perpetrator of the outrage. Rome lost its liberty because it had deprived other nations of their freedom and right of self-government.

These, it may be said, are ancient precedents and have often been cited. Let us look upon modern examples. There is not before us to-day one upon which we can look and gain greater knowledge, by the experience that has come to that nation, than upon the Kingdom of Spain. When, under the patronage of Spain, the Genoese navigator discovered America, the Spanish Kingdom was perhaps the most powerful in Europe. It dictated the policy of the Continent when it stood in league with imperial Germany, and often outweighed the latter in importance. Then came colonial expansion; the adventurous spirit of the nation sought all parts of the world, the Western Hemisphere as well as the Orient, and every exertion was made to enlarge the area of dominion, the wealth of the nation, and the power of the monarchy by incorporating all the ends of the earth. And why? Did they not, too, say when they began this policy that it was to give the benefits of Christian civilization to the savages of the Orient and the Occident? And yet when the religion of the Cross was brought, the same hand that gave it also inflicted serfdom and slavery under the guise and form of colonial government, which sought not the good of the native, but the aggrandizement of Spanish power and the enrichment of the Spanish people.

Four centuries of this policy have passed, and what has been the result? The last vestige of Spain's important colonial possessions has passed from her; and notwithstanding the fact that she has robbed every people she had under her sway by exactions the most brutal and government the most tyrannical ever known among civilized men, to-day her nobility is impoverished, her peasantry is ignorant and helpless, and the Spanish nation, sapped of its vital energy by its own cruelty, has become so poor that no nation in Europe will bow to do it honor. Her internal resources have been neglected until now there is neither energy nor intelligence to develop them.

And what of the Republic of France? France has her colonial possessions; she has lost many of them, but the remaining portions of her empire have given occasion for an army that sought to conquer the world and has dragged France from the lofty place it once held until now, though this army is the chief power, it has become so corrupt that even the partisans of the French Republic can not defend it, and the nation struggles in fierce effort to escape the baneful influence that threatens decadence and decay.

Germany, which within the last four decades has advanced with giant stride in civil and martial strength, rebuilding the structure of a regenerated empire upon ancient foundations, not content with her phenomenal success at home, has joined in the mad march of the nations to far-off climes for the purpose of creating a vast system of colonial possessions. Her venture has only begun, yet even now she is sacrificing the flower of her peasant youth, and many of all classes find destruction under the burning sun of the Torrid Zone in the vain chase for evanescent power.

But perhaps the greatest example of colonial possessions and power is that of England. It is often pointed to as the one great exemplar in the endeavor to establish the doctrine that colonies can be used to advantage. Unquestionably, England presents the most favorable picture, and yet when you scrutinize it carefully you find the colonial policy of England has been and will be a positive disadvantage to that country. I believe that one of the greatest blessings that ever came to England was the loss of the American colonies, which became, during the Revolution and are now, the United States of America.

I believe, further, that the darkest pages of her history are those which record her transaction with her colonies of the Indian empire. I would not have my country accumulate wealth and power by the government of possessions upon the same plane and in the same manner that England governed India under the East India Company, for it is beyond question that when Hastings and his compeers were sent to India to administer affairs there, bringing in their train famine, mutiny, destruction, and death, it was not for the purpose of civilization; it was not to Christianize, but it was to press from those unfortunate people all the wealth and the richness and the gold and the jewels that could be gathered. It made no difference how they were procured, so that they were brought to the coffers of England's great company.

And what has been the result? The spirit of colonization has grown, the energies of England have been concentrated upon foreign lands. For half a century almost she has been directing her army against the barbarous inhabitants of Africa and Asia. She has not met the Caucasian race since the Crimean war, and now, when for the first time for half a century she attempts to send her armies to destroy a brave and courageous people, she all at once rudely awakens from the dream of her power, because she finds that corruption has eaten to her very vitals, and her army, which she deemed was still like that of Cromwell, invincible, has been belabored and defeated every day since they attacked the Boers. And, sir, justly so. And it may be at no distant time when the insidious influences which have thus debased her will entirely destroy the weighty structure of empire she has erected.

But, sir, whatever may have been the experience of other nations, our own Government is founded upon a different principle from that of either Spain, France, Germany, or England, which have been cited as examples.

Abraham Lincoln, simple, wise, great, and good as he was, justly described the intention of the fathers of the Republic when he said that "a new nation had been founded upon this continent, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal," and further that ours is "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

From the time when the Declaration of Independence emanated from the City of Brotherly Love to the beginning of the Spanish-American war there had never been an hour when all the might and power and influence of this country were not dedicated to liberty and self-government.

The American people, in the immortal Declaration, asserted with the positiveness of what they considered "a self-evident truth" that "all men are endowed by their Creator with inherent and inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." This Declaration was written by Jefferson, inspired by Franklin, cordially indorsed by Washington, Adams, and Hamilton. And, sir, if the propositions advanced in 1776 were true then and applicable to the American people struggling for freedom, have they grown less forceful by the passage of a century and a quarter of time? And are they less applicable now to a struggling people in the year 1900, even though they dwell in the distance and are weak beginners in the contention for national life and the establishment of a government by their own consent, so long denied them by the tyranny of Spain? If it was a truth then it is a truth now. It has never until now been controverted by Americans. The whole course of their national life has been favorable to the practical application of the principle thus asserted by the founders of the Union. The aspiration of our people has been to have the leaven of liberty rise and spread to the "uttermost ends of the earth." The flag of our country has to the present never waved but as the ensign of freedom. Three things there are that appeal with greatest force to the heart and spirit of Americans: The holy altar of our religion, the sacred circle of our home, the silent language of our flag. The latter is the most powerful, for the altar of religion is deserted, the circle of home is broken that Americans, heeding the appeal of their flag, might march to battle and to death for the preservation of the liberties and franchises of their native land.

Our banner was the ensign of Washington when he achieved independence. It was borne by Jackson when he preserved the liberty of the Union. It floated over the volunteers who fought for Texan freedom upon Mexican soil. It survived in the civil strife from which Lincoln emerged, bearing in the one hand the renewed charter of Federal government for a reunited people; in the other, the emancipation and enfranchisement of a race. It was carried by our Army as it stormed San Juan Hill for Cuban rights. It waves now in silent majesty over our great Republic. Its very existence is dedicated to liberty. Its history proclaims self-government and speaks of a continuous policy of encouragement and support of liberty-loving and aspiring peoples. In the language of President McKinley himself, "From Plymouth Rock to the Philippines the grand triumphant march of human liberty has never paused."

Shall it pause now? Shall the advancing columns of freedom-seeking men be retarded and obstructed? Shall we who have led the vanguard of the march turn upon our fellow-soldiers in the cause and bar the way when they would reach the same vantage ground we occupy and turn them back? Shall there be a reversal of that policy now, and shall we in the future, demanding for ourselves freedom, deprive others of that great boon because we stand a giant of strength and they are weaklings before us? If it is our purpose to discard the doctrines of government under which we have prospered and grown great, would it not be well to ponder and carefully consider by the light of the past as it illumines the narrow strip of the present and gives a fitful gleam into the future? For it is only by comparing the events of the present with the recollections of the past that we may foreshadow and fashion the future.

Will we not sacrifice more in the end than we gain? This is a selfish proposition, and yet even upon this, to my mind, we should hesitate before abandoning our past record and adopting a new code of national honor.

In the resolution I have offered I clearly indicate the purpose I have in view. It is not to abandon the present war until certain conditions have been reached, but to endeavor the attainment of these conditions as quickly as possible, and then give to the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands an opportunity of creating for themselves, as we did in Revolutionary times, by evolution and self-exertion, the best government possible for their condition.

I deem it an unfortunate situation that we are compelled to be at war in the Orient; and had the note of warning which I gave nearly two years ago in this Chamber been heeded, there would be no necessity for either the blood or the treasure that must be there expended. I trust the Senate will bear with me as I take a brief retrospect of the intervening time. Upon the occasion to which I allude I stood here, the only Senator upon the Republican side of the Chamber who ventured to oppose the tide of public opinion and voice the deep conviction that the war which was about to be declared against the Spanish Kingdom was unnecessary, and therefore unjust. I felt then, and I have the same faith now, that every contention made by our Government could have been accomplished by peaceful means through diplomatic negotiations.

Up to the day when war was declared every demand made upon Spain had been acceded to, and there seemed to be but one thing more necessary, and that was that Spain should withdraw from Cuba; that the last vestige of her authority in the Western Hemisphere should depart, and that Cuba should have an opportunity of attaining that freedom for which she had so long struggled. But, sir, the feeble protest was not heard, or at least it was unheeded, and war came. It was brief, and the results were, so far as military and naval conditions go, splendid and glorious. I well remember that when I appealed that the war should not be, I further said that if my countrymen determined to make war they would find the conservative people of the State which I had the honor in part to represent in this body, though they were opposed to war, in the forefront of battle. The events which came justified that declaration, for, sir, that July morning which by its rising sun heralded the destruction of the Spanish naval power in Santiago Bay, as it illuminated the line of American warships advancing to deal death and destruction to the Spanish fleet, surrounded by a halo of glory the martial figure of a son of Maryland, Winfield Scott Schley, who guided and directed the great contest.

And though it now seems to be the policy of a cabal in one of the departments of this Administration to rob him of the glory which justly is his, the verdict of the American people has been recorded and he will go down to history as the true hero of that naval battle. By the force of that victory the Spanish power on the island was broken, the land forces no longer made resistance, and Cuba was practically freed from the domination of Spain. By the treaty of Paris, Spain in due time withdrew her troops, and America, by the very resolution upon which she entered upon war with Spain, was in honor bound to grant the right of self-government to the Cuban people. A year and a half has passed since the great battle; almost a year since the ratification of the treaty, and yet there is no indication that we intend to keep faith, but there is every indication that by the power of syndicates, cabals, and combinations there is to be continued in Cuba the despotism of a military government in which the Cubans themselves have no part, which is beyond the pale of any law save that of force, and is not recognized by our Constitution.

There was no doubt that we would be victorious, but in the very victories we were to win there were dangers that would in the end more than counterbalance the good accomplished. A very Pandora's box of national troubles has been opened, and difficulties and dangers are gradually taking form and surrounding us. In the Spanish-American war the island of Puerto Rico, almost without defense, was taken from Spain; the people made no objection. Even if there was to be only a change of masters, they deemed it would be better to escape Spanish maladministration. But, sir, from them now comes the cry for help, a Macedonian cry, which says, "You broke the bands that bound us to our former moorings, you destroyed the trade we had, you have left us hanging between sky and water in mid-ocean, and you have given us nothing in return."

But, sir, the great question, the absorbing topic that now confronts us as a result of this war, is the question of the Philippine Islands. In the far-off Orient, 10,000 miles from our capital, is the archipelago which demands our attention. We know but little of its history or present conditions. Our information concerning it is imperfect and limited. Of its geography we are so ignorant that even the publications of the Government can not tell us whether the islands are 800, or 1,200, or perhaps 1,600 in number. Regarding the population our knowledge is defective, it being variously estimated from eight to twelve millions. The inhabitants of the divers islands we know are of every shade of color, every degree of intelligence and civilization, ranging from the absolute barbarism of the Sulus to the refinement and culture of Aguinaldo and his compatriots. To assume absolute control of and permanently hold the archipelago would be a burdensome and thankless task. Our chief concern, however, is with larger islands, and as a type of these we may consider the island of Luzon, upon which is situated the city of Manila, the metropolis of the whole dependency.

When the Cubans were struggling for freedom the Filipinos were not idle; time and again they had attempted to throw off the Spanish yoke which imperfectly rested upon them, and when they saw their brethren in tribulation in the Caribbean Sea struggling for freedom, they, too, once more began the attempt to destroy their Spanish masters. When our war with Spain began these insurgents had gained advantages at different points in the islands, more especially upon the island of Luzon, where they had gradually gathered a large army and had taken one Spanish position after another until they were virtually in possession of the whole island, except the small territory occupied by the city of Manila and the range of country beyond it controlled by its guns. It is

said, and I believe truthfully, that these insurgents had, before our fleet came to the harbor, erected a cordon of intrenchments that had gradually moved in juxtaposition to the city of Manila, reaching from water to water, and it appeared to be only a matter of time when the last citadel of Spanish power upon the island would fall into the hands of these people.

At this point the Spanish-American war began, and it became the purpose of the President to strike Spain wherever vulnerable, and therefore it was that our fleet in the Orient, under the command of Admiral Dewey, was ordered by the President to proceed to Manila, there intercept the Spanish fleet in eastern waters and, if possible, destroy it. It is a matter of history that the American fleet carried out its instructions and that upon the May morning in Manila Bay attained a glorious and almost bloodless victory for American arms, annihilated the Spanish fleet, and in its annihilation brought about an entire destruction of Spanish law and authority in the Philippines. It now became a question merely of the surrender of the city of Manila and as to whom it would prefer to have as its captors. The Spaniards preferred the Americans, because they knew if the Filipinos took possession there would be a dread and bloody reckoning for centuries of misgovernment and maladministration.

The leader of the Filipino insurrection had been Aguinaldo, who for certain reasons had retired from the islands and taken up his residence in Hongkong. With the coming of the Americans and their victory he was summoned to return, and if I am rightly informed, and I believe I have been, it was by the tacit consent of our Government, given inferentially if not distinctively, that Aguinaldo did return and operated in unison with the American armies as our ally to bring about the defeat of Spain and the entire capture of the province of Luzon. This came about in due time. An armistice took place, which was to last either until a treaty between our country and Spain was made and ratified by both countries or rejected. During the time of this armistice the treaty of Paris was concluded, and by that treaty Cuba and Puerto Rico became absolutely free of Spanish government and domination, and by the stipulation of that treaty the American Government paid to the Kingdom of Spain $20,000,000 for the sovereignty of the Philippine Islands. Sir, I voted with much hesitancy for the treaty of Paris. I believed then, as I believe now, that it would not conduce to our prosperity as a nation to carry our operations to the far-off Orient, and before I voted for the treaty I determined for myself to have an understanding as to the policy of the Administration so far as it was represented in the President of the United States and as to the ultimate purpose of our Government in connection with these islands.

I felt that I would not, either for the sake of my own country, for its honor or material advantage, or for the sake of the rights and privileges and aspirations of the Filipinos, vote for a treaty of this kind and character if it were the purpose of our Government to permanently acquire the islands and retain them as territory. I may be wrong, but, sir, I was left under the impression that it was not the purpose of the Administration to take forcible possession of this territory and permanently hold it against the armed protests of its population, many of whom had aided in defeating the common enemy during the Spanish-American war. Sir, I declare, in my judgment it was not then in contemplation to permanently acquire the islands, and the payment of the $20,000,000 was not considered as a price either for the square miles contained in the 1,500 islands that lay scattered in that eastern sea or for the bodies of the ten millions of inhabitants that dwell upon them. It was not intended to deprive them of the God-given right to govern themselves and to dwell under laws of their own making, and I desire to say further that, in my humble opinion, it is not now the intention of the President, either upon his personal wish or for political uses, to conquer the Filipinos and hold them as subjects against their protest. If such be his design he must have experienced a change of purpose since the adoption of the treaty of Paris.

As time passed, however, there seemed to be here and there an evidence that there was pressure being brought which should, after the adoption of the treaty and the payment of this price, bring about such a condition in our country as would make it imperative upon us to assume sovereignty permanently. It would have been well for us as a nation if Admiral Dewey could have retired from the Bay of Manila on the morn after he had destroyed the Spanish fleet, but he did not dare do so. He had destroyed the Spanish power, and it would not have been proper for him, as representative of the conquering nation, to depart and to leave anarchy and chaos remain instead of authority. Therefore through the weary months of the interregnum they remained. Manila was taken and the American power stood side by side with the Filipino forces. It was not until after the acceptance of the treaty that it became known that it was the purpose of some to bring about a misunderstanding which should end in war between the American forces and the Filipino army. War, however, did come as between the forces who had been working for the same end—the destruction of Spanish power.

It is said it came by Filipino attack. If that be true, and most probably it is, I can not defend it; and yet there is much excuse, for the Filipinos had been dwelling generation after generation under the domination of Spain, under treachery and cruelty, and they had no reason to expect from the maneuvers of the American armies, the breaches of faith and the failure of American promises, that the change of masters which had come would be greatly to their benefit. Therefore, being in possession of the greater part of their islands, they determined to stand by their arms and obtain, if possible, consideration in that manner. I believe it was wrong. I believe it was a mistaken idea. I have still faith enough in American honor to believe that under no circumstance will we be so far forgetful as to deprive these brave though misguided people of that which we hold dear to ourselves and which must of necessity be doubly dear to them.

The clash came between the two forces and the war began. I felt then that as an American I must stand by my Government, and that so long as there was armed resistance I must aid by voice and vote to bring about a condition of law and order, not for the sake of conquest, but with the intent of producing such a situation as would in due time bring about a home government for the Filipinos with which we could treat as a friendly power.

The war went on for a campaign. We had been assured that 6,000 men in a few weeks would restore order. The whole force of General Otis was employed for an entire campaign, and at the end of that campaign, though in the press the censored dispatches gave us victory after victory, we found at the end of that time that in fact little had been accomplished toward the pacification of the island of Luzon or any other island save perhaps that arrangement, made in a manner half diplomatic, half military, by which the United States of America entered into a compact to continue the government of the Sultan of Sulu in his domains. Another campaign has begun and the American people are looking forward to its results. I venture to assert now that no great advantage has as yet been obtained, and unless action is taken we may look forward in yonder islands to a war of a desultory character which may last for an indefinite period of time.

There should be some understanding, some conclusion, as to what the war in the islands really means. If it means a war of conquest, if it means a war to the bitter end, if it means that there must be absolute submission of the Filipinos to arbitrary American power, then you may look forward to that character of war which always comes when a weak people is making a struggle for liberty against a powerful foe. They will retire to their mountain fastnesses. They will issue forth from them and commit depredations, and a guerrilla warfare will become the order of the day. Shall it continue on for years? Is the American people to be called upon to send regiment after regiment of its youth, that should be employed in developing the natural resources of our country, to the far-off antipodes, to these islands of the sea, to lose their lives by the weapon of the insurgent or by the fever and plague of that distant zone? Shall we continue to pour million after million of treasure to deprive these poor people of the only wealth they have—their freedom? If so, I am not content to sit silently by, but will make such opposition as the deep conviction I have demands. But, sir, if it be war merely to reestablish order, to proclaim our sovereignty for the purpose of giving free government, then I believe it can and should be accomplished. Even this, to me, is an unfortunate situation, but it can not now be remedied. It is one of the resultant effects of the Spanish-American war.

It is neither fair nor just to attack the President or the Administration for the conduct of the present war. When the unfortunate contention began, the President could not do otherwise than uphold American authority and stand by American arms, and during the months of the interregnum between the two sessions of Congress it was his duty to continue this war for the upholding of American authority on the islands. The American forces could not be withdrawn, for the moment of their retreat or embarkation would have marked the beginning of internal disorder, and possibly foreign intervention. The American nation was compelled to hold its armies there, and the President would have been lacking in the fulfillment of his duty had he not made every endeavor to tranquilize the islands. That there was small measure of success should be charged neither to the commanding general nor to the Administration.

If this war continues doubtless all will learn the severe lesson that embarking upon such undertakings means loss, both in human life and in national treasure. It will be found a huge undertaking to attempt the subjugation of such a people with all the attendant difficulties that present themselves. But, sir, the period of the interregnum has passed; the responsibility of the President has ceased, for Congress is now in session and it is the duty of Congress to provide such legislation as will proclaim to

the world in a manner emphatic and free from equivocation the design and purpose of our Government with the Philippine Islands. For this reason I have offered the resolution, plain and simple, making a declaration which can not be misunderstood. Adopt this resolution and I believe many of the tangles of the situation will be unraveled and the war will be hastened to a conclusion.

Sir, I oppose the permanent annexation of these islands for the reason that I believe it is in opposition to the basic principle of our Government. I oppose the permanent annexation of these islands because I believe it is unrighteous and unjust to deprive any people of their right of governing themselves. I oppose this mode of expansion because I believe it to be to the detriment of our people, for, sir, if we are to forcibly acquire this territory, we must incorporate it as part of ourselves and take its people as full partners of our institutions, admit them to citizenship and to all the rights and privileges of that condition as we enjoy it here, or we must by the hand of our power strike down the right for which we have ever contended and make them our serfs and subjects and political slaves.

I object strenuously to either of these conditions. I am not in favor of bringing the Filipino into full communion with American citizenship, and I deprecate forcing a government upon him which prevents his enjoying all the privileges of a free citizen in his own land. There can be no "benevolent assimil[illegible]n;" there should be no tyrannical absorption. That part of the population of the Philippines that has emerged from barbarism has Spanish civilization, Spanish language, Spanish religion. Their education, home life, and code of honor are all Spanish. We have nothing in common with them. They are apart from us in every aspiration, save that they crave the right to govern themselves. We are inhabitants of a temperate clime; they are dwellers of the Torrid Zone. We can not, by reason of the climate, dwell with them; they will not come to us, and it would not be well that they should. Their environments are as different from our own as distance and atmospheric conditions can make them. We can not successfully satisfy their wants, for their needs, requirements, sentiments, and ideas stand in antagonism with ours. Our Government and our mode of administration is not adapted to the situation existing among the Filipinos.

But, sir, beyond all this, they do not desire affiliation with us. They demand, as they are entitled to do, home rule. We are great and strong. Can we not be just—nay, more than that, generous to these oppressed people? We have as a nation received generous treatment from a powerful ally when we were weak beginners in the art of self-government. In the Revolutionary war the French people gave the American patriots aid upon land and sea. Their army and navy assisted in the hour of utmost peril and brought victory from the very jaws of defeat. Without them the British surrender at Yorktown could not have been accomplished, and final independence would have failed. At the close of that war the colonies were free, but they lay prostrate; they were exhausted. Chaos reigned and terror was abroad.

Did France turn upon the young Republic and rend it because it was weak and its struggle seemed unavailing? Nay; though the Bourbon reigned, still was there proffered to our people the helpful hand which was to raise up, not the powerful arm to smite. Oh, my countrymen, let us not forget that hour, but stand in the lustrous light of its remembrance and bless our Philippine allies with the same measure of benefit. Can a Republic, owing such a debt of gratitude, afford to be less generous now than was the monarchy of France more than a century ago? Would it not be the irony of fate that we should begin a war with the intention of striking down a tyrant nation because it would not grant freedom to its rebellious dependency, Cuba, and in the ending of that war begin another to punish a second colony of that selfsame power because it dared to aspire to the boon of self-government and ourselves become enslavers? We dare not do so, for liberty would depart from us and seek another resting place beyond our borders. Her curse would descend upon us, and all her attendant train of beneficent spirits would disdain longer to abide with us.

But, say the advocates of "imperial destiny," these inhabitants of the far-off islands are not capable of self-government. They are too ignorant to know their own supreme interest, too inexperienced to found a government, too weak to maintain their liberty.

Sir, the people that aspire to liberty deserve it. The nation that struggles for self-government and gives the lives of its patriotic men in the endeavor to achieve it is neither too inexperienced to establish nor too weak to defend a republic. There can be no doubt that these islanders have fought with undaunted courage, with resolute endeavor, with fervor and constancy. In the campaign of last year they met our troops, and though almost defenseless—most of them armed with primitive weapons—they threw themselves against the advancing columns of our army, met every disadvantage with the bravery of desperation, and gave their lives in a vain endeavor to retard our triumphant advance; and when they fell their women stepped into the ranks to fill the places of the dead.

Not only have they courage, but they have intelligence and ability. They have demonstrated their capability of founding a government. The conditions in Luzon for establishing a republic, under the leadership of Aguinaldo and his compatriots, is as favorable as that of Cuba, if not more so. The proclamations of the Filipino chieftain show him to be possessed of the elements of statecraft and diplomacy. The constitution adopted by the government of Aguinaldo will compare favorably with that of the South American Republics, and for the conditions existing in the archipelago it is perhaps as wisely constructed as our own organic law. The government they would establish may not be similar to ours, save in the kinship of purpose, but it will be infinitely better than any form of administration that we could give if we hold the islands permanently, after beating down opposition by fire and sword.

The Senator from Indiana drew a superb picture of ideal men who should represent our Government in the new possessions and administer affairs to the inhabitants. Surely he knew that the ideal is unattainable, and that men are much the same in their passions, vices, and ambitions as they were a century and a half ago, when Englishmen, as the representatives of his "Most Christian Majesty's" Government, led by avarice and greed, transgressed every law of God and man, committed every crime in the decalogue in the administration of government in the British dependencies, with the one purpose of amassing fortunes for themselves and their employers—the British nation. Does he not know that opportunity makes dishonesty thrive, that government begun by conquest and continued by force makes despots, and that men invested with extraordinary power, untrammeled by close inspection, and far from the home government breed corruption? War begets pestilence, famine, and death.

Despotic government is productive of every species of depravity. Having bound by cords of tyranny a people, you cast to the wind all restraint upon the satraps who are to command them, and where safeguards are lacking there license begins. Therefore we should grant the just demands of these islanders. Let not the end of three and a half centuries of Spanish servitude be the beginning of another term of enslavement by America. The Filipino may fail in much, but he will be free, and to freemen all things are possible. He will slowly but surely rise and evolve such a standard of government as will be both honorable to us and beneficial to him. Instead of using our Army to subdue and subjugate him, let them restore and guard his interests and protect him against any and all comers who would intervene until he is strong enough to stand alone; then, as a friendly nation, treat with him and receive from him such concessions as are deemed to be of advantage in eastern waters, and by such action welcome to the family of nations a new republic, with the cheery wish "God speed you on your way!" Benedictions from a grateful people will be showered upon us as rose leaves upon the quiet waters of a brook, and blessed fruit will spring from them; both nations will prosper apart; each will reap advantageous results.

I have said that in justice we must not forcibly absorb and hold them as subjects. Yet it would be equally disastrous to attempt incorporation with ourselves, with the grant of all the rights and privileges of American citizenship. I believe such a course would be disadvantageous to the great body of our own people. And, sir, for good and sufficient reasons, as a nation we have attained a larger measure of success in a century and a quarter than did the modern European kingdoms in ten centuries. We have achieved not only political freedom, but commercial independence.

When the colonies cast aside English domination they were an agricultural people. Under British influence they had been denied manufactures. After the Revolution and the erection of our magnificent superstructure of constitutional power, population began to find its way to the western Republic from every state in Europe, for here the oppressed of every nationality and every condition in life hopes to find a new home and a betterment of condition. They sought to find freedom of conscience, civil liberty, and material well-being. By the creation of new industries there was abundant employment for all. With unexampled rapidity the march of the pioneer cleared the way to the westward, carved Commonwealths out of the wilderness, and bound ocean to ocean, across 3,000 miles of continent, with bands of steel and currents of electricity. In this manner the natural resources of our country have been developed under the American system of protection. Our progress has been so extraordinary that cities have risen as if by magic, manufacturing interests have leapt into being in a day, mines have multiplied, and agriculture has advanced with equal swiftness, hand in hand with industrial activity upon the highway of national progress.

Under these conditions the American citizen, the laborer, the workman, and the artisan have risen to a loftier plane and to greater dignity than their brothers in even the most favored

countries of Europe. Under the benign influence of this American system of protective tariff, labor of every character and description enjoys higher remuneration and better wages than in any other land. But in the latter years of our history emigration from foreign soil assumed such proportions as to counteract the effect of the tariff to a degree that it was found necessary to enact laws restricting the influx of labor, and even now Congress is considering the matter of additional legislation deemed necessary to still further retard and decrease the coming to our shores of the labor of England, Ireland, Scotland, Germany, France, Italy, Scandinavia, and other countries.

Now, let us for a moment consider. If it is incumbent upon us in order to safeguard American interests to deny admission to the comparatively intelligent labor of European countries when it knocks at the entrance of our ports, when it is necessary to enact drastic legislation upon immigration for the purpose of keeping the high standard of American wages protected, as it is by impost duties, would it be well to reach out 6,000 miles beyond our western coast, and, by the contemplated policy of imperial destiny, make the Philippines American soil and the inhabitants, to the number of millions, competitors of American labor without any protective duty to intervene? I am not ready to sacrifice the well-being of our people for the glittering bauble of Philippine sovereignty by the acquirement of the far-off archipelago.

Beyond question the incorporation of 10,000,000 Filipinos, with their peculiar surroundings, the cheapness of labor and of living, to enter into competition in American markets (without restriction) with the labor of the citizen of Maryland, Pennsylvania, New York, California, South Carolina, or Texas, or any of the five and forty States of the Union, would lower the scale of American wages and the standard of American living. Not only would this occur, but under the treaty of Paris the Spaniards are conceded the same privileges in Philippine ports that Americans are to enjoy; and if we make them American soil, without protective tariff or impost duties, what is to prevent the commodities made by cheap labor of Spain from being sent to Manila free of duty, and from thence to the citizens of this country, that they may thus compete and put down the price of like commodities produced among ourselves? It may be contended, however, that present duties will be maintained, and Americans shall pay duties in Philippine ports, thus preventing the free importation of Spanish goods to Manila and the free importation to our own ports of goods of Philippine manufacture. If this is to be the policy, then what advantage has the American trader in the possession of these islands? How will the situation be improved for American trade more than it would be if we did not claim sovereignty? Such a situation would not long continue without causing discontent and difficulty.

Our triumphs in the realm of national development have come by the advoidance of external complications, ever heeding the advice of Washington that the nation should beware of "foreign entanglements," and the continuous policy has been, if I may be permitted to use an American phrase, "strict attention to our own business." The energies of the nation have been directed to internal improvements, and we have wrought a marvelous transformation; but there is still a vast domain at home which will for centuries furnish material for all the labor of mind and muscle which we and our descendants, with their coworkers, can give. Shall we leave this great work undone, let it fall into disuse or neglect, and join the concourse of European nationalities who seek power in the Orient and the distant south for the acquisition of territory and employment for their surplus population, by activities in the partition of China, conquest of Africa, and the appropriation unto themselves of the ragged edges of the earth in many climes?

There may be excuse for our cousins across the sea in such endeavor, for their area is small, their cities overcrowded, and a vent must be found for the ill-fed and underpaid millions who drag out a weary existence from the beginning to the close of life's journey. And then, too, they have never contended for the propositions of freedom, which are the foundation stones of our superstructure of state. Many of them still hold to the monarchical principle, which claims sovereignty and the right to rule by the grace of God, and not by the will of the people. We, however, can not plead such excuse in extenuation of our conduct, should we engage in such enterprise. We should devote our youth and strength to the task of fortifying our present high position, and first look to it that all is well at home. This done, our object and aim should be to have the influence of American thought and the strong hand of American power reach out beyond our borders in favor of liberty, freedom, and self-government among all men.

And, sir, to my mind a golden opportunity to give the world a bright example of our faith, by works, is to crown the desire of the Filipino for self-government with fulfillment. The resolution I have offered has this object in view. It will give a positive declaration of our purpose. It will relieve the President of the responsibility he has been compelled to assume, for it is the duty of Congress at this time, without further delay, to enter upon the task of solving this problem. It is a duty which can not be avoided, and I trust that no member of the Senate or of the House of Representatives will shrink from meeting squarely the issue now placed before him. The contention of the expansionist has been, and I believe a just contention, that the situation in the Philippines could not be avoided; that war had come as between the natives and our invading army, not by our own seeking; and though I have grave doubts of the correctness of this proposition, I am willing for the present to concede it. They say further that the war can not cease until there is a settlement of the questions at issue and that those who objected to it, who deprecate its continuance, can not offer a solution for the existing difficulty.

Sir, I believe this resolution, if adopted, will conclude the war in a manner both honorable and glorious to the American nation, as well as our present foes, the Filipinos. The moment it is known that the American Congress has committed itself squarely to this declaration upon the war, that the policy of the Government has been clearly defined, and that our end and aim is to give to them the boon they have desired, there will be submission to American authority, and the era of peace in Luzon and the neighboring islands will have come. If we fail to do this, either the present uncertainty will remain, the war will drag its length through the months to come, the bitterness of continued struggle will grow upon either side, we will be doing battle without definite purpose, and encouraging the supposition that many hold that our intention is to seize and hold perpetually as colonies these islands. If such be the purpose of the Administration and the majority party, then let it be made known in a direct, unequivocal, and manly fashion. Doubt and uncertainty will cease, and the nation will stand face to face with a new dispensation in its affairs. I shall protest against it. I have a deep conviction that it will be a national crime which would ever blot the escutcheon of the nation and remain a stain upon the national honor. And having these convictions, I must stand against every attempt made to carry into effect such a grievous error.

I come of a stubborn race. We are perhaps dull and slow of learning, but a lesson once taught is with us not easily forgotten; an opinion once formed, which becomes a heartfelt conviction, will not be surrendered. History tells us that nearly four centuries ago a German peasant became an Augustinian monk. As such, after years of mental struggle, he found himself compelled to stand against the existing order. He became the great reformer of the sixteenth century, and as he stood alone before the combined forces of the Roman hierarchy and the German Empire he refused to recant what he had written; and when the anathema of the church and the ban of the Empire were about to be hurled upon his devoted head he stood before the vast assemblage and said, "I have a deep conviction. I can not recant unless I am refuted. It is not expedient to act against conscience. God help me. Amen." Coming of his race and people, I feel today a faint reflection of the strong will and fixed conviction of this man. I have a deep conviction. It has not been shaken and I will not swerve from it; and I close my appeal for justice to the Filipino with the declaration that neither party policy nor personal interest in a future career shall cause me to surrender the right "as God gives me to see the right." [Applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE IN NORTH CAROLINA.

Mr. McENERY. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that, with the permission of the Senate, on next Tuesday I will submit some remarks on Senate resolution No. 68, declaring certain proposed amendments to the constitution of North Carolina in contravention of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

POLICY REGARDING THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. BACON. I ask leave of the Senate to call up for one moment the joint resolution (S. R. 45) declaring the purpose of the United States with reference to the Philippine Islands, which was introduced by me, for the purpose of asking that an amendment may be allowed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia asks unanimous consent to call up Senate joint resolution 45, heretofore introduced by him, and which is on the table. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BACON. In the sixth resolution I ask to have the words stricken out which are indicated and the words substituted which are written.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia desire to have the amendment read?

Mr. BACON. It is not necessary to read it. Let it be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution as amended is as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Government and people of the United States have not waged the recent war with Spain for conquest and for the acquisition of foreign territory, but solely for the purposes set forth in the resolution of Congress making the declaration of war—the acquisition of such small tracts of land or harbors as may be necessary for governmental purposes being not deemed inconsistent with the same.

SEC. 2. That in demanding and in receiving the cession of the Philippine Islands it is not the purpose of the Government of the United States to secure and maintain permanent dominion over the same as a part of the territory of the United States, or to permanently incorporate the inhabitants thereof as citizens of the United States, or to hold said inhabitants as vassals or subjects of this Government; and the United States hereby disclaim any disposition or intention to exercise permanent sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said islands.

SEC. 3. That the United States, having accepted the cession of the Philippine Islands from Spain, and having by force of arms overthrown all organized authority and opposition to the authority of the United States therein, the duty and obligation rest upon the United States to restore peace and maintain order throughout the same; to protect in said islands the enjoyment of life and property and the pursuit of lawful avocations; and to continue such protection until the power and duty to maintain said protection shall have been transferred and intrusted by the United States to a government of the people of said islands deemed capable and worthy to exercise said power and discharge said duty.

SEC. 4. That when armed resistance to the authority of the United States shall have ceased within said islands, and peace and order shall have been restored therein, it is the purpose and intention of the United States, so soon thereafter as the same can be practically and safely accomplished, to provide the opportunity and prescribe the method for the formation of a government by and of the people of the Philippine Islands, to be thereafter independently exercised and controlled by themselves, it being the design of the United States to accord to the people of said islands the same measure of liberty and independence which have been pledged by the Congress of the United States to the people of Cuba.

SEC. 5. That when a stable government shall, by the method aforesaid, have been duly formed and erected in said islands, competent and worthy, in the judgment of the United States, to exercise the powers of an independent government and to preserve peace and maintain order within its jurisdiction, it is the purpose and intention of the United States, reserving to themselves only such harbors and tracts of land as may be needed for coaling stations or other governmental purposes, to transfer to said government, upon terms which shall be reasonable and just, all rights and territory secured in said islands under the treaty with Spain, and to thereupon leave the dominion and control of their islands to their people.

SEC. 6. That when said government has been thus formed and set up in the Philippine Islands and approved by the United States, it is the design and intention of the United States, through such means and measures as may be deemed most efficient and appropriate, to secure the guaranty of the continued independence of the same.

Mr. BACON. In this connection I desire to state that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the morning business, I shall ask the permission of the Senate to call up the joint resolution S. R. 45 for the purpose of submitting some remarks thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution as amended will be printed and lie on the table, subject to the Senator's call.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that, with the indulgence of the Senate, on Monday, after the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. PRITCHARD], I will make some remarks on the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] and other cognate resolutions now on the table.

VOID ENTRIES OF PUBLIC LANDS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Calendar under Rule VIII is in order. The first bill on the Calendar will be stated.

The bill (S. 386) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers on public lands and to provide for the repayment of certain fees, purchase money, and commissions paid on void entries of public lands" was announced as the first bill in order on the Calendar, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed its consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill has been read at length and it went over under objection without prejudice.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] is ready, I think, to go on with his remarks upon the financial bill, House bill No. 1, and I ask unanimous consent that it may now be taken up.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, when I concluded yesterday I had taken up the bill for a brief examination and had reached the third section of the measure as it passed the House. As I stated yesterday, this bill provides for a division of issue and redemption. As I understand, the Department has full power under it to create such divisions without any statute, so far as the ordinary administration of the Treasury Department is concerned. After this division is created there are the following provisions:

There shall be transferred from the general fund in the Treasury of the United States and taken up on the books of said division as a redemption fund the amount of gold coin and bullion held against outstanding gold certificates, the amount of United States notes held against outstanding currency certificates; the amount of silver dollars held against outstanding silver certificates; the amount in silver dollars and silver bullion held against outstanding Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890.

These are made payable specifically in coin by this act, although they would be under the general provisions of the act without that, I believe. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] seems to approve of that provision. I do not know why they saw fit to treat those separately. In addition, there shall be deposited in this division a sufficient—

amount of gold coin and bullion to constitute a reserve fund equal to 25 per cent of the amount both of United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890.

I understand that this sum is about $110,000,000. Is that correct? At the present time it will require a transfer of about $110,000,000 to this division.

Mr. ALDRICH. A hundred and nine million dollars, perhaps.

Mr. TELLER. I was not exact.

The bill then provides, in section 4:

That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to maintain the gold reserve fund taken up on the books of the division of issue and redemption, as herein provided, and for this purpose he may from time to time transfer to such fund any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated—

That gives the Secretary, as I understand, everything in the Treasury against which there is not an appropriation standing—

or may exchange any of the funds in the division of issue and redemption for other funds which may be in the general fund of the Treasury—

That is a mere exchange.

And in addition thereto he is hereby authorized to issue and sell, whenever in his judgment it is necessary to the maintenance of said reserve fund, bonds of the United States bearing interest at a rate not exceeding 3 per cent per annum, payable in gold coin at the end of twenty years, but redeemable in gold coin at the option of the United States after one year. But no transfer shall at any time be made from the general fund of the Treasury to the division of issue and redemption which will reduce the general fund below $50,000,000.

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and required to use said reserve fund in maintaining at all times the parity and equal value of every dollar issued or coined by the Government.

That means, if it means anything at all, that every dollar we have is redeemable in gold, if the Secretary sees fit so to redeem it. I will ask the Senator from Rhode Island, who is sitting near me, if that is not what it means?

Mr. ALDRICH. I am not so sure that I understand the provision of that section as it stands in the bill, and, therefore, I can not offhand answer the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. TELLER. That is the way I construe it, that every dollar of paper money, if the Secretary sees fit so to rule, becomes a charge upon the gold reserve in this division.

Yesterday the Senator from South Dakota asked me if there had been any silver dollars redeemed in gold, to which I replied with the greatest confidence that there had not been, because I had so frequently inquired of the Department whether it had been done that I supposed I could not be mistaken. Since then I have been handed by a Senator a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, showing that since the 4th day of March, 1897, there have been silver dollars and silver certificates equal to about $19,000,000 redeemed in gold. I do not think that makes any difference in the argument I was making that the silver dollar takes care of itself. During that time there have been $6,000,000 of silver exchanged for gold, leaving a net redemption of silver perhaps by gold somewhere in the neighborhood of $12,000,000.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this clause is exceedingly objectionable, if we are to escape that of which we have heard so much of late—this endless chain which was drawing gold out of the Treasury. It is true the act of 1893 declared it was the policy of the Government to maintain parity. There was no authority given the officer that he did not have before to maintain the parity in that way, as I understand it; and up to March 4, 1893, it never had been exercised at any time. The act of 1890 also contained a declaration of the same general character, but during all that time, with the exception of the statement made by Mr. Carlisle, that if it became necessary to maintain the parity he would redeem in gold, there has been nothing done in that direction.

If this is true the charge upon the gold of $150,000,000 will aggregate almost a thousand million dollars. It is, under the House bill, $109,000,000. It will be a charge on the $109,000,000, or under the Senate amendment it would be upon the $150,000,000, because that amendment raises it arbitrarily to $150,000,000. Now, if we are to redeem all these securities, all these debts—for they are debts, of course; the silver certificate is nothing but a debt, with silver lying there to pay it—that $109,000,000 is not enough.

I know it may be said that the bill as passed by the House will not be before the Senate and will not be the bill; but, Mr. President, logically and technically the House bill is before us, and that is what we are considering. If we make the amendment, the House may not agree to it.

Mr. SPOONER. We are considering both measures.

Mr. TELLER. As the Senator from Wisconsin says, we are really considering both measures. But, as I said the other day, knowing something about the methods, I think I should prefer to

discuss the House bill now rather than to attempt to discuss it on a conference report, which, in the way it might come here, would be somewhat difficult to do.

I repeat, Mr. President, if you are going to go to the gold standard and redeem everything in gold, $109,000,000 will not be sufficient.

THE RESERVE.

Before I get through, or at some other time, I expect to make some remarks upon the impossibility of maintaining the $150,000,000 reserve under the present condition of the world if a financial storm should strike any part of the world with severity.

And if at any time the Secretary of the Treasury deems it necessary in order to maintain the parity and equal value of all the money of the United States, he may at his discretion exchange gold coin for any other money issued or coined by the United States.

I have not read the whole of the provision. This follows:

The notes and certificates so redeemed—

I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island to this language. How are we to get out these certificates? I know there was some discussion in another place and that some claimed that there would be difficulty, while others asserted that there would not be. I myself see a great deal of difficulty in doing it:

The notes and certificates so redeemed or exchanged shall be held in and constitute a part of said redemption fund and shall not be withdrawn therefrom nor disbursed except in exchange for an equivalent amount of the coin in which said notes or certificates were redeemed or exchanged, except as hereinbefore in this section provided.

Now, Mr. President, when the notes are redeemed they go into this division in the Treasury. We will suppose there are $50,000,000 of them put in. Now, you can not get them out under this bill unless somebody goes there with gold and takes them out. Is not that what it means? I think nobody will dispute that.

I will read further. Then, here is something about the act of the 14th of July, 1890, which does not belong here. Then there are several provisions about silver and all that. I do not care to spend much time on those. We have got the gold out and the certificates, whatever they may be, greenbacks or whatever has been redeemed, in there. They can not be got out except for gold.

Now, no one wants to go there and deposit gold and take them out. In the meantime they run down until they have reached the point where the Secretary of the Treasury is compelled to reimburse the fund. He can reimburse the fund in various ways. He may reimburse it by exchanging for gold from the Treasury, if it is there. He can exchange it with anybody. He can receive deposits, etc. But suppose no one comes to make deposits, and there is not gold in the Treasury for him to exchange. Then he is authorized to sell bonds. Suppose he does sell bonds. Suppose he sells $50,000,000 of bonds and replaces the $50,000,000 that have gone out. The notes go in there. Then you have $100,000,000, and nobody then comes with his gold. You repeat that operation again with another $50,000,000, and so on ad infinitum.

Now, is not there a way to do what so many of the gold financiers of this country have been insisting on should be done—that is, to lock up the Treasury notes and greenbacks and silver certificates, and put us absolutely on nothing but gold as a circulating medium? If the bill does not mean that, then it is a very extraordinary measure and a badly drawn bill. But that was the theory; that has been the demand of the junta which prepared this bill and directed the House of Representatives to pass it. I hope this language will not be offensive to the House.

But, Mr. President, the party that claimed, through the public press and elsewhere, to have originated this bill, and its paternity has never been denied, have been proclaiming everywhere from the housetops that the way to come to a proper and sound financial condition is to retire the greenbacks either by destroying them by law or by the executive interference of the Treasury Department by locking them up, and that is what is meant, Mr. President. I will say by way of parenthesis that that is what the Senate provision means, too, in my judgment. Later, perhaps, I may touch on that.

The bill comes here, then, as a contracting bill. I do not know but that it would be a good time for me to make an inquiry, unless somebody can question my assertion, whether under these provisions there is any way to get these redeemed notes back into the Treasury except by an exchange for gold? It was said in another place that the Secretary of the Treasury would have the right to put that first $50,000,000 back into the general fund without receiving gold therefor. But to do that would be a plain, palpable violation of the letter and spirit of this act, and that could not possibly be the proper interpretation. There could be but one way to get it out, and that would be by future legislation.

I do not believe you could get any future legislation in that direction. I think you would find in a short time that all the greenbacks in this country were locked up, redeemed, and then the people who have been complaining that they have been reissued from time to time and have talked about the absurdity of the Government buying its debts and then putting them out again, as if the Government was in the exercise of an ordinary commercial transaction in these money relations, which is not true, would insist that they could not again perform money functions unless exchanged for gold. If we should attempt to issue new ones, we would be met by the arguments we have had here for twenty years against the Government issuing paper money. The silver certificates would get there in due time, and there would take the place of this paper money that it costs us nothing to circulate an interest-bearing 3 per cent bond. I do not see how anybody can escape that conclusion. It is as true as Holy Writ that it is within the province of the Secretary of the Treasury to put every silver certificate and every greenback and every Treasury note into that fund and hold it there and replace it by interest-bearing bonds, which will amount to almost a thousand million dollars.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. A thousand million dollars?

Mr. TELLER. Yes; if you take the greenbacks and Treasury notes and the silver certificates, the sum amounts to in the neighborhood of a thousand million dollars.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. The thing I had in mind was how that could be refunded or placed in bonds without some further legislation, either in the House bill or out of it.

Mr. TELLER. There is no such thing in the bill as coming here for permission to issue bonds; I am going to touch on that.

In 1875, when we proposed to go to resumption, we put in, for the first time in any statute in the civilized world, in my judgment, a provision for the unlimited issue of bonds in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury. No such thing was ever done in Great Britain; no such thing was done in any other country, so far as I know. Mr. President, I am willing to say that up to 1885 that prerogative had never been abused, but, in my opinion, it was most grossly abused under the Administration of Mr. Cleveland. It is not any answer to my objection to say that this power will not be abused. It will be abused; and if it is not abused it is a false system of finance that turns over to one man, the President of the United States, the power to put out an unlimited amount of bonds simply because he may think it necessary to maintain the parity between the silver dollar and the gold dollar.

STABLE MONEY.

Now, I want to say just one word more about parity. Whenever you have a righteous system of finances, that opens your mints to gold and silver alike at fixed ratio, the Government of the United States has no concern as to whether the money that is paid out from the mint purchases more or less. The Government's interest ceases when it has given to the people a silver or a gold dollar of a proper fineness and character, so that the fineness in the silver dollar and the gold dollar is correct and the weight is the proper weight. When the Government has done that, Mr. President, its province, all its functions have ceased, or should cease.

Why should we undertake to maintain the parity between a silver dollar and a gold dollar? It is desirable, I admit; stable money is the greatest blessing that can be given to the human race; but it is not in the power of anyone except Divinity to make a stable dollar. You may maintain the relation of your gold dollar with your silver dollar by an obligation on the part of the Government to take up the gold and give a silver dollar, or to take up the silver and give a gold dollar. But it is not in this exchange that the trouble comes with unstable money. It is when to-day a dollar buys a bushel of wheat and the next day it buys two.

Now, has anybody in the history of the finances of the world been able to find out how you could have a stable dollar? Why, Mr. President, a gentleman in the House the other day said: "We are for the gold dollar, the dollar that is always a dollar, a dollar that is 100 cents." There is no such thing as stable money in the sense that it never varies with reference to commodities.

What we call stable money is money that goes for a length of time buying an equal amount of commodities. Yet, I repeat, no money has been invented, no money has ever been in circulation that continues all the time with the same command over commodities. It can not do so. A few years ago a gold dollar or a silver dollar would buy in my part of the country 2½ bushels of wheat, and the very next year it took a considerable amount more of either gold or silver to buy 2 bushels of wheat than it did the year before to buy 2½ bushels. It may be said that the purchasing power of the dollar is the same but that the price of wheat had risen. I admit that that is the rule we have applied always when it is only one item, but old Locke said in 1777, and nobody has ever disputed the statement since, that I know of, that when the whole range of prices rise or fall the change is not in the commodity but in the money.

You are now boasting of the prosperity that has come to this country, which my friends on this side of the Chamber attribute not to the beneficence of Providence, but to the action of the President of the United States. You tell us prices have risen all over the country 15 per cent. They have risen more than that on some things; but what is that but the lowering of the purchasing power of the dollar?

If it is the business of the Government of the United States to keep the silver dollar and the gold dollar interchangeable, always bearing the same relation to each other, why is it not the same duty on the part of the Government to keep its dollar always purchasing the same amount of a commodity? Why, a man would be crazy in these days who tried to do that. It has been tried. I can show you statutes providing that a given amount of gold should buy so much wheat and so much corn. I can show the decrees of kings that every man should give so much wheat for so much gold, so much wheat for so much silver. But men did not do it. History says that those statutes and those orders were in a little while disregarded.

Oh, no, Mr. President, you can not keep money stable. The relation that one kind of money bears to another, if it is primary money, if it is the world's money, will never seriously vary. It will never be of such a divergence as to disturb commerce and trade, for if too much in one country it will go to some other.

Of course, if there was a great demand, as there was from 1850 to 1860 for silver in Asia, and Asia was demanding more silver every year than the mints could produce, there would be a divergence in favor of silver as against gold, as there was at that time.

If, as in 1808, 1809, and 1810, let us say during the Napoleonic wars, there was a great demand all over Europe, outside of England, for silver, because silver was the only standard money of the Continent at that time, there would be a difference in favor of a dollar of silver; and if there should come, as there did come, a great demand for gold because certain states went not to the gold standard, but to the use of gold, which they had not been using as money, then there might come a demand for gold, such as made gold rise so as to be at a premium of 17 per cent in Hamburg, where it was nothing but merchandise, where you could not open a bank account with it any more than you could with wool or wheat or cotton, where the Bank of Hamburg would not lend you a dollar on it because silver was the only money which it recognized. Although not standard money, it went at one time, according to the evidence before the bullion committee of 1810, to 17½ per cent premium.

It went to that premium over bank notes in England. Gold was the standard in England, but England was without either much gold or silver. The Bank of England having been allowed to suspend specie payments and to issue a great quantity of notes, there was a divergence between the paper and the gold. There was a most singular condition there. I do not know that I am able to account for it, and I have not been able to find anybody who ever did, but it is a historical fact that is very interesting. Gold bore a premium in England of from 5 to 15 per cent over Bank of England notes. It was only needed for export, and everybody said the rate of exchange was from 5 to 27 per cent, as I think it went at one time, and yet the evidence shows that during all that time a man who had a note on the Bank of England could buy just as much exchange on continental Europe with that bank note as he could with gold.

I attribute the circumstance to the interference by law, which our friends here tell us never affects money in any shape or manner, nor even the material out of which money is made. There could have been no other reason than that there was a law against the exportation of gold. And so the man who sold exchange had to take the chances of getting into the penitentiary over there if he exported gold to cover his draft that he drew on the banks of continental Europe. The law was the same as to both silver and gold. No English coin nor bar made out of English coin, either of gold or silver, could be exported without the man who exported it taking the chances of a prison life. Some of the witnesses before the bullion committee said that if the restriction against export were taken off, they believed that immediately the rate of exchange would go to par.

Now, what I am trying to say (and I want to say it so that I think it can be understood not only here but elsewhere) is that there is no obligation on the Government of the United States to undertake to say that its money shall always have the same purchasing power, because that is an impossibility; and if they are obliged to do that, which is the great evil of an unstable money, they are not required to go to this expense of interchanging one dollar for another which is just as good as the other in the domestic affairs of this nation, and load up this country with a debt such as will be incurred under the provisions of this bill.

BANKING UNDER THE BILL.

The next provision of the House bill relates to the banking business. Mr. President, that is an ugly question to touch. Nobody agrees in this country with another as to what the banking system ought to be, and I certainly would not assume that I know what it ought to be. I know some things about it that ought not to be. I am very confident I know that the suggestion made by the Secretary of the Treasury in his annual report is not one that the American people want to follow. I assume that this somewhat difficult and to me somewhat uncertain provision about the banks is intended as the beginning of such a system as the Secretary of the Treasury is now in favor of—a bank issue based on credits on deposits; that is, the greater the debt, the greater the issue of bank notes.

I have been contending for a good many years for the use of silver, and I have been charged on this floor and elsewhere with a desire to have a cheap money. No, I do not want any cheap money. But I do not want any dear money; and if I can not have a righteous money which is neither dear nor cheap, I would much prefer to have cheap money than to have dear money. But, Mr. President, I do not want any cheap money under this bank bill as provided by the House. I am opposed to banks issuing money at all. It is not the province of a bank in a commercial sense to issue money, and for a long time in the history of banking the banks did not issue money. They had a system of credits by which they gave one man credit and transferred that to another; but the issue of bank paper is comparatively modern. I do not mean to say it has come in my day, Mr. President, and yours, but I mean it has come to us within the last two hundred years; and, in my judgment, the commercial world has suffered greatly by the improper issue of bank paper.

I admit that there is not gold and silver enough in the world to do the business of the world. It might have been done if we had remained, perhaps, upon a silver and a gold basis, a metallic basis; but since we have gone to the system of issuing paper money, I do not think we can quit. But if we do have bank paper it must be based on something better than individual credit.

My understanding is that money is the creature of law. I know that somebody will say, "Oh, well, Senator TELLER is a fiatist." Mr. President, there never was any money under the sun that was not the creation of law. I do not mean that gold bullion and silver bullion did not perform monetary functions, but it was a voluntary exchange not of money but of one kind of merchandise with great value and small space for another. But it was barter, just as much as an exchange of wheat for wool or wool for wheat would be. Money is the creation of law. So said Xenophon, so said Aristotle, and so has said every writer of repute who has written since the days of Aristotle.

I remember in 1896 a distinguished speaker in Chicago said it was not within the power of Congress nor of Parliament nor of any body to make a dollar; that nature had made the dollar. Mr. President, if nature has made the dollar, nature must have made a great variety of dollars. It made a dollar of one size in one country and a dollar of another size in another country. Whenever you confer upon a dollar the legal-tender power which compels one man to take it from another in discharge of a debt, it is a creation, a money function by law. You can put in the dollar to-day 25.8 grains of standard gold, and, if you choose, you can to-morrow put in but 20 grains. In our first gold dollar we put in 27 grains of standard gold, and now we have in a gold dollar 25.8 grains. We had a silver dollar with 416 grains of standard silver; we now have a silver dollar of 412½ grains of standard silver.

There is the same defect in the Senate substitute as to bank issues as exists in the House bill. But I believe I shall leave that for a moment and take up other parts of the bill, because I do not wish to extend my remarks beyond a reasonable time.

SENATE BILL PROVISIONS.

The Senate substitute simply reiterates in somewhat more appropriate language the provision as to the unit of value. It says:

That the dollar consisting of 25.8 grains of gold .9 fine shall, as established by section 3511 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, continue to be the standard unit of value—

I suppose it would have been the standard of value without that provision, would it not? I do not think there is anything in this bill which would have repealed the provision made in 1873, that the gold dollar should be the unit of value. The substitute continues—

and all forms of money issued or coined by the United States shall be maintained at a parity of value with this standard.

That is equivalent to the declaration made in the House bill that the Government must maintain the purchasing relation between the silver dollar and the gold dollar. Now, mind you, that is all you do when you maintain the parity. You must maintain the purchasing power of both silver and gold, and you can not get rid of it; but you must assume the burden of saying, if the world should want silver and could not get it, and silver should go, as it went in London more than once, to 10 cents above the mint price on the Continent, you will make the debt-paying power as between the silver and gold dollar relatively the same. You can not do that unless you give more gold for it than 100 cents. On the other hand, in my mind, it is quite as likely that somebody will want the gold of this country, and gold may be wanted to such an extent that the silver dollar here may be in greater circulation than the gold dollar.

If the variation between the dollars comes, one dollar or the other for the time being will be in greater demand for the transactions of domestic commerce. Which will that be? When the

demand I speak of came for silver in England, it was for silver to go to India, where it was needed and where it was of greater value than in England, and the India demand put it to a premium.

Mr. President, demand for domestic use is always for the cheaper money. If gold becomes relatively cheaper than silver, gold will be what every man in commercial life will seize upon with which to pay his debts; and just as soon as he begins to use the gold, which is below par, we will say, that use, that demand, brings it up to a level with the other money. The fact that he does not take other dollars or the higher dollar brings that down to a lower level. That is one of the beauties of bimetallism.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to inquire, if one were above the other, would not that offer an excuse to the Government to issue more bonds?

Mr. TELLER. Of course; for the Government would have to maintain the parity and would have to exchange the dearer money for the cheaper money, or to issue more bonds and take them up at a premium. There is difficulty in circulating money made of two different kinds of metal. If the demand should be very great for one, the coin of that metal may depart from the country; but it will come back in time, and the relation will never be a disturbed relation for any considerable length of time. That is the history of money. That relation must be practically close, because the demand for domestic use is always for the cheaper money, and the lack of or lessened demand for the dear money lessens its value, and so the equilibrium is maintained.

It is provided in section 2 of the substitute—

That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury, in order to secure the prompt and certain redemption of United States notes and Treasury notes as hereinbefore provided, to set apart in the Treasury a reserve fund of $150,000,000 in gold coin, which fund shall be used for such redemption purposes only, and whenever and as often as any of said notes shall be redeemed from said fund it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to use said notes so redeemed to restore and maintain such reserve fund in the manner following, to wit: First, by exchanging the notes so redeemed for any gold coin in the general fund of the Treasury; second, by accepting deposits of gold coin at the Treasury or at any subtreasury in exchange for the United States notes so redeemed; third, by procuring gold coin by the use of said notes, in accordance with the provisions of section 3700 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

That provision of the proposed statute simply enables the Secretary of the Treasury to buy coin. Mr. Cleveland made one of his bond issues under a provision of law similar to it, but I have forgotten which issue it was. That is the bond issue when he made private arrangements with people in New York for gold bonds. I think that is the only time he availed himself of section 3700 of the Revised Statutes, though I may be mistaken.

If the Secretary of the Treasury is unable to restore and maintain the gold coin in the reserve fund by the foregoing methods, and the amount of such gold coin in said fund shall at any time fall below $100,000,000, then it shall be his duty to restore the same to the maximum sum of $150,000,000 by borrowing money on the credit of the United States, and for the debt thus incurred to issue and sell coupon or registered bonds of the United States in such form as he may prescribe, in denominations of $50 or any multiple thereof, bearing interest at the rate of not exceeding 3 per cent per annum—

These bonds are "to be payable at the pleasure of the United States after thirty years from the date of their issue"—

and the gold coin received from the sale of said bonds shall first be covered into the general fund of the Treasury and then exchanged, in the manner hereinbefore provided, for an equal amount of the notes redeemed and held for exchange, and the United States notes exchanged in accordance with the provisions of this section shall, when covered into the Treasury, be reissued as now provided for by law, and the gold coin in the reserve fund, together with the redeemed notes held for use as provided in this section, shall at no time exceed the maximum sum of $150,000,000.

Section 3 provides for canceling the Treasury notes issued under the law of July 14, 1890. Those notes seem to be very obnoxious to both branches of Congress. I do not know why.

The fourth section:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to receive deposits of gold coin with the Treasurer or any assistant treasurer of the United States in sums of not less than $20, and to issue gold certificates therefor in denominations of not less than $20, and the coin so deposited shall be retained in the Treasury and held for the payment of such certificates on demand and used for no other purpose.

The section continues:

Such certificates shall be receivable for customs, taxes, and all public dues, and when so received may be reissued, and when held by any national banking association may be counted as a part of its lawful reserve: *Provided*, That whenever and so long as the gold coin held in the reserve fund in the Treasury for the redemption of United States notes and Treasury notes shall fall and remain below $100,000,000 the authority to issue certificates as herein provided shall be suspended.

That is the present law, as I understand.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is the intention of the present law.

Mr. TELLER. That is the act of 1882.

Then the committee in the substitute describe the character of the bonds to be issued. The same power is given, I think, to the Secretary of the Treasury in the substitute that is given in the clause of the House bill for maintaining the parity, to which I have called attention. I do not wish to repeat myself on that point.

REFUNDING THE DEBT.

Then comes the proposition that we refund the public debt. Some of our obligations are due; $25,000,000, I believe, are payable at the option of the Government. Some of them, I do not recall how many, will be due in 1904—$100,000,000, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] says—some in 1907, and some in 1908. Eight hundred and forty million dollars or $850,000,000 are to be refunded in 2 per cent bonds, which are to be made the basis of the banking system of this country, as I understand. That is supposed to be the merit of the bill, as this provision is to be the agency which will secure their exchange, for the banks will use them, as I understood the Senator from Rhode Island to say in his address the other day in the Senate.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is one of its merits.

Mr. TELLER. Well, one of them. I have no doubt that these bonds will be exchanged to some extent; but I doubt very much whether all of them will be exchanged until about the time they become due.

But, Mr. President, in this exchange of bonds is the Trojan horse. Here is the declaration that these bonds are payable in gold. The Senator from Rhode Island the other day, when he was addressing the Senate, said one of the objects of this bill was to strengthen the public credit—I shall not have time to read what he said—and that another object was to remove the burden of taxation from the people. Am I correct in that?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I will admit that the burden of taxation can be removed from the people to some extent by reducing the interest on the bonds; but I am at a loss to understand how you can remove the burden of taxation by issuing new bonds. That is the feature of this bill which renders it acceptable to the class of men in this country who have been trying to accomplish what they call financial reform.

These bonds as they are exchanged are to be the basis of the banking system of the United States. Mr. President, when the Secretary of the Treasury, under the power given in this bill—whether the House bill or the Senate substitute, I care not which—has tied up and destroyed the paper money of this country, the people of the United States will be upon a paper basis in part at least, and that will be paper issued entirely by the banks.

GOLD MONOMETALLISM AND BANK CURRENCY.

In 1893, when we repealed the Sherman Act, I predicted that the attack would be made upon the greenbacks and silver certificates which is now being made by all the people who are demanding "financial reform."

We have not heard very much of it here, I admit, for it is not a very popular thing to go before the American people and propose the destruction of their paper money, whether it be silver certificates or greenbacks. You are not doing very much loud talking about it, but you are pursuing the same course that those who are doing the talking are pursuing—and every man who votes for this bill knows or ought to know it—and this destruction of these forms of paper money is to be the logical result of its passage. That is why it is being pressed here; and, as I said yesterday, and I repeat it now, I feel from my heart we are surrendering every public declaration made previous to 1896 by the great party now in power. That party has declared that we are incapable of creating our own metallic money, except by the interference and consent of foreign powers, and then we turn over that well-known prerogative of sovereignty, which never ought to be surrendered—the right to make money—to the corporations of the country.

I repeat, Mr. President, that such legislation ought amongst thinking men to bring us into absolute contempt. Talk about removing taxes and the burden of taxation by the adoption of the gold standard, which has afflicted the race now for twenty-five years, and surrender the power to make money to the banks! Mr. President, in the history of the world there is not a nation which has gone to the gold standard which has not reaped from it tribulation and distress. We have suffered something of it ourselves, and we will suffer more from it under this proposed law as time goes on.

The pending bill, I know, is to be crystallized into law. I know when the Republican caucus, composed of Republican members in this body and in the other, said that this was to be the legislation enacted, there was nothing we who oppose it could do here except to enter our protest against it. There was a time in the history of the Republican party when no caucus would have attempted to dominate this Senate, when no caucus would have said to an independent Senator on this floor, "You must follow the majority of this caucus" on a question so vital to the country. I have attended a great many Republican caucuses in the past, and I have heard it again and again stated, "No man is bound by the action of this caucus."

There are men on this floor, Republican Senators, who know this is not a proper bill to be enacted into law, and, uninfluenced

by partisan caucuses and partisan force, they would never vote for it. Mr. President, I do not believe the American people will take kindly to the creation of their money by corporations. I believe they think that if paper money is to be issued by anybody the Government of the United States is the proper authority to issue it, for then it would have back of it all the wealth of the nation; it would have back of it the instinct of the American people to do right, to be just, and to maintain the honor of the country in seeing that such money is redeemed at such time as we pledge ourselves to redeem it.

We have seen something of the power of the national banks. Why, Mr. President, within a short time we have seen one of the great banks, through its vice-president, appealing to the Secretary of the Treasury to deposit large sums of the Government moneys in its coffers upon the theory that it or its directors had rendered valuable service during the last campaign to the political party in power. You have not forgotten, sir, I think, the letter sent by Mr. Hepburn to the Secretary of the Treasury. I have it here, and, so that no one may say I misrepresent it, I am going to read it. It ought to have blistered the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury when he received it, because he retained it without rebuke to the man who wrote it—he a man who himself had held a high position in this country as a financial officer in connection with the Treasury. Financial favors to be extended to national banks because they have extended favors to a political organization! I will read the letter, which is as follows:

THE NATIONAL CITY BANK OF NEW YORK,
New York, June 5, 1897.

MY DEAR MR. GAGE: The National City Bank of this city, of which I recently became vice-president through the consolidation of the business of the Third National with it, is one of the banks designated as a United States depository, and I write to request that in any changes which may be made under the Administration we may not be disturbed in this respect. We should like to remain a United States depository, as at present. Of course, the bank is very strong, and if you will take the pains to look at our list of directors you will see that we also have very great political claims in view of what was done during the canvass last year.

Yours, very truly,

A. B. HEPBURN.

Hon. LYMAN J. GAGE,
United States Treasury, Washington, D. C.

Mr. President, I do not read that letter with any feeling of pleasure. I am not one of those who would ever willingly and with satisfaction speak ill of those in authority. I like to believe that the American people and the American officials are honest; I like to believe that they pursue proper methods. But here is a letter which ought to have gone back to the man who wrote it with a blistering reply from the Secretary of the Treasury; but it did not. It is put upon the files of the Department. Why? Because subsequent events indicate very strongly that the Secretary of the Treasury intended to comply with that request, and to comply with it as a reward for services rendered in a political campaign.

Mr. President, I have not the language in which to express, and I shall not trust myself to try to express, what I think and feel about such a transaction as that; but when I see bank presidents and Secretaries of the Treasury acting, not in the interests of the American people, but in the way of reward for what some man has done politically, I do not want these banks to get any greater power in this country than they have now; I do not want to see the time when they shall say, as they may, "We will make money dear in this country," or "We will make it cheap." Mr. President, we often hear of the high sense of honor which is said to exist among banking men, but I have no doubt the man who wrote that letter is as much respected and honored as any other man in the banking circles of New York, for what he did the rest of them are doing—they are getting their reward for their support of the political organization now in power.

No, sir, the American people do not want their financial affairs mixed up with politics. They do not want these banks to be able, when an election is coming on, to make money plentiful and again when they want to assist a party in power, as they did in 1893, when they wanted to make odious a statute which had been passed, contract the currency of the country so as to make hard times and bring about certain results. We have not forgotten the aid they rendered Mr. Cleveland in 1893 to produce the memorable financial crisis of that year to secure the repeal of the Sherman law of 1890.

DOES NECESSITY EXIST?

Mr. President, is there any necessity for this legislation at the present time? I asked that question yesterday, and I shall be delighted if any Senator will tell me, beyond the statement made by the Senator from Rhode Island, that the bill is to sustain the credit of the United States and ease us of taxation. Then I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island whether there is any trouble with American credit? Is anybody attacking American credit at this hour in any part of the earth? Is there any other country that can sell its securities at such figures as we can? All our bonds are in price above the bonds of any other country in the world; no one is doubting our solvency or our honesty; and yet we are to have legislation the avowed purpose of which is to strengthen the credit and to remove taxation. The Senator did not tell us how our credit is threatened, nor did he tell us how this bill can possibly relieve us from the burdens of taxation.

I repeat, this legislation is proposed for the purpose of meeting a demand which is made outside of this Chamber, not by the people, but by the money power, to put us upon the gold standard, so that we who are opposed to this policy can not reverse it unless we shall secure control of all three branches of the Government. When it comes to be to the interest of this great banking combination that there shall be no change of the Administration in power, which remembers them in its beneficences when it pays out money, and when it deposits the money of the people in their banks and leaves it there, they will see, by methods which they understand, that no change shall be made.

INTERNATIONAL BIMETALLISM DESERTED.

It will not do for Senators to say that they now hope for bimetallism by international agreement. That plea has had its day with the Republican organization. It was the shibboleth of the campaign in 1896. When we claimed the Republican party was a gold-standard party they denied it; when we said to them, "You are not in earnest about promoting international bimetallism," they declared that they were. A question came up in another place in the spring of 1897, before this Administration came into power, as to the construction of the platform at St. Louis. Some gentlemen said it was a gold-standard platform, but distinguished members of this political organization declared then and there that it was not a gold-standard platform, but a bimetallic platform; and in that discussion they quoted the Republican platforms of 1888, of 1892, and of 1896 as proof to those who listened that the Republican party was as a party wedded to bimetallism.

One gentleman of high prominence in the Republican party—he voted for this House bill—declared that the Republican party was a bimetallic party, and he quoted a provision of the platform of 1896 to prove it. The discussion was on the question of the appointment of a commission to go to Europe. I do not know whether it is true or not, but I thoroughly believe that if this political organization now in power had declared in 1896 that they were for the single gold standard, they would not be in power to-day. This was in 1897. This gentleman—he had been interrupted—said:

I was saying that more than one hundred men who will ornament the next House of Representatives on the Republican side owe their election to that platform and an honest espousal of it before the masses of the people.

He and his associates were then contending that that was a bimetallic platform against those who were contending that it was a gold-standard platform. I know, of course, that the Republican party have claimed that they have done all that can be done in the way of an international agreement. I do not believe they have. I know that a great many people have not much faith in an international agreement. I know we tried it in 1878 and failed. We tried it in 1881 and failed. We tried it in 1892 and failed. We tried it again in 1897, and we failed again, and any man who will take a careful survey of the condition that then existed knows that it was infinitely better for an international agreement in 1897 than it was when either of these other conferences met.

The President of the United States sent a commission consisting of three distinguished gentlemen. I want to bear witness that in my judgment that commission did everything in the power of any three men. I do not attribute to them any dereliction of duty. I believe they went to Europe with the express purpose of procuring an agreement if they could—at least, two of them did; with one of them I did not have the pleasure of personal acquaintance, and therefore I can not speak so thoroughly as to him—but two of them went over hoping, and I do not know but believing, that they could secure some international arrangement touching this difficult question.

But no man familiar with this question could have hoped, could have expected, could have had a shadow of expectation of success unless the commission was strongly and consistently supported by the President. We knew before the commission was dispatched the difficulties we had had in 1878, the difficulties in 1881, and the difficulties in 1892, and that some of them were still existing; and yet it has been recognized ever since we attempted it that in order to succeed the Administration must stand back of the commission and that it must have the hearty support of the Government of the United States. Such support has never been behind any commission up to this hour, and you will never secure an international agreement until you have that kind of support.

The commission went to Europe, and in a little while we began to see in the newspapers reports of the kindly way in which it was received. We knew that the House of Parliament had declared just a short time before that they were much disturbed by the existing relation of gold and silver, and had declared it was the desire of the British Government to secure some kind of an

arrangement that would put the two metals in commercial harmony, if possible, or words to that effect. I have the report here, but I do not think it is worth while to read it. We knew also that the Russian Government before that time had, through one of their great conventions of agriculturists, declared—and, it was said at the time, with the approval of the Czar—that they were in favor of going to the bimetallic system. We knew that the President of France was an open and avowed bimetallist and in favor of an international arrangement with us.

I will leave one of the commissioners to tell the tale. We got encouraging news from Europe. The most of us who keep up correspondence with men of like ideas abroad received letters saying, "There is hope over here," and we all felt cheered for a time that possibly the solution of this difficult and important question would be brought about. Nobody begrudged this Administration the credit of the accomplishment if it could bring about general bimetallism. I would have been delighted myself if it could have accomplished it. I could have walked back into that political organization if it could have done that. But it failed. And it failed because this Administration did not intend it should succeed. We know that the Secretary of the Treasury filled the newspapers from the time the commission reached Europe until it acknowledged its failure with declarations in favor of the gold standard. We knew that he had done everything in his power to thwart the purpose for which these men were abroad.

I am going to read the remarks made by my colleague [Mr. WOLCOTT] on this subject when he returned. Nobody will dispute their correctness:

Here, Mr. President, I should naturally end this account of our negotiations, negotiations which are still pending and undetermined. The extraordinary statements, however, lately made by the Secretary of the Treasury, and which, unexplained, must seriously affect the future of any further attempts toward securing international action, require some reference at this time.

When Congress convened on the 6th of last month the President, in his reference to the subject of international bimetallism, spoke earnestly and anxiously of his desire to see an international bimetallic agreement consummated. His assurances gave renewed hope to bimetallists all over the country, and seemed final and conclusive answer to those who had claimed that the President was not in earnest in his efforts toward international bimetallism. For myself, I needed no such proof. I had again and again been made to know how genuine was the President's devotion to this settlement of the vexed question. Within a fortnight after this, with no event meanwhile which would change existing conditions, the Secretary of the Treasury, in support of a bill which he has prepared respecting the currency, said as follows to a committee of Congress:

"The objects I have in mind in the series of provisions offered by me are four in number:

"1. To commit the country more thoroughly to the gold standard, remove, so far as possible, all doubts and fears on that point, and thus strengthen the credit of the United States both at home and abroad."

The two statements are utterly at variance and contradictory to each other. They can not be reconciled. This is not the proper occasion to analyze the bill of the Secretary. It will reach limbo long before it reaches the Senate. He proposes to capitalize the premium on our bonds sold recently and to make of them, with others to be issued, a security definitely payable in gold.

The Secretary forgets that only a few months ago, when the country was in dire distress, we were compelled to pay $9,000,000 for the privilege of keeping the word "gold" out of some of these very bonds. He ought not to forget, for the bank of which he was president, it was said, got some of the bonds and received some of the proceeds of that deplorable transaction. But I do not intend to discuss the bill which the President's message specifically does not indorse, and it is premature to criticise the Secretary's Republicanism, for his advent into the party and the Cabinet were practically contemporaneous. We must accept the situation.

In my opinion, the great majority of the members of the Republican party are bimetallists, and the fact that they are misrepresented by a Cabinet officer is not pleasing, but it is endurable. The selection of the members of his official household is the President's own affair, and so long as he stands upon the question of bimetallism where he has ever stood there is no serious ground for apprehension. But even in the inconceivable event that the Chief Magistrate of this people should, in the exercise of his judgment, determine to countenance the final fastening upon this country of the burdens of the gold standard, I trust we may still have warrant for faith and hope in the pledges of the party and the wisdom of its counsels.

We will cross our bridges when we come to them. The time when this country will submit to the final imposition of gold monometallism is far away. Whatever differences of opinion may exist as to the ability of this country to maintain alone the parity between silver and gold, there is no question that the concurrence of other nations would help and not hinder the cause of bimetallism in the United States, and efforts to secure it ought to receive the cordial support of every citizen who is opposed to gold monometallism.

THE PRESIDENT'S PART IN IT.

Mr. President, there was trouble not only with the utterances of the Secretary, but while this commission was negotiating, and at a time, I believe, when, if they had ever had any hope or reason for hope, it then existed in greater degree than at any other time, the President of the United States sent to us a message. I have said I did not believe the Administration wanted this effort to succeed. No man better than I knows that that is a grave charge, a charge that I would not make here or elsewhere for political purposes, and I would not make it if I did not believe the President's action had in a great degree injured the attempt that was being made, and I think was made, for the express purpose of closing that transaction and giving the world to understand that we were going to the gold standard and there intended to remain. This message came to us on the 24th day of July. The House of Representatives had already sent to us a resolution for adjournment. That resolution was lying on the table of the Committee on Appropriations waiting to be reported, when it should be seen that it could be passed or amended, if necessary, in order that we might adjourn at the time fixed by the House of Representatives. We had been here since the 4th of March. The message of the President of the United States is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

In my message convening the Congress in extraordinary session I called attention to a single subject—that of providing revenue adequate to meet the reasonable and proper expenses of the Government. I believed that to be the most pressing subject for settlement then. A bill to provide the necessary revenues for the Government has already passed the House of Representatives and the Senate and awaits Executive action.

Another question of very great importance is that of the establishment of our currency and banking system on a better basis, which I commented upon in my inaugural address in the following words:

"Our financial system needs some revision; our money is all good now, but its value must not further be threatened. It should all be put upon an enduring basis, not subject to easy attack, nor its stability to doubt or dispute. The several forms of our paper money offer, in my judgment, a constant embarrassment to the Government and imperil a safe balance in the Treasury."

Nothing was settled more clearly at the late national election than the determination upon the part of the people to keep their currency stable in value and equal to that of the most advanced nations of the world.

The soundness of our currency is nowhere questioned. No loss can occur to its holders. It is the system which should be simplified and strengthened, keeping our money just as good as it is now, with less expense to the Government and the people.

The sentiment of the country is strongly in favor of early action by Congress in this direction, to revise our currency laws and remove them from partisan contention. A notable assembly of business men, with delegates from 29 States and Territories, was held at Indianapolis in January of this year. The financial situation commanded their earnest attention, and after a two days' session the convention recommended to Congress the appointment of a monetary commission.

I commend this report to the consideration of Congress. The authors of the report recommend a commission "to make a thorough investigation of the monetary affairs and needs of this country in all relations and aspects, and to make proper suggestions as to any evils found to exist and the remedies therefor."

This subject should receive the attention of Congress at its special session. It ought not to be postponed until the regular session.

I therefore urgently recommend that a special commission be created, nonpartisan in its character, to be composed of well-informed citizens of different parties who will command the confidence of Congress and the country because of their special fitness for the work, whose duty it shall be to make recommendations of whatever changes in our present banking and currency laws may be found necessary and expedient, and to report their conclusions on or before the 1st day of November next, in order that the same may be transmitted by me to Congress for its consideration at its first regular session.

It is to be hoped that the report thus made will be so comprehensive and sound as to receive the support of all parties and the favorable action of Congress. At all events, such a report can not fail to be of value to the executive branch of the Government, as well as to those charged with public legislation, and to greatly assist in the establishment of an improved system of finance.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *July 24, 1897.*

The world knew that the convention at Indianapolis had declared in the most emphatic terms possible for the gold standard and that they had recommended a commission for the purpose of securing legislation to establish the gold standard. In view of this fact was not the President's message equivalent to a declaration to the world that we intended to go to the gold standard? I state what is a fact, and, if necessary, I could call upon the members of the commission, and I could call upon plenty of men who are not members, when I say that from that hour there was no longer any interest on the part of Great Britain in this financial question with relation to international agreement. Two weeks later a report came concerning the Indian affairs, which had been held in abeyance for many months to see what might come out of this conference, declaring that India was to be put upon the gold standard. I do not like to comment upon this message very much, and yet I can not see why the President sent it to us unless he wanted to give notice to the world that the Republican party hereafter would be for the gold standard and not for bimetallism.

I remember some utterances of his and words that he sent through his friends to people in distant sections that he would "keep the promises he had made," and that they were construed everywhere into a declaration that he intended to establish the gold standard. The promises which his party had made were that they would maintain the condition of affairs which then existed, and that they would go on and promote bimetallism by an international agreement. Does anybody think that the course of the Administration was calculated to promote international bimetallism?

Mr. ALLISON. What does the President mean when he says he hopes the commission will recommend legislation that will meet the approval of all parties?

Mr. TELLER. The President of the United States could not have hoped that a commission appointed in the way that this was to be appointed could ever submit a measure that would meet the approval of everybody. Certainly not if it was to establish the gold standard. The Senator from Iowa, with his long experience, knows that no financial bill could be brought here that would meet the approval of everybody.

International bimetallism is abandoned. You will hear nothing of it unless it be at the beginning of the campaign next year for

the purpose of deluding the voters, as we heard it in 1896. Mr. President, immediately after the close of the last election one of the great newspapers of New York announced that "it was time to be honest." I supposed I had the verbatim quotation, but I have mislaid it, apparently. I can not put my hand on it for the moment. It announced that it was now time to be honest and to stop fooling with international bimetallism, that the international bimetallism clause had been put in the platform to catch votes, and now that the election was over the proper thing was just to repudiate the whole thing. That seems to have been the attitude of a good many others than that newspaper. I think the utterance represents the position of a good many people, I am sorry to say.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator from Colorado allow me to remind him that the President, previous to the time under consideration, influenced a Democratic House to repeal the Sherman law, and that a Democratic Congressman from Maryland said the Chicago platform of 1892, which those of us who were present said was a bimetallic platform, was good enough to be elected on, but was not worth a snap afterwards? Perhaps our Republican friends learned the same trick.

Mr. TELLER. I should say they did.

DEMONETIZATION OF SILVER.

Now, Mr. President, there has been a good deal said in the country, and I will not spend much time on it, about the act of 1853 demonetizing silver. I have heard a great many men say it did. I have seen the statement in a great many newspapers. The act of 1853 simply changed our financial system as respects the small money; it dealt with the half dollars and quarters and took out some of the silver and reduced the extent of the legal-tender quality of some of the coins. That is all it did. We had found that up to that time there was too much silver in our subsidiary money, or just as much in two half dollars as in a dollar, and they had been legal tender; but the enactment of that year took about 6 cents' worth out of each half dollar, I think, or something in that neighborhood.

Mr. ALLISON. It reduced the value 7 per cent.

Mr. TELLER. Seven per cent. I wanted to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the act was passed February 21, 1853. But in March, 1853, a few days later, another act was passed That act is practically an unlimited coinage act. It provided for the silver being refined and taken to the mint and mint certificates being given before it was coined into dollars, and it is not possible to torture that into a demonetization of silver. It was said in another place that the debate indicated a desire to get rid of silver. I do not think that contention can be sustained anywhere. I do not think anybody has any proof that anyone in that transaction supposed he was disturbing the silver dollar itself.

I shall not attempt to-night to say some things which yesterday I said I wanted to say about "unrealized prophecies." I will take occasion to say what I wanted to say on that point some other day, because it is not absolutely essential to this debate. I know we made some prophecies that have not altogether come true, but we will offset them. We will put them against all the prophecies our friends ever have made from time to time as to the danger of the use of silver, none of which came true.

WHY CHANGE?

But, Mr. President, I wish to ask a question here, and then I believe I will conclude for the present. I wish to ask Senators who advocate this bill and say it is a good time now for us to change our financial system if it is not a fact that at this time, whether it is not true, that with all the great output of gold in this country and in the world in the last few years, that in the whole history of mankind there has ever been a greater struggle for gold than is going on right now; and is it not to be assumed that this struggle must continue if we go to a gold standard and make gold the only money in use in this country except bank paper, which, of course, is not international money.

Mr. President, the Bank of England is the great financial regulator, perhaps, of Europe. It is not so great a bank in some respects as the Bank of France, but it has had, perhaps, a greater influence on the affairs of mankind than the Bank of France. A writer not long since said that whenever the Bank of England made money dear money was dear all over the world, and I think there is some truth in that statement.

Now, what has been the condition of the Bank of England—that is, the great commercial center of the world to-day? It has recently raised its rate of discount from 5 to 6, and threatens to raise it to 7. There is every reason to suppose that it may be compelled to do so. Why? Because a few hundred thousand dollars of gold were drawn out of its coffers for use somewhere else. The Bank of France has raised its rate of discount twice within a very short time, a proceeding very unusual for the Bank of France, simply to prevent the export of gold. The banks of Russia have raised their discount to 10 and 15 per cent, and Russia, with her great stock of gold, has not yet fully established the gold standard.

Now, Mr. President, other countries have attempted to go to the gold standard besides ours. Russia has attempted to go to the gold standard; Austria has attempted to go to the gold standard; the Argentine Republic has attempted to go to the gold standard; Chile, Brazil, and Japan. In a letter written in 1898 Dr. Giffin, who is the most notable of all the gold advocates of Europe, declared that all those countries had failed to establish the gold standard. The public press tell us that Chile is about to return to her silver standard because she can not maintain the gold standard. And this, too, notwithstanding the output of gold in the last three years has been greater than it was for one hundred and fifty years after the discovery of America.

What is our own condition? If the Treasury Department is correct, we have more than one-fifth of the world's gold. And yet we are in financial distress. There was recently a panic in New York, the Secretary of the Treasury says, to such an extent that he was compelled to offer to take in $25,000,000 of bonds, and he paid out for bonds $21,000,000. Not only that, but so great was the disturbance of financial affairs in this country that the Secretary of the Treasury has put into the national banks of this country for their use, to keep up the prices and to maintain the commercial equilibrium, I believe somewhere in the neighborhood of $120,000,000. He had $94,000,000 in the banks not long since, and he has been putting in ever since, and I have seen in the public press that the sum amounts to $120,000,000. He expressed his determination to put in, in addition to what was in, when there were eighty-odd millions, at least $40,000,000 more.

A commercial condition that requires boosting up by the Treasury Department is a bad one, and if a people with nearly one-fourth of the world's gold are in extremis, what will we be if there should be a demand upon us, as there may be, for a large share of that gold which we now hold? We certainly hold more than our share. No nation in the world has ever been able to hold for any great length of time any more of the bullion money of the world than her share. France comes nearer to doing this than any other nation, and she has had a struggle from time to time to hold her gold in her treasury or in the Bank of France. With financial disturbance in France, in England, in Austria, in Germany, in Russia, in Roumania, Mr. President, it does not seem to be a good time to go to the gold standard and stake everything upon one money metal and that the money metal that the world is struggling for. Of course we may continue to have this great output of gold; I trust we may; but we ought to remember that $400,000,000 next year will not have the same influence upon the commerce of the world that $150,000,000 had in former years. The influence of the yearly output is determined by the mass against which it goes.

THE WORLD'S GOLD OUTPUT.

When Columbus discovered America the world was devoid of money metals, and a few millions of money coming in was a great percentage on the world's stock. Now the world's stock is between nine and ten thousand million dollars of gold and silver. Then, when there is a great output of gold and silver, it is a trifling percentage of the great stock, and its influence is slight. Reduce it one-half, destroy the silver, and then the silver that comes out has its influence in no part of the Christian world as a money metal, and the gold that comes out is left to have its influence upon the gold of Christendom alone. If we have four thousand six hundred million dollars of gold in Christendom, I will say, $400,000,000 is but a trifling percentage on it, but its effect is greater than it would be on all the silver and gold together.

It is a well-known fact that as the quantity of gold increases so the demand for it increases. Money is the only thing in the world for which a superabundance or oversupply increases the demand. An excess of wheat or corn or cotton or of any of the commodities of life tends to lower their price. Money, on the contrary, when that comes in excess, creates a commercial activity, and this increases the demand for it. That again begets a further demand for money. Such is the history of the world. If $400,000,000 comes from the mines next year—and I would not be surprised if it does, and I hope it will—that sum will be absorbed in the channels of trade and commerce without financial disturbance, except to the extent that it lowers the purchasing power, or, on the other hand, putting it the other way, to the extent that it raises prices, which I believe will be a great blessing to mankind.

But we do not know how long this increased supply of gold may continue. We are going to a financial system that will outlive, perhaps, this great output of gold. We saw in 1858 and 1859 the whole world upset because there was one hundred and fifty or one hundred and sixty million dollars of gold that came into circulation in a single year, because California put upon the markets $60,000,000 of gold. We heard not only in Europe but in the United States men predicting that gold would be too cheap for money, and some contracts were made in the United States and in Europe for payment in silver. Some of them exist in New England to-day and are being paid in silver by weight.

If it had not been for the action of France, which accepted all

the gold that came to her mint and resisted the efforts of leading men who declared that she ought to demonetize gold, prices measured in gold would have risen much beyond what they did, and the purchasing power of gold would have been 50 per cent of what it had been. Yet Senators will tell us that gold is a stable metal and that a dollar of it is always of the same value.

Mr. President, nobody need be alarmed about the great output of gold. It is a blessing to mankind. We have some prosperity now. We owe it to the fact that gold has increased in a degree that nobody expected. Our financial condition is not better than that of some parts of Europe. You talk about prosperity here and say that the Administration brought it. Who brought it to the greater part of Europe? Conditions are infinitely better now than they were five years ago in Europe. We boast of our great production of commodities. The entire world is now manufacturing more of everything than it ever manufactured before in its history. We talk about the great output of iron in this country. Why, Mr. President, the European countries are keeping pace with us proportionately in the growth of iron and steel industries, although hey do not quite come up to us in the prices, simply because we have a great combination that fixes the price of iron and steel in this country. Russia has increased her product of iron in a greater per cent than we have ours. England maintains her output in proportion to ours.

GOOD TIMES AND THE VOLUME OF MONEY.

Mr. President, this gold that comes out and enters into the channels of trade is doing what we declared it would do when we said there was not money enough in the country to do the business with. Having increased our stock of money in this country to a very large extent, we can see the impetus that is given to business, and it would have come to us if Mr. Bryan had been elected, or Mr. Smith, or any other man. No political organization has a right to stand before the American people and say, "This prosperity comes by our agency." You can not point out anything that you have done that brings it to us. Does your tariff create this great export of commodities? Nobody will pretend that it does. I do not mean to say that I do not think a tariff is a wise and beneficial thing properly laid. I do so believe, and I believe that the tariff may sometimes change conditions very materially.

But, Mr. President, this is not a local or national change only. I repeat, there is not a country in Christendom that has not felt the stimulating and life-giving influence of this great output of gold, and all will continue to feel it, I hope. Times would have been equally good if silver had been recognized as a money metal for some years by the world. We would have been getting the benefit of the great product of that metal, not at 50 cents on a dollar, but at its old mint rate. A great production of silver has the same effect on commerce and trade that a great production of gold has.

There are many other things that I hope to say before this debate is over, but I will not attempt to say them now. I do, however, want to say another word that comes properly in this connection. I adverted to the condition of the Bank of England. I wish to say what I should have said when I was touching upon it. Within the last two months the Bank of England seriously proposed shutting off all discounts for the purpose of holding her gold. She only refrained from doing so, an English periodical says, when the brokers who make loans in London, fearing a panic, went to the bank officials and said, "If you close your discounts, we will close ours." Then what happens? The bank will have to shut up. Then the bank reconsidered the matter. Now, Mr. President, with that condition of the world, I repeat, we ought not to be going to any new experiments and trying this standard when things are well enough here at home, or, if not good enough, better than they have for some time been, and better than, I believe, they will be under this bill when it becomes a law and its full effect as such is felt.

GOLD STANDARD IN INDIA.

England has been trying to put India upon the gold standard. She commenced that process actively immediately after the failure of the last international conference. She had been sending some gold there and tying up some in the Bank of England for the purpose of getting India on that standard. The result has been just as it was when they closed the mint in 1893. Soon after that there came a famine, which my colleague on this floor [Mr. WOLCOTT] properly characterized as not a food famine but a money famine. And all Europe admitted that it was a money famine. There is another famine in India. It is another money famine, Mr. President; it is not a food famine.

My colleague in the remarks he made when he came back from Europe stated that there were a thousand million ounces of silver held by the natives of India in spangles and bangles and trinkets, which I think is not an exaggeration. I myself, from an examination I made many years ago and from the testimony of some who know something about it, think the quantity is even greater than that. A thousand million ounces of silver are worth in India money with open mints $1.38 an ounce, as they have the ratio of gold to silver of 1 to 15.

Heretofore, up to the last famine, up to 1893, when there was a stringency of food, the men who had silver bullion or silver ornaments took their silver to the mint, got rupees for it, and bought food for their families. Their wealth, their savings, consist in these silver trinkets that I have mentioned. When they want to convert them into money they go to the Indian broker and sell them, and formerly they did this, or went to the mint with them and got rupees for them.

Now, since the mints have been closed they sell to the Indian broker for whatever he is willing to pay. If he offers them an insufficient price, they must take what he will pay, as the mints are closed.

Probably in the whole history of brokerages and purchases of that kind there are nc people who are more intolerant in their dealings than those Indian brokers. So the poor, ignorant native, heretofore considering his spangles and bangles the same as money, goes to the broker, and the broker says that the silver in them is not worth $1.38 an ounce; it is worth 50 cents or 45 cents or 40 cents, or whatever he thinks the man will part with it for.

So, Mr. President, those people are selling those things for less than a third of what they would have sold them for, and their consuming capacity and supporting capacity is destroyed to the extent of two-thirds.

Yet, sir, we are told again and again that commerce settles all these questions and that law means nothing when it touches money. Why, law cut those people out of two-thirds of their holdings as certainly as you would have done here if you had taken out of the banks in this country two-thirds of the cash deposits and appropriated them to your own use. There are starving and distress in India because the interest of British capital is considered instead of the interest of the people of India.

AMOUNT OF GOLD IN CIRCULATION.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator allow me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. TELLER. I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. CHANDLER. One of the questions which seem to me to make the adoption or rejection of gold monometallism, as proposed by this bill, almost a moral question is the damage done to the people of the silver-using nations of India and China by the destruction of their values, which have been values in those countries almost from the foundation of the world. The Senator from Colorado is presenting that view of the case.

I have never said anything about "the crime of 1873," because I have thought the stoppage of silver coinage in the United States at that time was an accident and not intentional; but I am inclined to think that the deliberate reduction by England, aided by the United States, of the values of the silver coins and the silver hoards in the Orient is almost a crime, an offense against morality—for a great economic question may have a moral side to it.

Now, the injury done to the poor people of the Orient depends very much upon the quantity of silver coin and silver bullion which there is in those countries. The Senator from Colorado has made some statements as to the amounts. I have previously made some statements in this body as to the amounts. The junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT], now absent, made estimates in a speech to which the senior Senator has referred.

All this is preliminary to a question. I want to ask the Senator from Colorado whether his attention has been called to the fact that the present Director of the Mint in his report for last year has largely reduced the quantities of silver in India from previous estimates, and that if he is correct the amounts are not nearly so large as we have thought they were, and consequently the damage done by demonetization is not so large. Has the Senator's attention been called to those reduced estimates? If so, what does he think about them?

Mr. TELLER. The Senator is diverting me from what I was saying, except that I made a statement as to the amount of silver in India.

Mr. President, I do not rely upon statistics presented by the Treasury Department. I found in one report that the amount of gold in circulation in Great Britain was placed at $584,000,000. I thought then that there was not a man in the country who touched statistics who did not know that that statement was untrue. There had been a great discussion going on in England for some years as to the volume of the gold in circulation, and some of the scientists of Great Britain, men who dealt with economic questions, have declared that instead of there being about five hundred millions, as had been claimed, there was less than $400,000,000. Nobody, I think, claimed above $500,000,000. That is about the amount at which it was generally stated.

The last report of the Director of the Mint has corrected that error, and instead of placing the amount as $584,000,000 it is given

at $438,000,000. Here was $146,000,000 more gold said to be in Great Britain last year than is now reported there. When I made an investigation in order to ascertain whether Great Britain had been importing or exporting gold, I found she had a net import of gold since the report of $584,000,000 was made, and still she now has only $438,000,000. When it was claimed she had $580,000,000 she did not have $400,000,000. A distinguished firm of scientists has declared that she did not have more than $380,000,000.

I can find many other errors in all of the reports, and many errors as great as these in the statistics which come to us from the Treasury Department. I do not remember the amount of silver which they have given as being used in France. If you take the official report, I venture to say you will find it does not give half the amount of silver that is in circulation in France. Can the Senator from New Hampshire give me the last report of the mint on the amount of silver in France?

Mr. CHANDLER. I have not the table here.

Mr. TELLER. Never mind; these erroneous statements have been repeated from time to time for three or four years. France has not been exporting silver. She has been holding her silver steadily, and it is performing money duty. She can not afford to export it, and she does not; but it serves the purpose of the Treasury Department in their statement to cut the amount down, and that has been done.

In 1887, or about that time, the minister from this country to France reported that we usually said that France had $800,000,000 of silver, whereas he stated that France had more than one thousand million dollars of silver in circulation. If she had it then, she has it now. Authorities which are recognized everywhere say she has $150,000,000 of silver coin belonging to the members of the Latin Union, which circulates in France, which she can at any time call upon them to pay her for in gold; but she does not do it because she does not want to make the scramble for gold greater than it has been. I have no doubt there are one thousand million ounces of silver in India which is not in money.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him a moment?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Kansas has informed me that in asking a question I had used the word "gold" when I intended to use the word "silver." I think the estimates of the Director of the Mint, which are soon to be printed, reduce the estimate of the quantity of silver in India to something like $650,000,000.

In an article in the New York Tribune of February 8, 1897, signed "I. N. F.," Mr. Ford, describing the condition at that time of the Indian peasantry, says:

Sir Lepel Griffin states, on the authority of Mr. Lesley Probyn, that the amount of silver in the possession of the Indian peasantry in the form of ornaments is 1,312,500,000 ounces.

Of course, at $1.29 an ounce that would be more than $1,500,000,000 in ornaments. Now, the estimate which the Director of the Mint makes is that there is only $650,000,000 of silver in all India. How does the Senator account for that?

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator from Colorado allow me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. TELLER. I do.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator from Colorado will permit, I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] whether that estimate is upon a gold basis or upon a coinage basis of 16 to 1?

Mr. CHANDLER. The coinage basis.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator will allow me, I should like to inquire of the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Colorado what pertinency that has to the pending bill?

Mr. CHANDLER. I will state now, if the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] will allow me, that the question of destroying silver as a money metal is very pertinent when there is a bill before the Senate to establish gold monometallism in this country.

INTEGRITY OF THE STATISTICAL AUTHORITIES.

Mr. ALLISON. Will the Senator from Colorado allow me?

Mr. TELLER. Yes.

Mr. ALLISON. I think I ought to say that the Director of the Mint in his report always gives the sources of his information. I do not suppose he has any means of counting or enumerating the bangles and other silver ornaments worn throughout India, and therefore he can only make the best possible estimate; but inasmuch as he gives the sources of his information and how he reaches his conclusions, I think he ought to have at least credit for integrity.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have not impugned the integrity of the Director of the Mint. The Senator did not understand me to do so. The table which he gives in his report is accompanied by a letter, and I think his estimate is $650,000,000 of silver in India, as against $900,000,000 of a year or two ago in the report then made. I think it says that this estimate is obtained from the United States consuls. Whether the full report explains more in detail where he gets his new amount I do not know, but I do know that the effort is being made to reduce the estimate of the quantity of silver money and silver ornaments in India.

Mr. ALLISON. It seems that the Director of the Mint has also made an effort to reduce the estimate of the quantity in Great Britain, so that he seems to be impartial in the matter.

Mr. TELLER. I will not say that the Director of the Mint purposely misstated that there was $584,000,000 of gold in England, but either he is not the man who ought to make estimates in regard to these matters or else he has been misinformed. I think it likely he did not know what he was talking about.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not make any such accusation as that. I found several errors in one of his tables, and I called them to his attention. He has explained them satisfactorily to me, and I make no imputation against him. I think Mr. Roberts is endeavoring to arrive at the truth; but there is a great deal of uncertainty about the quantities of gold and silver in the form of money, in the form of bullion, and in the form of ornaments in this world of ours. I ask the Senator from Iowa how much gold there is in India, according to his understanding of the case?

Mr. ALLISON. I have not the figures before me, but I know there is a very large amount of gold in India held in the same way that silver is held, in the form of bangles, ornaments, etc.

Mr. CHANDLER. The best we can do is to get what information we can from the most reliable sources; and I am not imputing dishonesty to any statistician.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, as the personal agency of the Director of the Mint has been brought into question, I think it is but fair I should read what he said about the stock of money in England. It seems no more than just that I should do so.

The estimate $584,000,000 as the stock of gold in the United Kingdom December 31, 1896, as published in the fiscal report for 1897, was based upon information contained in Money and Prices, published under the auspices of the Bureau of Statistics, State Department—

An American source—

The estimate of $438,000,000, now made, is based upon official information received from the British Government.

My recollection now is, in looking it up, that I found that between the time he reported the amount at $584,000,000 and the time that the statement was made the net imports of gold by Great Britain were $113,000,000. I had not intended to touch upon this question. There was not only an error there, but there was an error regarding other countries.

Roumania's stock of gold estimated upon official information at $38,000,000 December 31, 1896.

Now it is estimated at $14,500,000. Here is a reduction of $24,000,000 in Roumania.

Mr. ALLISON. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. TELLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator is referring to the report of 1897, giving estimates and statements derived from various sources, which are stated in the report. I make this statement so that no imputation of ignorance or lack of ability may be cast on the present Director of the Mint or his predecessor.

Mr. TELLER. I was quite aware that the present Director did not make these estimates. My remarks referred to the man who made them. I want to go a little further. The report proceeds:

For the stock of gold in Egypt, as published in previous reports, $129,300,000 was the estimate of the late Ottomar Haupt, an eminent statistician of France—

He was about the only gold-standard statistician France has had for some years. This man, who is now dead, was a very ardent gold-standard man—

but from unofficial information there is substantial reason for the belief that Haupt's estimate was far too great, and it is now placed at $30,000,000.

Here is an error of $99,000,000 more in Egypt. I repeat what I said about England. Any man who has kept in touch with the finances of the world ought to have known there was not $130,000,000 of gold in that country, any more than there is $4,000,000 of gold in the Hawaiian Islands, as now stated by the Director of the Mint. This figure would give $40 per capita in those islands. The statement is perfectly absurd. Here is an error of $146,000,000 in Great Britain, an error of $24,000,000 in Roumania, and one of $99,000,000 in Egypt. The aggregate is a pretty large sum.

This calculation is made upon the amount of gold there is in the world; and when we say there is not gold enough to do the business of the world, we are answered there is so much gold here and so much there. I think these estimates are in very many cases made because the parties have a scheme or a position to maintain. You will find, if you look over these different estimates, that I will be borne out in the assertions I have made.

Mr. President, I shall leave that subject. I mentioned India. I wish to have inserted in the RECORD an article I intended ro read and comment upon, which appeared in the Financial News of January 3, 1900, written by Mr. Moreton Frewen, who is well known to most of us. The article is on the condition in India and the suffering there. It is a very interesting presentation. It makes a pathetic picture, and I ask that it may be inserted in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The article referred to is as follows:

INDIAN FAMINE AND INDIAN MINTS—"STARVATION BY LEGISLATION"—THE NEW DRAIN OF GOLD TO THE EAST AND THE BANK RATE.

[By Moreton Frewen.]

A serious famine has again overtaken some millions of our fellow-subjects in India, and the public are appealed to for funds to assist the government of India to fulfill its duties. What is wanted is not food, but money to buy food. Thanks to the liberal railway policy of the past fifteen years, supplies can be obtained from districts within India which enjoy a surplus, in order to feed sufferers within the famine areas. It was the same with the famine of two years since. Lord George Hamilton asked our community for money subscriptions—for cash and not for kind—on the ground that there was no real scarcity of food anywhere, but that money was sorely needed. The official figures, published a little later, showed that he was right and that in the worst famine districts the price of a pound of rice was at no time so high as the price of a pound of wheat in London.

It would not be becoming to mince matters merely to avoid ruffling the susceptibilities of official vivisectionists, and I wish to be permitted to record my conviction that the closing of the Indian mints by our Government is murder. With mints closed, whenever there is a local scarcity, whether in the Deccan, the Punjab, or elsewhere, while individuals will starve to death, vast numbers of people are going to suffer horribly, and this reduced vitality makes them the easy victims of the ordinary Indian fevers. When we accuse official India of this odious crime, one official and then another gets up and splutters rage and denial; but not one of these has ever found any reasoned reply to our repeated statement that the closing of the mint involves the death, after cruel suffering, of our fellow-subjects and that their real famine reserve fund, accumulated during centuries, is in their ornaments and their hoards of silver bullion.

Let me once again quote the evidence of an eyewitness, Mr. Forbes Mitchell, a well-known Calcutta merchant. Mr. Mitchell wrote to me during the last famine that he had seen a peasant from one of the worst famine districts arrive in Allahabad with bangles and other ornaments which, had the mints been open, would have coined into 1,980 rupees; but the mints were closed, and accordingly this poor man had to part with his little hoard of uncoined silver for 600 rupees; so that the closing of the mints took from this one man 1,380 rupees and reduced this famine fund, in a village where people were dying of starvation, by just that amount. Does this justify my assertion that this precious scheme of tampering with the Indian silver currency is murder; and if it does not, then why not? And so I ask why we here are to subscribe those 1,380 rupees, when the government of India can itself subscribe them by merely opening its mints and coining them, and why again we are to put our hands in our pockets, not to help people who, with mints open, are well able to help themselves, but that we may prolong the life of a currency experiment which is not merely unscientific, but is shamefully immoral—is an experiment in human suffering?

Well did Mr. David Yule, the president of the Bank of Calcutta, declare of this amazing trick, "Enforced scarcity of money is the only hope on which the famine-begetting gold standard depends. To become wealthy the government of India is endeavoring to render itself and its trading community destitute." Such, then, is the position; we are once again being asked to give our sovereigns for these poor Indian sufferers. But let us watch what happens if we do. The sovereign goes to Calcutta, is there exchanged for 15 rupees, and, together with 5,000,000 more sovereigns, is thereupon locked up in a "war chest," never to appear again; they remain to look well on paper and to help to maintain a bogus confidence in this precious gold-standard experiment. Five million sovereigns have in this way been grabbed and stowed away in Calcutta; no turn of the exchanges can bring them back to the life of trade; for the want of these 5,000,000 sovereigns, which would naturally be here irrigating the ducts and the drying water courses of our trades, our bank rate, which would be 4 per cent, is now 6 per cent, while every industry in the country is to be pinched of necessary accommodation.

In an admirable leader, on December 18, on the "Scramble for gold," and on the reserves of gold in the Bank of England and in the chief banks of the Continent, that excellent monometallic organ the Scotsman says:

"The chances are that it (the period of stringency) will be much more prolonged than has been anticipated up till now. The natural cure for such a situation is, of course, a lessening of the pressure at present borne by the existing supplies—in other words, a contraction of trade. This is an eventuality which has now to be prepared for as the only healthy solution of a problem that has been sprung upon us."

Currency, in short, is not the handmaid of commerce; but commerce is the handmaid of the currency. The incumbent must be lopped or must be lengthened to fit the bed Procrustes has designed for him.

The Scotsman next proceeds to point out that while in the Bank of France the gold reserve is £2,250,000 larger than a year since, yet its discounts and advances are £7,300,000 higher, while its note issues are £6,600,000 higher. The Imperial Bank of Germany holds £2,500,000 less gold than it did a year since; it has £8,300,000 more of loans and discounts and a larger note circulation by £1,000,000. "The banks of Russia, Belgium, and Italy are in the same case with the Imperial Bank of Germany." Is it possible, under these conditions of acute pressure, that the government of India is to be permitted to lock up a further 5,000,000, 10,000,000, 20,000,000, 50,000,000 sovereigns in order to starve both her citizens and our industries? And do we recall the situation of this prodigious currency experiment? The responsible officials of the government of India, Sir James Westland at their head, proposed a currency scheme which left us all betwixt laughter and tears.

Not a shred or tatter of this preposterous scheme was permitted to survive the inquiry; it was laughed out of court. But, lo! a committee is appointed by the secretary of state for India, which committee devises a brand-new scheme of its own, and it is this precious scheme of half a dozen ex-statesmen from India, with a London exporting merchant or two thrown in, which to-day is permitted to tamper with the currency of 300,000,000 people over there, and, indeed, with the currency of 40,000,000 people here. It is not an official, a responsible, scheme at all; it is the creation of a number of amiable amateurs in contraction, who were selected by the secretary of state because of their alleged impartiality; in other words, because, never having learned anything about currency, they had the less to forget.

Let me refer the Indian government, struggling to-day with famine, to an interesting analogy. At the session of the Agricultural Congress of the Nine Governments of Central Russia, at Orel, in May of last year, M. Georges Boutmy, of Odessa, said of Russia's variation from her silver standard:

"During the five years which preceded the famine of the year 1897–98 Russia exported 506,000,000 poods more and obtained in exchange 84,000,000 roubles less than during the five years which preceded the famine of the year 1891–92. If we had kept our legitimate silver standard, these 506,000,000 poods of food and 84,000,000 roubles, lost to us through the gold standard, would have been saved to us and would have sufficed to have spared Russia the frightful famine which devastated actually 19 provinces, with a population of 30,000,000, cruelly decimated by the typhus and by the scurvy, those satellites of famine. The famine of 1891 claimed 656,000 human victims. These hundreds of thousands of men, who were swept off by actual famine, are the human sacrifices, sacrificed to the golden calf by the fanaticism of its worshipers."

M. Boutmy proceeds to show that as the result of the famine of 1891 no less than 78 per cent of the men recruited for the army were found to be "incapables."

Because of the experiments of the Indian government the gold question to-day transcends in importance all other questions. If India, in place of drawing her trade balances in silver, is for the future to draw them in gold, the drain of gold to the East is certain to keep the European and American money markets in a perpetual state of irritation and unrest. In February of last year, under the heading, "The coming drain of gold to India,"—a drain which has in the interval already doubled our money rates, although still in its infancy—you permitted me to lay before your readers these figures, which let me repeat. I then wrote (February 1, 1899):

"That anyone with the figures disclosed by Mr. Goschen's silver committee of 1875 can placidly contemplate a drain of gold to India, instead of a drain of silver, passes all comprehension. The report of 1875 shows that between the years 1848 and 1874 the aggregate trade balance in favor of India was no less than £511,000,000 sterling, a sum largely in excess of all the gold which came during those years from California and Australia combined. Recall that this drain to India was to a much smaller population, with far less facilities for export than to-day. To switch off, then, by our own legislation, the specie hunger of these myriads and to substitute for a demand for silver a demand for gold—truly a change so revolutionary promises in the next century such a catastrophe as may involve all national debts."

Emerging from the age of steam, we stand to-day upon the threshold of the electrical age. Our manufacturing supremacy in the coming years will depend upon vast conversions. Very probably, indeed, the ocean tides at our doors may be destined to give us the motive power we have derived in the past century from cheap coal, and may protect us against the competition of the cheap pauper labor of the far east. But the harnessing of the tides will require an almost incalculable expenditure, and upon the fact that we can borrow at cheaper rates than our foreign competitors our commercial victory may depend. To choose such a time, then, to start a drain of gold to the East is suicidal; and yet this is exactly what is now going forward in full sight of all men. Your Calcutta correspondent, in the letter you published last Thursday, showed that during the single month of November the Indian government had commandeered 8,600,000 rupees of gold from Australia and Japan—say £600,000. In addition to which they had earmarked, and thus taken out of the market, some £850,000 in gold, which sum is now lying in the Bank of England.

It is safe to say that the exploitation of our money market by the Indian government has already ruined scores of traders here and in America, traders who are even now ignorant of the cause which has led to their disaster; and I am sure that the estimate is no whit overstated that the appropriation of only 5,000,000 sovereigns for Calcutta has written down the value of securities in London and New York by fully £100,000,000 sterling. And all this crime and confusion for what? For a half-baked project that is not merely immoral, but which every intelligent student of currency conditions knows will eke out not more than a year or two of life, but which will entail for all time our discredit abroad and our disaster at home.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I believe I shall close for the present. I may take occasion to deliver some further observations to-morrow or on some subsequent day.

Mr. ALDRICH. If it is not the desire of the Senator from Colorado to proceed to-morrow, and if no other Senator then wishes to occupy the floor, I shall move that the Senate adjourn until Monday; but if that Senator or any other Senator desires to go on to-morrow, I shall not make the motion.

Mr. MORGAN. I should perfer that the Senate would not adjourn over to-morrow for several reasons.

Mr. ALDRICH. Then I withdraw the suggestion.

Mr. TELLER. I think I shall not consider my speech concluded, but shall merely suspend for the time being.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator reserves his right to the floor?

Mr. TELLER. I reserve my right to go on at a later day.

AGREEMENT WITH BANNOCK AND SHOSHONE INDIANS.

Mr. SHOUP. Yesterday I called up the bill (S. 255) to ratify an agreement made with the Indians of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation in Idaho and making appropriation to carry the same into effect. The bill was in process of being read at the hour of 2 o'clock, when it was laid aside for the purpose of taking up the regular order. I now request that the bill be taken up and concluded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill named by him. Is there objection?

Mr. CULLOM. I should like to have an executive session; and I inquire of the Senator whether the bill will occupy any more time than will be required for its reading?

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Idaho wants to have the bill passed.

Mr. SHOUP. I think there will be no discussion regarding the bill. I desire to have it passed.

Mr. CULLOM. I think the Senator had better let the bill go over until to-morrow. It is now almost 5 o'clock.

Mr. SHOUP. I give notice, then, Mr. President, that after the completion of the morning business to-morrow I shall call up the bill.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After fifteen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, January 19, 1900, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 18, 1900.

FIRST LIEUTENANT IN REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Second Lieut. Preston H. Uberroth, of Pennsylvania, to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed George E. McConnell, promoted. Mr. Uberroth is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

SECOND LIEUTENANTS IN REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Third Lieut. Abert H. Buhner, of California, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed A. R. Hasson, resigned. Mr. Buhner is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Third Lieut. John Mel, of California, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Preston H. Uberroth, promoted. Mr. Mel is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

POSTMASTERS.

William C. Campbell, to be postmaster at Los Gatos, in the county of Santa Clara and State of California, in the place of Josephine J. Gaffney, whose commission expires March 13, 1900.

Franklin W. Rollins, to be postmaster at Ellsworth, in the county of Hancock and State of Maine, in the place of H. H. Harden, whose commission expires February 11, 1900.

CIVILIAN MEMBER OF BOARD OF ORDNANCE AND FORTIFICATION.

Thomas J. Henderson, of Illinois, as civilian member of the Board of Ordnance and Fortification, vice Joseph H. Outhwaite, resigned.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY—INFANTRY ARM.

To be second lieutenants, to rank from January 1, 1900.

Davis C. Anderson, of Ohio, now serving as second lieutenant, Fortieth Infantry, United States Volunteers.

Robert D. Carter, of the District of Columbia.

Douglas Potts, of the District of Columbia, now serving as private, Troop C, Fourth Cavalry, United States Army.

TRANSFER IN THE ARMY.

Second Lieut. Arthur S. Cowan, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, January 12, 1900, with rank from February 16, 1899.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY—ELEVENTH CAVALRY.

To be second lieutenants, to rank from August 12, 1899.

Sergt. Maj. Dennis P. Quinlan, Eleventh Cavalry, United States Volunteers.

Private Otto W. Rethorst, Eleventh Cavalry, United States Volunteers.

Henry C. White, jr., of Ohio.

James D. Keene, of the District of Columbia.

[NOTE.—The above-named persons were nominated to the Senate December 6, 1899, and confirmed December 20, 1899. This message is to correct errors in the dates of rank of the nominees.]

COMMANDER ON RETIRED LIST.

Commander Augustus G. Kellogg, United States Navy, retired, to be a commander on the retired list of the Navy on account of incapacity resulting from long and faithful service, and from sickness and exposure therein, as provided in section 1588 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

SECOND LIEUTENANT IN MARINE CORPS.

John G. Muir, a citizen of the District of Columbia, to be a second lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps, from the 13th day of January, 1900, to fill a vacancy existing in that corps.

PROFESSOR OF MATHEMATICS IN THE NAVY.

William S. Eichelberger, a citizen of Connecticut, to be a professor of mathematics in the Navy, from the 15th day of January, 1900, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade.

ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS IN THE NAVY.

George W. Reeves, jr., a citizen of New Jersey, and Walter T. Camp, a citizen of Connecticut.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 18, 1900.

CONSUL.

Robert W. McWade, of Pennsylvania, to be consul of the United States at Canton, China.

MEMBER OF BOARD OF ORDNANCE AND FORTIFICATION.

Thomas J. Henderson, of Illinois, to be civilian member of the Board of Ordnance and Fortification.

SURVEYOR-GENERAL.

Eli S. Warner, of St. Paul, Minn., to be surveyor-general of Minnesota.

ASSAYERS.

Charles H. Sherman, of California, to be assayer of the mint of the United States at San Francisco, Cal.

Roswell K. Colcord, of Nevada, to be assayer in charge of the mint of the United States at Carson, Nev.

INDIAN AGENT.

J. Blair Shoenfelt, of Douglas, Wyo., to be agent for the Indians of the Union Agency in the Indian Territory.

POSTMASTERS.

Everett William Greene, to be postmaster at Patton, in the county of Cambria and State of Pennsylvania.

Samuel G. Wilson, to be postmaster at Bridgeport, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania.

George D. Leonard, to be postmaster at Newberry, in the county of Lycoming and State of Pennsylvania.

George C. Bell, to be postmaster at Portland, in the county of Middlesex and State of Connecticut.

Thomas H. Williams, to be postmaster at Mount Carmel, in the county of Northumberland and State of Pennsylvania.

Michael Weyand, to be postmaster at Beaver, in the county of Beaver and State of Pennsylvania.

Charles Harris, to be postmaster at Westport, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut.

George H. Ford, to be postmaster at Waterville, in the county of New Haven and State of Connecticut.

Sanford E. Chaffee, to be postmaster at Derby, in the county of New Haven and State of Connecticut.

Rufus C. Reed, to be postmaster at Damariscotta, in the county of Lincoln and State of Maine.

George R. Foster, to be postmaster at Lisbon Falls, in the county of Androscoggin and State of Maine.

Arthur A. Dinsmore, to be postmaster at Dover, in the county of Piscataquis and State of Maine.

Henry E. Merrick, to be postmaster at Henniker, in the county of Merrimack and State of New Hampshire.

Abbie H. Souther, to be postmaster at Cohasset, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts.

Charles Newhall, to be postmaster at Danvers, in the county of Essex and State of Massachusetts.

Charles H. Griffin, to be postmaster at Oakfield, in the county of Genesee and State of New York.

Thomas Moritz, to be postmaster at Glenridge, in the county of Essex and State of New Jersey.

Evan F. Benners, to be postmaster at Moorestown, in the county of Burlington and State of New Jersey.

Wesley Mulford, to be postmaster at Unadilla, in the county of Otsego and State of New York.

Dudley S. Mersereau, to be postmaster at Union, in the county of Broome and State of New York.

William J. Guthrie, to be postmaster at Philadelphia, in the county of Jefferson and State of New York.

John C. White, to be postmaster at Knoxville, in the county of Tioga and State of Pennsylvania.

Lewis W. Snyder, to be postmaster at Bethlehem, in the county of Northampton and State of Pennsylvania.

J. M. Brothers, to be postmaster at Knox, in the county of Clarion and State of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *January 18, 1900.*

The House met at 1 o'clock p. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

INSTRUCTION OF THE DEAF AND DUMB.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut and Mr. LANHAM of Texas as directors of the Columbia Institution for the Instruction of the Deaf and Dumb.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. LANE for one week, on account of important business.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following change of reference:

That the Committee on Military Affairs be discharged from the consideration of so much of House Document No. 291 as relates to estimates for the Rock Island, Ill., Armory, and the Springfield, Mass., Armory, and that said estimates be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, do I understand that was taken out?

THE LATE HON. DANIEL ERMENTROUT.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Saturday, February 3, after the hour of 1 o'clock, be set apart for the purpose of paying fitting tributes of respect to my late predecessor, the Hon. DANIEL ERMENTROUT.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that February 3, after 1 o'clock, be set apart for memorial exercises on the death of the late Mr. ERMENTROUT, of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SIMS. What day of the week is it, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Saturday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, that order will be made.

There was no objection.

REFERENCE BOOKS FOR HOUSE LIBRARY.

Mr. RAY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution I send to the Speaker's desk, and I ask for order, because it concerns every member of the House. I desire to say to gentlemen——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York will suspend until his request for order is complied with. Gentlemen will resume their seats and cease conversation on the floor.

Mr. RAY of New York. In asking this unanimous consent—I desire to say that I will ask in connection with that resolution unanimous consent that all the amendments except the first be disagreed to and the resolution as originally introduced be adopted, for we find that the amendments are unnecessary, and the Committee on Accounts can take care of that matter; but they have no jurisdiction of the original resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the superintendent of documents be requested to furnish the House of Representatives, for the use of the House library, 50 copies of the Revised Statutes of the United States (second edition, 1878), and also 50 copies of the Supplement of the Revised Statutes of the United States (volume 1, second edition, 1874 to 1891).

The amendments recommended by the committee were as follows:

Line 5, after "fifty," insert "two."

At the end of line 8 add the following: "two of which Supplements shall be for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary.

"*Also resolved*, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to furnish, for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary, the indexed Digest of United States Reports, in three volumes, published by the Lawyers' Cooperative Publishing Company; volumes 57 to 97, inclusive, of the Federal Reporter; one copy of Standard Unabridged Dictionary; Bouvier's Law Dictionary, last edition, and American and English Encyclopedia of Law, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House."

Mr. RAY of New York. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say in connection with that that these volumes of the Revised Statutes and Supplement are printed by the Government, so that this involves no expense whatever. It simply means a transfer of those volumes from the Superintendent of Documents, who has them, to the House library; and the librarian tells me, and it comes from all parts of the House, we have had no additional copies since 1886, and those we have have become scattered or lost, and these are absolutely necessary for the use of the House, the members of the House, and the committees of the House. The other amendments which were added by the Committee on the Judiciary we find are unnecessary, because the Committee on Accounts can take care of them. They may supply the books if they deem them necessary. I repeat my assertion, that if unanimous consent is given for immediate consideration, I will ask that all the amendments be disagreed to except the one providing for 52 copies of the Supplement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from New York said there were certain amendments.

Mr. RAY of New York. I ask unanimous consent that all of the amendments be considered as disagreed to except the one providing for 52 copies of the Supplement, 2 of which are for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. RICHARDSON. You mean it to be stricken out of the resolution?

Mr. RAY of New York. That is what I mean.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Then I would like to hear the resolution read as it will be offered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not understand the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I understand the motion of the gentleman from New York to be to strike out all the amendments except so much as gives the House library copies of the Revised Statutes and Supplements.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to strike out all the amendments except that which gives—what to the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. RAY of New York. Two extra copies of the Supplement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the other amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. RAY of New York, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill and resolutions of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 734. An act relating to Cuban vessels.

Senate concurrent resolution 4:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to have a survey made and to submit a report of the survey and an estimate for the improvement of navigation of the Livingston Creek, in Columbus County, N. C., and Lockwood Folly River, in Brunswick County, N. C.

Senate concurrent resolution 17:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 7,500 additional copies of Senate Document No. 164, third session Fifty-fifth Congress, being the report of the Daughters of the American Revolution, 1890-1897, of which 2,500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 5,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

SENATE BILL AND RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill and resolutions of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

Senate concurrent resolution No. 4:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 7,500 additional copies of Senate Document No. 164, third session Fifty-fifth Congress, being the report of the Daughters of the American Revolution, 1890-1897, of which 2,500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 5,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives—

to the Committee on Printing.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 17:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to have a survey made and to submit a report of the survey and an estimate for the improvement of navigation of the Livingston Creek, in Columbus County, N. C., and Lockwood Folly River, in Brunswick County, N. C.—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

S. 734. An act relating to Cuban vessels—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state that in the change of reference made a few moments ago the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] states that he addressed the Chair for the purpose of making some observation in regard to the change of reference. The Chair would suggest to the gentleman from Iowa that he enter a motion to reconsider.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I enter the motion now because I did address the Chair, but the Chair apparently did not hear me. I do not want to lose any right of objecting to that reference, and I enter the motion now to reconsider.

The SPEAKER. That will be considered as pending.

ADDITIONAL CLERKS FOR TWELFTH CENSUS, ETC.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider the House bill 2179, the census bill, and pending that, I desire to have some agreement made with reference to the length of general debate on the bill.

Mr. COX rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. COX. I want to call attention to a resolution that has been sent in.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Tennessee that there is a motion already pending. The gentleman from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. COX. Well, he generally has the floor. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Tennessee suspend until this matter is disposed of?

Mr. COX. Certainly; anything to be agreeable. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOPKINS. How much time, I will ask my colleague from Connecticut, will be satisfactory for general debate?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, as far as I understand the opposition to this bill, it is confined to section 4.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that members speak loud enough for the House to hear.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, as far as I understand the objection to this bill, it is confined to an amendment which is entitled section 4, authorizing the Director of the Census to contract outside of the Government Printing Office, or any Government establishment, for the publication of the reports. I will suggest to my colleague that general debate might run not later than 4 o'clock. That would give an hour, perhaps, for consideration under the five-minute rule, and give the House an opportunity for a vote on section 4 as to striking out the section, or any amendment that may be proposed to that section.

Mr. HOPKINS. Then I ask that general debate on the bill be closed at 4 o'clock, or not later than 4 o'clock, as it may be that we shall not want to occupy that time, and then that the bill be taken up under the five-minute rule and reported back to the House not later than half past 4.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not later than 5, it being understood that we shall have a vote on the amendment to strike out section 4.

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent, pending the motion to go into Committee of the Whole, that general debate on this bill shall extend to not later than 4 o'clock to-day, after which five-minute debate shall be had on the bill, with the right to vote on the last amendment to the bill, and that the vote be taken not later than 5 o'clock.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, the right to vote on the amendment to strike out section 4?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes; that is right.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me it is not wise to limit the five-minute debate to an hour. The whole controversy is to be on this fourth section, and I have no doubt there are many members of this House who desire to be heard upon it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania objects.

Mr. DALZELL. To the latter part of it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we ought to let the five-minute debate run until 2 or 3 o'clock to-morrow. I shall object to staying here until 5 o'clock and then have to remain to vote on one or two roll calls until 6 or 7 o'clock.

Mr. HOPKINS. Suppose we limit the general debate to 3 o'clock.

Mr. RICHARDSON. How long will you allow the five-minute debate to run?

Mr. HOPKINS. Until 4 o'clock.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Suppose you have not read the bill through by that time?

Mr. HOPKINS. There is only one proposition in it that there is any controversy about.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would suggest that the general debate be limited, and then let the Committee of the Whole control the five-minute debate.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I object to running the debate till 5 o'clock, and then to have possibly two roll calls and keep us here until 6 or 7 o'clock, when we have nothing to do to-morrow.

Now, let us go on with it until 5 o'clock—I do not care under what rule, whether it be general debate or five-minute debate—and then to-morrow debate it for an hour or so, and vote at 2 o'clock or 3 o'clock. Let us vote in the middle of the day. Let us not stay here until 6 o'clock this evening, when there is no necessity for it.

The SPEAKER. The motion before the House is that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill which has been reported.

Mr. HOPKINS. Before that motion is put, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be closed at 4 o'clock to-day.

The SPEAKER. Pending that the gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be closed at 4 o'clock. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

And then, on motion of Mr. HOPKINS, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2179) relating to the Twelfth and subsequent censuses, and giving to the Director thereof additional power and authority in certain cases, and for other purposes, with Mr. CANNON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read at length.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, it is understood between the gentleman from Illinois and myself that he is to control half the time of general debate and that the other half be controlled by myself. That is the understanding, is it not?

Mr. HOPKINS. If that is agreeable to the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I make that request, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut suggests that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] control one half of the time for general debate and that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RUSSELL] control the other half. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, I crave the attention of the members of this committee on both sides of the Chamber during the brief period that I shall occupy your time for the purpose of attempting to make some explanation of a portion of this bill, upon which there seems to be a sharp controversy among the members. The bill, excepting the fourth section, meets with the unanimous approval of the Census Committee of the House, and I take it that there will be no division of sentiment in this Chamber as to the propriety of enacting that speedily into law. There is a division of sentiment as to whether section 4 shall be ingrafted onto this bill and made a part of the law covering the taking of the Twelfth Census. That section reads as follows:

That the Director of the Census, whenever he shall find that there is a probability of delay in the printing or publishing of the census reports beyond the period required by the said act of March 3, 1899, be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to contract with any individual, copartnership, or corporation for the printing and binding, or either, of any of said reports, in the manner prescribed by law for the letting of public contracts.

Mr. RAY of New York. That, I understand, is a proposed House amendment.

Mr. HOPKINS. That is a House committee amendment. When the law creating the present Census Bureau was passed it seemed to be the universal sentiment, not only among the Republicans of the House and Senate, but amongst Democrats as well, that some provision should be made that the volumes relating to population, mortality, vital statistics, the products of agriculture, and manufacturing and mechanical establishments should be prepared, tabulated, printed, and published by the 1st day of July, 1902, and so strong was that sentiment in the last Congress that that provision was ingrafted into law, and the Director of the Census was authorized and directed to bend all of the energies of his Bureau to that end. Any work authorized by law, outside and independent of those volumes, was subordinated to that for the purpose of getting these statistics out in time to make them useful to the general public.

In the publication of the volumes relating to the Tenth Census nine years expired from the time the census was taken before the last volumes were published and given to the general public. In the Eleventh Census the publication of these reports extended over a period of more than eight years, and people not only in this country, but statisticians and scientific men abroad found when these reports were published, at an expense of many millions of dollars to the Government, that they were absolutely useless, and the statisticians and scientific men in this country resorted to other methods and means to acquire the information contained in these delayed reports, in order to do the work that they were engaged in in their several callings.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman allow a question right there on that one point, so that he can carry it along?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, was not the delay largely the result of the compilations of the Census Office, and did they not keep men compiling the work for some four years after they should have closed up that work?

Mr. HOPKINS. Well, I can answer that. There is no question but what there was some delay in that, but I have a tabulated statehere showing the time when many of these reports were sent to the Public Printer. For example, I find that after the proof plates were ready and returned to the Public Printer the fourth volume of Vital Statistics was retained by the Public Printer one year four months and sixteen days before it was published at all. I find that the Report on Agriculture, after the proof plates were ready, was retained by the Public Printer for nine months and one day; that volume 2 of Manufactures was retained one year one month and twenty-six days, and there were many other of these reports that were detained by the Public Printer in the same manner.

Mr. SOUTHARD. Do you mean it required that time to print them?

Mr. HOPKINS. In making this statement I am making no assault upon the Public Printer. The present occupant of that office is a gentleman whom I have known for more than a quarter of a century. He is a personal friend of mine, who is thoroughly competent to discharge the duties of that position, and I am not saying that if the work could be done there, Mr. Palmer could not do it as well as anybody else. I am simply calling the attention of members of this committee to the fact that in the Tenth Census the reports were delayed nine years and over, in the Eleventh Census the reports were delayed for some cause or another eight years and over, and that the Fifty-fifth Congress, when it made preparation for taking the Twelfth Census, provided that these five great divisions, which are of paramount importance to the general public, should be published, printed, and delivered to the general public by the 1st day of July, 1902.

Now, I want to say to the gentlemen of this committee that if it can be shown that the present Public Printer, with the force that he has or the force that he can acquire, can meet the demands of the Fifty-fifth Congress, and can take the many tons of tabulated statistics that will be presented to him and publish them within the time prescribed by this law, there is no member of this House who will be more anxious than I to have this work done at the Government Printing Office.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I wish to bring to your notice section 28 of the Statutes at Large, 601, which reads as follows:

The Joint Committee on Printing shall have power to adopt such measures as may be deemed necessary to remedy any defect or any delay.

Again, here is another section which I want to bring to your attention:

All printing offices in the departments, now in operation or hereafter put in operation by law, shall be considered a part of the Government Printing Office and shall be under the control of the Public Printer.

Now, there are two statutes which seem to cover that point.

Mr. DALZELL. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. HOPKINS. Let me answer the gentleman from Georgia first. I can say that the law to which I have just called attention, limiting the publication of these five great divisions of the Twelfth

Census to the 1st day of July, 1902, is a provision that was never incorporated in any previous census law since the foundation of the Government.

The Director of the Census is not desirous of taking this printing away from the Public Printer; but if the Congress and the country demand that he shall have these reports printed and ready to distribute to the general public by the 1st day of July, 1902, then this Congress must take some action in order to facilitate the publication of these reports. Or if Congress shall do away with this limitation and say that they care not whether these reports are published at that time or at a later date, then that emergency is met and the Director of the Census will go on with his work as prescribed by law. Under existing law, as I will demonstrate, if gentlemen will permit me to proceed for a few minutes——

Mr. DALZELL. Will you allow me to ask you a question?

Mr. HOPKINS. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DALZELL. You said a few moments ago that you were perfectly willing that the Public Printer should conduct this work if it could be done within a proper time. Now, I want to know whether or not the Public Printer was called before your committee and consulted with reference to this matter?

Mr. HOPKINS. Why, Mr. Chairman, the Public Printer was not called before the committee, but I have a letter here from the Public Printer, in answer to a letter of the Director of the Census, in regard to these publications, and during my time I will send both letters to the Clerk and have them read from the desk. The letter from the Director of the Census estimates the amount of work that will be sent to the Public Printer, the number of volumes within the limitations of the publications of the Tenth and Eleventh censuses, and then asks him, as you will see from the letter, how long it will take him to do the work that will be thus sent him by the Director of the Census.

Mr. DALZELL. Was that letter written before or after this bill was agreed upon?

Mr. HOPKINS. It makes no difference.

Mr. DALZELL. I understand my friend to say it makes no difference. I suppose that means it was written after.

Mr. HOPKINS. I trust my friend from Pennsylvania will not go into factious opposition.

Mr. DALZELL. Not at all. But I am seeking information.

Mr. HOPKINS. The gentleman does not show the spirit I would like to see prevail in this debate.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, CENSUS OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1902.

DEAR SIR: Referring to our conversation of the 12th instant, relative to the time required by you to print and bind the several census reports, I herewith submit an estimate of the number of volumes, number of pages, and size of the edition which will probably be issued.

	Number of volumes.	Pages.	Edition.
Population	2	2,103	60,000
Agriculture	2	1,848	20,000
Manufacture	4	3,378	30,000
Vital Statistics	2	2,500	40,000
Compendium	3	3,210	150,000

On this basis, will you please inform me as to the length of time necessary to do the work, manner in which copy must be supplied, how many pages of copy will be required per day, and all other information which may be necessary?

Can you work on the several reports at one time if part of the copy for each is furnished?

Kindly advise me at an early date on the above points.

Respectfully,

W. R. MERRIAM,
Director of the Census.

Hon. F. W. PALMER,
Public Printer, Washington, D. C.

Mr. HOPKINS. Now, I should like to have the members of the House listen to the letter written by the Public Printer as to the time it will take him to do the work.

Mr. SHATTUC. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HOPKINS. I prefer not at the present time.

Mr. SHATTUC. Just a moment.

Mr. HOPKINS. Very well.

Mr. SHATTUC. Will you agree to an amendment in the fifteenth line, after the words "any individual, copartnership, or corporation," to insert "employing exclusively union labor," so that it will read:

SEC. 4. That the Director of the Census * * * be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to contract with any individual, copartnership, or corporation employing exclusively union labor for the printing and binding, or either, of any of said reports, etc.

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes, sir; I have no objection whatever to that.

The Clerk read as follows:

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE,
OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC PRINTER,
Washington, D. C., January 16, 1902.

SIR: Your letter of January 13, relative to the time required by this office to print and bind the reports of the Twelfth Census mentioned by you (Population, Agriculture, Manufactures, Vital Statistics, and Compendium), did not reach this office until yesterday morning.

In reply, I have to say that, on the basis of your estimate of the number of volumes, pages, and number of copies of each report to be issued, it is believed that the work can be done by this office in three hundred working days. In order to accomplish this, however, it will be necessary for the Census Office to begin to furnish copy in large quantities at the commencement of the period of three hundred working days; to furnish it from day to day during a period of one hundred and fifty days in an amount sufficient to keep a large force of compositors employed without interruption on account of lack of copy, and to furnish all the copy for the reports within one hundred and fifty days from the time the work is commenced.

It will also be necessary for your office to promptly return, and from day to day, the proofs for plating and printing, that the bindery may have a sufficient length of time within which to do the binding. The copy should be prepared and supplied in such a manner that no radical changes therefrom will be required in the proofs.

Work could, of course, proceed on several reports at one time, but, in order that presswork and binding may be commenced before all of the reports are in type, it would be much better to place this office in possession of the copy of complete reports at a time.

If it is proposed to insert illustrations in any of these reports, the material for them should be supplied, if possible, in advance of all the copy for the publication in which they are to appear.

Respectfully,

F. W. PALMER, *Public Printer.*

Hon. W. R. MERRIAM,
Director of the Census, Washington, D. C.

Mr. HOPKINS. The members of the committee will notice that Mr. Palmer says that it will take about three hundred working days, which covers a period of one year, and we know that under the most favorable conditions set out in that law it will be absolutely impossible for the Director of the Census to comply with all of the requirements set forth in Mr. Palmer's letter, or for the Public Printer himself to meet all the requirements set forth in his letter and that of the Director of the Census, because it is perfectly plain that after they have finished their final revision it may be necessary for them to make repeated corrections and changes even. So that anybody who is familiar with the subject knows that instead of being one year, as the Public Printer says, it will take him one and a half years from the time that this material is given to him by the Director of the Census before the public will receive the reports.

Now, the Director of the Census tells me that it would be impossible, if this bill is incorporated into law, giving him the extra force that he here asks and giving him all the facilities that he has now under the present law, to send this material to the Public Printer or to any printer before the 1st day of January, 1902. Now, mark that, gentlemen—that it is utterly impossible, with the facilities that he has or with any that can be given him, to get this material to the Public Printer or to any printer at all before the 1st day of January, 1902. That leaves only one hundred and fifty working days to get out these volumes relating to these five great subdivisions and meet the requirements of the law. So that, on the showing of the Public Printer, there must be an extension in the time limit in the present law or else this amendment that I propose must be adopted.

Now, gentlemen, that brings me to the question of whether we should have this all done by the Public Printer or delay the issue to the public of statistics that are so important to the people of this country, so important to scientists, so important to all statisticians, just for the sake of benefiting a few trades-union people that work in the Government Printing Office. It is admitted that we can get as good work done, and it can be done as cheaply in New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, or in any of our large cities, as it can be done by the Public Printer. The only question that is presented here, and the one that has created the opposition to the committee amendment, is the fact that the work done by the Public Printer is union work. The union men in the Government Printing Office claim that if this amendment is adopted the work will be done by nonunion men.

I wish to say to the members of this committee that there is no intention upon the part of the Director of the Census to have any part of this work done in other than a union office. It is his purpose to take these five great divisions and give as much of the work to the Public Printer as it is possible for him to do. If he can do two divisions, he will have two of them; if he can do three divisions within the six months, he shall have the three divisions. It is impossible, on his own statement, to do all five of them; so that the Director of the Census must of necessity go outside for some of this work.

I can see no reason, gentlemen, why that should not be done, because the wording of the amendment prepared by the Director of the Census fixes it so that he is compelled to go to the Public Printer. When he finds he is compelled to go outside, he only goes outside to the extent that is necessary for him to go in order to comply with the law. I want to say here and now, speaking for the Census Committee, and speaking for the Director of the Census, that the work done outside will be done by union labor. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUC] evidently has an amendment of that kind, but whether an amendment of that kind is adopted or not, if this recommendation of the Census Committee is adopted, the work that goes outside will be done by union labor.

I have received, as many of you have, a number of telegrams from labor unions in New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago. They have

been stirred up by the union in the city of Washington to the belief that this is taking away the labor from the union. I want to dispel that illusion and do away with that impression. I want to say, as I have said, if this amendment is adopted, whatever work may necessarily go outside will be done by the same class of labor that it is being done by in the Printing Office in the city of Washington, and that, it seems to me, takes away all the argument that has been urged by the committee of labor who waited on me in Washington and all the arguments that can be inferred from the telegrams that have been showered on the members on both sides of the House.

Mr. FARIS. Will the gentleman allow me an interruption?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes.

Mr. FARIS. In order to dispel the illusion and get rid of the impression, why not, as chairman of the committee, inform the House that you will offer the amendment which will dispel and destroy it?

Mr. HOPKINS. If that is the will of the House, I will do so when we reach it, or I will allow the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUC], who first called my attention to it and who has evidently prepared an amendment of that kind, to offer it, and if it is offered by him I will accept it.

Mr. FARIS. I make the suggestion at this time in order that we may all understand that it will be offered and accepted.

Mr. HOPKINS. I will say that if the member from Ohio who interrupted me [Mr. SHATTUC] and indicated that he had an amendment of that kind will offer it I will accept it. The only observation I make is that inasmuch as we have put the obligation upon the Director of the Census to have these publications at a certain time, we should clothe him with full authority to do the work. The adoption of the committee amendment is no assault on the Public Printer. We all know the amount of work he has to do, and we all know that he is compelled at times to lay aside some of the work which is sent there to be done in order to meet the demands of Congress on emergency printing.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Will the gentleman allow me a question right there?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. If the gentleman will permit me to preface my question, I will say that I am in favor of the bill, and I have no hostility to labor organizations. I have heard him intimate that he would accept an amendment providing that the work done under the bill should be done by union labor. I desire to ask the gentleman what right has Congress, if it intends to let this work outside to the lowest bidder by competition, to limit it to a certain price? Have we the legal right to do it?

Mr. HOPKINS. I will say this, that the argument is made that all public printing should be done by the Public Printer. I have a letter from the Postmaster-General in which it is shown that the Postal Guide and a large amount of work in that Department is done outside, and done as efficiently and as well done as at the Public Printing Office. And the Appropriations Committee, so ably presided over by my colleague who is now in the chair, has appropriated as much as $125,000 at one time for work of that kind to be done outside the Government Printing Office; and it is only done because the Public Printing Office is limited in its capacity and can not do the work.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. How about the legal question?

Mr. HOPKINS. I think they have that right. We may differ about that.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman from Illinois allow me just one question?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman says he will accept an amendment providing by law that the public printing done outside shall be done by union men. I want to know if that is not rank class legislation?

Mr. HOPKINS. Each member must settle that for himself. I make this statement only to show that there is no hostility to the ranks of labor, as is contended by those opposed to this amendment. There would be no opposition, or at least but little strength to it, were it not for this issue that is made; and knowing as I do that the labor at the Government Printing Office is union labor, I deem it but fair to those who favor the amendment, as I do, and fair to the Director of the Census, to say that this amendment is not hostile to that labor, and the work that is to be done outside, if this amendment is adopted, will be done by the same kind of labor found in the Government Printing Office. Now, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BABCOCK. I should like to ask the gentleman a question. If the amendment which the gentleman has proposed is adopted, and all this work shall be done by union labor, does not that antagonize the present law and practice, to wit, that the work shall be let to the lowest bidder? When these bids are advertised and a "rat" office comes in and offers to do the work for 75 per cent of the price of a union office, what is the Director going to do in that case?

Mr. HOPKINS. Why, Mr. Chairman, there is not a "rat" office in America that can do this work. There is not a "rat" office in this country that can do any part of it. And putting the amendment in as suggested by the gentleman from Ohio is, in my judgment, a limitation that is not in conflict with existing law. It is simply a limitation without affecting the law that is already upon the statute books.

Mr. LANDIS. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HOPKINS. I will yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. I notice you have a letter from the Public Printer.

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes.

Mr. LANDIS. Was the Public Printer summoned before your committee?

Mr. HOPKINS. I have answered that question two or three times.

Mr. LANDIS. I did not hear the gentleman's answer. I was not present at the time.

Mr. HOPKINS. The Public Printer was not before the committee, but the Public Printer has the estimates of the Director of the Census, as shown in the letter read at the Clerk's desk, and has taken a day or two to figure out the matter, and has shown that it will take him three hundred working days to do the work.

Mr. LANDIS. What do you mean by a working day—eight hours?

Mr. HOPKINS. Why, I mean just what the Public Printer means by that.

Mr. LANDIS. Well, he means by that a day of eight hours.

Mr. HOPKINS. I don't know whether he means that or whether he does not.

Mr. LANDIS. The Public Printer tells me that he can easily put on three shifts of workmen.

Mr. DALZELL. And do the work in one hundred days.

Mr. HULL. That will take him only one hundred days.

Mr. LANDIS. Yes. In other words, the Public Printer tells me and other members of Congress that if he is given an opportunity to explain to the committee he can demonstrate conclusively that he can do this work.

Mr. HOPKINS. The Public Printer does not have to demonstrate to anybody but the Director of the Census. If this amendment is adopted, and the Public Printer can show to the Director of the Census that he can do this work in one hundred days or within the time limited by law, then he gets the contract under this proposed amendment.

Now, there is no hostility on the part of the Director of the Census to the Public Printer; none at all; but the gentleman can appreciate his desire, when he is required to get out the work, that he shall be put in a position where he can demand that the work shall be done. If the Public Printer can do this work, as indicated by my friend from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS], then I can assure my friend that the work will be done at the Goverment Printing Office, because there is no more faithful friend of the Public Printer than the Director of the Census himself.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I want to ask the gentleman if he will not accept a substitute for section 4 which will bridge over this controversy and answer the purpose that he is seeking to establish?

Mr. HOPKINS. Well, I will look at the amendment.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Let me read it.

Mr. HOPKINS. How much time have I occupied, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Thirty minutes.

Mr. HOPKINS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Let me read the proposed substitute:

The Public Printer, on the request of the Director of the Census, shall establish in the office of the Twelfth Census a branch printing office, which shall be under the direction and control of the Public Printer.

Mr. HOPKINS. If you will make it "sufficiently large to meet the demands of the Census Office"——

Mr. LIVINGSTON. You will accept it?

Mr. HOPKINS. I personally will favor it. I will consult with the balance of the committee; and if they are satisfied, I shall be satisfied.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Is there any provision for the taking of the census of deaf-mutes outside of asylums?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes; we have covered that.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, there will be no controversy between my colleague [Mr. HOPKINS] and myself, and no difference of opinion, I take it, in this House as to the desirability of the prompt issuing of the census reports. The Committee on the Census in the last Congress recognized the fact that it was desirable to have the results of the census in the hands of the public as early as possible, and much sooner than the results were given to the public in the last census and the census preceding.

So, then, the Committee on the Census in the last Congress, recognizing this desirability of prompt issuing of census reports, put in the census bill this provision:

The only volumes that shall be prepared or published in connection with the Twelfth Census, except the special reports herein provided for, shall

relate to population, mortality, and vital statistics, the products of agriculture and of manufacturing and mechanical establishments as above mentioned, and shall be designated as and constitute the census reports, which said reports shall be published not later than the 1st day of July, 1902.

That is a provision of law which is mandatory upon the Director of the Census, and, as I construe it, mandatory upon the Public Printer, and, as I construe it, mandatory upon the Congress of the United States, in furnishing to the Census Director and to the Public Printer a proper and sufficient appropriation to carry out that mandate. I think it is a provision which is mandatory upon everybody who has direct or indirect connection with the enumeration and the publication of the census reports.

Further than that, Mr. Chairman, the committee in the last Congress put this provision in the bill, and to that I call the special attention of the members of this committee. It is section 25:

That the Director of the Census is hereby authorized to print and bind in the Census Office such blanks, circulars, envelopes, and other items as may be necessary, and to print, publish, and distribute from time to time bulletins and reports of the preliminary and other results of the various investigations required by this act.

Under the provisions of that section the Director of the Census is authorized to establish in the Census Office a printing office, the limitations of which are only described by the limitations of the appropriation which the Congress of the United States makes for that purpose. The design of that section was intended to facilitate the early publication of all the results of the census taken this year. Now, you will bear in mind that the reports of the census, which are mandatory in their publication by July 1, 1902, cover four topics, the topics of population, of vital statistics, of manufactures, and of agriculture. Those are to be the principal reports of the census this year, as they were in the Tenth and Eleventh censuses.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] has read from a statistical table showing the time taken in the publication of those reports in the Eleventh Census. This table was furnished by the Director of the Census and given to the committee. It comprises a report of the time when the final proof was received at the Printing Office and of the time when the whole edition of the work was ready for distribution, as to each one of the volumes relating to agriculture, population, manufactures, and vital statistics.

The gentleman gave you the time which elapsed between the receipt at the Public Printing Office of the final proof and the distribution of the edition in three cases. All together there were ten volumes, and the average time which elapsed between the receipt at the Government Printing Office from the Census Office of the final proof for those volumes and the handing over by the Public Printer to the Secretary of the Interior of the completed edition for distribution to the public was less than six months. The edition of one volume was ready for distribution in two months and six days, one in two months and eighteen days, one in one month and three days, one in three months and twenty-nine days, and the third volume of the Report on Vital Statistics in one month and fifteen days. I have the statement, as follows:

The following statement shows the time required by the Government Printing Office to print certain of the Eleventh Census reports after the finally revised plate proof was returned "ready for the press:"

	Final proof returned.	Edition delivered.	Time taken to print.
Agriculture	May 23, 1895	Feb. 24, 1896	9 months 1 day.
Manufactures 1	Oct. 29, 1895	May 5, 1896	6 months 7 days.
Manufactures 2	Mar. 28, 1895	May 23, 1896	13 months 26 days.
Manufactures 3	Apr. 3, 1895	June 9, 1895	2 months 6 days.
Population 1	Apr. 13, 1895	July 1, 1895	2 months 18 days.
Population 2	July 31, 1897	Sept. 2, 1897	1 month 2 days.
Vital Statistics 1	Sept. 29, 1897	Jan. 27, 1898	3 months 29 days.
Vital Statistics 2	Jan. 8, 1897	Jan. 8, 1897	
Vital Statistics 3	Dec. 7, 1894	Jan. 22, 1895	1 month 15 days.
Vital Statistics 4	July 20, 1895	Dec. 12, 1896	16 months 16 days.

The statement of the date upon which the last proof was returned "O. K. and ready for press" is from the records of the Government Printing Office, and that showing date of delivery of the printed edition was furnished by the document clerk of the Interior Department, to whom all reports were delivered for distribution.

Now, there is a reason why in the three cases there was so long a time elapsing between the receipt of the final proof from the Census Office and the delivery by the Government Printing Office of the full edition. It was hoped, it was suggested, that the Government Printer might come before the Committee on Census and give officially the reason why this long time elapsed in the delivery of the edition of three volumes; but, unfortunately, it was not the sense of the committee that the Government Printer should appear before us. So we have only to take the statement as we get it, unofficially from the Printing Office, in reference to the time that ensued between the receipt of the final proof in the Government Printing Office and the delivery of the edition.

I think I ought in justice to this committee to state that there were peculiar reasons why some of the reports of the last census were delayed so long after the type was set up and after the final proof had gone to the Printing Office from the Census Office. It is at least a fact that one volume was held up by an officer of the Government, superior even to the Public Printer or the Director of the Census, for further examination and further correction. It is a fact, also, that there was in the case of one or two of these volumes a large volume of type which was held up from distribution awaiting final proofs, so that it could not be used for other purposes. My colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HEATWOLE], will touch further on this matter. Mind you, then, as now, the Government Printer was restricted in the facilities of his office in doing the public work by the appropriations the Congress of the United States gives him for that work.

Mr. BROMWELL. May I ask the gentleman a question right there?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. BROMWELL. What are the comparative facilities of the Public Printing Office as to equipment and number of employees and their power to do this work as compared with the power to do this work in 1890?

Mr. RUSSELL. The facilities of the Government Printing Office are increasing very rapidly from year to year. I can not answer that question in detail, but I should say the present facilities of the Government Printing Office over ten years ago were much greater—nearly one-third greater.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. I would like to ask the gentleman, Did the committee make an effort to ascertain the comparative ability of the office at this time and the last time to do this work?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, it was suggested to the Census Committee and it was requested of the Census Committee that the Public Printer be called before that committee to make a statement of his facilities for doing the work and his equipment, and also as to the time in which he would be occupied in doing the work; but that suggestion, unfortunately, did not meet with the favor of the majority of the committee, and so——

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. Is it not a fact that the committee claimed that if the Public Printer was brought before them he would demonstrate conclusively that he could do the work?

Mr. HOPKINS. That statement is not correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. The members of the committee opposed to this amendment did not fail to try to have the Public Printer appear before the Census Committee.

Mr. GAINES. Did you go down to the bottom of that inquiry—did the Public Printer refuse to testify or afford you the information, or was he asked?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Public Printer did not refuse; he was not invited to come before the committee. We suggested in committee——

Mr. GAINES. Was that question asked the Public Printer?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, to questions by individual members of the committee and by members of this House interested in this subject, asking the Public Printer whether he could do this work, he replied that he could do the work in any time that the law designates or mandates him to do it in, provided the Congress of the United States gives him an appropriation with which to do the work.

Mr. GAINES. Why is it that other parts of the census prepared under the present law are so far behind, if they are behind? If for the lack of means, they should be furnished.

Mr. RUSSELL. In a moment I will answer that question. The records of the last census show that the Government Printer, under a mandate of law, would have been prepared to issue any edition then, and the record of that office is a very creditable one. Further, the chairman of the committee has had read at the desk a letter addressed by the Director of the Census to the Public Printer, with the reply of the Public Printer to it, relating to the facilities for doing that work within a specified time.

That letter did not appear before the Committee on the Census, and the only answer we can make to it is by the inquiries made by individual members of the House of the Public Printer. From letters of the Public Printer, which will be read later, he states, as I have said before, that he stands ready, with the facilities of the greatest printing establishment in the world, to do any kind of work in any specified time, provided only the Congress of the United States gives him the money to do that work with.

Mr. GAINES. The gentleman has not answered my question. I asked it very seriously and for my own enlightenment and that of others around me.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will answer that later.

Mr. GAINES. My question is why that work under the former law has not been completed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can not yield now.

Mr. GAINES. The gentleman said he would answer my question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, the Public Printer is entirely dependent upon the appropriation you make here for him to do the work. The letter which he gave in answer to the inquiry of

the Director of the Census was based in his estimate upon the force actually employed to-day in the Printing Office, working eight hours a day, and without any calculation or estimate whatever as to the increase of that force or as to the working of two or three shifts for a force.

So I stand here, not representing the Government Printer any more than I am the Director of the Census, to declare to this House that if the House does its duty in making an appropriation the Government Printer will execute the work which the Director of the Census gives him to execute within any specified time which the law requires him to do it.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman permit me a statement right there?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I was in the office of the Public Printer two days ago and was told that they had expensive plates and machinery bought for the other census, which are not by any means obsolete, and with which the work could be done with great economy, and I do not believe the House, under the circumstances, will hesitate to give this work to him.

Mr. HOPKINS. Will my colleague allow me? In response to the suggestion made by the gentleman from Georgia, an amendment has been prepared by my colleague from South Carolina which I desire to read——

Mr. RUSSELL. I submit that my colleague ought not to interrupt me. There will be time enough to consider that later. In reply to the gentleman from Tennessee, in the first place, as I said at the beginning, the general census law which we passed in the last Congress contemplated a public printing office to be established in the Census Office for the purpose of printing the schedules and preliminary work of the census. That printing office has not been fully established, but a printer has been appointed and some of the machinery has been purchased, and the office is getting under way, and it is calculated to enlarge it as the Director of the Census may recommend, under the appropriations of Congress later.

But the schedules which have been prepared and sent out to the supervisors of the census for preliminary work have been turned into the Government Printing Office. I have here the records, showing not only the capacity of the Government Printing Office to execute these orders, but the facility and promptness in executing the orders in a short space of time.

The copy for the general agricultural schedules, which is to be used all over the country in the collection of statistics, was received at the Government Printing Office November 2, 1899. Seven million five hundred thousand copies of that schedule were required to be printed. The proof was sent to the Census Office November 7, five days after it was received at the office. The proof was returned to the Printing Office December 8, one month and one day having elapsed while the proof was kept at the Census Office.

The matter was put on the press December 12 at the Printing Office, four days after the final proof was received, and nearly the whole number of copies, 7,500,000, of the schedules were delivered January 15, 1900. The copy for the population schedule, the schedule which is to be used all over this country in the enumeration of the people, was received at the Government Printing Office October 9, 1899. This first order required the printing of 1,500,000 copies.

Mr. BROMWELL. How many pages in that schedule?

Mr. RUSSELL. A number of pages; that is my memory. The proof was sent to the Census Office October 11, three days after being received. The final proof was returned to the Printing Office November 24, one month and thirteen days having elapsed while the proof was held in the Census Office for correction. The proof was put on the press November 29, five days after the final proof was received at the Printing Office, and the whole edition was completed December 29, the very day it was received.

Mr. RAY of New York. I would like to ask the gentleman from Connecticut if there is any explanation that he knows of for that delay at the Census Bureau in reading these proofs?

Mr. RUSSELL. I must say to the gentleman from New York that I do not consider that an extraordinary delay. I think the members of this committee should bear in mind that the time necessarily consumed in the revision of proof between the original proof and the sending back of the final proof must be considerable. It has to be very carefully gone over, additions have to be made, and that is one reason why I am utterly opposed to doing the work outside the Government Printing Office, so admirably equipped for that work. [Applause.] I think that the gentleman from New York and others will understand that I am not reading these in any way as a criticism on the Census Office. I think they were expeditious in the time they consumed.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. If it should be developed that additional facilities should be provided for printing the reports, does the gentleman think this Congress should provide those facilities?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. If the gentleman the chairman of the committee is prepared to offer an amendment to accomplish that purpose as a substitute for this section, will the gentleman accept it?

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me go on with my remarks and consider that later. The schedule on mortality statistics was presented to the Printing Office October 14, and the proof was sent back to the Census Office October 19, five days afterwards. The final proof was sent to the Printing Office November 24, in one month and five days. And the whole edition was printed December 15, sixteen days after it was put to press.

So I have statistics in reference to the printing of other circulars and schedules which have already gone to the Public Printer from the Director of the Census, all indicating a pleasant disposition on the part of the Public Printer to meet, just so far as we give him the means of meeting, all the requirements put upon him by the law and by the Director of the Census.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman indulge me just one more inquiry?

Mr. RUSSELL. Just a moment.

Mr. GAINES. Just a question. I asked you why it was the Eleventh Census had not been completed. You have directly, I infer, answered me by saying the reason was that the machinery and force of the Public Printer were used in printing for the Twelfth Census.

Mr. RUSSELL. Why, as far as I know, Mr. Chairman, the Eleventh Census has been completed.

Mr. GAINES. I do not so understand. I was informed to the contrary, and I want to know why.

Mr. RUSSELL. I referred to a statistical table which the Director of the Census presented to us, showing in the Eleventh Census what time had elapsed in the publication of the four subject volumes which are dealt with in this bill, the time between the receipt of the final proof and the delivery of the general edition. I do not care to go over that again, and I can not yield further now, Mr. Chairman.

Now, I am opposed to this amendment which is put upon the Senate bill for two principal reasons. First of all, it overthrows, or attempts to overthrow, an established policy of this Government in reference to public printing. For the first time we, by law, are asked to give to an officer of the Government authority to go outside of our Government Printing Office and contract, without any limitation whatever, except as the general law may put those limitations upon him, for work in any other office that he sees fit, anywhere.

Now, if this amendment carries, it may be made a precedent which may be called upon by any Department, by any bureau of any Department, by any officer of the Government, to take printing away from the Government Printing Office. Whatever may have been its intention, I consider it a very dangerous step to take. We have a Government Printing Office, admittedly the largest and best-equipped office in the world, an office purposely equipped to be ready at any time to fulfill any mandate which the law of Congress may put upon it. We have a Government Printing Office which necessarily must be more fully equipped than any single private office anywhere in this country.

So I am opposed on general principles to doing anything which shall say, either directly or by inference or by a precedent, that we are inclined to take away the Government printing from our own office. Further than that, Mr. Chairman, if, as I deny now, there be an emergency in the case of the printing of the census reports—and it can only come through the failure of Congress to make sufficient appropriation to do the work—if the emergency comes through that failure, now is not the time when we should enter upon any such legislation as this proposed amendment for contract work.

Mr. RAY of New York. May I interrupt the gentleman right there?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. RAY of New York. Would the gentleman from Connecticut have any objection to substituting an amendment here for section 4, which is an amendment, to provide that the Public Printer, at the request of the Director of the Census, should furnish additional facilities, so as to do this work within the time required by law?

Mr. RUSSELL. I see no objection to any such direction or mandate, if you please, as that; but I will say to my friend from New York [Mr. RAY] that Congress has got to give the Public Printer the means to do this work, and that comes right back to why I object to this amendment at this particular time. According to the statement of the chairman of the committee, which I think was the statement made by the Director of the Census before our committee, the Director of the Census will not have this work ready for any printer before January, 1902. We are to have an-

other Congress before then. We are certain to have another Census Committee. Who will be the Public Printer we do not know. What the Director of the Census will have to furnish to the Public Printer we do not know.

Mr. DALZELL. I should like to ask the gentleman a question for information.

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. DALZELL. Suppose this section 4 were stricken out of the bill, would not the Public Printer, under the law, be compelled to do this printing?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will recall, I stated at the very beginning that I believed the provision in the census law which we passed in the last Congress was equally mandatory upon the Public Printer and upon the Director of the Census. And, further, I stated that I believed as long as that law stood upon the statute book it was mandatory upon the Congress of the United States to give to both officials the money necessary to carry out its provisions.

But to go on, the Director of the Census can not tell to-day the amount of printing, the amount of work, if you please, that he will call upon the Public Printer or any other printer to do in January, 1902. I take it that depends largely upon the extent to which he will tabulate the statistics gathered, and that it will depend upon the length of the reports, the deductions, so to speak, which he will make. Now, the time when we should make this amendment, if we make it at all, is some time in the next Congress.

And further, answering my friend from New York, I am inclined to think, with full deference to the Committee on the Census, with the chairman of which I am very sorry to disagree on this matter, and standing, as I ought to and as I do, for all its prerogatives, I think that such amendment should properly accompany appropriations which are subsequently to be made for the work in the Census Office and for the work in the Government Printing Office, and may come, perhaps, from another committee of this House than from the Census Committee.

In other words, to sum this point up, outside of my objection to the general taking away of public printing from the Government Printing Office, I can not see either the necessity or the reason or the good judgment of anybody in passing such an amendment as is proposed at this time. I am inclined to think that it is harmful. I am inclined to think that it is not good policy for the Director of the Census, so far as his personal convenience and his personal safety are concerned.

I am free to say to the members of this House that if I was a Government official in charge of a great Government establishment directed to do a certain work, and there were tools at my next door to finish that work, the law prescribing how it should be done, relying upon Congress for the appropriation necessary to have it done, I should very much prefer to have that work finished under Government control than to take the chances of the annoyances, and, as I believe, the expenses, of going outside and engaging in open competition in contract work.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman allow me one question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. SIMS. I want to see if I understand the gentleman. Your contention is that in order to do the work, and to do it in time, all that is needed is a sufficient appropriation, and that it is premature now to consider that question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have the personal assurance of the Public Printer that if Congress gives him the money he will do any amount of work in any time which you require of him; that he has the facilities, so to speak, in the Government Printing Office. He has the general facilities and the machinery to do it, but he has to have the money to run that machinery and to pay his help. He can not do the work, perhaps, working the force now employed there only eight hours a day. He possibly could not do the given amount of work in the specified time with that force working that number of hours.

Mr. CLAYTON of Alabama. I want to know if you do not think it would cost the Government less to have the Government Printer do this work than it will if we go outside?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is my opinion that it would cost the Government in the end very much less, because the statistics of the last census, the statistics of the census before, and the record of Government printing show that the great expense was in the correction of proof—the changes. Why, I will ask the attention of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] to the fact that in one of the volumes of the last census, I think it was, 700 pages set up and printed had to be entirely stricken out.

Mr. GAINES. That was under civil-service machinery, too, was it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Now, do not ask me to call attention to the date of the years when that was done.

Mr. GAINES. I do not care under whose administration it was done, if it was done under the civil service.

Mr. RAY of New York. I dislike to interrupt the gentleman when he is speaking, but I want to know if he can point out any objection to a provision in this bill which would enable the Director of the Census to call upon the Public Printer, if the Public Printer is to do the work, and insist upon his providing additional facilities for doing this work? Is there any objection to such a provision?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not if Congress gives him the means to do it.

Mr. RAY of New York. Very well, we have nothing to do with that, and the Committee on the Census has nothing to do with that, and the whole of the work will go for naught unless the Committee on Appropriations gives the money. Now, if such a provision is to come here, and there is no objection to it, it seems to me it would do away with the whole difficulty, provided the Committee on Appropriations sees fit to appropriate the money.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very likely; but I believe that provision is in the original law we passed.

Mr. RAY of New York. Mine would not be substituted for it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think there is any need of an amendment or substitute at this time.

Mr. BABCOCK. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. BABCOCK. I agree with the gentleman heartily. I do not think there is any need of an amendment nor any committee amendment or substitute; but here is something that has been suggested which is practically a direction to the Public Printer to prepare himself to do that work promptly, to comply with a mandatory law. I will read it to the gentleman, and ask him if he approves it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I presume, without your reading it, I would approve it; but will the gentleman consider that that properly and in its proper place goes with the means that Congress must give the Public Printer to increase his facilities. That is all. I do not want anything to go into this bill which will delay the preliminary work of the census, which shall in the slightest degree seem to arouse a feeling of lack of harmony between the Government Printer and the Director of the Census. I do not know that there is any to-day.

I am sure that this amendment was not suggested by the Government Printer, for the Government Printer has had no opportunity to pass officially upon it; and I assume that the Director of the Census proposed it and asked the committee of this House to adopt it because he thought it was necessary. But in that I think he was wrong for the two principal reasons which I have given; and, Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to say anything which shall be construed as proposing or suggesting any impediment or any handicap upon the prompt issuing of the census reports.

If it be necessary, at the proper time, if it be the opinion of the committee that now is the proper time, to put such instructions as the gentleman from Wisconsin has in his hand in this bill, I am content. My principal contention is that I do not want here and now to take any action that will in any way destroy or tend to destroy the Government Printing Office or establish a precedent that the Government printing is going outside, up and down the country, offering itself to the lowest bidder. Sometimes contracts go to the highest bidder. I think we ought to prevent that, at least.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LACEY. Before the gentleman takes his seat, as I understand, one of the troubles is the liability of conflict between the Public Printer and the Director of the Census?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think there is any such liability.

Mr. LACEY. If section 4 were adopted, and we added this provision:

Provided, That before letting any such contract the Public Printer shall first find and certify in writing that such probability of delay exists.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not in favor of that, because that brings up the principal reason why I am opposed to taking away the printing from the Government Printing Office. If you are going to do that, abolish the Government Printing Office, for which we are appropriating hundreds of thousands of dollars every year.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Suppose the Public Printer's Office should be destroyed by conflagration. How would you have it printed then?

Mr. RUSSELL. Outside, I suppose.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Suppose the work should be arrested by labor strikes, which is a supposable case. How would you have that work done then?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is not so supposable a case as the other. We would have to do the best we could. The very instant the destruction came to that Printing Office we would set about the institution of another Printing Office, or else go entirely out of the Government printing business.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Suppose there was no appropriation available for that purpose?

Mr. RUSSELL. We would make it as soon as we convened.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. You would have to have an extra session of Congress, likely.

Mr. RUSSELL. Perhaps not.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Is not the only effect of this amendment to provide against a contingency of that character?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think not. Suppose we should all die; I suppose something would have to be done by which another Congress might come together.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. But it could not be done before the 1st of July, 1902.

Mr. RUSSELL. Before I close I want to say I have here a number of letters. I think they come from heads of nearly every Department; but they are certainly from the Treasury Department, from the Agricultural Department, from the War Department, from the bureaus of the different Departments, all giving instances not only of the facility, but of the promptness of the Government Printing Office in executing work. I wish to call particular attention to the letters from the Treasury Department and the Agricultural Department, which I will submit:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *Washington, June 15, 1898.*

DEAR SIR: Secretary Gage wishes me to express his high appreciation of the valuable service recently rendered to this Department by Capt. H. T. Brian, foreman of printing. The short time the Department has set for itself in which to float the new war loan made it necessary that the utmost expedition should be employed in every feature of the plan to successfully place the issue of bonds. It was, therefore, especially gratifying that the Government Printing Office was able to deliver almost 4,000,000 circulars, pamphlets, and blanks in the short period intervening between 3.30 p. m. Saturday and 9 a. m. Monday last.

Very truly, yours,

F. A. VANDERLIP,
Assistant Secretary.

Hon. F. W. PALMER, *Public Printer.*

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS,
Washington, D. C., November 2, 1899.

MY DEAR CAPTAIN BRIAN: I beg to express my appreciation of the promptness with which you have printed the Monthly Summary. The tables of imports for consumption were unusually difficult, and the total number of pages was larger than that of any preceding month except that of June, yet it reaches me on the 3d day of the month—just two weeks earlier than that of the June number, which corresponded in size with this. What more can I say in expression of my appreciation?

Very truly, yours,

O. P. AUSTIN, *Chief of Bureau.*

Capt. H. T. BRIAN,
Foreman of Printing, Government Printing Office.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
DIVISION OF PUBLICATIONS,
Washington, D. C., November 29, 1899.

DEAR SIR: I inclose herewith press copy of the Report of the Secretary of Agriculture for 1899, in which are indicated a very few slight corrections which were overlooked in the hurry of reading the proof, and I will be obliged to you if you will have the same corrected in the remainder of the edition.

I am directed by the Secretary of Agriculture to thank you for the very great promptness with which the report was handled and printed.

Very respectfully,

GEO. WM. HILL.

Capt. H. T. BRIAN,
Foreman of Printing, Government Printing Office.

Just one other point. I want to call the attention of the committee to this point, which is essential. You can not contract your Government printing into an outside establishment where you have a seal of secrecy over it or the absolute control over it that you have with the Government Printing Office; and that is an important consideration, not only for Congress, but every department of this Government. I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HEATWOLE].

Mr. HEATWOLE. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill, with the exception of the fourth section. The gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on the Census, sent to the Clerk's desk a letter from the Public Printer, in which he stated that the work required by the Census Office could be done in three hundred working days, and I assume that to mean three hundred working days of eight hours each. There was nothing said in that letter about putting on two extra shifts, or being able to do the work in a third of the time, but in order to be sure as to the capacities and facilities in the Public Printing Office I telephoned the Public Printer and received the letter in reply which I would like to have read from the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE,
OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC PRINTER,
Washington, D. C., January 17, 1900.

DEAR SIR: In accordance with your request made to me this morning, I will state that the Government Printing Office is equipped with material and employees to execute promptly the reports of the Census Bureau for the Twelfth Census in the time required.

It seems to me that the allotment of contracts for this printing to private or corporate parties would leave the superior facilities already provided by the Government in this office to be unused.

If the Census Bureau, in the event that the work should be done here, will prepare and furnish copy so that uninterrupted employment can be given to our compositors, and proof shall be returned promptly, with few radical alterations, this office will do its share toward the completion of the census reports in time to meet all necessary requirements.

The records of this office will show that the work when completed will be of the highest order and the cost in all respects favorable to the Government, and yet with just compensation to the people employed.

Yours, respectfully,

F. W. PALMER, *Public Printer.*

Hon. JOEL P. HEATWOLE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. HEATWOLE. Members of the committee will see from this letter that the Government Printing Office is able to do all the work that will be required by the Director of the Census.

Mr. BROMWELL. As I understand it, he is able to do it with the facilities and force he now has. The only thing is that they shall furnish him with copy and corrected proof promptly. If we want it done more rapidly, all we have to do is to give him more men and better facilities.

Mr. HEATWOLE. It is proper to say that the Government Printing Office is in a better position to do this work than any office we can reach by contract. It is estimated that the thirteen volumes brought into question by this amendment and the communications which have been made by the Census Committee will comprise 13,039 pages. One hundred men working eight hours a day would set this matter in about 260 days. By working two shifts they could set it in 130 days, while by three shifts of eight hours each this type could be set in less than 100 days. By increasing the force there is no question but what the type for the entire edition of 13,039 pages could be set in less than 50 days.

In order, however, to put these publications all in type it will be necessary that the copy be furnished almost at the same time—that is, that all the copy go into the office at once. It will require to set these pages about 260,000 pounds of type, costing about $90,000, which will give members of the committee some idea of what it will require in a private office to do the work.

Now, there has been something said about the delay in the published reports of the Eleventh Census. At one time during the printing of those reports there was tied up in the Government Printing Office over 26 tons of type waiting proof and revised proof and additional copy from the Census Bureau.

Mr. GAINES. Then it was not the fault of the Public Printer.

Mr. HEATWOLE. Evidently not.

Mr. BROMWELL. I want to ask the gentleman from Minnesota if there is, within his knowledge as a practical printer, in the United States any establishment which could hold up that large amount of type while waiting for copy, if it had the contract to do the printing?

Mr. HEATWOLE. There may be, but not to my knowledge. I understand there is a very extensive nonunion establishment in Indiana which might do some of this work, but as to its capacity I know nothing. Now, assuming that this 26 tons of type was nonpareil, the value of this metal tied up would be between twenty-five and thirty thousand dollars. It will be noted, therefore, that if a private individual or corporation is to do this work he or it would necessarily require additional type, additional machinery, and, of course, additional space.

It is true that a contract could undoubtedly be made with a private individual or a corporation to publish these reports at a certain price, including minor changes from the Census Office, but it would not be possible to make a contract that would properly protect the interests of the United States if the methods under which copy and proofs were prepared under the preceding census is to be repeated in the coming census. That is to say, in many instances it was almost entirely rewritten on the proof and changes made in the complete proof which required alterations in the stereotyped plates. This not only occasions much delay, but is very expensive, and extras would increase the cost indefinitely.

Now, from the report that I have on my desk from the Public Printer, and which I may send to the Clerk's desk later to have read, I notice that one of the books of the last census of 794 pages was put in type but afterwards was "killed"—that is, the type was distributed and had to be reset. That is to say, new copy had to be furnished before the work could be finished. Of course it is required that the Census Office shall be duly diligent in furnishing copy and in correcting proof, if it is expected that the Printing Office will get the work out on time. There are two sides to this question. I want to call attention to the statement of Mr. King, chief statistician of the Census Bureau, and alluded to by the gentleman from Illinois. He spoke about one of the reports on manufactures requiring thirteen months and twenty-six days, and Vital Statistics No. 4 requiring over sixteen months to be printed.

It is proper to say that we have been unable to obtain any data in regard to why this delay was occasioned. That work was done under another administration of the Printing Office. But the gentleman failed to read the statement showing that Population No. 1 was gotten out in two months and eighteen days; Population No. 2, in one month and two days. And as an illustration of what that work is, I will show you one of the volumes on vital and social statistics. It is this large volume which I hold in my hand, a volume consisting of tabulated matter, called two-price matter. That is, where there are 10,000 ems composition, nonpareil, on a page, it would count for the printer 20,000 ems composition. This is one of the books. I do not know how many there were in the edition, but that was gotten out in a remarkably short time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HEATWOLE. I should like a little more time.

Mr. LANDIS. I ask that the gentleman be given time to conclude his remarks.

Mr. HEATWOLE. I should like to have a letter from the Public Printer read.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will yield ten minutes longer to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HEATWOLE] is recognized for ten minutes.

Mr. HEATWOLE. I insist that there is practically no limit to the work which can be done by the Government Printing Office. It seems to me that every report required by the Director of the Census can be gotten out in the time needed to meet the requirements of the Census Office. But in view of the fact that something has been said in relation to delays, I desire to send to the Clerk's desk and have read a statement from the Public Printer in regards to those delays.

The Clerk read as follows:

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE,
OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC PRINTER,
Washington, D. C., January 16, 1900.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of January 13, inclosing copy of memoranda furnished by the Director of the Census estimating the length of time which will be required to print certain reports of the Twelfth Census, and a statement showing the time occupied by this office in printing certain reports of the Eleventh Census, and stating that you should like to have any data I may be able to give in regard to the progress of the work on the last-named reports, and whether or not copy and final proofs of such reports were promptly furnished by the Census Office.

Appended hereto is a statement showing the dates upon which copy was furnished to this office of the following-named reports of the Eleventh Census, the date upon which the final plate proofs were marked "ready for press," and the date upon which the completed work was delivered to the Department of the Interior: Population, 1890, Part I; Population, 1890, Part II; Manufactures, 1890, Part I; Manufactures, 1890, Part II; Manufactures, 1890, Part III; Vital Statistics, 1890, Part I; Vital Statistics, 1890, Part II; Vital Statistics, 1890, Part III; Vital Statistics, 1890, Part IV; Agriculture, 1890; Compendium, 1890, Part I; Compendium, 1890, Part II; Compendium, 1890, Part III.

I also inclose herewith copies of communications from this office, calling the attention of the officials having charge of the printing of the reports of the Eleventh Census to the delays of the Census Office in furnishing copy, returning proofs, the submission of incorrect copy—necessitating many changes in proofs—the making of alterations in matter after it had been stereotyped, etc.

I desire to call your particular attention to the copy of a letter addressed by me July 27, 1893, to the Acting Superintendent of Census, stating that there were in the possession of his office, at that date, the proofs of 2,327 pages and 151 galleys of matter belonging to the Final Reports of the Eleventh Census. The type in which these 2,327 pages and 151 galleys of matter was set weighed 52,540 pounds, or more than 26 tons. I also wish to invite your attention to my letter of May 13, 1897, to Hon. Carroll D. Wright, in charge of the Eleventh Census, submitting a statement of the condition of the work of the publications of the Eleventh Census, stating my wish to complete the work at the earliest possible moment, and requesting him to lend his good offices to that end, and to his reply thereto, dated May 14, 1897.

There were 794 pages of the report on Indians put in type, which matter was afterwards "killed" and new copy, making 683 printed pages, furnished. (See letter from Census, dated March 16, 1894.)

It will be seen by reference to the above statement and correspondence that, with the exception of Part II of the Report on Manufactures and Part IV of the Report on Vital Statistics, there was no great delay upon the part of this office in promptly executing the work, while the copy was not furnished in from two to six years after the taking of the census.

The chief of the printing division of the Census Office, in a letter addressed by him to the Director of the Census January 12, 1900, a copy of which was received with your communication, gives the following as an estimate of the various chief statisticians as to the number of volumes, pages, and editions of the reports of the Twelfth Census named: Population, 2 volumes, 2,103 pages, 50,000 copies; compendium, 3 volumes, 3,210 pages, 37,000 copies; agriculture 2 volumes, 1,848 pages, 25,000 copies; manufactures, 4 volumes, 3,578 pages, 25,000 copies; vital statistics, 2 volumes, 2,500 pages, 25,000 copies.

The following is an estimate of the number of employees which will be required to print and bind these reports within three hundred working days, provided there be no delays in furnishing copy and proof reading on the part of the Census Office.

COMPOSITION AND PRESSWORK.

Compositors	100
Pressmen	10
Press feeders	20
Laborers	15
Presses employed	18

PROOF READING.

NOTE.—This includes ordinary author's corrections—one second proof only. Further corrections and proofs, as heretofore required in Census Office, constitute an indefinite proposition. (See letter dated September 15, 1894, from Public Printer to Acting Superintendent of Census upon subject of imperfect copy.)

Copy editors	2
First readers	4
Copyholders	4
Second readers	3
Revisers	2

ELECTROTYPING.

Electrotypers, etc	10
Laborers	2

FOLDING AND GATHERING.

Folders, gatherers, etc. (females)	65

BINDING 411,000 VOLUMES.

Forwarders	30
Casing books	10
Making cases, by machine	4
Stamping cases:	
Males	4
Females	8
Sewing books (females)	100
Laborers	10

RECAPITULATION.

Mechanics	183
Females	193
Laborers	27
Total	403

Working two shifts, eight hours each, it is estimated that the work can be done in 150 working days; three shifts, eight hours each, 100 working days. By increasing the force this time could be shortened, if necessary. It is observed that the chief of the printing division, Census Office, estimates that the work can be completed in 306 working days with the following force: One hundred and twelve mechanics, 30 laborers, 48 girls; total, 190. After a careful consideration of the subject this force is deemed entirely inadequate.

Respectfully,

F. W. PALMER, *Public Printer.*

Hon. JOEL P. HEATWOLE,
Chairman Committee on Printing, House of Representatives.

Mr. HEATWOLE. Mr. Chairman, it will be noticed in this letter that the Census Office had proofs of 2,327 pages and 151 galleys of matter belonging to final reports. This matter was tied up in the Government Printing Office, and really is more type than is usually found in a large printing office owned by a private individual or corporation. It will be noted in the letter read that attention is called to a letter directed to Mr. Wright, Acting Superintendent of the Census, from the Public Printer, in which he showed that numerous pages of matter had been set up for the Census Office and then killed or ordered to be thrown in, and the attention of the Census Office was directed to the fact that such proceedings were extravagant and unwarranted. Repeatedly the attention of the Census Office was called to the fact that proofs were being delayed, and that consequently the work on the printing was delayed.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Who was responsible for the killing of that matter?

Mr. HEATWOLE. The Census Office was responsible for the killing of it. If the Government Printing Office can not do this work in the time asked or prescribed under the provisions of the census act, I do not see how it is possible for any private printing office or office owned by a corporation to print it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HEATWOLE. I ask unanimous consent to append, in addition to my remarks, a statement which I hold in my hand.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to print a statement in addition to his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

Statement showing the dates upon which copy was furnished to the Government Printing Office of certain reports of the Eleventh Census, the dates upon which the final plate proofs were marked "Ready for press," and the dates upon which the completed work was delivered to the Department of the Interior.

POPULATION, 1890, PART I.

First installment of copy received December 20, 1892; additional copy was received December 27, 1892, April 18 and 19, 1894, June 6, 1894, and July 9, 1894; copy commencing Table 23 withdrawn November 13, 1893 (pages 914 to 1021), and returned December 8, 1893; title, contents, etc., received March 13, 1895.

Final plate proof, marked "Ready for press," received April 13, 1895.

Presswork begun March 26, 1894, about one year in advance of volume being completed for press.

This volume was delivered to the Department of the Interior July 1, 1895, and within three months after the return of the final plate proofs.

POPULATION, 1890, PART II.

First installment only of copy (1-877) received December 9, 1895; future installments as follows: 1-292, December 1, 1896; 1-238, December 4, 1896; 293-481, February 25, 1897; 239-432, March 12, 1897; 433-550, May 15, 1897; 551-708, May 27, 1897; 1-36, May 27, 1897 (title, etc.); i-vii, 1-141, May 27, 1897 (plate matter).

Final plate proof, marked "Ready for press," not received until July 31, 1897.

Presswork begun June 15, 1897, or before the final plate proof was returned.

Within thirty-four days from receipt of final proof this volume was delivered to the Department of the Interior, September 2, 1897.

MANUFACTURES, 1890, PART I.

First installment of copy was received February 13, 1895; second installment received June 4, 1895; preliminary matter received September 10, 1895.

Final plate proof, marked "Ready for press," received October 29, 1895.

Presswork begun February 13, 1896.

This volume was delivered to the Department of the Interior May 5, 1896, within seventy-one days after receipt of final plate proof.

MANUFACTURES, 1890, PART II.

First installment of copy was received December 28, 1893; second installment received March 21, 1894; preliminary matter received November 8, 1894.

Final plate proof, marked "Read y for press," received March 27, 1895.

Presswork begun March 27, 1896.

This volume was delivered to the Department of the Interior May 23, 1896, fourteen months after receipt of final plate proofs.

MANUFACTURES, 1890, PART III.

Copy for preliminary matter not received until March 6, 1895.

Final plate proof, marked "Ready for press," received March 26, 1895.

Plate correction received March 28, 1895; proof submitted and received in return March 30, 1895.

Presswork begun July 30, 1894, about nine months in advance of completion of the volume.

This volume was delivered to the Department of the Interior June 9, 1895, within seventy days after return of final plate proofs.

VITAL STATISTICS, 1890, PART I.

First installment of copy received December 31, 1896; Table No. 26 (folios 1259 to 1271) was withdrawn May 14, 1897; preliminary matter received July 31, 1897.

Final plate proof, marked "Ready for press," received September 29, 1897.

Presswork begun September 8, 1897, in advance of completion of volume for press.

This volume was delivered January 27, 1898 (within four months after receipt of final plate proof), to the Department of the Interior.

VITAL STATISTICS, 1890, PART II.

First installment of copy received June 7, 1895; preliminary matter received October 19, 1896.
Final plate proof, marked "Ready for press," received September 23, 1896.
Presswork begun November 9, 1896, in advance of completion of the volume for press.
This volume was delivered January 8, 1897 (within four months after final plate proofs were returned), to the Department of the Interior.

VITAL STATISTICS, 1890, PART III.

First installment of copy received November 23, 1892; title, contents, etc., received November 17, 1894.
Final plate proof, marked "Ready for press," received December 7, 1894.
Presswork begun November 27, 1893, almost one year in advance of completion of volume for press.
This volume was delivered to the Department of the Interior January, 22, 1895, and within sixty days after return of final plate proofs.

VITAL STATISTICS, 1890, PART IV.

First installment of copy was received August 2, 1894; title, contents, etc. received June 5, 1895.
Final plate proof, marked "Ready for press," received July 20, 1895.
Presswork begun September 12, 1896.
This volume was delivered to the Department of the Interior December 12, 1896.

AGRICULTURE, 1890.

First installment of copy was received October 6, 1894; title, contents, etc., received April 25, 1895.
Final plate proof, marked "Ready for press," received May 23, 1895.
Presswork begun October 31, 1895.
This volume was delivered to the Department of the Interior February 24, 1896, within two hundred and seventy-five days from the time of the receipt of final plate proof.

COMPENDIUM, 1890, PART I.

First installment of copy was received November 19, 1892; title, contents, etc., received November 22, 1892.
Final plate proof, marked "Ready for press," received January 24, 1893.
Presswork begun May 17, 1893.
This volume was delivered to the Department of the Interior October 14, 1893.

COMPENDIUM, 1890, PART II.

First installment of copy was received ——; title, contents, etc., received April 14, 1894.
Final plate proof, marked "Ready for press," received May 12, 1894.
Presswork begun December 20, 1893.
This volume was delivered to the Department of the Interior May 26, 1894.

COMPENDIUM, 1890, PART III.

First installment of copy was received September 23, 1896; title, contents, etc., received March 17, 1897.
Final plate proof, marked "Ready for press," received May 22, 1897.
Presswork begun May 8, 1897.
This volume was delivered to the Department of the Interior July 1, 1897.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE,
OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC PRINTER,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1892.

SIR: I return herewith proofs of pages 505 and 745 of the Final Report on Mining Industries in the United States, received from you this day with certain corrections, and have to inform you that these pages were stereotyped some time ago.

Very respectfully,

W. H. COLLINS,
Chief Clerk.

Dr. O. C. KETCHAM,
Chief Printing Division, Census Office.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, CENSUS OFFICE,
Washington, January 22, 1892.

SIR: Referring to your letter of January 21, 1892, returning proof of pages 505 and 745 of the Final Report on Mineral Industries in the United States, with the information that these pages were stereotyped some time ago, I have to advise you that the corrections noted were received two days ago from the author, Dr. Day, and are believed to be necessary for the proper presentation of the report.

Of course, I know it would be much better if all corrections could be made before stereotyping, but you are aware that corrections are frequently made after that process, and these proofs are herewith returned, with the request that the corrections noted be made.

Very respectfully,

O. C. KETCHAM,
Special Agent in Charge, Eighteenth Division.

Mr. W. H. COLLINS,
Chief Clerk, Government Printing Office.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, CENSUS OFFICE,
Washington, June 10, 1893.

MY DEAR SIR: I am glad to be able to inform you that about 700 pages of the report will be ready for plating next week, viz: Insurance Business in the United States, 468 pages; Pauperism and Crime, 235 pages; Compendium, 147 pages. The other proofs are first page proofs, and while they can not be sent for plating next week, I have given very imperative directions for pushing forward the work as rapidly as possible. I am watching this daily and will not allow a moment of unnecessary delay. At the same time I hope you will be good enough to use every endeavor possible to get as many of these reports in type as may be practicable.

Very respectfully,

ROBERT P. PORTER,
Superintendent of Census.

Mr. H. T. BRIAN,
Foreman of Printing, Government Printing Office.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE,
OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC PRINTER,
Washington, D. C., July 27, 1893.

SIR: There are now in the possession of the Census Office proofs of 2,327 pages and 151 galleys of matter belonging to the final reports of the Eleventh Census. Until a large portion of these proofs have been returned here it will be impossible to put in type any more of this work.

Very respectfully,

F. W. PALMER, *Public Printer.*

JAMES H. WARDLE,
Acting Superintendent of Census, Washington, D. C.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, CENSUS OFFICE,
Washington, July 31, 1893.

SIR: I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your favor of the 27th instant, and in reply would state that I appreciate thoroughly the many disadvantages this office labors under in having such a great amount of type locked up in your office, and I shall use my utmost endeavors to have a large portion of the matter released within a very few days.

I have had personal interviews with all the special agents and chiefs of division having matter in hand, and they have given me assurance that within the next ten days they will be able to furnish corrected revises of several hundred pages of proof.

Instructions will be issued at once to all employees having printed matter in charge to pass upon the same more rapidly than has been the practice heretofore.

Very respectfully,

J. H. WARDLE,
Acting Superintendent of Census.

Hon. F. W. PALMER, *Public Printer.*

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, CENSUS OFFICE,
Washington, March 16, 1894.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to respectfully request that the plates now in existence in your office for the final report on Indians be withheld until further orders.

Copy for a revised report will be furnished, and there will be no economy in using the plates now in existence for this revised report.

Respectfully,

CARROLL D. WRIGHT,
Commissioner of Labor, in Charge.

Hon. FRANK W. PALMER, *Public Printer.*

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE,
OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC PRINTER,
Washington, D. C., September 15, 1894.

SIR: I have before me proofs of Appendix, Fire Department and Water Supply for Fire Purposes, pages 1130 to 1237, inclusive, census matter, received in this office on the 13th instant from your bureau, marked "killed."

I find that the original copy of this matter was received here on July 2, and that three separate proofs in connection with it have been sent you. In view of the fact that I am, under the statute, compelled to exercise due economy in the execution of public printing, I inquire if it is possible to secure through your office a definite and final completion of copy now in hand or to be sent here by your authority to appear in the census publications, that such waste and loss may be saved to the Government in future.

The facilities of this office are required for the publication of matter which should reach the public. It needs no argument to show the misuse of funds when this office is engaged in the preparation of hundreds and thousands of pages of matter, supposed to be based upon statistical information collected under authority of law, and then marked "killed" after the third proof reaches your hands.

I shall not feel at liberty to take up any further census copy until it comes from your office with an assurance of its genuineness and completion as a Government publication.

Respectfully,

TH. E. BENEDICT,
Public Printer.

Hon. CARROLL D. WRIGHT,
Acting Superintendent of Census, Washington, D. C.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, CENSUS OFFICE,
Washington, October 5, 1894.

SIR: Your letter of the 15th of September relating to imperfect copy, etc., was duly received.

Since my return to Washington I have given it very careful consideration. I am in entire sympathy with your efforts to secure clean copy before composition, and since being in charge of this office I have done all in my power to secure this result; but with the multitudinous branches of the Census Office, several officers collecting information along kindred lines, I find that each has worked independently and that afterwards the inharmonies of their statements have appeared. In the case you refer to in yours of September 15 the matter was "killed" by the author.

I shall do everything possible to meet your requirements, but now and then shall be obliged, in the interest of economy, of harmony, and of the credit of the Government, to "kill" matter.

Inclosed you will find a copy of an order issued March 31, 1894, bearing upon this very matter.

I gave the chief clerk of your office yesterday verbally a very full statement relative to the condition of matters in the Census Office. I trust you will find everything fairly satisfactory.

I am, very respectfully,

CARROLL D. WRIGHT,
Commissioner of Labor, in Charge.

Mr. TH. E. BENEDICT,
Public Printer, Washington, D. C.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE,
OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC PRINTER,
Washington, D. C., September 17, 1896.

SIR: I desire to inform you that this office is awaiting copy and proofs in connection with census volumes on Vital Statistics, Part II, and Population, Part I. We are not only ready but anxious to receive the matter and complete the work.

If other matter concerning new volumes or parts of volumes of census matter is to be furnished this office, we would be glad to receive same at once and progress the work to completion.

Respectfully, yours,

TH. E. BENEDICT,
Public Printer.

Hon. CARROLL D. WRIGHT,
Commissioner of Labor, in Charge of Eleventh Census.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, CENSUS DIVISION,
Washington, D. C., September 17, 1896.

SIR: In reply to your favor of the 16th, informing me that your office is "awaiting copy and proofs in connection with census volumes on Vital Statistics, Part II, and Population, Part II, and that if other matter concerning new volumes is to be furnished you would be glad to receive the same," I have to say that I hope by the 1st of the ensuing month to furnish you with all copy pertaining to the volumes you mention, as well as the copy for the third volume of the Compendium. The clerks in the division have remained at work, without vacation, during the summer with this end in view, and I see no reason at present why you should not have the copy, or the greater

part of it, for all the remaining census volumes, viz, the ones you mention and third volume of the Compendium, within the next fifteen days.

As to proofs, I have to say that there are now in the office only 168 pages of proof, all of which will be forwarded to-morrow or next day. In this connection I beg to say that I do not think there has been any delay here.

Very respectfully,

CARROLL D. WRIGHT,
Commissioner of Labor, in Charge, etc.

Hon. TH. E. BENEDICT, *Public Printer.*

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE,
OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC PRINTER,
Washington, D. C., May 15, 1897.

DEAR SIR: The following is a statement of the condition of the work on the publications of the Eleventh Census in this office:

Report on Population, Part II. Cast (xiii-clxxv, 1-627) February 18, 1896, to May 10, 1897; plate proof (1-624) sent February 28, 1896, to May 12, 1897; plate proof returned for printing, pages 1-315; waiting on return of remainder of plate proofs and furnishing of title, contents, and index; galley proof first sent on this volume January 23, 1897; work suspended for some time owing to delay in furnishing better part of copy, which was not received until February 25 and March 12, 1897.

Vital and Social Statistics, Part I. About 200 galleys, proof out April 7 to May 12; no proof returned. Census Office gave us to understand that they were not prepared and would not read proof further than to overlook plate matter; galley proof sent for examination of titles and headings only.

Compendium, Part III. Cast (i-vii, 1-1150) January 26 to March 30; plate proof sent February 16 to April 7; returned in part (1-475) March 18 to May 3; now waiting on return of plate proofs; press started May 8, and unless plate proofs are returned more rapidly will have to stop press.

It is my desire to complete this work at the earliest possible moment, and have to request you to lend your good offices to this end.

Respectfully,

F. W. PALMER, *Public Printer.*

Hon. CARROLL D. WRIGHT,
Commissioner of Labor,
in Charge of Eleventh Census, Washington, D. C.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, CENSUS DIVISION,
Washington, D. C., May 15, 1897.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of yours of yesterday, giving a statement of the condition of the publications of the Eleventh Census and requesting my good offices in completing the census work at the earliest possible moment.

In reply, I have to say that the embarrassment at the present time is the result of an arrangement made some time ago with the Printing Office, to the effect that the proof reading on the census copy should be done there, the Census Office only revising the arrangement of headings, etc. This arrangement has not proved satisfactory, as material errors were found, which made reading by copy after the plating was done desirable. Nevertheless, we have driven matters to the utmost extent with the very small force left after disbanding practically the proof-reading section.

This morning all the galley proofs of Part I of Vital and Social Statistics were returned to the Printing Office, so there will be no particular delay on this volume. The thing which embarrasses you most, I judge, is Part III of the Compendium. I have now loaned the Census Office the services of four proof readers, and shall try to secure some from the Department of the Interior for temporary service, in order to push this volume to completion. All that is to be done is simply to read the plate proof by copy to avoid errors.

Part II of the Report on Population will be pushed in the same way. There is copy which will make about forty printed pages still to be sent to Printing Office, as I am informed.

I am exceedingly gratified to know that your office will do everything in its power to complete the census at the earliest possible moment, and I beg to assure you that everything in my power shall also be done. I do not hesitate to say that so far as the Census Office is concerned the last page of copy should have been out of our hands more than a year ago, and would have been had it not been for influences entirely beyond my control.

I am, very respectfully,

CARROLL D. WRIGHT,
Commissioner of Labor, in Charge of the Eleventh Census.

Hon. F. W. PALMER, *Public Printer.*

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE,
OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC PRINTER,
Washington, D. C., July 15, 1897.

DEAR SIR: That the Report of the Eleventh Census on Population, Part II, may be printed and bound without further delay, this office would be glad to have you complete, at your earliest convenience, pages 628 to 824, both inclusive.

Respectfully,

W. H. COLLINS,
Chief Clerk.

CHIEF OF CENSUS DIVISION,
Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, CENSUS DIVISION,
Washington, July 16, 1897.

DEAR SIR: Yours of the 15th instant, relative to Part II of the Census Report on Population, just received.

I am trying to hustle this along as rapidly as possible; you have plate proof complete up to page 627; first proof of pages 628-743 has been returned and second proof asked for, of which pages 628-672 have been received. (673-699 received since above.)

First proof of pages 744-824 has been returned and second proof of 16 pages asked for, the remainder being passed to plate.

We are now clear of everything except such second proof as has been called for, and this will be disposed of just as rapidly as you can send it, being compared for correction only.

The new matter (628-744) will have to be read in the plate by copy, and arrangements have been made to secure additional assistance and put it through very quickly. I hope we can get entirely through with it in a very few days.

Respectfully,

W. A. KING,
Chief Census Division.

Mr. W. H. COLLINS,
Chief Clerk, Government Printing Office.

Mr. RUSSELL. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has fifteen minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman from Illinois now occupy some time?

Mr. HOPKINS. I will yield ten minutes to my colleague [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to provide against contingencies, and that is its sole and only purpose. It involves no question of etiquette between bureaus. The respective bureaus of the Government have no legal or vested right in any particular part of the public service. This is solely and entirely a business proposition.

Some reflection has been made upon the conduct of the committee because it omitted to invite the Public Printer before it to give a statement.

I believe every member of the committee is and was of the opinion that the Public Printing Office has the capacity, or may be given the capacity, to publish the census reports within the time required by the original act; but to provide against contingencies that may possibly arise the committee deemed it wise to give this power to the Director of the Census. Objection has been made that it violates a long-established custom and introduces a dangerous precedent.

There is some force, I concede, Mr. Chairman, in that argument; but when the committee keeps in mind that this is a special kind of work and that the time of its consummation is arbitrarily limited, it seems to me that it is proper for Congress to confer upon the head of this great Bureau this extraordinary power. The man who has charge of this work has been selected on account of his executive ability, because of his integrity of character, and we all know that in all the great functions of government discretion must ultimately be vested in the integrity and the wisdom of some man.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that if this amendment shall prevail there will be no difficulty in relation to the printing of these reports, and the probabilities are that they will be printed in the Government Office. The Director of the Census only asks Congress to give him power to contract for this work elsewhere in the event that any contingency should arise that would make it impossible to get the work done at the Government Office. It seems to me, when we view the peculiar features of the case, its unusual aspect, the grant of authority can not stand as a precedent that would authorize permanent bureaus to procure power from Congress to contract here, there, and elsewhere over the country for work that ought properly to be done by the Public Printer.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Why not vest this discretion in the Public Printer? If he can not comply with the law with the force at his disposal, why not give him the authority to contract with other parties?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. My answer to that is that the Director of the Census has been made personally and officially responsible for this work, and the Public Printer, if he does the work, must do it out of the appropriation for the Census Bureau. It is census work, and the Director of the Census is responsible for it. His appropriation must pay for it, and he is naturally and logically the one who should have the discretion to determine when a contingency arose that would justify him in going elsewhere under the power that this bill confers.

Mr. Chairman, after having listened to the able and exhaustive argument of my colleague upon the committee, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RUSSELL], I can still see no just and sufficient reason why this authority ought not to be granted under the peculiar conditions of the case. If we expect to get these volumes out by the 1st of July, 1902, we must give some one the power, almost an absolute power, if he should see fit to exercise it, to meet the date that has been arbitrarily fixed by Congress.

It is likely that if the Public Printer should set apart a force of 100 or 200 men and should procure other facilities and devote them exclusively to the work of printing and binding the reports, the entire work could be done in the Government Printing Office. But the fear has been entertained by some members of the Committee on Census that the Public Printer might conclude that he would be justified in using his regular force in printing the census reports when they were not required for his regular duties, for the duties bearing directly and personally upon him as the head of a great department, to be paid for out of his own appropriation. And this provision is simply to meet contingencies. If the Government Printing Office has the capacity, and the Public Printer has the disposition, there will be no occasion for the exercise of the power conferred upon the Director of the Census under this bill. But if the Government Office does not have the capacity, or if the Public Printer should not have the disposition, then I believe every man on this floor will agree with me in the conclusion that the Director of the Census ought to have the discretion that the bill confers upon him.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will it interrupt my colleague if I ask him a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Not at all.

Mr. RUSSELL. You made reference to the fact that this work was to be done out of the appropriation given to the Census Office. Now, why give the Director of the Census this power before we give him the appropriation? Why is it proper that we should now authorize him to do contract work before we have given him any money to print anywhere, either in the Government Printing Office or outside of that office?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Well, we should give him power before we make the appropriation, because appropriations are always based upon duty, upon what the law requires of a bureau, and not upon a speculative possibility.

Mr. RUSSELL. He has the duty of doing that. That is in the general law. This is a perversion of or limitation upon his duties.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The Director of the Census said to our committee that this power ought to be conferred upon him, and that he ought to have it now, so that he could be taking the preliminary steps that may be necessary to finally determine that question. I do not know how long a time he would require to ascertain whether the facilities of the Public Printer were such that he could satisfactorily do the work. I do not know how long a time he might need to arrange with some private institution to do the work, in the event that he had to resort to that alternative.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Certainly.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Why should we give to the Director of the Census power to pass judgment upon the capacity of the Printing Office?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I am sorry I have not time to answer the question.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me there are many questions sought to be presented here in the discussion that have no proper place in the consideration of this bill. I have always been friendly and have always espoused the cause of labor wherever its interests were at stake. I have always been friendly to the printers' union, to the typesetters' union, and to all that great class of laborers.

Now, the bill before the committee this afternoon presents in none of its features any question involving any of the rights of labor or of the labor-union cause. The value of the work of the census depends largely upon the prompt and expeditious manner in which the results of the work of that Bureau are disseminated and placed in the hands of the general public.

Now, as members well know, the work of the last census, as well as the work of the census of 1880, and many volumes of various particular parts of the work, which the public were interested in, most especially, were not distributed and were not accessible for three, four, five, and six years after the census was taken, and for all practical purposes the publication and dissemination of reports after that length of time are useless.

Now, to avoid a repetition of that, in the Fifty-fifth Congress a clause was passed in the census bill which provided that the publication of these reports should be completed not later than the 1st of July, 1902. The Director of the Census is made responsible by law for the completion of the publication and distribution of these reports within that time.

It is contended and urged that the Public Printer was not called before the committee. Suppose, for the purposes of the argument, we concede the strongest case that the Public Printer can possibly make, and that is that he could complete the work; that he has the facilities with which to complete the work within the time specified.

There is no question here but that the sum and substance of the fourth clause as to that discretion is this: That if by peradventure, from any cause, the Public Printer finds himself unable, and the Director should come to the conclusion that the Public Printer will not be able, to complete the distribution and dissemination of these reports within the time required by law, then, and in that event only, is the Director of the Census authorized to contract outside. I think, gentlemen, that that is a just and reasonable request.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question that the other gentleman failed to answer for want of time?

Mr. GRIFFITH. Certainly.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Why is it necessary to give to the Director of the Census power to pass judgment upon the capacity of the Printing Office?

Mr. GRIFFITH. Because, by law, he is charged with the duty of completing and distributing these reports by the 1st of July, 1902. He is an executive officer—the officer who, by law, is charged with this responsibility. I have confidence that the Director will not abuse the discretion we lodge with him. The people are anxious that the results of the census be published and ready for circulation at the earliest possible date.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL].

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to say, before I say anything else, that I have had no telegram, no letters from anybody with respect to this measure. I made up my mind when I read this bill, a few days ago, that this was a dangerous provision and one that ought not to pass. This question is, as the gentleman from Indiana on my right stated a few moments ago, a pure business question. It is not a question of Democracy or Republicanism. It is not a contest between the Public Printer and the Director of the Census Bureau. It is a pure business question. The United States Government has a certain amount of printing to do. The United States Government is the proprietor of the finest printing office on the face of the earth. A distinguished Englishman, who was here not long ago, said that, after having gone into the workings of this Government in all of its departments, he left Washington with such admiration for the Government Printing Office as did not extend to any one or all of the other Departments put together.

Now, the proposition is that this proprietor of the best printing office in the world shall employ somebody else to do its printing, and shall employ that somebody else to do that printing, involving an expenditure of millions of dollars, at the discretion of the head of a bureau.

I want to say here, now, that I know no gentleman connected with the United States Government for whom I have a higher respect or greater esteem than the Director of the Census. His integrity is beyond question; his ability and competency to discharge the duties of his office are beyond question. I want to say the same as to the Public Printer. But the United States has now, and has had for unnumbered years, a policy on this subject, and the policy is to place the responsibility for Government printing in a single hand; to make a single man responsible, and that man is the head of the Public Printing Office—the Public Printer. I know of no reason why, in this particular instance, the rule heretofore followed, the wise, common-sense, business rule, should be abandoned.

The only question that ought to influence us is, Is the Public Printing Office sufficiently equipped to do this work? The answer to that is to be found in the experience of the past. It has been demonstrated here that so far as the Eleventh Census was concerned, in every single instance where there was a delay, the delay was attributable to the Census Office; and in every single instance when there was no delay on the part of the Census Office the work had been well and expeditiously done by the Public Printer.

Now, let me read you an extract from the last report of the Public Printer:

> Notwithstanding the unusual and unprecedented demands made upon this office by several of the Departments of the Government in consequence of the war with Spain, I am pleased to state that its facilities were such as to enable it to promptly fill all orders, and that no complaint has been received that the operations of any Department were impeded or delayed one moment on account of the failure on the part of this office to expeditiously execute all requisitions made upon it.

That in a time of war, when every Department of this Government was calling upon the Printing Office with unusual and extraordinary demands.

He goes on to say:

> The most striking illustration during the past year of the capabilities of the office for executing hurried orders was the printing of the message of the President transmitting the report of the naval court of inquiry upon the destruction of the U. S. battleship *Maine*. This publication consisted of 208 pages of text, 24 full-page engravings, and 1 lithograph in colors, and although the originals of the illustrations were not in the possession of the office until 3 o'clock p. m. of March 28, and the manuscript of the text was not received until 6 o'clock p. m. of the same day, complete printed copies, in paper covers, were placed upon the desks of Senators and Representatives by 10 o'clock of the following morning.

[Applause.]

A feat incapable of performance by any other printing office within the bounds of the United States.

A MEMBER. Or the world.

Mr. DALZELL. Or the world. But, not to deal with generalities, how about this particular case upon which we are to-day sitting as a jury? The Public Printer says, in a letter addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Printing:

> In accordance with your request made to me this morning, I will state that the Government Printing Office is equipped with material and employees to execute promptly the reports of the Census Bureau for the Twelfth Census in the time required.

Not only that, but he goes on to say that if you allot these contracts to outside parties you not only deprive the Government Printing Office of the doing of that which it is capable of doing, but you turn into disuse and leave unemployed the Government property in that Printing Office.

It seems to me—

The Public Printer continues—

> that the allotment of contracts for this printing to private and corporate parties would leave the superior facilities already provided by the Government in this office to be unused.

As a plain business proposition, to be dealt with by business men upon the same basis with which they would deal with their own, I say that this fourth section of this bill ought to be stricken out.

Now, just one word more. It is suggested here, by way of compromise, that some amendment should be offered as a substitute, which shall say that the Public Printer, upon the request of the Director of the Census, shall do thus and so. Why on the request of the Director of the Census?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. I should like one minute more.

Mr. RUSSELL. How much time have I left, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has eight minutes remaining.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield one minute.

Mr. DALZELL. Strike out the fourth section, and it gives the Printer under existing law the charge of this work. Now, why divide the responsibility? Why say, on the request of the Director of the Census, he shall do thus and so? Why leave it to the Public Printer to say, hereafter, that this work was not done because the Director of the Census did not request it; and the Director of the Census to make an excuse that the Public Printer did not do thus and so? Why not abide by the ancient landmarks and stand by the policy that we have heretofore established? Place your responsibility in a single hand—make a single man answerable for the use of the instruments, sufficient and adequate in themselves, with which we have provided him. [Applause.]

Mr. HOPKINS. How much time does the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WILSON] desire?

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Five minutes.

Mr. HOPKINS. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WILSON], a member of the committee.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the legislation so far adopted concerning the census, it is the purpose that this census shall be a departure from its predecessor; that it shall be nonpartisan; that it shall be prompt, and that it shall be accurate. Now, this provision which has been incorporated into the proposed bill is designed solely to accomplish one of these purposes, to wit, that this census report as to those four schedules shall be promptly printed and promptly disseminated.

The opposition to it seems to me to revolve around the personality of the Public Printer. I have nothing to say against the Public Printer. I know him slightly, I know him favorably, and I am satisfied he is as good a Public Printer as we have ever had. But we can not bring this debate down to a matter of the personality of either of these gentlemen—the Director of the Census or the Public Printer. It is, as all parties agree, a plain business proposition.

Now, there are certain fixed conditions that underlie this matter. Those conditions are that the time is fixed, beyond which the Director can not go, at which time these books shall be published. Another condition is that, by the admission of the Public Printer, read in your hearing this afternoon, the present establishment of the Government Printing Office is utterly inadequate to do that printing within the prescribed limit, because, in his own language, it would take three hundred days to do this work. In other words, if that work should be given to him January 1, 1902, it would be January, 1903, before the Public Printer would be ready to deliver the goods to the Director of the Census.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Suppose he increases his force?

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. The third condition is of importance to the people of this country, that they should be promptly supplied with the results of the census. Now, what is proposed to be done by the amendment or the substitute which I shall offer for this amendment? It is proposed that the same time limit shall be in effect imposed upon the Public Printer as has already been imposed upon the Director of the Census.

Both of them are public servants. Both of them are amenable to legislation which this Congress may enact. Congress has already said to the Director, "You must give these books to the public by July 1, 1902." Congress has never said—and I ask the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] to that fact—Congress has never said to the Public Printer, "You must get these books printed by July 1, 1902."

The light of past experience shows us that when the proofs were promptly delivered it took the Public Printer over one year to deliver the reports.

I do not refer to the present Public Printer necessarily, but I refer to the occupant of that official position at that time. It took him over one year to deliver the printed goods after the proofs were delivered to him. What guaranty have we that the same limit of time will not be consumed in 1902?

What objection can any friend of the Public Printer raise to this Congress, in the exercise of its power and in the exercise of its duty to the American people, saying to him, "As we have required of the Director of the Census, so we require of you, the Public Printer, that this work shall be done within this prescribed limit"?

Who but the Director of the Census knows what facilities will be required, what additional force will be required to enable him to have this done before July 1, 1902? I do not believe in allowing one public servant to dictate to another of equal grade. Neither does this amendment which I propose make any such provision. Mr. Chairman, when the time comes I shall offer as a substitute for section 4 the amendment which I now ask to have read. I do not see how any man who really wants to see this work done within the time, and who does not wish to see an impossible condition of affairs forced upon the Director of the Census, can object to it. I ask the Clerk to read my proposed amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOPKINS. I will yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the request of the Director of the Census, the Public Printer shall provide such additional facilities as said Director may request to enable him to comply with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for taking the Twelfth and subsequent censuses," and amendments thereof, which printing shall be done under the supervision of the Public Printer.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Now, Mr. Chairman, as the reading of that shows, nothing is taken away from the Public Printer. The same power and the same privileges that he now has are accorded to him, or, rather, are left with him. The only additional provision is that if the Director of the Census should find that the facilities of the Public Printer are not such as to enable the Public Printer to do the printing within the specified time, then, not at the dictation of the Director of the Census, but at the request of the Director of the Census, the Public Printer is authorized and directed to make an additional equipment, to furnish the additional force, which will enable the Director of the Census to carry out the law. [Applause.]

Mr. HOPKINS. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I only desire time in which to present an amendment, which, as I understand, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WILSON] has already suggested.

Mr. HOPKINS. It is not the same amendment, is it?

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. No; it is a different amendment.

Mr. HOPKINS. Then I will yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, in my time I desire to have read this amendment, which I wish to offer at the proper time.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lieu of section 4 as proposed insert:

"SEC. 4. The Public Printer, on the request of the Director of the Census, shall establish in the office of the Twelfth Census or elsewhere in the city of Washington a branch printing office, which shall be under the direction and control of the Public Printer, of sufficient capacity to meet the demands of the Director of the Census in the publication of the census reports."

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is in exact conformity to the present law, which says that all branch printing offices that have been or may be established shall be as I have directed in that amendment. This amendment of mine bridges over the whole trouble between the Director of the Census and the Public Printer, Mr. Palmer.

It is due to the Director of the Census that when we press him, as we have under the law, for certain reports or documents to be issued at a certain time it is nothing but right to give him the privilege of saying to the Public Printer, "This must be done within this time." Now, the Public Printer, under this amendment of mine, has nothing to do but just establish a branch office and turn over from his own office such printers, binders, and other employees as may be necessary to do this work in the prescribed time, on the request of the Director of the Census. This ends the whole fight between the two gentlemen and between the friends of the two gentlemen and it is in perfect conformity with the law on printing, as the most of you are well aware.

Mr. COWHERD. Would that make any additional cost?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No additional cost, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield half of my remaining time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] and the remaining half to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE].

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to delay the printing and binding of the census reports or in any way retard their publication. But I am opposed to the fourth section of this bill because I believe it to be unwise and unnecessary legislation. In order to obtain some information that I, as a member of this committee, was unable to secure from the committee, I directed a letter to the Public Printer, and I now send the reply to the Clerk's desk and ask to have it read in my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE,
OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC PRINTER,
Washington, D. C., January 17, 1900.

SIR: In answer to your letter of January 17, I have the honor to state that the Government Printing Office was created, supplied, and is maintained for the purpose of executing all printing and binding required by the Government

including the printing and binding of the reports of the census, and that it is well equipped to turn out the work with sufficient speed and in a satisfactory and meritorious manner.

Indeed, section 87 of the act of January 12, 1895 (Stat. 28, page 622), provides that "all printing, binding, and blank books for the Senate and House of Representatives and for the executive and judicial departments shall be done at the Government Printing Office, except in cases otherwise provided by law."

In my judgment this office is fully equipped and able to turn out, with necessary dispatch, the census reports referred to in section 3 of House bill No. 5486.

The leaflet received with your communication is returned herewith.

Respectfully,

F. W. PALMER, *Public Printer.*

Hon. W. H. RYAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Now, Mr. Chairman, in view of the information contained in that letter, I believe it to be unwise as a business proposition to adopt this section, because we all know the Government now maintains the largest and best-equipped printing office in the world. I can not conceive how the gentlemen who preceded me on the floor in favor of the adoption of the report made by the chairman of the Census Committee will explain the necessity for going outside of the finest equipped and largest printing concern conducted on either continent when this Printing Office was established for the express purpose of turning out just such publications as is noted in the request of the Director of the Census. The Public Printer declares that he can do the work within the time required.

The contention was made in the committee that, provided the work was contracted for outside of the Government Printing Office, a saving of 25 per cent in the cost would be the result. Now, Mr. Chairman, if that be true, it necessarily denotes that this work is to be performed against the interests of organized labor, a fact which the gentleman from Illinois and others have already denied. Both statements can not be true. The truth of either one is sufficient reason why this report should not be accepted.

The statement that 25 per cent of the cost is to be saved is, perhaps, or at least in my judgment, the nearer to the truth. This saving would not come from any causes of better equipment or grander plant or wider experience that any other printing office, in its entirety, may possess to the disadvantage of the plant, equipment, and experience that is combined in the institution known as the Government Printing Office. This saving must necessarily come from labor, and I feel, and I trust we all feel, that this is a condition we wish to avoid.

The Census Bureau now has in operation, under the law, a printing office, with power to increase its capacity as the necessities may require. The ability and capacity of the Government Printing Office is limited only by the appropriations made by Congress from year to year; and as the Public Printer has stated that he can do this work within the time specified, I can see no reason why we should go elsewhere. In view of this fact, and others heretofore stated, I believe that this amendment, known as section 4, should be stricken from the bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it seems thus far in the discussion that there is no contention but what the Public Printer can do the work under consideration. He has so stated, and no one thus far has denied his statement, either by letter or otherwise. The next question which presents itself is, Is it wise at this time for us to leave the Government Printing Office and go up and down the streets of our great cities and invite people to enter into competition to do the public-printing business? As I understand, the Printing Office was established for the express purpose of getting away from the very idea sought to be ingrafted in this measure to-day.

As I understand from older members who served in the years from 1850 to 1860, there were scandals connected with the farming out of printing. For the purpose of removing any question of appearance of evil the Government Printing Office was established, and from that day to this there has been no question raised as to its being properly managed, no matter under what Administration the Public Printer may have been appointed. In the last Administration there was no question raised, and in the present Administration there has been no charge of scandal having arisen in the Printing Office. Therefore, it seems to me that it would be unwise for us at this time to go back to the old way and raise again the question of doubt, and get ourselves into discussions, political and scandalous, growing out of the letting of public printing to political favorites or rat offices.

For one I believe in standing by the old landmarks; for one I believe in striking this section entirely from the bill, and allowing this bill to be passed by this House exactly as it was passed by the United States Senate. Let us determine once for all that the Public Printer shall do the public printing of the Government of the United States. If it should turn out that he is not competent or qualified to do this work, Mr. Chairman, the Committee on the Census can make such a report to the House of Representatives, and we will see that he does that work; and if not, we will ask the President who put him in charge to put him out and put in a man who has the zeal, the energy, the honesty, and the ability to conduct the work of the Government Printing Office. [Applause.]

Mr. HOPKINS. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. RIDGELY. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my voice on this proposition to those who favor this work being done exclusively by ourselves—by the Government. As has been said, and as the facts and figures that have been presented to this House show, we have equipped ourselves as a nation with the best printing establishment in the known world; and our Public Printer, in charge of this establishment, tells us that he has facilities with which, if we, the legislative branch, will furnish him the money to hire the help, he can dispatch any amount of public printing within any reasonable time that may be asked of him; therefore I say, let us remain within the well-established policy of this nation so far as our public printing is concerned; at least, let it be done by and for ourselves. I think we certainly should do so, and authorize no one to let out this printing either to individuals or corporations. Thanking the gentleman in charge of the bill for his kindness, I will return to him whatever time I have not consumed.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, I crave the indulgence of the committee while I attempt to meet some of the arguments which have been urged by gentlemen who desire to strike out the section of this bill that is proposed by the Census Committee. I regret, Mr. Chairman, that the personality of the Public Printer has been injected so prominently in this debate. I realize the power and influence that he may have if he seeks to exert it, and it has been too conspicuous here to-day, in my judgment, for the healthy condition of public legislation. But for all of that, I desire to say, in my judgment, the action of this committee in reporting this amendment is not only not intended and does not in fact encroach upon the power of the Public Printer when properly considered.

The whole argument of the gentleman from Pennsylvania was that the proposition of the committee was to take this census printing from the Public Printing Office. It does not propose to take any of it away if the Public Printer can do it, as is now claimed by the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from New York. What is the object of it, then? The object of it is this, that the law imposes on the Director of the Census that this work shall be completed and in the hands of the public on the 1st of July, 1902.

As I stated in my opening remarks, the work is of such a character that the Director of the Census will be unable to put this in the hands of the Printer until the 1st day of January, 1902, leaving practically only six months in which to do all this work. I have shown here that in the previous census eight or nine years were occupied between the Public Printer and the Director of the Census in accomplishing this work. Now, these gentlemen say the Public Printer is ready at all times, under existing conditions, to get this work done. I deny that. I have here a letter written by the chief clerk of the Geological Survey, in which he says:

> The publication of our annual reports, monographs, bulletins, and water-supply papers, the work on which is done at and through the Government Printing Office, is, in many cases, not so prompt as is desirable. We believe that the Public Printer does the best he can, but other demands on his office sometimes postpone work on our reports to a vexatious degree. For example, Part V of our Nineteenth Annual Report (consisting of seven volumes), which was transmitted on December 20, 1898, has not yet been delivered.
>
> Very respectfully,
>
> H. C. RIZER, *Chief Clerk.*

The chief clerk of the Interstate Commerce Commission complains that they are delayed in their publications and that the work is very unsatisfactory. Now, I do not state these facts to criticise the Public Printer, but I state them to the members of this committee to show them that the Public Printer does a vast volume of work, and unless some action be taken to-day to enable the Director of the Census to comply with this law we shall find a repetition, in the publication of these reports, of the Tenth and Eleventh censuses.

If the members of this committee are willing that should be done, then I have no objection to this fourth section, that is proposed by my committee, being stricken out. But if it is proposed to require the Director of the Census to live up to the spirit of the law, then I ask the members here to-day to join with the Committee on the Census to effect a condition so that this work can be done.

Mr. HENRY of Mississippi. Will the gentleman allow me an interruption?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes.

Mr. HENRY of Mississippi. I want to know why, if the Public Printer says he can do this work, you are not satisfied with it? He says he can do it, and asks the House to be permitted to do it. Why does the gentleman say he can not do it? The Public Printer ought to be the judge of his own business.

Mr. HOPKINS. I will answer the gentleman. The Public Printer has stated in a letter to the Director of the Census that it will take him three hundred working days from the time he receives the proof from the Director of the Census before he can get out the work. Now, take the three shifts, if you please, and make it one hundred days. That does not provide for any contingency. It does not provide for any breakdown or any delay in the printing matter sent by the Director of the Census; in fact, it does not provide for any of the one hundred and one contingencies liable to occur.

What I want to do is this: I do not want to take it away from the Public Printer; I do not suppose it will be taken away; but I want the members of the committee here to take some such action as will insure the publication of these reports within the time limited by law or take away the limitation. One way to do that is to adopt the compromise measure offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

I can say that, while in my judgment it is not so wise a provision as the one contemplated by the Committee on Census, yet in the interests of harmony, and to meet the demands of gentlemen who think the Public Printer ought to do the printing, I am ready to accept that amendment. That leaves it under the control of the Public Printer, but it requires him, from the time Congress acts, when this bill becomes a law, to enlarge his facilities and make his arrangements to meet the extraordinary demands that will be placed upon him by the work that will come from the Census Office.

Mr. HENRY of Mississippi. Suppose the eligibles now out of employment are put to work, is it not possible that the Public Printer can do the work? He is our authorized agent, and he says he can do it, and I want a better reason than the gentleman from Illinois gives why he should take it away from him.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is laboring under a misapprehension. I have stated again and again that the object was not to take it from the Public Printer, but to make it certain that these volumes will be published within the time prescribed by law.

If the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Georgia is adopted, then the Public Printer will at once, if his facilities are not such as make him able to meet these demands—and in my judgment they are not—then he will take such steps as will enable him to do this specific work and get out the publications by the 1st of July, 1902, and he will, if necessary, come to the Committee on Appropriations of the House and Senate and demand the money to be used by him to enlarge the facilities of that department so as to meet what I suggest.

Mr. HENRY of Mississippi. But the gentleman does not answer my question.

Mr. HOPKINS. I decline to yield further. I am not responsible——

Mr. HENRY of Mississippi. If the gentleman is not responsible, then he would better sit down. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, I should dislike to be responsible for the comprehension of the gentleman. I tried to make my position clear, and I am exceedingly unfortunate, evidently, with him.

Mr. HENRY of Mississippi. That is not an answer to my question.

Mr. HOPKINS. But I want to say that if I have shown anything, I have shown that there is a necessity existing for prompt action to be taken here, in order to enable the Director of the Census to comply with the requirements of the law.

Now, without taking up any further time, I ask the members of this committee, Republicans and Democrats alike, to look at this matter from the standpoint of the duty that is imposed upon the Director of the Census, where, as I said, a limitation is placed in the law that has never existed in any previous law in regard to the taking of the census of the United States, from the formation of the Government down to the present time.

It is an emergency duty that has been placed upon the Director. It is a duty that can not be met unless we adopt the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] or the amendment proposed by the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Clerk to read the bill by sections.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in addition to the power and authority conferred upon the Director of the Census by an act entitled "An act to provide for taking the Twelfth and subsequent censuses," approved March 3, 1899, said Director of the Census shall have power, and is hereby authorized, to appoint and employ, as the necessity therefor may arise, 1 purchasing agent, at an annual salary of $3,500; 2 chiefs of division, at an annual salary of $2,000 each; 5 clerks of class 4, 6 clerks of class 3, and 8 clerks of class 2; to employ such number of special agents, not exceeding 35 in all, as may be proper and necessary for the purpose of gathering any information or data in relation to or required by the agricultural schedules; to employ special agents to assist the supervisors in large cities whenever he may deem it proper, in connection with the work of preparation for, or during the progress of, the enumeration, or in connection with the reenumeration of any district, or a part thereof; to employ as special agents such of the supervisors of census as he may deem wise and proper, at the compensation provided for in section 17 of said act, the intent and purpose being that the supervisors of census may be appointed special agents at the time they are acting as supervisors, and receive the compensation to which they are entitled as supervisors, and also as special agents.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment to this paragraph recommended by the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after "agents" in line 16, page 2, the following: "and the Director of the Census is authorized and directed to collect statistics relating to all of the deaf, dumb, and blind, notwithstanding the restrictions and limitations contained in section 8 of said act entitled, 'An act to provide for taking the Twelfth and subsequent censuses.'"

The CHAIRMAN. The question pending before the committee is, Shall the amendment reported by the Committee on the Census, just read, be adopted? That is the amendment to the third section. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] asks recognition, as the Chair understands.

Mr. HOPKINS. I desire to move to strike out the word "two," in line 16, page 3, and insert the word "five;" so that it will read "$5,000" instead of "$2,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman that that is an amendment which the gentleman from Illinois proposes to offer. The first matter in order is the question, Shall the amendment reported by the Committee, which has just been read, be adopted? That should first be disposed of, and then the gentleman's amendment would be in order.

Mr. HOPKINS. I ask for a vote, Mr. Chairman, on the committee amendment.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to interfere with the speedy taking and announcement of the results of the Twelfth Census, but I do wish to oppose certain amendments which have been proposed to the Senate bill now before this body. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS], in his concluding remarks, urges haste upon this body, that the Director of the Census may be enabled to proceed speedily with the duty with which he has been charged, and to enable him to proceed speedily we are asked to allow him to take from the Public Printer a large share of his duty. Now, Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me——

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the gentleman that the amendment to which he refers is not now under consideration. His speech will properly come in a little later. I ask him to let us take a vote on this amendment first, and he can present his views when we reach the other matter.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I was informed that that was the amendment which was pending.

Mr. HOPKINS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] will be recognized later.

Mr. HOPKINS. I ask for a vote on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS], chairman of the committee, has notified the Chair that he desires to offer an amendment. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] will be recognized later.

Mr. HOPKINS. In line 16, page 3, I move to strike out the word "two" and insert the word "five," so that it will read "five thousand" instead of "two thousand" dollars; and I desire to state to the members of the committee that this is not a committee amendment, but one which I offer in response to a suggestion made by the Director of the Census in a letter which I now ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CENSUS OFFICE, OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1900.

DEAR MR. HOPKINS: I find, on consultation with the statisticians, that it will be necessary to amend line 8 on the third page of the proposed bill, to make it read "to not exceed the sum of $5,000," instead of $2,000. The books and periodicals necessary to be purchased for the proper carrying out of this act will certainly cost at least $5,000, so I suggest that you change the wording from $2,000 to $5,000 in line 8, page 3, of the proposed bill.

Truly, yours,

W. R. MERRIAM, *Director.*

Hon. A. J. HOPKINS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The amendment was reported by the Clerk, as follows:

On page 3, line 16, strike out the word "two" and insert in lieu thereof the word "five;" so that it will read: "not to exceed the sum of $5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk. I think it will be acceptable to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut proposes an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Insert after the word "censuses," in line 21, page 2, the following:
"And the Director of the Census be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to collect statistics required by section 8 of said act, in regard to mines, mining, and minerals, at the time fixed for the enumeration of the population, agriculture, and manufactures, notwithstanding any restrictions or limitations contained in section 8 of said act."

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment changes nothing in any respect except the time. Section 8 reads:

That after the completion and return of the enumeration of the work in the schedules relating to products of agriculture and to manufacturing and mechanical establishments—

After that work is all done, which must be done in 1903, then this work is to be taken up, and it will not be possible to do this work and make the report in 1903 if this part of the work is delayed until after that is done. It changes it in no other respect that I know of. It is a matter of form, and it will aid the Geological Survey, which cooperates with this work.

Mr. HOPKINS. I have consulted with the members of the committee, and I think there is no objection to that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to line 16, page 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Amend line 16, page 2, by inserting the word "not" before the word "also;" so that it will read: "And not also as special agents."

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Chairman, I should like to know whether it is intended by this bill, as it seems to me it is intended, to pay these supervisors not only a thousand dollars for about two or three months' work, but to allow the same supervisor to act as a special agent, to be paid for that and to be paid traveling expenses, and then to be paid $3 a day for subsistence. If that is the meaning of this bill, it seems to me that it is making a great deal more liberal provision for supervisors of the census than is made for the pay of members of this House.

Mr. HOPKINS. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK] can answer that.

Mr. LENTZ. I should like to have the question answered before I make any remarks, and I yield to the gentleman to answer that question.

Mr. BABCOCK. Has the gentleman completed his statement?

Mr. LENTZ. I say I yield for an answer as to whether that is the meaning of this bill, and if so, why?

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I can tell the gentleman why it is so. It is for this reason, and this only: In certain districts, of which my own, the Third district of Wisconsin, is an example, it is almost an entirely agricultural district, and there is but very little work for a special agent in the way of gathering statistics—so little that it would be practically impossible to get a special agent there.

I was present in the office of the Director of the Census when he said to the supervisor having charge of that district, "After your work is done I would like to have you do this special work, if you will, as there is not enough of it to send a man there for the purpose." That is the reason, and, I understand, the only reason, why these supervisors can be employed in those districts where there is but little work after their duties as supervisors are completed. They are not to draw double pay.

Mr. LENTZ. Is it not a fact that the supervisor is provided with clerks during the progress of the two or three months' work in taking the census?

Mr. BABCOCK. No, sir; I do not understand that there are any districts where clerks are allowed, or only a few.

Mr. LENTZ. Am I to understand that this special work is not to be performed during the progress of taking enumeration?

Mr. BABCOCK. Not until after that is completed.

Mr. HULL. Then it is really a matter of economy?

Mr. BABCOCK. It is a matter of economy to the Government of the United States, and because of the difficulty of securing suitable men for this special purpose.

Mr. LENTZ. Well, if it is meant that these men are not to draw double pay, or pay in two capacities at the same time, I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. HOPKINS. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin is correct in saying this work by special agents is separate and distinct from the work of a supervisor or enumerator, and that it is to come afterwards.

Mr. LENTZ. May I ask what work will be required after the census is taken and the enumeration reports are made to the supervisor?

Mr. HOPKINS. They have to have special agents to take the manufacturing and mechanical statistics, which are not contemplated in the instructions sent out to the enumerators. It has been found that they have to have a different class of men, frequently of higher talents and larger experience, for this special work than for taking the enumeration of the people.

Mr. LENTZ. Does that mean that the special agent will travel over the same district and get the statistics?

Mr. HOPKINS. Oh, no.

Mr. LENTZ (continuing). To obtain the facts in reference to manufactures?

Mr. HOPKINS. In a purely agricultural county they do not require any special agent, but there may be a city of 10,000, 20,000, 30,000, or 40,000 in a county where the enumerator will only take the population, and a special agent will go to the manufacturing institutions and learn all in regard to the facts that it is proposed to be gathered in respect to them. Their separate report comes to a separate division of the Census Bureau, over which presides a statistician, and the facts will be bound in a separate volume when the reports are published.

Mr. LENTZ. That will come in later.

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman explain the language under which they may appoint special agents at the time they are acting as supervisors?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes; it may be done.

Mr. HULL. They may be appointed while acting as supervisors?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes.

Mr. LENTZ. If the gentleman from Illinois will pardon me while I read line 10, page 2, which says:

To employ as special agents such of the supervisors of census as he may deem wise and proper, at the compensation provided for in section 17 of said act, the intent and purpose being that the supervisors of census may be appointed special agents at the time they are acting as supervisors, and receive the compensation to which they are entitled as supervisors and also as special agents.

Now, if that does not give them double pay, why——

Mr. HOPKINS. One moment. Let me explain to the gentleman. Under existing law the supervisors are not clothed with the authority, nor is the responsibility imposed upon them, to gather statistics relating to manufactures, etc. That legislation contemplates a separate officer for that.

The Director of the Census has discovered, as in the case of my friend from Wisconsin, that it would be impossible to select different men for that, because of reasons that exist in the districts, and in those cases that duty will be imposed upon the supervisor of the census; but inasmuch as it is work that was not contemplated in the legislation when he was appointed, it is proposed to pay him, if he does the work, the same compensation that would be paid to a third party, in case the third party could be secured who is competent for the work.

Mr. LENTZ. I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois that it has been intimated to me by one who is to be a supervisor that they expected legislation which will give them more than $1,000 for this work, and it seems to me that this very language carries to the supervisor additional pay, because you have put into this section the words—

At the time they are acting as supervisors, and receive the compensation to which they are entitled as supervisors, and also as special agents.

Why not make that plain? Why not strike that out? If the gentleman's explanation is correct, then my word "not" belongs here, and I do not want to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. HOPKINS. If the supervisor does the work, he ought to be paid the same as any other person.

Mr. LENTZ. What work does he do for the thousand dollars? His clerks will do substantially all the work. It is enough to donate a thousand dollars to a supervisor.

Mr. HOPKINS. The enumerators that are appointed by the supervisor will report to the supervisor every day as well as to the Director, and it is the duty, under the law, of the supervisor to take these reports and tabulate them and verify them and send them on to the Director of the Census. That is the work he does, in addition to laying out his district and appointing the enumerators. That is what he gets the $1,000 compensation for.

Mr. LENTZ. Is it not intended that that shall all be done in two months?

Mr. HOPKINS. Oh, no; the supervisors were appointed months ago. They are working now and have been for two or three months.

Mr. BABCOCK. If the gentleman will permit me, I attempted to state what I have known of the practical working of the office. It is intended by the Director to appoint special agents, where there is sufficient work to employ them for any reasonable length of time. In my district a man will do it in ten days. The arrangement made by the supervisor in that district is that after he has completed his enumeration he will do the special work and be paid by the day.

Mr. LENTZ. Granting all that, is not this true that the supervisor has 100 enumerators reporting to him, and that he has work enough to take up all of his time as a supervisor? Why can not

he employ some one else to do the ten days' work? There are plenty of competent men in the community to do it.

Mr. BABCOCK. I think the gentleman's amendment would add expense instead of economy. The idea of the Director is that in these districts where there is so little to do it would be economy for the Government to permit the supervisor to do it.

Mr. LENTZ. But why not employ local special agents to do it? Why can not a man in Milwaukee or Chicago——

Mr. BABCOCK. It is not intended to apply to large places. They have special agents in those large places. It is only in districts where there is very little work to do that the supervisor is to be employed.

Mr. LENTZ. I do not see why we should give him double pay.

The question was taken on the amendment offered by Mr. LENTZ; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LENTZ) there were 87 ayes and 101 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the committee amendment, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, at the beginning of the paragraph, insert the word "however."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk (reading the bill) read as follows:

SEC. 2. That in addition to the other statistics required to be collected by section 7 of said act approved March 3, 1899, there shall be collected on the agricultural schedules information concerning the number and kinds of live stock not on farms; and the Director of the Census shall have power to pay the enumerators for collecting such information, in his discretion, not less than 5 nor more than 10 cents for each barn or inclosure visited in which such live stock may be found: *Provided, however*, That the Director of the Census may appoint special agents to gather the information required by this section whenever he may deem it proper.

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The clerk read as follows:

On page 4, line 3, after the word "proper," insert the words "which agents shall be apportioned equitably between the Territories as well as the States."

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Chairman, in offering that amendment I assume that there is general legislation providing that in all appointments made they should be equitably distributed between the States and the Territories. I represent more people and a larger area than any other gentleman on this floor. Most members have been apportioned six places in the Census Office in their district—— [Cries of "Oh, no, no, no."]

That is all right—you have not got them all in office yet—but six have been allotted in many cases.

A MEMBER. Only four.

Mr. FLYNN. Some gentleman states that they only got four. I am willing to accept that statement. But why, if they have only had four, should I be curtailed to two? I have not mine in yet, although, as a matter of fact, I was authorized to appoint two in my district. I am not finding fault with the Director of the Census about that; in fact, I have no fault to find with him except this, that he does not seem to realize that in our section we have a country expanding, a population increasing, and that we would like the same representation in the Census Office there as is accorded other Representatives on the floor of this House.

When I say that gentlemen have been accredited with four, I realize that they are not all in office yet. I am not talking about those who can not pass the examination. What I do ask is that this apportionment, which it appears to be taken for granted we are entitled to, be equally divided. I want my share. [Laughter.] I desire to have it understood that I have patriots enough in my district who are willing to draw the emoluments and swear to support the Constitution, so that I want them to have a chance.

Mr. BABCOCK. Are there more than two of the gentleman's constituents who will pass the examination necessary?

Mr. FLYNN. Why, we have in Oklahoma 400,000 people, and I warrant the statement that there is no Representative on this floor who has as intelligent a constituency. [Applause and laughter.] Why, Mr. Chairman, 98 per cent of them are native-born American citizens. [Applause.] Their enlightenment and a desire to go forward and help build up this great country induced them to come to Oklahoma and leave the drones behind them. [Laughter.] I believe that the gentleman in charge of the bill [Mr. HOPKINS] will accede to the proposition that in this apportionment the Territories should have also, in proportion to their population, their proportionate share.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, there is no law on this subject, and the gentleman, according to his own statement, has succeeded better than I have, and better than many other members have, and I think we had better vote the amendment down.

Mr. FLYNN. One moment, Mr. Chairman, we are making law now, and that is the reason I offer this amendment.

Mr. LENTZ. I should like to know, and I was going to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FLYNN], whether it would be possible to get one Democratic enumerator in any Northern State under his provision?

Mr. FLYNN. If I had my way there would not be a Democratic enumerator in any State under a Republican Administration. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. LENTZ. In other words, you want a Republican census and Republican census enumerators for the next campaign.

Mr. FLYNN. I want a competent census, and that is why I insist on Republican enumerators. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RIDGELY. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma, because I believe it but fair to his people, notwithstanding the partisan sentiment that the gentleman has just now expressed. I see the gentleman even scowls at the idea that I should support his amendment. [Laughter.] It is possible that he may suffer the same fate that I and others in my State have. He says now boldly that he would not allow any Democrat anywhere in the United States to have anything to do with the taking of the census. I want to say to him and those on that side that you talked in a very different tone when you were first passing this law. You put into the law a provision that these appointments should be made fairly upon merit and not from any partisan reasons or bias.

Mr. SHATTUC. That is what they are doing.

Mr. RIDGELY. Not in my State. I want to say here that in the State of Kansas this partisan policy that the gentleman [Mr. FLYNN] has just indorsed has been absolutely applied, and no Democrat or Populist gets any position on the entire field force in the State of Kansas, not even one supervisor, although in many other States you have conformed to the spirit of the law. Out in Kansas the policy and idea is that we are not entitled to anything. I say to you if you can afford to practice such partisan selfishness, go on and you will make votes for us. We have Republicans out there who believe in fair dealing and who believe that the sentiment and spirit of this census law should be complied with there as well as in other States. I will say, in justice to the Director, that this matter has been carried over his head to the President, and the President has taken the partisan stand and has insisted that every appointee in Kansas shall be a Republican, and that has been done. The Director has kindly allowed us two clerks in his force.

Now, gentlemen, I say support the amendment and vote for it, because it is in the direction of fair dealing for the good people of his Territory, and we ought to support fair dealing whenever we have an opportunity. The gentleman is right in offering the amendment, and I hope his Republican friends will stand by him in behalf of the people of Oklahoma, even if you do abuse and ignore half the good people of my State.

Mr. HOPKINS. I ask for a vote.

Mr. SNODGRASS. I ask that the amendment be again read. There was so much confusion that we could not hear it.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. FLYNN. I merely desire to state, with reference to the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. RIDGELY], that he is a very genial gentleman, and I am an admirer of his in everything except his politics; but my statement that I would not appoint a Democratic enumerator is based upon the fact that in my Territory we had four years of national Democratic rule, and we were unable to secure the appointment of resident Democrats scarcely in the entire Territory of Oklahoma to hold many offices that of right belonged to us.

Under the census management, though we have not had many places, they have been given to those who resided in the Territory. Consequently I offered this amendment in good faith, and I am confident that it would have passed if I had not received the support of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. RIDGELY] under the circumstances. [Laughter.]

Mr. RIDGELY. It may not hurt you as much as you think, after all. Though your own words here do not entitle you to the support of the House, yet I hope your people may not suffer on account of your personal discourtesies to me.

Mr. HOPKINS. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. FLYNN) there were—ayes 18, noes 97.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

That in the event of the death of any supervisor or enumerator after his appointment and entrance on his duties, the Director of the Census be, and he is, authorized to pay to his widow or legal representative such sum as may be just and fair for the services rendered by said supervisor or enumerator prior to his death.

With the following amendment proposed by the committee:

In line 7, after the word "widow," strike out the word "or" and insert "if there be one, and if not, to his."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the remaining committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting as section 4 the following:

"SEC. 4. That the Director of the Census, whenever he shall find that there is a probability of delay in the printing or publishing of the census reports beyond the period required by the said act of March 3, 1899, be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to contract with any individual, copartnership, or corporation for the printing and binding, or either, of any of said reports, in the manner prescribed by law for the letting of public contracts."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. HOPKINS. I move to strike out the committee amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following, which is the amendment of my friend the gentleman from Georgia, slightly modified.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Do I understand the gentleman to say that that is my amendment with a slight change?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] moves the following substitute for the committee amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lieu of section 4 as proposed insert:

"SEC. 4. The Public Printer shall establish in the Public Printing Office a division or branch printing office, which shall be under the direction and control of the Public Printer, of sufficient capacity to meet the demands of the act approved March 3, 1899, entitled 'An act relating to the Twelfth and subsequent censuses.'"

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I accept that amendment.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, I think that meets the requirements of both sides and that it will satisfy gentlemen who have been opposed to section 4. I trust we can take a vote on it without any debate.

Mr. LENTZ. Will the gentleman from Illinois permit a question?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes.

Mr. LENTZ. Are we to understand that this branch printing office is to be put into some other building, away from the Government Printing Office?

Mr. HOPKINS. No; it is just to create a division.

Mr. LENTZ. What object is there, then, in calling it a branch office?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] has the floor.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HOPKINS. If the gentleman from Massachusetts desires to make a speech I will yield to him.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Just for a moment.

Mr. HOPKINS. I yield to the gentleman three minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. I did not propose to speak against the amendment which he has now offered, but to speak in its favor. I was opposed to the committee amendment known as section 4, whereby it was proposed to take this work out of the hands of the Public Printer, thereby doing away with the old-time custom of giving all such work to the proper officer. Now that his importance has been recognized and this work has been placed in his hands, where it properly belongs, I trust the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. [Cries of "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio will pardon the Chair. Does the gentleman from Connecticut desire recognition?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio will be recognized later.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I only have a word to say. Except for the great regard I have for the ability and good nature of my colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Census, I should say, almost, this proposition was a ridiculous one. It proposes that the Government Printer shall establish in the Printing Office—in his own office—a branch establishment.

I do not understand the object of it. Shall he draw a division between all the branches and all the processes of the Government printing and say all on that side of the line is a branch of the Census Office and all on the other side is another office for general Government work? I do not think it needs comment to show to the members of this House that this division would be impracticable and almost ridiculous. I am decidedly against any amendment. You can not reach this question except in one way. You can not reach it except by voting up or voting down the section proposed by this bill. [Loud applause.] And on that I am ready to stand.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is next entitled to recognition.

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that it seems to me that if we have done any good here at all that we have finished our work when we write the word "death" at the end of the third section. This bill will be better without the fourth section, and it will be better without the proposed amendment of either gentleman. There is no necessity for all this verbiage which is proposed to be tacked on here. The Government has a printing office. That establishment is so well administered that everybody has devoted time in complimenting our Government.

Why all this talk? You may just as well draw chalk lines in certain parts of the floor of the Printing Office and say that part shall be set aside for the Public Printer and that the other side shall be set apart for the Director of the Census for a branch printing office. If the Director of the Census will get the material ready and deliver it to the Public Printer the work can be done, and will be done, and it seems to me it will be done cheaper than if it were done at a branch office.

If there is anything intended by a branch office at the Census Bureau, it is that there shall be more branch officers to hold more places, or it means nothing; and if we are to amend at all let us be honest and say we mean to create a few more places for persons seeking a chance at the public Treasury. It seems to me that in the discussion this afternoon it has been well demonstrated not only by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], but also by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RUSSELL] that there is no necessity to waste any further time, and that there is no possibility of gentlemen here making any provision or any amendment of this law which would be worth one penny to the Government or to the census.

Let us close with the word at the end of the third section, vote down the amendment proposed, and vote down the fourth section; and when we shall have done that, it seems to me we shall have done all we can do and ought to do on this subject to-day.

Mr. HOPKINS. I have corrected the amendment I sent up so as to meet the views of gentlemen on both sides, and I desire to have that amendment read as I desire to see it pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. The Public Printer shall establish a division or branch printing office, which shall be under the direction and control of the Public Printer, of sufficient capacity to meet the demands of the act approved March 3, 1899, entitled "An act relating to the Twelfth and subsequent censuses."

Mr. HOPKINS. And now I desire to say, Mr. Chairman, just a word, because I do not desire to delay the vote, that this places the responsibility on the Public Printer precisely as the law of the Fifty-fifth Congress places it on the Director of the Census to get his work out, and it leaves it with the Public Printer to say that if he can do it all in the building where he now is, it can be so done; but if necessary to establish a branch at the Census Office, it can be done there. Without taking any further time, I ask for a vote on the amendment. [Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that, in my opinion, it is good for the House and good for the country that we have had this discussion. It is a vindication of the Public Printing Office and has shown to members of the House that it is what many of us have known it to be for years—one of the best equipped and best managed in the country. The present incumbent of that office is one of the most courteous and capable men holding office under this Administration. Under all Administrations the public printing has been done satisfactorily; it has been done well. He tells the House he can do the census work, and we believe him. Now, shall we reflect upon this officer by inserting in this bill a paragraph which implies that he has not heretofore done or does not in the future intend to do his duty? He can print the messages of the President and the reports of the various Departments, and can not be trusted to print for the Census Department! I join with the gentleman from Connecticut in saying that I believe the whole of this paragraph ought to go out and the substitute be voted down.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. We are making no reflection in this amendment upon the Public Printer.

Mr. McRAE. It requires him to establish a branch or division for the Census Office.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. It does not require him; it gives him power to do it.

Mr. McRAE. If you are to believe him——

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. It enlarges his power.

Mr. McRAE. If you are to believe him, he can do this work without such division just as well as he can do the other work he is called upon to do, if you will give him the space and printers.

Gentlemen complain that they have not been able to get the Nineteenth Geological Report; but I tell gentlemen that I have at least one copy, the twentieth volume of that report, printed and bound, with all the plates necessary to illustrate the work. There may be some delay in some of them, because he has not enough force at times. But we have made an appropriation to construct a new building, now being built, and when that work shall have been done he will have sufficient accommodations for all the compositors necessary to do all of the printing for the Government.

I hope that the Director of the Census, capable as I hope and believe he is, will learn something from the experience of the

delays of the last census and this discussion, and that we shall not have this delay in the furnishing of material to the Printer. This discussion has shown that almost all of the fault and delay was in the Census Bureau and not in the Printing Office. If this Bureau will prepare the manuscript, I believe I should be safe in guaranteeing that the Public Printer would give to the public the reports promptly and in better shape than they can be furnished by any other individual or corporation.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask one question. The evidence before this House is to the effect that the Public Printing Office, as now constituted, is abundantly able to do all of this work. I want to ask this question: Why establish in addition a branch office? [Applause.]

Mr. HOPKINS. The answer to that is this: That it does not require him to use any different men or machinery than he has now, but it directs him to set apart sufficient of those to meet the requirements of the law, precisely as the Director of the Census is required to do it under existing law.

Mr. FARIS. Mr. Chairman, I was about to ask a similar question to that propounded by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that I regard this as an ill-considered proposition and one that we ought not to introduce. It is meaningless in effect and seems to me to be nothing more than hasty legislation.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say but a single word, because I did not get an opportunity to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] a question on his explanation of the effect of the pending substitute if adopted. If I catch its meaning, as read from the Clerk's desk, it does not sustain the explanation made by the gentleman from Illinois. Let us see. It provides that the Public Printer shall establish "a branch or division" in his office, and that branch shall be sufficient in equipment and force to do all the census work. Now, that branch of the division, the new establishment—I say establishment, for what does the word "establish" mean?—would remain at least comparatively permanent. After Congress adjourns there must be a shrinkage of the force in the Public Printer's employ, and it would occur in the old establishment and not in the new under this substitute. And it would be true under the language of that amendment, if I can construe it rightly, that a Public Printer's force would go on in the census branch, and then, when a less force was needed, the shrinkage would occur on the old force. The point is that the old force would suffer and the new would continue unmolested.

Mr. UNDERWOOD rose.

Mr. HOPKINS. I want to say this——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have the floor, Mr. Chairman, and I desire to proceed. Mr. Chairman, I did not in the beginning intend to say anything on this proposition. I intended to vote for the bill as the committee brought it in. We have known in years past that the people of the United States have not received the benefit of the census work as performed by the officers of the Government. Why? Because ten years have rolled by after once you have completed the taking of the census before you gave it to the people for their inspection. By the time the printing of the books was completed in the usual old way, and they were laid before the people, your work in may respects was no longer valuable. It is valueless for the purposes for which it was printed. For that reason I say it is the duty of this Congress, if it is impossible at any time for the Public Printer, in the usual course of business and with the facilities at his hand, to complete these volumes within the time that they can be furnished to the people, so they can receive the full benefit from the statistics gathered, then it is our duty to allow the Director of the Census to go out on the open market and contract for the printing of these volumes at the least price and furnish them to the people of the United States.

If that can not be done under the bill as it stands to-day, if it can not be done under the law as it stands to-day, it can not be done under any amendment such as is now offered. I consider the proposition an absolute absurdity. Under the laws of the census, and under all the censuses heretofore, the Public Printer has been allowed to enlarge his force without any specical legislation; if the Appropriations Committee allow the money, he can put on men and establish the necessary force to print these documents whether you provide for a special power or not. I say that when we attempt to dodge the question we are not doing justice to our constituents, to the people who are entitled to this information. We ought to vote down this proposition to establish a branch printing office. You accomplish nothing by adopting this proposed amendment, because the Public Printer can accomplish it all now under the law as it now stands.

Mr. SIMS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama if this has been referred to the Public Printer?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The proposition seems to have been brought before this House without any consideration by anyone. There is no estimate brought in here to show whether the Public Printer can do the work better under this law than under the law that now exists. There is no information that it has been inquired into by the Director of the Census. The only thing I can see is that possibly some of the gentlemen on this floor who were in favor of the fourth section have now become alarmed and wish to run away from a vote. I say if we are in favor of the fourth section and want to assist the Director of the Census in sending out volumes, let us face the question honestly and squarely. [Applause.]

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I sent to the Clerk's desk was in the interest of harmony. If there is objection, I wish to withdraw it and take a vote on the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The substitute is withdrawn by the gentleman from Illinois, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Committee on the Census.

The amendment was rejected without a division.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report the bill as amended to the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CANNON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (S. 2179) relating to the Twelfth and subsequent censuses, and giving to the Director thereof additional power and authority in certain cases, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, and with the recommendation that as amended the same do pass.

Mr. HOPKINS. I move the previous question on the amendments and on the bill to its passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any of the amendments?

Mr. MCRAE. I ask that the amendments be again reported.

Mr. HOPKINS. Oh, they have just been read.

Mr. MCRAE. I withdraw the request.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any of the amendments? If not, they will be voted upon in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this is a bill that ought to be ingrafted into law at once, I ask for a conference with the Senate on the disagreement between the two Houses, and that the Speaker appoint the House conferees, this being a Senate bill with House amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves that a conference be asked with the Senate, and that the Speaker appoint the conferees on the part of the House.

The motion was agreed to; and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. GRIFFITH.

On motion of Mr. HOPKINS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DE GRAFFENREID for five days, on account of death in his family.

And then, on motion of Mr. PAYNE (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of the Missouri River at Napoleon, Mo.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for the investigation relating to the relief of the Fourth Arkansas Mounted Infantry—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copies of communications from the officer in charge of the overland relief expedition and a report of the adjustment of the accounts of the Cape Smythe Whaling and Trading Company—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Supervising Surgeon-General of the Marine-Hospital Service submitting an estimate for equipment of new building at the marine hospital at Chicago, Ill.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a copy of a

communication from the Acting Commissary-General of Subsistence relating to legislation affecting officers who disburse subsistence funds—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution of the House (H. J. Res. 77) to provide for pay to certain retired officers of the Marine Corps, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 73); which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MONDELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2965) to complete the establishment and erection of a military post near the city of Sheridan, in the State of Wyoming, and making an appropriation therefor, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 74); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PEARRE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6777) relative to the widening and extension of Sixteenth street, in the District of Columbia, reported the same, accompanied by a report (No. 75); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1192) for the relief of Charles Gallagher, of New York, and to refer his claims to the Court of Claims—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 3434) for the relief of the New England Distilling Company, of Covington, Ky.—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (H. R. 4430) granting a pension to Catharine Coughlin—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6138) granting an increase of pension to Lillian Capron—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6403) granting a pension to Alice Bozeman—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 6766) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of telegraphic cables between the United States of America and Hawaii, Guam, and Philippine Islands, and other countries, and to promote commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreigh Commerce.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 6767) to grant an American register to the steamer *Windward*—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine (by request): A bill (H. R. 6768) for the raising of revenue, the creation of a tariff commission, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CROMER: A bill (H. R. 6769) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Anderson, in the State of Indiana—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6770) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Muncie, in the State of Indiana—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TONGUE: A bill (H. R. 6771) to construct a revetment on the left bank of the Willamette River, near Independence, in Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 6772) for the establishment of a general depot of the Quartermaster's Department of the United States Army at Omaha, Nebr.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 6773) authorizing the extension of Welling place—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 6774) to amend an act entitled "An act for the erection of a public building at St. Paul, Minn.," approved February 16, 1891—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RANSDELL: A bill (H. R. 6775) to provide for the permanent improvement of the Ouachita River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

From the COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: A bill (H. R. 6777) relative to the widening and extension of Sixteenth street, in the District of Columbia—to the House Calendar.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 6778) to repeal the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McLAIN: A bill (H. R. 6868) to amend an act authorizing the terms of the district court of the United States for the southern district of Mississippi to be held hereafter at Biloxi—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6869) establishing under the Treasury Department a bureau of health—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 6870) to extend laws enacted by Congress for the Territories to our new islands—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 6871) for the erection of a monumental statue in the city of Washington, D. C., to the late Maj. Gen. Henry W. Lawton, United States Volunteers—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. ZENOR: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 125) construing the act approved June 27, 1890, entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents"—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 126) diverting and setting apart $50,000 out of the sums heretofore appropriated for jetty work at Cumberland Sound, in the States of Florida and Georgia, for sluicing and dredging at the entrance of said sound—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: A resolution (H. Res. 98) relating to the appointment of chaplain in the United States Army of the Roman Catholic faith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 99) relating to the appointment of chaplain in the Unites States Navy of the Roman Catholic faith—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COUSINS: A resolution (H. Res. 100) calling for information from the Secretary of the Interior relative to the Sac and Fox Indians of the Mississippi residing in the State of Iowa—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON: A resolution (H. Res. 101) requesting information from the Secretary of War relative to the proposed power canal projected by the Michigan-Lake Superior Power Company—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BURKETT: A resolution of the legislature of Pennsylvania, relating to the election of United States Senators by popular vote—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: A resolution of the legislature of Pennsylvania, relating to the election of United States Senators by popular vote—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A resolution of State Agricultural Society of Minnesota, relating to subsidies for American shipping—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 6776) granting a pension to Annie Chamberlain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROMWELL (by request): A bill (H. R. 6779) to pay certain Treasury settlements—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6780) to remove the charge of desertion against Frederick Madaka and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6781) to remove the charge of desertion against William Bode and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6782) to remove the charge of desertion against John Breslin and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKETT: A bill (H. R. 6783) granting a pension to Moses Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROMER: A bill (H. R. 6784) granting a pension to Henry H. Neff, of Winchester, Randolph County, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 6785) to increase the pension of Maria Egan, widow of Michael Egan, late captain Company G, Eighty-eighth New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 6786) for the relief of W. S. Hutchinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 6787) to pension Edwin A. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6788) for the relief of John Kingston—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 6789) granting pension to Martha L. Sheridan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 6790) for the relief of the Globe Works, of Boston, Mass.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 6791) granting privilege of reenlistment to Charles Campbell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 6792) for the relief of John Stull—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 6793) for the relief of Samuel Gibbons—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6794) to pension Rosanna Early Macfarlane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6795) for the relief of Daniel Leary—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 6796) granting a pension to Joseph H. Failes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 6797) granting a pension to Martha C. M. Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 6798) for the relief of Oliver Halsey—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LYBRAND: A bill (H. R. 6799) granting a pension to Rosana Mock, widow of Taylor Mock, Company E, Thirteenth United States Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 6800) for increase of pension of Maurice M. Woodbury—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 6801) granting a pension to Margaret Eleanor McCoy, widow of Col. Thomas F. McCoy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 6802) to grant a pension to Rev. Warren Cochran, of Omaha, Nebr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARSH: A bill (H. R. 6803) granting an increase of pension to James Grazier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 6804) granting a pension to Sarah Berry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6805) granting a pension to Mrs. S. T. Emery, widow of Obadiah German—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6806) granting a pension to Salva Vance—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6807) granting a pension to Letetia Fowler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6808) granting a pension to Maria Tripp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6809) granting a pension to Mrs. Thomas Russell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6810) granting an increase of pension to Peter Anderson, of Strong City, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6811) granting a pension to Matilda Taylor, of Yates Center, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6812) granting a pension to W. A. Shannon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6813) granting a pension to Anna C. Walquist—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6814) granting a pension to Mary A. Watkins, of Quenemo, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6815) granting a pension to Franklin Bannon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6816) granting a pension to D. H. Hazzard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6817) granting a pension to Eunice I. Godfrey, of Madison, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6818) granting a pension to Mrs. Ann Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6819) for the relief of Mathew Cowley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6820) for the relief of Mrs. I. J. Russell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6821) for the relief of E. N. Smith—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6822) for the relief of Serena M. Clay, of Toronto, Kans.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McLAIN: A bill (H. R. 6823) to correct the military record of Charles M. Gordon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLMSTED: A bill (H. R. 6824) granting a pension to Rev. Stephen W. Pomeroy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6825) granting a pension to Miss Mary Shiffler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6826) granting a pension to Thomas Laramore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 6827) for the relief of Eliza M. Abbott—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPRAGUE: A bill (H. R. 6828) granting an increase of pension to Adelaide E. Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6829) granting an increase of pension to John K. Crosby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6830) granting an increase of pension to John Cairo—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6831) granting a pension to Frances E. Wild, widow of Edward A. Wild, late brigadier-general, United States Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 6832) to correct the military record of Albert Thurber—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6833) to increase the pension of George Bellamy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6834) to increase the pension of Nathan W. Snee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIBLEY: A bill (H. R. 6835) to pension Caroline S. Humphrey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6836) to remove charge of desertion against Henry Dykeman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6837) for the relief of the heirs of A. Lawrence Foster—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THROPP: A bill (H. R. 6838) to correct military record of John Piles and remove charge of desertion therefrom—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6839) to correct the military record of Peter Bader—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6840) granting a pension to Mrs. Catharine McMullen—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WACHTER: A bill (H. R. 6841) for the relief of Julia Nolan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6842) removing charge of desertion against John Benson, late seaman on the United States steamship *Iroquois*—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6843) to remove the charge of desertion against Lorenzo Dorritee, deceased, late of Company I, Third Maryland Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6844) increasing the pension of Margaret Engelhardt, widow of Frederick Engelhardt, late private in Company B, Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6845) for the relief of Carl Jordan and restoration to the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6846) for the relief of Julia Nolan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6847) removing charge of desertion against Thomas Saville, late lieutenant and captain, First Maryland Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6848) increasing the pension of John Clark, late of Company B, Second Regiment Iowa Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6849) increasing the pension of David E. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 6850) for the relief of Ellen Mary Anderson, of Heidelberg, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WATERS: A bill (H. R. 6851) granting a pension to Charles E. Colton—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6852) for the relief of Sarah A. Cady—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6853) granting a pension to George W. Frasher—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6854) to increase the pension of Frederick W. Kellogg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6855) granting a pension to Annie C. Fletcher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6856) to remove charge of desertion from the military record of John O'Mara—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAM E. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 6857) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Luther Cline—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6858) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6859) for the relief of Helen Gillen, widow of Daniel F. Gillen, late captain Company I, Sixty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6860) to increase the pension of Charles Williams, late captain Company A, Eighty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6861) to grant Samuel S. Boyer, late first lieutenant and assistant surgeon, Fifty-fifth Pennsylvania Volunteers, a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6862) granting a pension to James D. Gay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6863) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Walter E. Duncan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 6864) for the relief of Joseph Courts, late of United States revenue cutter *Toucey*—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 6865) for the relief of Jacob A. Henry—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6866) to amend the military record of James Roche—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 6867) for the relief of Eli Sharp—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Hatters' Fur Industry of New York City, protesting against the ratification of the reciprocity treaty with France—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, concerning banking and currency—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ADAMS: Resolutions of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring the appointment of a commission to study and report upon the industrial and commercial conditions of China—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Joseph Courts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKETT: Resolution of the Central Labor Union of Washington, D. C., in opposition to section 3 of House bill No. 5486—to the Committee on the Census.

Also, resolutions of the Nebraska Dairymen's Association for a law taxing butter imitations—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New York for equipment of coast artillery for defense—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CRAWFORD: Petition of dental surgeons of North Carolina, favoring the appointment of dental surgeons in the Army and Navy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALZELL: Resolution of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, in favor of a commission to study and report upon the industrial and commercial conditions of China—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: Memorial of the New York Chamber of Commerce, in favor of the increase of coast artillery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Marine Society of the City of New York, in favor of the shipping bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the New England Shoe and Leather Association, asking that the treaty with France be amended so as not to discriminate against American leather—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of New York: Petition of citizens of the borough of Brooklyn of the city of New York, protesting against the proposed consolidation of the post-office in the borough of Brooklyn with the post-office in the borough of Manhattan in the city of New York—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GAMBLE: Memorial of the New York Chamber of Commerce, in favor of the increase of coast artillery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: Petition of clerks of the post-office at Atlantic City, N. J., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the classification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Papers to accompany House bill No. 318, to amend the record of Philip M. Topham—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Petition of T. H. Sheckler and others of Nora Springs, Iowa, mass meeting at Nashua, Iowa, and synod of the Presbyterian Church of Iowa, against the seating of B. H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah, and for an amendment to the Constitution making polygamy a crime—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: Petition of American citizens protesting against the locating of claims in Alaska by power of attorney, etc.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JOY: Petition of the Woman Suffrage Association of Missouri, for equality of rights for the women of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Papers to accompany House bill correcting the record of Oliver Halsey—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McALEER: Resolutions of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of the appointment of a commission to study the industrial and commercial conditions of the Chinese Empire—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCLEARY: Resolutions of the Minnesota State Agricultural Society, with reference to the bill for the encouragement of the American merchant marine—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MAHON: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Margaret Eleanor McCoy, widow of Col. Thomas F. McCoy, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARSH: Petition of A. J. Kalb, of Quincy, Ill., relating to the stamp tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERCER: Resolutions of the First Regiment, Vicksburg Command, Union Veterans' Union, of Omaha, Nebr., protesting against the passage of House bill No. 3899—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OLMSTED: Petition of druggists of Lebanon, Pa., H. E. Keller, George W. Smith, and J. E. Slothower, of Harrisburg, Pa., relating to the stamp tax on medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the employees of the Harrisburg, Pa., post-office, favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of G. A. Gardner and others, of Harrisburg, Pa., and vicinity, favoring a bill providing for the reclassifiation of the Railway Mail Service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. POWERS: Petition of druggists of Burlington, Vt., for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAY of New York: Petition of J. W. Merchant, of Whitney Point, N. Y., for the passage of a bill relating to dairy food and products—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Petition of post-office clerks of Charlestown station of the Boston post-office and of the Lynn, Mass., post-office, favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the reclassification of postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of Oscar M. Holcomb, for legislation for Mexican soldiers—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Nebraska: Petition of the Woman Suffragists of Nebraska, against the insertion of the word "male" in the suffrage clauses of the constitutions of Hawaii, Cuba, etc.—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: Petition of citizens of Jefferson City, Mo., in favor of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of Charles Bigelow and others, asking for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEELE: Petition of P. H. McGreevy, of Peru, Ind., favoring a bill providing for the reclassification of the Railway Mail Service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of John H. Weil and H. G. Beekman, of New York City, N. Y., for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THROPP: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Mrs. Catharine McMullen—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of post-office clerks at Altoona, in favor of the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, paper to accompany House bill to remove the charge of desertion against the military record of John Piles—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, statement to accompany House bill to correct the military record of Peter Bader—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER: Protests of citizens of the counties of Champaign and McLean, State of Illinois, against the seating of B. H.

Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of the citizens of the borough of Brooklyn, N. Y., against the consolidation of the Brooklyn and New York post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: Memorial of the American League, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring peace with honor to the Philippines, and to secure a sound basis for reconstruction in the islands—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia, Pa., Board of Trade, urging the appointment of a commission to study and report upon the industrial and commercial conditions in China—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *January 19, 1900.*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. SCOTT, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal, without objection, will stand approved.

GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR AND RAILWAY COMPANY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the annual report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator and Railway Company for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1899; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS IN INDIAN DEPREDATION CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 17th instant, a list of all judgments for Indian depredation claims that have been rendered by the Court of Claims and are not included in his last report.

The Chair is uncertain whether the communication should go to the Committee on Claims or to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

Mr. CULBERSON. I suggest that the report of the Attorney-General be referred to the Committee on Appropriations. It was the object of the resolution to obtain information for the use of that committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the distribution of the appropriation bills the Indian appropriation bill goes to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. CULBERSON. Very well. Let it be referred to that committee, then.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The communication will, without objection, be printed and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore subsequently said: An order was made directing the information conveyed by the Attorney-General touching Indian depredation judgments to be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs. The Chair is informed that the appropriation is contained in the deficiency appropriation bill, and therefore the papers should be printed and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, rather than go to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. ALLISON. The item making appropriations for judgments in regard to Indian depredations is in the deficiency appropriation bill as it came from the House, and it is pending before the Committee on Appropriations. I was not aware the matter had been referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The reference will be changed, and the communication will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, if there be no objection.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WELLINGTON presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Cumberland, Md., and a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PERKINS persented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the establishment of a department of commerce and industries; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., praying for the immediate construction of the Nicaragua Canal and for its absolute control by the Government of the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the adulteration of food and liquors; which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of San Francisco, Oakland, Los Angeles, and Alameda, all in the State of California, praying that the Chinese restriction law be so amended as to permit Chinese Christian converts to bring their families into the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CULLOM presented petitions of sundry railway mail clerks of Danville, Elgin, and Mendota, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of Dr. Arthur R. Reynolds, commissioner of health, department of health, Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to secure information regarding the sanitary character of all public water supplies; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CLARK of Montana presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Butte, Mont., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. SEWELL presented the petition of F. B. Everitt and 22 other citizens of Trenton, N. J., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Dover, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. DAVIS presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of St. Paul, Minn., praying that certain Indian reservations be withheld from public sale for national-park purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the State Agricultural Society of Minnesota, praying for the adoption of a system of bounties on the exportation of breadstuffs, cotton, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented the petition of Hendrickson, Lefler & Co. and sundry other business firms of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to compel telegraph and express companies to pay themselves the charge for the revenue stamps required to be attached to telegrams and express receipts; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Huntington, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. DANIEL presented sundry petitions of citizens of Pulaski, Clifton Station, Lucretia, Norwood, Wakefield, Richmond, Dayton, Hinton, Mount Clinton, Harrisonburg, Lovettsville, Medley, Salem, Roanoke, San Marino, and Sturgeonville, all in the State of Virginia, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of the Furniture Board of Trade of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase American shipping; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Antikamnia Chemical Company, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of Hon. Lon V. Stephens, governor; F. L. Pitts, State treasurer, and sundry other State officials and citizens of Jefferson City, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a concurrent resolution adopted by the legislature of Missouri, favoring the appropriation of a sum of not less than $20,000 to the county of Camden, in the State of Missouri, for the purpose of constructing and erecting a bridge over the Osage River at the point or near the point where the Niangua River runs into the Osage River on the northeast fourth of the northeast fourth of section 35, Township 39 north, Range 17 west, in Camden County, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented the petition of Hon. Isaac H. Sturgeon, of

St. Louis, Mo., praying for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal and for a cable to the Philippines and China; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Missouri Horse Breeders' Association, praying for the passage of a pure-food bill; which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. HALE presented the petition of Dr. Louis B. Weymouth and sundry other citizens of North Vassalboro, Me., praying for the immediate cessation of hostilities in the Philippines; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PACIFIC CABLE.

Mr. HALE. I present certain papers relating to the question of the Pacific cable, upon which the Committee on Naval Affairs is making or is trying to make a careful investigation. I ask that the papers may be printed separately as documents and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

There being no objection, the papers were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed as separate documents, as follows:

An American Pacific Cable, by George Owen Squier;

A paper on the United States Government Pacific cable, by George Owen Squier, Ph. D., M. A., I. E. E., etc., captain, Signal Corps, assistant to the Chief Signal Officer, United States Army;

An argument in favor of private ownership versus Government ownership;

A letter of James A. Scrymser, president of the Pacific Cable Company, of New York, and sundry newspaper clippings; and

A letter from James A. Scrymser, president of the Pacific Cable Company, New York, together with an extract from testimony given by Mr. Carson, manager of the Anglo-American Telegraph Company, before the committee appointed to consider the laying of an all-British trans-Pacific cable, December 1, 1896.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. ALLEN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 66) for the relief of the heirs of Margaret Kennedy, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BURROWS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1717) for the relief of George H. White, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CLAY, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 70) diverting and setting apart $50,000 out of the sums heretofore appropriated for jetty work at Cumberland Sound, in the States of Florida and Georgia, for sluicing and dredging at the entrance of said sound, reported it without amendment.

Mr. McMILLAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported an amendment proposing an appropriation of $5,000 for the completion of the isolating building at the Providence Hospital, intended to be proposed to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. ALLEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1295) granting a pension to Louisa Hale, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1293) granting pay and allowances to Francisco V. De Coster, late captain, First Battalion of Cavalry, Mississippi Marine Brigade, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. KYLE. I am directed by the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 925) granting an increase of pension to John A. Hughes, to submit an adverse report thereon. The claimant has been dead a year and a half. I move that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

WARROAD (MINN.) HARBOR IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the following concurrent resolution, submitted by himself on the 15th instant, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to submit a report of survey and estimate for the dredging and other improvements of the harbor at Warroad, Minn.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 2553) to provide for the erection of a public building at Norfolk, in the State of Nebraska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. WELLINGTON introduced a bill (S. 2554) to exempt veterans of the war with Spain from disqualification for age, where otherwise qualified, for appointment to the staff and line of the armies of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2555) to provide for a complete system of automatic and manual fire-alarm signaling for protection of the United States Capitol; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2556) to provide protection for public school buildings of the District of Columbia against dangers of conflagration, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BERRY (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2557) granting a pension to Josie Brown; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 2558) for the relief of the owners and officers of the brig *Olive Frances* and others on board said brig; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HANNA introduced a bill (S. 2559) authorizing the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to redeem or make allowance for internal-revenue stamps; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2560) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Charles Mulherron; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2561) granting an increase of pension to John B. Goman; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2562) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Wolfley; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 2563) to correct the military record of Decatur Dakin (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2564) to correct the military record of Henry Beason;

A bill (S. 2565) to correct the military record of Shannon S. Bailey (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2566) to correct the military record of Isaac Holdbrook (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a bill (S. 2567) to authorize the Arizona Water Company to erect water-power plants on its canals across the reservation set apart for the Pima and Maricopa Indians by Executive order dated June 14, 1879, in the county of Maricopa, Territory of Arizona; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. McLAURIN (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2568) for the relief of Ellen Mary Anderson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 2569) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Webb; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2570) granting an increase of pension to John M. Swift; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 2571) to provide rules and regulations governing the importation of trees, plants, shrubs, vines, cuttings, grafts, and buds, commonly known as nursery stock, and fruits into the United States, and rules and regulations for the inspection of trees, plants, shrubs, vines, grafts, cuttings, and buds, commonly known as nursery stock, grown within the United States, which become subjects of interstate commerce or exportation; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 2572) to amend an act entitled "An act for the erection of a public building for the use of the custom-house and post-office at Newport News, in the district of Newport News, Va.," approved February 21, 1899; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2573) for the relief of Carolina Carter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2574) for the relief of Haliday & Richardson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 2575) for the relief of William Wolfe; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. KYLE introduced a bill (S. 2576) for the relief of William H. H. Lee; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

FRACTIONAL SILVER COINS.

Mr. COCKRELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to make to the Senate a report of the amount of fractional silver coins coined monthly from January 1, 1899, to December 31, 1899, and what amount of such coinage was manufactured from old silver coins melted, and what amount, if any, was made from new bullion, and from whom such new bullion was purchased, and the price paid therefor per ounce, and the amount of the seigniorage thereon.

JUDGMENTS OF COURT OF CLAIMS.

Mr. COCKRELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims requiring an appropriation for their payment and not included in his last report.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2284) extending the time for the completion of a wagon and motor bridge across the Missouri River at St. Charles, Mo., as provided by an act approved June 3, 1896.

The message also announced that the House had passed, with amendments, the bill (S. 2179) relating to the Twelfth and subsequent censuses, and giving to the Director thereof additional power and authority in certain cases, and for other purposes, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. GRIFFITH managers at the conference on the part of the House.

DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATIVE OF THE TRANSVAAL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a former day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. ALLEN, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate if any person has been accredited representative in any capacity to the United States of America by the South African Republic, commonly known as the Transvaal, and if such person was officially accepted and recognized as such representative by the Government of the United States, and if he was not, for what reason official acceptance and recognition were refused him; and the Secretary of State is further directed to inform the Senate of the name of such person, and when he applied for official recognition, and when and for what reason official recognition was refused him, and if any other government, and, if so, what government, or its official representative or representatives, objected or protested against the official recognition of such proposed representative of said South African or Transvaal Republic by the Government of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. SPOONER. I move to amend the resolution by striking out, in line 1, the words "Secretary of State" and inserting "President;" in line 2, by striking out "directed" and inserting "requested;" in the same line, after "Senate," inserting "if in his opinion not incompatible with the public interest;" and in line 8, by striking out "and the Secretary of State is further directed" and inserting "also."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, which will be read.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to know, if the Senator from Wisconsin has no objection to stating it, the purpose of that amendment? What is the reason why he offers it?

Mr. HOAR. The question has not been entirely put from the Chair. Let the Secretary read the resolution as proposed to be amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the resolution as proposed to be amended on the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to inform the Senate, if in his opinion not incompatible with the public interest, if any person has been accredited representative in any capacity to the United States of America by the South African Republic, commonly known as the Transvaal, and if such person was officially accepted and recognized as such representative by the Government of the United States, and if he was not, for what reason official acceptance and recognition were refused him; also to inform the Senate of the name of such person, and when he applied for official recognition, and when and for what reason official recognition was refused him, and if any other Government, and if so, what Government, or its official representative or representatives, objected or protested against the official recognition of such proposed representative of said South African or Transvaal Republic by the Government of the United States.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Wisconsin ought to state why he desires to have this amendment made before the Senate is called upon to vote on the amendment.

Mr. SPOONER. I am perfectly willing to do so, if the Senator desires it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. SPOONER. I think, Mr. President, we ought to have some rule, and be governed by some rule or principle, as to the form of this and similar resolutions. So far as I have known during my short experience in the Senate, and also so far as I have ever had opportunity to consult the precedents, my recollection is that it has been the uniform practice of the Senate, where it sought any information bearing upon our foreign relations, to address a request to the President, with the qualification which I have suggested in the amendment, to furnish it, if in his opinion not incompatible with the public interest.

It is not a mere matter of etiquette, in my judgment, either, but if it were a mere matter of etiquette, dealing with a coordinate and independent branch of the Government, we certainly ought to employ that formula which is most in harmony with politeness. But in my view, and I think it is perfectly clear, we have no right to demand information of the President as to the status or conduct of our foreign relations. If that be true, the form of the resolution as introduced by my friend from Nebraska is objectionable, because where we can not command or demand we ought not to assume to direct.

I never have heard it denied, until recently, although it is asserted by Justice Story, by Pomeroy, and stated by the Supreme Court of the United States in many decisions, and by other judicial tribunals, that the organ of communication between this Government and foreign governments is, under the Constitution, the executive department. It is not Congress; it is not the judiciary; it is not one branch of Congress; it is the President. In practice it must be so, Mr. President. The Secretary of State, so far as his function concerns the foreign relations of the United States, has been understood and has been treated by Congress as upon a different basis or footing from the other Cabinet officials. That was the theory upon which that Department was created.

The President need not employ the hand or the brain of the Secretary of State in the conduct of our foreign relations. He may not utilize him unless he chooses in the negotiation of treaties. He need not utilize him unless he chooses in the conduct of our foreign correspondence. He may do it all in person if he sees fit, and when the Secretary of State does it he does it for the President. He does not perform any duty, so far as our foreign relations are concerned, under compulsion of any act of Congress. He carries forward no correspondence with foreign governments by command of any act of Congress, because by the Constitution that entire function is vested in the President.

I invite the attention of the Senator from Nebraska to the language——

Mr. ALLEN. I am not ignorant of it.

Mr. SPOONER. Then I will invite the attention of those who perhaps may be ignorant of it—outside, of course, this Chamber.

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. I call attention to the language of the section which imposes duties upon the Secretary of State. It is the old act of 1789, which has never been changed in that respect, and it is entirely in harmony with the theory for which I contend:

SEC. 202. The Secretary of State shall perform such duties as shall from time to time be enjoined on or intrusted to him by the President relative to correspondences, commissions, or instructions to or with public ministers or consuls from the United States, or to negotiations with public ministers from foreign states or princes, or to memorials or other applications from foreign public ministers or other foreigners, or to such other matters respecting foreign affairs as the President of the United States shall assign to the Department, and he shall conduct the business of the Department in such manner as the President shall direct.

I do not deny that he may not be called upon to discharge duties which are imposed by Congress, and possibly as to those duties we may direct him in a call for information, but I do deny that as to foreign relations he can be directed properly by the Senate.

We have no right to demand of the President—and I presume my friend from Nebraska will admit it—copies of correspondence as to current negotiations, and, I think, any negotiations between this Government and foreign governments. We have a right to request it; and we must assume that if the President is of the opinion that its transmission to Congress will be in harmony with the public interest, he will transmit it. But he knows more, and inevitably must know more, about the complications, the delicate phases, of foreign relations than we can know, because he is to conduct them.

I utterly repudiate the idea, Mr. President, which has been uttered here in this Chamber many times within the last two weeks, that the people of the United States are entitled to know from day to day everything connected with the administration of

the Government. It would not be contended that while the President is conducting a war under his power as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy the people are to be advised from day to day of the military plans, nor would it be expected that the people are to be advised from day to day of the correspondence, negotiations, pending with foreign governments, every one of which is a competitor of ours in many ways, certainly in commercial ways. Diplomacy must be secret in order to be successful.

I think the people of the United States are willing to trust the President, whoever he may be—I speak not simply of the distinguished gentleman who to-day is President, but any President—relying upon his patriotism and upon his discretion. The people know that the business of this Government can not be properly conducted if from day to day either House of Congress has a right to demand that there shall be laid before the country every detail and that nothing is to be regarded as confidential.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I should like to interrupt the Senator. The Senator, I dare say, knows that I entirely agree with him in the view which he has just expressed. I expressed it very earnestly within a day or two in the Senate when the resolution of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] was up. I do not ask it with a view of antagonizing his position, but as he is making a statement on this subject, I will ask him if he will express his opinion as to where we get the authority to direct the heads of the other Departments of the Government besides the Secretary of State, so that his statement may be complete.

Mr. SPOONER. The other Departments of the Government ordinarily are engaged in executing laws which we pass and in performing duties which we, by law, impose upon them. I admitted a moment ago that as to the Secretary of State we may pass laws imposing duties, and we may probably direct him to inform the Senate as to the performance of duties imposed upon him by act of Congress. I have attempted to draw the distinction, and I think it is a perfectly valid one, between the Secretary of State in his relation to the discharge of duties imposed by statute and the Secretary of State in his relation to the conduct of foreign relations, as to which he is not the servant of Congress; he is simply the servant of the President.

This contention upon my part I think my friend from Nebraska will see is not at all a partisan one. I would take the same position no matter who might be President of the United States. I submit to Senators it is as easy to recognize the status and position of the President under the Constitution in relation to the conduct of our foreign affairs as it is to violate it. I submit to Senators that we ought to adopt the rule—I do not mean a written rule, but to be governed by the tradition and the precedent, which is not only in itself a proper and polite thing, but is of value to the country—that in calling for information relating to our foreign affairs we should address a request to the President with the qualification which I have suggested.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to one point, if I may have leave of the Senator.

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. In regard to the Secretary of the Treasury, the original act, I think, contains this provision which is now the law in the Revised Statutes:

> The Secretary of the Treasury * * * shall make report, and give information to either branch of the Legislature in person or in writing, as may be required.

Now, no such provision was made when the Department of State was established at the same time, though they were contemporary acts, showing that the original organizers of the Government took the view which the Senator states as to the distinction between the State Department and the Treasury Department. I believe in forming and in establishing the other Departments that provision has not always been enacted about them. I can not have time to look now.

Mr. ALLISON. No; the other Departments report to the President.

Mr. HOAR. We have always considered that the principle applicable to the Treasury Department was applicable to the other Departments and have always undertaken to direct them to give us information in their Departments as we saw fit, and so has the House of Representatives; but so far as I am aware that never has been done with regard to the Secretary of State.

Mr. SPOONER. Never.

Mr. HOAR. If at all, very seldom.

Mr. ALLISON. Will the Senator from Wisconsin allow me a moment?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. ALLISON. We have a right to call on the head of a Department for information as respects our current legislation where it is a matter over which we have jurisdiction.

Mr. SPOONER. Or as to the discharge of duties imposed by act of Congress.

Mr. ALLISON. Or imposed by acts of Congress. That has always been the rule. But the Secretary of the Treasury is required to report directly to Congress under the statute of 1789.

Mr. HOAR. Either in person or by writing.

Mr. ALLISON. So his report always comes addressed to Congress, and all the other Departments report to the President.

Mr. SPOONER. That is true, as suggested by the two Senators; and from the organization of the State Department until to-day, so far as I have been able to find, there is no act of Congress requiring a report, and never has been any report from the Secretary of State to Congress as to foreign affairs.

Now, I think this resolution ought to be amended in accordance with this suggestion, and I hope my friend from Nebraska will not object to it. If there is any good reason why the President should not transmit the information, he will say so. The information can not be given to the people of the United States alone. That is one trouble with such matters. The President can not give information to the Senate in its executive session even with absolute certainty that its confidential character will be preserved. He can not give it to the people of the United States without giving it to the world, and my friend will concede that it might be very harmful many, many times to give it to the world.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, nothing would delight me more than to be able to agree entirely with my friend from Wisconsin if I could do so conscientiously. I can agree with him, and do agree with him, that all resolutions addressed to the President of the United States or to any Department of the Government should be couched in respectful language, and I had supposed, until he reminded me to the contrary, that my resolution was couched in the ordinary form of a resolution for information addressed to a Department. That is all I seek. I heard the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] contend a day or two ago, and it seemed to be universally acquiesced in, especially by my friend the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], who is a stickler for that form, that all resolutions addressed to a Department should be directed instead of requested.

No man has a higher regard for the President of the United States, the present incumbent of that great office, than I have. The world knows that I disagree with him in his political views. He is not a believer in any policy or measure that I know of to which I agree; and yet he is the President of the United States and an eminent gentleman, and to his office and to his personality I owe, as every other citizen owes, a due amount of respect, and I cheerfully accord it to him and to the office. But, Mr. President, I am not required to subordinate my views of the proprieties and amenities and decencies of life to the wishes or caprice of some other gentleman. I could not get along in this world very well if I did that, because I would be constantly running against gentlemen who disagree with me, as I am doing daily. I must be guided, Mr. President, by my sense of right and of propriety and of order, as I have been and shall be in the future.

Now, I do not agree with the Senator from Wisconsin, I regret to say again, upon the proposition that the Secretary of State can not be reached in this way. I am perfectly willing to accord full credit to the great opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States and the decisions of Mr. Justice Story. I do not know so much about Mr. Pomeroy. I do not know that I would be willing to give his opinion as much credit as that of the others referred to. But, Mr. President, there are certain things in connection with the construction of the Constitution of the United States of which no one man, past or present, has a monopoly, I care not who he may be. The history of the Constitution of the United States can be found within about ten or twelve volumes; it is not voluminous. It is not difficult to be understood by a person who sees fit to give it some attention. I utterly repudiate the idea sometimes brought out in our discussions that some one man by virtue of his location or his nationality or some other cause has a monopoly of all the wisdom that pertains to the construction of the Constitution and of our political institutions. I say this with no reference whatever to my friend from Wisconsin, whom I recognize as an able exponent of the Constitution.

Now, Mr. President, I recognize that it would be impolitic for the President of the United States to disclose any uncompleted diplomatic negotiations, for to disclose them might be the very means of thwarting their accomplishment. But when diplomatic negotiations have ended and have passed into history and are completed, there is no word in the Constitution and no deduction to be drawn from it that the President of the United States is the exclusive custodian of that record or of what it contains.

In so far as the Secretary of State is the clerk or the assistant or the means by which the President of the United States carries on his diplomatic correspondence and negotiations, I recognize him as exercising executive as distingnished from administrative power. Therefore I recognize his privilege in this resolution. But the distinction between executive power and administrative power is as clear and as well marked as the distinction between daylight

and darkness. The one is the constitutional power, involving discretion in the officer; the other is a mere statutory power and denies all discretion to the officer exercising it. The line of demarcation is plain and distinct in the duties of the Secretary of State. In so far as he carries on the negotiations of the Government as the agent of the President of the United States, the Chief Executive, his correspondence and his negotiations are free from intrenchment by us; but in so far as he is an administrative officer and is made the custodian of completed records that have passed into history, he is an administrative officer, and his protection as the agent of the President of the United States ceases.

If this were not true, Mr. President, there are no conceivable circumstances under which Congress could obtain valuable information necessary for our legislation and for our deliberations. Suppose the President of the United States were at variance with Congress; suppose we were to repeat the scenes of thirty-five years ago in this Chamber, and suppose the President or his Secretary of State was the custodian of valuable information necessary for Congress to declare war or to do something else that it alone has power to do, would the honorable Senator from Wisconsin say that under those circumstances the President or his Secretary of State could absolutely, without excuse, refuse us that information?

Mr. President, all this contention grows out of the doctrine sometimes discussed in this Chamber that the power of the President to carry on diplomatic negotiations and to recognize foreign countries is an exclusive power. I deny that. It is not the true interpretation of the Constitution. Suppose Congress says it will not recognize the existence of some foreign country. Suppose it declines in the most emphatic terms to do so, does the Senator from Wisconsin claim that the President of the United States, notwithstanding our declination, can do that? Can the Government be bound by it and by all the consequences to flow from it?

Mr. President, that is not the true doctrine. The sovereign power of this nation rests in three great coordinate departments, all of which have certain assigned duties and all of which must act in harmony to be productive of its full sovereignty, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial branches of the Government.

This resolution does not call for incomplete information respecting an incomplete negotiation. The Secretary of State is the custodian of the records to which we must have access for this information. If the event has passed into history and is concluded, is it not proper that Congress, the lawmaking power of this Government, and the power that exercises quasi judicial and executive functions, should have some information respecting this matter? Can the President of the United States, or the Secretary of State for him, recognize or decline to recognize governments at his caprice or his will without power in some branch of this Government to bring out the information and see whether that power has been exercised wisely or not?

While the President of the United States and his Secretary of State, acting as his agent or his clerk, have certain well-defined powers that we can not interfere with at all times, and which we should not desire to interfere with, yet ultimately, when the exercise of these powers has been completed in any particular instance, when the event has passed into history and it is necessary for Congress to have information to intelligently discharge its duties, we have the power to call for that information. It may be that the President has the power to refuse—I admit that freely—but I assume that no man who has ever occupied the Presidential office, and no man who ever will occupy it, will decline to inform Congress respecting those matters necessary for an intelligent discharge of its duties.

My friend from Wisconsin wants to strike out some of this resolution, but he does not say why.

Mr. SPOONER. I would strike out the word "directed."

Mr. ALLEN. Only the word "directed?" The Senator did not move to strike out the remainder of the resolution?

Mr. SPOONER. Oh, no; only to strike out the word "directed" and insert "requested."

Mr. ALLEN. I do not know why this amendment is offered, unless it is proposed to put this resolution in an attitude where the President can say that he does not see fit under the circumstances to disclose the information called for by the resolution. I care nothing about the mere matter of form. I do not care whether it is "directed" or "requested." "Requested" is the softer, the milder term; but I understand this word "directed" has been used here without exception. I have heard it discussed, I think, a dozen times since I have been in the Senate, and it has always been finally concluded that the word "directed" is the proper word. But I do not care anything about that technicality; call it "requested," if you will. The thing we want is the information.

Mr. President, if it be true, as has been suggested in certain quarters, that this South African Republic has sent its agents here to be recognized by this Government and we have refused to receive them in consequence of extraneous influences, the world ought to know that. There ought to be no attempt to shirk the responsibility of passing this resolution or to shirk its consequences by hiding behind words and phrases and insinuating that possibly the resolution is not couched in that elegant and stilted language that would be used by an Oriental diplomat.

Here is a Republic almost a hundred years old, complete and perfect in itself. We have at its capital a representative from this Government, and that Government has no representative in Washington, as I was informed a few days ago by the State Department. I had occasion to ask for the information of some constituents of mine for the name of the representative of the South African Republic, and I was told there was no such representative here. We know, Mr. President, as a matter of current history, that one man, if not more, has been appointed by the Transvaal Republic to represent that country at Washington. If the press is to be believed, one at least of those men has applied at the State Department for recognition and has not received it—has not received it, Mr. President, at a time when that Republic needs recognition at the hands of this great Government, at the hands of a sister Republic; and if any hidden or subtle influence has interposed between the State Department and the recognition of the agent of that Government, it is not only proper that the Senate of the United States should know it, but that the people of the United States should know it as well.

I utterly repudiate this un-American theory that Congress and the President are so much more eminent than all other citizens that secrets can be intrusted to them alone. Why, Mr. President, this is not your Government any more than it is mine; it is not mine any more than it is the Government of the 75,000,000 people who are citizens of this nation, all of them, or most of them, eligible to the discharge of public duties in one capacity or another. They pay the taxes; they carry our banner on land and sea; they send the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and other distinguished gentlemen to this Chamber and to another branch of Congress to represent them; yet, as soon as they come here, we are told that the people do not know enough to be intrusted with this information, and that they ought not to have it; that there must be certain custodians, certain trustees of this valuable information which comes to the Government at Washington, but that the people can not be trusted with it.

I do not want my friend to undertake to put me in a ridiculous light, as he did a moment ago, by claiming that I want negotiations with foreign governments thrown out broadcast to the people before they are completed. Whenever a negotiation is pending, Mr. President, that is not complete and has not passed into history, it ought to remain a secret in the State Department until it is completed; but when it is an accomplished fact and has passed into the history of the country as any other great national fact has passed into its history, there is no reason or propriety in keeping it away from the American people.

Look, if you will, at the studied effort to keep from the American people the negotiations at Paris in connection with the treaty made a year ago last fall. It has been declared upon this floor that the correspondence which passed between the President and the State Department and the Paris commissioners ought never to be made public. Why, Mr. President, what was there, or is there in the correspondence which passed that is so sacred that the world should never know it? If anything passed between the commissioners and another branch of the Government which was not to the credit of this country, it ought to be known by the American people; if it was to the credit of the Government, they ought to know that also; for it is only by knowing the history of their country that they are able properly to criticise the action of this Government and determine what they shall do in the future.

I am willing, if the Senator from Wisconsin or the Senators on the other side of the Chamber want to throttle this resolution, to have it throttled. If you want to take this resolution by the throat and strangle it by putting it in some of the caverns of this Capitol, where it will never see daylight again until Gabriel blows his horn, then put it there. Mr. President, do not let us undertake to strangle it by emasculating it and making it useless and worthless.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska is in a ridiculous attitude in regard to this proposition, he has not been placed in such a status by me.

Mr. ALLEN. I am used to it.

Mr. SPOONER. The responsibility for that will be easily located. I do not take kindly to the notion suggested by the Senator, that because I moved to amend this resolution I am impeaching the intelligence of the people who sent him here. My State sent me here, Mr. President, as his State sent the Senator from Nebraska here, to attend to the business of a great nation in an orderly way, treating it as confidential where the interest of the United States requires it to be treated as confidential, and making it public where it can be made public without detriment to the interests of the United States. I am not sent here to be a demagogue. I am sent

here to help, as one member of this body, to transact the public business in harmony with the public interests and in accordance with the Constitution as I understand it, this department treating always the coordinate and independent branches of the Government with that respect to which they are entitled.

I shall take no time in discussing the distinction which my friend was able to discover under our Constitution between the executive and administrative functions of that branch of the Government and the judicial and legislative branches, but, Mr. President, I undertake to say that the wisdom of the amendment which I offered, and the wisdom of the adherence by the Senate to the traditions of the Senate upon this subject, never can be better illustrated than they are by this amendment of the resolution offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

What is called for by this resolution, Mr. President? First, the Senator proposes to direct the Secretary of State—

to inform the Senate if any person has been accredited representative in any capacity to the United States of America by the South African Republic, commonly known as the Transvaal, and if such person was officially accepted and recognized as such representative by the Government of the United States, and if he was not, for what reason official acceptance and recognition were refused him.

Who accepts representatives from other governments? The Secretary of State? Who receives ambassadors? The Secretary of State? Who refuses to receive ambassadors and other public ministers? The Secretary of State? Whose reason is it, Mr. President, which leads to the acceptance or rejection of ambassadors and other public ministers? It is the President of the United States, not the Secretary of State, who is the mere instrument of the President in the conduct of our foreign relations. The Constitution explicitly confers upon the President the power to accept envoys, ambassadors, and other public ministers. So that this proposition is a proposition that the Secretary of State, in a sense—and I use this language with perfect deference to the Department and its great importance—is the mere right hand of the President, and he is directed to inform the Senate as to an act of the President under a power vested in him and imposed upon him by the Constitution.

Not only that, Mr. President, but the resolution directs the Secretary of State to send us the reasons which caused the President to act one way or the other in the discharge of his constitutional functions. When before has this Cabinet officer ever been directed by resolution of this House, or, so far as I know, of the other House, to transmit the reasons which moved the President in the discharge of his duty, made by the Constitution purely executive? It is not only, in my judgment, a gross piece of impudence, but it is an imputation upon the Senate itself to assume to direct the Secretary of State to transmit to the Senate the reasons which governed the President in his action in the discharge of this purely executive function.

That is not all there is of the resolution. It proceeds:

And the Secretary of State is further directed to inform the Senate of the name of such person, and when he applied for official recognition, and when and for what reason official recognition was refused him.

There it is again. Nor is that all, Mr. President. We might as well consider this subject and have some rule upon it. If it is to be understood that the Senate assumes the function or the power of directing the Secretary of State to lay before the Senate all the transactions of the President in the matter of our foreign relations, let us have it so understood and be governed by it hereafter.

Further than that, this resolution says:

And if any other government, and if so, what government, or its official representative or representatives, objected or protested against the official recognition of such proposed representative of said South African or Transvaal Republic by the Government of the United States.

The communications of foreign governments are with the President, not with the Secretary of State. He is the mere conduit; he may receive the minister and receive the communication, but in contemplation of law it is a communication with the President; it is a communication addressed to the Government; and here the Secretary of State is not only proposed to be directed to send a statement to the Senate of the President's action, and the reasons for the President's action, but he is directed to send to the Senate communications from a foreign government. How many foreign governments will enter into communication or correspondence with the United States if they are given to understand that in a week, or the next month, they can, upon the demand of the Senate——

Mr. ALLEN. I suppose the Senator wants to stay within the facts as to the resolution.

Mr. SPOONER. I do.

Mr. ALLEN. There is not a communication of any kind called for in the resolution.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not know what a protest against the contemplated action by the United States would be unless it were a communication, either in writing or orally. Does the Senator know?

Mr. ALLEN. I was not observing the Senator's question. If he will state it again, I will tell him.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator ought not to criticise my observations if he does not understand them.

Mr. ALLEN. I do understand you when I listen to you, but I do not always listen to you, I regret to say.

Mr. SPOONER. Then you lose something.

Mr. ALLEN. I know I do; but I have been missing these crumbs of wisdom all my life. I wish I could get in shape to listen to the Senator every day.

Mr. SPOONER. I am obliged to listen to the Senator from Nebraska almost every day.

Mr. ALLEN. I know the Senator from Wisconsin does not like my speaking out my sentiments here.

Mr. SPOONER. I do, but I do not like your sentiments; that is all.

Mr. ALLEN. Very well; I do not like yours. I am not sent here by the class of people who sent the Senator from Wisconsin here. I am sent here to speak my sentiments; I propose to do that within the rules and orders of this Chamber; and I am not at this time hunting for the approval or disapproval of any Senator who disagrees with me politically.

But I rose to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that he is simply sticking in the bark. There is not a communication between the State Department and the Boer Government which is called for by the resolution. I ask the Senator to take up the resolution and read it and find what it does call for.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator has had something to say about the class of people who sent me here.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not mean that offensively.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator once lived in Wisconsin.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator will permit me——

Mr. SPOONER. I did permit you.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator declines interruption, I shall reply to him at the proper time.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator reflects upon the class of people who sent me here.

Mr. ALLEN. Not at all.

Mr. SPOONER. I did not reflect upon the class of people who sent the Senator here.

Mr. ALLEN. And I did not reflect upon the class of people who sent the Senator from Wisconsin here.

Mr. SPOONER. But I will say one thing, and that is, with the Senator's views upon public questions the class of people who sent me here never would send him here. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President——

Mr. SPOONER. I mean that with due deference to my friend's ability and with full confidence in his integrity.

Mr. ALLEN. With all due deference to the Senator from Wisconsin and to the great people of the great State he represents, that is the highest compliment he could pay me.

Mr. SPOONER. From your standpoint.

Mr. ALLEN. From my standpoint, which is correct.

Mr. SPOONER. I certainly did not intend to become involved in any bandying of words with the Senator from Nebraska. The proposition which he has made here and the amendment which I have offered did not call for it; and I think, when the Senator reads his remarks, he will find no justification for the rudeness of some of his observations.

Mr. ALLEN. If I have said anything rude, I will withdraw it.

Mr. SPOONER. I again read from the resolution:

And if so, what government, or its official representative or representatives, objected or protested against the official recognition of such proposed representative?

The Senator does not ask whether or not any foreign government communicated to this Government upon the subject; but he wants a characterization of their communication, whether they protested or not. Is not that calling for the communication, the substance of it, the character of it? Take the whole proposition, and, as I said before, it is the best possible illustration of the wisdom of the proposition which I make here, that the information called for is the President's information; it is information as to the President's own act, and we have no right to it, although we have a right to request it. This resolution should be amended as I have proposed.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I think the occasion warrants probably a remark from me, notwithstanding it may be somewhat burdensome to my friend from Wisconsin. I wish I could put an end to the idea that because I am not with either of the dominant parties here, therefore I must take a back seat entirely and speak only when some gentleman wants me to speak, and remain silent when some gentleman wants me to remain silent. I am not here for that purpose, and I do not propose to do it. I propose to speak in this Chamber, whenever I am within the rules of the Senate, upon any question that is properly before the Senate and when I think the occasion requires it in the interest of

the people I am endeavoring in my own way to represent, and who have confidence in my ability to represent them.

No sneering remark by the Senator from Wisconsin, however artfully put, at the people of Nebraska, or that portion of the people of Nebraska who agree with me—for we have Republicans and Populists and Democrats there—no imputation upon their intelligence or upon their patriotism will in the slightest degree deter me from discharging my duty conscientiously as I understand it; and I want to say for the benefit of the Senator from Wisconsin, for whom personally I have the highest conceivable respect, and for his great ability and experience I have respect, that we differ radically and irreconcilably upon policies and upon measures. I have no doubt the Senator's convictions are the result of experience, of reading, of observation. My convictions are the result of the same things, perhaps in more modified form, for I have not dwelt in the high and pure intellectual atmosphere the Senator from Wisconsin has dwelt in from boyhood up; but that is my misfortune. I have got to take my life exactly as I find it. I can struggle with my environments, but I can not always release myself from them or their influence.

Mr. President, the people of Wisconsin—and I had the honor when I was a boy of sojourning there for a little over a year—are a great people. They are as intelligent and as patriotic a people as can be found in the United States. If there were any question about their intelligence, that would be set at rest by the representation they have in this Chamber. But because of this fact it is not necessary for me to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin whenever he capriciously asks me to do so, nor in my school of ethics have I ever understood that it was a proper thing to impute to a man ignorance or viciousness or demagogy, or something else that is wrong, simply because he disagrees with me. I find men every day who are irreconcilable from my standpoint upon various questions. I have no doubt about my being correct, of course, about those questions, and yet I would not for a moment, for the edification of the galleries or bystanders or anybody else, impute a lack of sincerity or a lack of intelligence or anything of that kind to those men.

This is a serious question, Mr. President. I admit, of course, that the Senator from Wisconsin is a better lawyer than I am.

Mr. SPOONER. Oh, no.

Mr. ALLEN. I can not hope to convince the Senate of the United States that it would be possible for a Populist to be a good lawyer or a good statesman or to know anything intelligently upon any question. That is illustrative even of the provincialism of the Senate of the United States itself. It is not the part of wisdom, in my judgment, nor is it the part of statesmanship, nor is it the part of ordinary culture and good neighborhood, to assail the intelligence or the motives of a man because you happen to disagree with him. This, of all places, is the place where that ought not to be done.

No man in this Chamber has a higher regard, I repeat, and a more kindly feeling for my distinguished friend from Wisconsin than I have, but I do not want to be nagged from day to day and hour to hour, when I see fit to give my opinions in this Chamber respecting this or any other measure, by the imputation that it is coming from a demagogue or a man who belongs to a political organization which has no standing in the world. You will find out whether it has a standing or not.

While I am upon that subject, Mr. President, I want to say this—and I do not want to digress much, either—that it is studiously circulated throughout the press east of the Alleghany Mountains that the Populist party has gone to pieces. It is sedulously published in the daily and in the weekly press. There are to-day in the United States more Populists loyal to their party than there have ever been in the history of this country. The party is capable of casting distinctly two and a half million votes, and they are not all the votes of fools, either. Yet it is constantly dribbled out studiously and for a purpose that this organization has gone to pieces. An organization of discontented men, it is said. Once in a while you hear a man say that the Populist organization grew up only because the men in it did not receive recognition in the old parties, and you can find people foolish enough to believe that that is true as well as others foolish enough to assert it, and men in high life, too. They will smile and smirk at it as though it is the truth, to the injury of this organization.

This great party grew out of the fact that the Republican party is given to empire and to the destruction of republican form of government. You on the other side of this Chamber do not advocate a doctrine in the interest of the people—not one. You stand for the great banking institutions and the great corporations that fill your political pockets and the coffers of your party as against the masses. Look at the Hepburn letter, which came out here within the last ten days. You say you are in favor of protecting American labor, and to-day you are engaged in a scheme to incorporate with the inhabitants of this country over 12,000,000 pauper laborers to compete with American labor. In 1888 and 1892 and in 1896 you said you were the friends of bimetallism and an enlarged volume of money, and yet you stand in this Chamber to-day without a blush or an excuse in favor of the single gold standard. Where is your boasted patriotism, your boasted intelligence, your boasted policies for the benefit of the country? Yet because I disagree with these oft-asseverated falsehoods, I am to be held up by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin as a poor representative of a poor people.

Mr. SPOONER. I did not do that.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, my people are poor—a great many of them. I am poor; poor in this world's goods and poor in intellect, I suppose; but yet I have a right to live; I have a right to my opinions, and those I propose to maintain.

No, Mr. President, this country can not run along in this way. You can not take the 49 per cent of the people of this country who live on the farms and in the little villages and choke them to death without a protest on their part. Thank God, the center of population is moving West; it is on the Mississippi River to-day; and before fifteen years roll around the political power of this nation will be in the West. I call the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee to the fact that the time will come when you will wake the sleeping lion of this nation.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, it does not seem to me that this is a very practical question. I think myself the custom has been to address inquiries of this character to the Secretary of State. I do not see any objection to addressing it to the President, if anybody wants it to be addressed to him, although if addressed to the Secretary of State it is practically addressed to the President.

The Constitution, in defining the powers of the President, provides, among other things:

> He may require the opinion, in writing, of the principal officer in each of the Executive Departments upon any subject relating to the duties of their respective offices.

That has been recognized as an absolute control of the Departments by the Executive, and when you address a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury you address it to him, just as you do to the Secretary of the Interior, as the agent or mouthpiece of the President. I have not any doubt that we have a right to call on the President for information; but as I have said two or three times in this debate, it is a matter of discretion with him whether he will respond to it. The Constitution further provides:

> He shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient.

Mr. President, he can do that on his own motion, or he may do it if we call upon him; but in either case it is discretionary with him what he sends. Therefore there is no danger of getting anything in response to the resolution which ought not to come. I think myself, of course, that there should be a proper discretion exercised as to calling upon the President or heads of Departments for information; but whenever we do need the information, we have a right to call for it. The President is a part of the treaty-making power, but not the whole of it.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator from Colorado permit me at this point? I do not want to interrupt his remarks, but it occurs to me that early in the history of this Government it was the habit of the Senate and the House to call upon or direct Cabinet officers to come before them to answer questions, and it was done on more than one occasion.

Mr. TELLER. I do not remember any occasion when a Cabinet officer came, although I have no doubt of the power of Congress to call them here if it saw fit. The President has come into this Chamber in executive session and given his views to the Senate on more than one occasion in the early history of the country.

The President's power over treaties is this:

> He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

It is also provided in another section that he shall receive ambassadors and ministers. I believe that has been construed into a rule that the President shall determine whether they are to be received or not. I do not know how we would interfere with him, although I have not the slightest doubt that we have the right to ask him why he did not receive them. It seems to me that we ought to. We can determine by legislation, I suppose, the relation of this Government to some other government. I do not see why we should not be allowed to call for the information requested here; and if the President did not receive the representative, I can conceive myself of no injury to the public service if he answers that he did not receive him because he did not think he was entitled to be received, and give us the reason.

I do not know whether there has been any recognition of this ambassador, but it seems to me if some one has come here from the Boer Republic we should certainly receive him, because we have a representative there. One has been appointed within the last few weeks. We have recognized their nationality at all events, and if they have sent us a representative for the first time—I do

not know that they have ever had one here before—I do not see why we should not recognize him. I do not understand why it should be a one-sided arrangement and we should only have a consul over there. If we have a consul there, we certainly can have a minister if we see fit to send him. It is for us, and not the President, to determine whether or not we will send a minister.

Mr. ALLEN. There is one point to which I want to call the Senator's attention. I meant to state it in reply to the Senator from Wisconsin. The power of the President to receive ambassadors or ministers does not necessarily include the power to recognize consuls and consular agents, and the distinction I wanted to make, but it escaped my mind in the pleasantness of the controversy, was that the Secretary of State is not entitled to any immunity upon the supposition that he is the clerk of the President to receive ambassadors and ministers, etc., because he appointed the consular agent.

Mr. TELLER. We have had a consular agent over there for some years. He having resigned, the present Administration a short time ago appointed his successor. He has gone over there, and I think perhaps by this time he has landed at the capital of the Boer Republic. If Congress had provided for a minister there by appropriating money, as we do when we want a minister, the President would have been compelled to send him there. I do not know any way that he could prevent that.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not think so.

Mr. TELLER. Why not? The Senator shakes his head.

Mr. SPOONER. I was merely expressing my opinion.

Mr. TELLER. In the history of this country I do not think there is a precedent where Congress has provided that a minister should go to a country that he has not gone. However, I do not know. Possibly there has been. You can not compel the Executive to do a hundred things that we provide he must do, but there has never been any trouble in having them done, because you must presume that the President will do what is the right thing. If it is the right thing to send a minister to one country or the other, he will go without any question.

What I particularly wanted to say is that there seems to be great emphasis put upon the words "if he thinks it incompatible with the public interest, he need not send the information." Now, we may send to the President a resolution of inquiry of this kind and leave out those words. Does anybody suppose that if he thought it inexpedient and improper to send the information, he would not say so? I do not want the practice to grow up here or to have anybody believe that there is no discretion in the executive department of the Government in reference to these things which they think ought not to be given to the public, and those will be mainly and practically only in connection with the negotiation of treaties; and, as the Senator from Nebraska says, when that thing is accomplished, I do not see any reason why we should not know about it.

The absolute power of the Senate to call for anything touching treaties I do not think can be questioned. Of course they are called for in executive or secret session. We are as much a part of the treaty-making power as the President himself. No treaty can be made without us. No treaty ever has been or ever can be made without us. Unlike the Government of Great Britain, where the executive makes a treaty without reference to Parliament or any other authority, here it is the act of one branch of the legislative government and the President. I do not pretend to say it is a legislative act, but it is a duty put upon this body by the Constitution for the purpose of seeing that no improper treaties are made.

I think perhaps in reference to treaties the Senate is more absolute than in anything else touching our relation to the President; and perhaps, pending a treaty, the President would not be authorized to conceal anything from us which we would be required, possibly under common rules of decency and propriety, to keep from the public, if he should say it was a matter that should not be given to them. I have no doubt he could come here and discuss any treaty with us. I say the precedents are that he could do that.

Practically I do not see any difference whether we address the resolution to the President or to the Secretary. Perhaps we ought to adopt some rule by which we shall be governed in the future. I believe we have addressed a great many more of these inquiries to the Secretary of State than to the President. I do not see any reason for a departure now. I do not think there is any occasion for some of our friends to be so sensitive about these resolutions.

There is nothing, I think, which should be hidden or covered up. If there is, I am in favor of having it uncovered. I shall regret very much if it shall turn out that the Boers have sent an official representative here and that we have failed to recognize him. I do not want to enter into any discussion of the Boer question. It would be impossible for me, however, to see a little Republic struggling against a great power like England and not have my sympathies go out to the people who are trying to maintain their autonomy and, as they think, their liberty. Yet I do not want to do anything that is improper in relation to it. I recognize that we must remain neutral in every respect, but I think we should be as neutral on the other side, to the great power that apparently is getting ready to overwhelm them with tremendous numbers, as we should be with reference to the struggling patriots.

It seems to me there is a great disposition to think we should be very neutral as to the Boers, both in our commerce and our language when we speak about them. I would not say anything that would be offensive to the English people, and yet I would not regard it as offensive to them, nor would I regard myself as an independent man if I were not willing to express my sympathy for the struggling Boers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. HALE. Will the Secretary state the amendment? I was not present when it was offered.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed, in line 1 of the resolution, to strike out the words "Secretary of State" and insert "President;" in line 2, to strike out the word "directed" and insert "requested;" after the word "Senate," in line 2, to issert "if in his opinion not incompatible with the public interest;" and in line 8, to strike out the words "and the Secretary of State is further directed" and insert the word "also."

Mr. CHANDLER. Read the whole resolution as it is proposed to be amended.

The SECRETARY. If amended, the resolution will read as follows:

Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to inform the Senate, if in his opinion not incompatible with the public interest, if any person has been accredited representative in any capacity to the United States of America by the South African Republic, commonly known as the Transvaal, and if such person was officially accepted and recognized as such representative by the Government of the United States, and if he was not, for what reason official acceptance and recognition were refused him; also to inform the Senate of the name of such person, and when he applied for official recognition, and when and for what reason official recognition was refused him, and if any other government, and if so, what government, or its official representative or representatives, objected or protested against the official recognition of such proposed representative of said South African or Transvaal Republic by the Government of the United States.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I do not think it very essential, as to the form of a resolution calling for information in respect of our relations with any foreign people, whether it be directed to the President or to the Secretary of State. I agree with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] that substantially the same result will be reached either way. In connection with a resolution which I drew and presented to the Senate, calling for information relating to certain seizures of American property by the British military authorities, I examined the subject and found that resolutions had been offered in either way. Of course the largest discretion finally rests with the President, and if it goes to the Secretary of State the compelling mind will be that of the President. So it does not seem to me that the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] is very essential, in view of the action of the Senate; and yesterday, upon a resolution which I offered in the Senate, the President was substituted for the Secretary of State.

But, Mr. President, one thing is essential in the present natural, undeniable sentiment of the American people, and that is, that either the President or the Secretary of State shall give to the American people, through Congress or through the Senate, full information as to what has taken place in any negotiations. I had not supposed until the intimations which I have heard to-day that any duly accredited representative from the Transvaal Republic had appeared in Washington and had been rejected by the President of the United States when his intercession was offered and when his credentials, whatever they may have been, were presented. I should deem it a most unfortunate event if that occurred. I do not believe it has occurred.

I have heard that irresponsible, unaccredited parties, perhaps citizens of the United States, had appeared in Washington and had claimed to represent this gallant people which is to-day struggling for its liberty and its home government, but no such mission can be for one moment regarded either by the Secretary of State or the President. I have yet to be made to believe that a duly accredited representative of that great people in South Africa has appeared before the President of the United States and has been denied hearing and admission; and the sooner we are informed by the President or the Secretary of State, whichever it may be, that it is not true, the better for the American people.

I do not fail to take notice that throughout the length and breadth of the land the sympathies of the great American people are in favor of the struggle that the Boers are making to-day to maintain liberty, to preserve a republican government against one of the greatest powers of the world. I do not doubt that the American people agree with me that the war which Great Britain is waging against the Boer Republic is the most fell blow at human liberty that has been struck in the last century, and I do not doubt that the Administration, representing the great people of the

United States, feels to-day as I feel upon this subject and as I believe nine out of ten of the American people feel. I read only a little while ago from a deliberate, prepared speech, such as members of the British ministry make either before their constituents directly or in some prominent place in England, the following utterance of the leader of the present government in the House of Commons, Mr. Balfour, made at East Manchester:

I know of no war in which Great Britain has been engaged, except that resulting in the independence of the American colonies, which did not end triumphantly. Yet I do not know of one which has begun triumphantly. True, the war in South Africa is disappointing, but it is not a fact that Great Britain has suffered exceptional reverses or great disaster. On the other hand—

Listen, Senators—

the war has knit together every branch of the English-speaking race, making all feel that they have a great, common destiny which it is their duty to accomplish.

I deny, sir, that the American people are in sympathy with the administration of Great Britain in the war in which it is engaged to stamp out human liberty. I deny that the section of the English-speaking race that lives on this continent is to be carried on and tied to its chariot wheel in the war that is now being waged against the Republic in South Africa. When the leader of the Conservative party in the House of Commons stands before the world and asserts that, he must be met by some disclaimer from this side.

Nor do I wish complications or war with any people. I remember that we have not been so much in love with neutrality in the days passed that we could not speak up boldly for Hungary and Poland and Armenia and Cuba, and Greece, as the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] suggests to me. I do not know how it is that to-day we must be asked to speak with bated breath in favor of liberty because liberty is assailed in Africa instead of in Europe or Asia or America.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator allow me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. I would suggest to the Senator, or would ask the Senator, whether it is not because the American people, the larger proportion of them, possibly a majority of them, I believe a big majority, believe that we are engaged in similar business in the Philippines?

Mr. HALE. Oh, well, Mr. President, whatever I may think about the Philippine performance, whether I agree or disagree with the Senator, that is not involved here. I should say, Mr. President, if the result of our complications with the Philippines is that we dare not speak for liberty and a struggling people anywhere, that that is the greatest demonstration of what a calamitous thing the Philippine war is. But I do not think the time has come when we are obliged to speak with bated breath in favor of liberty anywhere.

I do not count this as a movement, as a sentiment against the English race, nor against the English people, nor against England. I do not believe that the English people are in favor of this war, or ever have been. I believe that the great Queen on her bended knees has prayed that this war may be averted from her. I do not think that the great premier, the head of the present administration, favored this war. It is the act and the movement of a sharp, predatory cabinet minister, engaged with a gold speculator, that has forced the English people into this war.

I am glad in the humiliation that has fallen upon Great Britain; it is not we who have given it to her. I remember an old friend, a neighbor of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], told the story once before of England's humiliation:

There is weeping by England's hundred streams,
By Severn and Thames and Trent;
And o'er the graves of her fallen braves
The Queen of the Sea is bent.

One lesson should serve this haughty isle,
Girt round with stately towers;
Thank God, the blow that has laid her low
Was dealt by no hand of ours.

I fully sympathize with that feeling, Mr. President. I do not in any way hate the English people, but my whole heart is aroused at the contemplation of a people with an established government seeking to maintain it in republican form when it is sought to be overwhelmed by the forces of one of the greatest empires of the day, which itself claims to be an exponent and apostle of human liberty.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

TWELFTH AND SUBSEQUENT CENSUSES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2179) relating to the Twelfth and subsequent censuses, and the action of the House requesting a conference with the Senate on the bill and amendments.

Mr. CARTER. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House and agree to the conference requested.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. CARTER, Mr. HALE, and Mr. MCENERY were appointed.

AGREEMENT WITH BANNOCK AND SHOSHONE INDIANS.

Mr. SHOUP. I ask that the Senate resume consideration of the bill (S. 255) to ratify an agreement made with the Indians of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, in Idaho, and making appropriation to carry the same into effect, that the reading may be completed, and the bill be placed on its passage.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. President, before the reading commences I desire to make a few remarks, which will take up but a minute, in order that the Senate may generally understand the condition of affairs that exists on that reservation.

There is a town named Pocatello in the heart of the reservation. It had, according to the last census, nearly 4,000 people. To-day, in my judgment, there are something over 5,000 people in the town. It is in the heart of the reservation. This town site was purchased from the Indians, and the Indians realized something over a hundred thousand dollars from the sale of town lots. I deemed it proper that I should make this statement. The passage of this bill is desired by the people living in that part of the country, and throughout the entire State, in fact. It is concurred in by my colleague [Mr. HEITFELD] and also by the member of the other House from that State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read that portion of the bill which has not hitherto been read.

Mr. LODGE. It was partly read the other day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill was nearly all read the other day.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

REGISTER FOR STEAM WHALER BOWHEAD.

Mr. LODGE. I ask for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1933) to provide an American register for the steam whaler *Bowhead*. It is a very short bill, and it is very important to get it passed as soon as possible. I do not think it will cause any objection whatever.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read for information.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment to add at the end of the bill "whenever it shall be shown to the Commissioner of Navigation that the repairs put upon such vessel in the United States are equal to three-fourths of the cost of such vessel when so repaired;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Navigation is hereby authorized and directed to cause the foreign-built steam whaler *Bowhead*, owned by John A. Cook, Preston B. Keith, F. B. Howard, E. T. Packard, D. W. Field, A. W. Barrows, George Bickford, W. H. Bryant, and H. B. Madison, citizens of the United States, to be registered as a vessel of the United States, whenever it shall be shown to the Commissioner of Navigation that the repairs put upon such vessel in the United States are equal to three-fourths of the cost of such vessel when so repaired.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DRY DOCKS AT LEAGUE ISLAND AND MARE ISLAND.

Mr. PENROSE. I ask for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1484) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to change the material to be used in the construction of the dry docks at the navy-yards at League Island, Pa., and Mare Island, Cal., from timber to concrete and stone.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, the hour of 2 o'clock having arrived. It will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President——

Mr. PENROSE. I ask the Senator from Alabama to yield for a moment, so as to permit the passage of this bill. It is very important, as the work of construction is held up at those two great yards.

Mr. MORGAN. If there is no debate I will yield, but I desire very much to control my time to-day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1484) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to change the material to be used in the construction of the dry docks at the navy-yards at League Island, Pa., and Mare Island, Cal., from timber to concrete and stone.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, on page 2, line 9, after the word "not," to insert "in the aggregate;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899, and for other purposes," approved May 4, 1898, relating to the construction of dry docks, as modified by "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1899, are hereby further modified so that the Secretary of the Navy may, in his discretion, contract for the construction of dry docks at League Island, Pa., and Mare Island, Cal., in addition to those at Boston, Mass., and Portsmouth, N. H., to be built of concrete and stone, and in such case the limit of cost of the dry docks for Mare Island, Cal., and League Island, Pa., is so far modified that the total additional increased cost for the two dry docks aforesaid shall not in the aggregate exceed $700,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, in discussing this bill, which is the regular order, I set out with the proposition that it does not affect the real issue now before the country whether the standard measure of a dollar is 371¼ grains of pure silver or 23.22 grains of pure gold. The dollar is the same, whether it is made of gold or silver. It is a measure like a yardstick or a foot measure, and it is the same whether it is made of gold or silver, and if we adopt either, or both, as the measure of a dollar, the dollar is the same.

The real question is, Shall we have bimetallism; shall we have dollars made of gold and also of silver, or shall gold dollars alone be coined in the mints, invested alone with full legal-tender power, and shall silver dollars be denied these qualities, privileges, and powers?

The question now is, as it was in 1873, Shall the silver dollar be dropped from the coinage and its legal-tender power depraved to the condition it was placed in by the act of 1873, when it was made a legal tender only for the sum of $10 in one payment? Since 1873 the friends of silver money, who are the friends of an unimpeached and inviolable Constitution, have worked with a zeal that has never faltered to restore silver legal-tender dollars to the people, and they have so far succeeded that they have caused to be coined $501,335,550, the product of our mines, which is now in circulation among our people.

Of this sum $345,040,347 is held in the Treasury on special deposit to redeem silver certificates of the same amount. This has been done to meet a mere convenience of trade and commerce. This silver coin and its representative silver certificates stand in the way of the issues of notes by the national banks. It occupies a field that otherwise would be occupied by national-bank circulation, and its removal is their fixed purpose, as it is the real object of this bill.

Silver dollars circulate in the country and hold the volume of currency at a steady and firm standard of supply. This silver money prevents the banks from reducing the volume of circulating currency when it is desired by their controllers to put down the price of property and crops, and from increasing the volume and raising the price of property and productions after they have passed out of the hands of first owners and producers.

The complete dominion over the currency of this country will be established by this bill in the hands of the national banks. That must be its leading purpose, as all its provisions lead to that result. When this power is established the banks will have no competitor in the whole field of money circulation except gold coins.

Gold coins are not and will not be in common use by our people. There are no gold coins of less size than $2.50 pieces. As to the gold dollar, that form of coinage is abolished. Subsidiary silver coin will do the work of trade and commerce in all minor transactions, which, in the aggregate, are really the major transactions, and paper issues of the national banks will do the rest when this bill becomes a law.

To clear the field of all other paper-money competition, so as to give the national banks full swing, this bill provides for retiring the greenback circulation of $346,000,000. It destroys the greenback by changing it to a gold certificate of deposit. When this is done and silver dollars are driven out, we must find gold or national-bank notes to fill a void of $850,000,000.

The bill provides for the issue of notes by national banks to the full amount of the United States bonds deposited by them to secure their redemption, which is logical; but it increases the power of the banks 10 per cent to control the volume of the currency, while it does not compel them to issue any amount of notes, and leaves it in their power at their will to create either a money famine or a money inundation.

The power to create money and to destroy it by refusing loans and by calling loans is absolute, except to the extent that the gold in the country will supply a resisting force to counteract such movements, and it is impotent for that purpose. Such power lodged in the hands of 3,505 corporations, all cooperating, as they do work together in perfect harmony, is of itself the supreme master of the people, and its authority is absolute.

When we recur to the fact that this ruling power is sustained entirely by the taxation of the people, and that the capital on which its circulating notes are based is exempt from taxation, the monopoly it creates for private gain, by usurping the power to create money, is the most complete and the most onerous and unjust that exists in any country.

This bill legalizes the usurpation by the national banks of the power to create money.

It then provides for the perpetuity of the national debt and for its increase by the sum of $50,000,000 whenever the holders of greenbacks can contrive to reduce the gold reserve in the Treasury below $100,000,000.

The "endless chain" process of depleting the gold held in the reserve fund in the Treasury that caused the issue of bonds in the Cleveland Administration—so fatal to the Democratic party—is carefully provided for and arranged in this bill by separating this fund from the general fund in the Treasury and by providing that all redemptions of greenbacks or Treasury notes shall be made from it and not from the general fund in the Treasury.

Having thus segregated it as a mark for financial archery, there is the provision that it shall at no time exceed $150,000,000, and shall justify and require the issue of bonds whenever it falls below $100,000,000.

All that the financiers who work the crank that turns the machinery that moves this "endless chain" have to do to create a gold panic is to accumulate a fund of $51,000,000 and run the reserve below the minimum. When that is done, the bill provides that it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury "to restore the same to the maximum," which means that he shall issue $50,000,000 of bonds, no less and no more.

To force an issue of bonds to the amount of $50,000,000 the financial operators have the help of the greenbacks, amounting to $346,000,000, the Treasury notes, amounting to about $85,000,000, and "all forms of money issued or coined by the United States," including national-bank notes, amounting to about $200,345,567, and silver coins, with which to move against the Treasury in the demand for gold. One column of attack, consisting of the greenback and Treasury-note corps, will move against the reserve fund, and the other, consisting of national-bank notes and all other "forms of money issued or coined by the United States," will move against the Treasury to prevent the reinforcement of the reserve fund.

Thus corraled and shut up in a financial jug, the Secretary of the Treasury will hasten to issue bonds in batches of $50,000,000 as often as this sham battle shall be waged.

No more astute contrivance or more complete machinery was ever devised for the transfer of the capital of the country into interest-bearing and non-taxable securities than is set forth in the provisions of this bill.

The pretext for all this, and for changing the existing debt of the United States into a debt in perpetuity, is that it is proper, not that it is necessary, to reaffirm the state of the law as it is alleged to exist under section 3511 of the Revised Statutes.

If the gold standard exists it is not necessary to reaffim or reenact it.

It is merely set at the head of the column of a new and disastrous invasion of the rights of the people, intended for another and a perpetual subjugation of the masses who toil to the money power. They are invited to follow the gold standard and plant it on the Capitol under the battle cry of "sound money." But they and their children are led into the perpetual bondage of a perpetual national debt on which they must earn and pay the interest to men who pay no taxes.

If we have the gold standard now, why do we wish a new law to establish it? If we are able to carry on war with a great fleet and an army of 65,000 men in the Philippines and at the same time to pile up such a surplus in the Treasury that our Secretary, to get rid of it, is buying our bonds at a heavy premium, why do we

wish to change this situation by making it impossible that the excessive fruits of our prosperity shall be applied to our debt, and why do they decree that it shall be made perpetual?

The answer is too plain to escape a child; it is, simply that the national banks see that the vigor and power of our people are growing with the new zeal of a new era in the history of this great Republic; that the resources of the people are expanding with the power and glory of the Republic, and that the people are lifting the bonds on which the foundations of the banks are laid, and they find that they will soon have to give up their vast monopoly.

The Democratic party never had a prouder or more patriotic mission, nor was a more glorious declaration ever made in their creed, than its constant demand for the payment of the national debt. If we adhere to that slogan and prove that we are true to ourselves, we shall not fail to win this great battle for the people.

When the national banks, with their stocks rating at such enormous figures that $100 of stock sometimes sells in the market for more than $4,000, shall have no longer any public debt on which to build these temples dedicated to the golden god, they will cease to create money and will give way to Divine Providence, who created gold and silver for mankind. Then they will cease to usurp the power of making money in the place of the Government and will begin to place their great wealth where it will be a blessing to mankind.

So long as the public debt exists the banks and their owners will have the power to dictate to the politicians the sort of money that is best suited to their purposes and the quantity that will bring them the greatest profit, and the people—the real burden bearers—will be compelled to submit. When our national debt is paid, the banking of the country will change from the bond basis to the old Democratic specie basis, and in that basis silver, legal-tender money, is always a factor of equal power with gold.

This bill presents for the first time the direct and true financial issue between the Democratic and Republican parties, and the question is, Shall we pay our national debt, according to its obligation, in coin, or shall we change the obligation to gold and make the debt perpetual?

In this question is involved the destiny of our race in this Republic.

As yet the feudal principle, which in Europe is changed from land tenures to corporate stocks and banking and money power, has not laid the cold and relentless grasp of the law upon our people.

In this bill we have the initiative, and we will soon feel the drawing of the chains of a fearful fate. When our debt again goes up to two or three billions, as it will, there to remain as a perpetual incubus upon the country, the lines between the classes who hold the bonds and those who pay the interest on them and the taxes will be as clearly defined as they are in England, and it will then be better for the laborer to adopt a good master than for him to indulge the flattering vanity that he is a free and independent man.

I am not speaking of social position and its advantages, but of labor and the vast distance that lies between the man who earns bread and the man who eats it. When our country is fully and finally stocked up with distinct classes of bondholders and laboring taxpayers, it will not matter much to either class whether the other has the enjoyment of true and sincere American liberties. There is too much of that jealousy now for the good of the Republic.

It is not the wealth or grandeur of any man of which a true American is jealous, but when wealth is living on his labor and uses its power to interfere with all his affairs there is danger of disturbance; when one class is enabled by law to use its power against another class so as to oppress it, they will divide into hostile camps. That condition is already nearly approached.

In all the service I have tried to render to free silver for more than a quarter of a century I have been led and directed by two prominent considerations. The first is the necessity to our people, to their productions and the preservation of their national spirit, that our country should enjoy full independence in its financial policy, free from the control of any foreign power.

To establish and maintain this independence, we have an isolated position in our geography that frees us from the influence of old countries and dynasties, that use the power to create money as they use the sword to maintain absolutism and to enrich the crown at the expense of the people. We have, through the grace and bounty of Providence, a surplus of production in everything we try to grow or manufacture, and an almost exclusive monopoly of some of the leading staple articles of the commerce of the world. Added to these, we have fisheries on both coasts that furnish food at the lowest cost and in the most attractive form to the millions who toil—the free gift of the seas.

Then our mines of iron, copper, gold, and silver yield more than we need of these precious metals to furnish the capital to produce, manufacture, and transport all of these vast stores of true wealth without seeking the aid of the credit of anybody. With such resources and such a natural money supply in the control of this peculiarly independent and strong people we do not need an artificial basis on which to build up a financial system. What we need is the time-honored specie basis of the old Democratic party anchored in the Constitution and composed alike of gold and silver coin. Give us that, and all other things will be added unto us.

Another leading reason why I have so earnestly favored the full and free coinage of silver is that it is gathered by the toil of man in the deep and dangerous mines; it is converted into coin by the highest art of the chemist; it is the gift of God, who made silver and gold alone for use as money in their functions of real value, and it is the reward in money, not in promises to pay, of the laborer; the reward of each day's work when the night shuts in. It is the fruit of the pick and the shovel, and is not the product of some artful brain in a bank parlor that is busy with contrivances to deceive the world into the belief that his credit is better for the people than this gift from heaven and that his wisdom has made a back number of the omniscience of God.

It is not cant or demagogy to say that silver is "the poor man's money." It is the real, living truth, and a more important fact in finance, industry, prosperity, and the equal rights of man was never stated. As men are educated in a knowledge of their natural and political rights this universal truth will grow in importance and it will assert itself against all who oppose it, whether they are kings on their thrones or bankers in their palaces, until it is recognized as a supreme power. Silver money is the real life of trade and commerce among the laboring and indigent classes, and they have a better right to it, in full supply, than the wealthy and more thrifty people have to the full supply of gold and the towering fabrics of credit they build on that foundation.

The poor can not exist without silver money. The loaf of bread, the scrap of meat, the tattered, second-hand garment, and the fire that scarcely dares to burn in the little stove to warm the children in the ragpicker's house are bought with silver money, not with gold or credit, and it is to them the last hold they have upon existence.

When the people are deprived of it they simply die and are cast out and forgotten of all except the God of mercy. The ravages of cholera, bubonic plague, and the black death are often due to the want of silver money among the poor. They starve first, and then they become wretched in helpless filth, and then, with a sort of retributive justice, they poison the world as they leave it. The best disinfection that could be provided is to give these miserable men, women, and children—for they are still men, women, and children—a chance to earn a little silver money to supply their physical necessities.

But it is not only the very poor who need and must have silver money. The richest man in Washington can not supply his daily wants without it.

It is the great and noble class of thrifty working people on the farms and in the mines and factories who are most in need of silver money, and the millions who toil in an infinite variety of employments in the great cities must have it.

If silver money was or could be driven out of the great cities of the world, if it were made a crime to use it, as it is to use counterfeit or clipped coin, not one of them could stand for a week against the indignant mobs that would destroy everything that stood in their way.

Governments would perish and peoples rush to ruin under such a decree. It is no more possible to conduct government without the use of silver money than it is to float a ship in a desert.

This being true, why should any government set to work to dishonor or to destroy silver money, in defiance of all political economy and in a scoffing contempt of the divine laws of the Creator of men and nations?

There can be but one answer to this question. It is that politicians are in the power of a mighty class who use the powers of government to give increased and unnatural value to gold money, because they can use it to advantage in their business at the expense of silver money, without which those who are the toilers in the daily walks of life can not and do not transact any business. It is the greed of monopoly, supported and fostered by the laws, that gives life and impulse to this fatal movement.

This bill stands at "the parting of the ways" in the history of this great country, and prescribes separate paths for its homogeneous and most worthy people.

We have lived and worked and fought and prayed together without class distinctions until we have made American institutions the honest admiration of mankind, and now a bill is brought in by a great party in the hour of a great national triumph which creates two classes among our people and makes a cleavage between them that is to be perpetual.

The untaxed bondholders and the great corporation trusts are aligned on one side and the taxpayers, toilers, and producing classes on the other side.

And all this is to be done under the false and miserable pretext

that it is best to affirm a doctrine, which they assert is already fixed in the law, that the true standard measure of a dollar is a gold standard.

Not for one moment have I ever doubted that the real purpose of the leaders of the Republican party is to force the country back to the precise condition it was in when the Sherman Act of 1873 was passed. The Democracy, aided by other political parties, have worked without ceasing for nearly thirty years to restore the country from the terrible blow then inflicted upon us, a blow that was launched in the Bank of England and delivered against us by a British agent.

In that time we have restored the full legal-tender power of the silver dollar and its partial and temporary coinage until we have given to the people 501,000,000 silver dollars, the product of American mines.

This contribution to the permanent wealth of the country has done its work in the farms, workshops, and mines, and has been paying debts and buying property in the smaller dealings that the banks never stoop to handle.

It has probably been the commercial medium of five or even ten billions of dollars in business transactions, which would have been greatly embarrassed, if not prevented, in the absence of these silver dollars. But, far beyond this, the Government has literally lived upon these silver dollars and their representatives, silver certificates, and is living upon them to-day.

They have tided the banks and the Treasury over panics that have three times convulsed Europe and America. These silver dollars have supported our fleets and armies during the Spanish war and are doing that work to-day in the Philippine insurrection. They are paying all our officers and agents of Government, and are indispensable to every line of business in the country.

So true is this that the gold men in this bill are trying to seize upon silver dollars and silver certificates and wash them over with gold so as to appropriate them to their service, but they enter in this bill a final decree that there should be no more of them. They wish to coffin them in gold and lay them away in their vaults.

To test the truth of what I am saying, let us try to imagine the condition of our country if these 500,000,000 of silver dollars and silver certificates were suddenly retired from circulation and gold coin was invited to fill the vacuum. It would be a disaster that no imagination could conceive of, and it is useless to attempt to describe it in any other phrase than universal ruin.

The labor of the Democratic party—sometimes requited with treason in high places to party fealty and the creed and practice of our Democratic fathers during seventy-two years of splendid success—has been to haul the country out of the grave dug for it by the Sherman Act of 1873. The labor of the Republican party has been to haul it back into that bottomless pit. This bill is the final act that will land us again at this zero of financial and industrial depression. There is no law for the coinage of silver dollars, except for a few parcels of bullion left over under the Bland-Allison law.

If Mr. Cleveland had been a Republican President, as he well deserved to be, we would now have a law for the coinage of silver dollars from the product of American mines.

The Bland-Allison Act, an unfortunate compromise, restored grudgingly the legal-tender quality of the silver dollar, and these features of the law, backed by the faith of the American people in silver money, has enabled the legal-tender power of these $501,000,000 of silver to carry the Government on their shoulders in peace and in war and thus far to battle with the combined powers of gold, bondholders, and monopoly in Europe and America, and with 4,000 national banks.

To break this legal-tender power of the silver dollar is the final effort of this bill. It discredits silver as an independent, self-sustaining money metal by providing for its redemption in gold, as an imbecile is discredited by having a guardian set over him in authority.

Silver coins in the Treasury are to be kept there under this bill and silver certificates are to be issued in their stead, and these are made redeemable in gold. Very soon the courts will follow this declared public policy, and a tender of more than ten silver dollars in payment of a debt will be held to be insufficient under this law of public policy.

But there is more than that, Mr. President, as to the purpose of this particular measure. I find in the House bill the following provision:

> Nothing herein contained shall be construed or held to affect the present legal-tender quality of the silver dollar, or of the subsidiary or minor coins, or of the paper currency of the United States, or the laws making national-bank notes receivable and payable for certain public debts and dues and obligations between national banks.

Why this committee has ex industria stricken out that provision of the House bill which preserved the legal-tender power and quality of the silver dollar is something that is incomprehensible, except upon the hypothesis that this bill is so framed by design and purpose as that that fact is accomplished by a concealment of the purpose; but, in fact, by a proper legal construction of the meaning of the bill it destroys the legal-tender function of silver dollars.

When this is accomplished silver dollars will be more completely destroyed in their money functions than they were, even under the Sherman Act of 1873.

The Republicans are about to arrive at their haven of hope, and the Democracy, which means the people, will have to renew the battle that began more than thirty years ago. If the people can see their danger while the illuminations of national prosperity and glory are ablaze, they will rise in November and wipe out the Sherman Act of 1873 and this bill, which is intended to be the consummation of its wickedness.

They will scorn and repudiate this effort of Congress to repudiate and annul the express terms of their bonded debt, and will demand the right to pay it, according to agreement, in either gold or silver coin of a standard value fixed in that contract.

In the progress of events that no human brain has devised or could accomplish, and they may therefore be reverently ascribed to Divine Providence, new factors have entered the financial situation for which, of necessity, and for the sake of national honor, we must provide. We have acquired the control over the future government of 13,000,000 people.

How or why this has been done, or how this dominion will be exerted, is a matter foreign to this present discussion. We found them in tatters and humiliation under the iron rule of a cruel despotism, and it is our noble task to clothe them and put them in their right mind.

Their first and greatest need is money—silver money—because that is the money they are accustomed to use.

The Spanish peseta, at 40 per cent discount in American money, is returning to Spain, where it is at par with Spanish gold. This hegira of silver has left all these Spanish islands with a circulation of less than $3 per capita. If we would do justice to them we would increase this allowance of silver to them up to $10 per capita. Estimating their numbers at 12,000,000, this is a new demand upon us for $120,000,000.

The product of our mines, after supplying the home demand for the arts and subsidiary coinage, is less by about $40,000,000 than this new demand and market for silver, and this $40,000,000 is a little more than the amount of the excess of the world's supply of silver bullion for the year ending July 1, 1899.

How plain and simple, then, is our power to place silver on a commercial equality with gold, at the rate of 16 to 1, if we do not forget or refuse to do our duty to these new wards of the nation.

A simple blow like this would unshackle the limbs of the people of India, and in turn it would unfetter the world of poor, shrinking, starving people. Shall I ask sordid men to approve a national benevolence that would win the hearts of all the people of all the Spanish islands and wed them to us in bonds that fleets and armies can not create? I despair of this, but I do not despair of the power of a resolute minority, sustained by humanity, national duty, and the corresponding rights and interests of our own people, to force this measure of justice or some other measure in which the government of those people is to be provided for.

For one I will glory in the honor of assisting in this battle for the rights and welfare of those people.

What has come to us, Mr. President, and is called "expansion"—which I conceive to be a necessary growth from conditions that we have removed, and were necessarily followed by war—has brought to us this great opportunity to do our own people in this country full justice and at the same time to comply with the honorable obligation we are under to those thirteen millions of newcomers to supply them with all the legislative measures necessary for their prosperity. They have no mines; they have no mints; they have no credit; their bonds could not be marketed in any part of the world, even if they had separate independence in Cuba, and as to the others of course that is an impossibility. They are entirely at our disposal and under our control as to all of their industrial affairs that are dependent upon financial conditions.

I do not understand how any American Senator can look over this broad and splendid field of opportunity and demand and deny to himself the privilege of providing this true bond of union between these Spanish possessions and the United States. If we cut deep the grooves of commerce by establishing between us and those islands a system of finance in which there shall be no premium for exchanges we shall have no occasion at any time hereafter to doubt or distrust our complete commercial control over those people, so far as we desire to exercise it; and by that I mean a control that shall be mutually and honorably advantageous to them as well as to us.

What is called expansion, which was the result of a treaty of peace with Spain, throwing our border lines around distant countries, has become a fixed fact; and yet it is often referred to on the floor of the Senate as if it were something in the future to be realized. We hear it suggested that if annexation shall take place, for instance, between the Philippine Islands and the United States,

then certain policies are to be adopted, which of course implies that if annexation does not take place, those policies would be inapt or improper.

Sir, if it is possible to create an act of annexation by the supreme law of the United States in accordance with our Constitution and the laws of nations, the Philippines are annexed. Whether that takes within their borders the international law—the private laws of nations I refer to particularly—or whether it takes ex proprio vigore the Constitution of the United States in all its efficacy, whatever the government may be there and whether it may exist after that treaty has been ratified and confirmed as it has existed from that time until now, without deriving assistance from any special act of Congress, seems to me to make no difference as to the question of our supreme and sovereign title to and dominion over that country.

Mr. President, Congress can supply, and perhaps in a very brief period of time must supply, these people with a financial system, and that, of all the other matters connected with these outlying possessions, is by far the most important. Now, sir, I expect when bills are brought forward for the government of these Spanish possessions, if I am present in the Senate, to offer amendments to those bills, unless the committee shall report something that is agreeable to my views, to the effect that the Congress of the United States will make a special provision for financing those different islands and relieving them, as far as possible, from the burdens which have been left upon them by Spain in the course of its tyrannical and exhausting government. This question can not be avoided, and I can not conceive that the blind adhesion of anyone to a particular theory of finance is going to forbid him from supplying these people with that description of money and in that quantity which is necessary for their real prosperity, and without which, it appears, they have never had any true prosperity, and I suppose they never will.

I wish to bring this subject up in the hope that some gentleman on my side of this question, some gentleman who is opposing the bill, who is not in favor of it (not for the purpose of breaking it down, but for the purpose of trying to improve it), and the still brighter hope that some person on that side of the Chamber who favors the bill, will add to it a provision by which the finances of these different islands acquired from Spain shall be arranged. So far as Hawaiian government is concerned, a bill has been reported here from the commission that was sent out there, and it has gone, I believe, to the Committee on Finance. I do not know what attention it may have received.

Mr. CULLOM. The bill has been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations and is now in the Senate.

Mr. MORGAN. Without amendment?

Mr. CULLOM. I mean the general annexation bill.

Mr. MORGAN. I speak of the special bill in regard to currency and coinage.

Mr. CULLOM. There has been nothing done yet in regard to that measure.

Mr. MORGAN. It will be very necessary to dispose of that question in regard to Hawaii, as much so as in regard to the tariff or any other provision of the bill reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Hawaiian Government had a system of finance which was almost exactly like that of the United States. They use our gold and silver coins without discount. They coined $1,000,000 of silver coin, and they fixed it at the same weight and standard of value and put upon it the impress simply of the Hawaiian Government. It was coined in the mint at San Francisco. They have a postal savings or banking system there which seems to have operated very beneficially to the people, and that has to be rearranged, either approved and adopted or else changed by act of Congress.

In dealing with this subject I propose to leave Hawaii to stand upon the ground which she herself has selected, for her system needs almost no change at all to make it completely harmonious with the financial system of the United States. But in regard to the Spanish possessions there is need of radical change—a change in the fundamental principles and provisions of the entire line of financial policy—and it is to that subject that I am addressing my attention at this moment and expressing the hope that some gentleman connected with this bill, in support of it, will give the Senate an opportunity to vote upon a special provision designed for the benefit of the Spanish islands.

If that provision is carried out by the coinage of silver bullion dug from American mines after the date of the passage of the bill, excluding all silver dug before, we will find that our mines in this country will supply a sufficiency in two years to give to those people a per capita allowance of silver of $10. We will find also in doing that that we will in our coinage consume so much of the silver supply of the world that we will leave a deficit in that supply of at least $2,000,000, and whenever it appears that there is a deficit in the silver supply of the whole world I shall be hard to convince that that will not put the commercial value of silver at least at par with gold at 16 to 1.

With an instrumentality thus thrown in our hands by the provision God has made in the mines and the other provision which He must have made to bring about these new conditions under which we are now living, why shall we not, for the sake at least of assisting those people, whether ours are to be benefited by it or not, relax our rigid adherence to certain academic doctrines and principles and proceed like wise men ought to work in supplying currency to these Spanish islands?

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 22, 1900, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *January 19, 1900.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ARSENALS AT SPRINGFIELD AND ROCK ISLAND.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I entered a motion to reconsider the change of reference of a communication from the Treasury Department in regard to the armories at Springfield and at Rock Island.

I want, Mr. Speaker, to ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement of my reasons for making that motion to reconsider.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, there is so much noise in the House that it is absolutely impossible to hear what the gentleman from Iowa says.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order. The public business has begun, and gentlemen will please cease conversation and resume their seats.

Mr. HULL. I will repeat what I said, that on yesterday I entered a motion to reconsider the action of the House by which the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the consideration of appropriations for the armories at Springfield and Rock Island, and the same were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

I tried to enter an objection at the time, but did not succeed, and the Speaker recognized me to enter that motion. My understanding, Mr. Speaker, is that this is not a debatable question. Am I correct in that?

The SPEAKER. It is not debatable.

Mr. HULL. Then I ask unanimous consent of the House to make a brief statement of my reasons for making this motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] asks unanimous consent to be permitted to make a brief statement in support of his motion to reconsider the order of the House concerning the reference of a part of Document 221. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to make an objection, but, as I understand, it refers to the arsenal at Springfield, Mass.

Mr. HULL. Yes, that is one of the arsenals referred to.

Mr. KNOX. I see that my colleague [Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts] is not in his place.

Mr. HULL. This does not affect anything except the question as to which committee shall consider it.

Mr. KNOX. Had my colleague [Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts] any notice as to when this was to come up? Did he have notice that it was to come up this morning?

Mr. HULL. I entered that motion yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? The Chair hears none.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have just entered the Hall. What is the matter under consideration?

The SPEAKER. It is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. HULL) to reconsider.

Mr. PAYNE. He wants a chance to be heard on his motion.

Mr. CANNON. I hope the gentleman will let that go over until Monday.

Mr. HULL. Well, on what ground?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, well, the gentleman makes his motion to reconsider, and I think a brief period for examination will perhaps hasten the discussion.

Mr. HULL. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am willing to make my request

that the gentleman from Illinois be also given the privilege of making a statement for his committee if he desires to.

Mr. CANNON. Well.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois be permitted also to make a statement.

Mr. CANNON. Is the motion to reconsider called up?

The SPEAKER. The motion was entered last night, and it is now called up by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CANNON. I suggest to the gentleman from Iowa that an exceeding press of business from the Committee on Appropriations, as well as duties on the Committee on Insular Affairs, have so engrossed my attention for a week that I have been under considerable pressure, and no harm can come by unanimous consent being given that this matter go over until Monday morning.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Illinois puts it on the ground that he has not had time to examine it I will not enter any objection to the matter going over, but will ask that it come up immediately after the reading of the Journal on Monday morning.

The SPEAKER. It may come up at any time. The gentleman withdraws his request.

Mr. HULL. For how many days may it come up?

The SPEAKER. It may be called up at any time by the gentleman from Iowa.

CHANGES OF REFERENCE.

The SPEAKER announced the change of reference of House Document No. 294, being letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of David I. Lillard against the United States, from the Committee on War Claims to the Committee on Claims.

The SPEAKER also announced the change of reference of the bill (H. R. 4746) to authorize the Delaware Indians of the Cherokee Nation to bring suit in the Court of Claims against the United States, and the Mississippi Choctaws to sue the Choctaw Nation, and for other purposes, from the Committee on Claims to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

WAGON AND MOTOR BRIDGE ACROSS MISSOURI RIVER AT ST. CHARLES, MO.

Mr. JOY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up from the Speaker's table, for present consideration, the bill S. 2284.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2284) extending the time for the completion of a wagon and motor bridge across the Missouri River at St. Charles, Mo., as provided by an act approved June 3, 1896.

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for completing the construction of a wagon and motor bridge across the Missouri River at St. Charles, Mo., as fixed by an act approved June 3, 1896, be extended to June 3, 1902.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. JOY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6627) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6627, being the pension appropriation bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, before that is done, I desire to make some arrangement with the gentleman as to general debate on that bill.

Mr. BARNEY. I would state to my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, that so far as I know little time will be desired on this side of the House for general debate. Of course, I am willing to enter into any arrangement that is reasonable for the purpose of general debate on this bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Well, we may just as well go on, and we can agree when we get in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BARNEY. All right; perhaps that is the best way.

The motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union was then agreed to.

The committee accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. HOPKINS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6627, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6627) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARNEY. Mr. Chairman, the amount carried in this bill is $144,245,230, about the same amount that was carried in the pension appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1900, exceeding it, I think, by some $14,000. The amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1899 was $141,483,830, and upon the hearing before the committee it appeared that of that sum there had been expended for that fiscal year a little less than $140,000,000, leaving to the credit of the fiscal year 1899 something like a million dollars, which, of course, will remain to the credit of the Bureau for two years from the expiration of that fiscal year, and we are informed that probably the most of it will be needed for sums properly chargeable to the year 1899.

The amount of the appropriations for the fiscal year 1900 was $145,233,830. Up to the present time, or rather, I should say, for the first five months of the fiscal year 1900, the sum of $58,462,085 has been expended, and we are assured by the Commissioner of Pensions that doubtless they will keep within the appropriation.

As I stated, the amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1901 is practically the same as the amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1900, and the Commissioner tells us that doubtless the amount of the pension roll growing out of the civil war will decrease and be slightly less perhaps for the year 1901 than for the fiscal year 1900; but there will be a considerable increase on account of claims growing out of the Spanish-American war, and he thinks it is wise to make the appropriation for pensions for the coming fiscal year the same as for the fiscal year 1900. The only changes which are in this bill from the bill of last year are for the items of rent and clerk hire.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question? I do not want to ask him one if it breaks the line of his argument.

Mr. BARNEY. Certainly. I yield willingly at the present time.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I want to ask the gentleman if there is any new legislation in the bill?

Mr. BARNEY. I would say that this bill contains no new legislation, and it contains all the legislation which has been on the pension appropriation bill for years.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I want to ask further, how much is appropriated in the bill for the pension of soldiers of the late war—the Spanish-American war?

Mr. BARNEY. That is not segregated and probably ought not to be; but, as before stated, the Pension Commissioner tells us that he anticipates considerable increase on that account, and for that reason asks the same appropriation for the fiscal year 1901 as we gave him for 1900, although he anticipates that the pensions growing out of the civil war will be somewhat decreased.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Is there any estimate to show the probable amount of those claims?

Mr. BARNEY. Growing out of the Spanish-American war?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes.

Mr. BARNEY. I think not. We are told that there are about 25,000 applications now on file, but necessarily it would be very difficult to estimate what these claims will amount to.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I was going to ask the gentleman about that.

Mr. CURTIS. Between twenty-four and twenty-five thousand claims.

Mr. BARNEY. I am informed that there are between twenty-four and twenty-five thousand claims.

Mr. RICHARDSON. About 25,000 claims growing out of the Spanish-American war. How many applications have been granted or allowed for such pensions?

Mr. BARNEY. Something over 300, we are told.

Mr. McCLEARY. Will the gentleman allow me an interruption?

Mr. BARNEY. Yes.

Mr. McCLEARY. In answer to the gentleman from Tennessee, I will say that my recollection is that the Commissioner of Pensions thought that five or six millions would cover the pensions for the Spanish-American war. There was something like five or six millions less than the hundred and forty-four millions appropriated last year, and he asked for the same, expecting that would be sufficient to cover the claims growing out of the Spanish-American war.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Well, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BARNEY. One moment. I think the gentleman from Minnesota is mistaken in his statement. The statement of the Commissioner was that for the fiscal year 1899, when only about one hundred and forty-one millions was appropriated, only one hundred and thirty-nine millions plus was required for the payment of pensions for that year, which was about five millions less than is estimated for the fiscal year 1901; but the fiscal year 1900

was the one when one hundred and forty-four millions was appropriated, and the expenditure for the first five months of that year is simply an indication of how much will be needed for the present fiscal year, and the only evidence which at present we can have of that fact.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If my colleague will permit me, I believe there is one item of new legislation in this bill where additional clerks for agencies is provided for. Am I right?

Mr. BARNEY. Additional clerks are not provided for in terms, but there is an increased sum appropriated for clerks in the pension agencies; but that I do not understand to be what is called new legislation.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. You do not think that is new legislation?

Mr. BARNEY. I do not think it is, but I propose to explain that a little further on. Now I will listen to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I want to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill if it is not true that all the pensions granted widows of the Spanish-American war are not at the same rate as those granted to soldiers or sailors in the war between the States?

Mr. BARNEY. I will say, as I understand it, that what is called the general pension law, the law of 1862 and amendments, places the sailors and soldiers of the Spanish-American war on the same footing as those of the civil war, but that the law of June, 1890, does not apply to soldiers of the Spanish-American war, except that section which relates to dependent parents.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am seeking for information, and as I understand the law a discrimination is made in the pension laws against the soldiers of the Mexican war and the Indian war—they do not get as much for the same disability as the soldiers in the war between the States and the soldiers of the Spanish-American war. Am I not right? Is there not a discrimination against the soldiers of the Mexican war and the soldiers of the Indian war as to the amount or rate paid?

Mr. BARNEY. I did not suppose that was so. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee, although I am not thoroughly informed upon that branch of his question, that I only know the act of June, 1890, does not apply to any but soldiers of the civil war, except that section which relates to dependent parents.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not want to debate the matter, but I hoped we should find in this bill—and that there would be no objection to it—a provision to pension all the soldiers of all the wars alike. I would be very glad if the motion could be made to amend the bill by unanimous consent, so that all the soldiers in all the wars should be pensioned at the same rate.

Mr. BARNEY. The gentleman from Tennessee knows, I may say, better than I do, that an amendment of that kind would be entirely out of order and, if it had been inserted in this bill by the committee, would have been subject to a point of order.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It would be, unless it was admitted by unanimous consent. I concede that.

Mr. BARNEY. And the House seems to be very jealous of the rule to prevent new legislation on general appropriation bills, and I did not feel at liberty, and of course the committee did not, to insert anything of that kind in this bill. In fact, I may say in this connection that it is only the province of this committee to make appropriations for pensions under existing laws and that all amendments to existing pension laws, and, in fact, all new legislation upon that subject, comes properly from another committee, all of which is of course well known to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. TALBERT. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BARNEY. Yes.

Mr. TALBERT. In view of this tremendous increase in the pension list and all that sort of thing, in view of the danger of this great rise in the amount of the appropriation, I would like to ask the gentleman if it would not be a good time now for Congress to stop this Friday night business, where they pension deserters, bounty jumpers, and coffee coolers?

I should like to ask him if it would not be an opportune time now to shut off this Friday night business and stop this appealing to Congress from the decisions of the Pension Bureau. I should like to ask him if he does not think that the laws on the statute books are liberal enough now, without supplementing them by the acts which we pass at Friday night sessions, to pension coffee coolers, deserters, and bounty jumpers? I think the time would be very opportune now to shut off that.

Mr. BARNEY. I am not in favor of pensioning actual deserters and bounty jumpers, and I do not think any member on either side of this House is in favor of so doing; neither do I think the present pension laws are as liberal as they ought to be in some particulars.

Mr. TALBERT. I did not say that the gentleman was, and I did not say that anybody was. I asked if it was not a good time to shut off that business.

Mr. HULL. Is not the gentleman in favor of pensioning coffee coolers? I am, because every man in the Army was a coffee cooler. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARNEY. When he could get the coffee to cool.

I do not consider the question of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT] pertinent, for the reason that in my judgment many, if not all, of the special bills which are considered here on Friday night are as meritorious as any claims growing out of pensions, and I am not in favor of stopping any efforts in doing justice to the soldiers and sailors of this Republic.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. BARNEY. Well, I will yield for a question to my friend from Georgia, and then I should like to be allowed to finish my statement.

Mr. BARTLETT. I would like to ask the gentleman with reference to this provision on page 2, the first proviso:

> That the appropriation aforesaid for Navy pensions shall be paid from the income of the Navy pension fund so far as the same shall be sufficient for that purpose.

I want to ask the gentleman if it is not true that all the pensions granted in the Navy are paid out of that fund, which arises from the sale of prizes and things of that sort?

Mr. BARNEY. Well, I do not know what proportion is paid out of that fund. Of course, I understand there is a fund of that kind, and a portion of the Navy pensions are paid from it, but I am not informed as to what proportion. We did not examine the Commissioner of Pensions with reference to that, but I presume likely his report shows it.

Mr. BARTLETT. I ask that for this reason, that if there are any pensions granted to sailors, or to people dependent upon sailors, in this Congress by the passage of any special bills here they, too, will be paid out of that fund, will they not, because of the mere fact that they are pensions either to sailors or to the wives or dependents of sailors? The amounts provided in those bills passed in that way would be paid out of this fund as well, would they not?

Mr. BARNEY. I presume that would be true.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is all I want to know.

Mr. BARNEY. Now, with reference to what was said by my colleague from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON], regarding the increase of clerks at pension agencies, I would say that for several years, and until the last two years, I think, we had appropriated $430,000 for the payment of clerks at pension agencies; that is, outside of the Pension Bureau in Washington.

But that amount was cut down by the last two appropriations, as I remember, to $415,000. The Pension Commissioner, in the hearing before the subcommittee, urged us strongly to give him the old sum of $430,000; that is, $15,000 additional to what has been given in the last two appropriation bills.

He told us that they were absolutely unable to execute the law with their present force of clerks at the several pension agencies; that they were behind in their work; that at the same time there were many things provided by law that they should do which they were absolutely unable to do, and that our cut of $15,000 was entirely unjustifiable—that he actually needed this appropriation.

I might say that he further added that he would much prefer to have the appropriation for the Pension Bureau in Washington cut down by that amount when the legislative bill came before the committee if we would allow him this $15,000 additional for clerks in pension agencies. In view of that fact, we saw fit to add $15,000 to the estimate, and I think the committee were justified in so doing.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. May I ask my colleague as to whether these additional clerks are to come through the classified service or not?

Mr. BARNEY. I understand that they are.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I understand that they do not, from the reading of the latter clause of the section here, which is:

> And the salaries paid shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

If they come from the classified service, their salaries are fixed by law.

Mr. BARNEY. I am fully assured, and my own judgment coincides with that, that all of them are in the classified service.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Then the Secretary of the Interior can not interfere with their salaries in any manner, form, or shape.

Mr. BARNEY. I suppose he has something to do with their classification, and that is all.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Because if they are second, third, or fourth class clerks, the law fixes their salary in the legislative act. I wanted to bring your attention to that clause.

Mr. BARNEY. It is the clause which has usually been placed upon this section of the bill, and I did not suppose it would interfere with the general law relating to the classified service, and I do not believe that it will.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I did not notice it until just a moment ago, and I only wanted to bring it to the attention of my colleague.

Mr. BARNEY. It is the same law we have always had ever since I have had anything to do with this appropriation bill, and we know that up to this time the clerks at these agencies have been and are on the classified list. Yet I understand this is the legislation that we have always had upon this subject.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman allow one question for information?

Mr. BARNEY. Certainly.

Mr. SIMS. I do not wish to interrupt the gentleman, but only ask for information. I wish to know if the gentleman has had occasion to examine, so that he can inform the House, as to whether, in the applications for pension for a like period of service and an equal number of soldiers in the recent Spanish war, the number of applications from one branch of the service exceeds that from the other—that is, whether the applications from the volunteer force or from the Regular Army are in excess?

Mr. BARNEY. I have no information upon that subject. We did not examine the Pension Commissioner with relation to the differences in the number of applications from the Regular Army soldiers or the volunteer soldiers, so I know nothing whatever about it.

Now, the only other change that there is in the bill over the bill of last year is a slight reduction in the payment of rent to pension agencies, growing out of the fact that gradually our pension agencies are getting into public buildings, and, of course, whenever they get into a public building that reduces the amount of rent paid. So the amount in this bill for rent is a few thousand dollars less than in the last bill.

I think, Mr. Chairman, unless some other gentlemen desire to ask questions, that that is all I desire to say at the present time, and I will yield the floor to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Suppose you take up an hour on that side and then give me an hour.

Mr. BARNEY. I do not believe we will want that much time on this side, but I will see. I will yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. McCALL. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. BARNEY. I yield first, then, to the gentleman from Massachusetts, and then the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] may be recognized.

Mr. McCALL. I simply wish to ask the gentleman how much the estimates show will be required to pay the pensions growing out of the Spanish war for the ensuing year?

Mr. BARNEY. As I have said in answer to several interrogatories upon that subject, it is absolutely impossible to make an estimate.

I stated that at the present time there were 25,000 applications; that something like 300 of them have already been allowed; and anticipating more applications, and anticipating the granting of many of these applications that are pending, I may say that we have added four or five million dollars to what otherwise would probably have been appropriated; but the Pension Commissioner says that it will probably not take that amount or near that amount. For safety, however, we have done so.

Now I will yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], reserving the balance of my time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, in 1893, from some unknown source, perhaps from ignorance, likely from malice, but most probably from a desire to show zeal, no matter at whose expense, that startling, false, and fictitious charge was originated that thousands of fraudulent pensioners were on our roll. Soon after the advent of the Administration which installed Mr. Lochren as Commissioner pensioners were dropped and pensions reduced by the thousands, and that, too, without notice or opportunity to be heard.

In order to sustain this arbitrary and biased action on the part of the Pension Bureau, Mr. Cleveland, in his message of December 4, 1893, used the following language:

> Thousands of neighborhoods have their well-known fraudulent pensioners, and recent developments in the Bureau establish appalling conspiracies to accomplish pension frauds.

That charge was most unfair and unjust to thousands of brave men who showed their love of this country by offering it their lives. It was not only false, but a slander against thousands of patriotic veterans who made part and parcel of the grandest army that ever marched to drumbeat or willingly answered the bugle's call. Coming, as it did, from the Executive head of the nation, and coming to us soon after the dropping of so many pensioners and the reducing of so many pensions, it naturally attracted the attention of the public to those men; and in many cases the epithet "fraud" was applied to one who had worn the blue and had suffered on the battlefield, on the march, or in prison pens.

An investigation proved the falsity of these charges, and it showed that, instead of the pensioners of this country being frauds, they had been robbed by the officers of this great, rich, and opulent Government of their little pensions, and that, too, without opportunity to be heard and without notice. So unfair was the action of the Commissioner of Pensions that on the 21st day of December, 1893, Congress passed a law forbidding the dropping, the reducing, or the withholding of pensions without first giving thirty days' notice, and provided that all pensions should be deemed and held by the officers of this Government to be vested rights. But the dropping of pensions continued. The board of revision, which had been established, continued its work. But members of Congress, by reason of the reports of the local medical examining boards and the evidence on file, and with the assistance of Deputy Pension Commissioner Murphy, who was a friend of the soldier, were able to have many of them restored.

However, in order to shut out members of Congress, and to prevent them from ascertaining whether or not injustice had been done the old soldiers, instructions were issued to the various pension examining boards of this country that they should no longer rate the pensioners they examined. The conduct of the Pension Bureau was so outrageous, the object was so apparent, that on the 2d day of March, 1895, Congress passed a law requiring the various local pension boards to rate those they examined. In 1893, in 1894, and in 1895 pensioners were dropped, pensions were reduced, and pension claims were rejected by thousands, and the old soldiers became disheartened and discouraged. They would not urge their claims, because to ask action was to invite rejection. Just to show how much——

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I would like to ask the gentleman a question, if he will yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I understand the gentleman to say that in 1893 pensioners were dropped by the thousand?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky (continuing). And pensions were reduced by the thousand?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I would like to know how it is that the table given in this report shows a steady increase of pnsieoners and also in the amount of pensions.

Mr. CURTIS. That is shown by the allowance. But no man who knows anything about pension matters will deny for a minute that your people unjustly and unfairly reduced pensioners; and he will not deny that we compelled them to restore them to the roll, because the evidence showed that an outrage had been perpetrated.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Can not you answer my question?

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Who was the Commissioner of Pensions at the time you say these men were reduced?

Mr. CURTIS. Commissioner Lochren.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Was not he an ex-Union soldier?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, he was; but his acts demonstrated that he was not a friend of the Union soldier.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Will you answer an additional question?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. You have stated that your people compelled our people to restore these pensioners.

Mr. CURTIS. I say we compelled your Commissioner, after he had dropped them, to restore many of them to the roll, and the present Commissioner has restored a number.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Why, then, is it that in 1897 the number of pensioners on the roll does not very much exceed those on the roll in 1893, if, as you state, you have compelled the Commissioner to restore a large number that were dropped?

Mr. CURTIS. You know that there are a great many thousand pension claims pending. There have been some claims allowed; there have been some rejected, and your people dropped a great many.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. In 1893 there were 966,000 pensioners on the roll. Now, you say that a large number of them were dropped by Commissioner Lochren?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Now, in 1897 there were 976,000 on the roll, a difference of 10,000 under your own people, when you say that Commissioner Lochren had been compelled to restore many.

Mr. CURTIS. He had to continue in business, did he not?

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. There were just 10,000 more than were on the roll in 1893. Now, will you explain how it is that 10,000 covers more than the normal increase? If these men have been restored, why does not the roll of 1897 show a greater increase than 10,000?

Mr. CURTIS. I do not know; but no man who has examined the records of the office will deny for a single minute that they were reduced, and you must remember that at this late date after the

war the pensioners are dying by thousands. They die at the rate of 30,000 a year. Now, let me tell you what the board did in 1895. I have the figures taken from the report. In 1895 the board of revision, in round numbers, examined 104,000 cases; they dropped 4,000; they restored 2,000 to the old roll; they reduced 20,000, and they called for evidence in 77,000 cases. Is it not strange that that board should find something wrong, something of error, in every case that they examined?

The rejection, the reduction, and the withholding of pensions was so unfair that on the 6th day of March, 1896, Congress passed a law fixing the date for the commencement of pensions, and it provided that where pensions had been reduced or rejected or withheld, upon the filing of a new application and the allowance of the claim, the payment should date from the filing of the first application if the evidence showed a pensionable disability at the date of first filing.

In order to sustain the charges against the pensioners, the various special examiners and clerks detailed to that work were sent to different parts of this country for the purpose of unearthing pension frauds. The vast increase in the appropriation will show the efforts that were made, and the small number of indictments found and the few convictions had will show how groundless the charges were.

Why, in 1893 there was appropriated for the special examining division, $225,000; in 1894 there was used in that division $400,000; in 1895, $450,000; in 1896, $497,000; in 1898, $431,000; in 1899, $389,000; and yet, gentlemen, with nearly a million pensioners on the roll, with 50,000 attorneys practicing before the Department, with five to ten witnesses in each case, with thousands of men before whom testimony has been taken, there were only 963 indictments found in the three years of 1894, 1895, and 1896 and only 596 convictions had. Do these figures show that thousands of neighborhoods had fraudulent pensioners? No, but they do show that the pension roll of this country is one grand, sublime roll of honor.

The very fact that nearly all the pensioners who were dropped have since been restored to the roll is evidence that the charges were false in the first place. Now, another thing. In 1896 many thousand dollars were spent by the special examining division of the Pension Bureau. The Commissioner tells us that by and through the efforts of the special examining division and the law division there was recovered to the United States, in round numbers, $20,000. Mark you, there was an increase in the expense of the special examining division over 1893 of over $270,000. He does not tell us the amount expended by the law division, nor does he tell us what it cost the Department of Justice. It seems to me that comment is unnecessary.

On the 4th of March, 1897, there was a change of Administration, and the soldiers of this country looked forward to a new Commissioner of Pensions and a change in the Bureau of Pensions. They looked for a change in the rules and regulations; they looked for a more liberal construction of the law, but I am sorry to say, they were disappointed. The Republican party has always been and still is the friend of the old soldier. But the new Commissioner of Pensions, with the exception of the continuance of the board of revision, which I believe had completed its work, and the consequent stoppage of the reduction and dropping of pensioners, continued the same rules and practices as the former Administration. He kept up the same false charges against the pensioners. He permitted himself to be interviewed and wrote articles for the press and did other things to attract the attention of the public to his Bureau.

I ask you if the figures contained in his own report sustain the charges against the pensioners? Why, in the three years 1897, 1898, and 1899, with the large number of pensioners on the roll, as I have heretofore stated, with 50,000 attorneys practicing before the Department, with the great number of witnesses and the large number of officers in these years, there were only 750 indictments and only 437 convictions had! There were only 29 attorneys disbarred in 1898 and only 63 in 1899.

Mr. SIMS. Does not the gentleman think they ought to be discharged?

Mr. CURTIS. I do, if they did not obey the law. I give these figures to show how groundless the charges were. There was nothing tangible and nothing real in the charges that were made and are being made to-day against the pensioners of this country.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am not against the gentleman, but were not some of these charges made by the Commissioner of Pensions himself?

Mr. CURTIS. That is what I have been saying.

Mr. BARTLETT. I understand that. Now, may I ask——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Oh, let him go on.

Mr. BARTLETT. I ask that the gentleman have as much time as he wants.

Mr. BARNEY. How much time does the gentleman from Kansas desire?

Mr. CURTIS. Ten minutes.

Mr. BARNEY. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. BARTLETT. Now, if this is true, and I have no doubt it is, is not the remedy of it in the hands of the Administration? The Grand Army of the Republic has refused to indorse Mr. Evans, and the President, either expressly or by permitting him to remain, does indorse him.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not believe the President does indorse him. I do not believe the President knows what is going on in that office.

Mr. GAINES. Why does he not have the courage to condemn him?

Mr. CURTIS. I do not agree with you that the President can go down into details and examine each and every case.

Mr. BARTLETT. I did not say that.

Mr. CURTIS. The Commissioner says his policy is all right. If you will allow me, I will touch upon that. I do not believe the President of the United States is sustaining the Commissioner of Pensions, or that he would if he knew the truth, because he is a soldier himself, and he is the soldier's friend.

Mr. GAINES. Have you asked the President to condemn him?

Mr. CURTIS. I have talked with the President, and the President said that he would look into the charges that are made.

Mr. GAINES. Have you been back to see whether he has done so?

Mr. CURTIS. He has not had time.

Mr. GAINES. Have you been dilatory about it?

Mr. CURTIS. No; I have gone to other officers and talked with them about this matter.

Mr. SIMS. If the gentleman will allow me, was not the present Commissioner of Pensions also a soldier in the Union Army?

Mr. CURTIS. They say he was a soldier; but I understand he did not serve very long. I am not advised of his service.

Mr. SIMS. Like most of the pensioners, I suppose.

Mr. CURTIS. You do not dare say that about the pensioners.

Mr. SIMS. I say that about some of them.

Mr. CURTIS. The pensioners were honest and faithful men, who served their country long and well, and you know it, or ought to know it.

Mr. SIMS. Some of them.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman allow me to state right there a matter which I think the country will be interested in? Henry Clay Evans was a soldier. He was born in the State of Pennsylvania, and when I first knew him he was a private soldier in a Wisconsin regiment. He came to Chattanooga and joined the Army of the Cumberland. How long he served I do not undertake to say, but that he was a soldier—an enlisted man—and did serve is a fact. After his term of service, near the close of the war, he was a clerk in the quartermaster's department at Chattanooga, where he made his home finally and where he lives now.

Mr. CURTIS. Now, I want to say that the same kind of charges were made while Mr. Raum was Commissioner of Pensions, and I want to call your attention to what he said in a letter that was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He said: "I have no hesitation in expressing the opinion that a very small percentage of the cases allowed consist of fraudulent and unjust claims." He says, further, in regard to what the newspapers were charging: "They have charged frauds right and left, without a case before them upon which to found their charges." And that is true to-day, and true of the charges that are being made against the men upon the pension roll of this country. There is no foundation for them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the fault is in the pension laws, with the exception of one or two in regard to widows, and perhaps the law of 1890 should be more explicit, so it could not be misconstrued. I believe the trouble is with the rules and the regulations and the constructions placed upon those laws by the officers in charge. It is openly charged that the act of March 6, 1896, has been and still is being ignored. The Commissioner of Pensions tells us that he does not give the soldiers the benefit of the ratings of the local boards, notwithstanding the act of March 2, 1895, and notwithstanding the fact that it is included in this bill that the local pension board shall rate the pensioners. If the law requires the pensioners to be rated, then why not give them the benefit of that rating?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Will the gentleman allow me to call his attention to the hearings on page 7?

Mr. CURTIS. I will get to that in a minute.

Mr. SIMS. Then you charge that the Commissioner is not acting honestly in discharging the law as he finds it?

Mr. CURTIS. I will get to that part after a while. I have to say that I believe the policy pursued by the Commissioner of Pensions is not just to the old soldier.

Mr. SIMS. Your charge is that the law is all right and the Commissioner is wrong?

Mr. CURTIS. With few exceptions, I say the law is all right now. The Commissioner of Pensions said that he does combine disabilities, but if any member of Congress will take the time to examine the cases which I have, which have been rejected, he will find that the Commissioner does not always do so, and if this letter from him, published in the National Tribune, the great soldier paper of the country, on the 28th of December, 1899, is true, he does not do it. Listen: "There is no warrant in the act of June 27, 1890, for an 'aggregate' of disabilities; * * * consequently the rejection of your claim is affirmed." That letter was dated December 16 and signed by the Commissioner himself, and published in this paper on December 28.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Do you claim that the rating of the local pension board should be final?

Mr. CURTIS. No, sir; but I do claim that where the local pension board rates a pensioner and gives him a ratable disability, he should be given the benefit of that rating; and if it does not give him a ratable disability, it ought to be ignored.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Can it be made conclusive under the law?

Mr. CURTIS. I think the law is sufficient. It is simply a question of construction in the office of the Commissioner.

Mr. RAY of New York. One moment now. Is the gentleman correct in that, that it is a question of construction in the office of the Commissioner of Pensions?

Mr. CURTIS. He says so himself.

Mr. RAY of New York. Has it not gone up to the Interior Department repeatedly, and has not the Interior Department decided over and over again that under the law as it stands they must so hold, and is not the Commissioner of Pensions simply following up the construction that is given by a higher construction than himself?

Mr. CURTIS. That is what the Commissioner claims; but if you will examine these cases, you will find that he does not.

Mr. RAY of New York. Oh, the gentleman ought not to say that.

Mr. CURTIS. I said it because I have examined the cases; and if you want me to put them into the RECORD, I can do so.

Mr. RAY of New York. You had better, if you make any such claim.

Mr. CURTIS. Let him deny it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CURTIS. Why, certainly, if my time is extended; but I want to finish up what I have to say.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. I should like ten minutes more.

Mr. BARNEY. I yield to the gentleman ten minutes more.

Mr. RAY of New York. Now, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly.

Mr. RAY of New York. Now, I do not think you are just.

Mr. CURTIS. I want to be.

Mr. RAY of New York. I do not think you are just in your remarks concerning the Commissioner of Pensions in regard to that ruling, because any decision made by the Commissioner on a question of law or the interpretation of the pension laws is always subject to appeal to the Secretary of the Interior, and Webster Davis is a very competent man.

Mr. CURTIS. And he has reversed the Commissioner often.

Mr. RAY of New York. And he has repeatedly reaffirmed this doctrine of which you are complaining, and alleges that that is the law. Now, if the gentleman will look a little further, he will find that a bill to amend and correct the pension law in that regard has been introduced in the Senate and has passed that body.

Mr. CURTIS. And ought to pass this House, so that the Commissioner of Pensions can not misconstrue it.

Mr. RAY of New York. Very good; then you ought not to charge against the Commissioner of Pensions that which has been affirmed by a higher authority, and a bill is now pending to correct it.

Mr. CURTIS. I charge it because I have examined the cases; I have a memorandum of them in my pocket, cases where I believe he has absolutely ignored the decision of Webster Davis. I want to call your attention to the fact that in 1897 he says he rejected, in round numbers, 107,000 cases—89,000 on medical grounds, 13,000 on legal grounds, 5,000 on the ground of no benefit. I charge openly that if in these rejected cases the benefit of the ratings had been given to the pensioner a large number would have been allowed. I have no feeling against the Commissioner of Pensions; he has always treated me nicely; my calls have been promptly answered; my suggestions have been given consideration, if not always favorable; but I have examined these cases, and I am of the opinion—and that opinion is based upon my examination of these cases—that his policy is against the interest of the old soldiers and that they are not receiving fair treatment at his hands.

Now, why were pension laws enacted? The answer is simply, because the Government owed a debt to the soldiers it could not pay; because they did their duty to this country when it needed defenders, when loyalty and patriotism were put to the test. But the Commissioner of Pensions tells us that there have been $2,000,000,000 paid to the soldiers since 1866. Why, gentlemen, in 1861 this Government needed men and money. Loyal, patriotic men answered the call of the Government, and loyal men loaned their money to the Government. There has been paid back to those who loaned the money over $5,000,000,000. Yet the Commissioner of Pensions says nothing about that. They loaned their money and accepted the bonds of the country. The money and the interest should have been returned, as it has been; but I submit it is unfair to parade before the public the amount of money paid to the pensioners in order to justify those who were in charge of that almost sacred fund in their technical construction of the laws.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I would like to ask if the difficulty about which you complain may not appropriately be charged to the fact that men entirely out of sympathy with the old soldier have been kept upon the board of review in the Pension Office under the civil-service laws of the Government and against the interest of the old veterans?

Mr. CURTIS. I have been told that that was true; but the Commissioner of Pensions has the right, he has the power to change any man that is on the board of review and send him to some other division.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Oh, certainly; but that only shifts the force and retains the unsympathetic employee. The soldier did not stand on a technicality when he took up arms for his country. Why should the Government now? I would give him the benefit of liberal construction of law.

Mr. McDOWELL. I will ask the gentleman, has not the Commissioner authority to overrule the decisions of the board if he thinks they are not just?

Mr. CURTIS. I think so. I say, yes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Do you think the rulings of Webster Davis are any more in the interest of the old soldier than those of the Commissioner?

Mr. CURTIS. I know the decisions of Webster Davis are in the interest of the old soldiers, and all they ask is fair treatment; and if the law be administered as laid down by Webster Davis they would be perfectly satisfied.

Mr. McDOWELL. Why, then, does it take so long to have these cases disposed of that are carried there on appeal?

Mr. CURTIS. Because there are so many of them. Now, Mr. Chairman, it is true that this war cost this Government a great amount of money; but when we figure that we must not forget the price that was ungrudgingly paid by the old soldiers and their families. It was paid in crimson currency, in broken hearts, and bitter tears. It was paid and is still being paid in aches and pains, the result of wounds received and diseases contracted in the service.

Those men who sneer at the pensioners must know nothing of the hardships of the march and battle; they must never have read of Andersonville and Libby—those pens of filth, disease, and death—names to be conjured with only in the chamber of horrors. Now, why should the old soldier, who was examined, who was accepted, and who served his country long and well, be compelled to prove that he was sound when he enlisted? Why should the old soldier who served his country and has proved that he was wounded in the service or contracted disease in the service or was injured in the service and shows that he is still suffering from those disabilities, and the medical evidence shows that they are of long standing, be compelled to prove their continuance each and every year? Why should the old soldier who was wounded or injured in the service and is still suffering be compelled to prove the continuance of the disabilities which his neighbors could not know of unless he made an exhibition of himself?

Why should the ironclad property rule be applied to widows? Why this delay in granting widows' pensions under the old law? Why not give all widows entitled to pensions $12? Why not do justice to these women? Why wait and delay action in their cases under the old law until they have been laid beside the old soldier and the debt the Government owes is laid up in a pigeonhole to be brought up in the time of some future special examiner? Why not, and in this I conclude, give to the old soldiers fair treatment? Justice is all they ask; liberally construe the laws that are now upon the statute books, and the soldiers and the soldiers' friends will be satisfied. [Applause.]

Mr. LIVINGSON. I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I deem this the

proper time and place to call to the attention of the House that which concerns thousands of people in the country, and intimately concerns every member of this body. I desire to register a protest as vigorously as the justice of the case demands, and within my humble power, against the delay in the interpretation of the well-established law of this country on the subject of granting pensions. We find a situation prevailing now on the subject of the right of those under the law to pension who were under 16 years of age upon the death of the pensioner—the soldier who was entitled—and yet when his children applied and when their pension cases were before the Pension Commissioner he rendered a decision against the plain law, I believe, and unfavorable to that class of applicants.

Briefly, the law reads as follows:

SEC. 4702. If any person embraced within the provisions of sections 4692 and 4693 has died since the 4th day of March, 1861, or hereafter dies by reason of any wound, injury, or disease, which, under the conditions and limitations of such sections, would have entitled him to an invalid pension had he been disabled, his widow, or if there be no widow, or in case of her death without payment to her of any part of the pension hereinafter mentioned, his child or children under 16 years of age, shall be entitled to receive the same pension as the husband or father would have been entitled to had he been totally disabled, to commence from the death of the husband or father, to continue to the widow during her widowhood, and to his child or children until they severally attain the age of 16 years, and no longer; and if the widow remarry, the child or children shall be entitled from the date of remarriage.

That law gave those who were under 16 years of age a pension, and under its enforcement for years and years they were granted a pension, though applied for after they arrived at 16. Now, a decision of the Pension Commissioner on this subject was long ago made, and on appeal to the Secretary of the Interior, where it has laid for over a year, the Commissioner's decision was overruled, and by another process of delay it went to the Attorney-General. There is not a member in this House but who has received letter after letter, month after month, asking for justice at the hands of the Government under this law, and asking for a decision of this plain proposition.

And yet, by reason of the policy of procrastination and delay that everywhere pervades the Department on the subject of pensions, these children and those who were children then are not granted a pension and can not get a decision. Why? The point presented is this: Children under 16 years of age, though confessedly entitled to a pension had they applied before that age, would have received it, but now these children, under guardian then, these children in charitable institutions, public and private, while they were under 16 years of age, those who were the beneficiaries of charitable people all over the country, children of soldiers under this law entitled to pensions, are to have the statute of limitations, some imaginary statute or bar, set up against them because they did not apply before they arrived at the age of 16.

That is the proposition confronting us by the Bureau's delay in the enforcement of this law—in the delay in deciding. Why not make a decision; why hold up these claims; why present to this country a cowardice upon the subject of interpretation of what seems to me to be a plain proposition of law? I want to warn the members of this body, every one of whom is interested in this subject, that the codification proposed, the compilation of law proposed by Congress, is aimed at striking out these just cases.

This compilation of law is aimed at striking out these just cases for pension, and I warn you so, that you may be on guard.

So I protest against this delay in the interpretation of law, to say nothing at this time about the delay in the taking up and considering the pension applications of the Spanish-American soldiers. [Applause.]

Mr. BARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I have entered into an agreement with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] that the general debate shall continue until 4 o'clock, and then the five-minute debate continue until half past 4, at which time the committee will rise and the vote be taken.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I see no objection to that on our side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks that general debate on this bill shall expire at 4 o'clock, when the bill shall be considered under the five-minute rule until half past 4, at which time a motion for the committee to rise shall prevail. Is there objection?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is satisfactory, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I now yield ten minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DALY].

[Mr. DALY of New Jersey addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES].

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Chairman, taking advantage of the temporary rule allowing general debate, I shall discuss the power of Congress to say what shall and what shall not be transmitted in the United States mails, claiming as I do that Congress can and should stop trusts, combines, monopolies, and their allies from using the mails in transmitting any and all their correspondence. The power of Congress is unquestionable to pass and enforce such a law, and Congress has done so in similar cases, and the necessity for the vigorous exercise of that power along this line is at hand.

But I will stop for a moment to say this on this pension bill now pending: Our pensioners and disbursements in 1899 were less than in 1898, but when we remember that the civil war closed thirty-five years ago, and that even though the responsibilities were less in 1899 than in 1898, showing some reform, our pensioners and disbursements were, nevertheless, four times greater in 1899 than in 1879, twenty years ago. We can not blame the people who welcome this reform for wondering why this roll has not been reduced more.

The official figures of the committee reporting this bill are as follows:

Fiscal year.	Number of pensioners on the roll.	Annual value of pensions.	Disbursements on account of pensions.	Total number of applications filed.	Total number of claims allowed.
1879	242,755	$25,493,742.15	$33,664,428.92	57,118	31,346
1898	993,714	130,968,465.00	144,651,879.80	37,524	52,648
1899	991,519	131,617,961.00	138,355,052.95	48,765	37,077

I shall continue to sustain the Commissioner of Pensions as long as he keeps up this work, believing as I do that he has tried to do his duty as he sees it, and that, too, in the face of many opposing members of his party and the Grand Army of the Republic. This clash of itself casts suspicion on our pension roll. It should be reformed until it is placed above suspicion—made, as my people would have it, a veritable roll of honor. The Southern people favor just pension laws, rightfully administered.

But, Mr. Chairman, I shall now take up my subject—trusts and their allies, and the power and propriety of Congress denying them the use of the mails in the transaction of their business. Without the use of the mails, clearly they would be powerless to survive, as was the Louisiana lottery, and that, too, after the supreme court of that State and of the United States said that under the constitution of Louisiana that lottery had the right to exist. But Congress said that they should no longer use the mail for the transaction of their business, and straightway strangled that institution to death in this country, and forced it to go, as it did, to Honduras, where it undertook to carry on its business from that place in the United States; but its correspondence was soon, by another statute, denied the privilege of the mail service, which finally drove that nefarious business from the land. So we see how far-reaching and destructive it is to deny the use of the mail, even to a great moneyed institution which the court said had the right under the fundamental law of Louisiana to exist.

If something is not done, and at once, to crush the trusts and other combines, we will have in this country another roll of pensioners filling the almshouses of the cities, counties, and States of the Union, and invincible corruptionists will continue to prowl around the precincts of legislation, State and national, until they shall dominate the courts of justice, the last resort of the people short of open rebellion.

The Supreme Court of the United States, in repeated and unanimous opinions, have held, and it is now the law, that Congress, under the constitutional grant of power "to establish post-offices and post-roads," has the sole power to say what shall and what shall not be carried in the mails, and that, too, regardless of whether the thing admitted or excluded is immoral in itself, because Congress is not required to furnish mailing facilities for "every purpose," says Chief Justice Fuller in the case of Rapier (143 U. S., 133), who was convicted of violating the anti lottery statute passed by Congress; or as was said by Justice Field in the early and like case of Jackson, reported in 96 U. S., page 727:

The power possessed by Congress to establish post-offices and post-roads embraces the regulation of the entire postal system of the country. The right to designate what shall be carried necessarily involves the right to determine what shall be excluded.

Both of these opinions have been repeatedly reaffirmed, the Rapier case being referred to as settling the constitutionality of the lottery law in the two Horner cases, reported in 143 U. S., at pages 213 and 578. The court fully approved the Jackson case in the Rapier case, the court holding in both that Congress has the power to exclude what it pleases from the mails, whether moral or immoral.

Chief Justice Fuller, in the Rapier case, continued:

It is not necessary that Congress should have the power to deal with crime or immorality within States in order to maintain that it possesses the power to forbid the use of the mails in aid of the perpetration of crime or immorality.

The court had already said, I may add, that while the mailing facilities were for the benefit of the people, Congress was not required to furnish such service for "every purpose."

Judge Fuller continued:

The question to be determined relates to the constitutionality of section 3894 of the Revised Statutes as amended by that act.

In ex parte Jackson (96 U. S., 727) it was held that the power vested in Congress to establish post-offices and post-roads embraced the regulation of the entire postal system of the country, and that under it Congress may designate what may be carried in the mails and what excluded; that in excluding various articles from the mails the object of Congress is not to interfere with the freedom of the press or with any other rights of the people, but to refuse the facilities for the distribution of matter deemed injurious by Congress to the public morals.

Congress is not obliged to furnish mail facilities for "every purpose." I will show in a few moments this is true in practice. I shall show what matters are nonmailable. Continuing, Chief Justice Fuller, in the Rapier case, says:

The States, before the Union was formed, could furnish post-offices and post-roads, and in doing so could bring into place the police power in the protection of their citizens from the use of the means so provided for purposes supposed to exert a demoralizing influence upon the people. When the power to establish post-offices and post-roads was surrendered to the Congress, it was a complete power, and the grant carried with it the right to exercise all the powers which made that power effective. It is not necessary that Congress should have the power to deal with crime or immorality within the States in order to maintain that it possesses the power to forbid the use of the mail in the perpetration of crime or immorality.

The argument that there is a distinction between mala prohibita and mala in se and that Congress might forbid the use of the mails in promotion of such acts as are universally regarded as mala in se, including all such crimes as murder, arson, burglary, etc., and the offense of circulating obscene books and papers, but can not do so in respect of other matters, which it might regard as criminal or immoral, but which it has no power itself to prohibit, involves a concession which is fatal to the contention of petitioner, since it would be for Congress to determine what are within and what are without the rules; but we think there is no room for such a distinction here and that it must be left to Congress in the exercise of its sound discretion to determine in what manner it will exercise the power it undoubtedly possesses. * * *

The freedom of communication is not abridged within the intent and meaning of the constitutional provision unless Congress is absolutely destitute of any discretion as to what shall or shall not be carried in the mails and compelled arbitrarily to assist in the dissemination of matters condemned by its judgment, through the governmental agencies which it controls. That power may be abused furnishes no ground for a denial of its existence, if government is to be maintained at all. In short, we do not find sufficient grounds in the argument of counsel, able and exhaustive as they have been, to induce us to change the views already expressed in the Jackson case, to which we have referred. We adhere to the conclusion therein announced.

Unless this great court overrules these and fifty or more similar opinions on the subject, holding the various laws on this subject are valid, then the constitutionality of the bill I have introduced is "unquestionable." I will now read the bill, as follows:

A bill further regulating the class of matter denied admission to the mail.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no letter, postal card, or circular that relates to or is designed to promote the affairs of, and no check, draft, bill, note, money, postal note, or money order drawn by or to, or issued or drawn to conduct the business or affairs of, any firm, association, company, or corporation, or two or more persons dealing in or manufacturing or producing any growth, product, commodity, or article of commerce or trade, shall be carried in the mail or received or delivered at any post-office or branch or station thereof, or by any letter carrier, when such firm, association, company, corporation, or persons are associated or combined for any or either or all of the following purposes:

First. To abolish, abridge, or in any wise affect open and free competition in trade, or exclude rivalry between the parties thereto, or to abridge or attempt to abridge competition between others not parties thereto, or themselves and others, engaged in like or other business.

Second. To create or promote any restrictions in trade or commerce or to limit or restrict production of any article or commodity of trade unduly to affect the market.

Third. To affect the wages of employees of themselves or others or diminish the opportunities of wage-earners by contracting production, abridging competition, or otherwise.

Fourth. To diminish the product of labor and skill in order to increase the price thereof.

Fifth. To create monopoly or do that which tends thereto.

Sixth. To control the market or to limit or abridge the opportunities of the public as to supply, price, or quality of commodities or products, or by partitioning territory in which to operate between the parties thereto, or otherwise limiting the operations of either or all, so as to limit production or competition or prices.

Seventh. To arbitrarily set a minimum price so as to exclude competition between themselves, or to pool prices or profits, or prorate orders.

Eighth. To boycott others engaged in like business or any business, or to seek by other means than fair and open rivalry in trade to undermine competition, or to force or seek to force dealers to handle their commodities or products solely.

SEC. 2. That any person who shall deposit or cause to be deposited, or who shall knowingly send or cause to be sent, anything to be conveyed or delivered by mail in violation of this act, or who shall cause to be delivered by mail anything herein forbidden to be carried by mail, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction shall be fined not less than $5,000 and imprisoned not less than one year for each offense. Proceeding may be instituted by information or indictment, and trial had either in the district in which the unlawful matter was mailed or in that in which it was designed to be delivered.

SEC. 3. That grand juries shall have inquisitorial powers to inquire into violations of this act and any citizen shall be permitted to testify thereto of his own volition, and if no person offers himself as prosecutor in any case juries shall make return of such bill of indictment into court, if found, and the court shall order the name of the district attorney entered thereon as prosecutor ex officio.

SEC. 4. That any person who informs upon and successfully prosecutes any violator of this act shall be awarded by the trial judge one-half of the amount of the fine imposed and collected, out of which the court may fix and allot his attorney's fee.

SEC. 5. That judges of courts shall deliver this act in special charge to grand juries at each term.

I want to say that I take no special pride in the fact that it is my bill. You may call it anybody's bill you please. What I want is to save my countrymen and save my people from being outraged, from being deprived of their natural rights and the right of free trade between the States.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GAINES. I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin will yield me ten minutes more.

Mr. BARNEY. I yield the gentleman ten minutes of my time.

Mr. GAINES. I am very grateful to the gentleman. A fair-minded man never loses anything in dealing fairly with another man who is trying to deal fairly, whether he is doing so or not. I have a letter indorsing this bill from the distinguished attorney-general of Ohio, Mr. F. S. Monnet, who has given the trust question long and distinguished attention. I have not time to read it, but will insert it in the RECORD by permission:

I am delighted to know that you have introduced a bill with penal features to reach trusts through the powers vested in Congress in Article I, section 8, providing for the establishment of post-offices and post-roads, or bring it under the mail department. This relieves us of the State's sovereignty objection made to Congress, interfering with State commerce by attempting to reach the commerce clause through section 8. Inasmuch as the court sustained this class of legislation in lotteries, I think you are producing one of the most effectual lines to reach trusts and monopolies that can not be reached through the commerce clause. I would feel complimented if you would have your clerk send me your proposed bill.

Congress controls the local or State as well as interstate mails, while under the interstate-commerce clause Congress is confined to the regulation of interstate and international commerce pure and simple. Hence this bill as a law would crush local or State trust commerce and interstate trust commerce, and do so equally all over the United States. It would be necessarily uniform in legal if not practical effect. These are strong points in favor of the policy of this bill.

Section 1 says if certain concerns or persons "are associated or combined for any one or either or all of the following purposes," naming them, and in addition have used the mail to transact their business, the Federal grand jury finds a true bill and enforces the law against them, as in any other criminal case.

Section 3 gives the right to the humblest man in this land to go before the grand jury, and gives the jury the right to summon him before the grand jury, for the purpose of finding a true bill against the violator of this statute.

One of the weaknesses of the present anti-trust law, Mr. Chairman, is that it puts it entirely in the hands of the Attorney-General of the United States to say when suits shall be filed against trusts. By my bill I put it in the hands of the people of this country to say when it shall operate. They are the ones who suffer. They are the victims. I put it in the hands of the plain people of this country—our Federal grand jurors—I put it in the hands of the Attorney-General and the Federal judge in the district where the trust is, and the people can go before the grand jury and say, "Here is A, B & Co., a trust." They find whether it is or not a trust formed for any one, either, or all the purposes named in section 1; and if they find it is a trust, they ask, "Did it send its letters through the mail?"

If the grand jury find that it has done so, they find a true bill, and then they go before a jury of the country, a jury of their peers, and there the case is tried. If they find that it is a trust formed for any one, either, or all the purposes named and that it used the mail in transacting its business, it is found guilty and fined $5,000 or imprisoned one year. I am tired of this one-man Government; I am tired of the Attorney-General of the United States—I do not care whether he is Mr. Olney or Mr. Griggs, I do not care whether he is that greatest of patriots, William Jennings Bryan; if Attorney-General, I would oppose putting it in his hands exclusively—to say whether or not the trust shall be prosecuted or arraigned by the injunctive process in the courts.

Sir, there has never yet been a remedy for the trust evil suggested that its apologists did not pick a flaw in it. They masquerade as friends of the people and are heard exclaiming, "Trusts are a bad lot, but this is not the way to get at them." Any way is the wrong way. The great nullifying defect in the law of 1890 was doubtless injected into it by the friends of the trust for the exact purpose it has served—to nullify the act. It leaves its execution and the institution of actions solely to the Attorney-General, and the Attorney-General does not see proper to do it, and so there you are. It is a dead letter, utterly and absolutely useless and of no avail, because its execution rests with one man who does not see proper to enforce it.

My bill addresses itself specifically to this great defect. I have seen this bill criticised for that, it was said, it throws upon postmasters and carriers the onus of determining what is a trust, and I admit the criticism would be fatal if it were well founded; but nowhere in the bill is such duty imposed. On the other hand, the inhibitions, penalties, and maledictions of the bill are all leveled at the person who misuses the mail, and postmasters are not commanded to throw out or refuse mail until the fact that it is sent

by a trust is established by the court. Its mandates are addressed to courts and juries and not to postmasters.

The Federal judges are required to give it in special charge to the grand juries, and the juries are given inquisitorial power to ferret them out, and the doors of jury rooms are set ajar to citizens to lodge complaints, whomsoever will, and thus the path is so open and easy and straight to conviction that no trust or person will dare to take the risk. It eliminates this one-man power. It relegates the enforcement of it back to the people themselves, where it rightfully belongs.

The bill enforces itself by its terrors and the ease and certainty with which they may be invoked by bringing the courts into use, and by the invitations it extends to citizens to cooperate with the courts, and the power it confers upon grand juries to ferret out and compel information. Our entire system of criminal jurisprudence rests upon the probity and effectiveness of the grand jury. It stands between the people and the lawbreaker with drawn sword, the guardian of the one and the terror of the other; it is hoary with age, and is the wisest and surest and most effective of all the instrumentalities designed for the protection of society and the suppression of vice, and this bill predicates itself in the impregnable and unimpugnable strength and wisdom of this old-time grand-jury system that has never failed in any other branch of crime to fully meet the exigencies and demands of the case.

It sends this monster evil back to this source of all power and rectifier of wrongs to be weighed in the balances. It removes it beyond the power of any one man, or administration, or party, or politicians with pulls to protect an evil that saps the public welfare. It sends these giant trusts back to answer for their deed to the people, in their own sacred forum, where all violations of law, great and small, must answer; and if this bill is wrong in doing this, then the whole jury system is wrong, although the wisdom of ages has approved and perfected it, and it has never failed before. I maintain that it is right and just and lawful and equitable to compel these trusts to be measured by this same standard that is set up for all transgressors, and I am assured that it can not harm them if they are innocent, because it is the common people who are measuring them, and they may be depended upon to mete out exact justice, and of this no man or combination of men can complain.

In proof of my statement that Congress has the right to say what may and what shall not be carried in the mails, and that, too, regardless of whether the matter denied or admitted is moral or immoral, I cite certain acts which are declared by Congress to be "offenses against the postal service," as follows:

1. Combination to prevent bids to carry the mails. Acts of 1876.
2. The use of the mails to promote frauds. Acts of 1889.
3. Fraudulently assuming fictitious addresses. Acts of 1889.
4. Libelous, indecent, scurrilous, defamatory, or threatening envelopes and wrappers are made nonmailable. (Rev. Stat., sec. 3893.)
5. Obscene and like matter are made "nonmailable."—*Ib.*
6. Lotteries, gift enterprises, etc., their circulars, etc., are made "nonmailable." (Rev. Stat., sec. 3893.)
7. Bringing lottery tickets into the United States is made a crime and prohibited. (Acts 1893.)
8. Postmasters are not allowed to be lottery agents. (Rev. Stat., sec. 3851.)

We have, then, clearly seen that the court of last resort has held that the power is in Congress to say what shall and what shall not be carried in the mails, and that, too, regardless of whether the matter denied or given this privilege is moral per se or not, and until Congress shall reverse this it is clearly in its power to enact laws similar to the one that I propose.

But even if Congress were confined to excluding only such things as are immoral per se, I contend that trusts are immoral; that they are contrary to the public policy, to the common law, in derogation of the general welfare, and that Congress, in the act of 1890, and many of the States have so declared.

I see no difference in a concern which corrupts one's morals in the common acceptation of the term and a concern that deprives the individual of his natural means of making a living, and therefore gradually deprives him of life.

We are all God's creatures, and each of us has the right to live, and having the right to live we must have the further right to exercise our natural rights to make a living, and anyone who deprives us, however small or great, of the means of exercising this natural right of making a living directly deprives us of the right to maintain life. The welfare of society and the country at large requires that each man shall earn a livelihood by the sweat of his face. He must not become a beggar and a nuisance to society and later on a pensioner upon our charities and almshouses.

Hence the common and statute law reprehend monopolies which tend to bring about such an unhappy result. Trusts and monopolies are therefore contrary to good morals and to public policy, to American institutions, to the statute law of Congress in 1890, and to many State statutes, and are therefore under the ban of the law. Why, then, should they be permitted to use the mails? Why should Congress aid all trusts by permitting them to use the mails, and at the same time condemn only those that engage in interstate commerce when by barring the use of the mails to all they can all be destroyed? Why strangle those that are engaged in interstate commerce with one hand, under the act of 1890, regulating interstate commerce, and with the other hand aid those that are engaged in State and interstate commerce by allowing them to use the mail?

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to extend my remarks on this subject by inserting the letter of Attorney-General Monnett.

The letter referred to is as follows:

JANUARY 12, 1900.

MY DEAR SIR: Your esteemed favor of the 6th instant came in the rush of inauguration and other work, and I take pleasure in now replying more fully than I could at an earlier date.

Our Ohio anti-trust act was passed April 18, 1898, to take effect July 1, 1898. Under our constitution and statutes Governor Bushnell was not required to sign the bill; he has no veto power under our constitution and, therefore, is not given authority or power to approve or disapprove of the same. We took the Sherman anti-trust act, the Texas act, and compared the various trust acts of other States, and think we got the best for our State of any that were heretofore enacted. The objectionable feature, or rather the weak part, of the act has proved to be that we can not procure the testimony of interested parties, for the reason that they claim the right of the Federal and State constitutions, on the ground that such testimony would criminate themselves.

I prepared a bill, which has been introduced by Judge Russell, of Meigs County, in the assembly this last week, in the form of a supplemental act to the anti-trust act, following the language, as well as the approval of the language in the United States Supreme Court, that is used in the interstate-commerce law, making such evidence or testimony a privileged communication, so that the evidence adduced in the trial of this class of cases can not be used against such witnesses in any subsequent prosecution. Relying upon the Federal court's decision as to the efficacy of this protection, and there being compelled to testify, it will enable us to speedily enforce the act, both by compelling the witnesses to answer in evidence before a master, referee, or other officer taking such testimony, and also compelling the officers or agents of such corporations so offending against the trust laws to answer the proper interrogatories attached to the pleadings under the old equity practice. We have a larger number of cases pending thereunder, but they have nullified the powers of the courts by refusing to answer interrogatories, produce books, or to give oral testimony. The great secrecy maintained by the head officers in this class of nefarious business makes it next to impossible to get competent testimony from without; hence the necessity of such a provision in both the State and Federal act as I prepared for Judge Russell as above referred to.

There was no member of the house or senate that had the hardihood to stand out against the anti-trust act, and there was only one man that was accused of dodging the vote and trying to do something against it; at least he did not vote for it, and is now holding a Federal place. In order to get the public sentiment so strong that the bill would pass practically without opposition, we had a committee appointed in the Senate, of which Valentine was chairman, to investigate the formation, operation, and effect of trusts upon trade and commerce within the State borders, and the disclosures therein made were such that a lobbyist could scarcely withstand the tide that was set in on behalf of the people for proper legislation to restrain the abuses of corporate combinations at the expense of the depreciated prices of the producer and the increased prices to the consumer.

I am delighted to know that you have introduced a bill with penal features to reach trusts through the powers vested in Congress in Article I, section 8, providing for the establishment of post-offices and post-roads, or bring it under the mail department. This relieves us of the State's sovereignty objection made to Congress, interfering with State commerce by attempting to reach the commerce clause through section 8. Inasmuch as the court sustained this class of legislation in lotteries, I think you are certainly producing one of the most effectual lines to reach trusts and monopolies that can not be reached through the commerce clause. I would feel complimented if you would have your clerk send me your proposed bill. One of the difficulties just now suggested to me under the proposed measure is just in what manner you can determine when they are a trust, unless you defined it in an act as explicitly as we did in our act above referred to.

Let me suggest another move in the right line, namely, to have some legislation along the line suggested in the syllabus in the case of Smyth *vs.* Aimes, 169 U. S., 466, incorporating in Federal Statutes what they would incorporate a decision, namely, furnish statutory right for any shipper to bring action against a railroad company or common carrier, such as a pipe line, express, or telegraph, to recover back the excess that may be exacted from such shipper or patron of these common carriers whenever such charges for freight or passengers or pipe-line services shall be in excess of a fair return and upon the capital invested in such common carrier, plus the necessary expenses.

This is certainly the true solution of watered stock and fictitious bonding of common carriers. It is in harmony with the fundamental principle recognized in the right of eminent domain; or put it in another way, private property is ever held to be inviolate and can be taken only for public purposes. Therefore, when so taken for public purposes, for any more than a return upon the actual investments and the actual labor expended thereon, they cease to use it for public purposes and prostitute it to private gain. The courts certainly recognize this principle in the above case and others, that this Congress should not overlook and give the States in the Mississippi Valley and other rural districts an opportunity to protect themselves against the heavy discriminations against them.

We should not be permitted to endure two years more of paying tribute to creatures exercising governmental functions and at the same time abusing those governmental functions by carrying fictitious values on watered stock and demanding tribute to support the same. In addition to giving double or triple damages, as set forth in the principles of the Sherman Act, the United States Supreme Court ought to be given original jurisdiction in quo warranto to take away charters granted by Federal authorities, and the States could make it a similar offense against corporations having State charters.

Then, again, the act should provide for the United States to be a party plaintiff and to have the right to bring an action and obtain a restraining

order or injunction on the complaint of a shipper whenever such corporation doing an interstate business was attempting to nourish these excessive values. If we are not ripe for Federal or State ownership of these quasi-public corporations exercising governmental functions, we must supervise more minutely their actions and exercise our right of control thereover and let this proposition be followed up by a committee of investigation that would give a month toward investigating the rates and abuses along this line, most of which could be obtained in the Interstate Commerce Office; the investigation would give you backing to put the bill through, and such a bill would certainly make a strong issue before the people, as one that has great merits in it, from my point of view.

To illustrate, the Buckeye Pipe Line Company, one of the constituent companies of the Standard Oil Company, charges 20 cents a barrel, or about $1 per ton, for shipping oil through their pipe lines any distance; the average producer shipping a few lines to their nearest tank, and it costs less than 5 mills per ton per mile through their pipe line, and yet, while they are exercising their right of eminent domain and doing a State and interstate business as common carriers, you can see the enormous per cent they received over and above a fair return of their investment, being several thousand per cent greater than they should be entitled to under the principle laid down in Smyth *vs.* Aimes.

Believing at all times that the sovereignty of the Government is supreme, the creator more powerful than the creature, I hope you will work out the true solution of the problems along the lines you have already started, and if my suggestions are of any value, I will be glad to assist the cause.

Hoping to have the pleasure of seeing you when I am in Washington, I am, yours, very truly,

F. S. MONNETT.

JOHN W. GAINES, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. BARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I am authorized by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE], who is controlling the time on the other side, to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] ten minutes.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I have the honor to be a member of Congress from Tennessee. I am a Democrat and elected as such, and certainly no one who knows or is acquainted with the political conditions in Tennessee will suppose that a Democrat comes here charged with any great amount of love and affection for the Hon. H. Clay Evans—I mean from a political standpoint; and I am not up here to defend Mr. Evans in any respect whatever. But he is the Commissioner, and it is his acts as Commissioner that I propose to notice, and only briefly.

Now, we all know, who think for a moment and consider the surroundings of the Commissioner as a citizen and as a Republican in Tennessee, that there could not be any motive on his part from a political standpoint in administering the Pension Office so as to meet with the disapproval of those who favor liberal pensions. I look at another thing. He must have come into that office prejudiced against Democrats, and he did not expect to win any favor from the Democrats by pursuing a course approved by them. He was not looking for it, he was not seeking it, and he could not and did not expect any favor from Democrats. If he had been seeking political promotion or help in his own State from his own party, I say he has certainly made a mistake in conscientiously construing the laws as he finds them. Every temptation was in the other direction; every temptation was to be liberal to pensioners.

While his ambition was not confined to the State of Tennessee it was not confined to the borders of that State, because it was known that he was a candidate for the Vice-Presidency. It is known that he was an applicant for a Cabinet position, and he ought to know if he was looking for favor among the old soldiers—I will not say among the old soldiers, but from that army of pension grabbers and attorneys that are hounding him to his political death—that he could not expect to get it by a strict construction of the pension laws. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] did not say it in words, but he insinuated that he was not honestly administering the law; that the laws were all right, and if the Commissioner would only do his duty there would be nothing of which to complain.

Now, if the laws are all right, then it is only a question of construction, and, as shown by the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY], there are appeals from his decisions which have been taken and which can be taken.

My honest opinion is that the speech of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] was made for home consumption, and was intended to benefit himself locally and those standing in need of such benefit, and that he was not sincere in the tirade which he has made here to-day. No resolutions have been introduced to investigate the Pension Office or the rulings of the Commissioner.

Well, let us look at a pension. What is it? A gratuity—simply a gratuity. Then should not those seeking that gratuity clearly establish their title to it? Ought they not to place themselves within the provision of the law that gives them this gratuity?

Then, shall it be said that a Commissioner of Pensions is dishonest who requires that the provisions of the most liberal pension laws ever enacted in any country on the face of the earth should be construed with at least reasonable strictness? Do they expect the Commissioner to come here and say, in effect, "These laws were intended to give everybody pensions who are entitled to them, but I will override the law, and not scrutinize the evidence, and give pensions to those who apply, simply because they have applied?" It is known that applications have been filed from some of the regiments engaged in the recent Spanish war almost if not equal to 50 per cent of the entire membership of the regiment, and those applications must be for disabilities of service origin.

If a regiment serving not over six months in the late war with Spain, that never fired a gun and never was in battle, a regiment composed of hale and hardy young men, has already made applications equal to 50 per cent of the entire membership of that regiment—if that number of these young men are applying for pensions on the ground of service disability, is it not something to attract the attention of this House? Should not the Commissioner of Pensions, in the discharge of his duty, scrutinize the evidence to support such application? Should he be condemned for taking the necessary time to properly investigate and determine the facts in the case?

Now, upon that ratio I do not know exactly how long the war has been over, for it hardly commenced before it was over; but if 50 per cent of some regiments are already applying for pensions due to service origin, in another twelve months I suppose the whole number will be on the application list. Yet an executive officer of the Government is to be condemned because he does not grant pensions in proportion to the rate of applications. That is what has been charged here. We are to-day comparing the number of pensions granted in a given time with the number of applications, and condemning him for investigating each case as he ought to. It is more important now than it ever was to investigate pension cases carefully.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Why does the gentleman from Tennessee say that a pension is a gratuity?

Mr. SIMS. Because it is the truth; that is the reason.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Is it not a solemn obligation upon this Government—an implied contract, sacred and binding—that those who bore the brunt of battle shall not ask in vain for help from the Government they saved?

Mr. SIMS. It is a gratuity, as held, determined, and acted upon.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Is it not a vested right, when once granted, to be enjoyed by the veteran, and of which he can not be deprived at the whim of any man?

Mr. SIMS. It is a pure gratuity. It is not a contract; it is not a contract obligation. It is a gratuity which I do not propose to criticise. But they who ask for charity should not condemn the donors for not being overrapid in granting it.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Well, I ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he thinks it is right to say that this is a mere charity? When men gave their lives and their services to their country in time of peril, does it not raise a higher question than one of mere charity and gratuity? Does it not fix an obligation upon this Government to see that its defenders do not suffer or come to want?

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman from Michigan has stated the grounds and the motives that will move us in the bestowal of the gratuity, but he does not change the nature of the case.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Has it not been held that a pension is a vested right? Is it not so regarded in law?

Mr. SIMS. If so, I have not read the decision.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I am quite sure it has been so held whenever a test has been made.

Mr. SIMS. There was a bill introduced and tried to be passed to make it a vested right, and I therefore suppose it was not so held.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. It has, as I believe, been formally decreed that it is a vested right; and I think in the case of Justice Long, of the State of Michigan, where an attempt was made to deprive him of a pension because they said he was drawing a salary as a justice of the supreme court of that State, I believe the court ruled that it was a vested right and that a pension once granted should not be frivolously taken away by the mere whim of a Commissioner of Pensions. I do not like the language of the gentleman from Tennessee that a pension is charity. It is a sacred debt of honor, a binding obligation, and the Government is doing itself great credit and great honor when it treats these soldiers liberally and well.

Mr. SIMS. I am glad to have a good speech delivered in my time. It will read well in my speech; but unsound and untrue.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Well, I take issue with you on the statements made.

Mr. SIMS. But the right to a pension is not a vested right before it is granted, whatever it may be after it is granted. I have not seen the decision which the gentleman refers to, and I think he is mistaken in saying so, because bill after bill has been introduced in this House to make a pension a vested right after once granted and to require notice before the pensioner could be taken off the pension roll. But I was making this point: The Commissioner of Pensions is criticised for not granting pensions in proportion to the number of applications. I say if there ever was a time when we ought to be careful, now is the time. The war between the States is a matter of memory almost. Over thirty years have elapsed since it occurred, and where our liberal pension laws have not enabled soldiers of that war to be pensioned

by this time, it seems to me there must be some weakness in their cases and that caution and care should be exercised.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. If the gentleman will permit me, the reason why many of the soldiers of that war have not been pensioned heretofore is because they have not asked for pensions until by the force of circumstances they needed it; and when that time arrived, I do not think the Government ought to be too rigid in its construction of the rule that will permit these men to get their just deserts from the Government. I would make the laws more liberal, and feel sure the Commissioner would gladly administer them.

Mr. SIMS. All honor to men who have waited thirty years before asking for a pension. I say that, but they are few and their voices are low and weak.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Yes; but all honor to any man who fought in defense of his country. The small sum he gets as a pension will only be his just reward, and a great country can do no less than justice by its soldiers.

Mr. SIMS. But the gentleman should bear in mind that hundreds and thousands of these applications now pending are for increases.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Yes; and many are for original pensions. Thousands of deserving soldiers are waiting to have their cases decided. And, while I would not criticise the administration of the Pension Bureau in any particular case, I do feel that it is the duty of the Government to be liberal and to give quickly and promptly, if it is going to give at all, and not wait until these men have answered the last drumbeat and passed beyond the reach of Congress and beyond the help of this Government. Let us show our appreciation while they live and not wait to strew flowers on their graves after they are dead.

Mr. SIMS. That expression of the gentleman brings to my mind something which occurred in the last Congress. No longer ago than last winter a case came before us in the Pension Committee, or several cases, where officers were killed in the Spanish war. Their widows were to get $30 a month under the law, and very promptly there came in bills to increase those pensions to double that amount in some instances. And the argument was made before us in that committee that we should give quickly and give doubly and encourage the volunteers by letting them know that their widows and orphans would be well protected and cared for in case they died or were killed.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Does the gentleman object to that policy?

Mr. SIMS. I most emphatically objected to it. I said, Let the widows stand under the law on the same footing with the widows of the war of the rebellion. Does not the gentleman say that also?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I do not believe the gentleman from Tennessee represents the best sentiment of the Democratic party upon that side of the Chamber in that statement.

Mr. SIMS. I represent the cause of truth; and if the Democratic party does not sanction it, that is their fault, not mine.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that in the passage of pension bills here it has been to the eternal credit of members upon that side of the Chamber, many of whom were in the Confederate army, that they have thrown less obstruction in the way of a liberal administration of the pension law than they have ever been given credit for doing. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMS. I admit what you have said is true in some instances, and it is true from the same motive, I have no doubt, that animated some of those present on your side or those who had claims for pensions for the soldiers.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. That is a poor excuse.

Mr. SIMS. You have made a statement, and we will investigate it. We find that on the Friday night sessions for the consideration of private bills—I am willing to say that it is true of some Democrats as well as Republicans—there comes the cry of "Vote!" "Vote!" and we can not even have the report read or any intelligent action taken on it before the cry is "Vote!" "Vote!" Some of those cries come from Democrats and some from Republicans. They do not want to hear anything further; they do not want to have an investigation so as to show those who furnish the money on what grounds these pensions are to be paid.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Can the gentleman from Tennessee tell the number of pension bills that pass and become law?

Mr. SIMS. A great many.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. None of them do.

Mr. SIMS. Too many pass.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. They do not become law.

Mr. SIMS. They have been passed and became laws and will be passed again, and I will tell you why. Right here, night after night, in every Friday night session, there is no quorum in this House. Only those as a rule, either Republicans, Democrats, or Populists, attend the Friday night sessions who have bills they are personally interested in, and consequently every gentleman is ready to vote, and ready to vote a pension for some other gentleman he does not approve in order to get his own bill through. In almost every instance, almost uniformly, these bills are passed, voting away the people's money without proper investigation, in fact without any investigation on the part of the House.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. The gentleman has been here long enough to know that these private pension bills, considered at the Friday night sessions, are of no avail to the pensioners. These bills pass on a Friday night in Committee of the Whole and go to the House Calendar, and are never reached; and if we are going to do anything for the soldier, you must liberalize the pension laws and allow them to be administered liberally at the proper department.

Mr. SIMS. That proves clearly that the gentleman from Michigan does not know what he is talking about. There were more than 600 private pension bills passed last Congress.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I do know what I am talking about.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman says that the bills passed here at the Friday night sessions do not pass and become laws.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. They are of no avail.

Mr. SIMS. Why?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. The gentleman must know that the bills passed on Friday nights never become of any avail to the pensioner.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIMS. My time has been largely consumed by others, and I should like to have some more time.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I apologize for occupying so much of the gentleman's time.

Mr. SIMS. That is all right. I should like to have about ten minutes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I do not desire to occupy the gentleman's time, but I would like to have him say——

Mr. BARNEY. I would like to inquire of the Chair how much time has been occupied on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. Fifty-five minutes has been occupied on the side of the gentleman from Wisconsin and forty-five minutes on the side of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BARNEY. Already occupied?

Mr. BENTON. How long do I understand the debate has to continue?

The CHAIRMAN. Until 4 o'clock.

Mr. BENTON. So that there are fifty-five minutes remaining for each side?

The CHAIRMAN. There are fifty minutes remaining to the gentleman from Wisconsin, and sixty minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BENTON. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I should like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee why there should be such delay on the subject of Spanish soldiers' applications as to almost amount to absolute exclusion?

Mr. SIMS. I want to say to the gentleman from Indiana that there ought to be such delay as is necessary to permit a judicious determination of those cases.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. But it amounts to exclusion.

Mr. SIMS. Oh, it does not amount to exclusion. The great majority of the soldiers who were engaged in the Spanish war were young men, who have a long life before them. Now, you want to have them pensioned as boys, when they have long lives before them, and to be drawing pensions all that time. I say that any Commissioner of Pensions, regardless of politics, ought to take such time as is necessary to properly investigate and determine the facts of a case when it is before him.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. But what construction would you put on such action where one has lost an arm or a leg, or his health has been ruined in an unhealthy climate?

Mr. SIMS. Of course I can only speak in a general way. I can not go into the details of that question. But if a case is made as strong as the gentleman from Indiana puts it, I am certain he could go to the office and get the case made special.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. There are hundreds of cases where men have had their legs and arms cut off in the Spanish-American war that are being held up.

Mr. SIMS. Does the gentleman charge there are hundreds of cases where men lost their arms and legs during the Spanish war who are being held up?

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Or have been injured by sickness.

Mr. SIMS. But your statement was that they had lost their arms or legs.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. But men can be sick enough without the loss of arm or leg to be entitled to pension.

Mr. SIMS. Oh, you have got another statement before me now. I am not prepared to answer; but here is what I want to say. You condemn the executive officers of the Government because they do not more liberally, hurriedly execute the law which has very

liberal provisions, and this criticism comes from members of Congress who pass these private pension bills night after night without study or information. When 50 private pension bills are passed through this House in one night it is utterly impossible for Congress, with all the pressure of members, who cry "Vote!" "Vote!" to act upon them intelligently.

Well, if you will stand up here and vote away the people's money on Friday nights without a quorum, when you can not wait to hear what is in the report and show so much impatience with the chairman of the committee when he rises to make a statement, what weight has any criticism by a member of Congress who will do that upon any executive officer of the United States? I arraign and charge the members of Congress—not in this Congress, for there has not been a private bill night for pensions—for voting for pension bills without one particle of investigation. If they will do that as members of this body, can you expect anything less than criticism if you do not open the door to every avenue to take money out of the Treasury and put it into the pockets of the applicants?

No longer ago than last session, there came a pension bill over from the Senate to pension the widow of a professor in the school at Annapolis, who had never enlisted, who drew a salary of $2,500 for twenty-five years, and they wanted to pension that widow at $50 a month and pull the money out by a system of taxation in consumption from widows who do not own $50 worth of property in the world in order to pay such pensions. I stood up and fought against it, but a tremendous pressure was brought to bear to pass the bill, which had no status in law or in equity, only the desire of members of Congress to make a donation to a worthy and estimable lady. And then to hear gentlemen who, without the slightest consideration, are willing to vote for bills like this, get up and denounce the Administration because it is slow. I condemn it because it is not slow enough. That is the trouble; they do not take pains enough; they grant pensions that ought not to be granted.

Now, I want to have the Clerk read some of the applications that are made here that members are weeping over because they are not hastily granted.

The Clerk read as follows from the hearings before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations:

Mr. BENTON. That is, the men had filed two claims under the same law?

Mr. EVANS. Yes, sir; the men may have filed three or four. They strike different pension attorneys, and they persuade them they have better facilities, and so they file another claim, and those claims have to be considered, jacketed, filed, etc.

Now, another thing makes a large number of rejections.

Men are now filing claims for new disabilities under the old law. They have had a pension for many years for certain disabilities. Age and the infirmities of age come on and they are disabled more and more, and they file an application for a new disability. There is nothing of it in the war records as a basis to work that claim on. They are given the privilege under the practice to prove the existence of that disability is of service origin.

Possibly that claimant has had a half dozen or a dozen medical examinations during this period that he has been pensioned, but this new disability for which he sets up a claim has not been made apparent by the medical examination of half a dozen or dozen, as the case may be, so that it is pretty hard for a man, after thirty-five years or more have elapsed, to prove a new disability which he claims is of service origin, and the claim must necessarily be rejected under the law. I can not allow those claims unless they are established by proof, because the records are against them to start with.

Mr. SIMS. Now, Mr. Chairman, you will see some of these applications the gentlemen are so disturbed about. They are applications for pensions by men who have already been pensioned, who have been examined as much as half a dozen times, and now they are asking for pensions upon grounds that never were disclosed before, in medical examinations which show every ground for which they were entitled to a pension at time of examination; and then you say that the Commissioner or the executive officer ought not to be cautious in such cases.

With the record all against such an applicant, with the medical examinations, as many as a half a dozen, showing no disability of a certain kind, he comes in twenty-five or thirty years afterwards and asks for a pension on a new ground. And then members get wild and furious on the floor of this House because he does not get his pension quick enough, because they are not dealt out with such haste as would not secure a proper investigation. My criticism is that there is too much haste for the good of the country.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. Will the gentleman allow me one question?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. I want to ask a sincere and candid question and receive a sincere and candid answer. Is not the gentleman opposed to pension laws? As a general proposition, is he not opposed to the whole thing?

Mr. SIMS. No; I am not opposed to pensions as a general principle, but I am opposed to taking advantage of a general principle and abusing it so that the burdens of the people are such as never were borne by any people with so much patience.

The general principle we have forgotten, lost it, and are in favor of reckless administration of the pension laws. Look at the first pension laws and the pensions granted under them. Were they not honest and liberal then? It has often been stated, what General Garfield said, that thirty or forty millions was the maximum of pension appropriations on account of the late war. Now, it was one hundred and thirty-eight millions paid out last year. One war is hardly over before another is on. Is it not time to call a halt and investigate, and be sure that a man is entitled to a pension before you give it, and make it a vested right, according to the gentleman from Michigan, so that you can not get it away from him?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIMS. I am not through, but I will subside.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having taken the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill and resolution of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. 386. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers on the public lands, and to provide for the repayment of certain fees, purchase money, and commissions paid on void entries of public lands."

Senate concurrent resolution 16.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to submit a report of survey and estimate for the dredging and other improvements of the harbor at Warroad, Minn.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2179) relating to the Twelfth and subsequent censuses, and giving to the Director thereof additional power and authority in certain cases, and for other purposes, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. CARTER, Mr. HALE, and Mr. MCENERY as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SENATE BILL AND RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a Senate bill and resolution of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 386. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers on the public lands, and to provide for the repayment of certain fees, purchase money, and commissions paid on void entries of public lands—to the Committee on Public Lands.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 16:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to submit a report of survey and estimate for the dredging and other improvements of the harbor at Warroad, Minn.—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BARNEY. I now yield ten minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY].

Mr. RAY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with deep interest to the discussion by the various gentlemen on this subject of pensions, and notice a wide difference between some of them. For instance, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH] has said within a few moments that at our Friday night meetings we grant too few special pension bills, while the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] asserts that we grant too many by far and with little investigation. The gentleman from Michigan inquired how many private pension bills had been granted by special legislation within the last two Congresses. The Fifty-fourth Congress passed 378 that became laws, and the Fifty-fifth Congress enacted into law, with the approval of the President, 693 private pension bills. There was, however, quite a wide difference in the rates of increase of pensions allowed between those enacted into law by the last Congress and those enacted into law by the Fifty-fourth Congress.

In the one case—the Fifty-fifth Congress—each bill carried $13.55 a month additional, on an average, while in the Fifty-fourth Congress each bill carried $19.74 increase, on an average. In the Fifty-fifth Congress no private pension bill—with one exception, that of a private soldier—carried over $50 per month. In other words, in the last Congress we deemed it best to give aid to a greater number with the same amount of money rather than to have the appearance of extravagance, and so we aided about double the number with about the same amount of money.

Mr. RIDGELY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. RAY of New York. I do not want my time all used up in queries, because I have other matters that I desire to refer to. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. RIDGELY. Do you not think, in view of the increasing age of the soldiers, that we should in this Congress increase, even above the last, the number that we help?

Mr. RAY of New York. Oh, certainly; when we find a deserving case requiring special action we should be prompt to act.

Now, I was about to come to this question. We have written upon the statute books a general law which grants a pension to all the old soldiers who incurred certain disabilities, from which they now suffer, while in the service of the United States, the amount depending on the nature and extent of the disability. Then we have the act of June 27, 1890, which grants a pension to the old soldier whether he incurred his disability in the service or not, regardless of that question, if he is now so situated that he can not earn a livelihood by manual labor; under this act a pension in excess of $12 per month can not be allowed. Now, this has given rise to a great deal of criticism throughout the country, because there is a class of men who say that the old soldier who incurred no disability whatever in the service should not, under any circumstances, be granted a pension. On the other hand, the great mass of the American people say that when the old soldier, who served his country long and faithfully, becomes old and poor and unable to earn a living, he should be kept out of the almshouse, kept from want, and so should have the pension, whether or not he incurred his disability in the service, the maximum of which is $12 a month.

Under the general law the pension granted is rated according to the disability incurred in the service, and can not include disability incurred since. Now, a misunderstanding of these two acts and a confusion of their provisions has led to a great deal of criticism of the Commissioner of Pensions and a great deal of fault-finding, not only among members of Congress who do not understand the law, but among citizens generally, and especially among the old soldiers themselves, simply because they do not understand the law. Now, let me illustrate how this misunderstanding arises. Here is an old soldier who contracted disabilities in the service, and under the law and rulings of the Department is entitled, we will say, to $25 a month on account of such disabilities. His disabilities incurred in the service entitle him to that, and still he is able to do a great deal of work. Here is another old soldier in the same neighborhood who incurred no disability whatever in the service, but who is poor and unable to work at all, and who receives from the Pension Office $12 per month, which is all they can give him, as that is the maximum and is fixed by law.

A large number of citizens in the neighborhood, and many of the old soldiers themselves who do not understand the reason of this difference, say, "Here is one man no worse off than the other; the one gets $25 per month and the other only gets $12. The law is unjust." And they condemn the Commissioner of Pensions. They assume that he is responsible. He must obey the law. The one received his disability while fighting under the flag; the other received no disability there, but it has come upon him since he left the service, and the pension is given to him in such case as a gratuity, we may say, to aid him and keep him from actual want. The Commissioner has no discretion whatever in such cases. He is forbidden to pension the same soldier under both acts at the same time.

Now, again, the Commissioner of Pensions is criticised severely by some of the old soldiers because the ratings of the local boards are not followed and because under the law they can not be as they are made by local boards, who do not fully understand the law, and who, in rating the disabilities, do not understand or at least do not draw the distinction between those incurred in the service and those not incurred in the service. Here, for instance, is an old soldier who was shot through the leg or the arm or the body while fighting under the flag, and it may be has lost a limb. By reason of that disability he is, we will say, entitled to $15 per month, or perhaps $25 or $30 per month, according to the disability of service origin. Since the war closed he has from some other cause become totally paralyzed, absolutely helpless.

Now, all he can get under any law is $15 per month, or $25, or $30, as the case may be, because that is the full measure of the pension to which he is entitled under the general law. His paralysis or total helplessness came by reason of something that has occurred since the war, and if you drop out the service disability and pension him for his paralysis, all that the Commissioner of Pensions can give him is $12 per month. But the local board of surgeons, when they rated his disability, said, "He is totally disabled." They did not draw the distinction between the two laws; the board did not distinguish his service disabilities from those incurred since, and they rate him at $72 per month, the rate for total disability of service origin. Well, now, the Commissioner of Pensions must administer the law as he finds it, and he must distinguish the service from the nonservice disability. He can not increase that man's pension a single cent on account of the disability not of service origin, notwithstanding the fact that the local board has rated him at $72 per month.

Now, I mention this to show how unjustly the Commissioner of Pensions is criticised. I mention it again for the purpose of answering the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], who, in my judgement, has made a most unwarranted and unjustifiable attack upon the Commissioner of Pensions. Equally unwarranted is the statement that the President is ignorant of what is being done at the Pension Office. I do not stand here authorized to champion the Commissioner of Pensions. I do not stand here as a special friend of his, but having served for two years as chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, I have been brought in frequent contact with him and with his administration of the law. I do not approve all the rules of the Bureau of Pensions, but on the whole they are wise and necessary. In some cases I had occasion to differ with him, in some cases to argue with him, and in a very few cases our committee overruled him because we thought such action just and proper and that the conditions warranted it, but only in a very few cases.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARNEY. I yield ten minutes more to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RAY of New York. Criticism has been made that claims when allowed are not made to commence at the date of the filing of the first application. The act of March 6, 1896, is very plain in its provisions and provides—

That whenever a claim for pension under the act of June 27, 1890, has been or shall hereafter be rejected, suspended, or dismissed, and a new application shall have been or shall hereafter be filed, and a pension has been or shall hereafter be allowed in such claim, such pension shall date from the time of filing the first application: *Provided*—

And now mark and heed the proviso—

Provided, That the evidence in the case shall show a pensionable disability to have existed or to exist at the time of filing such first application, anything in any law or ruling of the Department to the contrary notwithstanding.

It is very plain that no pension under this act can be granted to commence at a date prior to that when a pensionable rate of disability is shown to exist or to have existed. No other construction is possible; and if Congress wants a different law applied, it must first make it.

Mr. Chairman, I ought to call attention to the wisdom and liberality of our pension laws. We have the most liberal pension system of any nation of the earth. The soldier totally disabled by reason of army service and requiring constant aid and attendance gets $72 per month. No man should assert that this is too much. Every man who periled his life that this nation might live, and in so doing received wounds or incurred disabilities of any kind that have reduced him to a condition of helplessness, should be kindly, tenderly, and efficiently cared for by a generous and a patriotic people. So in proportion to the disabilities incurred in the service should the helping hand be extended. But in extending this aid on such grounds care must be taken to ascertain by satisfactory proof that the alleged disabilities exist and are of service origin and not the result of vicious conduct since the war closed.

Thirty-five years after the war it is difficult to procure proof in many cases, and the Pension Bureau is charged with delaying claims. I have failed to discover any case where the present Commissioner has assented to any act tending to delay the adjudication of a claim. During the last year there have been added to the rolls on original claims 37,077 names, and 3,914 were restored. Add to this list the thousands of cases where increases have been granted, the Spanish war claims allowed, and we see how unjust the charge of delay in the Bureau. During the same year death has claimed 34,345 pensioners, and they are passing away at about this rate, but June 30, 1899, we had remaining on the pension rolls a great army of 991,519. To these pensioners we paid last year $138,355,052. Over 300,000 claims for increase are now pending and thousands of claims for original pension in addition, and now comes the added claims for pension on account of the Spanish war, over 6,000 now demanding and clamoring for immediate consideration.

In 1899 the Commissioner sent out and received 5,773,512 letters, and a vast amount of labor has been done on pending claims not adjudicated. The total force in the Pension Office is only 1,741, and when we consider the work completed and the work done on pending cases not disposed of we may well be astonished that so much has been accomplished. Certainly no thoughtful and just-minded man can charge delay against the Commissioner of Pensions. The Government has been just and liberal, and no unwise clamor should be raised against the administration of our Pension Bureau. Those who incite discontent among the old soldiers of the Republic feed fat the opposers of our pension system, who declaim against it and charge the pensioners with unpatriotic greed. They point to the discontent as evidence that our pension system is unwise, and argue that it would be far better to repeal all laws on the subject.

Mr. GAINES. If the gentleman will permit me, I should like to answer the question that my friend from Ohio put to my colleague [Mr. SIMS] a little while ago about his being opposed to any kind of a pension. I want to say to him, and I say to everybody here, that I never heard a Southerner in my life say that he was opposed to paying an honest or a just pension—never in my life.

Mr. RAY of New York. I do not agree with any gentleman who charges the gentleman with opposition to just pensions. I

have found him reasonable, patriotic, and only desirous of careful scrutiny in passing private pension bills.

In administering the law the Commissioner of Pensions must carefully examine or cause to be examined every claim; he must see that proof is furnished in every case, for if he does not the Bureau will be flooded with unjust and fraudulent claims, and the whole pension system discredited and brought into disrepute. The "roll of honor," of which all are so proud, must, as it always has been, be kept purged of every imputation of fraud from a respectable source. The soldier himself feels this and is opposed to unmerited pensions.

I want to say here emphatically, and I want the old soldiers in my district to hear it, and I want the old soldiers all over the country to hear it, that I believe the present Commissioner of Pensions in the administration of the pension laws of the United States has acted and is acting to-day faithfully, honestly, and intelligently, and is trying to carry out the law as he finds it written for the benefit of the old soldiers and their widows and orphans. That he has made mistakes I will not deny. We all make mistakes. But the man who rises here and condemns him as unfriendly to the pension laws or unfriendly to the old soldier is, in my judgment, unjust to himself and unjust to the Commissioner of Pensions. And I regret that any man on this side of the Chamber has taken that position. That injustice is sometimes done at the Pension Bureau I do not deny, but the Commissioner will correct all errors when attention is called to them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to one or two other things, and the limit of my time will prevent my saying all that I desire to say. I called the attention of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] to the fact that there was an appeal from these decisions of the Commissioner of Pensions and that on the particular subjects to which he referred the Commissioner has been sustained by Mr. Webster Davis, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior—and, of course, that carries with it the approval of the Secretary of the Interior—and a bill is already pending now, and will undoubtedly be enacted into law, that will correct all evils complained of and leave no room for doubt in the interpretation of it. When questions of fact are presented the soldier should always be given the benefit of the doubt, and our pension laws should be liberally construed to carry out the intent.

Again, it has been claimed that great injustices are being done to the widows of the old soldiers by H. Clay Evans, Commissioner, because he so construed the law as to hold that $96 per year net income is made the measure that entitles her to a pension under the act of 1890. Well, now, that decision has been sustained, and lawyers, men of good judgment everywhere, sustain the Commissioner, and the remedy is to correct the law itself. Let Congress change the law or take the "cussing"—the Commissioner is not at fault. So a bill has been introduced in the Senate and has passed that body, and I hope it will pass this House, making $250 the measure. That, of course, I think is more just and more equitable, because no man on either side of the Chamber would claim for a single moment that $96 per year is sufficient to support the widow of an old soldier, with an added pension of $8 per month, the maximum allowed a widow under the act of June 27, 1890. This question was of so much importance that Commissioner Evans recommended the change in the law and the President of the United States called attention to the subject in his annual message.

As the years come and go, whitening the heads of our deserving pensioners and adding to their physical infirmities, I would see the laws made more liberal, for no deserving old soldier or war widow should ever know actual want or stand in fear of the almshouse. At the same time care must be exercised lest extravagance in this direction lead to more stringent laws instead of conservative liberality. It must be remembered that the act of June, 1890, only applies to the widows of soldiers who served in the war of the rebellion, and that they are getting old and feeble, and hence when dependent and entitled to the benefits of that law $8 per month is a very small sum indeed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RAY of New York. Oh, certainly.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Is not $8 per month exactly the sum you give to all Mexican soldiers?

Mr. RAY of New York. Oh, yes.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Is that enough for them?

Mr. RAY of New York. My friend, you do not understand me.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Maybe not.

Mr. RAY of New York. Eight dollars per month is all we give the widow of a soldier of the war of the rebellion——

Mr. RICHARDSON. I know.

Mr. RAY of New York (continuing). Under the act of June 27, 1890.

Mr. RICHARDSON. You say that is not enough?

Mr. RAY of New York. That is not the question I was referring to.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I thought you were.

Mr. RAY of New York. I was referring to this: It has been held in construing the act of June 27, 1890, that if the widow of an old soldier has an income of $96 a year, she is not within the act of June 27, 1890, and they will not give her a pension.

Mr. WEEKS. She was not dependent.

Mr. RAY of New York. They held that she was not dependent. In other words, they held that $96 a year was, in the eye of the law, enough to support her with a pension of $8 per month added. The Government by pension legislation has not assumed to fully support or care for its soldiers or soldiers' widows, but only to give a reasonable amount of aid in certain cases. If the act referred to becomes a law, and I hope it will, widows having an income of $250 per annum, net, will get $8 per month pension.

Now, my friend from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] has referred to another fact, and he complains and criticises the Commissioner of Pensions because he has held up certain claims of persons he calls minor children. No case of a minor child has been held up. No case has been held up, nor is there any want of speedy construction of the law or determination of the case where the child is under 16 years of age. But the Commissioner of Pensions found this condition existing: A man 30, 35, or perhaps 40 years of age comes to the Pension Office with a claim for $1,000, $2,000, $3,000, or possibly $4,000 back pension, claiming that he was the son of an old soldier, that while he was under 16 years of age he became entitled to a pension of $2 a month, that the pension was never applied for in his behalf by any person, and it was not drawn. He, having discovered that fact now and having arrived at the age of 25, 30, or 40 years, puts in a claim for that pension that he or his mother or guardian would have been entitled to draw when he was under 16 years of age.

Mr. Chairman, that pension was intended for the use of the mother or the guardian of the infant in his support while in infancy, but it was not needed, and so was not called for. Now, having reached maturity, being well off, well to do in the world, this man puts in this claim for this back pension that accrued years ago when he was under 16 years of age. The Commissioner of Pensions believes, as I believe, and as I think all good and patriotic men are bound to believe, that under the law that $2 a month was given to aid the minor in his or her support while he needed it; to aid the mother or the guardian in taking care of and educating that child at the time when he needed it. If he did not need it, if it was not applied for, I say it is not just to the Government and it is unjust to the old soldiers, needy and poor, and the needy widows of the old soldier to give the claimant that back pension now. Thousands of broken and needy old veterans who answered when the call was made need help from the nation, and let the money go to them.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. I agree with you.

Mr. RAY of New York. I agree with the Commissioner. That class of claims has been held up. That ruling was first made by Judge Lochren, and Mr. Evans has followed it. The question will soon be determined, and if it is decided against the Government by the Department having it in charge I trust that Congress will pass a law, if we have the power, that will cut off such claims and prevent taking money from the Treasury for any such purpose. Mr. Chairman, there are many thousands of old soldiers scattered all over this land, old, poor, and in need, struggling to keep out of the poorhouses, and there are thousands of old and deserving war widows, who were the wives of the defenders of the nation during the war, who are now poor and needy, making their just claims upon the Government of the United States, and in my judgment they are entitled first to be considered and first to be cared for. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. NORTON].

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I wish that my time was for an hour at least. I would like to talk dispassionately on this question, for unless at some time in the history of this Congress or the history of some other Congress we can so talk upon this subject honestly and devoid of partisanship and sectionalism, then justice will never be done to the men of the war of 1861 to 1865. I asked a question simply of my friend, because he is my friend, and his guardian from Tennessee, not waiting until I spoke to this House, must put a different imputation upon the question from that which I intended.

When I turn to the right I see men that were in the Confederacy, some of whom I know and faced in the battles in 1862. There is not one that ever faced a Northern soldier but is manly and just and fair. I can look them in the face and say, gentlemen, what would have occurred if the Confederacy had been successful? Every man within your army that deserved a pension would have had it, and would have been entitled to it, and not one of you would criticise such action.

Mr. BARTLETT. I want to say to the gentleman, on that line, that most of the Confederate States are paying pensions out of their State treasuries.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. I know it, and I honor them for it. It shows the patriotism and the earnestness with which you of the South consider the interests of the men who defended your homes and the homes in which they live. I greatly regret to hear carping upon this floor upon questions that ought to be considered in a better spirit. I am not here to criticise Mr. H. Clay Evans, and yet I make the charge that the rules under the Pension Department, the rules of construction under the law, have been more unjust than have ever been applied in any court, even in the United States. Under the law of 1890 a man who never received an injury in the war, or a disease, is receiving a greater pension than those men who served for three years during the war and who are diseased. Why? Because under the construction of the law you demand that these men apply for an original pension, showing proof by two comrades—as if one comrade could not speak the truth—when and where and under what circumstances his disease was contracted. If he fails to do that, you reject his claim, and all the appeals to Webster Davis, or God Almighty, or those above the earth or below the earth, make no difference; he must meet with defeat.

These things are unjust, they are unfair, they are unreasonable. You demand the record in the War Department as if the War Department was infallible; and to-day a soldier putting a claim before the Pension Commissioner with an honorable discharge from the Government can not receive a pension because the record does not show that he was mustered into the service.

A MEMBER. He has a hospital record.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. Yes, the hospital record seems to be the prevailing record. I venture to say that men who came to Washington and served on Pennsylvania avenue or on the heights beyond for three months are the largest pensioners to-day of their class that there is upon the entire pension roll.

Let us not criticise H. Clay Evans, but let us demand that an honest administration of the law shall be had. You can do it, and I look upon you gentlemen here to lay aside party and prejudice and aid in securing justice and right. Personally I esteem H. Clay Evans. I met him upon the stump in Ohio. I have known him ever since he has been Commissioner. I have no objection on earth to Webster Davis. He is over in Africa to-day investigating matters in the Transvaal, and I presume as soon as he returns and gets to these cases he will do absolute and eternal justice. I say I met H. Clay Evans on the stump in Ohio when every soldier of my State was looking for him. Why? Because they had received a communication from the secretary of a Senator that their claims were going to be immediately adjusted, and they were there hunting up H. Clay to have it done while he was there. After the election was over the secretary could not be found, the Senator was engaged with troubles of his own, and Mr. Evans is left alone in his struggle to frame and comply with rules that will enable the Department to deny ten thousand claims and admit ten.

In the great struggle of 1896, before he was fully under subjection to the powerful syndicates and trusts that now govern and control his actions, the great and true heart of President McKinley was shown to the American people when, in his letter of acceptance, he wrote:

> The men who were willing to die for their country must not be left helpless and defenseless by the country.

And again, while speaking to his fellow-citizens at Akron, Ohio, he said:

> The soldiers and sailors of the Union should neither be neglected nor forgotten. They are men who are justly entitled to generous aid in their increasing necessities.

In platforms, in campaign speeches, and wherever talk would count the present dominant party has paraded itself as the only soldier's friend. Mr. Chairman, to do is to do; but how not to do is what this country, especially the old soldiers of the land, is learning to be the position of the Republican party on the pension question.

Existing laws regarding pensions are clear, specific, and well settled by judicial construction, but they become clouded, misleading, or completely nullified under the forced construction of them by the Pension Department as set forth by rules and orders of practice issued by the authority of the Pension Commissioner. The Department assumes to itself the right to prescribe in what way and upon what conditions members of Congress may presume to do business with it. It denies to any attorney the privilege of speaking to a member regarding any pension case before the Department.

I have in my district a State soldiers' home, and not a day passes but I find in my mail appeal after appeal from the old veterans to aid them in securing simple justice. In one received to-day is the comment:

> It is plainly evident that when over 100,000 rejections occur in a year, law or no law, nothing is taken into consideration but the haphazard decision of a one-man power.

Others I receive are full of condemnation of the Commissioner on account of the seeming unnecessary delay. I know that it is an impossibility for the Commissioner to pass individually upon every application; but I claim that his office force, his heads of divisions, his board of review, and medical referees should not be chosen and continued in place solely on account of their hostility to the soldiers and antagonism to laws whose provisions it is their duty to see carried into effect, and no rules or orders should be made or sanctioned that abrogates the spirit and intent of the laws passed by Congress, even though it be done in the interest of economy.

The Grand Army of the Republic has year after year advocated and contended for safeguards around the pension roll that it might be indeed a roll of honor. They have demanded that the utmost vigilance be maintained that no fraud be committed and no unworthy claim allowed, but, on the other hand, they have sought constantly to secure the prompt and faithful discharge of the nation's obligations to its defenders and their dependent ones. In national convention assembled they have asked President McKinley to dismiss Commissioner Evans, not from any personal ill will against him, but because he represents in the maintenance of unlawful rules and orders a barrier in the way of the soldier who freely, gladly, gave the best years of his life to his country now receiving his just and proper recognition.

I could go on and bring specific charges and details—they come to me in private correspondence; they are published in the newspapers throughout the land—but I will only take up one item, presented by the Grand Army of the Republic at their last convention at Philadelphia in 1899, in regard to the so-called Order No. 225, which is as follows:

Order No. 225.

As to adjudicating and fixing rates of pension under the act of June 27, 1890.

(1) A claim for pension under the second section of the act of June 27 1890, can only be allowed upon proof of mental or physical disability of a permanent character, not the result of the claimant's own vicious habits, incapacitating him from the performance of manual labor in such a degree as to render him unable to earn a support.

(2) No specific injury or disability can as such have a pensionable rating under that act nor be considered otherwise than as it affects the capacity of the claimant to perform ordinary manual labor.

(3) Proof that the disability is not the result of the claimant's own vicious habits is requisite, and therefore the causes and circumstances of the origin of the disability should be shown by the evidence furnished in support of the claim for pension, so far as can be done, and by persons other than the claimant.

(4) To give the claimant a pensionable status under this act, the disability must be such as to incapacitate him from the performance of manual labor in such a degree as to render him unable to earn a support, yet the act recognizes differences in the degree of such pensionable disability, giving $12 per month in case of the greatest and $6 per month in case of the lowest degree of such pensionable disability rendering the claimant unable to earn a support by manual labor. It also provides for intermediate ratings proportioned for the intermediate degrees of such pensionable disability. The proper ratings under this act will therefore be made in accordance with such rules for rating as the medical referee shall prescribe, subject to the approval of the Commissioner of Pensions.

Under former practice if an invalid applicant for pension was found upon examination to be suffering from two or more disabilities, the aggregate of which would entitle him to the rating of $6, $8, $10, or $12 per month under said act, according to the degree of the total of his disability, under order 225 a claimant's disabilities were no longer considered collectively, but each separate one was looked upon as though each one existed in different persons, and unless one of the disabilities was equal to the minimum rate fixed by law, the whole claim was rejected upon the ground of no disability. This rule still remains in practical effect, although it is claimed that there have been modifications in the practice. Under date of July 12, 1899, in discussing an appeal case where this order came under consideration, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior said:

> Order 164 was an extremely liberal construction of the law as to rating under the act of June 27, 1890; indeed, it could not be consistently maintained when the terms of the act were compared with former laws. On the other hand, order 225, as put into effect and as formerly construed, went to the other extreme and in many cases resulted in great injustice to claimants.

Concluding, he uses these significant words:

> It will be observed that in the last clause of order 225 the question of rating is left largely at the discretion of the medical referee, subject to the approval of the Commissioner of Pensions.
>
> As already indicated, much depends upon the construction given to the law and the order (225) now in force. It should be borne in mind that the average age of the surviving soldiers who were in the war of the rebellion is 60 years or upward. It is not an unreasonable presumption that nearly all are in some degree mentally or physically disabled. The spirit of the law and the circumstances attending its enactment certainly warrant the conclusion that a liberal interpretation should be given and relief granted, at least at the minimum rate, if an appreciable disability which impairs ability for self-support by manual labor is shown to exist.

Order 164 was issued soon after the enactment of the law of June 27, 1890, and was in harmony with the law. It is conceded to have been, as the Secretary says, "an extremely liberal construction," but not more so than, as he says, "the circumstances at

tending its enactment certainly warrant." The boys in blue did not measure their voluntary service by fractions, but offered their country a complete unit—their all. They can not now fathom the depths of a complex system of eighteenths and their subdivisions into minor and minute classifications, expressed in words not embraced in the vocabulary employed by them in the stern school of loyalty when the nation's life hung in the balance.

They refuse to accept as conclusive a certificate of perfect health from a board of review sitting at the national capital, while they are suffering from inflamed muscles, impaired sight, dulled hearing, fast-stiffening joints, and restricted pulsations of the heart which once sent the life currents swiftly coursing through their patriotic bodies as they kept step to the music of the Union.

The law of 1890 does not require that the disability shall be traced to something that occurred to the soldier while in service. It asks:

1. Did he serve in the war of the rebellion for at least ninety days?
2. Was he honorably discharged?
3. Is he suffering from a mental or a physical disability of a permanent character, not the result of his own vicious habits, which incapacitates him from the performance of manual labor in such a degree as to render him unable to earn a support?

If his proof makes answer "yes" to each and all of these questions, his name ought to go upon the pension roll.

The manifest purpose of this law is to place upon the pension roll disabled soldiers whose disability is of a permanent character, provided they served the statutory time, were honorably discharged, and did not, by vicious habits, contribute to the disability.

And yet under and by virtue of the rules promulgated in the Pension Department, unless there is some one deficiency that incapacitates the claimant from earning a support by manual labor, he can not be granted his earned pension.

I ask you are these rules fair and just? Every member of this House who has a soldier constituency has met in his own experience, again and again, flagrant malversation of justice in the conduct of pension cases. Why, they will refuse a pension to an old soldier who served full three years or more in the war, and received honorable discharge, on the ground that he had some kind of a disease at the hour he entered the service.

Mr. Chairman, the soldier of the United States stands unique in the history of the world. The records of the ages show us no such sacrifices, no such devotion, no such love of country, and no such heroic achievement as the history of the American soldiery presents. Other nations have their troops "bred in camps and inured to arms," who fight for glory or for pay and whose whole lives are devoted to military careers. Their government's rear lofty monuments of bronze and stone to their memory and provide material support for the declining years of the veterans and those dependent upon them, their widows and orphans; but here, in this land of liberty and freedom, made so by the heroism of her soldiers from the plow and the plane, from the machine and from the pen, from store, office, and shop, at danger's cry our citizen soldiers leap in quick response and go forth unhesitatingly to do and dare and die in their country's defense; and when the warfare is ended, victory attained, they return to the quiet avocations of peace, hoping, expecting confidently and as a right that the memory of their sacrifices will forever endure in the hearts of grateful countrymen.

But how does that country reward him? Scarce a generation passes by and the veteran is forgotten; discriminated against by the Weather Bureau, part of his meager pension confiscated at Soldiers' Homes, rules created in the Pension Department to deprive him of his due meed and reward. I am now looking the honest Speaker in the eye—a man who wears the crown of glory as a soldier and makes me love him for the service rendered to his country—and yet they would say to him: "You can not be pensioned because you had this disease when you entered the service," while this Government compels him to undertake an examination before passing him and giving him a place upon the rolls. And if he had not served he would have been marked as a deserter at the time.

Is it fair, is it honest? Is there not enough patriotism, in God's name, upon this floor and upon both sides of this House to reach an equitable and fair understanding for the men of 1861 and 1865? They are now entering into the eventide of life, the shadows gather about them darkly; already stars are out to greet them, and they appeal to us to give them kindly care and action ere they pass into the great unknown.

They are not begging you. I deny the assertion of the gentleman from Tennessee that they are asking charity from you. They ask only what every decent government on God's earth has given the soldier—justice for the services they have rendered. If it had not been for them the flag of my country would not wave over Tennessee; there would be no land of liberty, there would be no United States. I speak in the name of the soldier, and I demand only justice, only decency, only fair play; the same rights and the same privileges that any free citizen has under the law. For them and in their name I demand that they shall have it.

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a record taken from a report of the Commissioner of Pensions that I believe ought to go under the eye of every soldier in these United States; and I trust that no friend of the soldier will object to my printing it at the end of my remarks.

Mr. RAY of New York. What is the paper?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman to print the paper in the RECORD?

Mr. RAY of New York. Before that consent is given I desire to know what that paper is.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. It is a comment by a soldier upon the Pension Commissioner's report, giving certain figures from that report and showing by what means these constructions have been placed upon the law that prevented the allowing of pensions and suggesting the remedy to make a more beneficial and fair and liberal construction of the law.

The paper referred to is as follows:

JANUARY 15, 1900.

SIR: As you are a member of the House Committee on Invalid Pensions and a man whose heart is warm yet for the old soldier, I invite your attention to the conduct of the Bureau of Pensions. My impression is that the administration of said Bureau is not what the people demand.

If you will read the Commissioner's last annual report, you will see by page 11 that all claims pending June 30, 1899, amounted to 477,239; that there is in said Pension Bureau 1,741 clerks, including the honorable Commissioner, but not the clerks and board of appeals in the Secretary of Interior's office.

In the Secretary's office there were about 13,347 appeal cases pending, and from 800 to 1,000 per month being filed. You will further see upon investigation that the board of pension appeals are now more than one year and seven months behind. At the present rate of dispatch it will take some over four years for the Bureau of Pensions to dispose of present cases, even if no more are filed. This is a slow gait, while the claimants for pension are passing away at the rate of 40,000 annually, and four years is a long time for weak and distressed claimants to be looking for and expecting food. Congress appropriated $140,000,000 for payment of pensions for term ending June 30, 1899, and yet the Commissioner of Pensions turned back of this sum about $1,644,947, which would have paid many claimants if their claims had been granted. For some reason this was not done, although claims have been complete for more than two years, and appeal after appeal for action has been made with only silence as the tomb in answer. Now, Mr. NORTON, is this for want of clerical force in the Bureau of Pensions?

May I ask, has Congress by inadvertence failed to provide sufficient number of clerks? Commissioner Raum, I believe, issued about 1,000 certificates of pension each working day, while the present can only get out about 1,400 to 1,700 a week. Raum had about 2,000 clerks, but just think of the vast difference in the work now and then. Raum had hundreds of thousands more claims to handle a year than the present Commissioner. Why is this so? With civil-service clerks in the Bureau, as at present, they ought to accomplish a great deal more work.

This delay is either the fault of the Commissioner, of Congress, or the laws, and I do not believe that it is the laws or Congress, but an unreasonable interpretation of the acts of Congress—too much construction, too much strained technicalities, and not enough of practical business sense. As claims should be decided on merit and justice, there should be satisfactory evidence; but pensions to soldiers, except service pensions, should be granted for disability and not on some theory of a name. If the claims are just they should be promptly paid, if unjust under the law they should be as promptly refused, and not delayed for years and then rejected.

They should not be held up if the evidence is all that the claimant desires to present. There is a class of claims which has been held up by the Commissioner by his recommendations or upon the order of the Secretary of the Interior for a year or more. I can not give the exact date. These claims are called "minors' claims," where the application for pension was not made until the minor was over 16 years of age, as though the statute of limitations ought to bar a minor. They are soldiers' children and orphans just the same, and the delay has not injured the United States because no guardian was appointed or the guardian failed to make application while the minor was under 16 years of age. Many minors have been paid pensions when 16 and since they were over 16 years of age. Is it right now to so construe the law after the practice of paying such pensions for thirty years? Who has done this holding up? I can not conceive its purpose, unless it was to establish a record for economy and to starve the veterans' children.

I want to call your attention to another question which will bear great cogitation. Congress appropriated $400,000 for special examiners in the field. There was paid out $387,443.14 for expenses alone. Now, what were the salaries of these special examiners, of whom there were 244? I suppose about $2,000 per head, making a total of $488,000 for salaries, which, added to their expense account, will give $875,443.14. This is an enormous amount. At $100 a year it would pension over 8,754 widows or veterans. Former Congresses have gone to the extent of half a million of dollars, and yet no special examiner seems to be sent into the field until a claimant to pension has made out, by good and sufficient evidence, enough to establish a prima facie case. On page 70 of Commissioner Evans's report, year ending June 30, 1899, you will find interesting reading in connection with this.

Now, if what the Commissioner says on page 44 of that report is true, there is absolutely no need of this useless expenditure of $875,443.14 per annum; but is it true? He says, "The laws are generous; the interpretation of the laws by the Department have always been to liberalize, and the administration of the laws by the Bureau officials has been, and is now, under the established practice, far more liberal than the generous laws, always giving the benefit of the doubt in favor of the soldier."

He further says, "No new rules of evidence have been introduced." If these two things are true, why does he need 244 special examiners to determine the merits of claims, at an annual expense of $875,443.14, claims and facts already proven and admitted? The above does not go to the cases where fraud is charged or suspected. The Commissioner has the power and duty to investigate such cases, outside of this appropriation of $400,000 and the salaries of 244 special examiners.

I believe there are now about 300 of these examiners in the field, all for the declared purpose of aiding claimants to prove their just claims. The whole thing is a farce which ought to be put on the stage, with these men called special examiners the actors. They would draw a full house; and on the tickets might well be printed in large type, "No person need apply for a pension." And yet Congress promised, by pension laws, to give the old veterans pensions as a matter of justice and honor. I do not believe the American people approve the practice of the Bureau of Pensions as shown in the rejection last year of 107,919 claims.

There are, I believe, about 31 homes for disabled veterans, which have cost millions to build and millions to keep up. In them admission is hard to gain, as they are all full of old, disabled, wounded, crippled veterans, while many soldiers' widows, like Christ, have nowhere to lay their heads and appeal to Congress for aid. Why make any distinction in pension laws in reference to a soldier's widow? Give them all the same pension, say, $12 per month, regardless of the military or naval service their husbands were engaged in; then if there should be special cases warranting additional pension, let Congress grant it by special act.

I believe that pensions should be granted to the soldiers for disabilities at the same rate, whether actually contracted in the service or not, unless they were contracted in willful violation of law. Let me refer you to a Treatise on the Practice of the Pension Bureau, Governing the Adjudication of Army and Navy Pensions, 1898, compiled by order of the Commissioner of Pensions. On page 24 of this treatise he hits the nail on the head when he says:

"Although the character of the disease may be such that it still exists, it is the disability therefrom that gives title to pension, and not the fact alone of the mere existence of disease." I claim that this is not the practice of the Bureau of Pensions, because, through the medical referees, they speculate as to names and pathological sequence, and not the extent of disability of the claimant. It is not a theory that confronts us, but a condition. Again, on page 96 thereof, when claimants, under the law of June 27, 1890, have attained the age of 65 years and 75 years, they are entitled to $8 and $12, respectively, although they have no disability other than simply age. This is good sense, not theory, but condition, but when we come to the practice of the Department, the acts of July 14, 1862, and amendments are applied, theory comes in, and not condition, and the age of claimant does not add any reason for any increase of pension and age is no factor in increase or rate of pension. Then, too, a widow's age, dependency, disability, or insanity is no factor. With her it is simply a question of income. This is a harsh rule; it may be good law in the eye of the Commissioner, but it is not justice nor patriotism.

Go back to page 12 of this "Treatise" of the Commissioner and you will find the milk in the cocoanut, and these words: "A claim for pension may be proved by the record evidence only, or by record and parol evidence, but never by parol evidence alone." Here is where, among other statements, 107,919 claims were rejected last year and only 89,054 certificates issued of all kinds and classes. This shows that while all claims must be proven beyond any reasonable doubt, the claimant for pension or increase never has the benefit of the doubt in his favor. The rule on page 122, which says, "Rejected claims can not be reopened after ninety days from rejection," deprives many claimants of just rights, because in many claims, owing to the poverty of the applicants or other reasons, the witnesses which might be had can not be found in ninety days, and the ends of justice are defeated.

I submit my opinion that unless the commissioner is clothed with plenary power there is no pension law giving him authority to make any rule or order.

In Pension Decisions, volume 8, page 5, and again in volume 9, page 218, the Secretary of the Interior discusses the law and says, "Neither the doctrine of res judicata nor stare decisis is strictly applicable to pension cases, and when adopted by the Department simply becomes a rule which each administration prescribes for itself as a matter of policy or convenience, and may be waived, suspended, or ignored, as justice, policy, or convenience requires."

So the rule of ninety days after rejection, as applied to having claim reopened, is neither justice nor law.

I call your particular attention to page 25 of the Treatise, and at top of page 26. I suppose he refers to an old rule or a new one. He is speaking of complaints on page 25. His words are, "or when their enforcement would result in unusual delay or denial of pension, the Bureau will aid, by special examination, the claimant, or the Commissioner or one of the Deputy Commissioners will waive or dispense with part of the evidence."

I would like to ask what rule this is, and when was there ever a special examination ordered to "aid the claimant?" And when and where has any essential evidence been waived or dispensed with by the Commissioner or one of his deputies to aid a claimant and prevent unusual delay or prevent the denial of a pension? Does not the Commissioner of Pensions universally deny a pension unless the war records show wound, injury, or disease and the treatment thereof by Army surgeons? Has Mr. Evans or any of his deputies ever waived this Army record and granted a pension to a soldier or his widow? It is often impossible to give any satisfactory evidence to the Commissioner on this question, as he says "it can not be proven by parol;" so where is the claimant given the benefit of a doubt?

In regard to seven years' absence, in the act of March 13, 1896, see Pension Decisions, volume 9, page 500, and volume 10, page 7, 1898, relating to this act. In opposition to this act, the Commissioner has never granted a pension on this seven years' absence, his decisions, I believe, being about in this language: "The absence of the soldier is not explained by evidence which is satisfactory to the Commissioner," although there is a provision in the act which expressly says: "And any pension granted under this act shall cease upon proof that officer or enlisted man is still living."

The rule of the Bureau of Pensions is, that it makes no difference how long a soldier has been a pensioner of the United States, nor how much evidence may be on file with his original claim, if the pensioner departs this life his widow must make the proof over again, which seems to me an unreasonable requirement, to do that which has once been done by the soldier; then the widow must prove that her husband was never married until he married his present widow, or if he was previously married, must show by evidence that his prior wife or wives are dead or divorced, and also prove their legal marriage, even if he had lived forty or fifty years with his present widow. If this is the law, it certainly needs legislation to remedy matters. All these things I have referred to need reformation, and that soon. My old spelling-book says, "Delays are dangerous."

I hope you will concede that I have the right to criticise the acts of public servants intelligently (so far as my ability permits), either favorably or otherwise. I have made these suggestions that you, as a representative of the people and of the many old soldiers in your district, may know to some extent what I, in connection with the thousands of my comrades who are victims of unwarranted and illegal construction of the law, feel in the matter.

You will have the pension question before you in various forms in this the Fifty-sixth Congress, and whether you agree with me or not makes no personal difference to me; but if I have enlightened the issue to any extent or opened the way to a discussion of the question, I shall feel gratified.

I have given you my views on the question of delays in the decision of pension claims and the practice in the Bureau of Pensions, but if you will read the last annual report of the Commissioner of Pensions and his treatise of 1898, I am confident that you will conclude that some remedy should be found or made whereby pensions should be finally acted upon without from two to a dozen years after a claimant has submitted all evidence asked for or required by law for the adjudication of his claim.

Very respectfully, yours,

A. Y. T.

Hon. JAMES A. NORTON,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. BENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to protest against the manner in which the Pension Department has treated the veterans of the Spanish-American war.

It has come to my knowledge frequently during the past year that many deserving applications for pensions from soldiers of the Spanish-American war have been denied by the Pension Department.

A short while ago, in conversation with the Pension Commissioner, he informed me that it was the intention of the Department to keep back these claims as long as possible. I remonstrated with him and told him that I thought the men who had gone to the front in the late war, who had, through injuries or sickness received in the service, been incapacitated from manual labor, should receive the recognition they deserve at the hands of the Government.

I repeat here on the floor of this House what I said to him at that time, that the Government is under every obligation, both moral and otherwise, to do these men justice.

I received a letter to-day from a young man who enlisted in one of our Massachusetts regiments who was stricken down with typhoid fever while in Cuba, confined to the hospital there for five months, and this disease took such a hold on his system that he has become a confirmed invalid, incapable of supporting himself or those who are depending upon him.

His application for pension has been before the Department for six months, yet no action has been taken upon the matter.

Why, Mr. Chairman, the report submitted by the chairman of the committee shows that out of a total of 25,000 applications for pensions on account of sickness or injuries resulting from service in the Spanish-American war only 300 have been granted.

I venture to say that the deaths alone of Massachusetts soldiers in this struggle were easily more than this number.

Massachusetts has a glorious record in this war; she sent more men to the front in proportion to her population than any State in the Union, and while they were actuated by the sincerest patriotism and love of flag to perform their duty, yet I do not think if any of them, through wounds or sickness, have become incapacitated and unable to earn a living, the Government is justified in refusing them and those depending upon them the necessary aid.

Mr. Chairman, though not in actual service, I was an eyewitness to many hardships and sufferings of the soldiers here in the camps in the United States.

I was in and about Camp Alger during the greater part of the time that this camp was occupied by the soldiers, and I saw what was going on.

I witnessed men insufficiently fed and clothed and improperly provided with the modern requirements of soldiery.

I saw sick boys—they were not men—compelled to lie for hours on the cold, damp ground, because of a difference of opinion between the division and regimental surgeons.

At Montauk Point, where I lived for three weeks, sleeping in the same tents with the soldier boys that returned from Cuba, I was an eyewitness to scenes of suffering that would melt the heart of the strongest and bravest men.

I saw boys by the hundred unloaded from the transport, start for the detention camp, a mile away, and fall by the roadside from sheer exhaustion and fever.

I saw the beds in the hospital without proper clothing, and I saw many of the wards in charge of incompetent physicians.

In the detention hospital, although before my arrival there were hundreds of cases in the hospitals at the time, there were no nurses except the soldiers themselves, and the first thing that I did after I had noticed this condition of affairs was to see General Wheeler and ask his permission, which was readily granted, to send for a dozen nurses to Boston. These women were on the ground within forty-eight hours, and hundreds of soldiers are alive to-day indebted for their lives to these noble women.

I could occupy the time of this House for hours relating the sad scenes and incidents that I witnessed at Montauk Point, but it is enough for me to state that I do not care to witness such scenes again. The men who enlisted in the Spanish-American war performed their duty, whether in the camps in this country or in Cuba, Puerto Rico, or the Philippines, in a brave and heroic manner. If any of them are unable as a result of that service to support themselves or those depending upon them, it is the duty of the Government to come to their aid.

Mr. Chairman, I warn the Pension Commissioner that he is committing a grave injustice, if not a crime, before the people of this country if he delays even an hour the granting of the just claims of the Spanish-American war veterans.

Mr. BENTON. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT].

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to send to the Clerk's desk and have read the following clipping taken from the Even-

ing Star, copied from the New York Journal, which will explain the reason why I asked the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin this morning which I did ask during his speech. I want the attention of the House to the reading of this clipping.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE GREEDY PENSION ATTORNEYS.

[From the New York Journal.]

It has come to pass that no orthodox Congressman can feel easy in the House without offering up a breezy and far-reaching pension bill in behalf of his constituency. By all means, let us give the veterans of our wars their just dues. But for the benefit of the veterans themselves we would call attention to a few facts.

If the pension bills now before Congress are passed the yearly pension list will amount to nearly $350,000,000, not including an arrearage list of $500,000,000 more. We might stand even this, but there are features in several of the new bills that are not founded upon justice. Senator CULLOM, of Illinois, has presented a bill which practically rewards desertion and places deserters on the same footing with deserving veterans. By the provisions of this bill deserters, bounty jumpers, and cowards will be paid $10,000,000 a year by the Government.

As if this were not enough, Mr. LENTZ comes forward with a bill calling for $100,000,000 a year for "general service" pensions to those who do not need aid and have probably never asked for it.

Representative HALL adds to the preposterous list with a bill authorizing the Government to pay over $6,000,000 a year to teamsters in the quartermaster's department during the war—to men who were noncombatants and ran but little more danger than if they had been driving trolley cars up Broadway. There is danger in all this. There is danger that the honest old veteran who now receives a small pension from his country may be called upon to pay much of it back into the Treasury in taxes for the payment of unjust pensions to those who do not deserve them. When will Congress call a halt?

Mr. TALBERT. Now, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman yield for one statement?

Mr. TALBERT. Certainly.

Mr. HULL. Is it not a fact that Senator CULLOM introduced that bill by request, and has stated in the public prints that he had not read the bill and that he did not indorse it.

Mr. TALBERT. I did not know anything about that.

Mr. HULL. That is the fact.

Mr. TALBERT. Well, that does not alter the case materially, and in view of the general tendency——

Mr. HULL. I do not think the gentleman would want to do the Senator an injustice.

Mr. TALBERT. Oh, of course not; but I want to say that in view of the general tendency to increase the liberality of the pension laws I only asked the question of gentlemen this morning if it would not be a good time to do away with the Friday night sessions. Now, as is well known by my record in this House, I have never opposed giving a pension to any honest, brave soldier in my judgment who deserved it, and I never expect to oppose any such pension. My contention is that the pension laws on the statute books of the United States are sufficiently liberal for every soldier and soldier's widow who needs it to go to the Bureau with the proper proof and get his or her pension.

Now, in view of the fact that the war is now closed in Cuba and the war is now on in the Philippines, and all the past wars to come in with an increasing pension roll, would it not be well for Congress to call a halt, or at least to do away with the establishment of these Friday night courts here, which can be considered nothing more nor less than appellate courts from the Bureau of Pensions, in order that those who do not deserve pensions may come here and get them and get increase of pensions? The large majority of the bills for special legislation here, as gentlemen know, are for increases and for desertion and for camp followers generally. No doubt there are some deserving cases, and I will always take pleasure in voting for those cases, but I submit, Mr. Chairman, that in view of the fact that this pension roll continues to swell and will continue to grow, would it not be well for us to do away with the Friday night sessions? Now, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. RAY of New York. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. TALBERT. Certainly.

Mr. RAY of New York. Now, you were a pretty constant attendant during last Congress of the Friday night sessions, and you have repeatedly stated that those bills were to pension deserters, coffee coolers, and bounty jumpers.

Mr. TALBERT. Many of them were. I said I did not say all of them were. The gentleman must not put me in a false light, because I will not be put there. I said there were some few deserving, and that I always took pleasure in voting for those, and always voted against those that I thought were not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAY of New York. Will not the gentleman give him time to answer this question?

Mr. TALBERT. Please give me the time.

Mr. BARNEY. I will give the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. RAY of New York. I ask you this: Was there a bill, a single bill, reported from the Committee on Invalid Pensions that came to your knowledge during the last Congress to pension a man who had been a deserter, even by implication, or a man who did not serve and fight in the ranks?

Mr. TALBERT. Why, a number of bills were introduced to remove the charge of desertion, pretendedly, and as soon as the charge of desertion was removed, as a matter of course, the applicant would immediately apply for a pension, notwithstanding the proviso contained in the bill:

Provided, That no pay or emolument shall accrue to the applicant by virtue of this act.

Mr. RAY of New York. Now, I ask the gentleman if there was ever a bill brought in by the Committee on Invalid Pensions——

Mr. TALBERT. I said bills brought in on Friday nights; and there were other bills brought in here that were not only not meritorious, but outrageous.

Mr. RAY of New York (continuing). To pension a man who did not fight with a musket at some time or other?

Mr. TALBERT. Why, we all witnessed the passage of a bill, or at least an effort to pass a bill, for a photographer that never had shouldered a gun, who got shot in the back as he was getting off from the battle of Gettysburg with his pictures and camera [great laughter]; and another man was pensioned for total blindness, when he lost his sight by the bursting of a cannon on some Decoration Day or something of the kind; and I could stand up here for two hours and tell you of numbers of these bills that were passed. That is why I raised my voice against the passage of such bills as that, and I want to say to this House that if you desire to continue such measures at these Friday night sessions you must bring a quorum and do it legally and constitutionally, and then I will say nothing more about it except to oppose unworthy measures.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARNEY. I now yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RAY of New York. Now, Mr. Chairman, in view of what the gentleman has said, I desire to correct him as to his assertion respecting the character of bills introduced here.

Mr. TALBERT. I do not think and did not say that this bill for the pensioning of a photographer was passed at the last Congress, but at some Friday night session.

Mr. RAY of New York. The gentleman said that a bill was brought in here and passed to pension a photographer. Well, now, that bill was brought into the House in the Fifty-fourth Congress, and I believe that it was passed.

Mr. TALBERT. I did not confine myself to the Fifty-fifth Congress.

Mr. RAY of New York. In the last Cougress——

Mr. TALBERT (continuing). I want to say that the gentleman was just about as fair as he could be, and was like the old Irishman who said if he couldn't be easy he would be as easy as he could. [Laughter.] He was as fair as he could be, and it was because those sessions were largely composed of gentlemen who came here logrolling together, and voting for each other's bills because they wanted their own bills passed; and therefore I was opposed to it, and would do all I could to stop it [laughter], and will continue my opposition to all such iniquities.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BARNEY. Now I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York, and not to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. BENTON. Am I to understand this time is yielded to the two gentlemen, the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. BARNEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RAY of New York. Now, Mr. Chairman, all I desire to say in regard to that photographer's bill is that it was reported adversely by the committee in the Fifty-fifth Congress, and all bills of a like character met the same fate; but we did find 650 good bills that became law.

Mr. TALBERT. I want to say to the gentleman that frequently he did right. [Laughter.]

Mr. RAY of New York. The gentleman is robbing me of my time.

Mr. TALBERT. Well, I will not do that.

Mr. RAY of New York. Now, I doubt not, Mr. Chairman, that in this Congress the committee will do its duty, although I have nothing to do with it, and that they can find not only 650 bills, but 1,250 good bills, that should be enacted into law for the benefit of the old soldiers, their widows, and orphans.

Mr. TALBERT. So mote it be. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, this Pension Bureau disburses some $140,000,000 annually, and it is very easy to criticise it in a few isolated cases. In this opposition that has grown up during the last year against the Commissioner of Pensions and the Pension Office there is a class of gentlemen at the bottom of it, and I think the time has now come to have something to say in reference to those gentlemen. It is well known that the city of Washington is infested with what is known as pension shark lawyers. They

will send their circulars all over the country, send blank applications and a blank power of attorney, and get these claimants, whether they are entitled to a pension or not, to sign and execute these papers and return them.

Then they send them a few blank affidavits, and the whole outfit does not cost them 10 cents. From the time these papers are sent out, it is my experience, and it is the experience of every man who lives in a community where these soldiers live, that they must resort to a lawyer, or to the home of the justice of the peace, or to a notary public, or to that man whom we find in nearly every village who sort of looks after things of that kind for the people, and they execute the papers for them. I will take you to the Pension Office and show you that not one case out of forty do these gentlemen ever put in an affidavit in their own handwriting. I have filled up hundreds of these cases, and I never charged a soldier a dime in my life. When the case is made up, and the member of Congress succeeds in getting favorable action upon it, what do these pension shark attorneys do? They walk up to the Treasury of the United States and take their ten-dollar bill or contract for $25 from these claimants, for which they have never rendered one penny of service except to send out a few blanks.

Mr. RAY of New York. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania pardon me a suggestion right there?

Mr. MAHON. Yes, if you do not use up too much of my time.

Mr. RAY of New York. I want to add to what the gentleman says that after the adjournment of the last Congress I received letters from all over this country, in cases where we had granted special pensions, asking me if the attorneys in the cases were entitled to charge $25, $30, and $50, as they were doing, for work that they had never done and cases they never had anything to do with.

Mr. MAHON. Since I have been in this House I have handled over 3,800 pension cases. I live in a country where war raged for four long years, and in a State that furnished 378,000 men to the Union Army, and in a district that put 25,000 men into it. I have requested the Pension Commissioner, and written to him, not to allow these infamous sharks to take a dollar from the claim after it has been allowed.

Now, this appeal that is made to you is in the interests of these sharks who have been robbing the soldiers of this country. [Applause.] In 1898 the present Commissioner paid out $730,000 of the money awarded the soldiers, of which over two-thirds, or one-half, went to the pension sharks of Washington City. I do not refer to the reputable lawyers. I traced a case in this city to find a pension attorney by the name of McBride, and I found him, on Louisiana avenue, to be an Irish washerwoman. The city is infested with these people, and they have neither office nor desks. Now, during the last year the Commissioner in his report under June 30, 1899, says that he paid them instead of $730,000 only $476,969.61, almost $300,000 less than they had received heretofore, and although more pensions had been granted during 1899. Now, for this speech I expect to receive the compliments of a paper called The National Tribune, which claims to represent the soldiers of this country.

It was these pension sharks, through that paper, that have stirred up the soldiers all over the country, and I am one of the men in favor of passing a law, or putting it into this bill, indorsing the Commissioner of Pensions and providing that these men shall not rob the claimants of the money allowed them by this General Government. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why not put it into this bill?

Mr. MAHON. We have not reached that point yet. I want to say that the commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, at their convention held in the city of Philadelphia within the last year, appointed a committee of men who were prominent during the war—and my Comrade NORTON, from Ohio, knows all about it—and sent them over to the city of Washington.

Pension Commissioner Evans threw open the doors and gave the committee all the information desired, and after a thorough and complete investigation by the representatives of the Grand Army of the Republic in the United States, who represented these men fairly and honestly, the committee went back to that great encampment and made a report that this infamous lie created by these pension sharks was without foundation and without proof. And that great body of the old Army, numbering thousands of delegates, indorsed the Commissioner and said his administration of that office was just and in the interest of the old soldier of the civil war. I am sorry that any member of this House, if there is such, will allow these men to lead him into an attack on the Pension Office.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have a paper here, brief and concise, that gives the situation and the business of the Pension Office during the past year. I propose to put it in the RECORD alongside of that of our complaining friends, and when it is printed in the RECORD to-morrow morning, I defy any man, whether Republican, Democrat, or Populist, to read this paper, and then come in here and say that the Commissioner of Pensions has not fully and to the utmost extent discharged the duties of that high office. [Applause.]

The average amount paid annually to each pensioner, invalid, and widow now on the rolls, is $132.74, a magnificent record made by the Congress of the United States. The annual value of the entire pension roll amounts to $131,617,961. I am now speaking of the year just closed, that amount being $649,496 more than has ever been paid out in any single year in the history of the Pension Office.

Notwithstanding this fact, that we have made this large increase over all previous years, still the Pension Department is criticised for its illiberality. I have had under my own supervision and under my own notice cases in which there were hardships, no doubt. In those cases I felt that justice had not been done the claimants, as my friend from Ohio and my friend from Massachusetts have said. But where is there a court in Christendom, where is there a judge, or where is there any tribunal anywhere of which litigants do not complain that they have not had full justice done them? And in this great Bureau, which last year handled over 153,000 cases, why, if a case involving a little hardship now and then did not occur, it would be extraordinary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania three minutes more.

Mr. MAHON. Now, Mr. Chairman, gentlemen on the other side say, Why not settle these cases at once? I remember when a Democratic Congress opposed an increase in the annual appropriation. I am not complaining of that. Perhaps that is politics; but when we, on this side, are in power, they are always willing on that side to see an increase of pension appropriations. They help to swell the appropriations that will be charged against the Republican party.

But before I close I want to say this in behalf of the old soldiers of the civil war. I want to say to gentlemen on the other side of the House that we can not complain of their want of generosity, and one of the most marvelous spectacles that has ever been seen in a parliamentary body is to see the men whom we met in battle showing this spirit of liberality. I have been here nearly eight years, and in all that time I am free to confess that I never heard a man who served in the Confederate army, and who is upon the floor of this House, criticise the pension policy of the Government. And on behalf of the Union soldier of the North, the East, and the West I say we owe our thanks to the gentlemen on the other side who stand in this position for their generosity in allowing these pensions to go through.

I know there is an occasional critic here. Even my good friend from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT], genial and kind as he is, during the entire session of the Fifty-fifth Congress, even on Friday nights, never raised his voice against a private pension bill. I am informed that he had a contest on hand, and in consideration of his kindness toward the people on our side of the House we permitted him to hold his seat. [Laughter.] I only wish there was a contest on hand now; not for the purpose of putting anybody out, because I would vote to keep them all in, but I wish there was a contest on hand now, so gentlemen would not make some of these speeches against private bills. [Laughter.]

Mr. TALBERT. I want to say to the gentleman that he is entirely mistaken, because during that Congress I opposed more bills than during any other since I have been here, and I am not afraid of any contest, because you can not throw me out, and I will do my duty regardless of consequences.

Mr. MAHON. I want to say to the gentleman that in his efforts to defeat the teamster, the deserter, and the camp robber I am with him heart and hand, and I hope the present Pension Committee will give a black eye to every bill of that kind during the present Congress. I want to say, further, that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT] has always kept silent on all meritorious bills, but always opposed improper ones.

Mr. TALBERT. I thank you, sir. You are sometimes right.

Mr. MAHON. Now, Mr. Chairman, with these few remarks I want to ask leave to print a statement which I hold in my hand to append to my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked to print a statement in the RECORD in connection with the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. BENTON. What is it that the gentleman wants to put in the RECORD?

Mr. MAHON. It is a review of the work of the Pension Office during the last year. It simply presents some facts without any comment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

The annual report of Hon. H. Clay Evans, Commissioner of Pensions, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899, will present some very interesting facts in connection with the condition of the pension roll at this time and the operations of the Pension Bureau during the year.

There are now on the rolls the names of 11 surviving widows and daughters of Revolutionary soldiers, as follows:

Name.	Age.	Residence.
Widows.		
Esther S. Damon	85	Plymouth Union, Vt.
Nancy Jones	85	Jonesboro, Tenn.
Rebecca Mayo	86	Newbern, Va.
Mary Snead	83	Parksley, Va.
Daughters.		
Hannah Newell Barrett	99	Boston, Mass.
Susannah Chadwick	84	Emporium, Pa.
Sarah C. Hurlburt	81	Little Marsh, Pa.
Eliza Sanford	.....	Bloomfield, N. J.
Ann M. Slaughter	89	Mitchell Station, Va.
Rhoda Augusta Thompson	78	Woodbury, Conn.
Augusta Fuller	.....	Bridgeport, Conn.

WAR OF 1812.

Hiram Cronk, of North Western, N. Y., is the only surviving pensioned soldier of the war of 1812. He is 99 years of age, and he served with the troops from New York.

The number of widows on the rolls, based on service of their husbands in the war of 1812, is 1,998.

INDIAN WARS, 1832 TO 1842.

One thousand six hundred and fifty-six surviving soldiers and 3,899 widows are pensioned, based upon service in the Indian wars.

WAR WITH MEXICO.

For service in the war with Mexico 9,204 surviving soldiers and 8,175 widows of soldiers who served in that war are pensioned.

On June 30, 1898, the total number of pensioners was	993,714
On June 30, 1899, the number was	991,519
Decrease	2,195

During the year there were added to the rolls the names of 40,991 pensioners, and 43,186 names were dropped, of which number 34,345 were dropped by reason of death.

The amount appropriated for the payment of pensions for the year was		$140,000,000
Amount paid out by disbursing agencies for pensions.	$138,253,923	
Amount paid out by Treasury	101,129	
		138,355,052
Balance in Treasury		1,644,948

The average amount paid annually to each pensioner (invalids and widows) now on the rolls is $132.74, and the annual value of the entire pension roll amounts to $131,617,961, being $649,496 more than it ever was. The average annual value of each class of pensions is higher than last year.

The pension roll is made up of 753,451 surviving soldiers, 237,415 widows and dependent relatives, and 653 army nurses.

The "navy pension fund" yielded only $342,275 for the year, while the total payments on account of navy pensions was $3,683,794.

The payments on account of pensions under the general law for the year were	$71,115,703
On account of the war with Spain	28,606
On account of pensions under the act of June 27, 1890	64,321,460

The number of pensioners residing in foreign countries is 4,306, and the amount paid to them is $653,309.70. Of this number 2,139 are residents of Canada, 415 reside in Ireland, 605 in Germany, and 321 in England.

The amount of first payments on all certificates issued during the year was $9,247,957.75; full amount of fees paid to attorneys, $476,969.61; for the year 1898 it was $730,000.

The total disbursements to army and navy pensioners since 1866 was	$2,389,910,974.74

For the same period the following disbursements have been made for the purposes stated, viz:

Fees of examining surgeons	$15,490,986
Maintaining pension agencies	12,062,178
Salaries and other expenses of the Pension Bureau	52,237,226

The total number of original applications for pension filed during the year, including those filed on account of the war with Spain, and old wars, was	48,765
The number of original claims allowed during the year was	37,077
Number restored to the rolls	3,914

The rates of pension to soldiers and sailors now on the rolls under the act of June 27, 1890, range as follows:

$6 per month	105,787
$8 per month	128,143
$10 per month	36,540
$12 per month (maximum rate)	160,406

The number of claims of all kinds allowed and in which certificates were issued during the year was as follows:

Old wars	1,559
General laws	20,066
Act of June 27, 1890	58,429
Total allowances	80,054

The total number of pieces of mail handled in the mail division of the Bureau for the year was 5,773,512.

The Army and Navy survivors' division added to the list of survivors of the civil war the names and addresses of 178,906 persons, and furnished the addresses to claimants and others of 223,470 comrades.

On June 30, 1898, there were 635,069 claims pending before the Bureau.

The number of claims of all classes pending on June 30, 1899, was 477,239, a decrease for the year of 157,830 claims.

The number of claimants of all classes, including those based upon service in the war with Spain, who have not received any pension, is 135,641. Excluding army nurses and soldiers of the war with Spain, there are only 69,468 soldier claimants who have not yet been pensioned.

Of the number of pending claims, 305,042 are claims in which pension has heretofore been granted and in which an additional allowance or an increase of rate is claimed.

The Commissioner has given the right of way to original claims in which no pension has ever been allowed, deeming it just and proper that such claims should have the preference.

The number of claims based upon service in the war with Spain filed during the year was 17,560, and during the same period 303 claims of this class were allowed.

Since April 1, 1897, the Commissioner has reinstated in the Bureau 157 and in the agencies 23 ex-Union soldiers or sailors, making 180 in all. During the same period there have been promoted in the Bureau 287 and in the different agencies 29 ex-Union soldiers or sailors.

The law which provides that preference shall be given to ex-Union soldiers and sailors in employment has been strictly observed in the Bureau.

Considerable progress has been made in bringing up the arrears of work in the Bureau. The work on original claims is practically current, and the work of ordering medical examinations in increase claims is being pushed, so that very little time now elapses between dates of filing and ordering the medical examinations in this class of cases.

The Commissioner reports the work in far better condition than at any time since April, 1897, and it is believed that further progress will be attained by the systems instituted in the different divisions.

The Commissioner calls attention to the fact that order 225, issued June 9, 1893, which provided for a readjustment of rates of pensions previously granted under the operations of order No. 164, is still in force, but he states that no revision of rates under said order has been made under his administration.

During the year 107,919 claims of all classes were rejected in the Bureau. A careful analysis of the causes of rejection of so many claims is given, showing that a large percentage of rejections occur in claims for increase, new disabilities, and other claims in which additional allowance of some kind is claimed.

A full and detailed explanation as to the causes of delay in the adjudication of claims is presented, from which it appears that in nearly every case of unusual delay the fault lies with claimants or their attorneys and not with the Bureau.

Complaints have been made against the Bureau for the stoppage of the pensions of those who enlisted or accepted commissions in the war with Spain. These pensions ceased by operation of law and not by any order or instructions from the Bureau.

Up to this date the number of reenlistments of pensioners for service in the war with Spain has been reported as 13 of the Navy, 44 of the Regular Army, and 66 of the war of the rebellion.

Out of 4,941 cases in which action has been taken by the Department in appeals from the action of the Bureau, the Bureau was reversed in 371, and many of these were cases in which the adverse action had been taken before April, 1897.

One thousand one hundred and thirty-seven claims have been filed under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1899, which provides that one-half of the soldier's pension shall be paid to his wife or minor children in cases of abandonment and other specified conditions.

Fiscal year ended June 30, 1899.

[Act June 27, 1890.]

Claims.	Filed.	Allowed.
Invalid	6,860	18,525
Widows	12,505	
Minors	1,066	
Mothers	169	
Fathers	97	
Brothers and sisters	8	
	13,845	12,100
	20,705	30,625
For increase	34,390	27,804
Total original claims filed		28,301
Total original claims allowed		36,782
		8,481

MEMORANDA EXPLANATORY OF REPORT OF RECORD DIVISION.

Total claims filed under general law, viz		45,351
First. Deduct duplicate applications:		
Invalid	1,180	
Widows and dependents	919	
		2,099
		43,252
Second. Deduct applications for increase		31,770
		11,482
Third. Deduct for those already pensioned under act of 1890:		
Invalids	986	
Widows and dependents	924	
		1,910
		9,572
Fourth. Deduct for those having claims pending under act of 1890:		
Invalids	866	
Widows and dependents	1,110	
		1,976
Leaving number of new claimants		7,596
Invalids		1,412
Widows		5,200
Minors		789
Mothers		75
Fathers		64
Brothers and sisters		18
Nurses		38
Total		7,596

WAR WITH SPAIN.

Total number of claims filed		17,345
First. Deduct duplicate applications	318	
Second. Deduct for claims filed under both laws	25	
Third. Deduct applications for increase	5	
Deduct applications on file for prior service	11	
	16	
		359
Total		16,986

Leaving number of original claimants as follows:		
Invalids		14,501
Widows		612
Minors		57
Mothers:		
General law	1,117	
Act of 1890	373	
		1,490
Fathers:		
General law	219	
Act of 1890	101	
		320
Brothers and sisters, general law		6
		16,986
Of this number, there have been pensioned:		
Invalids		119
Widows		176
Total		295
Total number of claims filed		85,754
First. Deduct duplicate applications:		
Invalids	22,784	
Widows and dependents	1,516	
		24,300
		61,454
Second. Deduct applications for increase		34,330
		27,124
Third. Deduct for those already pensioned under general laws:		
Invalids	2,342	
Widows and dependents	230	
		2,572
		24,552
Fourth. Deduct for those having claims pending under general laws:		
Invalids	1,537	
Widows and dependents	2,310	
		3,847
Leaving number of new claimants		20,705
Invalids		6,860
Widows		12,505
Minors		1,066
Mothers		169
Fathers		97
Brothers and sisters		8
Total		20,705

Mr. BALL. Mr. Chairman, whether this body is in favor of a liberal pension system or interested in economy in public expenditures, there is one platform upon which we ought to be able to agree, and that is that neither economy nor justice to pensioners now upon the rolls can be promoted by the war which is being carried on in the Philippine Islands. [Laughter on the Republican side.] I know that gentlemen laugh, I know that men who have served in the Senate of the United States and elsewhere with distinction and honor for many years, who venture to oppose this policy, are denounced as traitors and accused of prolonging the hostilities in those unhappy islands.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, it matters not to me what they say. I am answerable to my constituents for my views upon this floor. But there was a time when kind words were said in this country for Pitt, for Burke, for Chatham, and for Fox, who denounced the war in progress when our forefathers were fighting for their liberty. Later on, Mr. Chairman, when the Mexican war was in progress, Mr. Lincoln, whose name is revered by every man upon that side of the House and on this side of the House and throughout the country, was a member of Congress. I read from Holland's Life of Lincoln:

> The opposition in this Congress were placed in a very difficult and perplexing position. They hated the war; they believed it to have been unnecessarily begun by the act of the United States, and not by the act of Mexico; they were accused of being treacherous to the cause and honor of the country because they opposed the war in which the country was engaged; they felt obliged to vote supplies to the Army because it would have been inhuman to do otherwise, yet this act was seized upon by the President to show that his position touching the war was sustained by them; they felt compelled to condemn the Commander in Chief of the armies, sitting in the White House, and to vote thanks to the generals who had successfully executed his orders in the field.

How history repeats itself. In many respects the situation then was not unlike the situation now, so far as the men are concerned who venture to criticise the war begun and carried on by this Administration without constitutional right or authority. How stood Mr. Lincoln in that crucial period of his country's history? His biographer, Holland, says:

> Mr. Polk, at that time the President of the United States, was evidently anxious to justify the war which he had commenced against Mexico, and to vindicate his own action before the American people, if not before his own judgment and conscience. His messages to Congress were burdened with this effort, and Mr. Lincoln had hardly become wonted to his seat when he made an unsuccessful effort to bring the President to a statement of facts, upon which Congress and the country might either verify or falsify his broad and general asseverations. On the 22d of December he introduced a series of resolutions which, had they been adopted, would have given the President an opportunity to furnish the grounds of his allegations and set himself right before the nation.
>
> * * * * * * *

Mr. BALL. The Congress and Mr. Lincoln expressed themselves in strong terms by a joint resolution condemning the President.

Referring to votes cast by Mr. Lincoln, Holland says:

> Indeed, on the very day which saw these votes recorded he had an opportunity to vote that the war "was unnecessarily and unconstitutionally begun by the President of the United States," in company with nearly all the Whig members of the House, Southern no less than Northern. The same men voted thanks to General Taylor for his brilliant achievements in the war.

But, Mr. Chairman, in the debate which followed Mr. Lincoln criticised in the severest terms not only the bringing on and conduct of the war, but the President's motives and purposes.

We have progressed since then. It is treason now to do what Mr. Lincoln did. If we are traitors, was not he? In the same Congress Mr. Lincoln on the 12th of January made a great speech, from which I quote.

Mr. Lincoln spoke as follows:

> Mr. Chairman, some, if not all, of the gentlemen on the other side of the House who have addressed the committee within the last two days have spoken rather complainingly, if I have rightly understood them, of the vote given a week or ten days ago declaring that the war with Mexico was unnecessarily and unconstitutionally commenced by the President. I admit that such a vote should not be given in mere party wantonness, and that the one given is justly censurable, if it have no other or better foundation. I am one of those who joined in that vote and did so under my best impression of the truth of the case.
>
> Now, sir, for the purpose of obtaining the very best evidence as to whether Texas had actually carried her revolution to the place where the hostilities of the present war commenced, let the President answer the interrogatories I proposed, as before mentioned, or some other similar ones. Let him answer fully, fairly, and candidly. Let him answer with facts, and not with arguments. Let him remember he sits where Washington sat; and, so remembering, let him answer as Washington would answer. As a nation should not, and the Almighty will not, be evaded, so let him attempt no evasion, no equivocation. And if, so answering, he can show that the soil was ours where the first blood of the war was shed, that it was not within an inhabited country, or if within such, that the inhabitants had submitted themselves to the civil authority of Texas or of the United States, and that the same is true of the site of Fort Brown, then I am with him for his justification.
>
> In that case I shall be most happy to reverse the vote I gave the other day. I have a selfish motive for desiring that the President may do this. I expect to give some votes in connection with the war, which, without his so doing, will be of doubtful propriety in my own judgment, but which will be free from the doubt if he does so. But if he can not or will not do this—if, on any pretense or no pretense, he shall refuse or omit it—then I shall be fully convinced, of what I more than suspect already, that he is deeply conscious of being in the wrong; that he feels the blood of this war, like the blood of Abel, is crying to heaven against him; that he ordered General Taylor into the midst of a peaceful Mexican settlement purposely to bring on a war; that originally having some strong motive—what I will not stop now to give my opinion concerning—to involve the two countries in a war, and trusting to escape scrutiny by fixing the public gaze upon the exceeding brightness of military glory—that attractive rainbow that rises in showers of blood; that serpent's eye that charms to destroy—he plunged into it, and has swept on and on, till, disappointed in his calculation of the ease with which Mexico might be subdued, he now finds himself he knows not where. How like the half insane mumbling of a fevered dream is the whole war part of the late message.

Following this scathing denunciation of the President, Mr. Lincoln ventured to suggest his conception of the then President's state of mind, which may not be inapplicable to the situation of our present Executive:

> He is a bewildered, confounded, and miserably perplexed man. God grant he may be able to show that there is not something about his conscience more painful than all his mental perplexities.

In the same speech, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Lincoln gave expression to his ideas of a people's right to their liberties, which, uttered now by those of us who believe them true, would subject us to criticism as furnishing encouragement to Aguinaldo and his men. I therefore let Mr. Lincoln speak, and should his language find response in the hearts of the Filipinos and encourage them to further effort, let the responsibility rest upon the great father of the Republican party, Mr. Lincoln, who said:

> Any people anywhere, being inclined and having the power, have the right to rise up and shake off the existing government and form a new one that suits them better. This is a most valuable, a most sacred right—a right which we hope and believe is to liberate the world. Nor is this right confined to cases in which the whole people of an existing government may choose to exercise it. Any portion of such people that can may revolutionize and make their own of so much of the territory as they inhabit.

Mr. BENTON. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ].

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Chairman, I favor and shall continue to urge and vote for a liberal and generous interpretation of such pension laws as are now on the books, and I favor additional laws and at this time want to bring to the attention of this Congress a fact which others probably have met with, and which is happening entirely too often in my district and in other districts. A young man entered the civil war without the consent of his parents, at an age at which he had no right to go into the service.

He served a few weeks and was taken out of the service, and as soon as he was old enough he again enlisted and served for three years and then received an honorable discharge, having, however, marked up against him on his record as a minor the word "Deserter." He drew a pension notwithstanding that fact, and died about two years ago. His widow is before the Pension Department asking a pension, and throughout all these miserable months the Pension Department has held that widow at bay, saying that

this record of desertion against her husband prevents them from granting it.

Now, it seems to me that if there were a liberal and generous interpretation of the pension laws, or even a technical interpretation, such cases as this would be followed with an immediate allowance of the widow's pension. Suppose the minors had signed a promissory note, the court would have said, "It is null and void and of no effect." So I say they should have given the widow a pension in this case at once. The first enlistment was void from the beginning, and hence no charge of desertion should be considered or entertained. The fact that he was marked as a deserter when he was a minor should not bar her from a pension, and it ought to be sufficient for her to prove that fact alone. As soon as he became old enough he went into the service, served his full term of three years, and received an honorable discharge, which ought in itself to be all the evidence required at the Pension Department. There is neither a liberal nor generous construction at the Pension Department in cases like this nor in many others.

It seems to me that in this case there is absolutely a misconstruction of the law, and we ought to have legislation, either in connection with this bill or as soon as possible thereafter, providing that this widow and all widows shall go at once upon the pension roll where there has been a pension granted to the husband. There is no good reason why many of them, dependent as they are, should have to wait until Congress can pass a special bill in their behalf. The mere fact that the husband has been on the pension list ought to be sufficient, and the widow's pension should begin at once upon the death of her husband if he was on the pension roll at that time. I for one fail to see why any such construction should be put upon the pension law as has been in this case and many others against widows.

The death of the husband of course means a funeral, means funeral expenses, means a readjustment and an entirely different mode of living in many, many homes. It generally means a widow and dependent children; and if there ever is an hour when the family of an old soldier deserves consideration, it is immediately after the funeral; and I propose at the earliest opportunity to introduce a bill and in it provide that where a pensioner dies leaving a widow, the widow shall go at once upon the pension roll and there continue until a proper showing has been made why she should be stricken from the pension roll; and of the purpose to strike her name from the pension roll due and ample notice should be given her, so that she shall have an opportunity to make a showing why she is entitled to have her name remain.

Within the next ten years that Old Reaper called "Death" will mow down the old soldiers with his scythe faster than the swords and guns did in the civil war, and I for one am unwilling to see bills coming to the House by the thousands asking for relief for soldiers and soldiers' widows and those bills held up and never disposed of from term to term.

Let us have general laws to cover these thousands of meritorious cases that are now before Congress, but will probably never be reached, because we are devoting all of our time in these days of colonialism and imperialism to minding the business of people on the other side of the earth, rather than legislating in behalf of our own family at home.

It is for this reason that I have introduced the service-pension bill, and I take peculiar pleasure and pride in the fact that my bill stands as No. 11 among the several thousand bills already introduced in the Fifty-sixth Congress, and I do not propose to allow it to be forgotten that this bill was introduced on the first day of this Congress, and that it is entitled to an early consideration. I am aware that there is a disposition to ignore pension legislation, but if there ever was a time when a service-pension bill ought to be passed this is the session for that work.

I have observed that some on this floor are quite free in their criticism of the pension attorneys, but it seems to me that that is rather an evasion of the issue. If the Government paid the old soldiers the pensions due them under the laws as they now stand on the books, or had adjusted the claims, of which there are more than 600,000 on file and undisposed of, there might be some reason for complaining that the old soldiers have become impatient and are searching right and left for attorneys and politicians and members of the House of Representatives and Senators to help them secure a just and early settlement of that which has been so long due and denied them.

Why should not this Government pay the old soldiers what it owes them under the laws as they now exist, and do it as promptly as private citizens are expected to make settlements with their grocers and their butchers? Why should a man be obliged to wait five, ten, or fifteen years to have a pension claim adjusted and allowed? What right has anyone on this floor to criticise an old soldier for securing the services of a pension attorney and also asking the assistance of a Congressman to secure some little attention to his claim when his own letters are ignored and left unanswered even for a year at a time?

So far as the pension attorneys in my district are concerned, I have no complaint to register against them. I believe they are doing their duty as faithfully as any other class of attorneys. It is possible that some of them may be open to criticism, but in that they are not different from other attorneys, nor even from the physicians, the merchants, and possibly occasionally the preachers. It is human to err, and I have very little patience with the effort made by certain Congressmen to hold up the pension attorney and abuse him, when in fact the fault is really with the administration of the Pension Department.

The time has come when the members of this House ought to put a service-pension law in the statute books and provide for a more prompt and business-like adjustment of pension claims, and in connection with it provide a court of appeals, to which pension claims could be taken and promptly adjudicated. As it is to-day, at least one-half of the time of the Congressmen is taken in doing mere clerical work in connection with pension claims, when that time ought to be given by the members to a more careful study and consideration of the hundreds of millions of dollars that are now being expended annually by the Federal Government, concerning which but very few of us have any time to thoroughly inform ourselves.

Common sense and business sense both suggest that we ought to formulate our pension laws and regulate our Pension Department so that that subject would require less attention from the members of this House and give us an opportunity to save many millions of dollars in the other departments, which might more creditably and more honorably be applied in settlement of the claims of the men who saved the Union and for the time being relieved our Republic from the shame of slavery.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. Chairman, I believe after the statement of the gentleman who has just taken his seat, that if the proof can be made in regard to the allegation which he has made, General Ainsworth will see to it that the charge of desertion is removed from that boy's name. I believe if you have the testimony, you can get justice in that office. That is my observation and experience.

I congratulate my Republican friends on that side of the House that in the beginning of another Presidential canvass they have found a scapegoat on this pension question. I felicitate the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the Republican party in laying the whole trouble on the pension attorneys. I know that he is found somewhat an obstreperous animal. He gives us all more or less annoyance, and he gives you an excuse to defend your Administration. I thought some two or three years ago we had escaped him, when there was a rule made that we were not to call up cases on the invitation of pension attorneys. But he was too smart for that. He prepared the letter and directed the applicant to direct it to the Congressman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I in a humble way represent a class of men that are getting scarce in this country. There are a hundred and seventy-odd men on this side of the House, and of them there are 23 of us who represented a cause whose flag has long since been rolled up and put away forever. In a humble way I represent a class of men who never undertook at any time to break down and destroy the Federal Government of the United States, but a class of men who believed they could establish a government that would suit them better.

The armies of the Union, under the flag of the Union, successfully prevented the establishment of the Confederacy, and we came back into the Union and have become a part of it, and we are here to-day; and for those men, not only who are here on the floor, but for the thousands who are at home, I may be permitted to say that for thirty-odd years those men have gone on as best they could, some of them maimed and halt, most of them poor and needy, a great many of them without friends who were able to help them.

These men who came home from the battlefields after the war to find chimneys without houses, to find their farms and fences destroyed; those men who had once been used to ease and comfort came to despoiled homes. They did not lie down amid the ashes of despair and weep; but, on the contrary, gentlemen, they turned their backs to the moonlight of the past and their faces to the sunlight of the future. They vigorously took up life's labor.

They have steadily gone on to earn themselves a living; and though it has been thirty-odd years, I have yet to find a single Confederate soldier of the line ever complain, not only that he gets no pension from the Government, but has never complained at paying his part of the taxes that go to make up pensions for the soldiers of the Union. [Applause on the Republican side.] These old Confederate soldiers have long ago built up the waste places of the South, and they have as honorable records in peace as they made in war. [Applause on both sides.] The old Confederate stands in the front rank in every community where he lives. He is honest, faithful, and true. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, we had just as well come to see what we are up

against. We not only have on the pension rolls pensioners to pay whose pensions are close to $145,000,000 this year, but the Commissioner of Pensions tells us that he has 26,000 applications on account of the Spanish-American war.

It is no use for gentlemen on that side to lay the whole blame for tardy work on the Commissioner. He is under the Secretary, and is only an underofficer of the Administration. If pensions are delayed and claims rejected that should be allowed, lay the blame where it belongs—to the Administration.

Of course these Spanish war claims are being added to every day by soldiers returned from the Philippine Islands, and they will continue to increase. The amount of money paid out for pensions this year is not $140,000,000, but it is certain the amount of money which we appropriated in this bill will be used and probably more.

First, because the number of persons who will be added to the roll on account of the increase of widows and orphans will keep up the amount of money to the present sum, so that by the death of soldiers we will hardly gain anything for the Treasury. Then, in addition to that, the pensions of soldiers of the Spanish-American war, in my opinion, will run the sum up to $144,000,000.

Another thing; a bill has passed the Senate of the United States, and will inevitably pass the House, to pension widows whose income is not over $250 by their own exertion. Also in that same bill is a provision to permit the Pension Office to take the disabilities and cumulate them, so that the applicant can draw a pension.

When this bill passes it will, in my opinion, add from one to two million dollars a year; so that while we are under the law that we are it is idle and useless for gentlemen to criticise the pension action. My own opinion is that in the effort to keep down the pensions within the appropriations each year the Pension Office does not work with the rapidity and zeal it ought.

There is another thing that I have never been able to understand—and I know a good deal about the pension business, because I have a number of pension claims and I harass that office frequently—and that is, that the law indicates clearly, to my mind, that a man shall be pensioned from the date of his application if the testimony shows that at the date of the application he had the ailment for which he asks to be pensioned.

Mr. RAY of New York. Not exactly that, if the gentleman will pardon me, but if at the time of filing the application he had a disability to a pensionable degree.

Mr. BENTON. Yes; if he was pensionable at all. I believe that that law has not been carried out during this Administration, nor by the last. Pensioners are frequently called upon to go before the board and a pension is granted, usually at the smallest amount, and it does not date back to the application in any case that I have ever had.

Now, a word about the private pension bills. Complaints have been made by my friend on this side of the House about some pension bill having been granted that ought not to have been granted. I do not know about that. I was of the opinion that the Invalid Pensions Committee, under the lead of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY], was exceedingly careful, if not stingy, during the Fifty-fifth Congress. I did not learn until late in that Congress that I myself must pick out one or two bills and try to get them through.

I introduced something like twenty bills. I came within an ace of getting one through. Just about two days before Congress adjourned an affidavit which the chairman required me to get was forthcoming, and I am sure that the gentleman from New York would have reported the bill favorably for that widow if Congress had not expired. So I came within one of getting one pension bill passed out of the twenty I introduced. Now, if other gentlemen did not do any better than I did, the complaint they would have was that the Pension Committee was not liberal enough for them.

Mr. RAY of New York. Will the gentleman permit a suggestion right there for the benefit of the House?

Mr. BENTON. Yes.

Mr. RAY of New York. Speaking about the requirements of the committee that gentlemen of the House should point out the bills they want considered, we had referred to our committee somewhere between five and six thousand bills. It was not within the possibility for us to take up the bills and examine their merits and look through them, and therefore we had to ask members of the House to call to our attention the bills they wanted considered first. So no one could complain of that action.

Mr. BENTON. Now, gentlemen, I have not very much more to say, except this: The amount which your subcommittee found has been added—a very small amount—to what was suggested by the Department. The Commissioner of Pensions came before the subcommittee and insisted upon having $15,000 for the use of the pension agencies throughout the country. I readily voted for that, for I did not want the office here to have any sort of excuse for saying that Congress refused to give them a clerical force sufficient to transact the business of the office.

Now, I am not going to fall over myself against the allowance of pensions, for as long as we have the laws on the statute books which we have, then, in my opinion, they ought to be fairly construed by the executive officer. I have no doubt, I say to gentlemen on this side of the House, that they are now and then wrong. I am satisfied some men are able to prove more than others. I have seen men getting no pension at all. I have got a number of cases in my own mind which come about in a very unfortunate way.

Under the old law men are required to prove by somebody that the wound occurred in the line of battle or in the line of duty. I have in mind one case where a man was shot and taken to a hospital; while in the hospital he took the smallpox and came out of it deaf. He is not getting any pension. Unfortunately, he could not draw one under the law of 1890 because of the law, and he could not draw one under the law of 1862, for the reason that there is not and has not for twenty-five years been a single man living who knew absolutely that he was shot in the line of duty, although the proof was made—and I think that is a hardship—by a sergeant of another squad that came on him while he was down.

But no comrade was around there, and the Pension Office will not grant him a pension for that reason. There are a number of such hardships. I have no doubt a number of claims are allowed at the Pension Office that are unjust, because of the fact that some men can prove more than others and prove it easier. I know men justly complain who draw six or seven dollars a month for a very small disability that occurred while in the Army, and other men are drawing $12 a month who got sick after the war was long over.

These things look unfair to gentlemen. Let me say to you, the very best thing we can do is to watch and see whether the executive officers of the Government fairly construe the law under which they act.

Now, as far as I am concerned, I am not going to quarrel with anybody, but my judgment is that nothing good can come of criticising these large pension bills. They are not going to grow any smaller for several years, and you will find that in a short time young Congressmen from Georgia, Tennessee, Alabama, and Virginia will clamor just as hard for pensions to the soldiers of the Spanish-American war as will our Republican friends from Iowa, Illinois, and Ohio and Indiana for pensions for the old veterans of the civil war. It is altogether according to how hard you are pressed, and by whom you are surrounded, as to where your heart is on this question. [Applause and laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENTON] has two minutes remaining.

Mr. BARNEY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I have just taken a letter from the post-office, which I wish to read. It is from a widow asking assistance for another. She says:

> This is a case of Mrs. ——, whose husband died last May. He drew a pension for a few years previous to his death, and she has tried very hard to obtain the widow's pension, but as yet has not succeeded. She is a very worthy woman. Her husband left her with a farm, but no money. She is over 70 years of age, and really needs this.

Now, I have no desire to criticise the Pension Office, and I am not going to do so; but this is simply a type of very many letters which I have received, and I have in mind now the case of a widow in my own town who has property valued at $3,000 by the assessor. It is a little home out in the country. She lives in it herself. She is 70 years or more of age, with absolutely no income whatever. Yet the ownership of this property is charged to her as affording an income greater than any pension that she would receive, and she has been refused a pension by the Pension Office.

I desire to ask the chairman of the committee, not only for my own information, but for the information of the people of my district, whether any legislation is pending which will remove and do away with this injustice, and whether such legislation, if pending, construes the way in which an income is to be figured, and if, for instance, this old widow, 70 years of age, must have her $3,000 home assessed as equivalent to an income of a hundred dollars? If so, where is the money coming from with which she shall pay her taxes and repairs and then have any income whatever left upon which to live? I ask the gentleman in charge of this bill if in closing this debate he will not explain what seems to me to be the most difficult subject at present arising in the administration of the pension laws, namely, the question of the construction of a widow's income from property which she may have in her possession?

Mr. WEEKS. Is there not a bill pending to raise it to $250?

Mr. HILL. I do not know. I should like to ask the gentleman in charge of this bill a question. I understood from the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENTON] and also from the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WEEKS] that it is proposed to raise the amount to $250 a year. I should like to know if mortgage indebtedness on property owned by a widow is to be deducted from the amount of possible income which might be received?